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How to field strip a baby.
by Dalrock | June 19, 2010 | Link

Field stripping a baby is really no big deal. It doesn’t require any special tools (no disrespect to the great John Browning), and the cleaning patches are pre soaked with the required solvent. But always assume the baby is loaded and keep it pointed in a safe direction.

Cleaning patches for field stripping a baby

I posted this over on Citizen Renegade in response to an assertion made by Doug1 that men should rarely change diapers, leaving the basic care of very young children to women:

Doug1:

I didn’t say never. I specifically said that emergency or unexpected situations could arise; then I would and it’s fine. But I do think changing diapers, and generally caring for infants, is women’s work, yes. (That can also be hired women in part.) I also think that dealing with teenagers of either sex tends to be more a dad’s work, if he’s a good father. It’s mom’s too, but mother’s without present dad’s in the home and much better the biodad, tend to have a hard time with teenagers, or most of them.

The context being that women and men not only have natural roles when it comes to housekeeping, child rearing, etc, but that deviating from this tends to make both women and men less happy, and specifically is an attraction killer for women when men fail to act in a manly way. I think I agree with Doug1 in general (game does seem to have a great deal of validity) but I have much less hesitation than him to step in and change my kid’s diapers. Part of it is an aversion to lazyness. If something needs to be done now, my preference isn’t to go looking for a woman to do it. This is especially true if my wife is taking a nap (nursing moms have difficult sleep schedules). Also, our newborn son needs regular trips to the doctor and children’s hospital (nothing serious long term with treatment now), and I’ve been the one taking him. Some of the things docs have to do to kids are downright difficult for moms to watch.

Fortunately my wife and I finally solved our disagreement on which diaper bag to get for our son. Like so many couples, we disagreed on which camo pattern the diaper bag should be. She is more of a traditionalist and wanted woodland, while I prefer a more modern waterfowl hunting pattern. Although it technically is a bag for duck and goose hunting, it works great and keeps everything organized!

Dalrock’s diaper bag

Overall, I think women in general have been fed a very strange view about parenting. So many are terrified of being pigeon holed into what they see as the inferior role of the mother, but they can’t fulfill the role of father.
Polymath added the following insight:

Diapers are no big deal, and doing it with the right frequency will get you a very grateful wife. The right frequency is much less than 50%, too much and it becomes expected — basically you do it whenever there is any particular inconvenience for your wife to, which might be about 10% of the time. That way there is never any fighting over who should change the diaper.

However, and this is key, you have to NOTICE that the diaper needs changing and do it. If she has to ask you, then even if she only asks at first when it is very inconvenient for her to do, you will eventually have to start saying no or she’ll keep asking you more and more frequently. But if you notice and change the baby at a time when she is unable to for some reason, you get lots of LTR points, and she will never ask you to change the baby when she can do it.

As usual Polymath makes an excellent point, although I might dicker a bit on the 10%. Maybe 15-20%? I don’t see a hard and fast rule. My wife is staying at home to take care of the kids for now, but nursing a newborn is round the clock work. I’m happy to help out where I can. At any rate, we are on the same page. Without consciously thinking about it this is how I have been handling the situation. Pushing back on requests, but noticing full diapers periodically and just taking care of them. Much more important than how the work ends up being divided up is not getting into a situation where your wife is ordering you around. This would be true even if LTR game principles of attraction weren’t at stake.

Fortunately my wife has never been the type to try to create a list of things I need to do as seems common in so many marriages. I let her get her stuff done, and she does the same for me.

**The point is what you do as a husband is probably much less important than how you do it, especially the frame you keep.** The more I think of it, the more I’m averse to the idea of “women’s work”. Work is work, and all honest work is noble; no job is beneath me. Just change the work to reflect who you are instead of letting the work redefine you. I think that is the potential problem with men doing any number of women’s roles; turning yourself into a nanny your wife orders around is a problem. Working without changing your frame from that of a man isn’t. **Want me to take over decorating the place? No problem, but I’m going to do it man style.**

As a specific example, I took our (then) four year old daughter to the doctor last year to get some vaccinations. Is this women’s work, or a chance to be a dad? It all depends on the approach. Comforting her after getting shots at the doctors became a chance to put the truck into four wheel drive off road and have some quality dad/daughter time; she forgot all about her shots and couldn’t stop bragging to the neighbor kids about our brief adventure on the way home. And my wife got that gleam in her eye.

Likewise with the diaper bag. I may be old school/chivalrous, but I can’t bring myself to let my wife carry the heavy stuff when we go somewhere. I wouldn’t have her tote the suitcase out of the car, so why a diaper bag? But I’m not hauling around some frilly bag looking like a ball-less wonder. As I’ve said elsewhere, I feel the same about the stroller. This is precious
cargo needing protection, and I’m the strongest. It’s hard to get a truly manly stroller, but the jogging ones come as close as possible. Later this summer I will get my CCW so I can push the baby properly armed.

What do you think? Ever field stripped a baby? How important is it to maintain traditional gender roles in a marriage?

Oh, and happy Fathers Day!
Daddy, I’m a hooker!

by Dalrock | June 24, 2010 | Link

Ok, that isn’t exactly what my 5 year old daughter said to me, but it is very close. Before I give the exact quote though, I should share a little about my daughter. I won’t post any pictures, but if you could have seen her walking to her grandfather’s pickup truck with her long blond hair wearing her pink flowered dress with matching pink cowgirl hat and princess sandals you would have said: there is one beautiful Texas girl! I know because I hear this every time I take her somewhere. But you probably wouldn’t guess that once she got into her grandfather’s truck her first questions were does this truck have four wheel drive? (yes) and can we drive through mud?

So I’m in our living room reading while she is playing on the floor in one of her pretty dresses when I hear:

Hi, I’m a hooker.

It was a good book, but something in the back of my mind made me think maybe I should check into that. I looked up to see that the dialog came from the action figure driver of her toy Land Rover. He was in the process of connecting a winch hook onto one of the other trucks which I gather had become stuck in the mud. At this point I almost decided to just go back to my book, but instead I decided to explain that hooker wasn’t a good word. Why? “Well, hooker is a word for a bad woman”. But I’m just playing, and these are all men. Strange feeling to lose an argument to a 5 year old, but I’m getting used to it. So I decided to make sure she knew that women could drive trucks too. I know, but the way I’m playing they are all men. The last line was delivered with the expression reserved for when a grown up isn’t listening.

I let the issue drop and later shared the incident with my wife. After we stopped laughing she asked the question I knew she would: Does she understand that women can drive trucks? Yup. Gave me a look when I explained it even. Still, my wife was troubled by this so she made it a point to have a talk with our daughter later. I’m confident she received the same look I did.

But we both deserved the look. We weren’t listening. She knows she can be who she wants to be, and she chooses to play trucks with men driving them. She also loves to play with her massive collection of matchbox cars, build Lincoln logs and Legos, and play big game hunting adventure with her Barbies. Big game hunting is one of her favorites, because it incorporates Barbies, trucks, guns, animals, and (after the hunt) cooking. What could be more fun? Well, watching daddy unplug a toilet is more fun but that is another story.

What tickles me when I think of the whole exchange is the fact that:

1. Neither my wife nor I are feminists; accuse my wife of being a feminist and you will have a fight on your hands. Yet we felt compelled to lecture our daughter on something she clearly already understands.
2. She assessed the situation with the utmost clarity. She was free to play in whatever way she wanted, but she had observed from real life that almost no women actually want to drive trucks. Real life daddies and grandpas drive trucks, mommies drive cars or minivans. She didn’t feel the need to force a female character into the story just for appearance sake.

I truly hope she takes her current combination of openness and realism with her as she grows up. The fact is, there is practically nothing she won’t have the opportunity to do. At the same time, she will need to be realistic about the trade-offs involved and what her desires really are.

But as she grows up, feminists will make her feel guilty for not driving the truck. They will want her to be a hooker. This infuriates me.
Who *doesn’t* enjoy a good fanged female condom joke? If the answer is *you*, you might want to skip this post. If you aren’t familiar with **Fanged Female Condoms**, they are a product who’s good intentions are only exceeded by their impracticality.

On Citizen Renegade’s thread on Fanged Female Condoms, Gorbachev started some wordplay in the comments section, and I took up the bait. If you read through the entire post and decide the whole thing just isn’t funny, please post a comment and I’ll see what I can do about refunding your 5 minutes (no guarantees).

**Gorbachev:**

- Another way to be hooked on poon.

**Gorbachev:**

- So I can see how this condom can be a good idea. The argument has a lot of valid points.

**Gorbachev:**

- It’s a very sharply argued series of points, this argument for spearheading an anti-rape condoms. Withdrawal from the debate could be difficult once debate is entered, though.

- BTW, This is going to go on for a while.

**Dalrock:**

- Gorbachev

  Penetrating insight. I suspect we will be trading barbs for some time on this. You should brace yourself for some stiff opposition. Are you up for it?

**Gorbachev:**

- I don’t know if I want to poke into the patch stinging nettles this gaping maw of debate represents. You never know what well-aimed dart might pierce your pride and scar the tender flesh of upright thinking.

  Talk about nature savage in tooth and claw, indeed. It might require me to balance my thoughts on a knife edge, as we often are forced to do by the push and pull of regular debate.

- But I get your point.
Dalrock:

I get the thrust of your reasoning but I think you have become trapped in a circular argument. One must act carefully if you wish to successfully extract yourself from such a prickly predicament. Stay sharp man!

Gorbachev:

I don’t know if I can take any more of your biting commentary. All of these cutting remarks are beginning to sink their teeth.

Dalrock:

I knew it! Having been caught by your own rigid thinking, you now want to shrink away from the debate.

Gorbachev:

I think it’s time to retreat. To sheathe the sword and clothe the tenets of this debate in more gentle terms.
Exploding “Grey Divorce”
by Dalrock | June 28, 2010 | Link

My wife saw something in the media about some large trend of couples divorcing at or around retirement age, dubbed “grey divorce”. She was very troubled by this. I agreed entirely with the sentiment, but was also intrigued. Why would there be a swell of divorce at that particular time? Retirement is for many a time of great uncertainty and risk. Why jettison the partnership which has gotten you through the other trying times of life just as this new one approaches? Retirement is also a time to enjoy the fruits of a lifetime’s labor. Why not enjoy as a team the fruits you worked so hard to earn together? Furthermore, the one fact that everyone seems to agree on regarding divorce is that they are mostly initiated by women. But late in life the benefits of marriage to women are increasing. It simply made no sense.

So I set out to better understand this phenomenon. I googled “grey divorce” and read all of the articles I could find. I was especially interested in the source of the statistics driving this conclusion, and how they were being used. Here are some examples of what I found:

- **Saying “I Don’t:” Gray Divorce** Not every couple in their golden years will have a golden anniversary. Here’s why more and more long-time marrieds are calling it quits—and how they recover.
- **Women getting feet under them after “gray divorce”** Initiating more divorces after lengthy marriages, females can end up anywhere from fulfilled to frustrated.
- **Grey Divorce – Letting Go and Starting Over!**
  This is the same author/ similar content as you will find at: http://www.latelifedivorce.com/ Both end with a link to a divorce law firm.
- **Over 40 and divorced: Why older couples are breaking up**

From the headlines, a promising start! I should know more about what is really happening with just a few clicks, right? No such luck. When you strip out the sensationalist claims made by those who stand to profit from an increase in divorce (authors of books on divorce and divorce attorneys), all that remains are some vague references to US Census data and more commonly, a study performed by the AARP in 2004 on divorce after 40.

One phrase you will note on nearly every story about grey divorce is the assertion that it is “exploding”, or an “exploding phenomenon”. This catch phrase originated in the book Calling It Quits: Late-Life Divorce and Starting Over by Deirdre Bair. From the Amazon description, the book is a collection of individual stories of late life divorce, and was inspired by the AARP survey and the author’s own late life divorce.

I’ll go into the Census data in a later post, and briefly cover the AARP study in the remainder of this post. First off, the AARP study did not find an increase of “grey divorce”. In fact, the study wasn’t even focused on divorce after retirement age. 73% of the divorces examined in the study occurred when the respondent was in their 40s. Another 15% of the divorces they studied occurred when the respondent was 50-55. Only 11% occurred when the person answering the survey was over 55.
So we know what the AARP study didn’t say. Did it say anything interesting? As it turns out, yes it does! **Late life divorce tends to work out (relatively) better for men and worse for women;** try finding that in an article ongrey divorce. Here are some selected quotes from the study that the news stories decided not to share since it would have gone against their goal of selling divorce to older women (emphasis in quotes is mine):

Almost 9 in 10 men (87%) dated after their divorce, compared to 8 in 10 women (79%)... Among those who dated after the divorce, **more than half of men (54%) but fewer women remarried (39%).** *(Page 39)*

**Many women, especially those who have not remarried (69%), do not touch or hug at all sexually.** An even larger majority of women who have not remarried do not engage in sexual intercourse (77% saying not at all), in comparison with about half of men (49%) who have not remarried. *(Page 6)*

**Note:** The table at the bottom of P A-35 gives the breakdown of men vs women reporting no sexual intercourse over the last month. 33% for men, 59% for women. This doesn’t seem to be explained by age distribution of survey respondents. 56% of responses were from those in their 40s and 50s. 87% of the survey takers were in their 60s or younger.

Their age at the time of divorce also impacts dating, especially among women. Eighty-eight percent of women in their 40s dated (35% did before the divorce was final), while 79 percent of women in their 60s and older did the same (13% did before the divorce was final). *(Page 39)*

While women appreciate their new-found self-identity, freedom, and independence, their finances pose hurdles after divorce... [men] mention having more sex or different sexual experiences five times more than women as something they like best after divorce. They also tend to be better off financially. *(Page 31)*

This is just a cursory overview. If you are interested you can follow the link and look at the whole report. Even if you don’t look at the original report, note the misleading cover image of the sad older man dining alone.

While no doubt there is plenty of misery to go around following late life divorce, based on the survey results (and census data) **the cover image really should have shown a picture of an older woman dining alone.**

**Conclusions**

1. While at some point someone may have seen an up-tick in retirement age divorce, there is no evidence to back up the type of event being reported in the media. Put differently, if the media has any data to back this up they aren’t sharing it.
2. Men tend to fare better than women when considering remarriage and/or physical affection following late life divorce. A surprisingly large percent of women who divorced after 40 report receiving no physical affection at all, not even hugs. (more on why this is likely the case in part two when we go over the census data)
3. Men tend to fare better than women financially following late life divorce. (part three
will explore why this is likely the case)

4. The media is selling late life divorce to women as empowering, and an exiting new trend even though the report which originated the interest in the topic showed this is the opposite of what most women experience.

This is the first part of a three part series I will do on the topic. Part two will look at the census data and the dating/sexual marketplace implications of late life divorce. Part three will explore the shifting financial incentives regarding divorce as couples enter retirement.
Note: To avoid picking up trends driven by changing ethnic makeup, all of the tables presented in this post show values for non-Hispanic Whites only.

What percentage of the population marries, and when?

If you compare marriage rates for those in their twenties in 1999 vs 2009, you can see a clear trend of women (and men) putting off marriage. However, the scope of the trend isn’t as large as the rash of media stories about unmarried women in their 30s and 40s would suggest. Most women still marry in their twenties, and the vast majority marry by their early thirties.

To put this in perspective, in the US in 1890 the median age of marriage for women (all races) was 22; the same value for 2009 was just under 26 years old. PUA and MGTOW anecdotal evidence and aging feminist editor hand-wringing aside, the sky is not (yet) falling. Clearly men and women in their twenties can and do still marry if they wish to and realistically assess their own attractiveness.

Percent of Men and Women Ever Married by Age, 1999 and 2009:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Men who have ever married 1999</th>
<th>% Men who have ever married 2009</th>
<th>% Women who have ever married 1999</th>
<th>% Women who have ever married 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White alone—Non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 years</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 years</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 years</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39 years</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44 years</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49 years</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54 years</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keep in mind that for any given five year period the value represents the average across those years, not the value for the last year in the period. So the 57% ever married figure for women in the 25-29 year old bracket means that a somewhat larger number than 57% of women have likely married before they turn 30. Also keep in mind that just because those now in their late 30s and beyond have roughly the same rates of marriage as their counterparts did 10 years ago, this doesn’t necessarily mean that those now in their twenties will “catch up” with previous generations in the years to come.

One other item worth noting is that for older generations at least, if you live long enough the chances are very high that you will marry at least once. I wasn’t able to combine the tables for those 55 and older due to different formatting in the reports, but in both...
reports 97% of men and women who made it to their late 60s had married at least once. I don’t know exactly what drives this, but I would guess differences in life expectancy between married and unmarried, as well as some degree of settling.

How does the “sexual marketplace” change as men and women age?

Citizen Renegade has written extensively about how differences in aging and attraction in men versus women changes the balance of the sexual marketplace starting roughly when women are in their 30s (Warning: Citizen Renegade blog is harsh and crass). The data seems to back this up, and additionally shows how this balance continues to change as the ratio of single women to single men flips in men’s favor at approximately age 50.

**Ratio of Unmarried Women vs Men and Percent of Men and Women Married and Divorced by Age in 2009:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.20-24 years</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.25-29 years</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30-34 years</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.35-39 years</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.40-44 years</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.45-49 years</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50-54 years</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.55-64 years</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.65-74 years</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.75-84 years</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.85+ years</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because men marry older, die younger, and are able to marry more beneath their own age group than women, the ratio of unmarried women to men changes from roughly .85 single women for every single man in their twenties and early thirties to over 2 single women per single man over 65. **Women go from having the advantages of smaller numbers and greater attractiveness to the opposite situation.** Note how the likelihood of being married peaks for women in their early 40s and declines from there while the percent of men married catches up with women in their late 40s and continues to increase until some time in their late 70s. The situation is worse for women looking to date or marry late in life than these single women/men ratio numbers suggest, because the ratio only compares single men and women of the same age. Since men often have the option to date women in younger age groups, this means the practical impact of the ratios is greater than the number itself.

**The same basic trends show up in the 1999 data, except generally at an earlier age.**
Note the lack of an “explosion” of divorce during the later time periods in either table. Granted these stats only reflect net changes after divorce and remarriage during the bracketed years, but we know from the AARP study that the majority of women who divorce after age 40 are not able to remarry. If there were an explosion of divorce, this should show up as a spike in the percent of women divorced. But such a spike is not present; the percent of women currently divorced continues in a gradual increase until their late 40s, where it levels off before steadily declining later in life.

**Note on the data:** All of the data displayed in the tables can be found from this Census web page. For simplicity, I treated any marital status other than *Married Spouse Present* as unmarried when calculating the unmarried women/men ratio. There are two categories *Married Spouse Not Present* and *Separated* not shown in my tables which one might call either way which I lumped in as unmarried. However, both have very small values (1-2%) so this should not materially impact the results.

**Edit March 5th, 2011:** Ok Cupid has a report which reinforces the data presented above.
I should start with the disclaimer that I have a very limited understanding of divorce law in the US, but I do have some direct experience in the area of retirement planning.

**A simplified primer on retirement planning.**

When planning for retirement, the fundamental question is *how much can I spend each month/year without running out of money?* Knowing the actual answer to this question would require knowing 1) How long you will live. and 2) What the stock and bond markets will do over the period you are alive. Obviously neither is possible to know when entering retirement, but there are rules of thumb which have been created taking into account experiences from the past.

There is a great deal of literature on Safe Withdrawal Rates (SWR), which attempts to determine the optimal asset allocation and SWR based on past market performance and estimates on how long someone will live. To keep the analysis simple and to maximize the funds available to our hypothetical retirees we will instead have them use a product called a Single Premium Immediate Annuity (SPIA). With an SPIA, the insurance company calculates your life expectancy and agrees to pay you regular payments for the rest of your life in exchange for your lump sum of funds. If you die early, you still were able to enjoy a better quality of life than if you had stuck with the standard SWR. If you live longer than expected, well you hit the jackpot more than once.

**Hypothetical example.**

We’ll start with a hypothetical married couple, Ed age 65 and Edna age 60. They have net assets of $1 million to retire on (including proceeds from the recent sale of their home), but no pensions, social security, etc (lets keep this simple). Ed has done his research and decides to purchase a $1 million SPIA covering both of them jointly. The policy will make regular payments so long as at least one of them is alive. He goes to Berkshire Hathaway and uses their EZ Quote Tool and learns that their $1 million would buy them $4,825 a month. This is a non reversible decision, so he and Edna need to consider this carefully.

Meanwhile, Edna has been feeling neglected while her husband has been busy researching boring things like stocks, bonds, SPCAs (or something), etc. She watches Oprah one day and decides it would be terribly exciting to start life new so she files for divorce. The kids are adults now so no “child support” to stealthily nest alimony in. They decide not to give a huge chunk to lawyers so they each end up with $500k net to retire on.

Edna’s itching to *get her groove back,* and sees herself doing the shopping bag strut in the near future. She remembers something about SPCAs (or something) and wants to convert her half of the money into $2,412 per month in lifetime payments (half of $4,825). Ed kindly
gives her the Easy Quote link. But when she puts in her birthday and $500k she gets a pleasant surprise; they offer her $2,577 per month. She buys the policy and calls Ed up to gloat about her good fortune! Then she learns that Ed has left on a singles cruise after cashing in his $500k for $3,042 a month!

**Why did they each get more separately than 50% of what they would have gotten jointly?**

With the joint policy, the insurance company has to pay the full payment so long as either of them are alive. With separate policies, once one of them passes away the payments for that policy stops.

**Why did Ed get more for his $500k than Edna? Isn’t this a case of the “old boys club” keeping Edna down?**

No. What Edna didn’t understand is that if she had stayed married the odds were strong that she would spend or control more than half of the couple’s retirement assets. She is younger than Ed, and women typically live longer than men. If you plug in their sex and ages into this table, you will find that she is expected to live another 23.5 years, and he is expected to live another 16.8. Since retirement planning is done based on the potential longevity of the longest living member of the couple, the unspoken fact of retirement planning is that husbands are in essence planning for their wife’s retirement. What Edna got after divorcing Ed is what half really looks like. **Ed was able to spend more after Edna divorced him because he no longer needed to plan for her needs.**

**Caveats**

1. **Inflation:** In our example the annuities didn’t account for inflation. Some insurance companies offer inflation adjustment in exchange for a lower starting payment. Edna would pay a higher price for this protection than Ed because with her longer life expectancy there would be greater inflation risk to the insurance company. So if we were to have taken into account inflation the discrepancy would have been even more dramatic.

2. **No one suggest converting 100% of your retirement funds into an annuity like they did.** Most financial planners would suggest they start by taking something like 4% of their initial savings per year and then adjusting this amount up for inflation, plus rolling a portion of their funds into SPIAs over time. This tends to lower initial spending but makes more money available towards end of life for either spending or inheritance. Since Edna would live longer than Ed, if they stayed married she would likely end up being the one to enjoy the benefits of this. If they divorced in this situation, Ed might decide to move to a higher SWR rate based on his lower personal life expectancy or bequeath more of his assets as he saw fit. He would also benefit more from any partial annuitization he chose to implement. So again, the Annuity model understates the benefit to Edna of staying married.

**Note:** None of this is intended as financial advice. If you are interested in learning more about retirement planning, I highly recommend the Boglehead Forum

---
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New battle cry of the ageing feminist.
by Dalrock | July 4, 2010 | Link

What’s more annoying than a feminist in her teens or 20s? One in her late 30s or 40s!

Reading the blogosphere or current magazine stories, you would think that the average women finds herself in her late thirties desperate to find a husband. Yet as I found when researching Grey Divorce, this is anything but the case. For example, most white women still marry in their early or mid twenties, and roughly 90% are married before they turn 40. So these women in their late thirties or early forties pining for a suitable husband must be a fraction of the remaining 10% (not everyone wants to marry). So why all of the noise? I think it is no coincidence that the remaining 10% is the demographic of magazine editors. If they aren’t staring down the barrel of spinsterhood themselves, they have a lot of friends who are.

I recall how irritating feminists were when I was in my teens and twenties. They were constantly bleating “I don’t need a man”, or “A woman without a man is like a fish without a bicycle”. Yes, but all I asked is if this bus goes downtown.

What I didn’t realize at the time is that this is the charming stage of feminism. The stage where they are full of youthful idealism and can-do attitude. They really believe anything boys can do they can do better. And at that age you can’t really fault them yet for not being able to prove it. So they are annoying, but in the same way as a young twentysomething who is convinced they know the secret to walking across the freeway. Sure it’s asinine, but you have to admire the sincerity of their convictions. Meanwhile, I’ll take the overpass just to be safe...

But now the feminists are back, stuck on the grill of the mack truck of life, and they want to complain to us about their misfortune!

So we get this rash of articles advising women to marry him, or hand wringing about the state of men today. Instead of “I don’t need a man!”, the new battle cry is “Where have all of the good men gone?”
These aging single career women wander into Roissy’s blogs on a fairly regular basis. He attracts them like flies because he continually points out that the clock is ticking, and for many of them the alarm has already rung.

They can’t find a man. Or “no man wants to commit”. They say old school patriarchy things like men should grow up and take responsibility. Often they will briefly revert to form, claiming all they really need from a man is sperm. But of course, if this were really true it would be the easiest problem in the world to solve. They don’t just want sperm from a man, they want him to be obligated (financially and otherwise) to be a dad. But they want his obligation to come with no obligation on themselves. Of course, no man worth his salt is anxious to sign up for that sort of bargain; so instead of going off and having babies, they continue their public gnashing of teeth.

The thing is, I do sort of feel bad for these aging feminists, at least until I read something like grep’s outstanding recent blog post or remember that they want my daughter to be a hooker. I don’t wish them ill. I just wish they would stick to one slogan. Barring that, maybe they could admit they were wrong?

Original image by Julie Patricia, who released it into the public domain.
Interviewing a Prospective Wife Part I: Should you open a position?

by Dalrock | July 9, 2010 | Link

This is the first of a two part series on interviewing a perspective wife. This first part will focus on if you should marry at all. The second part will cover the actual “interview”. As you likely already know, Marriage 2.0 comes with great risk for men. This is undeniably true. However:

1. **The risk associated with marrying has always been great.** Even when the legal risks were much smaller, the risks to your future happiness and your children’s wellbeing have always been there. Marrying the wrong woman has never been something easily overcome. *Even Henry the 8th had a great deal of red tape to deal with.*

2. **The risks for men post feminism aren’t restricted to married men.** If you want to avoid these risks entirely you will have to take drastic measures. The Spearhead has a *new post on just this topic* which sheds some light on this.

More importantly, **not all marriages are loveless, sexless hells on earth.** There is a selection bias on internet forums. Guys who have been screwed are much more likely to want to tell their story than those who are happy. I’ve been married for a decade and a half and am deeply in love/bonded with my beautiful wonderful wife. We have grown so close over the years that friends and relatives often accuse us of being the same person. On top of this we have two beautiful children who are the apples of my eye. So if you are a beta guy contemplating marriage, my advice would be give it serious consideration.

At this point some readers are undoubtedly thinking: *Sure. I felt the same way until my loving wife of 20 years left in a caravan that included the gardeners, the pool boy, and our milkman.* I get it; one can never fully assess risks which might show up in the future. Another will likely point out that he felt the same way until he realized that according to the laws of genetics, *his four kids really shouldn’t have Afros.* I get that too.

So if you are a typical beta guy, you have to carefully weigh your choices. If after reading the spearhead post on Male Self Defense 101 your reaction is *lets take another look at that map,* part two of this series should be of interest to you.

Before you do marry, it is probably a good idea to learn something about relationship game. Some good resources are Married Man Sex Life, and Citizen Renegade (especially the *post by Dave from Hawaii*). You don’t have to be a kung fu master at pickup, but understanding the basic psychology of seduction should be very helpful.

**Answers to pre submitted questions from regular readers:**

**Q:** I’m so alpha that every time I walk past a convent the nuns hack into my iPhone to send me lewd pictures of themselves. Why should I marry?
A: I don’t think you should. Have fun!

Q: I’m so alpha all of my LTRs will cluck like a chicken in one of four languages if I give the correct hand signal. Should I marry?

A: No.

Feel free to post your thoughts on when/if a man should marry under marriage 2.0 below. Posts starting with “any man who marries today is stupid” are entirely acceptable, as are posts specifically calling me stupid for being a happily married chump! Also, feel free to post your feats of greater alphaness for mere mortal beta’s to weep over.
I’m starting from the assumption that you are a (mostly) beta guy who is open to the idea of marrying. I’m also assuming that the basic criteria to consider marriage are already met. You are head over heels in love with this woman, and she is with you. You have great chemistry, she is sane, has basic life skills (can handle a budget), you have compatible views on religion, kids, etc. I’m also assuming she is broaching the question of marriage. Men formally are the ones to propose marriage, but in every case I’ve seen the women unofficially raised the subject first and usually with a sense of urgency. Instead of freaking out, you can use this opportunity productively.

The problem is, now that “oneitis” has set in, you need to take a breath and think logically. **Being in love isn’t enough to justify marriage**; it is necessary, but not sufficient. And if you haven’t considered the issue ahead of time, you won’t be able to process the logical side. So when you find yourself in this position, your *unspoken* thought process should be:

**You know I love you, but why in the world should I marry you?**

In the world of *marriage 2.0*, I think a man’s default answer to this question should be no. I say this from the perspective of an advocate of marriage. This may seem contradictory, but I don’t think it really is. You have an obligation to yourself to not marry if the situation isn’t right. Moreover, **you have a solemn duty to your future children to pick their mother wisely**. This is bigger than love, and bigger than you. The stakes are enormous; your children need the best chance you can give them to grow up with both a mother and a father. You also have an obligation to Mrs right not to pick Mrs wrong over her.

So for all of the above reasons **a woman needs to bring something very special to the table to justify marriage**. The law and social convention won’t hold her to keep the vow she takes in front of God, your families, and everyone you both care about; **the moral force to keep her side of the promise needs to come from within herself**. Many women today lack this internal compass, but many others still have it. The questions below are aimed at assessing if she does bring these qualities.

**Why do you use the term interview? Are you serious?**

I’m not really serious about the term interview. If you pull out a clipboard and start interrogating your (potential) future wife, bad things are likely to happen. I’m assuming you have enough experience in relationships to know how to manage a conversation and work these questions in appropriately. I’m also assuming you will have the basic sense to know when to raise these questions and not to overload on the topic at any given time. But the concept of interview is still helpful I think. The time in the relationship that I referenced in the beginning of this post is a critical window of opportunity. She is pressuring you to propose to her. You won’t get another opportunity like this. Ever.
Below are the specific questions that you want the answers to, organized by category. Ideally many (most?) of these you will already know the answer to. For those issues you have already discussed, you don’t need to bring them up again but this should serve as a mental checklist.

**Does she take marriage seriously? Are her expectations in line with yours?**

- **What is the best part of marriage?** Is she more interested in the wedding itself or the ring than being your wife?
- **Will she take your name?** I can’t personally think of a convincing reason to marry a woman who wouldn’t or who struggled with this question.
- **What does marriage mean to her?** She’s asking you to sign on the dotted line. *What’s in this contract?*
- **What is the role of a husband? What are the obligations of a husband?** You want to be on the same page here, but this is also a setup for the next question. If she has a long list for you and a short one for her, that is very telling. Likewise if she rattles off the list for you but struggles to form the list for herself, you’ve just learned something.
- **What is the role of a wife? What are the obligations of a wife?** The specifics are important here, but her overall attitude to the idea of having obligations is critical as well. Does the idea of having a role to conform to or duties make her bristle? This is also your best opportunity to frame the roles the way you would expect them to be.
- **What if you are “in the mood” and she isn’t (aka “wifely duty”)?** I hesitated to include this, but I feel it really should be there. Part of what this will show is her general willingness to consider your needs over her own feelings (altruism) and her tendency to look for opportunities for compromise. This will also give you a hint about her perception of male sexuality. You also want to smoke out a potential to use denial of sex for power purposes. Lastly, for men sex in marriage really is love. How would you feel about a man who decided not to hug or kiss his wife, or refused to tell her he loved her?

**What is her attitude about casual sex? Does she have a history of following her ‘tingle’?**

- **What does she think about the double standard regarding promiscuity?** Frame this with sympathy to the feminist perspective. This is a bit of a trick question. The right answer is disgust with promiscuity across the board. The wrong answer is an instinct to shelter sluts from judgment for their actions. This question has the bonus of drawing out a feminist vibe she might be concealing, although in the scheme of things a little feminism in a young woman isn’t the end of the world. But you should know what you are getting into.
- **Why does she think so many women have to date “bad boys” before they learn to look for good guys?** Again, a bit of a trick question and should be framed non judgmentally. Ideally she should have disgust with those girls who chased alphas while she looked for something different. A convincing story about why she made this transition isn’t what you want to hear from a potential wife, but you should frame this question in such a way so this seems like a perfectly acceptable answer.
Does she see divorce as failure? Is she willing to make judgments about others who divorce?

- **What are acceptable reasons for divorce?** This should be a short list of no nonsense answers. I’m thinking infidelity, real and persistent abuse, persistent gambling and/or addiction, etc. Scary answers include the standard “just not happy”, “falling out of love”, “growing apart”, etc. These mean she will dump you the second things get tough or something or someone more interesting comes along.

- **What would she tell your children about divorce?** My wife and I were at a Thanksgiving celebration where our then 4 year old daughter met a boy who called his dad by his first name. When she asked him why, he told her about his mom’s divorce and remarriage. He explained that sometimes “mommies and daddies just stop loving each other”. She was distraught for over a week before she came to us. She was terrified we would just stop loving each other like the other kid’s parents. We told her “He’s wrong, his mommy was a brat!”. And we also told her not to say this to the boy or other kids in the same situation or she would hurt their feelings. After this she was fine. *Tell her this story and see what her reaction is.* Is she more protective of the frightened child, or the mommy who wanted to start a new life?

- **Will she judge other women who divorce frivolously?** Unfortunately it should be easy to come up with an example of this, so mention it in conversation and see what her reaction is. How would she feel about attending the second (or third) wedding of this woman?

This is just one man’s perspective, but it does come from a few decades of watching what worked and didn’t work for my peers. It also is highly influenced by the perspective of my wife based on the at times astounding conversations she has with other women. The world is filled with guys who married assuming incorrectly their wives would take marriage seriously. The good news is women with the right attitude still exist, and are often overlooked by other guys. You don’t want to be the male equivalent of the girl who walks past the nice guy betas to find the cad, only to complain about all guys being jerks.

Marriage is wonderful but every marriage will run into rough patches. Both parties need to have the commitment required to grow together and make it past the difficult periods. The law is one sided and either way insufficient for something as important as marriage. You need to make sure she has the internal compass to overcome the push of friends and society, and perhaps her own hypergamous instinct to move on when tempted. None of this should be construed as an excuse on your part to neglect her needs, be unfaithful, not work to be as attractive as possible, etc.

What do you think? Am I on the right page or out in left field? Any questions you would add or remove? Married and/or divorced men and women especially, don’t deprive others of your valuable insight. Please share your thoughts here, even if they contradict my own perspective.

**Note:** Comments on if one should or shouldn’t get married in the first place belong in Part I of this series, not here.
Hypergamous Addiction to Choosing.
by Dalrock | July 14, 2010 | Link

Haley’s Halo has a fascinating piece on the bad marriage advice given to Evangelical Christian women titled The importance of having chemistry. She references advice given to a woman from boundless.org, a part of Focus on the Family. The woman’s problem was that after two years of dating a man, she still didn’t have “chemistry” (sexual attraction) with him. The man is preparing to propose to her and she wanted advice on what to do. Haley pointed out that the reply was to essentially shame the woman into marrying the man even though on the sexual attraction scale the man was (Haley’s words) “Not In A Million Years”. I’m entirely with Haley on this. This is in my opinion just another example of the church loving weddings more than it hates divorce. In my last blog post advising men on marriage, I started with the assumption that the couple was head over heels in love with each other, and had great chemistry. Shaming people into marriage when the marriage isn’t likely to be successful is short sighted and neglects the risks both to the spouses themselves as well as their future children.

However, what struck me more than the bad advice being dispensed was how unbelievably cliché the woman’s predicament was. She was torn (in her mind) between an old boyfriend (badboy rocker who dropped out of college to join a commune) and her new one (pre med dutiful beta). At this point I found myself strangely compelled to clutch the monitor to my bosom, sigh wistfully, and sip some chamomile tea while musing ahhhh, which to choose....

Ok, I admit I made that last part up. But flashbacks of being forced to read tripe literature from the Bronte sisters in High School did sear my brain, as well as this image:

But even more surprising than how profoundly cliché her situation was, is the fact that I’m evidently the only person to see this. This is one of the most common themes in entertainment targeted to women. The theme is so powerful a woman Senator recently felt compelled to ask the current supreme court nominee which Twilight love interest she would choose.

My wife thankfully can’t stand chick ficks or romance novels, but has noted the common theme in many Danielle Steel novels/movies where the woman moves to a new exciting place after becoming a widow, only to fall in love again (where’s my chamomile tea?). She’s troubled by the fantasy being sold to women of having their spouse die so they can re choose another love of their life. I agree, but I’m convinced they only sell this because there is such a willing audience. If men fantasized about their wives dying and meeting an exciting new woman in some exotic locale, you can bet that Spike TV would be showing male equivalents of these Lifetime movies.

But the idea of the choice frozen in time, the re-choosing after choosing, reconnecting with an ex, and replaying the choice in an endless loop are strictly female entertainment themes. Occasionally you may see this theme altered such that the man is the one choosing, but even
here the target audience is women (just like the recent trend to insert wedding scenes into superhero movies).

The male equivalent to this female instinct is to have multiple women at the same time. This you will see played out on Spike, porn, you name it. So here’s an easy rule of thumb. If the central conflict of the story is which twin to choose, this is aimed at women. If the central conflict is how to get with both twins at once, this is aimed at men.

But there is another difference. Men’s instinct to be with multiple women is acknowledged by society and curbs are placed against this instinct. Obviously this is an instinct which doesn’t fit well with marriage. However, women’s instinct to endlessly re-choose is continuously fed at a fantasy level while denied as being real at a societal level. Women who fantasize about their husband’s death so they can choose another man aren’t shamed the way that men are shamed for wanting to build their own private harem.

Moreover, for all of the shaming directed at men for objectifying women with pornography, women don’t get called out on this. In the example of the christian woman who had constructed her own personal twilight fantasy, there is no shaming for her mistreatment of pre med man. No one called her on her behaving as if he was a character in her own private play and not a real human being. Her only hesitation against marrying him was her own dissatisfaction; it never occurred to her that he deserved to find a woman who honestly loved him.
Dallas area woman murders her daughter, is mourned as a victim.

by Dalrock | July 14, 2010 | Link

I was just watching the local news and the mayor of Coppell’s picture is on every channel. They said something about a murder suicide, but since they kept showing this woman in a flattering light I assumed she was one of the victims. I just googled the story under the assumption that her husband had killed her and her daughter. It turns out she was the killer, her husband passed away some time ago. Here is an example of the sickening video they are showing locally:

Coppell City Hall mourns loss of mayor

They have a comments section and clearly I’m not the only one stunned by the way they are handling this:

Children can be so annoying. Sometimes the best thing to do is just to shoot your child in the face.

Coppell City Hall mourns loss of mayor?????????? You must be kidding. The scum mayor is a MURDERER!!!!!!!!! I hope this scumbag mayor’s funeral procession is NOT honored with a police escourt.

At no point during that video do they mention that she was a killer. The whole thing is handled euphemistically as “The deaths of the mayor and her daughter”. But obviously they knew she killed her daughter and then herself because 30 seconds before the end of the video they note that she “was in great spirits” and “wasn’t despondent”.

Here is another story:
Stunned friends, neighbors mourn deaths of Coppell mayor and daughter

You wouldn’t know she was a murderer except for the hint nestled in this quote:

“I had a Christmas party one year, and Jayne and Don and Corinne came to visit us. We had a wonderful evening together, and they signed my door,” Rafiqui said. Don Peters died in 2008 of cancer.

Today, Lisa Rafiqui’s neighbor is considered a killer, but she says that isn’t the person she knew.

They can’t even directly call her a killer, or use her name when they do...

For those who might misunderstand, I’m not suggesting we start honoring men who kill their families. I’m glad they are demonized; anyone who would do such a thing is scum! But how can the media even to begin to justify glorifying this woman?
Thoughts on my friend Roland
by Dalrock | July 15, 2010 | Link

In my second year of college my father bought a house for me to stay in (with roommates) with the idea of keeping it as an investment property later. I drove up from out of state a week or so early to check the place out and do the minor plumbing repairs we knew had to be done.

Roland was one of my next door neighbors. He was in his 70s and not very strong, but Roland had a fantastic attitude and a great deal of wisdom to share with a young man. He couldn’t crawl under the house, turn a wrench, or hold a pipe for me; but he talked me through every challenge I came across. After I finished the plumbing, he helped me replace the wheel bearings and grease seals on my old pickup truck in the same way. He cheerfully pulled up a lawn chair on my driveway and walked me through the whole process.

To return the favor I helped him with a number of tasks he wasn’t able to complete himself. I held up his garage door motor while his friend bolted it into the ceiling, and I took him to Sears to pick up the snowblower he had bought so he didn’t have to carry it. This was a perfect partnership. Older wiser man willing to teach, younger stronger man eager to learn. I probably don’t have to mention that he was like a father to me.

Roland’s wife was understandably protective of him and anxious to ensure that he didn’t strain himself, so I didn’t get to spend as much time with him as I otherwise would have. I’m sure we both had more projects which would have been perfect to tackle together. But Roland had been diagnosed with stomach cancer and only had a few months left.

Knowing this his projects came into an entirely new light. He had lived there for 30 years and never felt the need for a snow blower or garage door opener. He was old school, and these kind of conveniences didn’t fit his view of what a man should be. These items weren’t for him, but for his wife after he passed. When he mentioned this I could see that her well being was all he could focus on. Obviously Roland had much more to teach this young man than a few tips on plumbing or car repair.

Once the semester started I didn’t have the same amount of time to spend with Roland on projects, and shortly thereafter his health got worse so he wasn’t able to any way. I wanted to visit with him but his wife always wanted to let him rest, and I didn’t push the issue. Roland passed when I was away on Christmas break. The garage door opener was very helpful to his widow, but I doubt the snowblower ever made it out of the box. I made it a point to shovel her sidewalk whenever the man who lived on the other side of her didn’t beat me to it.

I see a lot of discussion in the manosphere about alpha this or beta that, but in my mind Roland was the epitome of manliness. I’ve been thinking about him all afternoon and felt the need to write something up on him. And thank him for all that he taught me.
Are PUAs Mixing Hunting and Reproductive Instincts?

by Dalrock | July 18, 2010 | Link

I am a hunter. I haven’t actually hunted for several years, but like any addiction I am a hunter for life. Don’t get me wrong, hunting is a wonderful addiction. Some of my fondest memories are sitting perfectly still high in the Rockies with my black powder rifle half cocked, waiting for an Elk that never actually comes in range. We get up an hour before first light and silently hike a mile or more in the dark past the point where our trucks can’t take us. We set up as a team hoping this will be the morning. We care little about the weather except to select our clothing and ensure that we don’t get trapped in deep snow in the back-country. If we are lucky we at least hear a big bull across the meadow or over a ridge answering our infrequent calls. If we are really lucky we actually get to see them. Hearing them and seeing them makes our hearts pound and forces us to control our breathing. We recheck our lines of fire and the readiness of our primitive rifles. You may have heard a bull Elk bugle on TV. Or maybe you heard one at Estes Park or Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado. If so (and you aren’t a hunter), you probably think you know the sound I’m describing. But that sound wouldn’t prepare you for the sound a crazed bull Elk makes when he thinks you are a rival bull and he is convinced he’s about to kick your ass and take your women. At less than 100 yards an infuriated bull elk can sound more like a raspy mountain lion roaring than a bugle. He’s the master of his domain, and he’s about to deliver a hell of a beating. Or so he thinks.

Sorry for the digression. Like I said it is an addiction. Maybe more accurately an obsession. Depending on what part of the country/world you live in, you may already fully understand this. And for most hunters once they start it becomes a year round activity. If you doubt this, note the number of men fishing in the cooler months wearing camouflage. My wife used to complain that there was always something in season. And she was right. From what little I’ve studied about Evo Psych, this shouldn’t be a surprise. Men were built to be hunters.

So what does this have to do with Pickup Artists? As natural as sex is, and as obviously important as it is from a selection perspective, it strikes me that the modern PUA is an extremely novel niche from an evolutionary perspective. I think even Citizen Renegade acknowledges that it is the strange intersection of our formerly patriarchal society with feminism which created this highly unusual situation. The fact that very few men are what CR would call “Alpha” would seem to reinforce this. Historically being “Alpha” by CR’s definition wasn’t a particularly effective strategy. Certainly there have always been “Sneaky F*ers”, but what is going on in the world of PUAs is orders of magnitude greater numbers wise than I would imagine a wildly successful Sneaky F*er would have been able to accomplish in the past. Do it too much and it stops being sneaky.

But reading CR and the comments section, it is clear that they feel an addictive pull to always bag that next quarry. They become obsessed with their quarry’s habits and movements. They learn to admire everything about it, just like a hunter does. If you’ve ever been in the field with a hunter one thing you know is they see all sorts of animals you would have been totally unaware of. I suspect the same happens for PUAs and their targets.
You could explain the PUA addiction as any generic addictive activity, and that probably would be sufficient. Certainly sex in any form is a powerful motivator. It appears that the modern PUA’s stable quarry the carousel rider becomes addicted to the activity without any parallel to hunting. Being prey isn’t a selected for trait. But as a fellow hunter, something strikes me as extremely familiar when PUAs describe their craft. The obsessive studying of prey, habits, and habitat. The simultaneous admiration of and mastery over the prey. The identification, the stalk, and the close. CR seems aware of this because his writings are liberally laced with hunting terms.

This is purely speculation on my part, but I’m guessing there is something to it. What do you think?
Women shouldn’t settle.
by Dalrock | July 19, 2010 | Link

I know what you are thinking. This is the manosphere, and we tell women to settle. We’ve got a nice gig here, and Dalrock is trying to ruin it! But before you try to take away my man card, hear me out. Ladies, I hope you’ll hear me out as well.

In my previous post about Hypergamous Addiction to Choosing, I referenced a blog post by Aunt Haley on the bad advice given to Christian women on dating. I was pretty critical of the woman in the example she discussed, because the woman wasted two years of some poor beta’s life while imagining she had options which didn’t exist. In the woman’s defense, Haley pointed out that she was only trying to do what many in the manosphere would advise her; settle while she is younger/hotter/etc. I agree with Haley, which is why I’m making this bold stand. Telling women to settle is wrong and ultimately confusing for them. Women should never settle on who they marry. Women should only marry a man they are head over heels in love with.

Furthermore, I created a post specifically to help men select an appropriate wife, and I’ve been asked to do something similar for women. As I see it, the key challenge for women is knowing how to manage the whole choosing process. In my observation, women seem to get into trouble by either choosing at the wrong time, or not choosing when they really should. This is tricky stuff, so I’ve created a flowchart.

Follow this chart and you will marry the man of your dreams!
How to choose the perfect husband.

**Guys:** I’ll hang on to my man card.

**Married women:** Can you vouch for this process?

**Unmarried women:** No need to thank me. This is a public service.
Indian Grandmother raised an excellent question in the comments section of the second part of the post on interviewing a prospective wife.

In my many years of experience with regards to male-female relationships, it is more often than not the WOMAN’S “sexual needs” that go un-fulfilled rather than the man’s in a partnership.

A very important question for a woman to ask a man is if he is willing to spend the amount of time (and that can be considerably long in some cases) it takes for her to achieve multiple orgasms and thus be truly “satisfied”..... or would he rather her just “fake it” like most women do so he can roll over and go to sleep?

I should probably create a standard disclaimer explaining that when I’m offering advice to a man or a woman, it doesn’t necessarily mean I don’t think that same advice could apply to the opposite sex. So comments like this are very appropriate, but please understand that I’m not trying to diminish the needs or feelings of one sex or the other at any given time. For the purpose of clarity and brevity, focus is extremely important. Along those lines I think one could take my advice on choosing a spouse to men and women and re-tune each to work for the other sex.

In response to her specific question, I agree with what I believe to be her core point which is that women have legitimate needs in this area too. A husband has an obligation to do what he can to satisfy this need for his wife just as a wife does for her husband. Part of marriage is forbidding the other from fulfilling this need elsewhere, so this comes with an obligation to not leave the other party unfulfilled. Rolling over and going to sleep when she is saying “what about me?” is astonishingly insensitive and obviously inappropriate. Leaving your spouse frustrated and/or unsatisfied is cruel. The same goes for using sex as a bargaining chip or power play, etc.

My personal inclination is to stop the conversation here, at a hard clear rule. But I do understand that the world is a big place, and there can be corner cases. However, I think the immediate jump to corner cases when discussing obligations & duties is one of the biggest problems we have in our society. If I say; “it is wrong to rob a bank, and worse to kill a teller in the process”, without fail someone will think of an example where the teller is a serial killer who the police can’t convict, and the bank robber’s dying child needs the money for medical care so they can live and become healthy enough to act as a rare blood donor to save an entire village of nobel peace price winners in Africa. Not so easy now is it Dalrock? But that isn’t the game I want to play.

Having covered the obligation aspect of the question, I think there is another side to this which is often lost. If you are doing marriage right, bringing pleasure to your spouse is one of the greatest joys you can experience. I think it is essential to spell out the clear obligations people have, and not look for some loophole to get out of them. But this doesn’t
mean we shouldn't take great pleasure in fulfilling these duties. Hopefully this is totally obvious to everyone reading this. But I at times think feminism has so poisoned our society that the first instinct is to bristle at the thought of having to do anything for someone else.

When your child is sick, you have an obligation to care for them. But the right way to look at this is the honor that you have in being the one who can ease their pain. When my wife was 7 months pregnant our daughter caught a stomach bug. I made my wife promise to stay away while I held our daughter’s hair back, cleaned up the mess, etc. I ended up sick for over a week with this bug, but my daughter got well quickly and just as important my wife was spared an extremely uncomfortable and potentially dangerous situation. And I was truly glad to be able to do this.

On a more mundane level I take great pleasure in making coffee each morning for my wife. I’m pretty picky about my coffee, and she has grown to prefer this over anything she could make or buy. She raves about my coffee, so much so that my daughter comments on it to strangers: “Mommy can’t live without daddy’s coffee!”. This is a very small thing. But it is a great pleasure in my day. The same goes for the opportunity to ease her pain if she has a headache or back ache. Often I can see that she is feeling this before she is consciously aware of it. So I rub her neck or back, etc. She is the same way with me in a long list of ways.

My point is that Random Acts of Kindness shouldn’t be something reserved for strangers. And taking care of your family shouldn’t be categorized in your mind as a chore or a quid pro quo. If you aren’t taking pleasure in fulfilling your obligations, you aren’t doing marriage right.

Edit 7-23: I’ve just learned that Indian Grandmother is a troll who posts under multiple identities, and was already banned by another site. But the point of the post remains unchanged.
Next Phase of the Hypergamous Arms Race: Revenge of the Nerds?

by Dalrock | July 24, 2010 | Link

The most intriguing part of the current stage in the sexual revolution is how open many carousel riders are about their plan to snare a hapless beta after a decade or so of screwing the kind of men they really like. When you are planning on tricking someone, a little secrecy is typically helpful. But this is the worst kept secret on the internet. Anyone familiar with Citizen Renegade’s blog is at this point probably thinking of GBFM’s famous line: “younger, hotter, tighter, and free”.

lozzlzlzlzl!

We are already hearing anecdotal evidence that the hapless betas in question are starting to look less fondly on marriage. Certainly those carousel riders who really want to eventually get married are taking a significant risk. They are betting that they can play by a different set of rules than the women 10-15 years older than them did and still end up married at the same rates by their mid 30s.

But as I pointed out in Grey Divorce Part II, the data isn’t yet in on how this will turn out. We can see a significant reduction in the percentage of women currently marrying in their twenties, but we don’t know how this will play out when they are in their 30s. Will the betas now loudly complaining on the internet about being taken for granted follow through on their threat of a great marriage strike? Or will they blink at the last minute and decide that marrying an, er, slightly used former hottie beats remaining alone? Or will it matter anyway since the guys who are most bitter probably aren’t the betas these women have in mind? Could the great salmon run of carousel chasers finally returning to beta providers end in disaster and failure to breed?

My guess is there will be a measurable impact but that we won’t see the kinds of dire predictions being made around the manosphere come true. Like the picture above, the run
might not be as impressive as usual, but my prediction is it will still happen.

But salmon face a unique problem. Their route and timing are known in advance, and this makes them easy prey.

If I were a bitter beta I might decide I had a different choice other than “Take it or leave it”. He knows women of a certain age and a history of promiscuity are going to be looking for a sucker nice guy like him to marry and settle down with. What if he decides to con the conwoman? All he has to do is what comes naturally to him. He may want to learn a little game to make him seem more interesting, but he doesn’t have to move to full alpha status.

All he has to do is put himself out there in places where these women are looking for marks, and look like a better mark than the others. Since some of the remaining betas will be manning the picket line and the alphas are busy with the new crop of carousel riders, this probably won’t be too hard. Then he just strings her along for a while, or maybe strings several along all the while talking the provider talk and enjoying the ride. And since she is in full blown (pardon the pun) bag a husband mode, she’s going to be giving him the best sex she can to seal the deal. After a while she’s bound to get wise to the jig, but then another salmon carouseler should be jumping into his mouth bed to fill the void.

I’ve been mulling this possibility over for a few days, and then just today saw a comment over on Hooking Up Smart which initially suggested to me that this is already happening.

I have a friend who dated a guy who constantly talked about kids & types of strollers, invited her to meet his parents, shared his hopes & dreams, she knew most of his friends. They dated for 3 months before she realized he was doing the same thing with 2 other girls. His parents had met literally so many of his “girlfriends,” they were tired of it.

It turns out the woman in the quote was in her mid twenties, but the basic strategy would seem the same. There is some danger that the Beta will fall for the carouseler or end up getting her pregnant and having to pay child support, so this strategy isn’t without risk to
him. Also, some of those salmon won’t be carousel riders planning to con a beta but simply career minded women who lost track of time, or younger women thinking they just found the one alpha who wants to marry.

Whether this scenario turns out to be common or not I can predict with some confidence that like the previous rounds of the sexual revolution there will unfortunately be few winners and plenty of misery to go around. Part of the intent of my blog and many of those on my blogroll is to help ensure that better choices are made by all parties today to avoid heartbreak in the future. But all in all there is at least a little beauty to the thought of the written-off beta mark who has the last laugh on the carousel rider.

Salmon photo by Zhans33. Bear photo licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 Unported by Dmitry Azovtsev.

See also:

- Is Marcos evil for conning women looking to trade sex for financial security?
- Supply and demand in the marriage market.
- Last one down the aisle wins.
- Never marrieds piling up
This is What a Beta Looks Like.
by Dalrock | July 25, 2010 | Link

My wife is not only sexy and brilliant, but also a pretty patient woman. She puts up with me checking out Pickup Artist sites like Roissy, Citizen Renegade, Heartiste, and dating sites like Hooking Up Smart. She understands and supports what I’m doing with this blog, and knows how those sites fit into the larger picture. We happen to have just had a discussion on exactly this topic. I had to chuckle when I learned that what really bothers her is that I call myself a Beta. This really ticks her off. I don’t know how to say this without sounding like I’m bragging, but she is adamant that I’m alpha.

I tried explaining that I didn’t define the terms, and that I’m just following Citizen Renegade’s definition of Alpha. But even after I defined the terms, she still wasn’t happy. And it wasn’t that she wanted to think of me as a Pickup Artist who would have affairs on her (2 affair min to qualify as lesser alpha). This is a good thing, because I’m old enough to know for sure that I’m not that guy.

None of it made sense to her until I remembered a fantastic new show we watched last night called Man Woman Wild. Remember the amazingly cool guy on the show last night? He’s Beta.

This is what a beta looks like.

Click to see

If you don’t believe me, cross check CR’s definition of Alpha linked above with the show description and tell me this guy isn’t a Greater Beta:

Mykel Hawke is a former Special Forces survival expert. His wife, Ruth England, is a TV journalist. Together, they take on some of the most forbidding and remote locations in the world. Dropped into each spot with only a knife and the clothes on their backs, they must survive as a team for four days and nights. As they test their will and their marriage, the two find common ground standing up to nature as husband and wife in the wildest places on Earth.

I know what you are thinking: What a loser! The guy does stuff with his wife! And they find common ground! Doesn’t he know women are only good for a pump and dump? This guy is soo beta.

And you are right. Except for the loser part and the whole pump and dump thing. And the fact that I feel that way is what proves that I am Beta.
Part of the problem is the way CR views the world. To him anyone who doesn’t share his values is less of a man. I disagree but at the same time acknowledge that in his area of expertise he has something to teach. Fortunately he has put his definition in print so we can clarify what type of man is what. And from the point of view of general attractiveness to women, I think he is right. Like it or not, CR’s definition of Alpha is what a very large percentage of women are subconsciously looking for.

And if they are ruled by their subconscious, they will get what it is looking for. But being ruled by animal instinct isn’t always all it is cracked up to be. Sometimes our subconscious makes choices that our conscious self finds downright difficult to live with. This is for example why most men don’t murder, rape, etc. We all have those instincts from evolution, but somehow most of us manage to stay out of trouble. Weird, isn’t it?

Please don’t misunderstand. I’m not saying women should prefer Betas over Alphas, or that Alphas should change who they are. My goal isn’t to shame anyone into changing or choosing something they don’t want. **My goal is for you to have a good life, however you choose to define that.** So be who you are and choose what you want. Just make sure what you choose is actually what you want.

**Beta and wife.**

So if you prefer Alpha, don’t feel guilty for not wanting to be with a man like him. Sure you would probably not even notice him at the bar, but he’s doing just fine as a Beta and not on the market anyway. As I said in another post, no need to settle.

If you are interested in more about the show and what a Greater Beta looks like you can see the main promo. I also liked the clip titled Fire, and my favorite is A Meal and a Place to Eat It. Unfortunately I couldn’t find a clip of the scene we saw last night where he caught a medium sized crocodile with his bare hands so they could eat it.
OneSTDV has an excellent blog post about vegetarianism titled: Real (White) Men Eat Meat: How Vegetarianism Went Mainstream. In it he draws the link between promotion of vegetarianism and an attack on masculinity in our culture.

The SWPL media has been all too willing to promulgate this lie [about fats being inimical to one’s health]. They do so because meat eating has become synonymous with traditional and masculine culture, the bane of the liberal media.

In the comment section there is a lively discussion of what pre historic humans likely did and didn’t eat. During the discussion I remembered recently watching a somewhat painful pseudo-documentary on the Discovery Channel (I think) speculating on the coexistence of humans and Neanderthals. In that program they showed Neanderthals hunting one of these friendly fellows:

The program said that Neanderthals had to be built with extra bulk to be able to survive the kind of unfortunate mishaps which could occur at the business end of a woolly rhino’s 3 to 5 foot long horn. They were tougher than humans, but achieved this toughness at the cost of higher caloric requirements. With the help of Google I was able to back this up with a more reliable source (Excerpts from Scientific American: The Mysterious Downfall of the Neandertals):

…their brawny build seems to have been adapted to their ambush-style hunting of large, relatively solitary mammals—such as woolly rhinoceroses—that roamed northern and central Europe during the cold snaps. (P1)

…the energetic cost of locomotion was 32 percent higher in Neandertals than in anatomically modern humans, thanks to the archaic hominids’ burly build and short shinbones, which would have shortened their stride. In terms of daily energy needs, the Neandertals would have required somewhere between 100 and 350 calories more than moderns living in the same climates... (P4)

How bad-ass did they have to be to ambush hunt something like this? Next time your wife calls you a Neanderthal, take it as a badge of honor!

But Neanderthals weren’t the only ones hunting these bad boys. Our ancestors were hunting them too! In the program I watched, they speculated that humans were able to hunt woolly rhinos too using stand off throwing weapons. I haven’t been able to find any references to this from my own searching, but there does seem to be general agreement that
humans hunted these animals and made cave drawings of them. From everything2:

Depictions of the woolly rhino can be found in various cave paintings made by humans who hunted them for food. Probably not the easiest of prey to subdue due to their size and disposition, the woolly rhino also was quick afoot and possessed what was probably a short temper. Instead of tackling one head on with the weapons of the day, humans probably trapped them in pits and then killed them with either rocks and spears.

Oh, so our ancestors cornered the deadly beast before going after it with little more than their bare hands. In comparison I’m starting to think those Neanderthal were pansies!

Picture a band of early humans where the men are preparing to go hunt one of these. I’m guessing the ladies around the camp experienced a few tingles along with the fear that their man might not return from this particular shopping trip. Word has it there were very few bars or nightclubs in the Pleistocene era, so the early version of game might well have been dressing up in your hunting skins and strutting around the cave!

Maybe not as effective as a douchey top-hat and guy-liner, but I imagine it did the trick.
Does your church measure divorce?
by Dalrock | July 29, 2010 | Link

Organizations of any size and kind measure what they care about. This is a bit of a cliché in business, but it happens to be true. It is even true for bloggers. I don’t think you will find a single semi serious blogger who doesn’t know how many hits their site has been getting. Most probably make a mental note of how many comments each post generates and make adjustments to posts (even if unconscious) based on that. But I’d be willing to wager that very few if any bloggers count the number of say action verbs in their comments section; it simply doesn’t matter to them.

The maxim in business says that you will measure what you care about. But it also works the other way around. **Start measuring something and it is amazing how quickly everyone starts caring about it** even if you fail to set and enforce performance goals. It changes the way people at all levels think and behave. A great example is workplace accidents. I think everyone has seen one of these signs:

![this department cares about worker safety](image)

Conversely, **sometimes an organization wants to talk the talk but avoid any meaningful action on a topic.** One of my early jobs in the corporate world was reporting. I learned early on not to take many managers at their word about what mattered in their sphere of influence. Often they would harp on one aspect of the business every time you saw them. They could be really convincing. As a young man I made the mistake of trying to find ways to measure just such things. I’ve seen more than one manager turn white when I presented them with a way to measure what they claimed was a top priority. Looking back I realize how lucky I was to keep my job in these cases; I was threatening them at their core by measuring something they loudly claimed to care about but had no intention of taking any
meaningful action on. Now I don’t measure anything my manager doesn’t specifically ask me to.

**Does your church care about divorce?**

I’m guessing most readers who regularly attend church would answer an emphatic yes. When asked for proof, they would point to several Bible verses, a page on the church website admonishing against divorce, or maybe even dig up an old memo from the pastor.

This congregation cares about families.

But how many could post a picture of a sign like above?

I see a lot of people on the manosphere questioning what the church can do to counter the trend of frivolous divorce and the damage it does to men, women, and children. **The simple answer is first they have to care.** The good news is if they care there are some really great options at their disposal. Here are three ways your congregation could work to keep families intact:

1. **Keep track of every marriage the church performs.** The church could keep a simple spreadsheet or database and each week try to contact all of the couples married by the church which had an anniversary the last week. Getting the initial contact information would be easy to do when doing pre-marriage counseling. Do like creditors do and get the contact information of close friends and relatives at the same time to track down couples when they move. While speaking to them during the annual followup, the church member could invite the couple to rejoin the congregation (if absent), offer to pray with them about their marriage and family, or help direct them to resources they might need to strengthen their marriage. For married couples who join the church but weren’t married there, ask them to symbolically rededicate their marriage one Sunday in a short ceremony in front of the congregation and add them to
your database for yearly follow-up. Key to this process would be to track the stats of how many of the church’s marriages are still together vs ended in divorce. I would bet money your pastor would love the idea until you get to this point. Then he will likely turn white like the managers I mentioned.

2. **Calculate the ratio of the number of divorces per married couples who are members of the church for the past year** (and historically). For example if there are 100 married couples who belong to your congregation, and 5 of them divorced last year, you had a 5% annual divorce rate last year. Track the trend. Don’t look for cop outs of “well this couple didn’t read the Bible much”, etc. Take your lumps so you can understand the true nature of the challenge. Publish the statistics for everyone to see.

3. **Track and post the number of days since a frivolous divorce.** Just like the sign above.

Print this out and take it to your pastor. Post back with what he does.

My bet is he will turn white and excuse himself to go make preparations for the divorced members support/fellowship group. Or maybe he will tell you you should only read the Bible and not blogs with dangerous ideas. This is one time I’d love to be proven wrong. Please let me know what his reaction was. Please also let me know your thoughts on this idea whether or not you are an active member of a congregation.

**See Also:** Flyer sent home with our kindergartner.
Beta Husband Boot Camp.
by Dalrock | July 31, 2010 | Link

Tired of putting up with your husband’s nauseating betaness? Wish you had an alpha husband instead? Not true alpha mind you, just more alpha. You want your girlfriends to wish he would take them home with him; you don’t want him to actually do it.

But how do you make your boring beta hubby act more alpha? You could buy him a book on game or tell him about Married Man Sex Life and hope he follows through, but that could take forever before he starts practicing those cool alpha moves on you and you can get your tingle on.

We need to jump-start this process, and you need to be his coach.

As a public service, I’m organizing the first annual Beta Husband Boot Camp. That’s right, you don’t have to dump that zero to get yourself a hero! More details on the accommodations and costs involved below, but I can tell you that it will require the two of you to travel to our romantic getaway and you will need to go on a shopping spree for clothing as well.

As his coach, you will need to learn some principles of game and help him along as he changes his behavior and way of thinking. While he is learning your role as coach will be absolutely critical. Here is what you will need to do as his coach during boot camp:

- Help him understand that the concept of “Fake it till you make it!” Remember that even when the appropriate behavior feels strange to still follow through as if it were already natural. After first changing his behavior it will eventually start to feel natural.
- When he asserts a leadership role, accept this and follow his lead. You don’t want to undo what he has learned in seminar by killing his confidence. This goes for cases where he is practicing sexy moves in the bedroom. We won’t tell you the details of each exercise in advance, because we want the two of you to practice having him lead.
- While you are dining out, ask him to order for you.
- Wear sexy clothes and act as if he is the center of your world, especially when in public. Note the look of jealousy on other women’s faces as they witness your pre-selection.

Now that we have the coach role defined, on to the shopping spree!

There are several online stores you can use to buy the outfits you will need. I don’t have permission to name the stores in the blog, but you can go to this one, this one, or this one (links LSWF). If you prefer to shop at a different retailer that is fine, but these stores should give you a sense of the kinds of fashion you are looking for.

Logistics for Travel and Lodging:

To maintain your valuable privacy this will be a virtual boot camp, but it is very important that you leave your home and go someplace romantic for the weekend. If you have kids, be sure to arrange for a sitter.
Registration:

Space is limited so register early. To register simply leave a comment below with the words “I want to register” (but do not leave any identifying information like your real name, email address, etc). I will make arrangements separately with your husband to get him the curriculum. As I mentioned this is a public service so no registration fee is required.

We want this to be as realistic as possible, so he will be instructed to play along as if you simply planned a romantic getaway. We need to keep a sense of romance and mystery in the process, and have found that this is the only way to do this.

After the boot camp:

Buy him a book on game, and have him visit Married Man Sex Life.

Edit: I hope you and your husband had a fantastic boot camp weekend. Sorry about not contacting him with any explanation or instructions. I’d make up an excuse, but that was never really part of the plan. However, if you followed your instructions as coach you should be well on your way in the “fake it till you make it” process of reforming yourself to follow his lead. But just to be sure, you probably should explain to him what Game is and that it is important to you that he continue in his leadership role.
Things my wife says.
by Dalrock | August 1, 2010 | Link

On the changes to *Dexter* (less killings, more drama):

Why do they have to chickify every show we like! If women don’t want to watch it, then let them go have an estrogen moment somewhere else!

Blurted out when asked for her opinion on a shell (topper) for our pickup truck (perhaps it was a tad on the redneck side):

If we buy that one, everyone will think we are driving into town for a pie eating contest.

On Bitchy Women/Girls:

Do you want to end up 40 and divorced?

On Bitchy Men:

Man bitchiness is like broccoli on ice cream. It’s disgusting, unacceptable, and downright wrong.

On men who don’t stand up to their wives:

Balless

On men who are too controlling over their wives:

Asshole

**Note:** By my informal count the ratio of balless to asshole men appears to be about 4-1. Also note her own take on the whole Alpha Beta spectrum (the first letters even match).

On women who are too controlling of their husbands:

I wonder if she ever lets him have his balls back.

On golf:

Golf is the sport men play because their wives let them play it. They should do something more manly.

Dating advice to our newborn son after learning about her brother’s latest girlfriend:

Stay away from cougars!
On a group of especially bitchy 13 year old girls:

- Future ex wives of America club.
Stable Positions on the Monogamy-Hypergamy Continuum.

by Dalrock | August 3, 2010 | Link

I noticed a paradox when reading the recent blog posts at Lost Art of Self Preservation for Women and Hooking Up Smart on Jaclyn Friedman (Not Safe For Your Lunch) and her celebration of sluttyness.

In Piece of Advice #61: Do NOT embrace your inner slut grerp argues

There are so many things I disagree with in Jaclyn Friedman's message here, but even if you don’t, take this away: if this is what the dating pool now looks like, think of the market value a slim, chaste, not certifiably insane young woman has by her sheer scarcity. Supply. Demand.

As usual, it is pretty hard to argue with grerp.

But then Susan Walsh has a different take with her post titled Deconstructing the Sluthood of Jaclyn Friedman

Sexually discriminating women have every reason to withhold support from sluts. Sluts are wreaking havoc on the supply side.

Susan also makes perfect sense (as usual) arguing what appears to be the opposite position! I find myself torn between two very smart women. Which side to choose?

Luckily for me I don’t have to choose. They are both right. This is the case because they are speaking about different positions on the Monogamy-Hypergamy Continuum.
We all know that men are programmed to want a variety of women, as well as avoid investing in women who may not remain faithful. So men need to either choose between high investment accompanied by a high likelihood of female fidelity, or low investment sex with a variety of women. A third option would be to have it both ways.

On the other hand, women want to maximize the investment they receive from men as well as keep their options open to choose a better man.

The chart above depicts how this continuum likely looks for women when the contradictory wants of men and women intersect. However, it is a bit misleading because parts of the continuum tend to be very unstable. They might be an option available to many women for a brief period of time during social upheaval, or to a small number of women due to exceptional status. Traditional Marriage and the options to the left of it are generally fairly stable options. However, the options to the left of Traditional Marriage are unattractive to women for obvious reasons. Traditional Marriage is a happy medium of the needs of both men and women, and therefore tends to be stable so long as society is ordered in such a way as to foster this.

However if society fails to offer the required structure, the only women men are generally going to be willing to marry are those who have enough moral strength to convince a man she is marriage material. These are the women grerp is referring to.

The remaining women (the ones Susan is talking about) are likely to feel the temptation to continue moving farther to the right (more choice). As they do so fewer and fewer men are going to see the value in offering investment (fidelity, wealth, care of offspring) in women. As a result, a woman might shoot for Serial Marriage (2.0) and find herself pulled by competition.
from other women through Serial Monogamy, etc all the way down to Hooking Up (the next stable point on the continuum). This is of course exactly what we are starting to observe.

Unfortunately for women, once a woman has moved much past Serial Monogamy her options for moving back to the left tend to evaporate. In addition, as time erodes her beauty her opportunities tend to shrink as well. This is perfectly illustrated by the Aging Feminist Jaclyn Friedman and her self publicized descent into Craigs List status. Since she is no longer attractive enough to move to any point of higher male investment on the continuum, this is where she is stuck.
I put this together and thought I would post it for reader feedback. Where on the continuum is each group most likely to show up? Does this look right? Any changes you would suggest?
What to expect when you debate a feminist.
by Dalrock | August 7, 2010 | Link

Don’t expect rational debate/discussion.

Be prepared to discuss the underlying issue at all times, and always do what you can to move the conversation back to the actual topic. But don’t expect the feminist to actually want to discuss the issue beyond their well practiced opening salvo and a few slogans.

This will get personal

This is how the far left debates. In the former Soviet Union they would tie an idea they disliked with a person in the public’s mind, and then literally destroy the person. Fortunately in most of the west they can’t yet do this to us, so they have to settle for destroying us verbally, etc. But don’t ever kid yourself into thinking they wouldn’t do it for real if they had the chance.

You will be duped into adopting rules which only apply to you.

The sooner you acknowledge this, the sooner you can stop letting them do it to you.

Expect a temper tantrum.

That’s so sexist!

This will be your first indication that you are winning the debate. Don’t take the bait and join their emotional level. This is what they are hoping for.

You will be shamed and scolded.

You wouldn’t make that argument if you had a bigger penis.

Don’t take the bait and try to qualify yourself. Instead ignore them, point out how heartless
They are, or mock them.

**They won't listen to what you are saying.**

This is fine. The reality is you aren’t trying to change the feminist’s mind. Your objective should be to change the minds of those reading the debate who might be open to your arguments. Recognize that the logical folks reading likely already get it, or will quickly get it without you repeating it over and over. So make a logical case, but focus more on the emotion driven segment of the audience. The feminist herself is just a prop. If she behaves badly, all the better.

**This isn’t an arms race.**

Feminist tactics never change. Use this to your advantage. You already know where they are going to go, so feel free to set up an ambush.

**They will try to silence you.**

Every argument, word, phrase, metaphor, etc you use in making your case will be deemed wildly offensive to women. This will be the case even if you are using the same terms they are. Use good judgment, but don’t be afraid of them calling you names. Be aware of the site you are on and how easily moderators will be duped by this strategy, and take that into account as you frame your arguments.

**They will try to end the debate.**

When attempts to silence you fail, the feminist has only one more option. She will try to scuttle the whole discussion. Sometimes this is as easy as her going on a profanity laced tirade which causes the moderator to decide that “The debate has gotten out of hand”. There isn’t much you can do about this except be aware of it. Other times the moderators won’t take the bait immediately, so the feminist will try to
goad you into a strictly personal tit for tat insult session. Trading barbs with feminists while still making a point is one thing, but you falling into this trap is their best shot at terminating the discussion. Don’t fall for this trick.

Image source/license information: nuclear blast, handcuffs, ambush.
Roll your own alpha?

by Dalrock | August 8, 2010 | Link

One of the blogs on my blogroll is Haley's Halo. Haley is a Christian woman in search of a suitable Christian man to marry. From reading her blog, I gather that suitable means a virgin who knows how to put the moves on women, and is looking to marry but not beta.

Wait. I know what you are thinking. That should be really easy, right? Why hasn’t she found a hundred guys like this? But it turns out that not only do alpha men not want to marry and women outnumber men in most churches, but single alpha men are extremely uncommon in churches. As ThinkingMan puts it in the comments to one of Haley’s posts:

With the unspoken paradigm that ‘girliness is next to Godliness’ presented to men in far too many churches, B’s odds of landing a church alpha are low if she attends one of those churches.

Now that he mentions this, it does match what I have seen in my few visits to church over the last few years. Before my father-in-law found his current church, he took us to the church he was test driving when we visited them a few years back. I have to say I would have enjoyed the services much more if the pastor hadn’t cried quite so much while delivering the sermon, especially since the topics he was covering really weren’t emotional at all. It also brings to mind the wedding my wife and I attended about 10 years ago between two devout evangelicals. I had seen crying at weddings before that, but never by the groom, and typically not continued sobbing to the extent that it prevented saying the actual wedding vows. I don’t have to tell you what my wife said after seeing that bizarre display.

So maybe there is something to this. I have to say I would be much more likely to attend a church if I could find one which wasn’t thoroughly feminized. Which brings us back to Haley’s challenge. How to find an Alpha when as a woman seeking a Christian husband she is at a disadvantage to begin with?

My thought was maybe she could find one of the less nauseating beta guys and alpha him up a bit:

What about “rolling your own” alpha? Seems that women love the idea of taking an alpha on as a fixer upper, trying to mix in some beta qualities. Wouldn’t it work better to find one of the less nauseating beta guys at church and date him while trying to up his alpha qualities? One thing about betas, they listen to their girlfriends.

If he doesn’t progress as expected you could always throw him back and start over. After all, if he stayed in nauseating beta mode there would be no threat to the girl’s chastity.
This idea was shot down immediately and unanimously. While I still think the basic premise is sound, I can understand why it would have limited practical appeal. The primary reason given in the responses to my suggestion was that once the beta was alphad up a bit, he would instantly transform into a pickup artist trolling for other women. I don’t think that is the real issue. For starters, you don’t want to make him that alpha. Also, I think they are grossly underestimating the true nature of betas. Betas generally have oneitis quite bad. This is the nature of the condition, and can either be noble or a farce depending on how this is expressed. So a slightly alpha’d up beta would be much less likely to leave or cheat than a beta’d down alpha. The only other option would be to go with a totally unmodified beta.

However, as I said I think they are right that this isn’t really feasible. I think the primary reason is that the whole “women love a project” myth is exactly that. In reality it is just a rationalization of the preference for alpha bad boys many women follow.

**Note:** I hope Haley doesn’t mind my poking a bit of fun at the significant challenge she of course is well aware she faces. I admire her tenacity and feel that it is only right that she not settle when looking for the love of her life.
I have several ideas for new blog posts, but am having a really busy week so I’m not sure when I will have the time to write some new ones up. In the meantime I thought I would share the original photo I use for the header image. I took this from my kayak on one of the local lakes at sundown about three years ago (click for full size image).

I have always liked the photo, and I think the words on the buoy are words to live by. My wife and I often talk about people we know who have made bad choices and as a result left a trail of wreckage in their wakes (often involving kids). The words on the buoy are a reminder to me to take the time to make good choices as well as enjoy life. Plus there is something powerful about being on big water alone in a kayak, especially after sundown. I still try to get out at least once a week and paddle out to a nice spot to watch the sun go down.

Here are some other shots from the same series:
If women prefer alpha, why are most men beta?

by Dalrock | August 13, 2010 | Link

Game is founded on Evolutionary Psychology, and the fundamental premise is that women will find men more desirable if they were either naturally born with an alpha (Pickup Artist) personality, or learn how to mold themselves into that type of personality. So why is it that alphas (as a personality type) are so rare, and betas so plentiful? If there were really selection pressure towards alpha type personalities, alpha should be the most common personality type. The answer is because as currently defined, alpha isn’t about delivering what women are actually attracted to, but mimicking it close enough to activate their primal instincts. As a fisherman, I do this all the time. Which of the following crawfish looks like a tasty meal to you:
If you chose the second one, I’d wager you are an alpha chaser. You fell for the color, the exciting movement and the stimulating rattling sound of the fake, and overlooked the barbed hooks entirely. Ouch!

The thing is, as a fisherman I don’t care why a fish bites; I’m just looking for a meal. The same goes for the PUA. They don’t care why you sleep with them, so long as you do.

However, as a fisherman I’m also aware that not all fish will fall for such a poor imitation of a crawfish. After all, it doesn’t smell like a real crawfish and given the eye placement it is swimming in the wrong direction! But this doesn’t matter to me. Catching real crawfish and bringing them with me is time consuming and a lot of work. So while I might have more success if I used live bait, I also would have to work much harder and delay my fishing time significantly. Why bother when the fake works so well? Plus, I can take added pride in the sporting nature of my method of take. Those live bait guys have it too easy; all they have to do is lazily dangle the bait and it sells itself. I have the skills to overcome the challenges involved with not having the real thing. I know how to cast in such a way as to not spook the fish, and how to vary the retrieve speed, etc to maximize my chances of success.

Most fish resist their initial instinct to strike when presented with a lure that mimics the food they actually want. They become suspicious that something this easy and this perfect just fell into their laps. Crawfish usually don’t swim past a fish wiggling tantalizingly and making a racket. A smart fish will take a closer look and use some skepticism. Then they realize this isn’t a tasty meal at all, but a trick. They let it swim on past for another fish who isn’t as bright to bite. If I see a school of fish on my fishfinder, I’ll cast into them and see if one of them bites. If they do, dinner! If they don’t, I’ll try a few more casts and then paddle to another spot to try again. This is how PUAs work as well. A core teaching of game is to notice when a woman is likely to be responsive to their alpha mimicking signals. If she doesn’t respond, they move to another target.

I mention this last part because there is a presumption in the manosphere that all women only want to be with alphas. There is basic truth to the fact that women are generally attracted to alpha qualities, and learning some game will help any man become more attractive. But not all women are falling for PUAs. The majority of women still marry in their twenties, despite ready access to PUAs. And the median lifetime partner count for women is
only 3.8 (this includes the husband for those who marry). So obviously the women riding the alpha carousel are not the norm, even though it may seem that way to both the women themselves and the alphas they are chasing.

In the past a woman who fell for a cad instead of a less outwardly flashy but more solid and successful beta paid a high price for biting at the lure instead of the real deal. However, she generally still had children and even though they were at a large disadvantage they were often able to survive to adulthood. However, with birth control and the large stigma in the US against middle class women having children out of wedlock, falling for the fake could mean not reproducing at all. Certainly the alpha himself has a strong incentive in the form of child support to ensure that he doesn’t get her pregnant. Plugging this back into the Evo Psych equation, how many generations before this starts to have an impact on the personality type distributions of middle class men and women?

Boiled crawfish photo courtesy PDPhoto.org
So you want alpha?

by Dalrock | August 14, 2010 | Link

You’ve read about what an alpha actually is, and you still know this is what you want. You’ve considered rolling your own alpha and even marrying a beta and then making him more alpha, but that just doesn’t have the same feel. I’m here to help, even if I wouldn’t advise the choice you want to make.

The good news is alphas are available if you are an attractive woman. You can choose from one of the following empowering options:

1. Pump and dump
2. Short Term Relationship
3. Become a part of a PUA harem
4. Have an affair with a married Alpha.
5. Become one wife of several in a polygamous marriage.
6. Marry an alpha.

Let’s start with the glorious pump and dump. All you need to do is be on the lookout for the smoothest seeming guy in the world. Actually, just dress appropriately and he will find you. Don’t worry if he seems like the greatest guy in the world, who knows exactly how you are feeling and you have an amazing instant connection. You might be concerned when this happens thinking, wait a minute, all I want is a pump and dump and this guy seems like the man of my dreams. Not to worry. Your pump and dump is all but assured.

Now on to the short term relationship with an alpha. Actually your strategy should be the same as for a pump and dump, except you want to signal to him during the process that you are worth a relationship. Go ahead and act as if you would be the best girlfriend in the world.

Most women err on the side of not signaling relationship potential enough to alphas, and get stuck in the pump and dump phase.

Becoming part of a PUA harem is easier than it sounds, which is good news for you! Your best shot at joining this elite club is to fall madly in love with the PUA. Aim for a LTR or even marriage in your mind (but don’t mention commitment). You will know you are part of a harem when you feel like you are in a long term relationship with the man of your dreams. Don’t worry about the lack of sign of other women. Remember, he’s an alpha so it is guaranteed that he will be getting some on the side. The more alpha he is, the better the chance is that you are part of a full fledged harem (which for strategic reasons you can’t see).

Having an affair with a married alpha is another great option. Often times you can fall into this by accident by merely following the advice above. If you want to jump-start the process, find a friend or coworker who is already having an affair with a married alpha and see if he can work you in.

Becoming a wife in a polygamous marriage is tougher in the US than the other options,
simply because the law frowns upon this type of arrangement. Joining a less formal harem is probably a better bet. But if you really need absolute domination to find your tingle, you might consider emigrating to a country like Saudi Arabia. I’m told there are plenty of alphas there ready to fulfill your needs. As I understand it some areas of Utah can be a good place to find this kind of arrangement as well.

Marrying an alpha is the pinnacle of alpha chasing success. Instead of being “the other woman”, you could be the one with the satisfaction of knowing he is having exotic affairs while remaining married to you. This could be a point of pride for the whole family, your children included. Very few women ever make it to this level, although many try. For example, lets say you shoot for just a regular alpha, and not a lesser or super alpha. By definition, his lifetime partner count is going to be between 100 and 500. For simplicity’s sake, lets take the average of the two figures which comes out to 300 partners. Lets also assume that 1 in 5 of this level alpha actually marries. This would mean roughly 1,500 women sleep with alphas for every one woman who marries one. So chances are you will have to try lots of alphas before your number comes up. However, this brings up another problem. For an alpha (or greater beta for that matter) to see you as marriage worthy you will need to have a very low partner count. So with that said, your best bet is probably to be extremely beautiful and try to marry an older alpha while you are young and inexperienced. While the numbers are stacked against you, hopefully you can take solace at the other exciting and empowering ways to enjoy an alpha referenced in this post if your bid to marry an alpha turns unexpectedly into a pump and dump, harem participation, etc.

Now go out there and get your alpha, and report back on how it went!

**Alphas:** Any other suggestions?
On gun control and wimpy betas.
by Dalrock | August 15, 2010 | Link

The topic of wimpy betas is a common one in the manosphere. While being wimpy is not part of the definition of being beta, in practice it often seems that way. Why is this? Part of the reason would seem to be that the non wimpy betas get snapped up pretty quickly, leaving mostly just the wimpy ones behind. So while there is a shortage of manly betas, there probably isn’t as big a shortage as would seem. But if you are a woman looking for a manly beta, or a wimpy beta yourself the fact that the manly betas are likely already married isn’t especially helpful. So this brings us back to the question of why. Deansdal offers this insight in his post Now really, WTF is game?

The feminist zeitgeist indoctrinates all kids with the notion that men should be submissive to women under all circumstances, in addition to being nice, peaceful and “romantic“ – which is also redefined basically into catering to every whim of your goddess girlfriend. Many are so thoroughly indoctrinated that they will defend these ideas as long as they live.

This pretty neatly sums up the kind of indoctrination which game will help a man overcome. But there is another related but slightly different aspect to the issue. Verie44 wrote about her challenge finding a worthy man in church on Hooking Up Smart:

Much like most of American society, [the church] doesn't teach men to be men. I mean, sometimes you have to go Old Testament on someone’s ass. I guess I don’t feel like I could trust a lot of these guys to take care of business in the way that I know my dad would. If we were poor, he would break his back digging ditches to keep us fed and scheme until he figured out a way to build his own business rather than throwing up his hands and relying on government assistance to eke out a miserable living. If someone hurt me or my mom, he would kill them (not joking in any way — he honestly would find them and remove them from the planet).

Without advocating vigilante justice, I found something very poetic in her description of her father. What struck me was how un PC this was. She described her father as a potentially dangerous man. But our society has a hysterical fear of male power. Men must be made to be entirely non threatening. This is enforced by law, culture, you name it. In short, we are over civilizing men.
Please understand that this is a matter of degree. **To be a complete man, one must have the ability to be threatening.** But this must not be something which rules him. He must rule his own emotions and his own power, so that it is only expressed at appropriate times. But the feminists and the PC left are oblivious to any potential benefit from allowing men to remain men. They want to stamp out every last bit of potential for threat. So they indoctrinate him into fearing that part of himself instead of teaching him how to harness it. At the same time, they do everything they can to literally disarm him. These two go hand in
hand so closely that we have all met men who were elated that their government had disarmed them. They are actually proud to wear a muzzle, and they put it on willingly. Then they start suggesting I put one on as well.

If you are a woman unable to find a manly white collar man, my bet would be that you live in an area with strict gun control. I’d even bet that where you live there are strict restrictions on carrying a pocket knife. This is both a symptom and a cause of the problem. It is a symptom in that it reflects the local attitudes on men and male power. An area with strict weapons restrictions fears men and is looking for a way to make them as harmless as possible. Men who are less concerned with society are less susceptible to this kind of indoctrination. But a beta is all about following the rules and being part of the team (even when they are the leader), so they are most swayed by this kind of message. Because of this a beta in that area is likely to have adopted a fear of his own power as a man. You might want him to turn this part of him back on, but the brainwashing is often too much to overcome. Men who live in areas like this are repeatedly told that if someone breaks into their house and threatens their family, they should cower in fear and call another man to solve the problem. This is not how a healthy well adjusted man thinks.

The good news is there are still many men out there who are very manly, even in areas with strict gun laws. Blue collar men or those with a blue collar background are more likely to have a dose of male power properly mixed into their personality. After all, a man doesn’t need a gun to be dangerous. There are also pockets of white collar men who embrace this part of themselves, but you will have to search to find them. If you have no luck in your local area, look for a place which still believes in the right of self defense.

If you are a man who suffers from fearing your own power, the first step is to acknowledge it. If your first instinct is to tell me that the real solution is for all men to be powerless, examine that part of yourself. From there, look for ways to express this part of yourself and make it a slightly larger part of your overall mix. I’m not saying to become violent or nuts, but to become a man with a healthy sense of his own capacity to be dangerous. Part of being a man also means controlling that capacity, so don’t overlook that part either.

Wolf photo created by the US Government (see also here). Maltese photo from Arvin5200.
I didn’t make this joke up, but I think it fits well with topics on the manosphere.

A store that sells new husbands has opened in New York City, where a woman may go to choose a husband. Among the instructions at the entrance is a description of how the store operates:

You may visit this store ONLY ONCE! There are six floors and the value of the products increase as the shopper ascends the flights. The shopper may choose any item from a particular floor, or may choose to go up to the next floor, but you cannot go back down except to exit the building!

So, a woman goes to The Husband Store to find a husband.

On the first floor the sign on the door reads:

Floor 1 – These men have Jobs

She is intrigued, but continues to the second floor, where the sign reads:

Floor 2 – These men Have Jobs and Love Kids.

‘That’s nice,’ she thinks, ‘but I want more.’

So she continues upward. The third floor sign reads:

Floor 3 – These men Have Jobs, Love Kids, and are Extremely Good Looking.

‘Wow,’ she thinks, but feels compelled to keep going.

She goes to the fourth floor and the sign reads:

Floor 4 – These men Have Jobs, Love Kids, are Drop-dead Good Looking and Help With Housework.

‘Oh, mercy me!’ she exclaims, ‘I can hardly stand it!’

Still, she goes to the fifth floor and the sign reads:
Floor 5 – These men Have Jobs, Love Kids, are Drop-dead Gorgeous, Help with Housework, and Have a Strong Romantic Streak.
She is so tempted to stay, but she goes to the sixth floor, where the sign reads:

Floor 6 - You are visitor 31,456,012 to this floor.

There are no men on this floor. This floor exists solely as proof that women are impossible to please. Thank you for shopping at The Husband Store.

To avoid gender bias charges, the store's owner opened The Wife Store just across the street.

The first floor has wives that love sex.

The second floor has wives that love sex, have money and can really cook.

The third floor has wives that love sex, have money, can really cook and are drop dead gorgeous.

The fourth, fifth and sixth floors have never been visited.
Old School Cinderella
by Dalrock | August 18, 2010 | Link

My wife was born and raised in the US, but in many ways she was raised in another country. Her mother is German, and as a result my wife’s first language is German. When she first went to kindergarten they sent her home because she didn’t understand English. She had never eaten American style pancakes until we were dating, and had no idea such a thing existed. She also grew up learning the Brothers Grimm stories for children and young people. Many of these have familiar titles, but the stories themselves are very different than what you are likely expecting.

Take Cinderella, for example. The basics of the story are the same; poor girl with an evil step mother and step sisters who make her life miserable, a prince who uses her shoe to try to locate her after a surreptitious dance, etc. But in the Brothers Grimm version the emphasis is on her loyalty, humility, perseverance, and hard work instead of “just being” like girls are told in the Disney version. Hard work is a standard theme in Brothers Grimm, and those who consistently embrace it without complaint are eventually rewarded.

There she had to do hard work from morning until evening, get up before daybreak, carry water, make the fires, cook, and wash. Besides this, the sisters did everything imaginable to hurt her. They made fun of her, scattered peas and lentils into the ashes for her, so that she had to sit and pick them out again. In the evening when she had worked herself weary, there was no bed for her. Instead she had to sleep by the hearth in the ashes. And because she always looked dusty and dirty, they called her Cinderella.

Instead of a fairy godmother, there is a tree she planted by her mother’s grave and watered over the years with her tears, and a bird who granted her wishes.

Cinderella went to this tree three times every day, and beneath it she wept and prayed. A white bird came to the tree every time, and whenever she expressed a wish, the bird would throw down to her what she had wished for.

When the time for the famous dance with the prince came, Cinderella first dressed her step sisters, and then pleaded for permission to go herself.

the stepmother finally said, “I have scattered a bowl of lentils into the ashes for you. If you can pick them out again in two hours, then you may go with us.”

Cinderella calls on the birds to help her sort the lentils, allowing them to eat any which aren’t good. She has to do this twice because her stepmother pulls the same trick again, the second time putting two bowls of lentils in the ashes and giving her half the time to complete it. But with the help of the birds, she again is able to complete the task on time. Once she finished this the stepmother went back on her word and took the two stepsisters to the dance without her.
Cinderella went to her mother’s grave and wished for proper clothing to attend the dance. Once at the dance, the story looks much like the version we more commonly hear. The prince is smitten with her and wants to know who she is, etc. However, unlike the version we know, there is no time limit on the spell (home before midnight or the coach turns into a pumpkin). And the slippers are gold instead of glass.

**Who fits the shoe?**

This is where the Grimm version takes a dramatic turn away from the version we know. **This is a brutal world in which choices have consequences,** either good or bad. In their effort to trick the prince into thinking they were the woman he was searching for, the stepsisters cut off parts of their own feet. The first one cuts off her big toe:

She could not get her big toe into it, for the shoe was too small for her. Then her mother gave her a knife and said, “Cut off your toe. When you are queen you will no longer have to go on foot.”

The girl cut off her toe, forced her foot into the shoe, swallowed the pain, and went out to the prince. He took her on his horse as his bride and rode away with her. However, they had to ride past the grave, and there, on the hazel tree, sat the two pigeons, crying out:

Rook di goo, rook di goo!
There’s blood in the shoe.
The shoe is too tight,
This bride is not right!

The same scene is played out with the younger sister, but she has to cut off her heel instead. Both times the prince is fooled and then warned by the birds at Cinderella’s mother’s grave. Eventually of course Cinderella is able to prove that she is the one who left the shoe behind at the dance, and the prince takes her home to marry her.

At this point many of my female readers are probably saying, **finally we get to the wedding scene, where the two stepsisters marry dukes after Cinderella forgives them.** Not in Brothers Grimm. **This is a world of consequences, and the step sisters were evil.**

When the wedding with the prince was to be held, the two false sisters came, wanting to gain favor with Cinderella and to share her good fortune. When the bridal couple walked into the church, the older sister walked on their right side and the younger on their left side, and the pigeons pecked out one eye from each of them. Afterwards, as they came out of the church, the older one was on the left side, and the younger one on the right side, and then the pigeons pecked out the other eye from each of them. **And thus, for their wickedness and falsehood, they were punished with blindness as long as they lived.**

Don’t you just love happy endings?

**See Also:**
Brothers Grimm Marry Him
Brothers Grimm: Man up!
Mrs Dalrock’s favorite wedding scenes.

by Dalrock | August 20, 2010 | Link

Just because this is the manosphere, doesn’t mean we can’t have a post or two for the ladies. In their honor, I present Mrs Dalrock’s favorite wedding scenes.

#2) The TV show *Chuck*, where a special forces team parachutes through the skylight to save the day. Skip to 4 min 5 seconds.

#1) The movie *Defiance*. Short, sweet, no choosing and re choosing. Then break to the battle scene where the men are defending the tribe. Very romantic.

It wouldn’t let me embed the video, so [here is a link](#). Skip to 1 min 5 sec.

Any other suggestions?

**Edit:** Tonight is date night. The first time in months we have a sitter, so we are off to see *The Expendables*. Mrs Dalrock has been aching to go see this since before we went to see *The A Team*. 
How come women don’t understand how tacky movies like Eat Pray Love are?
by Dalrock | August 22, 2010 | Link

Spearhead has a post titled Feminists on the Defensive as Eat Pray Love Widely Panned by Critics. It is an excellent post, which discusses how everyone is treating the abominable subject matter of the latest divorce fantasy movie with kid gloves. In the comment section MNL shared his own story of being pressured by his wife to go to this awful movie:

Damn! A bunch of my wife’s girlfriends just invited my wife out to see this movie (as a big couples date) this weekend. The fellow husbands, and most of the invited wives, likely have no clue what they’re about to pollute themselves with. One of the wives simply read the book (thanks to Orca… er, I mean Oprah’s recommendation) and started the snowball invitation. Shit. Any suggestions on how to turn this situation around and into something funny?

My advice was to confront his wife on how tacky it was for a group of married women to be going to a divorce fantasy movie, and even tackier for them to expect their husbands to go.

The very fact that they would think this was somehow acceptable just blows me away. We have an entire society tip toeing around bad behavior of women out of some perverse fear. So let me be the first to say it in no uncertain terms: Movies and books that fantasize about divorce or (even worse) the death of a spouse are tacky, disgusting, and childish. If you are married and read books like this or watch movies like this, you are being tacky, disgusting, and childish.

I know for many stating the obvious like I just did may come as quite a shock. Hopefully for most readers it will be a pleasant shock. For those who find this unpleasant, I’ll turn it around to prove this isn’t some anti woman rant. If I start fantasizing about the death of my wife so I could remarried another woman, or start fantasizing about divorcing my wife for no good reason and traveling the world in celebration, I would be acting tacky, disgusting and childish.

Edit Aug 23: MNL posted below on how he was able to resolve this with his wife and her group of friends. Nicely handled MNL! Good to see this turned out so well.
An old man visits his doctor.

by Dalrock | August 23, 2010 | Link

Stop me if you’ve heard this one:

A 70 year old man was having his annual checkup and the doctor asked him how he was feeling. “I’ve never been better!” he boasted. “I’ve got an eighteen year old bride who’s pregnant and having my child! What do you think about that?”

The doctor considered this for a moment, then said, “Let me tell you a story. I knew a guy who was an avid hunter. He never missed a season. But one day went out in a bit of a hurry and he accidentally grabbed his umbrella instead of his gun.”

The doctor continued, “So he was in the woods and suddenly a grizzly bear appeared in front of him! He raised up his umbrella, pointed it at the bear and squeezed the handle.” “And do you know what happened?” the doctor queried.

Dumbfounded, the old man replied “No”.

The doctor continued, “The bear dropped dead in front of him!”

“That’s impossible!” exclaimed the old man.

“Someone else must have shot that bear.”

“That’s kind of what I’m getting at...” replied the doctor.
One interesting thing about EPL is that it is based on actual events that happened around 10 years ago. If you are like me you are pretty close to EPL’d out, but I thought I’d share a quick summary of what I was able to find on where Elizabeth Gilbert and her ex husband are now.

Having written a book on divorce, Elizabeth decided to write a book on marriage titled *Committed*. From the *Publishers Weekly* review on Amazon:

> How did a woman who didn’t want children land the only Latino hottie with a vasectomy in all of Indonesia?

I know the ladies are dying to see this Latino hottie, so here he is:

**Gilbert's Latino hottie!**

Click to see

Oh wait, thats him in the movie. Here is a picture of the guy in real life (full article):

**Elizabeth with the real Felipe**

Click to see

Now ladies, contain yourselves. Felipe is taken. You see, it turns out **he needed a visa to get into the US, so he asked Elizabeth to marry him**. After a year of bickering and unhappiness together, she finally said yes after he explained it to her. From the *Publishers Weekly* book review on Amazon.com:

> When are you going to understand? As soon as we secure this bloody visa and get ourselves safely married back in America, we can do whatever the hell we want.

You couldn’t make stuff this romantic up!

In case you are curious, Elizabeth is 41. Felipe is 58 and his real name is José Nunes. From her website she now lives with José in the US, and they have many pets.
The Ex

Her real life ex is named Michael Cooper, and seems like a very cool guy. Check out his linked in bio, including a picture.

According to The Daily Beast:

A decade after Gilbert divorced him, Cooper is now married to a Canadian diplomat named Béatrice Maillé. They have two young boys, Charlie and Sammy.

I didn’t find his age, but based on his undergrad start date on his bio I’m guessing he is about 45. I couldn’t find a picture of his current wife either, but here is her linkedin page with her impressive bio. I have to say though, it sounds like this guy didn’t learn his lesson the first time around, and married another feminist. Hopefully this one is better than the last.
Brothers Grimm Marry Him
by Dalrock | August 24, 2010 | Link

Long before Lori Gottlieb wrote her famous book, indeed long before the Brothers Grimm wrote this tale down, German parents were warning their daughters about the danger of becoming overly picky when selecting a husband. Today’s tale is called King Roughbeard, and it is about a beautiful princess who isn’t satisfied with any of the greatest men of the land:

A king once had a daughter who was beautiful beyond measure, but so haughty and proud that she considered no man good enough to marry her. She pretended to accept one after another the suitors who approached her, and then treated them with mockery and scorn. At last her father, the king, made a great feast, and invited all the most illustrious men for miles round to be present. All of them were introduced to the proud young princess by their rank. First, the king of a neighbouring country, then a duke, then a prince, and, after these, nobles of high position.

But the princess, when asked to choose for herself, had some fault to find with each. One was too fat, another too thin, a third was short and thick, and a fourth had a face as pale as a ghost; and so on, till they all went away quite offended, except one son of the king of a neighbouring country—the highest of them all. Now the princess in her heart liked this one of her suitors best, but she made no difference in her manner to him. The young prince had a very good-looking face, but his chin was a little crooked, and he had a rough beard.

"Oh!" said the young princess, when she saw he still waited after the others were gone, “what a chin he has, to be sure; just like a bird’s beak! I shall call him King Roughbeard and she laughed heartily as she spoke.

But as we saw with Cinderella, actions have consequences in Brothers Grimm tales.

After the feast was over, and the king found that not only had his daughter dismissed all her lovers, but that she had mocked and insulted his guests; he was very angry, and took an oath that his daughter should take as a husband the first poor wayfarer who came to the castle.

The king kept is word and married her to a minstrel who performed in a request for alms (basically a bum looking for a handout). He then sent her away to go live with her new husband. On the way to her husband’s hovel, they travelled through the woods belonging to Prince Roughbeard’s kingdom, and the princess bemoaned her terrible fate:

“Ah, me!” she cried; “this wood belongs to the prince that I mocked and insulted. Ah! poor delicate creature that I am! If I had only married him when he wanted me!”
Then they reached the husband’s tiny home, and she learned that from now on she would need to work according to her new status in life:

“Where are the servants?” asked the king’s daughter. “What servants?” replied her husband. “You must wait upon yourself now; and you will have to do all the work, to light the fire, to fetch the water, and cook my dinner, for I am too tired to help you.”

The princess was being punished now for her pride. Her husband, although he could sing, looked so repulsive in his ragged clothes, and with his face tied up as if he had the toothache, that she did not care to do anything for him.

After a slow start, she eventually did do the work required of her. When they needed money, her husband had her take on extra work in the home to supplement their income, but she lacked the skills needed for these occupations and fails at them. Finally he sets her up with a stall at the market where she sells goods for a small profit:

“See, now,” said her husband, “you are good for nothing at work. I am badly off indeed with such a helpless wife; so I must find a trade for you. If I purchase a basket-full of different wares, you can sit in the market and sell them.”

“Ah!” thought she, “when the market people from my father’s kingdom come out and see me sitting there with things to sell, how they will mock me.”

But she accepted that she had no choice if they were to make enough money to survive, and plus her husband was a kind man and she wanted to do well for him. However this didn’t work out either after an out of control horseman knocks over her stall, so he set her up with a job as a kitchen maid in the castle of the same prince she had scorned, and she learns he is about to be married:

They brought her whatever pieces were left for her to take home for dinner and supper, and she was often very tired. But she could hear what went on in King Roughbeard’s castle, and at last the servants told her that a great festival was about to take place in honour of the young king’s marriage.

The poor wife, who remembered that she could once have been his wife but for her pride, felt very sad; yet she could not help going to the door of the grand saloon, that she might see the company arrive.

The prince recognizes her, and in the process she is greatly humiliated:

she saw all at once a noble-looking prince approaching her. He was richly dressed in velvet and silver, and wore a golden order across his shoulders. He saw the beautiful princess who had lost her position through her own pride standing at the door. He knew her at once, although she was so meanly dressed; but when he advanced and took her by the hand, to lead her into the ball-room, saying that she must dance with him, she was in a terrible fright, and struggled to get free, for she knew it was King Roughbeard, her lover, whom she had treated with contempt. But it was useless to
refuse, he held her hand so tightly, and led her in.

In the struggle the band that fastened her basket round her waist broke, and all the broken pieces [kitchen scraps] which the servants had given her were scattered on the floor, and rolled in all directions, while the company looked on and laughed, in tones of mockery. Her shame was now complete, and she wished she could at that moment hide herself a thousand fathoms deep in the earth. She rushed to the door to run away

What she doesn’t know is that her husband has been the prince (now king) all along. The prince catches up with her and explains:

“Do not fear,” said he, in a gentle tone; “I am the wandering minstrel with whom you have lived in the wretched house in the wood are the same. My love for you made me disguise myself that I might win you through your father’s oath. I was the hussar who upset your basket I have done it to try if, after all, you really loved King Roughbeard, whom you refused and mocked; and I hoped that your proud thoughts would be humbled, and your haughty spirit bend, and that it would be as a punishment for having mocked and spurned me.”

Then she wept bitterly, and said, “I know I have done wrong, and I am not worthy to be your wife.”

But he said, “Be comforted; all is past now. You are my wife, and we have a splendid festival to celebrate the event after all.”

Then he took her to a beautiful chamber, where the maidens of the court dressed her in royal robes, and when her husband came and conducted her to the great hall, there was her father and his whole court ready to receive her, and wish her joy on her marriage with King Roughbeard, and so was there a joyful end to all her troubles.
The wisdom of a 5 year old.
by Dalrock | August 26, 2010 | Link

You would have more friends if you weren’t so bitchy.

Said by my 5 year old daughter to the girl at the McDonalds playground asking why none of the kids would play with her.

According to Mrs. Dalrock, the little girl in question had previously falsely accused each of the other kids of pushing her down and had generally behaved like a brat. As you might have already guessed, we’ve since advised our daughter about when this kind of honesty is appropriate.

It really is interesting to watch young girls and boys play though. Contrary to the myth so often sold in our culture, little girls tend not to be very nice to each other. Susan Walsh hinted at this in her comments to Old School Cinderella:

I’ve read a lot of criticism of the sanitized fairy tales that Disney produces – they create a set of expectations that is quite harmful to young women. The original Cinderella, for example, told the truth about female intrasexual competition in a way that Disney just glosses over.

We were at a local kids themed pizza parlor for our daughter’s 5th birthday not too many months ago and I saw exactly how this can play out. Our daughter is very friendly and excited to play with other kids, and unselfconsciously went up to the other kids her age and introduced herself. The little boys were delighted to have another kid to play with, and they invited her to play on the giant monster truck or crawl through the suspended tunnel system. But the little girls were very snotty. My wife has wisely advised our daughter not to take this kind of attitude to heart, and to find a nice boy to play with if this happens. This is what our daughter did without skipping a beat.

She started kindergarten this week, and today told us of a bratty girl who came up to her and told her her necklace was ugly and she should throw it away. According to our daughter, she just shrugged it off and went to build things with blocks with a little boy.

This seems like the best strategy to me, but it has me wondering what she should do as she gets older. I think this is easier for a son than a daughter. They don’t offer classes in bitchy jujitsu, and with a boy the dangers will come not from his friends but his enemies. For girls it is her female friends she has the most to worry about. And this doesn’t really get better with age, at least not for quite a long time. One thing she has going for her is a mother who isn’t blinded by delusions of some grand sisterhood (of either the yaya or traveling pants variety). After all, my wife was the president and founding member of the no girls allowed club in grade school.
I have some family issues I need to focus on and may not be able to get any substantive posts out this week. In the meantime, I thought you might like to see the manly way to catch salmon:

**Edit:** Mrs Dalrock asked me to clarify that the family issues don’t involve our marriage or our children.
Sex Cartel!

by Dalrock | September 3, 2010 | Link

greerp has an outstanding post titled More on Susan Walsh vs Friedman and Marcotte, where she describes the gradually changing landscape for women due to the sexual revolution:

- In 1965 you could get a husband without sleeping with someone
- In 1975 you could get a fiance without sleeping with someone
- In 1985 you could get a boyfriend without sleeping with someone
- In 1995 you could get a date without sleeping with someone
- In 2010 you’re lucky to get a phone number if you don’t have sex first.

The irony of course is that feminists created this sort of inflation when they pushed for the sexual revolution. They saw women’s sexual power as a coin the patriarchy was preventing women from spending. Feminists took the tack of a young child: “I never get to have any fun!” As a result they inadvertently flooded the market, devaluing the coin of women’s sexual power.

A group of women in New York City who want to marry bankers has recognized the cost of this devaluation of women’s sexual power. Even though they have likely lived anything but a traditional life, they want a return to tradition when it comes to marrying rich men. As a result they repeat the old saying “why buy the cow when you can get the milk for free”. They yearn for a simpler time, when golddigging was easier. They explain in their post titled Sexual Revolution and Feminist: Wrong. Grandma: Right.

Just think about it. What if every single woman out there stopped having sex. No more one night stands. No more casual hook-ups. No more f*ck buddies. No more ex-sex. No more let’s start having sex and if it’s good then attempt to backtrack into a relationship. The boys of New York would have to start working for it!

They are proposing a sort of cartel, which allows women to collectively hold out for a better deal. This same model has worked quite well for OPEC, allowing oil producers to fetch a much higher price than they otherwise would receive. However cartels need moral or legal force to

Closing their legs until the cows come home.
be effective. Otherwise everyone will encourage everyone else to hold out while they sell for whatever they can get. I’ll use the example of our golddigging friends in NYC to illustrate.

Lets say these women are serious, and decide to form a union (a form of cartel). They will need a suitably union sounding name if anyone is going to take them seriously. I propose: **Women Holding Out for Relationship Equity.** But there are other women having sex with bankers out there, so we need to identify them as well. These women aren’t in it for the money, but for the pure enjoyment of the sex and the ability to exercise their sexual power. Lets call them **Sisters Lusting for Unlimited Titillation.** To save space, I’ll refer to each group via their acronym in the rest of the post.

So lets say the WHOREs call a city wide sex strike. Do you think the SLUTs are going to take this lying down? Of course not! They’ll just enter into a backdoor agreement with the bankers and continue as usual. In addition, not all of the WHOREs will honor the strike. Some will claim they will honor the strike (lie) and then secretly cheat on the agreement. Thats right: lying cheating WHOREs. So if you are a banker, you have all of the SLUTS and lying cheating WHOREs you can handle. This naturally will bring the golddigging WHOREs to their knees.

What the golddigging WHOREs need is a method to enforce the strike. Labor unions use a combination of social pressure and legal protection to achieve this. However, the WHOREs are not in a good position to try to shame the SLUTs, so they probably won’t get enough social sympathy to enforce the strike or have the laws changed. After all, most of the WHOREs were in all likelyhood SLUTs until very recently, and as I mentioned earlier many of them are actually lying cheating WHOREs. More importantly, feminists have been very successful in creating an aversion to shaming SLUTs. Not too long ago shaming SLUTs was commonplace. But now as a blogger with a diverse audience I for example wouldn’t consider using slut shaming language, even to make a point. Many ordinary women have come to see an insult to sluts as an insult to all women.

It is important to note that not all women are golddigging WHOREs, lying cheating WHOREs, or SLUTs. There is another category which is often overlooked in the manosphere. These women understand that marriage is something much more than a vulgar economic transaction, and they take it very seriously. Unfortunately as we saw in the beginning of the post, these women can end up paying a price for the actions of the SLUTs and the WHOREs.

Cows pic from Wikipedia Commons.
Her husband was her best friend.

by Dalrock | September 6, 2010 | Link

I found a link to a very moving blog while looking at other sites which link to mine. The author is a woman who divorced her husband 7 years ago and now deeply regrets her actions. I can’t vouch for the authenticity of any site on the Internet, but her story does match both anecdotal evidence as well as the AARP study focused primarily on people who divorced in their 40s. In her blog post titled My husband was the best friend I ever had, she describes the reasons for the breakup of their marriage:

My husband was an easy-going, simple man. He never complained about anything, helped with anything when asked, worked hard and made an above average living, didn’t cheat on me, didn’t drink, never hit me, and was a loving father.

His faults were many: sleeping too much, clowning around too much, being too interested in sports, not knowing how to cook, not remembering the names of his childrens’ teachers, not getting home before 6 pm because of his 2-hour commute, not liking poetry and art, and other heinous offenses. All deserving of divorce, right?

The truth is that he endured years and years of my contempt, grinding criticism, big mouth, and deep character defects and he loved me in spite of it.

You see, he didn’t demand perfection like I did. He was just there for me through the good and the bad, doing what a real husband does. Too bad he didn’t have a real wife.

I think husband and wife being best friends is much more common than not. At least it is the case for my wife and I and the couples we know. Our 5 year old daughter complains that we talk all the time, and has commented that she can’t wait to have a husband who will be her best friend. Given the nature of female relationships and the difficulty of non romantic female to male relationships, this would seem like something wives should especially treasure. But somewhere along the way many can be talked into believing that they need to divorce.

About 6 years ago my wife was working for a small branch office of an insurance company and a woman came in crying and visibly upset. When she asked the woman what was wrong, the woman explained that her husband had just told her he wouldn’t continue their weekly lunch date since she was divorcing him. He was her best friend, and she treasured their lunches together more than anything else. When my wife asked why she was divorcing him, the woman struggled to explain. All she could come up with was that she had asked him to fix the garbage disposal in their sink several months ago and he hadn’t gotten to it. With some more probing my wife learned that all of this woman’s friends were divorced and were egging her on. When the woman left she had changed her mind on divorcing him, but given her choice of friends I suspect she might have reversed course again and gone through with it. I also wouldn’t blame her husband for not wanting her back. How could he ever trust her again? The words from the divorced woman’s blog could well be what she is saying to herself.
today:

I didn’t have the strength of character to make it through the demanding years of our childrens’ teenage and college years. If I had endured those tough years, I would now have a companion to come home to, to eat dinner with, to go to a movie, travel, and grow old with. I do all of those things alone now. Seven years after the divorce, I still miss him.

Another woman has him as a husband and best friend now and he has forgotten me. Good for him.

The primary reason women gave in response to my post on movies like EPL being tacky was that women were too smart to be influenced by the media’s ever present drumbeat selling them divorce. But this simply isn’t true. Happily married women are influenced by this message and the messages they receive from their peers. This is why divorce is catchy in a social group. Dana shared the example of her own mother being influenced by the pro divorce messaging on the comments section at Hawaiian Libertarian’s blog:

My stupid f***** baby boomer mother called me after the announcement of al gore’s divorce to tell me she was going to divorce my dad (41 YEARS of marriage) and LITERALLY pointed to an article about baby boomer women divorcing to back herself up. thank god i talked her out of it
women=morons

At least that story has a happy ending. I raised the question before of the authenticity of the blog I quoted in the beginning. I have to say I really hope it isn’t real. But even then, from the data the AARP found her story is far closer to the norm of what happens to women who frivolously divorce than anything the media sells them.
Cowboy boots and camo pants.
by Dalrock | September 7, 2010 | Link

I’m not a big country music fan. I do like some of it but this is probably best classified as country even people who don’t like country like. So if you were to examine my mp3 player you would find some Johnny Cash alongside the classical music and classic rock, but it doesn’t take up much of my space.

Much of the country I like is of the pro fatherhood/pro family variety. The Rodney Atkins video linked below is an excellent example of this. Our son is still a baby, but the song pretty well depicts what I love about being a father to our 5 year old daughter. Watching the video reminds me of the day shortly after her 5th birthday when I took her to Burger King for some father daughter time. It had rained heavily for several days and I found a nice group of mud holes for us to drive through on the way there. Once we got to Burger King I noticed that we had ripped off the front license plate holder when we bottomed out in one of the holes. Given the kinds of places I’ve taken that truck through in the last 12 years I have to laugh that this is the first time something tore the plate off. Good thing it has skid plates! After we finished our meal we went back and found the plate right were we had left it. And of course while we were there we decided to put the truck in 4wd have another go at it. It really was a fun day, and seeing how much she loved it reminded me of how much I enjoyed riding in my dad’s truck as a kid.

Aside from the line I used for the title, I really love the lines:

| We like fixin’ things and holding mama’s hand
| Yeah, we’re just alike, hey, ain’t we dad?

A guest poster on Roosh’s blog writes in the post titled The Famous Sailor-Explorer Lifestyle Model that fatherhood is emasculating. I have to say I have no idea where he got such an impression. If anything, I would say it is just the opposite.

| this model allows the two parent family structure to remain intact while allowing you to get release from the daily grind of stifling domestic boredom or the semi-castrating feeling of being seen as an asexual “daddy.”

All I would say is any man who finds fatherhood boring or emasculating simply isn’t doing it right.

Here’s another great pro fatherhood/pro family song, this one from Lonestar:
Women’s expectations in marriage.

by Dalrock | September 8, 2010 | Link

I found the following video about men’s and women’s expectations regarding marriage on the blog What Men Are Saying About Women Sex Differences: Why Won’t Men Commit?

Not a bad video, but I think it misses the key point. I didn’t feel like I was giving up on my dreams when I got married. Being happily married was one of my dreams. I think the real disconnect is men dream of marriage and far too many women dream only of the wedding.

In my post Her husband was her best friend the discussion in the comments thread turned to the question of women’s expectations in marriage. My wife has often commented that based on the Disney version of fairy tales many American women have extremely unrealistic expectations of marriage. They expect flowers and romance every day, and aren’t prepared for the reality of everyday married life. She feels that the Brothers Grimm versions prepared her much better. J made a similar comment:

| It’s a real pity that most women go into marriage not understanding what to expect. We think we are going to find Prince Charming and then live a life of unremitting romance. Instead, we end up spending a lot of our time picking up socks off the floor. No one tells you that’s gonna happen—although it’s not a bad life if your expectations are in line. No one tells you that marriage run in cycles. There are bad times, but if you’re patient, the good times come around again. |

Until very recently I would agree with the assessment that women’s exaggerated expectations from marriage were due to the messages they receive from Disney movies and other media. However, I learned in the response section to my post on EPL being tacky that women are in no way influenced by the media in matters regarding marriage. This has me perplexed.
The five stages of violent crime
by Dalrock | September 9, 2010 | Link

This post is slightly off topic, but none of what we talk about on this blog matters if you can’t keep yourself and your family safe. When it comes to crime, everyone tells you to “be aware”, “trust your instincts”, etc. What I almost never see are specifics about how a crime is likely to happen.

Yesterday evening I had to run an errand downtown. I pulled in to the site parking lot just before dusk and parked my truck. Almost immediately after I shut off the truck a black man about 6 foot tall in his mid to late 20s started walking over to where I was parked. This by itself set off alarm bells for me because I really don’t like strangers walking up to me in this kind of setting. He came up to my window and didn’t walk away when I shot him a look. I rolled my window down just a little bit and leaned away while I asked him what he wanted. He asked for a quarter, and I told him I didn’t have one and rolled the window back up. He started to walk away so I started to put on my camo rain jacket. It was raining off and on and I learned later we were under a tornado warning at the time.

I kept my eye on him while I put my jacket on and saw him circle around in my mirror and stand by the left rear corner of my truck. When he did this I pulled out my pocket knife and was in the process of deciding whether to grab my cell phone or my headache bag next. This guy was definitely starting to give me a headache (and scaring the crap out of me). After just a few moments he started to walk back to my window again, so I moved over in the seat of my truck to better face him and put some distance between me and the window. As I did this he circled back again and eventually walked away to another section of the parking lot. Once he was safely away I got out of my truck and headed straight to the open area of the site and went in.

Once inside I suggested to the receptionist that they might want to have security check out the parking lot since there was a guy out there who didn’t look like he had any legitimate business there. She didn’t hesitate or ask any further questions, and actually cut me off while she turned and asked someone out of view to call security.
The guy himself didn’t look out of the ordinary. He was fairly well dressed, didn’t need a haircut or a shave, and didn’t look talk or move like your typical thug. But everything he did was textbook for an attack. Once I had parked, I had inadvertently created a sheltered place where he could have attacked and presumably robbed me without anyone seeing. There was a tree and a line of shrubs in front of my truck, and the truck itself would have prevented us from being seen from the building entrance. It would be easy to pass off my instinct that something was wrong and attribute it to being overly cautious, racism, whatever. Unless you know the five stages of violent crime that is. The guy in question had just completed stages one through three. Stage 4 is the attack itself. Check out the link if you don’t believe me. Actually, I highly suggest you check it out either way. It could help you or your family a great deal one day.

**Note:** The pocket knife and the contents of the headache bag are all legal for me to have in my truck in Texas. Your local laws will likely be different.
Sometimes too much power too soon, or the wrong kind of power can be more of a curse than a blessing. We’ve all read about lottery winners ending up broke, or child stars who never recovered from the damage that too much wealth and fame did to them at an impressionable age.

First I should probably explain what I mean by female power. Not all power women wield is female power. Just like men and women both have testosterone and estrogen, each can have both male and female power. Both kinds of power are closely related to the respective gender’s sex appeal, but the two are fundamentally different. A man’s sex appeal is derived primarily from his male power. A [young] woman’s power is derived primarily from her sex appeal. As a result most young boys dream of being smarter, stronger, faster, funnier, and wealthier than other men; most young girls still dream of being prettier, more fashionable, and more popular than other women.

Male power is easy to understand and exercise, but typically takes many years for a man (or woman) to acquire. Female power is strongest when the woman is still very young, and is mostly the result of genetics rather than a long process of self improvement. Female power also is very difficult to spend, even though it can be extremely intoxicating. A comment by Jess on a post at Hooking Up Smart provides a classic example:

One of my friends did some lapdancing work at college. She used to loudly proclaim the benefits of the easy cash and the ego trip of having power over men.

Ego trip indeed. Men want her, and women want to be her. Who wouldn’t enjoy that? But converting this currency into spendable form has never been a sure bet, and has become much more difficult for women to do following the sexual revolution. Jess continues:

But its a slippery slope, she was tempted by a huge cash sum to go one step further and briefly dabbled in prostitution. Somehow she contracted a severe std and she said later it was the greatest regret of her life. I have not seen her for a few years now but she got really stung by the whole scene- I think eventually it jaded her view of men and sex, in addition to the physical symptoms of her infection.

Being rewarded for bad habits early in life typically is absolutely devastating to a person in the long term. Richard Ferri writes in the book All About Asset Allocation that one of the worst things which can happen to an investor is to get lucky early on in the stock market. Maybe they bet on gold or tech stocks going one direction or another and are proven right. They aren’t able to understand that this was simply good fortune because they had an underlying theory which caused them to expect this to happen. These investors typically spend the rest of their investing lives trying in one form or another to relive that initial glory, usually with disastrous results.

Female power at its core is about manipulating those with real power into using that power
on the female power holder’s behalf. Sometimes it is fairly out in the open, as can be seen when an especially beautiful woman is treated to something free by a male working at a bar or store. In other cases it is more subtle, where an establishment might provide perks to beautiful women in order to attract men who will ultimately pay their own freight and that of the women. But the more subtle the form of power, the more fragile it tends to be. The gold-diggers at Dating A Banker provide a perfect example in their rant against bottle service:

It was a magical time. Picture the velvet rope scene outside of a XYZ trend-o-rama club. Hear the roar of the bouncer, “Three dudes no ladies? Just go home!” See the line of guys waiting to get in. Now see girls prancing to the front of the line and being ushered in without having to explain to Alex that they were invited to Joe Schmoe’s table.

Behold: Female Power! What could possibly go wrong? Our golddigging friends explain how bottle service shifted the power back to the men who were ultimately footing the bill in either case:

Bottle service changed all that... If you are willing to buy a bottle of grey goose with a 500% markup, then a club is willing – justifiably – to let you in even though you are in violation of the BYOB [Bring Your Own Babe] policy.

Now the men are in the center of the power position, and the women are “dancing in a crowded circle around a solitary table topped with a veritable grey goose totem pole”.

Sometimes the fragility of female power is far more brutal and traumatic, and the switch from feeling powerful to being powerless occurs in an instant. The blogger at No Nonsense Self-Defense explains this in the section Having Power and Losing Control in the context of his larger post on rape.

many young women don’t realize that the power and influence they have over young men is given to them by the men. It exists only AS LONG as the man is willing to listen to her. And, as stated earlier, the reverse also is true. Men only have power over women as long as they grant it to them.

But, many young and inexperienced women assume that the power and control they have over other people comes from within themselves(1). This gives them a false sense of confidence and often a dangerous overestimation of their own abilities. They assume that the power is always going to be there and that with words alone they can control others.

While this can be true as far as it goes, there are many situations where words no longer have power.

He follows this with an example where two men are engaged in a fight and the women in their lives are attempting to exercise power over them in this context. But their normal power over these men is totally ineffective. They are too focused in the fight itself for the women to have any impact on their actions. To the women this can come as a huge shock:
All in all the most common reaction is for the woman to stand in total shock and confusion when her normal influence is temporarily shut off by the male. For that moment in time, she has absolutely NO power or control over him. This sudden and unexpected stripping away of her perceived power and control is as much a complete and overwhelming shock to her as the savagery of the fight itself.

I’m not saying women shouldn’t exercise their female power. On the contrary, I’m arguing that they should exercise it to their maximum advantage. But they also should be aware of both the limits and the fleeting nature of that power and the need to balance this with more traditionally male forms of power. Manipulation is a dangerous habit, but a very difficult one to kick even long after its main effectiveness has worn away. Obviously many women already understand this quite well. Many others wouldn’t be open to learning this even if was explained to them in detail.
Stop me if you’ve heard this one:

At one point during a game, the coach called one of his 9-year-old baseball players aside and asked, “Do you understand what cooperation is? What a team is?” The little boy nodded in the affirmative.

“Do you understand that what matters is whether we win or lose together as a team?” The little boy nodded ‘yes’.

“So,” the coach continued, “I’m sure you know, when an out is called, you shouldn’t argue, curse, attack the umpire, or call him a pecker-head. Do you understand all that?” The little boy nodded ‘yes’ again.

He continued, “And when I take you out of the game so another boy gets a chance to play, it’s not good sportsmanship to call your coach a dumb ass is it?” The little boy shook his head ‘NO’.

“GOOD”, said the coach.

“Now go over there and explain all that to your grandmother.”
A while back Christian blogger Terry Breathing Grace was kind enough to write a post on Does Your Church Measure Divorce. Overall the reception was positive but I would also say somewhat cool. I guess the mix probably looked like one would expect of a group of westerners, whether Christian or Atheist. Some expressed horror at the devastation divorce was inflicting on their neighborhoods and congregations. Others were concerned that social pressure against divorce might result in unhappy women. One thought I was prideful for thinking that pastors should do differently than they have for the last 50 years. Many were also in the middle. Something should be done, so long as no adults are made to feel worse than they already do.

Karen wrote a powerful comment which echoes the flyer sent home with our daughter:

over the past 10 years we have seen lots of kids come and go from our home, seems like we are somehow drawing children in who have family troubles. Whatever the reason for divorce even biblical The Children Suffer. I have seen kids from unhappy homes and they were seemingly coping with it, fall apart when it turns to divorce. I never want to hear that they are divorcing for the childrens sake. I also see that the children feel venom toward the parents even the one who had biblical rights to a divorce. I have seen this in these children and it is always the same I have not seen one situation that was made better for the children...and not so much improvement for the adults either. I have seen a full load of sexual abuse by “boyfriends ” of mom ,out and out neglect of children, lies being told, children being used as pawns , children who never seem to bond with anyone I am just so sick and yet I don’t know that the church takes this seriously and the people who attend church seem to have the worldly view that if mom is happy the kids will be too. At least someone is trying
, don’t know if it is the right way to do it , I don’t know what to do, I just know people even in the church are swallowing a pack of lies.

Terry herself made an excellent point:

I think “I’m not happy!” is a terrible reason to divorce and the biggest thing the church can do to help avoid this particular pitfall is stop teaching the world’s view of love and marriage to the congregations.

Can marriage be romantic? Absolutely! Is it always? No, and we shouldn’t expect it to be so.

Teaching a biblical foundation of what marriage really is will stem the tide of “frivolous” commitments and the “frivolous divorces” that result.

This reminded me of another excellent comment Haley made on her blog entry on Eat Pray Love:

I think the biggest cause of divorce is the easy availability of divorce and the belief that lack of “happiness” is a legitimate reason to sever the marriage bond.

A number of the commenters felt that my suggestions were unbiblical. This is a fair point as I’m nowhere near a biblical scholar. I’m looking for practical solutions, and they certainly don’t have to be mine. The Muellers made the following comment:

As for the sign, well… that’s a bit much in my opinion. I’m not sure posting how many ‘frivilous’ divorces a church has is really a biblical way to handle divorce. If a member of a church is truly being divorced for totally unbiblical reasons, then the church leadership has the right and the responsibility to approach the couple and try to counsel and even, if need be, discipline them. I realize that very few churches actually take the responsibility of spiritual accountability and discipline seriously, but if we’re going to look at the biblical model there it is.

Bike Bubba reinforced the point in his concluding line on his blog post on the topic:

Sometimes, it really is as simple as…..the Gospel.

For the record I’d prefer to not make any women unhappy, nor make any adults feel worse about their divorce. I’m not looking to maximize the number of loveless marriages. I also don’t think my proposal is the only possible way to address the problem. But don’t the kids count? What about the fact that these folks swore before God and everyone they knew that they would stay together until death? Is Christian marriage no different than being boyfriend and girlfriend?

I’d be ecstatic to see any methods which have produced concrete results. Based on the flyer and Karen’s comment I would say so would millions of kids. I’m heartened by the knowledge that Christians already know how to solve this crisis. This makes me think this must simply be a problem of the media failing to get the message out of how churches across
the nation have already fixed this. **Please share your success story of dramatically reducing the rate of divorce in your congregation in the comments section of this post.** I’ll devote a separate post to sharing these success stories, so please include the name of the church and the (low) congregation divorce rate you were able to achieve.
Shopping makes you feel good.
by Dalrock | September 17, 2010 | Link

Yesterday evening I took the family to Oktoberfest over in Addison. Last year when we went our daughter wore the dirndl her mother wore when she was 6 or 7 years old. Even at 4 she was just barely able to fit into it. She isn’t at all overweight, but just growing fast. She was so beautiful in that dress. We took a picture of her holding the teddy bear in lederhosen we bought her and it is still a favorite photo of not only us but friends and family as well. This year she rode all of the carnival rides by herself. The day we went last year was also the day we found out my wife was pregnant. What a difference a year makes.

While I was watching our son my wife took our daughter to some of the shops there. While waiting in line our daughter said the strangest thing:

| Shopping makes you feel good.

This floored my wife who detests shopping, especially the modern empowerment variety. Evidently one of the girls at kindergarten has been talking about how her mother takes her shopping every day and how great it is. My wife did her best to talk her down off this dangerous psychological ledge. Wouldn’t you rather ride though mud? she asked. Our daughter processed this for a while, and ultimately agreed (who wouldn’t?). Still sensing some hesitation, my wife continued; When you go shopping, all you do is buy a bunch of things you don’t need, and then sell them in a garage sale a few months later. This sealed the deal. Our daughter decided she would go back and explain this to the girls in class. Knowing how these things work, I have a mental image of the girls going home and telling their mothers what our daughter said. I hope the fathers are present when they do. It should be good for a laugh at least.

I can’t believe how early this nonsense happens though. I’m just getting over my 3rd cold in 4 weeks, but I now realize that a virus isn’t the worst form of infection coming back to our home from kindergarten.
Haley revisits the issue of settling in her thoughtful post titled Charlotte Lucas did right. She walks us through the plot of *Pride and Prejudice* to describe how a pragmatic woman might want to view her marriage options:

When Elizabeth vehemently rejects a proposal from her cousin Mr. Collins, a clueless, pompous clergyman, Charlotte swoops in and snags him. Elizabeth is shocked upon finding out and can’t believe Charlotte would give the doofus the time of day, but Charlotte calmly reminds Elizabeth that she is not a romantic and that given Mr. Collins’s material assets and social standing, she figures her chance at happiness is as good as anyone else’s who marries for love.

Shortly after Charlotte’s marriage to Mr. Collins, Elizabeth visits her friend for a few weeks, and through her eyes Austen reveals that Charlotte deals with her marriage by intrepidly avoiding her obnoxious husband whenever possible and politely not seeing his faults otherwise. She is depicted as a tolerant and intelligent wife, if one who openly settled for a man she didn’t love.

I have already shared my view that women shouldn’t settle, and should only marry if she and the man are head over heels in love. While I agree with Haley that falling out of love isn’t justifiable reason for divorce, I wouldn’t advise a man or a woman to enter into marriage where love and chemistry wasn’t at least present in the beginning. Haley has a different take on this, and explains how she thinks a woman might reasonably chart a different path:

Charlotte, old by the standard of the time and not pretty, had two options: either remain a spinster and continue to live at home with virtually zero hope of ever marrying, or marry an obnoxious lunk and get to be mistress of her own house. I think she made the right choice. Collins is not depicted as type who would notice that his wife had very little affection for him; in fact, he comes off as kind of asexual.

The world is not everyone’s oyster, and given the circumstances, I think both characters made out about as best they could. It would have been very difficult for Mr. Collins to find a wife who would have fallen in love with him, and nobody was beating a path to Charlotte’s door otherwise.

Haley acknowledges the moral ramifications of a woman marrying a man she doesn’t love; in her zeal to avoid having no choice at all, she is potentially doing him great harm by depriving him of the option of marrying a woman who does in fact love him:

Would I encourage a modern-day Charlotte Lucas to make the same choice? Maybe. If marriage is what she really wants and she understands its obligations and is prepared to fulfill them, then I don’t see the harm in accepting the non-ideal but only offer on the table. The success of a marriage is due largely to the actions of both parties after the vows. If the actions are good, I think both people will be better off than if they had remained single.
This is a complex issue, and I think Haley has navigated it with skill. However, as I mentioned earlier I disagree with her final assessment. While in theory it might be possible for a woman to avoid harming a man she (selfishly) chose to marry by acting the part of a loving wife, in practice the likelihood of her being able to follow through with this intent strikes me as unacceptably small.

As we discussed this in the comments section Haley made the following point:

I don’t want to speculate on Mr. Collins’s sex drive (EWW), but I’m sure Charlotte was mentally prepared to grin and bear it for the 15 total minutes per week she had to.

The novel also doesn’t seem to indicate that Mr. Collins doesn’t like Charlotte. He is depicted as a “love the one you’re with” type.

This is the very heart of the issue. Neither one was the cream of the crop, but both still have the right to at least have a chance at being loved. Mr. Collins doesn’t play a script in his mind saying I was forced to settle. He loves her as a husband is commanded to love his wife. Charlotte on the other hand does not appear to do this. She tolerates the man she married, acting as if she did him some profound favor by pretending she loved him. When I pointed out that She wasn’t settling. She was marrying an equal, Haley replied:

Please tell me you haven’t read the book. Mr. Collins would be a punishment to any woman above a 1.

Haley is right that I haven’t read the book. No man worth his mancard would read such a thing without the greatest of coercion, which I thankfully have escaped. I have no choice but to take Haley’s learned word here. Clearly the marriage deck is stacked against women. This would explain why we so often hear about women being forced to settle, but rarely if ever hear this about men. For some reason men are always able to marry someone they actually love, but women don’t have this option. I'm generally a skeptic of feminist theory, but this is obviously a case where the patriarchy has stacked the deck against women. This also might explain why women are far more likely to be the ones to initiate divorce. These poor women are forced to marry men who are beneath them. While I have to give the patriarchal conspirators their due for this diabolical plan, I think it is time we called them on it. This injustice must not stand.
Susan Walsh has a great blog post on Hooking Up Smart titled *I Found a Great Beta Guy, But He’s Ruining His Own Game!* It features a series of letters Susan received from a reader named Casey about the clueless guy she is dating. Here are some key excerpts from Casey’s letters to Susan:

Recently, I became involved with a guy who is the epitome of a great, good, beta guy. He is handsome, nice, fun, and so so caring.

We met through grad school. We’ve been classmates for a while, but never more than just casual acquaintances. Then in May we started becoming close friends. We clicked really well. Soon quick phone calls about assignments became one hour chats about politics, then three hour talks about life, and then a couple of all nighter phone calls (which I haven’t done since high school!!)

Things got even more interesting when we both broke up with our significant others this summer. We started hanging out even more and talking everyday. But we have never talked about “us.” We haven’t even really talked about our break ups. I thought that maybe he just wanted to be my friend but then the other night we kissed…more like made out. He was a total gentleman and walked me into my apartment, then left. I liked that. However, since that night he hasn’t tried anything else!!!

Our kiss was perfect and I had so much fun making out..I don’t understand why he hasn’t tried more. Maybe I am too used to horny, eager, alpha males (which is basically all I have ever dated), but I am dying for more sexual attention!!!

He seems old fashioned…traditional…formal and very much the gentleman so I don’t know how to bring this up without sounding like a slut. He has told me straight out that he isn’t into flings. He also told me his relationship was over way before he actually had the courage to break up with his ex. So I am not sure if maybe he sees me as a potential gf in the near future. But regardless, I am getting mixed signals and I am not sure what to do. I’d love to know your thoughts!!

How clueless can this guy be? Maybe he can still catch on and recover. Casey continues in her next letter to Susan:

In the hook up department, we’ve done all but actual sex. He told me he likes to go slow when it comes to that. He said he has been trying to change from the way he used to be when he was younger. He said that not only does he have to care about the girl that he is sleeping with but he would also prefer that the relationship be exclusive.
I am beginning to see a problem that I have seen with other beta type guys. I think I overwhelm these beta guys! So here is the situation, we were at dinner over the weekend. Everything was going great. But then I ran into some friends and it started to go downhill. He became very timid. It was very awkward. They sat down with us for about 10 min while they waited for their table and they asked him questions like, “So how is the job search going after grad school?” His answer: “Uh…I don’t know, I’m not really sure.” It was so bizarre. He came off as sheepish and lacking a personality.

The end of the night was the worst part. We went to meet some mutual friends for a drink. There was music playing so naturally, I started dancing. He stayed by the wall and just watched me even though I tried to get him to dance. I came back after two songs and he and another guy were talking about politics, so I chimed in. As soon as I opened my mouth (and I didn’t talk much) he stopped talking. From this point on it was very clear he was acting totally weird. And this isn’t new. It has been happening. He is acting more and more shy instead of opening up.

Fortunately for Casey, things might be looking up:

Just yesterday I met a guy at a friend’s BBQ who was exactly that—socially dominant. I found him extremely attractive. We hit it off instantly. He asked for my number (at 2pm). I heard from him at 11:30 pm. He sent a text that read: “What are you doing? Feel like coming over?” Are you kidding me?! My beta guy would never do that. He is too nice and polite for that. While BBQ guy wants to hook up with me the very night he meets me and doesn’t actually care about getting to know me, the Beta guy wants to get to know me yet gets too intimidated and ruins his own game. What to do??

Obviously this guy is a lost cause and just plain too beta. What can you do? I don’t think there is any hope for him. But reading her story of the clueless guy reminded me of a letter I received from a reader of this blog about a clueless girl he is dating. It really is funny to see how both men and women can at times be so profoundly unaware of how they come off. So here is one for the guys to keep things even:

Dalrock,

I wanted to get your advice on this beautiful girl I just started dating. We both go to the same grad school, and really started to hit if off especially after we each broke off our current relationships over the summer. At first it seemed like we had great chemistry. Several times we even ended up talking on the phone all night. I was thinking we had an amazing connection. Then I asked her out for dinner found out she is the date from hell!

I took her out to dinner over the weekend, and everything was going great until her friends show up. Instead of waving to them and saying she will connect with them later, she invites them to join us. On our date! I mean it, she had them all sit at our table in the middle of our date for at least 10 minutes. Who does this? So they all sit
down at our table– did I mention during our date?– and proceed to grill me about why I haven’t gotten a job yet! Instead of shooing them away, she sat there silently and took a posture of “Yeah, what’s that all about?”.  

But it got worse from there. After she was so rude on our dinner date we went over to see some mutual friends. As soon as we got there she just started dancing by herself! It was really awkward. One of my buddies looked over at me like “what’s up with your date?”. With this girl everything is about her. I was glad for the space after what she pulled at dinner, so I started a conversation with my friend. Once she was done dancing by herself she came over and interrupted our conversation. I just shut up because at this point I was really pissed off, but I’m not sure she got the hint. In fact, she had this really judgmental air about her. The ruder she got, the more she acted like I was doing something wrong.  

On top of all of this, I told her I wanted to be exclusive one night after we made out and she didn’t acknowledge it. It made me feel really dumb; I had put myself out there and she acted like it was no big deal, and she definitely didn’t reciprocate. It was so awkward I decided just to walk her home after that. I really wasn’t in the mood to fool around with a flake. Later I thought it was maybe just a misunderstanding so I tried taking her out to dinner. Now I know my first instinct was right. She seems very interested in talking to other guys, and I’m hearing from others in our mutual social circle that this is the way she always is. Even while you are dating her you pretty much know she is giving other guys her number.  

Anyway, she is totally clueless and I’m trying to give her the hint now that I’ve seen what she is really like. You know “it’s not you, it’s me”. I hate breaking up with girls, and actually stayed with my last girlfriend after it was over because I didn’t want to go through the drama of a breakup. Now I have to deal with the drama for a girl in my circle of friends who wouldn’t even agree to be exclusive. I don’t even understand that. How can I better give her the hint?  

His story is pretty amazing too! How clueless can a girl be?  

If I didn’t know better, I’d say I made his letter up.  

Edit Sept 23: I’m closing off comments on this post. I think everything has pretty much already been said. As someone on Susan’s blog said “anything more is just lawyering over the corpse”.  


Judging the performance.
by Dalrock | September 22, 2010 | Link

One of the things which strikes me when reading women’s accounts of dating is how completely unaware some of them are that they are a participant on a date and not just there to judge the man’s performance.

I’m sure many men do this too, but I think it is much more common for women to fall into for several reasons. First, men are the chasers. They are the ones expected to take the risk and ask women out. If you aren’t the one taking the risk, it could become easy to forget that it isn’t always as easy as it looks. Second, it is considered in bad form in our culture to point out bad manners in a woman. Mention this and you are practically begging to be shamed, and maybe scolded a bit for good measure. Expecting women to have good manners is just another way the patriarchy oppresses women after all. Moreover, we wouldn’t mind bad manners in women if we were better men. Real men don’t let little things like that bother them. Besides, you just attacked a woman! A helpless innocent victim who despite her constant professions of girl power is so fragile she couldn’t possibly bear the pain of introspection you are suggesting she endure. Bad man! Bad, bad man! Speak no more of this.

I think this is at the heart of the controversy over my post yesterday. All was fun and games so long as the male dater was the one on the dock. Every action was analyzed and reanalyzed to score his performance. Dude, why did he fold under pressure like that? There is something positive for men in looking at the world this way. Demanding more of yourself means you will get better. It is the only way. Men need to not only know how to handle themselves around women who are polite, but also how to handle the situation when women are rude.

But only focusing on the failure of the man in the end isn’t fair to women. We treat them like children so often. And so often (some) women act that way.

Edit Sept 23: I’ve closed off comments on the Clueless Dater post. Comments are still open on this post but I ask that you avoid further discussion of Casey and her Beta date as a courtesy to Susan. Comments on the basic question of women (or men) seeing themselves as judges vs participants on a date are fair game, as are thoughts on the general issue of criticizing men vs women.
When do I get to start having fun?

by Dalrock | September 23, 2010 | Link

Our daughter stayed home sick yesterday and was talking with my wife. Somewhat out of the blue she asked *When do I get to start having fun?* Not sure of the context, my wife asked “Do you mean when you aren’t sick any more?” *No, later. After college.* “But college can be fun.” At this point my wife was on the receiving end of an exasperated look. The look reserved for when *a grown up doesn’t understand*. Then our daughter clarified:

> | When do I get to have a husband? When can I be married?

This pleasantly surprised us both. While you probably have guessed that I’m pro marriage, we don’t lecture our daughter on this issue. But we are very happy, and laugh a great deal. So I think our daughter was paying us a huge compliment in her own way.

My wife and I were talking about it and neither of us had this attitude as kids. We both had it drilled into us that you had to “have fun” before getting married. We married fairly young anyway, and both are glad we did. Think of all the fun we would have missed otherwise. My wife mentioned the standard bromide that you need to “see the world” before getting married. As if this somehow wouldn’t be possible once married. We both did do some international travel before getting married, but we have done far more since we got married than before.

While there are some good potential reasons to hold off on getting married for a bit (not mature enough to commit, haven’t found the right person), wanting to have fun first strikes me as the worst reason. Not only is it not true, but it is an awful way to think about marriage. What does this say to your future spouse?

*Yeah, I wanted to get the fun stuff out of the way before I got tied down with you!*
The other day our daughter came home from kindergarten asking about girl power. Evidently the girls in her class have been talking about it, and she wanted to know what it meant. My wife explained that it meant cleaning up her room and always saying please and thank you. Not knowing this, I explained that it was what someone says when they can’t actually do anything.

Dalrock’s Iron Law of Girlpower: The more a woman or girl uses the term girlpower, the less she will actually be able to accomplish.

Given our different answers, it seems there are different concepts of what girl power is.

The sex positive feminists want her to be a WHORE or a SLUT. I’m not ok with that.

The remaining feminists have other ideas. I’m not ok with that either!
My idea is different. I want her to feel **perfectly comfortable being a woman** and not feel the need to compete with men. At the same time, I want to teach her real skills so she can **actually do things**. Nothing complicated, just things like how to:

1. Change a tire, oil, and spark plugs.
2. Build and program a computer.
3. Fix plumbing.
4. Fix electrical problems.
5. Build her own furniture.
7. Shoot and field strip a gun (rifle, pistol, and shotgun).
8. Field dress an animal.
9. Pull a trailer, and back it up where she wants it using her mirrors.
10. Drive off road.
11. Hook a chain or tow strap to a vehicle when stuck.
12. Properly react when her car goes into a skid.

I'm sure I will think of more as she gets older. After writing this list I remembered my favorite Heinlein quote:

```
A human being should be able to change a diaper, plan an invasion, butcher a hog, conn a ship, design a building, write a sonnet, balance accounts, build a wall, set a bone, comfort the dying, take orders, give orders, cooperate, act alone, solve equations, analyze a new problem, pitch manure, program a computer, cook a tasty meal, fight efficiently, die gallantly. Specialization is for insects.
```

Sounds about right to this dad.

Information on Janet Reno and prostitute images available from Wiki Commons.

**See Also:** What we need is more moxie!
35 and unmarried? Sing for a husband on youtube!

by Dalrock | September 25, 2010 | Link

I saw the video below on the Rex Patriarch blog post Hitting The Wall Like A Bug On The Windshield.

A 35 year old woman on a desperate husband hunt isn’t exactly news to the manosphere. This is a phenomena which has been exaggerated out of proportion, at least for the current crop of women 35 and older as can be seen by the median age of marriage and other Census org data:

![Percent of White Men and Women Ever Married by Age, 1999 and 2009](image)

The way the data is bracketed makes it impossible to be precise, but the woman on the video is in roughly the last 15% of white women her age who remain unmarried. While it may be the case that every woman she knows her age isn’t married, the reality is she is very much in the minority.

What surprised me about the video however is not the fact that a 30 something woman is all of a sudden in a rush to find a husband. It wasn’t the fact that she has already picked out her wedding date. It wasn’t even the awful singing which got my attention (although I did have to find a chalkboard to scratch my fingernails down just to get that sound out of my head). What did surprise me was how nearly universal the response was from men. Here in the manosphere the attitude towards a 30 something woman looking to marry is rightly or wrongly quite harsh. The comments on youtube looked very much like one might have seen on The Spearhead or Citizen Renegade:

Dmacho78:

> She’s not unlike most women, who are in love with the idea of marriage instead of truly being in love. It’s a win-win situation for them as they can get divorced and ass rape the man in court, which is their plan most of the time as most divorces are initiated by women.

> The more I learn about women, the less I respect them. When you think about it,
what can you really respect about women?

SIG551P:

You don’t seem mentally stable. And you’re about 10 years late into the marriage game.

You’ve probably been very promiscuous throughout those 10 years, so what gives you the impression that any man would at all be interested in you?

That’s just totally unrealistic.

BigTony413:

rudebwoy1974 is right! All of a sudden the town j***-jar realizes she’s over 30 and alone. Some poor schlub is gonna get taken-in by her fading looks and marry that crazy chick. Kinda like getting a donut that someone already sucked all the jelly out of…..( looks OK on the outside but is used up and empty on the inside).

A number of other commentators were especially curious about her sammich making abilities:

less music, more sammiches!

I have a wife already, but could use another one for odd jobs around the house… Can you make sandwiches?

I’m interested but the first thing that would have to go would be that keyboard, then I’d need a look at your mother. The real deal breaker would be your sammich making skillz and what kind of truck you drive. Oh yeah, if you have any disease other than EBR, it ends here.

So a note to unmarrieds over 30, bone up on sammich making skills since this appears to be in high demand.

The reason I say the reaction surprises me is because my generation as a whole hasn’t been all that suspicious of women in their 30s looking to marry. I know 3 different couples where the wife was 35 when they married. None of these women had kids or had previously married. And none of them struck me as carousel riders.

What I think is happening here is the cynicism of the younger generation who have witnessed the full meltdown of women’s sexual morality in the hookup culture is now seeping into older men. We knew this was the case in the manosphere, but from the comments on this video at least it seems much more widespread than just our corner of the internet.

Imagine being a typical 35 year old clueless beta/white knight and looking at that video. His first reaction might have been Mom! Come down into the basement and look at this, I’ve found a pretty(ish) woman who wants to marry! But we all know moms can’t be rushed when
making snacks for their sons, so she likely finishes her task before coming to view the good news. In the meantime, our intrepid beta will have read all of the disparaging remarks about this fine woman who finds herself suddenly 35 and unmarried. Reading these remarks has to throw at least a little cold water on his excitement to marry her. It might dispirit him enough that he stops mid reply and switches back to *World of Warcraft*, leaving his mother scratching her head while holding a juice box and PBJ sandwich with the crusts removed.

And who can blame him? I was 22 when I met my wife, and she was 18. We’ve spent the last 18 years together. She’s only a year older than our husband hunting friend above. It makes you wonder; what was she doing for the last 17 years? Was marriage not a priority for her? Was she *too picky*? Did she *overestimate her own value*? Did she treat dating as if *she was a judge and not a participant*? Was she *getting her fun out of the way*? Was she *riding the carousel*? As I said I think many women hit this age without having been promiscuous. But for a man *considering marriage* I think this is something which should at least give great pause. It appears this is the case already.

I can only imagine what today’s 25 year old men will think of 35 year old women in a rush to marry 10 years from now. Based on the smaller percentage of women married in their 20s now vs 10 years prior, many more women will be in that position in 10 years.
Stop me if you’ve heard this one:

A farmer stopped by the local mechanics shop to have his truck fixed. They couldn’t do it while he waited, so he said he didn’t live far and would just walk home.

On the way home he stopped at the hardware store and bought a bucket and a gallon of paint. He then stopped by the feed store and picked up a couple of chickens and a goose. However, struggling outside the store he now had a problem – how to carry his entire purchase home.

While he was scratching his head he was approached by a little old lady who told him she was lost. She asked, “Can you tell me how to get to 1603 Mockingbird Lane?”

The farmer said, “Well, as a matter of fact, my farm is very close to that house I would walk you there but I can’t carry this lot.”

The old lady suggested, “Why don’t you put the can of paint in the bucket. Carry the bucket in one hand, put a chicken under each arm and carry the goose in your other hand?”

“Why thank you very much,” he said and proceeded to walk the old girl home.

On the way he says “Let’s take my short cut and go down this alley. We’ll be there in no time.”

The little old lady looked him over cautiously then said, “I am a lonely widow without a husband to defend me. How do I know that when we get in the alley you won’t hold me up against the wall, pull up my skirt, and have your way with me?”

The farmer said, “Holy smokes lady! I’m carrying a bucket, a gallon of paint, two chickens, and a goose. How in the world could I possibly hold you up against the wall and do that?”

The old lady replied, “Set the goose down, cover him with the bucket, put the paint on top of the bucket, and I’ll hold the chickens.”
We don’t hit our husbands!

Said to an older woman at the Greek food festival who had just slapped her husband. The woman was quite startled to learn this.

Girls have to do that too?

When my wife explained that she was going to apologize to me for something she had said earlier.

Kindergarten Homework Assignment:

Draw something loud: Draws a woman

Draw something quiet: Draws a man

Said to me in her most tentative and diplomatic tone when she was 4. I may have been somewhat cranky that morning:

Daddy.

If I were you.

I think I would change my mood.

Related Posts:

Things my wife says.
The wisdom of a 5 year old.
Shopping makes you feel good.
When do I get to start having fun?
Girl power!
Daddy, I’m a hooker!
Old rules or new?
by Dalrock | September 30, 2010 | Link

Blogger Ferdinand Bardamu at In Mala Fide has a recent post titled My addition to the Catalog of Anti-Male Shaming Tactics where he talks about the attempt to shame game practitioners on moral grounds:

**Charge of Moral Degeneracy (Code Scarlet)**

Discussion: The target is accused of being morally or spiritually deficient. Examples:

- You’re a sexual degenerate.
- You’re an evil, destructive nihilist.
- Your immoral behavior makes you an enemy of Western civilization.

His counterargument is specific to the context of the attempted shaming; people are using the appeal to morality to win a debate:

In dismissing the target on moral grounds, the accuser is making an appeal to morality – a logical fallacy. The moral goodness of an individual or lack thereof has no bearing on the truthfulness of what they espouse.

His point here does have merit. Connecting the idea with the person doesn’t make logical sense. This is what Marxists have done for a very long time; they connect an idea with a person, and then discredit the person in order to discredit the idea. In the Soviet Union and Communist China often the state would take this to even greater extremes; the state would connect an idea to a person and then literally *destroy the person*.

But I’m more interested with the validity of the charge of immorality in the first place. What strikes me is that we have two very different sets of rules regarding sexual morality in place in our society following the sexual revolution. Feminists are attempting to hold men to the old standard and women to a new one. What makes this all the worse is that those we traditionally turn to for guidance on moral issues (the church) have bought into this idea entirely, capitulating and collaborating with such enthusiasm that even the Vichy French would be embarrassed. Spy an unmarried man in the church? He’ll be the recipient of subtle and not so subtle pressure to “man up” and get married. However, a few years down the road the church’s zeal for sexual morality will suddenly fail if the same man’s wife declares “I’m not happy” and decides to divorce him. As J put it in the comments to Flyer sent home with our kindergartner:

I think that the reasons religious institutions of various denominations don’t tackle the issue as directly as you would advocate is that they don’t want to be seen as mixing in inappropriately and alienating people. My own congregation has no stated policy on divorce, but efforts are made to support both parties and keep them involved in the congregation and guidance is given to those who seek it. Efforts NOT to take sides are made. I think divorce is a minefield for clergy.
I’m afraid she is entirely correct. While the church doesn’t hesitate to shame men into marriage on moral grounds, their moral legs go wobbly when the question is divorce. This isn’t the only case where the church starts off strong and then goes wobbly though. Haley describes how the church makes a huge deal out of virginity and chastity for teens and then looses interest in the question regarding adults in her post Tough luck, old virgins.

What makes this question more vexing is that even when the church goes wobbly it generally will still pretend it cares about an issue. Most pastors still pay lip service to the traditional rules of marriage. They may even give an impassioned sermon quoting all of the right scripture. What they won’t do is take any steps which would make the members of the congregation living under the new rules feel overly uncomfortable, especially women.

I’ve offered space on this blog to any congregation which wants to proclaim that they are living under the old rules and not the new. Since nearly every congregation will claim it is living under the old rules, I’ve asked the churches to provide their low divorce rates along with the name of the church. Bike Bubba referenced a great Demming quote on a post which I think applies perfectly:

| In God we trust, all others must bring data. |

Many of the commenters to this blog have described how they themselves live under the old rules. Fewer have described churches where it could be said the congregation still lived under the old rules. But none have been able to name a specific congregation eager to show the world that it still lives under the old rules. I believe that such congregations exist; I’ve even seen one. But they are on the fringe of Christianity.

Bringing this back to Ferdinand’s blog topic; while I wouldn’t say the lifestyle he is describing is moral, I question what institutional moral authority is in a position to proclaim it wrong. He himself has pointed out that it isn’t enough to say one way is wrong if you are party to the destruction of the right way.

In the end I don’t know the right answer to this until/unless we as a society decide which set of rules we will live by. I think from a practical perspective the best we can hope for from individuals for now is consistency. Pick one, old rules or new. I believe in and live by the old rules. I don’t condone but can somewhat understand those who choose to live by the new ones because they don’t see the old rules as a viable option, so long as they don’t bring children into the mix. I think the bigger problem we have today are those who choose one set of rules when it suits them and then switch to the other when it is to their benefit. Even worse are the churches which give those living under the new rules or blended rules false moral comfort. At any rate, none of this bodes well for our society. As Haley puts it in a recent comment on her blog:

| No society can survive, much less thrive, when the family unit goes kaput. |
It’s all about her.
by Dalrock | October 2, 2010 | Link

Earlier this week I stumbled onto a blog named sincemydivorce, a blog by a divorcée in her late 50s dedicated to celebrating the good from divorce. The blogger wrote a three part series on a woman named Jenni who wanted to share her story about divorcing her “emotionally controlling” and “verbally abusive” husband. Since this blog covers the topic of divorce at times I thought I’d share the story. Jenni explains how her road to divorce began:

I was doing anything and everything to numb myself from the unhappiness of the marriage and the relationship that was in front of me day-to-day. Yeah, we had sex but it wasn’t being touched in a way I like to be touched. It wasn’t being talked to in a way I liked being talked to. It wasn’t nice. It wasn’t sensual or what I imagine a healthy relationship is supposed to be like.

When Jenni says anything and everything, she isn’t kidding. In her desperate bid for happiness she became the town whore, and dropped her two young kids (the oldest was 8) off with a sitter for days at a time so she could freebase cocaine.

Oh, wait. Something is terribly wrong here. When I read the story on the other site it sounded so different. It made it obvious that Jenni was an innocent victim of an abusive husband. Sure maybe she made a bad choice or two which “compounded” things, but it wasn’t her fault. Somehow I’ve made it sound like she was an awful wife and mother. Even worse, my version makes it sound like she was an adult who should have taken responsibility for her own actions. I’ll try to do better.

Jenni’s repeated contact with unsavory characters lead to an absolutely awful, brutal assault:

I had a series of extramarital affairs and as a result of the affairs, I was sexually assaulted. I don’t blame myself for the assault because someone roofied me but that was my breaking point.

I was raped and he broke my tailbone. I had bruises on me and it wasn’t a good situation at all. I would consider it my nervous breakdown at thirty-one. I was
miserable in my marriage and I had to hide the fact that someone hurt me terribly.

I should clarify that in the original story she only admits to freebasing for days on end after the rape. I’m not an expert on drug abuse but from what I understand planning ahead for a weekend freebase bender isn’t typical for a first timer. So I’m assuming she had some experience here already:

I didn’t want my husband to know because if I’d copped to the assault, I would have had to cop to the extramarital affairs I’d been having. I was good at covering my tracks but it was horrible to lead a double life. I would never recommend it to anybody.

I don’t know how I got through. I was completely numb. The weekend after the assault, I put my kids with babysitters and went and got high all weekend. I freebased cocaine all weekend long.

Jenni’s next move was to manipulate her husband into uprooting the family and move to another state since word about her was spreading fast in their small town. Her husband agreed but learned about the rape (but not the affairs) just before the move:

I did mislead him into thinking I wanted to work on our marriage and that a fresh start in another state was what we needed.

He actually found out about the assault when we had the moving truck in front of our house. He knew that something had been wrong but he didn’t know what had happened and I wasn’t talking to him. He’s actually never been angry with me about it but he acted like it happened to him which makes me angry.

Not only did the husband agree to move the family for her, but he also checked her into a treatment center for both her drug abuse and psychiatric problems. There she learned that the cause of her bad choices wasn’t herself but her marriage:

Based on some of my behavior, I fit some of the criteria for a sex addict but I don’t want to say I’m a sex addict. I definitely had some issues but I think a lot of it was just that I was so unhappy in my marriage. There was no affection.

Now it is starting to make sense. I just knew it had to be his fault. This guy is such an insensitive ass! First he makes her unhappy, and then he has the gall to be upset with her when he finds out about her multitude of affairs:

I was supposed to be at the center for a month but my husband was so verbally abusive while I was there, I actually got grounded from talking to him. My case manager said,

“You can’t talk to him anymore. All he does is upset you.”

He had found out about the affairs and that’s what he was angriest about, which I can understand. I would never recommend having an affair to anyone. As good of an
idea as it sounds for the simple pleasures that you get, the long term is never worth it. It is too damaging.

So of course, Jenni did what anyone would do. She cashed out one of the couple’s retirement accounts and stayed in treatment for an extra month as a sort of vacation. After the money ran out, she returned home and parked herself on the couch:

Because he was so angry with me, I cashed out one of my IRAs so I could stay in treatment for another month. As much as I missed my kids, I needed the break, just from the role of mom and wife and feeling like damaged goods after the assault.

My husband was yelling at me to come home and take care of the kids and he wanted to try to make it work. But I knew then what I needed to do. I remember sitting there in California, crying, not wanting to come back and be with him.

Almost a year later came the incident which was the last straw for Jenni:

There were many fights but I remember one big one when he woke me up at 5:30 in the morning. We were still sleeping in the same bed at the time and I woke up to him calling me a whore, a bitch, a c*** and stuff, because he couldn’t find a piece of equipment for his work. Because of that, he decided to lay into me and blame me.

I actually called my parents and I would never usually call them at that hour. I spoke to my dad,

“Dad, I don’t know what to do. He’s being horrible to me, he’s calling me names, he’s screaming at me and I know the kids can hear it. I don’t want to call the police because I’d hate for my kids to see that.”

My dad is a police officer and he called me back later that afternoon and said,

“If I ever get another phone call from you like that again, you’ll have the police on your doorstep taking him away.”

It was a rough period. I had filed for divorce but I was doubting whether I should move out.

Between her husband’s previously described abuse and the wisdom of a Celestial Seasoning’s box, Jenni decided to take the plunge and move out on her own.

This is where the series ends, at least so far.

See also: It’s still about her.

Image from Oaktown Crack Online
The two previous Brothers Grimm tales we have explored had young women as main characters and stressed the importance of hard work and humility. Today’s tale is titled The youth who could not shiver and shake and has a young man as the main character. It focuses on the virtues of courage cleverness and strength and the vices of foolishness and cowardice, as well as an act of true love in marriage:

A Father had two sons, the eldest clever and sensible, but the younger was so stupid that he could neither learn nor understand any thing, and people would say, ”What a burden that stupid boy must be to his father.”

Whatever the father wanted done, Jack, the eldest boy, was obliged to do, even to take messages, for his brother was too stupid to understand or remember. But Jack was a terrible coward, and if his father wished him to go anywhere late in the evening, and the road led through the churchyard, he would say, ”Oh! no, father, I can’t go there, it makes me tremble and shake so,”

Sometimes when they sat round the fire of an evening, while some one related tales that frightened him, he would say, ”Oh! please don’t go on, it makes me shake all over.”

Our main character Hans is the younger son, the one too stupid to be useful to his father. He is envious of his older brother’s ability to experience fear, since he has never felt such a thing:

I can’t think what he means by saying it makes him shiver and shake; it must be something very wonderful that could make me shiver and shake.

His father has lost patience with him, and tells him he must learn to earn his own living since he is becoming a man.

Along comes the church sexton and the father explains the situation. His son needs to learn to work but is instead obsessed with learning to shiver and shake. The sexton has an idea which should solve both problems. He enlists the youth to ring the bells of the church at midnight. Once Hans is in place to ring the bells, the sexton appears disguised as a ghost. Hans feels no fear and simply orders the unknown figure to leave immediately. Hans gives a second warning: speak, if you are an honest man, or I will throw you down the steps. But the sexton doesn’t take him seriously, and neither moves nor identifies himself. So Hans matter of factly throws the sexton down the stairs:

and as there was still no answer, he sprung upon the sham ghost, and giving him a push, he rolled down ten steps, and falling into a corner, there remained.

Hans doesn’t think anything more of the incident, and finishes ringing the bells and then
returns home and goes to sleep. It isn’t until the next day when the sexton’s wife found him lying in agony on the stairs with a broken leg that the truth of the story came out. Hans’ father disowns him, and orders him out of the house:

There are fifty crowns, take them and go out into the world when you please; but don’t tell any one where you come from, or who is your father, for I am ashamed to own you.” I “Father,” said Hans, “I will do just as you tell me; your orders are very easy to perform.”

Hans hits the road, still bemoaning his inability to experience fear: When shall I learn to shiver and shake,— when shall I learn to be afraid? Another traveler hears this and offers an opportunity. He has Hans sit all night under a tree where the bodies of seven recently hanged men still swing. If Hans learns to shiver and shake, he is to give up his 50 crowns. But instead of experiencing fear, Hans cuts the corpses down and places them around the campfire as company. There is a comical scene where Hans warns them to move away from the heat so they don’t catch fire, but they remain too close and their clothes catch fire. He puts them out and ties them back up where he found them and goes to sleep.

The next day a fellow traveler meets him on the road and questions him, but Hans stays true to his promise to his father:

A wagoner walking along the road by his horses overtook him, and asked who he was.
“I don’t know,” he replied.
The wagoner asked again, “Why are you here?”
"I can’t tell,” said Hans.
“Who is your father?”
“I dare not say,”

Next Hans learns of a cursed and haunted castle:

“not far from here stands an enchanted castle, where you could easily learn to shiver and shake, if you remain in it. The king of the country has promised to give his daughter in marriage to any one who will venture to sleep in the castle for three nights, and she is as beautiful a young lady as the sun ever shone upon. Rich and valuable treasures in the castle are watched over by wicked spirits, and any one who could destroy these goblins and demons, and set free the treasures which are rotting in the castle, would be made a rich and a lucky man. Numbers of persons have gone into the castle full of hope that they should succeed, but they have not been heard of since.”

Motivated more by the opportunity to experience fear than the promise of riches and a beautiful wife, Hans eagerly accepts the offer. The bargain requires that Hans bring no living thing with him, but he is granted his request to bring a fire, a turning-lathe, a cutting-board, and a knife. Once situated in the castle around the fire, Hans is set on by two ferocious and large black cats. He handles them with his characteristic way:

two very large black cats sprung forward furiously, seated themselves on each side
of the fire, and stared at him with wild, fiery eyes. After a while, when the cats became thoroughly warm, they spoke, and said, “Comrade, will you have a game of cards?”

“With all my heart,” answered Hans; “but first stretch out your feet, and let me examine your claws.”

The cats stretched out their paws. “Ah!” said he, “what long nails you have, and now that I have seen your fingers, I would rather be excused from playing cards with you.”

Then he killed them both, and threw them out of the window into the moat.

Hans stayed there three nights, and battled all manner of ghosts, skeletons and monsters. Each time he defeated them by outwitting them, overpowering them, and matter of factly killing them. Each morning the king would come to check, assuming the young man was dead, and each morning Hans greeted him. On the final night one of the apparitions challenges Hans to a contest of strength. The man went first, and cut an anvil in two with an axe. Hans uses the opportunity to his advantage:

“I can do better than that,” said Hans, taking up the axe and going towards another anvil. The monster was so surprised at this daring on the part of Hans that he followed him closely, and as he leaned over to watch what the youth was going to do, his long white beard fell on the anvil. Hans raised his axe, split the anvil at one blow, wedging the old man’s beard in the opening at the same time.

“No! I have got you, old fellow,” cried Hans, “prepare for the death you deserve.” Then he took up an iron bar and beat the old man till he cried for mercy, and promised to give him all the riches that were hidden in the castle.

The ghost keeps his promise and leads Hans to great chests of gold, which are to be divided evenly between Hans, the king, and the poor. In the morning the king returns:

“You have released the castle from enchantment. I will give you, as I promised, my daughter in marriage.”

“That is good news,” cried Hans. “But I have not learnt to shiver and shake after all.”

The gold was soon after brought away from the castle, and the marriage celebrated with great pomp. Young Prince Hans, as he was now called, did not seem quite happy after all. Not even the love of his bride could satisfy him. He was always saying: “When shall I learn to shiver and shake?”

The princess is troubled that her husband is unhappy. She talks to one of her maids who tells her how to solve the problem:

So that night while Hans was in bed and asleep, the Princess drew down the
bedclothes gently, and threw the cold water with the gudgeons all over him. The little fish wriggled about as they fell on the bed, and the Prince, waking suddenly, exclaimed, “Oh! dear, how I do shiver and shake, what can it be?” Then seeing the Princess standing by his bed, he guessed what she had done.

“Dear wife,” he said, “now I am satisfied, you have taught me to shiver and shake at last.” and from that hour he lived happily and contented with his wife, for he had learnt to shiver and shake—but not to fear.
It’s still about her.
by Dalrock | October 8, 2010 | Link

In my previous post It’s all about her, I shared the story of Jenni as recounted from the blog sincemydivorce. Since then the blogger there has done three more installments on Jenni’s story, so I thought I would bring the story up to date.

As you might recall, Jenni was married to a terrible man and had to escape. Granted, she did make a few mistakes as the blogger at sincemydivorce explains in the first post of the series:

Jenni admits she made some poor choices beginning with a series of extramarital affairs that compounded the issues.

In post #4 in the series He made me feel stupid the blogger and Jenni tell us just how bad this guy was. Trust me, you’ve never seen a guy with this man’s ability to ruin people’s lives. Jenni didn’t meet him until she was 20, but he was able to retroactively cause her to have poor grades in high school and prevent her from starting college after that:

He kind of made me feel stupid. I was the stupid one in the relationship. I had a 1.97 GPA in high school. I hated school and never applied myself. I just didn’t do well.

When my husband and I would fight, he’d tell me I would never make it on my own, that he was the one with the education and the money. He said he’d use that in court against me so he could keep the children.

He’s almost finished with his Ph.D and although he said he wanted me to go to school, I never felt it was for an equal opportunity. It was always, “wait until I’m done.”

Now that they are divorced, Jenni is finally able to go back to school and pursue her dreams:

Right now I’m doing all the basic classes and I’m not sure what I’ll end up majoring in. Currently, I’m working towards a degree in fine art and graphic design but I feel like writing is something I should be doing. I don’t know what I’ll do when I graduate. I’ve been a hairdresser for eighteen years and I love what I do but at the same time I’d like to try making it at something else.

As a bonus, Jenni is able to live off of the student loan money as well:

Part of it was a financial strategy. I knew I could get extra loan money if I went full-time and I would be able support myself with an apartment and at least a couple of months’ money to live on.

In post #5 A DIY divorce, we learn more details about the financial and custody arrangements of their divorce:
We did everything ourselves and came up with a custody arrangement by ourselves. He and I held hands during our divorce hearing and went and got a beer and sandwiches afterwards.

In the agreement, it’s about a 70/30 split with my ex having the children most of the time. However, he’ll call me when he needs to go to work on a day off and ask if I can watch them so I probably have them closer to forty or forty-five percent of the time.

Not burning bridges with her ex was a wise move and has really paid off for Jenni. Your ex husband today could turn into a paying customer tomorrow:

Early on there was some negotiating because of sexual favors, not so much anymore. I figured I had something he wanted and he had the money. I have cut a lot of that off now even though we are still very co-dependent.

Co-dependent? Yeah, I’ll buy that. But I have to admit it wasn’t the first word that came to mind. I’m not sure which one looks worse in that arrangement, the hooker or the john. In addition to paying her for er, *odd jobs*, her ex husband also pays her alimony of $400 a month.

Fortunately aside from a minor complaint Jenni is satisfied with how her ex husband is raising their kids:

He doesn’t keep the house the way I wish it was kept but the kids aren’t dying. He does what he can as a single dad and I commend him for that because he works full-time in addition to going to school full-time and having the children most of the time. I do what I can to help financially here and there but he’s the one helping me more than anything.

This brings us to post #6, *A better mother after divorce*. We learn about her rejuvenated parenting ability after divorce. As any concerned mother would, she counsels her oldest daughter on drug abuse:

I can’t babysit you every minute of every day. You’re going to have to make that choice and deal with the consequences if that’s the choice you make for yourself. I can’t be there to hold your hand the rest of your life.

In order to walk the walk and not just talk the talk, Jenni has restricted her own drug use to marijuana and alcohol. She has even made some friends who aren’t drug users: *I don’t surround myself with everyone who smokes. Its nice to have friends who don’t smoke.*

She also understands how much she has done to harm her kids by her past actions, and has apologized to her oldest daughter:

I’m sorry that I let you see your dad treat me the way that he did all those years, and I’m sorry I set the example...it’s not okay to let someone treat you like that who is supposed to love you. They shouldn’t speak to you the way that your dad used to
speak to me.

Her twelve year old daughter gets it, and now thinks her mom is *pretty cool*. Unfortunately her seven year old son still struggles with the divorce:

My son’s had a harder time with the separation and the divorce and being away from mommy. He’s still at the age when he wants to hold my hand when we’re walking down the street. I try to keep him from feeling so angry and sad about it. We talk and I try to do special stuff with him.
I can’t find the link to the original article any more, but this was a comment by Jack on the AP version of the “Bad Economy Causing Fewer Marriages” story:

| Will fk for food, custody, the house, alimony, and child support. Free samples.

Take the free samples if you must men, but do not marry such a woman. Far better would be to avoid her altogether and find a woman worthy of marriage.
Is Marcos evil for conning women looking to trade sex for financial security?
by Dalrock | October 12, 2010 | Link

Several months back I wrote a post titled Next Phase of the Hypergamous Arms Race: Revenge of the Nerds? In the post I asked the question if today’s round of carousel riders weren’t taking a great risk in their plan to con some unsuspecting beta into marrying and supporting them once they tired of the carousel. I pointed out that in their attempt to con a beta, they ran the risk of having the beta turn the tables on them.

Marcos commented on the thread and said he in fact does exactly what I was pondering:

No matter what lake you find them in, the bait is the same. When they ask you (Trust me – they will! Several times) why you’re 34, 35 whatever years old and never married you just take a moment and say, “Candidly? I haven’t found the right girl. I’m a traditional man and was raised to believe the man takes care of all the bills and financial responsibility. You know, where the woman doesn’t mind taking care of the home. I don’t mind that a woman has a job/career or whatever...in fact that’s great! But I don’t want her to feel that she has to work. That’s my job. Also, I’ve been working all these years to get to a position financially to where I can afford the lifestyle my kids deserve and now I’m ready to focus on the right girl and settle down. You’d be surprised how hard it is to find a woman who wants to have kids and settle down these days.” Say this very relaxed, matter-of-factly tone and it will work. Especially if she’s over 32. Result: deer in headlights. And they buy it. Wanna know why?

Because what I say above taps into the psyche of all carouseler women:
1) These women really don’t want to work for a living – they just want something to occupy their time.
2) These women want a man to take care of all their financial needs/wants without them ever having to care about pricetags.
3) Of course, her biological clock is at the 11th hour and 59th minute.
4) The last reason she’ll buy it: hope.

So in a nutshell, what Marcos is doing is looking for women looking to use sex to lure a man into marrying her and supporting her financially. He says some of these women are what we would call carousel riders, some are women who made their career their priority, and most are A la carte feminists (brilliant term!).

On that and other posts we’ve had many explanations for why a woman might find herself in her mid 30s and suddenly looking for a husband. J explained on the youtube post that many of them are former nuns:

I personally know half a dozen 30+ brides who once were nuns.
I’m not sure that former nuns make up a significant portion of women in this demographic. But let’s assume for sake of argument Marcos is focusing on former nuns. This would make him evil, right? How dare he prey on innocent former nuns!

However, if they are trying to trade sex for financial security, how innocent can they be? I think this is the fundamental question. Marcos’ con won’t work on any woman not looking to trade sex (outside of marriage) for financial security. The old saw you can’t con an honest man comes to mind. If the nuns in question are chaste, Marcos isn’t going to waste any time on them. He didn’t say he is marrying them or even getting engaged. He’s dating them and sending signals that he would be a great man to try to get into a binding agreement to support her and any future children. If the woman isn’t looking to have him support her, she won’t be attracted by his “bait”. Moreover, if she isn’t willing to provide plenty of easy sex to lure him into a trap of her own, he isn’t going to waste his time with her.
Feminism and women’s happiness.
by Dalrock | October 14, 2010 | Link

I’m not the first to note that feminism tends to make women unhappy. For example, many have pointed out that it makes women unhappy by suggesting they arrange their lives in ways less likely to make them happy. Stressing career over family, stressing the need to dominate their husbands, etc.

But feminism also has from its inception been about convincing women that they are terribly unhappy. This is a foundational step for any group wanting to introduce sweeping changes. People won’t accept let alone push for change if they are happy with the status quo. Feminism wants to keep pushing social change, so they can’t afford to let up on their message to women that unless they are a fool they should be terribly unhappy.

But this blog is about solutions. Women can be happy. The patriarchy has merely tricked you into choosing the wrong options. Therefore, all you have to do is make different choices. You know, the ones where the deck isn’t stacked against you. To achieve true happiness as a woman, all you have to do is avoid all of the following unhappy options the patriarchy wants to force you into:

Life’s work:

- **If a full time mother being supported by a husband:** Your life lacks the meaning and fulfillment your husband enjoys by having a career. Raising kids is pointless drudgery imposed on women by the patriarchy.
- **If a full time career woman:** You are being deprived of the right to fulfill your all important maternal instinct. The patriarchy has forced you to abandon your dreams of fulfillment via motherhood, and trapped you in a pointless, thankless job.
- **If you have a career and children:** You are being forced to do double work by the patriarchy. You work the dreaded second shift. Both jobs are pointless, thankless, drudgery.
- **If your husband agrees to be a stay at home dad while you focus on the role of breadwinner:** Your husband is sponging off of you, while enjoying the great rewards of caring for your children. You are forced into thankless drudgery in a career.

Marital Status:

- **If unmarried:** Men have failed you in some way. They either failed you by being unworthy of marriage in your eyes, or they refuse to do their duty and marry you (fear of commitment!). This is true even if you divorced one or more previous husbands.
- **If married:** You are trapped in by binding agreement, prevented from fulfilling your life’s desires.

Leadership role in the marriage:

- **If the husband has it:** He is a tyrant who dominates you and prevents you from being
a full human being. No act of violence or deception on your part is beyond the pale of acceptable responses to such an unbearable situation.

- **If the wife has it (AKA shared leadership):** He is a loser. You feel like his mother.
I misunderstood this one at first, until my wife pointed me in the right direction. The Willful Child:

Once upon a time there was a child who was willful and would not do what her mother wished. For this reason, God had no pleasure in her, and let her become ill. No doctor could do her any good, and in a short time the child lay on her deathbed. When she had been lowered into her grave, and the earth was spread over her, all at once her little arm came out again and reached upward. And when they had pushed it back in the ground and spread fresh earth over it, it was all to no purpose, for the arm always came out again. Then the mother herself was obliged to go to the grave and strike the arm with a rod. When she had done that, the arm was drawn in, and at last the child had rest beneath the ground.
Marriage strike?
by Dalrock | October 19, 2010 | Link

Grerp has sparked a spirited discussion on her blog with her post A question for the gentlemen. In that post she mentions the oft cited manosphere threat of a marriage strike:

Having read extensively what the men in this corner of the interwebz have to say about marriage – that it’s a trap, a form of indentured servitude or slavery, that it’s a sure way to get robbed of both your money and your children in divorce court, that there are no women who are good wife material left in America – I’m left wondering what women should do if there is to be a marriage strike (or if there is already a marriage strike, which may be the case given the recent census data about marriage).

So this has me thinking about the question of whether or not there really is, or will be, a marriage strike. My first answer is that it depends on how we define the term. If those using it are thinking of a classical strike where men would eschew marriage out of a sense of male solidarity in an effort to extract a better social bargain, this isn’t happening and won’t happen any time in the near future. As I pointed out in Sex Cartel, in order for such an effort to be effective there would need to be means to enforce the strike.

But this still leaves open the possibility that men would avoid marriage not because they wanted to achieve some grander social aim, but because they felt it was in their individual best interest. This of course is another question entirely.

The most frequently cited data considered proof of a marriage strike is the number of marriages per 1,000 unmarried women. The Spearhead shared exactly these statistics in a post earlier this year ominously titled The End Of Marriage. They compiled the data into a helpful graph to assist us in visualizing the extent of societal change we are experiencing:

They even project out the trend into the future in semi tounge in cheek spirit:

So I guess thats it ladies! Game over; you may as well pack up your ring fingers and go home, right?

Maybe not. The data in the chart above suffers from two common problems when we are looking at data on marriage rates.

The first problem is that it lumps in all racial and demographic groups. I pointed out in the Sing for a husband post that since the delightful lady in question was 35 and white, per the census data she was one of the remaining 15% of women in her demographic who were
unmarried. That's right. Roughly **85%** of white women in the US have married by the time they reach 35. But the story would have been different if she were a black woman singing for a husband at age 35. In that case she would have been in the same boat as roughly **45%** of her peers. 15% and 45% are very different numbers, especially if you are singing for a husband! Any time you see marriage rates lumped together, you have to ask how reflective this is of you or whoever you are talking to. Averaging 15% and 45% isn't helpful to either group.

The second problem with the data in the chart above is a bit more subtle. The biggest problem with answering the question of whether marriage rates are changing is the problem of **timing**. If 100% of women used to marry exactly at age 20, and now 100% of them marry exactly at age 40, do fewer women marry now than in the past? In either case, 100% of women are marrying. But something rather important has also happened. More vexing still is for someone looking to understand marriage rates in the above hypothetical there would be a twenty year period where marriage rates appeared to decline precipitously. The data would show 100% marriage until the change, then decline steadily, and then jump back up to 100% again. Until the first crop of women delaying marriage reached aged 40, all you could do is speculate on how likely they would be to marry. That is a 20 year information gap, simply to know what would happen for today's women. If you wanted to know about the next generation you would have to patiently wait another 20 years.

The data series above is deceptively susceptible to exactly the kind of delay in marriage we are experiencing. Lets go back to the absurd hypothetical above for illustration purposes to see how such a shift would show up in the data. It probably isn't correct but lets assume that the above graph only measures marriage rates for unmarried women 20 or older. Lets also assume no divorce, and no deaths, changes in birth rates, etc. For the first scenario where women all married exactly at age 20, the number of marriages each year per 1,000 unmarried women would be 1,000. For the second scenario where women wait until exactly 40, only 1/20th (5%) of the women aged 20-40 (all unmarried) would marry on any given year (those who turned 40). So in the second scenario the rate of marriage per 1,000 unmarried women would be 50. In this admittedly absurd hypothetical, the rate of marriages per 1,000 unmarried women dropped from 1,000 to 50, even though the only change was a delay in the age of marriage. In both cases 100% of women were ultimately marrying.

So the marriage rate per 1,000 unmarried women metric isn't particularly helpful; we know that women are delaying marriage, and we know that marriage rates vary widely based on race. This takes me back to my original analysis from my second post on Grey Divorce. Lets look at the most recent census data for white men and women:
What I see in this data is that those in their mid 30s and older today don’t look that different than their predecessors did 10 years ago. At the same time women today in the age brackets under 35 look markedly different than their predecessors, and the difference is progressively greater the younger the age bracket you look at. **Something is happening.** The question is *what is happening?* Is the change simply an acceleration of women delaying marriage *as we have seen for over a hundred years?* And even if this is their *intent,* will they be able to catch up with previous marriage rates in the future? Will men still want to marry all of these additional late brides? We simply won’t know for another ten or so years.

What I do know is that the women making these choices are *taking a significant risk* if they expect to marry later. In just ten years time, the percent of white women marrying by their early 20s has dropped from 30% to 23%. This is comparatively a rather large 23% reduction. Whether they know it or not, they are betting that men 5-10 years from now will be *more willing to marry an older woman* than men have in the past. They might be right. We can only speculate while we wait to see.

**See Also:**

- Driving a stake in the heart of the US marriage strike myth.
- Clarification on my position on a marriage strike.
- Supply and demand in the marriage market.
Calibrating attraction by controlling the venue.
by Dalrock | October 21, 2010 | Link

Susan Walsh did an interesting post last week on meeting a good man in a bar:

Is it possible to meet the love of your life in a bar? Of course. Is it easy? No. The odds are not in your favor. Should you bother then? Well, I do know several happy couples who met in a bar.

She breaks the dos and don’ts down in her post and offers specific advice on how to choose the bar, how to dress, and appropriate body language and how to signal attraction. This way a woman can better her odds of being taken seriously by the kind of man she is looking to attract.

It all strikes me as sensible advice, and I suggest reading it if you haven’t already. But I think there is an additional challenge a woman creates for herself by going to bars whether looking for nice guys or not; she makes herself more likely to fall for a player.

Of course, falling for a player isn’t necessarily a bad thing for many women. So if that is what you want, I say have at it. But if you have given the issue serious consideration and decide this isn’t what you want, then you not only need to put yourself in a position to meet the right kind of guy, but to find this kind of guy attractive.

But how is this possible? We know that women are hypergamous by nature. Don’t mess with nature Dalrock. You can’t change it anyway.

Yes and no. Women are hypergamous by nature. They all want the leader, the successful man who is in command of his environment. But this of course leaves the question; which environment? Want to get gina tingles for aging rocker Brett Michaels? Spend some time on a bus tour with him. Before long you will be rocking your own misspelled tattoo while enjoying three way kisses with other women.

If you are looking for a man in a bar, or even spending time in bars or keg parties, you are unknowingly stacking the deck against being attracted to the kind of nice guy you have decided you want. So even if you do meet him, he just plain won’t shine in your eyes.

Alphas/Players/PUAs tend to thrive in pretty much any setting where the rules are ambiguous and when interacting with strangers. They will feel perfectly natural starting a conversation and building rapport with an unknown woman at a bar, the grocery store, a mega-church, or the local library. But a bar is their natural habitat. You are literally giving players the home field advantage by going to a bar and comparing different types of men. The kind of guy you want to be attracted to will be a fish out of water. They will seem weak, players will seem strong. Even when you leave the bar, those preferences will likely stay with you.

Imagine a church with strong moral leadership and which highly values masculinity along
with faith, loyalty, honor, intelligence, etc. I know this is hard, but really try. My father-in-law belongs to a cowboy church out in an area mostly populated by ranchers, so I have seen such a church. My guess is Jewish orthodox temples probably have a similar culture/values. Now imagine dropping the king of the local bar into that environment. Sure he is naturally social with everyone, including strangers. But he won't be the guy the men and women there admire; the ones the other young women looking for husbands wish they could get.

For women looking for a husband my advice is simple. Picture the kind of man you want to be attracted to. Picture him in the prime of his power. If you are a young woman who wants to marry a man more your own age, now picture that prime of his power man as he would have been at a younger age. A little less confident and powerful, but with real ability and a basic goodness about him. Now picture the kind of setting the younger version would be most comfortable and dominant in. That setting is where you should look for your husband, and the only kind of setting where you should position yourself to compare different kinds of men.

See Also (part 2): Overcivilized men, uncivilized women.
I was accused of kicking the week off on an overly somber note with my Monday post The Willful Child. With that in mind, I thought I would be less serious this Friday.

My wife and I used to love a cartoon called Sheep in the Big City. For those not already familiar with it, it has a pretty standard plot. General Specific the head of a Secret Military Organization, has teamed up with diabolical genius The Angry Scientist to create a sheep powered ray gun. Sheep learns of their plan to use him to power their ray-gun, and moves to the big city. General Specific and his gang follow Sheep, and set up a Secret Military Bakery as their base of operations.

In one of the episodes, General Specific hatches the plan to lure Sheep in for capture by staging a fake convention for sheep. They advertise the false convention across the city, and pack it with undercover agents dressed as sheep. Sheep sees the advertisements for the convention and longs to reconnect with fellow sheep, having been away from the farm for some time. He enters the convention and mingles with the crowd of military agents in sheep costumes. The discussion of the other (false) sheep goes something like:

Are you guys talking about grazing? I love grazing!

Suddenly Sheep gets the sense that something isn’t right. And he comes to an essential conclusion about the agents dressed as sheep who surround him:

These sheep are boring!
So he leaves the convention without General Specific or his gang ever having the chance to notice that one of the sheep in the convention was actually a real sheep, and the only sheep in the world who can power their sheep powered ray gun.

Anyway, this all came to mind to me this week when reading Ferdinand’s request that we stop paying attention to one blogger, and OneSTDV’s post about an atheist blogger. I’d tell you all about what was wrong with each of the blogs they mentioned and why you shouldn’t read them, but as it turns out I really don’t care. Both blogs referenced suffered from the problem I find with nearly everything written from the left; they were boring. I’m not sure the exact reason why, but I’m pretty sure it has something to do with the left’s uncontrollable need for conformity. Everyone has a point of view, but you also need a certain amount of slosh back and forth to keep the conversation fresh. I just don’t see this on the left.

For example, earlier this week I nuked a premise sacred to many in the manosphere. I’m sure it didn’t put me on the A Christmas card list of many in the manosphere, but I would say for the most part they accepted my argument like, well, men. There were no temper tantrums, and the discussion eventually turned into a fascinating conversation about social class. Ironically this might have been more interesting for a short period of time were I a blogger on the left who demolished a cherished idea there. Watching the contests of who could call me an enemy of the people the loudest while stamping their feet would be good entertainment, at least for a while. But then it would be back to the same old campy backslapping that all blogs on the left inevitably devolve into.

So instead of boring you with what is wrong with this or that blog on the left, I thought I’d share the delights of sheep in the big city. No need to thank me. This is a public service.
Default user snubs this blog and all of its readers!
by Dalrock | October 23, 2010 | Link

I just learned from Hawaiian Libertarian’s blog that war has erupted in the manosphere. This is deadly serious business, as Keoni Galt explains in his post THIS IS FARGIN WAR!!:

Default User called me a conspiracy nut once...

.....ONCE!

I’ve no choice but to declare FARGIN WAR....

This of course means war for Dalrock as well. I’m not talking about him insulting Hawaiian Libertarian. That part I get. I mean, who doesn’t?

But by declaring war on a whole host of other bloggers, including In Mala Fide, One STDV, Sibling of Daedalus, and Hope, while deliberately leaving me off the list?

This must not stand!

BTW: Who is this Default User fellow? And when did he get a blog?
Considering disabling comment threading.
by Dalrock | October 25, 2010 | Link

We’ve had several posts recently with 100 or more comments. With posts with fewer comments, the threading feature is really nice since it allows you to respond to a specific comment without always quoting it. However, with more comments this seems not to be so helpful and it can make finding the latest comments much more difficult.

Unfortunately if I do decide to disable threaded comments it will get rid of the existing structure on old threads. This will make it more difficult to understand the context of older comments because they will all be placed in line based on the date/time of the comment.

I haven’t made a decision on this but I thought I would let you know I’m considering a change. Feel free to share your own thoughts on this.

**Edit Oct 26:** I decided to put the change into effect.
I coined the term *post-marital spinsterhood* when I created the spoof warning label for *Eat Pray Love*. Women finding it difficult to remarry after divorce is something I’ve noted personally amongst my own generation. Many women my wife and I know our own age have been very surprised at the lack of long term interest they received from men following divorce. This same phenomena was documented by the AARP study on late life divorce which spawned the Grey Divorce hype. However, keeping with the standard spin for divorce in academia and the media, the study featured a picture of a sad old man on the cover and the news stories about Grey Divorce all painted a rosy picture of late life divorcées feeling empowered by this “exciting new trend”.

The actual findings of the study were that men fared better than women in a number of ways following late life divorce. It painted a grim picture where a surprisingly large number of women ended up struggling financially and receiving no sexual contact from the opposite sex, not even hugs. Here are some quotes from the report that you won’t learn from the cheerleading Grey divorce articles (emphasis in quotes is mine):

- Almost 9 in 10 men (87%) dated after their divorce, compared to 8 in 10 women (79%)... Among those who dated after the divorce, more than half of men (54%) but fewer women remarried (39%). *(Page 39)*

- Many women, especially those who have not remarried (69%), do not touch or hug at all sexually. An even larger majority of women who have not remarried do not engage in sexual intercourse (77% saying not at all), in comparison with about half of men (49%) who have not remarried. *(Page 6)*

I think it is no accident that the reality of the study wasn’t made widely known. Feminists in academia and the media have an agenda to sell divorce to women. They know that women won’t find the idea so enticing if they realize it quite often is a one way door to a much lower quality of life. This is because while women often fantasize about indulging in endless choice of mates, they also want a high level of investment from men both for the practical advantages and the status this confers on them. This is a large part of the reason *spinsterhood* has such a negative connotation. No woman wants to end up without a worthy man invested in her. In the early stages of the sexual revolution women quite often were able to have their cake and eat it too. But the data I have found which I have shared here suggests that this is no longer the case. Meanwhile the media is selling a dangerous fantasy which is leading many women into awful situations they can’t get back out of.

When Stella got her grove back, women across the world swooned at the idea of a 40 something divorcée bagging a newer, younger man. Even more exciting, just like with *Eat Pray Love*, the author based the story on her own life experiences. Terry McMillan wrote the book which became the movie after meeting and eventually marrying a Jamaican man 23 years younger than her. Here is a picture of Terry and her new young hottie *(full article)*:
Oh wait! I did it again. That’s them in the movie. Here is the real life author and her younger husband.

Real life author and her younger husband

Also like Eat Pray Love, it later came out that the dreamy younger man only married her for a visa. He also was looking to cash in on the royalties from the deal. Oh, and he also forgot to mention he was gay when he married her. Evidently that was a deal breaker for the author, and the two have since divorced. From SFGATE.com:

> It was devastating to discover that a relationship I had publicized to the world as life-affirming and built on mutual love was actually based on deceit,” she wrote in her declaration. “I was humiliated”.

Adding injury to insult, Terry was then forced to pay him spousal support even though he had signed a prenuptial agreement.

The divorce and new/better man theme is extremely common. All you have to do to find other examples is check out the women’s fiction section of amazon or turn on Lifetime to see more stories like EPL and Stella. The last example that came to mind when writing this is a real estate commercial they ran in the US a few years back focusing on how the Realtor had helped a 40 or 50 something divorcée buy a new home to start her exciting new life. Within a year she had married the next door neighbor who was a university professor. The end of the commercial showed the woman leading a line of dancing revelers around the backyard of her new home, with her dressed in a wedding gown and carrying a bouquet. The message of the ad was clear; dump your loser husband and we’ll find you a new better man along with a new house! Of course, they made their money whether the pipe dream panned out or not...

Edit Oct 29: Added quotes from the AARP study and the fact that Terry was forced to pay spousal support.
See Also: Post Marital Spinsterhood Part 2, the data.
I don’t really have strong opinions here, but the issue has come up frequently in the comments recently so I thought I would share my own thoughts on the issue and provide a place for others to share their likely stronger opinions. Here are my thoughts:

1. It does seem to be more natural for a woman to be attracted to an older man than the other way around. However, if cougars can get what they want without harming innocents (mainly kids) I don’t have any angst about that. I will however reserve the right to make fun of men or women who make an ass of themselves.

2. Large age gaps strike me as being less stable across the board, so I think couples should consider what this means when contemplating marriage. They shouldn’t marry into a situation where they could foresee in advance a reason for divorce. This is probably worse for younger men/older women but if a couple can make it work (either direction) then more power to them.

3. The media can play a hugely negative role if it cheer-leads for unworkable arrangements in an effort to score feminist points. They have a massive ax to grind here and I think they risk leading many down the wrong path. Respecting people’s choices is very different than creating a propaganda blitz.

4. My normal caveats regarding marriage still apply, both parties should be old enough to make the decision before entering into marriage (voluntarily) and they should be head over heels in love. In our culture 18 is probably the minimum for this.
As I mentioned on my first post on the topic, I’ve noticed a shift across the generations on how men felt about remarriage. It strikes me that men are both less willing to remarry after divorce (especially if they already have children), and less willing to marry a woman who previously divorced. Lavazza and grerp both made comments on grerp’s question for the gentleman post which shared this same impression:

**grerp:**

> there are a number of men who have been burned by relationships and are choosing not to marry a second time where perhaps before they would have chalked up the failure of their marriage to having chosen the wrong person instead of having chosen to participate in a broken institution.

**Lavazza:**

> I think this is very true. I guess the divide goes around birth year 1965 (give or take some years). Most men born before that year would have had the reflex to remarry using your described reasoning, whereas most men born after that year will see the institution as failed.

Anecdote is all well and good, but I wanted data. After all, J might know a bussload of former nuns who had each married several times without difficulty. So using Google as my friend I set out to find whatever hard data I could. The remainder of this post is what I found. If anyone has better data or can fill in any of the gaps, please don’t hesitate to share it. Please note that all charts displayed on this post link to a larger version of the same chart. In some cases the larger versions include more information on the methodology or source data.

One of the first sites I found when searching was remarriage.com, specifically their page on remarriage facts:

**Remarriage statistics complied from the National Center for Health Statistics (2002) show:**

- *54 percent of divorced women remarry within 5 years*
- *75 percent of divorced women remarry within 10 years*
- *Black women are the least likely to remarry*
- *White women are the most likely to remarry*

So there you have it, a site dedicated to the topic of remarriage quoting a relatively recent study showing that divorced women (at least divorced white women) don’t find it difficult to
remarry. Here’s the graph of the same data from page 32 of the original NCHS/CDC study in 2002:

![Graph of remarriage rates](image)

Notice the date in the bottom of the chart? The study was done in 2002, *but it used data from 1995*. Now this newish report isn’t seeming quite so new after all. It gets worse. In order to calculate remarriage rates 10 years after divorce in 1995, the divorces in question actually occurred in 1985!*

As you can see from the chart above, timing matters. Likelihood of remarriage has been steadily decreasing since 1950. The chart ends in 1989, but some other data points I’ve found separately suggest the trend has remained in place since then. The thing is, the stats presented are relatively well known. I’ve had them quoted to me this year in the comments threads of other bloggers. **Women are hearing these stats based on divorces 25 years ago, and thinking this represents the remarriage prospects for divorcées today.**

Before we look at more recent data to try to fill in the gaps, I wanted to share some other fascinating charts from the same report. First, as you might expect, younger women have an easier time remarrying than older ones:
Also, where the woman lives impacts her likelihood of remarrying:

Interestingly, for whites at least second marriages aren't that much more likely to break up than first marriages (roughly 30% vs 40% after 10 years). First marriages of whites are as likely to be disrupted within 15 years as second marriages are within 10 years. Note the different time scales on the following two charts when comparing them:
Filling in the remarriage rate gap since 1985.

The next data is from The National Marriage Project report The State of Our Unions. They don’t have specific stats on remarriage rates, but by looking at related trends we can fill in some of the blanks.

First note that less of the adult population is married now than in the past (though almost all whites still do marry at least once):

Of those who are married, fewer are divorcing since 1980. So the number of new divorcées per year must also be declining as a percentage of the population:
Even though the supply of new divorcées is rapidly falling, the likelihood of *being divorced* has continued to increase during this same time period:

I don’t see any way to interpret the three charts above except to assume that the trend of declining remarriage has continued if not accelerated.

Before moving on to some more data on remarriage rates, I thought I would share one more graph from the same Marriage Project report (Fig 4, P 67). Despite feminist myth-making to the contrary, **men and women both were happier with their marriages before the feminists “fixed” marriage by creating incentives for divorce**. This was true even though a far greater percentage of the population was married at the time. Presumably the
marriages which aren’t happening today are the ones where people would be even less happy, so this is a very powerful trend:

Data on remarriage rates for older women.

The next set of data I will share is from page 148 of a report by the National Institute on Aging (NIA) titled 65+ in the United States: 2005. Like the AARP study conducted the year before, this report focuses on older Americans. The relevant data is all from 1990, but this is still better than the 1985 data we saw in the original chart. It also allows us to see in more detail how age impacts remarriage rates, since the other report only looked women above or below 25.

In 1990, 30 of 1,000 divorced women aged 45 to 64 re-married during the year, a decrease from 45 per 1,000 in 1960. A comparable proportionate decline is seen for remarriage among women aged 65 and older; 4 per 1,000 divorced older women remarried during 1990, compared with 9 per 1,000 in 1960. Divorced men, on the other hand, were more likely to remarry, although they also experienced declines in remarriage rates. In 1990, 67 per 1,000 divorced men aged 45 to 64 remarried, a decrease from 97 per 1,000 in 1960. In 1990, 19 per 1,000 divorced men aged 65 and older remarried, compared with 30 per 1,000 in 1960 (Clarke, 1995b; National Center for Health Statistics [NCHS], 1964).

I’ve seen the data for divorced women over 45 stated in a very misleading way. Specifically here:

For divorced women, the probability of remarriage after age 45 is less than 5 percent.

What they should have said is only 3% of divorced women age 45 to 65 marry in any given
year. After 65 a divorced woman’s chance of remarriage drops to a vanishingly small 4 in 1,000 or .4% per year! And keep in mind that this data is 20 years old so given the trends we have seen even these amazingly low rates likely greatly overstate the remarriage prospects faced by older women divorcing today.

**Note:** I did a separate post on the AARP study which reinforces what these other data sources are showing. Instead of repeating it here I’ll simply link to my previous post.

**Update:** It turns out the data on remarriage rates is even more problematic than I first thought.

**Dec 21 2012 Update:** We now have a fresh snapshot of remarriage rates using what appears to be a more solid data set.
In my previous post Marriage Strike? I exploded the manosphere conventional wisdom that the US is in the throws of a marriage strike. I pointed out that the metric published by The National Marriage Project is being widely misinterpreted, and showed that the vast majority of current white men and women in the us in their mid 30s have married at some time. I also made it clear that women in their 20s today are making very different choices as a group than women the same age did just 10 years ago, and that we can’t assume they will be able to marry at the same rates we see today. We may yet see a marriage strike by white men in the US, but the data simply isn’t in yet.

But while no one could point out an error in my logic, several have made comments suggesting the Marriage Project data proves we already have a marriage strike. It has also been suggested that the Department of Census data which I presented isn’t reliable and that the Census is using different data than The Marriage Project. Since The Marriage Project data keeps coming up, I have decided to explain the problem with how people are interpreting it in greater detail.

What is the metric?

The chart in the original Spearhead post titled The End Of Marriage used data from The National Marriage Project report The State of Our Unions, Marriage in America 2009: Money & Marriage. For comparison, see figure 1 from page 64 of the report. In the notes at the bottom of figure 1 it explains where the data comes from. They had to compile the information from several reports, but much of the data series came from the U.S. Department of the Census Statistical Abstract of the United States, 2001, Table 117.
As I explained in my previous post, the metric of marriages per 1,000 unmarried women is highly sensitive to changes in the number of unmarried women even if the number of marriages per year is remaining relatively constant. The source data proves this. The absolute number of marriages per year rose slightly from 2,159 in 1970 to 2,244 in 1998. Even though the number of weddings was increasing, the rate per 1,000 unmarried women fell dramatically from over 76 to under 50 during this time period. The entire change in the chart from 1970 to 1998 is being driven by changes in the number of unmarried women over time. The continued drop from 1999 to present likely is driven by the same thing.

There are two ways the number of unmarried women can change over time as it did. The first is the population of women over 15 years of age can increase, and the second is the percentage of time those women spend married can decrease. We know that both of these have happened. Total US population increased from roughly 200 million in 1970 to 280 million in 2000.

The percent of women who are married at any given time has also decreased due to fewer marrying, later marriages, divorce, and reduced remarriage. Whereas people in the 1960s spent the vast majority of their adult lives married, people now spend far less of this time married and more time putting off initial marriage and following divorce (see Figure 2 in above linked Marriage Project report).

So part of what the metric is picking up is population growth increasing faster than the total number of weddings, and part of it is due to us spending less time being married. The less time being married factor is an important trend but a separate issue from the claim of a marriage strike. If as I showed 85% of white women are still able to marry by age 35 but they are waiting longer (and perhaps divorcing sooner), this doesn’t show that men are on strike. Marrying an older, less hot woman and then having her divorce you isn’t being on strike.

This leaves the question of population growth, but this in itself brings back the issue of

---

**No. 117. Marriages and Divorces: 1970 to 1998**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Marriages 1</th>
<th>Rate per 1,000 population</th>
<th>Unmarried women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number (1,000)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Men, 15 yrs. old and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>2,499</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>2,478</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>2,413</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>2,407</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>2,405</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2,386</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>2,405</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2,445</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2,371</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2,362</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2,362</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2,336</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2,344</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2,384</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2,244</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>(NA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
demographics which I mentioned in the initial post. Not only is our population changing, but the racial makeup is changing as well, and marriage rates vary greatly by race. Any part of the change which is being driven by changing racial demographics wouldn’t support the hypothesis of a marriage strike. In order to keep things simple I focused on whites, which make up 75% of the US population (and probably a greater percentage of the adult population). I don’t have timeline data on the percentage of whites who married by age in the US going back before 1999, so I shared the data for 1999 and 2009. For both time periods roughly 85% of white women had married by the time they were 35. It is possible that back in the 60s and 70s this number was something like 95%; I have no idea. If someone has this data please share it. Still, 95% feels like a theoretical max to me, and it is very close to the 90% we see today and 10 years ago for those in their early 40s:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>% Men who have ever married 1999</th>
<th>% Men who have ever married 2009</th>
<th>% Women who have ever married 1999</th>
<th>% Women who have ever married 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-24 years</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 years</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 years</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39 years</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44 years</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49 years</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54 years</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of White Men and Women Ever Married by Age, 1999 and 2009

So there might be a small shift down in white lifetime marriage rates in the US over the last 50 years, but right now it is so close to 100% it can’t have been large.

For a picture of how this looks across races, I found the following chart in the report **Who Marries and When? Age at First Marriage in the United States: 2002**:

Keep in mind that these projections are based on the status quo 8 years ago. So far these projections have held roughly true but we have already seen a shift to lower marriage rates for women now in their
20s. As I said in the original post, we can’t predict the future and can only speculate.

One other more subtle form of marriage strike in the US might be under way which wouldn’t necessarily show up in the data we have already reviewed. It is possible that the most desirable men are now less likely to be willing to marry, especially the high earners and those with game. As women delay marriage they may find they have to settle more than their predecessors did and marry lower status men who might otherwise have remained unmarried (or married even later). The highest status men starting to become more likely to opt out of marriage would make some sense, and at the very least the data doesn’t disprove this hypothesis. However, I can’t find anything which proves it either. Here is what I did find from the same report regarding likelihood of marriage by economic status:

This doesn’t really prove the issue either way because the category “not poor” is a very broad one. Also, there is no proxy I’m aware of for a man’s game.

Lastly, while the data doesn’t (yet) support the hypothesis of a US marriage strike, I showed yesterday that there is clear evidence of a remarriage strike.

I hope this clears the question of a US Marriage Strike up for those willing to approach it with an open mind. I understand that for the true believers no amount of explanation or data will prove otherwise. I also understand that it is possible, likely that I will at some time make a mistake. Please don’t hesitate to point any errors you find out to me in the comments section in a respectful way. However, please also note that telling me to learn calculus, generally accusing me of spinning the stats, or telling me If you figure it out, you will believe it aren’t valid forms of feedback.

See Also: Supply and demand in the marriage market.
Clarification on my position on a marriage strike.
by Dalrock | October 28, 2010 | Link

Fellow blogger Deansdale made an excellent point in the comments section to Driving a stake in the heart of the US marriage strike myth.

I’ll begin with admitting that I have not read the whole post. Usually I applaud thorough research of a topic but this is way too much 😞

I agree.

The proof that there isn’t the kind of widespread marriage strike in the US (which at least until recently has been commonly accepted in the manosphere) is right there in the simple table from census data that I created when investigating an entirely different question in the beginning of July:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>% Men who have ever married 1999</th>
<th>% Men who have ever married 2009</th>
<th>% Women who have ever married 1999</th>
<th>% Women who have ever married 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-24 years</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 years</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 years</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39 years</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44 years</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49 years</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54 years</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of White Men and Women Ever Married by Age, 1999 and 2009

I’ve been sharing these startling numbers ever since, but whenever I did I received push-back that it couldn’t possibly be right since The Marriage Project data proved unequivocally that we were in the final stages of a marriage strike.

I can certainly understand the initial push-back. The two data sets at first appear to be entirely at odds. How can both be true? I must have missed something. So I looked into it further and then explained the paradox in my post Marriage Strike?

But even when I had explained it, I continued to get the same push-back except now it was more personal. Instead of offering specific challenges showing where I had gone wrong, it was suggested that I either lacked a grasp of basic math and/or that I was a diabolical math genius who was somehow spinning the data. I realized that this kind of challenge wouldn’t ever totally stop, but I didn’t want to spend the next few months defending my integrity piece meal.

The thing is, there are some really fascinating conversations we can have once we accept that the Marriage Project data doesn’t say what so many of us (including me) originally thought it did. Deansdale continues:
The thing I want to say is this: The change may be small, but it is a fact that more and more “eligible” men are rejecting marriage.

This makes logical sense to me. I can’t prove it with hard data, but it still is an interesting topic of discussion. There is also the fact that something very real is happening with the generation of men and women currently in their twenties.

And of course there is also the very strong case to be made for a remarriage strike, which in my opinion is the powerful force which is most likely to eventually drive the pendulum back. But don’t take my word for it. Use the level of hysteria and denial from some of our more feminist commenters as your gauge of which scenario really threatens the status quo.

One last point. For those of you who are refusing to marry, I’m not denying your existence or equating you with UFO conspiracy theorists. As I’ve said before, we won’t see men banding together against their immediate interests to form a better social bargain longer term. But this doesn’t mean individual men won’t decide that marriage isn’t a risk they want to take. And who can blame such men?

Furthermore, I see the numbers in the table above as a disaster just like many of you likely do. I say this as an advocate of marriage. Men are obviously not being picky, and are marrying women who don’t deserve the honor.
On a transatlantic flight a plane passes through a severe storm. The turbulence is awful and things go from bad to worse when one wing is struck by lightning.

One woman in particular loses it. Screaming, she stands up in the front of the plane. “I’m too young to die,” she wails. Then she yells, “Well, if I’m going to die, I want my last minutes on earth to be memorable! Is there anyone on this plane who can make me feel like a WOMAN?”

For a moment there is silence. Everyone has forgotten their own peril.

They all stare, riveted, at the desperate woman in the front of the plane.

Then a man from Texas stands up in the rear of the plane. He is handsome: tall, well built, with dark brown hair and hazel eyes. He starts to walk slowly up the aisle, unbuttoning his shirt.

..One button at a time...

..No one moves.......

......He removes his shirt.......

........Muscles ripple across his chest.......  

........She gasps.......

........He whispers.........
“Iron this...then get me a beer.”
Hail to the king, baby!
by Dalrock | October 30, 2010 | Link

Warning: If you don’t like reading about married sex, you should not click on the link for Married Man Sex Life. I repeat, do not click on the link for Married Man Sex Life. The topic of married sex does come up at that site from time to time. Consider yourself warned!

Anyone who doubts Athol Kay’s mastery of the craft of writing only needs to visit his site to understand why he truly is the king of his topic.

But no one is cooler than Bruce Campbell and his Remington double barrel shotgun!

Happy Halloween.
Romance as a form of male investment.
by Dalrock | October 31, 2010 | Link

Ever since I coined the term, I’ve been on the lookout for others who might be using the term *post marital spinsterhood* or any variants. It strikes me as a very powerful term which names the previously unnameable, so it wouldn’t surprise me if it caught on over time. Yesterday I found another blogger Big Little Wolf outside the manosphere who used the term. In the comments section to her own post Send me no flowers, the discussion turns to online dating and how it hasn’t worked for her:

And for those of us for whom it doesn’t work or isn’t “us?” Are we the new millennial post-marital spinsters?

She seems like a very nice person, and off the bat I’m impressed by her perceptiveness in this case. I’m not sure if she coined the term separately after I did (there were no instances on google when I originally used it back in September), or if she was exposed to it somewhere. The EPL video has had nearly 900 views so she may have seen it there. Either way the term may be catching on. I’ve found links to my recent posts on the topic on several mainstream web pages, obviously shared by readers of this blog (Thanks!)

But perhaps more interesting is the topic of her blog post and the discussion which follows. She and the women in the comments section are disturbed by the lack of romantic gestures they receive from men:

Once upon a time, I had a life as a woman. You know. Dates. Romance. Sex. And there were tokens of affection – little notes and cards, love letters, and even flowers. Signs of wooing, and eventually, love.

She provides as an example the man she dated before she met the man she divorced:

In fact, the man I was seeing before I married was incredibly romantic. Money wasn’t an issue and that helped – for a year, extravagant floral arrangements arrived at my office every other week or so. Each time, something different. Each time, with a card he always took the time to personally pen.*I felt adored.*

She continues, now describing the present:

But we also seem to have bought into the New Order of Millennial Commodity Dating – size ‘em up fast, toss ‘em aside, buck up for the next (there will always be another)

She wraps up with a call for men to offer women more romance:

Any Real Men out there? Hello? Might there be a romantic bone in your body? No, not that one. I said *romantic.*

Because if there is, I’m here to tell you there are wonderful women waiting for small
gestures, as simple and powerful as the one in that film last night.

The blogger and the commenters are generally baffled by what has caused this change. Many think the busy schedules of modern life are to blame. Carol very nearly gets it and then shies away at the last minute:

Haven’t been there for several years now, but I have a distinct impression that these days it’s more about “hooking up” and less about relationships. The women’s movement the culprit? I don’t think so. I think it’s the current trend for “instant gratification” and moving on if you choose to.

NoNameRequired thinks from her dating experience that men are suffering from the misconception that all divorcees and widows (she doesn’t say which she is) want is sex, which she refers to euphemistically as *riding the bicycle* and *exercises*:

...the three approaches that went like this: one date and then on to exercises, was the immediate and expressed intent....NO ROMANCE AT ALL. Just an assumption that I want that ride.

I suppose I should be grateful for the bold winking offer to get right to bicycling, without even a two or three date threshold? Honesty! But again, an assumption.

Those of us who need (sometimes prefer) solitude and celibacy within which to work hard and parent are sometimes thought odd or prematurely spinsterish.

Some of the women also offer hope that romance isn’t completely dead. Kristen describes her husband:

I should hasten to add that he is far more adept at the bagels and coffee in bed sort of gestures you mention (and the whole taking care of the baby and toddler while I’m on bedrest for two months sort).

As much as I appreciate those gestures, I dp wonder if contemporary men got a memo some years ago saying that women don’t want flowers. An inadvertent byproduct of the women’s movement?

Susan describes how romantic a great guy she met online was before she ended her 2.5 year relationship with him:

We matched well and in particular matched in the area of romance and “old timey” thoughtfulness. I received flowers at work, he received hand written cards in the mailbox outside of his house – not the email inbox. I even sent HIM and bought HIM flowers on more than one occasion and he was incredibly touched. I printed out all our courtship emails and bound them in a book for a Christmas present so there would be a paper trail of “us”. 
Michelle Zive describes the little gestures by her husband which she finds romantic:

David will bring home my favorite bottle of red wine, he’ll call from the road and ask if I want a Diet Coke, and just now he gave me a shot of Emergen-C because I’m getting sick. So who said romance is dead? In my case, you just have to look harder.

So what has changed? Why did the blogger and many of the others commenting go from being so treasured by men to just another woman in a long list, valued only or mostly for sex? Roissy would undoubtedly say that her SMV has gone down as she has aged. This seems likely, but I don’t think it is the whole story. Romance is a form of male investment. It can probably be best described as male emotional investment. As the cliché says, it shows he cares.

But why should a guy care about a woman who isn’t committed to him or shows a history of not keeping past commitments? As a man this seems so painfully obvious that I struggle to understand why women don’t recognize that they can have sexual freedom or men who care about them; they are highly unlikely to have both, especially from a man with options. So many women seem totally oblivious to this simple point. I created a crude chart back in August to help illustrate the tradeoffs women can make when deciding the kinds of relationships they want to have with men:

![The Monogamy-Hypergamy Continuum](image)

Key to understanding the chart is knowing that as a woman moves to the right of marriage 1.0, her opportunity to move back to the left and receive greater male investment is very limited. Male investment can come in many forms, including Emotional/Romantic, Financial, Monogamy, and Willingess to Marry.

**Women are craving the investment men are withdrawing as the women themselves opt for greater sexual choice.** Roissy talks about how women crave the feeling and status provided by male investment in his post The Duke Rejection List:

this chick was rejected by each and every one of these high status men she banged.

“But how can that be?”, some of the duller among you will ask. “None of the men turned her down for sex.”

Don’t you know it’s different for women? Failing to get laid is not how women are
rejected; they are rejected when they don’t receive romance, love, and long term commitment from the men who f*ck them.

Susan Walsh posted last month on the disappointment many women had with the same lack of investment in the hookup scene in her post The Orgasm Chasm in Casual Sex. Susan quoted an interview with a man from hookup scene in a formal study on sex:

Definitely oral is really important [for her to orgasm], but with a casual hookup, I don’t give a shit.

Another man in the study actually used the term investment in explaining how he feels about different kinds of women/relationships:

Now that I’m in a relationship, I think [her orgasm is] actually pretty important. More important than [in a] hookup. Because you have more invested in that person...When it’s a hookup you feel less investment.

We see the same scenario at work in the extreme with online accounts of men deliberately farting immediately after casual sex. Obviously these guys are expressing their extreme lack of investment in the women they just had sex with by doing this. In Roissy’s post on the woman who bragged about having no strings sex with Tucker Max, the same woman complained:

The next day, he woke me up for sex, as promised. It was worse, because he was panting this time, and when he was putting his clothes on, he farted loudly, multiple times. I called a cab, and he gave me 20 bucks for the cab which I gladly took. (Hey, I’m in college.) He hugged me and said, “I’d totally hook up with you again. Call me if you’re ever in L.A.”

One of our gold-digging friends at DABA described a similar experience in the comments section of that site:

We are HUMAN beings, with feelings. We do not like being taken advantage of by slobs who fart and roll over after they come and do nothing to make sure us women are satisfied in bed and in a relationship.

The word RELATIONSHIP is a 4 syllable word that a lot of dumb guys just don’t understand. It is more than calling a women when you want to get your rocks off. It is more than coming over, grabbing our boobs and saying you are horny and pulling your pants down. We do not find this sexy or attractive. We want men who treat us right, buy us things and take us to go skiing.

Isn’t sexual freedom liberating!

Share this:

- Reddit
Several months ago I posted *What to expect when you debate a feminist*. Three of my key points were:

1. Don’t expect an actual rational argument beyond their well rehearsed opening salvo and a few well worn slogans.
2. They will try to shame you.
3. Once they realize they can’t win the argument, they will try to scuttle the debate.

You may be wondering if there is a risk in outlining their playbook so openly. *What if the feminists realize we are on to them and start doing things differently? What if they start using rational arguments instead of the same cheap tactics which they have used for 50 years? What then?* But then you would be forgetting one of my other key points:

| Their tactics never change. |

As evidence, I present to you Exhibit A: Ferdinand’s *DV Debate: David Futrelle fulminates; loses temper and debate*

I admit I didn’t read the whole debate between Paul Elam and the male feminist who’s cups runneth over. He went there to trade study for study on the question of whether women really do commit domestic violence against men at similar levels as men do to women. His argument was that since he could point to more studies showing the orthodox feminist view, his perspective must be right. I stopped reading after a commenter to the debate jumped in the ring and knocked the feminist out with a link to the Jezebel post where feminists brag about all of the domestic violence they have committed against their boyfriends: *Have You Ever Beat Up A Boyfriend? Cause, Uh, We Have*

Stay classy feminists.

The feminist looked like he might come to just in time to avoid the count. He started mumbling incoherently that the link didn’t prove anything, and there weren’t *that many* women eagerly recounting tales of abusing their boyfriends. Besides, the women were probably lying and had really just been defending themselves. And none of the comments looked that bad to him anyway. Most of those guys probably eventually recovered with proper medical treatment.
Then a commenter on his own blog pointed out that there are multiple pages of comments on the post, and referenced examples of the women breaking into ex boyfriends homes and stabbing them, etc. Even the feminist was stunned. I pretty much stopped following the action at that point.

So I wasn’t surprised to learn that shortly thereafter he stopped backing up the feminist study dump truck and decided to find an excuse to end the debate and remove the record of it instead.

Right about now you may be thinking **wait, the feminist forgot to say Paul has a small penis! Isn’t that a rule?**

Yes, but the feminist debating Paul is actually a man with gender inappropriate cleavage issues; this would put him in a tough spot when it came to making the small penis argument.

Fortunately for him, one of the female feminist commenters on his site was willing to step in and handle this task herself. To the feminist blogger’s credit, he did point out that telling someone they have a small penis isn’t exactly an argument. At this point the female commenter clarified that she of course didn’t mean that feminist men had small penises. As Deansdale shares in his post This is what a feminist brain looks like:

*Tec*, talking about MRAs: “**And fyi, I don’t get wet from little babies and their tiny baby penises.**”

*Manboobz*: “**Tec, thanks. (Except maybe for the baby penises bit; no need to sink to their level.)**”

*Tec*: “**And so David, so the tiny penis comment wasn’t meant for you, just the big babies who weren’t breastfed long enough and now whine about evil womynz.**”
Women are hard wired to wonder if they aren’t missing out on something. Could they find a better man? Do they have enough money, the right clothes and shoes? Are they being treated well enough by their husbands, and at their job? I think this pretty neatly fits with the concept of hypergamy, and it does serve a biological purpose. Women need to make sure they choose the best mate possible, and that they have the status and means to care for the child.

But constantly wondering if what you have is enough isn’t always a virtue; in the wrong context (most of modern life) it is a prescription for unhappiness. Not just their unhappiness, but that of their family, especially their children. A sane culture would curb the dangerous part of this tendency. It would caution women of the danger of never being happy, as the Brothers Grimm tale *The Fisherman’s Wife* does (post pending).

But then again we don’t live in a sane culture, we live in a feminist culture. Feminism’s founding motto is “I never get to have *any* fun!” Instead of curbing the worst instincts of women, our culture instead amplifies them.

Here’s an experiment you can try on your own. Find a five year old, and ask them why did all of your friends get ice cream today and you didn’t? or why are all of their toys better than yours? Find a bunch of toys they don’t have which look like they would be really great to play with. Then ask them why their parents don’t love them enough to buy them for them. For best results, taunt them relentlessly every day. Wake them up in the middle of the night and ask why their classmates get to sleep in a more comfortable bed than they do. At breakfast ask them if they think their classmates are eating better food right now. Find new and interesting things they should feel slighted about. Try this for say, 30 years.

Now test and see if they are happy.

DH Lawrence wrote about the problem in *The Rocking Horse Winner*. The story opens with the lines:

> There was a woman who was beautiful, who started with all the advantages, yet she had no luck. She married for love, and the love turned to dust. She had bonny children, yet she felt they had been thrust upon her, and she could not love them.

They had every reason to be happy:

> They lived in a pleasant house, with a garden, and they had discreet servants, and felt themselves superior to anyone in the neighbourhood. Although they lived in style, they felt always an anxiety in the house. There was never enough money. The mother had a small income, and the father had a small income, but not nearly enough for the social position which they had to keep up. The father went into town to some office. But though he had good prospects, these prospects never
materialised. There was always the grinding sense of the shortage of money, though the style was always kept up.

But the mother wasn’t happy. How could she be? There was always more to want, more to wonder if it couldn’t be just a little bit better:

And so the house came to be haunted by the unspoken phrase: There must be more money! There must be more money! The children could hear it all the time though nobody said it aloud. They heard it at Christmas, when the expensive and splendid toys filled the nursery. Behind the shining modern rocking-horse, behind the smart doll’s house, a voice would start whispering: “There must be more money! There must be more money!”

Our culture is like the house in the story, always whispering in women’s ears that they deserve better, and mercilessly amplifying every potential doubt. We saw this with EPL, and How Stella Got Her Groove Back.

My wife has witnessed this throughout her life.

From her devout Catholic maid of honor (now still unmarried at 37) when helping my wife put on her wedding dress 1 hour before the wedding (prompting her to throw her out of the room):

- What if you meet a better man in two weeks?

From the girls in the 7th grade class she taught, asking the only girl with a boyfriend why he hadn’t spent more than $50 on her for her birthday (he had saved all of his own birthday money to do so). Why didn’t he spend $100 on her if he really cared? The girl took the bait and was upset until my wife took her aside and talked it through with her.

From a woman we met on a cruise:

- Wouldn’t you like a newer car? Don’t you think your husband would take you on a vacation every year if you asked him?

From her friend:

- Don’t you think he would take you out to eat at nicer restaurants if you asked him to? Don’t you think you should have a monthly clothes budget?

The whispering is endless, by women and to women. By way of Vox Day’s Warning: Hamster at work there is the advice to a young woman with a self described perfect boyfriend from Amy Dickinson, the replacement for Ann Landers.

Dear Amy: I’m 23 years old and have been dating my boyfriend for just over two years. I love him, and I love spending time with him. He’s everything I’ve always wanted in a long-term partner: caring, intelligent, thoughtful and hardworking.

But lately, I can’t seem to shake this “antsy” feeling.
I find that when I go somewhere with my friends and meet other men (as a “wing woman,” I’m not actively searching out a new partner), I wonder what it would be like to date someone else.

I find myself jealous of my friends who are still dating and not in a committed relationship.

Does the new Ann Landers try to talk her off the ledge and explain that this is a female instinct gone haywire? Of course not. She reinforces it.

**Amy whispers:**

You might be mature enough for a committed relationship, but the relationship you’re currently in might not be the right relationship for you right now.

Commitment is like good comedy: It’s all about the timing.

Your guy might be the best guy in the world. He might be perfect for you. But if you can’t tame your restlessness, then you should take a break.

The only way to bring this up is the old-fashioned way: one word at a time.

You start with: “Honey, we need to talk.”
When our daughter was just over two years old my wife took her trick or treating for the first time. She was extremely cute in her pink leopard costume, and charmed all of the neighbors by her best attempt at Trick or Treat:

**Turkey Turkey!**

They didn’t hit very many houses but she ended up with a very full pail of candy anyway. The thing is, we don’t normally keep candy in the house and she had never had any before. She had had other sweets like cake and cookies and ice cream, but not yet candy.

So she was needless to say very excited about getting candy for the first time. She would take her pail out and sort it by type, color, and just generally have fun with it. She had a blast for several weeks.

We didn’t have the heart to tell her she could open it up and eat it, so we decided to keep that part to ourselves.

I know what you must be thinking; *how could you do that? How could you waste candy that other people spent good money buying?*

Not to worry. My wife and I didn’t let any of it go to waste.
I was reading an article in Psychiatric News the other day, and my wife asked me why I was laughing so hard. It was a really funny piece full of stories of women who didn’t fight back when they were beat up by their husbands and boyfriends. Once I was done laughing I thought to myself:

*Good times... Good times!*

Pieces like this just bring back such great memories for me. Like the time I went nuts on a girlfriend and started violently shoving her. Another time I overheard a girlfriend on the phone and it sounded like she was flirting with another guy, so I slapped the phone out of her hands and hit her in the face and in the neck.

I know, I should have warned you this would be such a funny post. But no, I’m not buying you a new keyboard if you just spit your drink all over it!

All of this got me thinking I’ll bet my friends have some great stories too. The first guy I called had a story so funny I was curled up on the floor holding my stomach I was laughing so hard. He slapped a girl when she told him she thought she had breast cancer!

Another friend punched a chick in the face and broke her glasses.

Let’s just *say* that it’d be wise to never ever f*ck with us.

**Edit Nov 10:** For the satire impaired, this post is a mirror with genders switched of a post celebrating domestic violence committed by the members of the feminist blog Jezebel.
Commitment as a form of female investment.
by Dalrock | November 5, 2010 | Link

Earlier this week I wrote about Romance as a form of male investment, and described how women generally have the option for sexual freedom or male investment, but very seldom both (at least in the long run). In that post I asked the question of why a man should be invested in a woman who wasn’t really committed to him, or showed from her history a lack of ability or likelihood to commit.

When I created the chart in that post, part of what I was thinking of was the R versus K reproduction strategies men can choose. If a man is going to invest in one woman to better ensure the success of albeit fewer offspring, he needs to have some confidence that his offspring will be his and that the woman shares his long view of high investment reproduction. If she isn’t on the same page, he is better off going for quantity over quality. So men with options are likely to show up at the marriage 1.0 section of the curve and the hookup section of the curve, but not as much in between. Women thinking they can hit the sweet spot in between are likely to be pulled down and to the right to the more stable hookup position. A few will overshoot even that and end up in craigslist status.

I think at some level men do consider this logically. Men are more and more starting to take into account a woman’s past sexual and marital history when deciding if they want to formally commit to her. But given that 90% of white women are still marrying by the age of 40, obviously many men still aren’t being very selective in that respect. The remaining 10%
can’t all be promiscuous women. A significant portion must be either uninterested in marriage or have some non promiscuity related defect which makes them unmarriageable. Nor does it seem likely to me that we could squeeze all promiscuous women into the fraction of the 10% of women who don’t marry but are interested in marriage and not otherwise unmarriageable.

Plus, logic is rarely the sole motivation when we look at the behavior of large groups. Culture almost always has a powerful impact, although culture itself is often grounded in the wisdom learned over generations. But our culture has been severely disrupted as a result of prolonged feminist assault. If anything our culture now directs men to do the exact opposite of what would be rational for them. Men are told by our culture not to take into account risk factors like previous children, histories of promiscuity, or previous divorce. While men’s attitudes appear to be changing, the change is happening slowly.

I read an excellent and extremely funny blog post by Solomon II this week titled Drive Thru Boyfriends, which got me thinking more about the likely mechanism changing the attitudes of individual men. This in turn would then act as a force to change the culture of men. Solomon’s post tells the common tale of the carouseler who has a change of heart late in her 20s. However instead of showing her as hopping from one night stand to one night stand, she is hopping from short term relationship to short term relationship:

“Welcome to McFling’s. My name is Solomon II. May I take your order?”

“Uh, yes. I’ll have the three months of meaningless sex from the Boyfriend Lite menu, add extra self respect. Hold the judgment and consequences please.

“I’m sorry; we’re all out of self respect. Would you like to add a side of rationalization for only $1 more?”

“Yeah. That’s fine. Super size it please.”

“Thank you. Please pull up to the window for your total.”

While this may go against the more common perception of a carouseller hopping from alpha to alpha in a series of bar hookups, it does seem to better fit what I have observed. It also fits with the common desire many women have to trade “a little more freedom for a little less investment”, or having her cake and eating it too:

There she is driving down the road of life at her own pace. She’s young, independent, beautiful and has all the time in the world. When she’s horny, she swings into the closest drive thru and places her order. She does the same thing when she’s sad, lonely, happy, up, down, in, out, excited, needy, afraid, strong, weak, depressed, moody, joyful, exhilarated, stressed, etc. Any and every reason is valid because she’s being “true to herself”. Every three months on average she swings into McFling’s and orders up the best looking or most exciting thing on the menu (because she’s sooo selective). There’s also a couple of late night snack runs
thrown in there for good measure, but not as many as some other girls, so you have
no right to judge her.

If you imagine the men in this scenario, they aren’t the stereotypical bitter betas being
passed over entirely. Nor are they the alpha player who defines the relationship on his own
terms. These guys are somewhere in between. Alpha enough to be attractive, but totally at
her mercy as to the terms of the relationship. She decides when it starts and stops, and her
real level of investment in him is next to nothing. She demands investment from him, yet
never considers offering it in return.

Over time, these guys have to be getting jaded. Not in the passed over bitter beta sense, but
simply learning from experience that getting emotionally invested in women is a bad idea.
Add to this the findings that men are more troubled than women by breakups, and I think the
mechanism for men learning not to become invested in women who crave choice becomes
clear. How many times do you have to smash your fingers with a hammer to learn that you
have to be very careful driving in a nail? It isn’t bitterness towards nails or hammers, but just
life experience. What these guys are learning the hard way is that for women just like men
commitment is a form of investment; not just one form though, the single biggest form.

As a society we understand that commitment is a foundational component of male
investment. But feminism has convinced the mass culture that it isn’t required the other way
around. Married women openly engage in divorce fantasies, and feel entitled to do so. In
reality, to the extent that the two are different commitment is more a sign of female
investment than male investment. Like so many things, we have it backwards in popular
culture.

But while the culture has it wrong the individual men are learning reality through life
experience. This is probably yet another reason the unmarried women on Big Little Wolf’s
blog post noticed a trend of less romance from men as time passed. As they got older the
men they dated also got older. Available men therefore are almost exclusively going to be in
one of four categories:

1. Spent their dating career as takeout for generally un-invested women.
2. Were married to a woman who they thought was invested in them until one day they
   learned the hard way.
3. A player.
4. An omega or lesser beta.

They would likely get all of the romance they can handle if they choose option four, but the
rest of the guys aren’t likely to be naive when it comes to assuming a woman is committed to
them. Add to this the fact that the woman finds herself uncommitted later in adulthood, and
chances are she isn’t sending “I’m totally committed” vibes to the guys she is dating.

In other words; she isn’t invested in them, and they aren’t in her.
Mangineering with PVC.
by Dalrock | November 6, 2010 | Link

Definition I submitted to Urban Dictionary. Will they post it?

Note: I submitted the above definition as an alternative to the existing bitchy one. It has since been accepted and you can vote for whichever definition you prefer.

When most people think mangineering they think of the handyman’s secret weapon: duct tape. While I do respect the classics, I have come to prefer PVC pipe instead.

[×]
PVC bunk bed a man created for his 3 year old.

It is easy to find, easy to work with, strong, light weight, and comes in a range of sizes with all sorts of connective fittings to choose from. It is a grown man’s erector set. Oh, and the pipe and fittings also come in handy for fixing sprinkler problems too!

[×]
PVC Jungle Gym a man created for his granddaughters.

I first started building with PVC when I was rigging my fishing kayak. The guys on the kayak fishing forums have made pretty much anything you can imagine from PVC and pool noodles, including truck and trailer racks for hauling kayaks and carts for taking them to and from the
water. I ended up making a light mast and a set of small stowable stands that keep the kayak off the concrete launch ramp I use.

My kayak on PVC stands with PVC light mast (mast not extended)

Mast collapses for storage/transport and protects the globe.

Mast fully extended with globe attached to end of light.

Once I started using PVC to rig my kayak I realized how useful it was for any sort of building project. I’m always tinkering with something or the other, so it comes in quite handy. Most recently I needed a way to stabilize my HD video recorder. The thing is really nice and small, but it doesn’t have optical stabilization so you have to hold it very steady especially if zooming. I use a tripod when practical and a monopod whenever a tripod is too much. The monopod works great at stabilizing side to side and up and down motion, even if I keep it in it’s shortest form and use it as a sort of handle for the video recorder. Unfortunately the monopod doesn’t help with rotational motion. I noticed this when I took zoomed video of our daughter sitting on Santa’s lap last year.

This year I decided to plan ahead and started thinking about how I could add a short arm on the monopod. Here is what I came up with using some 1/2 inch PVC pipe and fittings, some hose clamps, and some Krylon multi surface paint:
The paint cured just in time to take videos of our daughter in her Halloween costume. It worked perfectly, even without the leg portion extended. This is my new favorite way to take videos. I used a threaded connector to attach the handle and when I bring the arm up it tightens up exactly the way I wanted it to. It really helps keep the camera steady while allowing me to move around freely.

All of this is a very good thing, because if you put a five year old in a Super Girl costume, she’s going to run!

See Also: Share your own feats of mangineering.
The other side of hypergamy: fantasy of the forced choice.
by Dalrock | November 7, 2010 | Link

I’ve written previously about choice addiction, and how this is a very common theme in entertainment targeted to women. This fits fairly closely with the game concept of hypergamy; women have a primal fear that by committing to one man they will lose the potential of finding a better man.

But in looking at recent movies targeted towards women and thinking about how this relates to topics of discussion on this blog, I’m convinced that there is a counterpart to the fear that drives choice addiction; the primal fear women have of losing the opportunity to choose and ending up alone.

I think Haley hit on this basic fear when explaining why women enjoy reading widow/remarriage stories:

“Widow falls in love again” stories are appealing to women because women want to be assured that they are still attractive and that they will be able to find someone to love and care for them if the worst happened to them. That life isn’t over if their husband dies and that they aren’t sentenced to loneliness for the next 20 years.

This fear is the reason (or part of the reason) why:

- Marcos’ con is so effective.
- Marcos’ con is so infuriating to many of our female commenters.
- The term spinster has so much emotional power.
- Many women aggressively defend what they feel is their right to marry a man they don’t love, and why this theme is found in women’s literature.
- Books like Marry Him create such a stir despite lack of an actual marriage strike.
• Divorce fantasies like EPL and Stella as well as widow fantasy stories ultimately involve either remarriage or finding a stable relationship with another man who is invested in them, not just endless hookups with alphas.

From a biological programming perspective all of this makes sense. You need a counterbalancing force over hypergamy otherwise women would always sleep around and never create a stable environment to provide for and protect her children. Something stops most women from becoming either partially or fully addicted to choice. I think these two primal fears are designed to work together and counterbalance each other. The primal equivalent of fearing you forgot to pack something vs fearing you will be late to the airport.

As I discussed in The whispers, feminism has modified our culture to greatly amplify the fear of not being choosy enough. At the same time, it has done everything it can to mute the counterbalancing fear of spinsterhood. The very idea that women need investment from men is downright offensive to feminists. They have been successful to a degree, and have been able to change the decisions many women make on the margins either to marry later or divorce frivolously. But they can't make it go away entirely, which is why just in the last year or so we have seen multiple movies with the fantasy of the forced choice:

The Proposal

Life as we know it

The Switch

Yin yang image source information
No sex since 1955.
by Dalrock | November 8, 2010 | Link

A crusty old Sergeant Major found himself at a gala event, hosted by a local liberal arts college. There was no shortage of extremely young, idealistic ladies in attendance, one of whom approached the Sergeant Major for conversation.

She said, “Excuse me, Sergeant Major, but you seem to be a very serious man. Is something bothering you?”

“Negative, ma’am,” the Sergeant Major said, “Just serious by nature.”

“The young lady looked at his awards and decorations and said, “It looks like you have seen a lot of action.”

The Sergeant Major’s short reply was, “Yes, ma’am, a lot of action.”

The young lady, tiring of trying to start up a conversation, said, “You know, you should lighten up a little. Relax and enjoy yourself.”

The Sergeant Major just stared at her in his serious manner.

Finally the young lady said, “You know, I hope you don’t take this the wrong way, but when is the last time you had sex?”

The Sergeant Major looked at her and replied, “1955.”

She said, “Well, there you are. You really need to chill out and quit taking everything so seriously! I mean, no sex since 1955! She took his hand and led him to a private room where she proceeded to “relax” him several times.

Afterwards, and panting for breath, she leaned against his bare chest and said, “Wow, you sure didn’t forget much since 1955!”

The Sergeant Major, glancing at his watch, said in his matter-of-fact voice, “I hope not, it’s only 2130 now.”
YMCA Game!
by Dalrock | November 9, 2010 | Link

Since I first started reading Roissy and other sites in the manosphere, I’ve been talking about what I learned with my wife. Her reactions have varied from: I’ve always told you women were like that, but you would never believe me, like she said just today when I told her about Laura Grace Robins’ recent post on women’s friendships, to: that would never work, to: wow, I’d never have understood this if I didn’t know about game.

The last sentence applies to her friend(ish) who I’ll call Suzie. Mrs Dalrock met Suzie when she was guest lecturing at an East Coast university. Suzie was a grad student there and was married to another grad student. She was in her late 20s, pretty, and had a good husband and a nice comfortable apartment in a good neighborhood. Suzie’s life seemed to be on track and my wife had a great time with her while there. Suzie’s father was a surgeon and her mother was a former beauty pageant queen, so she had always run with the country club crowd.

This was several years ago, and in the interim Suzie decided she was bored and would be better off divorcing her husband and finding a better man. Her joining a feminist book club at the university may or may not have had something to do with this. Much to her shock as an early 30s divorcée she wasn’t able to attract anyone as good as her ex husband, let alone anyone better. She had a beta orbiter for a while, but he since married (and divorced) and in the meantime her SMV eroded at a brutal pace. Since then she has pretty much dragged along the bottom, dropping out of grad school just one or two courses away from her masters degree and even spending some time in a mental institution. More recently she has improved somewhat and now lives in low income housing and attends regular AA meetings.

She doesn’t actually have a drinking problem, but she has better luck finding men who want to date her there than anywhere else. Unfortunately the AMOG of the local AA meeting isn’t interested in her, and she’s feeling the sting of her ex husband being engaged to another woman. Her unemployed neighbor at the low income apartment complex also turned her down. So Suzie moved in with a mid to lesser Beta man she met who has been out of work for 5 years and lives at the YMCA.

My wife just heard from Suzie that she was kicked out by her YMCA boyfriend and has to move back to her apartment. Evidently Suzie irritated the AMOG of the Y, the guy who lives across the hall from her boyfriend. The AMOG threatened to have the boyfriend kicked out because women aren’t allowed to stay at the Y.

But even more interesting is that the AMOG of the Y himself has a different girl over every night. All of them very pretty women in their mid 20s. They are always buying him meals and bringing him baked goods and other gifts. One of them even bought him a car. All I can say is, that guy must have some seriously tight game!
Great Middle School Football Play!
by Dalrock | November 10, 2010 | Link

I saw this on the local news. Middle School and High School football are a big deal in Texas, but this play is good enough that it might make national news as well:

On the news they interviewed a number of people about whether this is legal or not. The men (including several refs) all said it was perfectly fine; there is no rule against it. At least one woman they asked was very troubled by it, even when told it was allowed under the rules. I think this might be one of those cases which demonstrates the different perspectives men and women have about justice.

Either way a pretty funny and smart play.
Few topics generate more excitement for rationalization hamsters than the question of why women don’t (re)marry later in life. Merely bringing this topic up is the equivalent of grabbing a megaphone and shouting:

_Hamsters! Start your engines!_

If you have followed this blog for any period of time you have no doubt already noticed this from the comments section. Perhaps you were thinking though, _maybe this is just here._ _Maybe it isn’t the same way on other blogs._

It’s that way everywhere.

Blogger extraordinaire _Solomon II_ has another fine post titled _Old Maids Over 40 Still Feed Rationalization Hamsters!_ He discusses a post by unmarried-in-her-late-30s bloggerette _Gooseberry Bush_ titled _Anecdotal & Statistical Proof That Women Over Forty Are Not Destined To Be Old Maids._

What’s that I hear? Is that a starting gun?
Yes, it is! Gooseberry Bush has started the rationalization race early, giving herself an unfair advantage! Tires smoking, she lurches from the starting line:

Eighty percent of all women are married by the age of forty. Of those women who remain unmarried, they have at least a 40% statistical probability of eventually marrying, maybe even better! And those statistics are probably not accounting for lesbians or for women who don’t even WANT to get married, for whatever reason.

I’m always on the lookout for actual data on this sort of thing, so I scoured her post for the link to the source of this statistic. While links abound, I never did find the one for this piece of information. What I did find instead was a link to a study saying that only 15% of never married 40 year old women are likely to marry within the next 10 years. The prognosis is slightly better at 20% if the woman has a degree.

So if I’m doing my math right, out of 1,000 never married 40 year old college educated women, 20 can expect to marry in the next year. And the remaining 980 are free to try again next year. Of course, the longer they wait the less likely they will be to marry and the quality of man they can attract decreases.

But no self respecting hamster would let reality get in the way. That is the whole point of a rationalization hamster!

Unfortunately over eager hamsters have a tendency to over-steer and put themselves into a spin:

when a woman is in her teens and twenties she starts to put up many barriers to screen out unwanted suitors. After 40, it might be time to lower the drawbridge. Let down your guard a little. When you were younger and there were many, many unsuitable suitors it made sense to give the men some hurdles to jump. Now, not so much. Men are intimidated by them. They want a woman who’s approachable - another quality that the younger women have in spades because they don’t have the battle scars that come with dating over time. The approachable thing might take some work.
Ouch, my head hurts! Is she saying women are more approachable when they are in their 20s, or that they put up barriers to approachability in their teens and 20s? And as a woman ages she goes from having many, many unsuitable suiters to having very few unsuitable suiters, so stop turning away the unsuitable suiters?

Never mind. This is a hamster race and rational thought has no place! Plus, there is competition on the field now. No time to start thinking logically. Dashing white knight runtobefit comes skidding onto the track out of nowhere:

What I find most interesting is that men, after the death of a wife, will likely marry again. However, women often don’t need to marry again. I believe this is because women are much stronger and independent than men. They are the foundation to which most of us men stand on. Women keep us steady and level headed. Without a woman, whatever age she may be, a man may feel disjointed. A woman makes all the pieces fall into place. A woman is a foundation on her own, capable of so many things. I know I have this view because I had a single mom growing up. I guess it made me realize that a man often needs a woman, but a woman rarely needs a man.

Outstanding move runtobefit! The fact that men have better odds and options to remarry when older must prove that women don’t need men! This puts him squarely in the lead!

But he isn’t the only competition. Running hot (on the wrong track) is Pattie with this mispost on Gooseberry Bush’s about page:

Love this article. How encouraging. I’m divorced and have been for many years. Am still looking to get married “someday”, but right now am enjoying my singleness and independence. We “older” women have a lot of great qualities and experience that those cute young things lack. I agree with you. Get out there ladies and strut your stuff. These guys won’t know what him ‘em!

That’s right. She may be an older model with a bored out big block and a lot of few miles on her, but her hamster has clearly been rebuilt and sports a new high performance cam. She is here to prove that post marital spinsters can rationalize with the best of them. You go girl!

What do you say esteemed readers; who is the winner of the Hamster 500? Is it the blogging spinster in the pink car? The white knight in the yellow car? Or the post marital spinster making good time but running on the wrong track? Or is it one of the many other competitors on the original blog post which I didn’t mention?

See Also: A post-marital spinster’s rationalization hamster in the final stages of exhaustion.

Hamster racing pic from Will 210. Hamster pic from Love hamster. Checkered flag from Ewan ar Born. I combined the last two to create the hamster 500 pick. You are free to use this new picture so long as you are in compliance with the original two image licenses.
Share your own feats of mangineering.
by Dalrock | November 11, 2010 | Link

H/T to Badger Nation:

The urban dictionary definition is up!


You are correct, def #2 is so bitchy. My one question: who the F are those women married to? Obviously they picked slobs and are now projecting their faults onto the entire male population.

Now I don’t want to bias the voting, so I would ask each of you to not let Badger Nation’s wise and well thought out opinion influence you. If you follow the link and look at both definitions, make sure you read each carefully and vote for the one you prefer (and thanks to those of you who already have!).

Gorbachev also had a comment on the Mangineering with PVC thread which I thought succinctly captured something I’ve seen referenced by others in multiple threads:

Men are so damned useful.

We should appreciate ourselves more.

With this humble thought in mind, I’d love to hear of reader’s feats of mangineering. I’ve already shared some examples of creating things using the materials at hand, so to kick this off I thought I’d share a few examples of my own of fixing things using the materials at hand.

Example 1:

In my early twenties my hunting/fishing buddy and I decided to go trout fishing on a stream up in the foothills of the Colorado Rockies. At the very end of what was probably an hour on various grades of unpaved roads, we started smelling hot coolant. We got to the place we were going to park and popped the hood. One of the coolant hoses that ran back to the firewall for the heater core had bounced repeatedly onto the alternator, and had sprung a small leak. My buddy and I didn’t say much to each other, but decided to go ahead and go fishing first before worrying about the truck. No point in getting scalded by coolant and missing prime fishing time. We got our fishing time in and as I recall did fairly well that day. When we got back the truck had cooled off so I cut the good heater core hose down to a manageable length and ran it back to the radiator (taking the heater out of the coolant loop entirely). We used a little duct tape to keep the hose from bouncing on the fan or any other moving parts and drove home. It wasn’t pretty, but it sure beat walking.

Example 2:
About 7 years ago when my wife and I moved to Texas we bought a 25 year old bass boat. Then we backed up the money truck to have it tuned up, etc. After a day of fun on the water my wife and I found that the tilt/trim wouldn’t raise the motor for trailering. We got it on the trailer and pulled it out of the water slowly, and it only had an inch or maybe two of clearance. We wouldn’t even have made it past the speedbumps to get out of the park. My wife saw a cop patrolling the area and went to go flag him down to let him know we might have to leave the boat there overnight if we couldn’t fix the problem.

I had never worked on a boat and was feeling pretty intimidated. I checked the fuses in the panel and none were blown. I then followed the wires for the hydraulic system to see if I could spot/bypass any potential problems. Otherwise I was going to disconnect the power tilt/trim from the outboard and jack the motor up with my floorjack to get it on the transom saver. My wife and the cop returned just as I finished stripping the ends of two pieces of wire I had cut from a roll in my toolbox. I bypassed the switch/relay, and ran current straight from the battery to the power lead for the hydraulic motor. It raised the motor enough for them to put the transom saver underneath it, and then I switched the positive and negative leads and it lowered the motor firmly in place. My wife and the cop both looked at me like I was Dr. Frankenstein when I first hooked those wires up and made the motor go up. The cop also said it was a good thing we were going to be able to take it, because boats left overnight were usually vandalized.

When I had more time to work on it later I realized the only problem was it had blown a fuse. The tilt/trim was after-market and they ran an in-line fuse instead of the ones I had been checking in the fuse box...

**Example 3:**

Actually this is one from my father. He has too many feats of mangineering to pick any one out, but one in particular has always made me chuckle so I thought I would share it. He and his copilot were sub hunting in their Navy helicopter many miles away from the carrier in the middle of the night when the transmission warning light went on. His copilot did something with the light and it went off, much to my dad’s relief. When my dad asked what he had done the copilot explained that he had removed the bulb, because if there really was a problem with the transmission they would never have made it back to the carrier. After thinking about it for a little bit my father decided he agreed with him. When they got back the mechanics took the transmission apart and found a small sliver of metal which had completed the circuit for the sensor. This mimicked what would happen if the transmission were coming apart and chunks of metal were floating around.

Your turn. Share your best stories of mangineering, either by you or someone you know.

See Also: Mangineering with PVC.
Crisis averted.
by Dalrock | November 12, 2010 | Link

5 Year Old Drama Queen: Eeek! There’s a moth! On the floor!

[A dramatic performance ensues]

Mrs. Dalrock (AKA Drama Stopper): Oh no! Where’s the phone?

5 Year Old Drama Queen: [Pauses dramatic performance] Why do you need the phone?

Mrs. Dalrock (AKA Drama Stopper): To call the school. So I can tell them you were eaten by a moth. And that I’ll have to come by later and pick up your homework.

5 Year Old Former Drama Queen: That’s silly. They don’t eat people. [Picks up her backpack and heads to the door for the ride to kindergarten.]
Scientific proof choice addiction makes your head spin.
by Dalrock | November 12, 2010 | Link
Linkage is good.
by Dalrock | November 12, 2010 | Link

Linkage #1: Captain Capitalism

I recently found the captain’s site as a result of all of the traffic he was kindly sending my way. Liking him already, I took a look at his site. Not only does he have good taste in the blogs he links to, but he is an Economist in the Manosphere, who likes guns, and has a softer side.

I swear, it is like looking in the mirror!

He has a nice variety to choose from. If you like your manosphere analysis served with a high dose of economic *charity goodness* (great term!), then you will no doubt enjoy this piece where he applies economic principles to the question of some women overestimating their value in the marriage market. If you prefer your analysis with more of a manosphere edge, then this piece should be to your liking.

Linkage #2: Solomon II (March 10th: Solomon’s site is down, but he posted the same article on the spearhead so I have changed the link).

I know, I already linked to him twice in the last few weeks. But it isn’t my fault. Solomon is to blame for continuing to write such outstanding posts. I simply can’t help myself. In his Elevator Speech post, he applies his business acumen to the question of how the Manosphere can get its word out:

A woman’s character is of utmost importance. A woman’s past actions matter. In fact, her past matters more than anything else because it reveals the character she developed during her impressionable years. A woman may change what she does, but she can’t change who she is or repair her reputation. Like hot or cold water eventually comes back to room temperature when no external forces are present, so a woman returns to her base character level when no external forces are present. If you choose to be a woman’s external force in order to exact a temperature change within her, don’t be surprised when she reverts to her room temperature character the moment you’re not around.

That is just a taste. Read the full post here. For those of you who prefer a kinder, gentler manosphere, may I suggest his very moving description of his former wife: Solomon II’s Confession. If you prefer more straight up discussion of game and pickup, I think you will appreciate Proverb 21: Special Needs Girls

Linkage #3: The Lost Art of Self-Preservation (for Women)

Grerp has expanded on the question of schadenfreude raised in the comments to my
Hamster 500 post in her post: The manosphere’s spinster schadenfreude

If you already know grerp and you haven’t yet read her post, I don’t have to tell you that you want to. If you don’t already know grerp, what are you wasting your time here for? Lay in something to eat and drink near the computer and put on some comfy clothes and start reading. Don’t worry, she has a handy blogroll feature which will alert you when my next post is out.

As to the question of why I care about women’s chances of marriage after a certain age, I think it was precisely what Roissy would call squid ink. Generally I know I’m on to something when the hamster rationalization geiger counter pegs, and the shaming language goes up to 11. Mutually exclusive denials of the fact and accusations that I’m being cruel to those suffering from what was just denied tend to also confirm to me that I’m very much on the right track. I’ll now add a more specific litmus test of “why do you care about this topic so much” as a sure indicator that I’ve hit paydirt.

If you require further proof, consider the fact that in my Hamster 500 post I secretly included images of cute furry hamsters doing things like driving pink cars and waving a checkered flag. Normally this is chick crack of the first order, but none of my female readers even noticed. Some made logical arguments about the point, others were hysterical about it, but the emotion of the topic was so powerful it overwhelmed the cuteness of the hamsters!

Seriously. It has had those cute pictures all along. Those images you saw instead with me juggling kittens while clubbing a baby seal were strictly in your mind. Open up the page and walk away from your PC for 10 minutes. Then come back and look at the screen from 10 feet away. You will see what I mean.

**Linkage #4: Hooking Up Smart**

Susan has an interesting post up on Understanding the Nature of Male Attraction. She even has data! Enjoy.
My wife? She’s just some woman I met at a bar. My kids? They’re family!

by Dalrock | November 14, 2010 | Link

No, that isn’t me talking about my wife. This is something I read on an investing forum once. It really troubled me when I read it, and has stayed in the back of my mind ever since.

Just recently it struck me what it was about the quote that was so jarring. It wasn’t that the sentiment was new. We’ve all seen men and women who act this way. And we’ve been hearing women say this for decades:

| Marriage is forever. |
| Unless I get unhappy. |

What was so jarring was to hear a man say it, in the way a man would say it.
I am sometimes curious what flavor of social and familial poison the Lifetime channel is serving up, so I’ll check out the description on our cable’s guide section. What is fascinating is they don’t even feel the need to sugar coat what they are selling, because they know no one will call them on it. I know I can’t change the world, but a little sunlight would seem like a good thing.

I’m not able to confirm either of my theories of what they used for a working title for this movie, but I’m guessing:

- *My mother was a whore* (has a nice ring, don’t you think?)
- *I was a pregnant slut*

Feel free to suggest your own working titles. Anyway, as you can see from the description this is a touching movie about a pregnant married woman who wasn’t haaaaapy. Oh no!
Addiction to divorce fantasy is also about power.
by Dalrock | November 15, 2010 | Link

As recent readers know, I’ve been poking at a massive sore spot for some of my female commenters lately with the themes of post marital spinsterhood and the remarriage strike. To be clear it is only a minority of my female commenters who are disturbed by this, as most seem to accept the truth in what I am saying and more importantly understand why I am addressing the issue.

Grerp’s spin-off post on the Hamster 500 addressed the charge of manosphere spinster schadenfreude, and she made a strong case for why such a feeling might be warranted. However, animosity towards spinsters isn’t my underlying motivation or point. Since the commenters most incensed by my posts were self proclaimed happily married women, I don’t think it was their true point of contention either. My fundamental point is that marriage is something women can’t expect to get multiple shots at, at least without risking either trading significantly down or losing the option to be married (or even be in an invested LTR).

I think my critics understand this all too well, and this is what has them thrashing in denial and rage. For far too many women the threat to leave their husband if he doesn’t do what they demand is their trump card. It is their nuclear option, and they reserve the right to threaten to press the red button whenever he displeases her.

![X] Do what I want if you know what’s good for you!

What I’ve had the extreme bad taste to point out is that you can’t launch a nuclear war without suffering from the blow-back. Instead of a unilateral threat of annihilation, I’m pointing out that it really amounts to Mutually Assured Destruction. It isn’t just your husband and your children who will suffer if you press the red button, but you as well.

This of course isn’t nearly as much fun. When your go-to relationship tool is to be a bully and someone points out that it really won’t work as hoped, this will provoke a massive tantrum.
In Post-marital spinsterhood part two: the data, I showed how stats from a NCHS/CDC study in 2002 using data of women who divorced in the mid 80s was causing women to have an unrealistic expectation of their chances of remarriage following divorce today. The other day I was looking for more (and hopefully newer and better) data on the question, and found another paper using the same 1995 NSFG data set: First Marriage Dissolution, Divorce, and Remarriage: United States. Advance Data 323.

This paper has the same results but shares more detail on the data used, methodology, and what they actually found. For example, this table on page 9 shows the values for the data points included in the charts I referenced in the other post:

Table 7. Probability of second marriage by duration of first divorce and woman’s age at divorce: United States, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of Divorce</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Less than 3 years</th>
<th>3 years and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 months</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 months</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent censored (not yet remarried at completion of interview)

- 0.37
- 47.90

If you click on the chart to see the full size version, you will notice the final row includes the percent of divorced women who’s data was censored in the study because they had not yet remarried at the time of the interview. Also note the age range for the data set. They only interviewed women aged 15 to 44 for this study.

The limited age range really made this a poor data set to try to determine remarriage rates. Of the women they interviewed who were over 25 at the time of divorce, 48% had not remarried! Yet this is the very data set referenced when we hear that a woman has a 75% chance of remarriage within 10 years of divorce.

The researchers used a mechanism called Life tables to try to make the best use of their limited data (page 3). This allows them to use data points which have partial value instead of throwing them out entirely:
Life table analysis can handle censored cases by keeping such cases in the analysis as long as they are at risk of disruption and then dropping them out once the risk is unknown (36). For example, when calculating the proportion of marriages that dissolve in each duration interval, a marriage that has existed for 24 months and is still intact at the time of the interview would remain in the denominator for each duration interval until 24 months of duration is reached, at which point the case would no longer be used in the calculations.

So a woman who divorced 5 years ago and never remarried can be used to determine the remarriage probability for the first five years. However, her data can’t be used to calculate remarriage probability for years 6 and beyond because her future status can’t be known. A woman who divorced 5 years ago and remarried after 3 years would be calculated as unmarried for the first 3 years and calculated as married for the remaining 15 years since they know remarriage is an event which can’t be “undone” (divorce doesn’t change the fact that she remarried).

At first glance this sounds much better than throwing out all of the surveys for women who hadn’t remarried. Not only would they be shrinking their sample size, but by studying only those women who had remarried they would bias their results towards remarriage. However, it seems the Life table approach would also create a bias towards remarriage, especially for longer time durations. For example, both women in the examples above had divorced 5 years ago. However, only the one who remarried will be included in the data used to calculate 10 and 15 year remarriage probabilities. Given that nearly half of the data they used had this problem, this would seem to be a very significant bias which isn’t accounted for in the methodological explanation of the paper.

This one bias alone seems quite significant to me, but in addition I noticed the following other problems:

1. Instead of reporting on likelihood of remarriage following divorces which occurred in 1985 as I originally thought, the study actually is going farther back and examining remarriage rates for divorces which occurred as far back as 1965. As I showed in the first post, remarriage rates are declining over time.
2. The results are being reported as for women 15-44, but because of how they structured their sample they ensured that they wouldn’t have any data on 10 year or longer remarriage rates for women who divorced over age 35. The five year data only includes women who divorced at age 40 or younger and is skewed strongly towards younger because only the oldest of those surveyed could possibly have divorced at this older
age. Even worse, the data is being represented as showing remarriage rates for women under 25 and those 25 and over. The over 25 results most closely represent remarriage rates of women who divorce between 25 and 35. Even worse, the statistic most often cited (the stat for all women) is skewed even younger, primarily representing women who divorced between 15 and 35.

All three of the biases I found would cause an overestimation of remarriage rates. If you add all three effects together, this study must be massively overestimating remarriage rates, and this is before taking into account the evidence that the remarriage rate itself has continued to fall in the 15 years since the data was gathered (see my original post).

**Why confusion about age is such a disaster when women see these stats:**

As I have shown the study is strongly biased toward divorces which occur earlier in life when a woman’s chance of remarriage is highest. While the population of divorced women is almost entirely over age 35, the study focuses almost entirely on women 35 and under. The age skew of the divorcée population occurs partly because you have to marry first to divorce (and marriage is occurring later in life), and partly because of the greater likelihood of remarrying quickly if still young. According to the 2010 Census Data, there are 13.8 million divorced (and not remarried) women in the US. **Over 80% of divorced women are over age 40, and 89% of them are over age 35.** We know from the AARP study and others that past age 40 divorcées are much less likely to remarry, and much more likely to be terribly alone if they don’t. As I have shared before:

| Almost 9 in 10 men (87%) dated after their divorce, compared to 8 in 10 women (79%)... Among those who dated after the divorce, more than half of men (54%) but fewer women remarried (39%). (Page 39) |
| Many women, especially those who have not remarried (69%), do not touch or hug at all sexually. An even larger majority of women who have not remarried do not engage in sexual intercourse (77% saying not at all), in comparison with about half of men (49%) who have not remarried. (Page 6) |

Keep in mind that the AARP study itself is reporting outcomes for women who divorced roughly 20 years ago, so the results for current divorcées are likely to be even worse based on the declining remarriage trend.

I know this is all very grim, and if you are like me you are pretty well exhausted with all of the data. But knowing the reality of the data is important, and I’m not aware of anyone else doing this work. Additionally no new studies have been performed for over 15 years, and I’m not aware of any on the horizon. Ignoring reality and actively selling late life divorce has gotten us over 11 million divorcées over age 40 in the US alone. Telling the painful truth can only help women not yet divorced make the best choice possible for their specific situation. On the whole the direction this moves their choices as a group will also be more moral (keeping their most solemn promises), in addition to being better for their children and hopefully themselves and their husbands.
**Note:** It is likely that one of my readers has much more experience with this sort of analysis than I do. From my own analysis I’m very confident that I am right. However, feel free to correct me if I have misunderstood or misrepresented the data or methodology of the report. I don’t mean *Dalrock is a meanie misogynist so it must be wrong*. But please share an actual logical explanation of where I have misinterpreted the report if you believe I have made an error.

**Dec 21 2012 Update:** We now have a fresh snapshot of remarriage rates using what appears to be a more solid data set.
Polygamy ahead?
by Dalrock | November 16, 2010 | Link

Vox Day seems to argue in The economics of polygamy that we can expect to see women push for legalization of polygamy. Part of his argument is that men have wised up to women using marriage/divorce as a wealth transference mechanism:

The question ultimately boils down to whether women of the politically active sort would prefer half of Prince Charming’s castle to the entirety of a woodcutter’s cottage. The acquisition of male assets through divorce was never going to work for long, as it only took forty years – a little less than two generations – for growing male awareness to break the traditional marital model and reduce marriage rates among the 25-34 age group from 80% to 45% and the overall rate to 52%. In less than three generations from Ronald Reagan’s signing of the California no-fault divorce law in 1969, conventional monogamous marriage will no longer be the statistical norm.

Vox doesn’t cite his source for the statistics, but they fit very closely with the 2010 Census data. I commented on his site explaining that he appeared to be misreading the data, but since I was late to the game and commenter 104 I don’t think he noticed it. Either way he didn’t respond.

As you probably already know the problem with the data he is using is it measures the percentage of the population currently married. But divorce theft doesn’t involve women being married, it involves them getting married and then divorcing. The right stat to look at would be the percent of men and women still marrying, and as I’ve shown these stats tell a very different story. As I’ve said before, marrying a woman when she is older and less hot and having her divorce you doesn’t mean you are on a marriage strike. I shared the latest census data with Vox in my comment to him:

The stats you are looking at are the percent of the population which is currently married. The change is important but doesn’t show that men are wise to divorce theft, at least initially. The vast majority of men (63%) and women (73%) still marry by their early thirties. These numbers are much higher if you look at just whites, with roughly 85% of white women having married by 35.

Either way, I don’t see men refusing to marry (if it does in fact start to happen) as the foundation for a push for polygamy. The feminists will detest the idea and the white knight useful idiots they depend on wouldn’t be willing to carry their water in this case. And even if it somehow became legal, why would wealthy men want to sign up to have their assets even more at risk?
Men, men, men, stop tricking women into loveless marriages!

by Dalrock | November 18, 2010 | Link

Men, we point the finger at women all the time in the manosphere, but now it is time to point it back at ourselves. I don’t want to name names, but some of you have been tricking women into loveless marriages and forcing them to experience the pain of divorcing you later. Here is one such example from a woman so distraught with the aftermath of this she was forced to seek advice from Salon (H/T Zed and Brendan):

I am 34 years old and have been married for about four and a half years. We’ve been together almost 10 years, my longest relationship. My husband is intelligent, handsome, funny and patient. One of my problems is that I don’t love him anymore. Well, I love him, but more like a close friend and not as a husband. He truly is a wonderful person and everyone thinks he is great. And he is great, mostly. I think it’s unfair for me to stay married to him when I don’t completely love him because he would make an awesome husband for some lucky gal.

Sure, he pretends to be nice and perfect and all, but that is just a front. I know his type. He uses that to trap women! Our poor victim continues:

The real trouble started this summer. I realized, after a series of illnesses and deaths in the family, that life was just too darn short to spend in a marriage I didn’t want to be in. A side problem to my realization that I didn’t want to be married anymore was the realization that I actually am in love with someone else. He’s my best friend and has been for half my life. He knows that I love him, and has said he loves me too. He also knows that my marriage is ending.

Not only did he trick her into marriage, but he stopped her from marrying the love of her life. How did the manipulative SOB ever pull such a thing off? Here’s how:

Allow me to back up a little. Before I got married, I had a mini-crisis. Everyone I knew was getting married or already had families. I was the last single person in my groups of friends. My husband and I had been dating for several years at that point, so it never failed that everyone (and I mean everyone) would ask when it was our turn. I have to admit, I fell for it. What was wrong with me that I wasn’t married? I had these feelings despite the fact I never even wanted to be married! I was in love with my best friend at this point, too, but things were complicated, so I decided to marry my husband because he was stable, loving and wanted me. But with the benefit of hindsight, I know now that I was reacting to my insecurities and not out of a desire to spend the rest of my life with my husband.

Typical. He played on her insecurities, and ultimately forced her to take half of his stuff!

I have discussed with my husband the fact that I am feeling trapped, and that we might not make it. He was devastated, and asked me if I would work on our marriage. The problem is that I do not want to work on it. I just want out. To
compound the issue, I slept with my best friend. To compound it even further, I haven’t heard from my best friend in two weeks, despite attempts to contact him. The truth? I love my husband as a friend, and my friend as the one great love of my life. One wants me, the other (it seems) does not.

First he traps her in marriage, and then he wants to make her “work on it”. Now she is forced to cheat on him just to be haaaapy.

Don’t be this guy.

Here is another guy you don’t want to be. I won’t link to the source but it is a comment on a Christian blog discussing divorce. The reality is these kinds of guys aren’t hard to find at all. I’ve even known a guy like this. Here is the poor woman’s story:

We were a Christian couple who divorced. We went through some marital counseling and one-on-one counseling. I prayed for a year that God would change my heart and help me love and respect my husband. I should also have prayed that my husband would love and respect me. He simply wasn’t willing. No matter how much we talked about us, he just yes’d me to death and go on as usual. Finally God made it clear to me that He was permitting me to divorce. My stepchildren were wounded by my leaving, especially since their own mother had left them when they were younger. Except for the pain I caused them, I have never regretted the divorce. The truth is that my husband didn’t love the real me. I would rather be alone all my life than ever face that sense of failure and rejection ever again. And the worst of it was that it really was all my fault. I would never have married him if it hadn’t been for the fact that we had pre-marital sex. I’d suffered sexual abuse as a child and when I became born-again, I’d felt clean for the first time. Then one day we were alone (first mistake) and I wanted to test him (major, major mistake). I wanted so badly for him to be that romantic hero of the Harlequin novels who loved and respected his woman so much he would never have sex with her before marriage. I wanted him to stop himself, but of course, he didn’t. So I did the only thing I could think of to clean up my own mess and that was to marry him. Even as I prepared for marriage, I knew I didn’t really love him, but I ignored it and made myself go through with it. What a fool. The response of our church was horrible. Within 2 weeks I had become a sermon illustration and my pastor had instructed the staff to stay away from me. So much of what happened was my fault, but I was so embarrassed that I couldn’t admit it. I developed horrible anxiety and panic attacks as well as depression with thoughts of suicide. I had become such a disappointment to everyone – my husband, my stepchildren, my pastor, my church, even those I’d thought were my friends. It took me 9 years and a move across country to forgive everyone involved.

Don’t be that guy either!

I mentioned I knew a guy like this. His plan was pure genius. He knew a woman who worked with my wife and me, and she came over to hang out with him after she broke up with her loser boyfriend. They became “friends with benefits”, and she got pregnant. All of a sudden it struck this woman that wait, I’m a devout Catholic! So of course she had to marry him, even though she didn’t love him. Then a few years later, she divorced him and took their young
son because she didn’t love him any more.

**Don’t be any of these guys.**

Men assume that when a woman tells him she loves him and she wants to marry that this somehow means she loves him and wants to be married. Don’t be so simple. It could mean that you are somehow secretly forcing her to take your kids and half of your stuff. So stay on the lookout for this.
Game resources for marriage.
by Dalrock | November 19, 2010 | Link

It strikes me that we need a placeholder for all of the great resources out there on game in a long term relationship and/or marriage. I’ll start the list with some that come to mind, and I’m confident the readers will have some other great suggestions in the comments as well.

In no particular order:

- The Dave From Hawaii post on Heartiste*, as well as Hawaiian Libertarian’s post on using game in life.
- Heartiste (Roissy)*
- Married Man Sex Life, starting with his posts on Alpha, Beta, and The MAP.
- Deansdale’s Blog, including WTF is Game, and others in his general category of game.*
- Solomon II*
- Mormon Men
- Game For Marriage
- Badger (a great choice for beginners because of his kind attitude)
- Rivelino in Spain*

Also, Ferdinand* and Ulysses have good posts on game along with their usual variety. I’m sure I am forgetting some, so please fill in any gaps.

*Pickup focused sites. Often crass and definitely not pro marriage, but you can often apply what you learn from the pickup perspective there for a LTR or marriage. Be sure to read the comments too.
Gaming your wife.
by Dalrock | November 19, 2010 | Link

One of the concerns which I hear with some regularity is why a man would marry only to need to “work” to game his wife. I’m not an expert on game, so I generally avoid dispensing game advice. There are plenty of other bloggers who are already filling this space, and I don’t feel the need to jump into that arena. I would rather point you to those who really know what they are talking about. With that in mind, I’ll take a shot at answering the basic question. I’m not answering it as a game expert, but as a (greater) beta husband who has been married for 15 years and has only recently started formally learning anything about game.

Unless you have an arranged marriage or she is a conniving massive bitch, she fell in love with you and is attracted to the real you. You don’t need to morph into a super alpha, you just need to avoid morphing into a sniveling beta and maybe dial up your natural alpha just a bit. Unless being a sniveling beta is your natural and preferred state, avoiding that really shouldn’t be something that feels like work. Guys don’t become sniveling betas because they want to or because it is who they are, they do it because they don’t understand and mistakenly listen to all of the messages of our feminized culture.

The foundation for her commitment to your marriage shouldn’t be your game. If she is only one, or a few, or even 50 failed shit tests away from walking away from her sacred vow and/or whoring around, then she isn’t a wife, she is a whore. Don’t marry a whore*. Game should be about making you and your wife happier with your marriage, not about putting the sole onus for the success of the marriage on you.

Being a man is fun. Enjoy it. Then she can enjoy you being a man too.

Part of game is about understanding what makes you an attractive man. Appreciate yourself (without getting a big head). Being able to appreciate yourself will also allow you to appreciate what is great about your wife without becoming a sniveling beta.

Chances are a lot of game already comes naturally to you. Even as a beta I realize that I have been doing much of what game would teach without really thinking about it. As she has learned more about game, my wife has commented on this multiple times: Wait, you have always done that. and So that is why I like it when you do that. and Hey, you just did it (used game) didn’t you? [Yeah, I guess I did.]

Hawaiian Libertarian describes game as being cocky funny. You call that work? Seriously? I was born a smart ass. Bring it on.

Shit happens, and shit tests happen. It isn’t as if you are free from shit tests until you get married and then all of a sudden have to deal with them. The only way you can avoid them is to avoid women and girls. And even then maybe not with our feminized culture. As with every other unavoidable aspect of life, you may as well learn how to handle them.

Her shit tests are her problem, not yours. As a loving husband you want to help her with
her problems, but don’t assign yourself responsibility for them.

Shit tests are an opportunity. Pass them and good things are coming your way. And even if they don’t come immediately, passing them is still more pleasant (for both of you) than failing them.

As you get better at handling shit tests, you should get fewer and fewer of them.

*If either of you struggle with the idea of judging men or women who cheat or walk away from their marriage without a legitimate cause, don’t marry.


Overcivilized men, uncivilized women.

by Dalrock | November 21, 2010 | Link

This post is the second part to two very different previous posts. A while back I wrote the post *Calibrating Attraction by Controlling the Venue*. That post met with general agreement, but left many readers understandably frustrated that while it was obviously good advice it also made it difficult to meet a large number of men. As the second part of that series, this post could also be titled *Calibrating Attraction by Controlling Yourself*.

I wrote another post prior to the Venue one titled *Gun Control and Wimpy Betas*. In that post I showed how we have over-civilized men, taking away too much of their wildness and making them too weak to be attractive. But there is a flip side to that as well. While we have been over-civilizing men we have also been un-civilizing women.

And by “we” I mean the feminists driving our culture.

Feminism despises any controls placed on women. It rails against any effort to teach women impulse control, manners, or general self control. All of this is seen as some evil plot by the patriarchy to keep women down and prevent them from exercising their power. But the reality is that *someone will control you*. If it isn’t yourself, it will be someone else. And that someone else seldom will have your best interests at heart unless you are a child and they are your parents. I’m assuming that if you are reading this you are no longer a child.

So what does self control have to do with calibrating attraction? Specifically, how can it help a woman adjust her tastes in men away from players and bad boys towards good guy (greater) betas?

I’ll start with impulse control. Men need to have a great deal of it in order to succeed in our organized society. Most guys won’t go very far punching out people who make them angry, being a wise ass at the wrong moment, or tossing their statistics book onto the bonfire while downing a beer bong when they should be studying for their final. The guys who are going to become tomorrow’s engineers, doctors, businessmen, etc need a strong dose of impulse control even in their late teens and early twenties.

Just like most employers you presumably also want a guy who is reliable, generally on time, won’t quit his job because he is bored or dislikes his boss, and won’t end up addicted and/or in prison. In addition I’m assuming you want a man who won’t cheat on you at every opportunity. All of these things require a good dose of impulse control.

The thing about impulse control though is that if you are around someone who has more of it than you do they tend to seem quite stuffy, and downright boring. They can also appear weak and timid. Someone who has less impulse control than you can be either extremely frustrating or exciting, depending on the context.

So if you are like so many current young women who have grown up seeing a lack of impulse control as making you *empowered, interesting and exciting*, you can see where this might
create a problem. Nice guys who are in control of themselves are going to seem boring and timid to you, which is the ultimate tingle killer. If you are pretty guys will still be attracted to you, but you will be extremely frustrating to them as you flit around like an over stimulated puppy. Beta guys without options will likely overlook the frustrating part, but you won’t want them anyway. Alpha and greater beta guys will see you as good for a pump and dump, but not want to waste their energy on establishing anything longer term with you because you are a pain in the ass. Plus they know they can’t trust you due to your lack of impulse control.

The brutal irony of the low impulse control woman is she needs an alpha to tame her, but she isn’t worth the alpha’s trouble beyond a pump and dump. Luckily for them it also means a quick lay is all but guaranteed.

How can you know if you lack impulse control? If you have ever said any of the following, it is a dead giveaway that you lack impulse control:

- I’m looking for a man who can keep up with me.
- There was music playing, so of course I started dancing.
- I’m not looking for anything serious now. I just want to have fun.
- That’s what credit cards are for.
- Well behaved women seldom make history.

I’m sure the readers can come up with more great examples.

Manners is another area of self control which will help you both be more attractive to the alphas and greater betas and more likely to be attracted to good guys. Hope provided an excellent example in her recent comment on Gaming your wife:

> We just recently quit a group in which another married couple were treating [her husband] with flagrant disrespect, silencing him and generally trying to make themselves out to be “on top.” The wife of that couple yells at and abuses others as well. It was a clear demonstration to me, “Don't be like that.”

I know what you are thinking. *Wait, he didn’t jump up like a monkey and bash the other man’s head in with a rock and then rape his woman? He just left the group? And she still wanted him after that display of weakness?*

Strange, isn’t it? That is the power of manners. Hope has them, and they helped her see her husband’s measured response in the right context. His choice to simply leave the group was a choice of strength, not weakness. Fortunately for Hope she has the sense of manners to accurately perceive that.

Prior to feminism our society had rules to help keep both women and men in check. These rules were devised over generations and tuned to the areas each sex needed to restrain. Today however many women no longer feel required to keep decorum. Not only are they not held to previous standards of manners, but this has spilled over to include special leeway when it comes to breaking the law. Feminists have set out to ensure that there are no (or very few) taboos when it comes to women, and they have been wildly successful here. As Lady Raine said on the Fresh Meat on Campus post at Hooking Up Smart:
Take a breath, ladies. It’s been OUR world for awhile and we can live however we want to with no repercussions.

Betas are men who among other things tend to follow the rules. If you have ever been a polite rule follower in the company of a group of rude irresponsible people (from your perspective), you have a taste of how most betas must feel in the company of many modern women. The stereotype of betas all being timid and unwilling to take risks is unfair. Bill Gates wasn’t afraid to take risks, and many would argue that he hasn’t been afraid to break the rules. But I would wager he has generally controlled his own behavior in social settings. Guys like this look weak when in the company of men and women who don’t care about the rules.

The current environment is a rather unique one. The social order is good enough that women feel very safe, but on many levels society is in chaos. One fellow blogger who recognizes this is Grerp. Her blog The Lost Art of Self Preservation (for women) starts with the following:

If you were born female in the mid-1960’s or later, you were probably fed all sorts of erroneous information about how life works, what women deserve, what men want, and what the future will be like. Here’s some actually useful advice to help you survive in this increasingly chaotic post-Sexual Revolution world.

She is trying to protect women. So what does her site focus on? Manners and self control. Feminists hate her site even more than they hate mine. She breaks all of the rules by advising young women to:

- Control their weight.
- Not be a slut.
- Not be rude.
- Not overspend.
- Be discreet.
- Not have a child out of wedlock.
- Keep their wedding expectations under control.
- Avoid going into debt.
- Don’t cheat.

Repeat after me:

*I don’t get to have any fun!*

**See also:** Raising Feral Females.
My new reality show.
by Dalrock | November 22, 2010 | Link

Evidently Lifetime learned about my new weekly series publicizing their channel, so they offered me my own show to demonstrate their gratitude. The deal almost fell apart over the title (and my catchphrase). They wanted to call it *Maybe you should reconsider*. I held firm though. Maybe you can find this in your area:

![Image of a television screen showing the details of a Lifetime program](image_url)

**Stop being a dumbass!**
11/14 08:00 PM - 10:30 PM
150 minutes

(2010) Genre: Reality

**Cast:** Dalrock

Dalrock pimp slaps contestants with his trademark wisdom: A housewife who "isn't haaaapy" and wonders if divorce would lead to an exciting new life after watching Oprah. A married executive who is thinking about having an affair with his secretary. A young man who wants to marry a stripper now that she has changed.
Women are the ones who want to avoid commitment.

by Dalrock | November 23, 2010 | Link

I and other bloggers have touched on this general issue before, but it strikes me that I haven’t seen the full extent of this addressed directly. Conventional wisdom is that women want commitment and men want to avoid it. All too often the reality is that women want commitment from men, but desperately want to avoid reciprocating.

A comment on Solomon II’s recent post on text game (NSFW) had me thinking about this more. Solomon was able to convince a 23 year old woman to send him a partially nude picture of herself. Commenter Lisa found this troubling:

Classy. Why do I even bother dating. How could I compete with this, being 39 with a child, even if I wanted to?

Solomon II replied:

Yes, this gets male attention, but so do plenty of other qualities that you likely have. Most importantly, this is not what it takes to get long term male commitment.

But unless she is a widow, a former nun who experienced immaculate conception, or divorced with legitimate cause or against her will, why should we assume a 39 year old single mother wants commitment? She has had over 20 years to enter into commitment if she so chose.

The conventional wisdom may be the dynamic for a very small percentage of alphas and a larger percentage of more traditional women, but the reality of the changes we have seen in dating and marriage have been just the opposite. Men have been the ones reacting to women’s lack of commitment and responding in kind.

Example: Shift from LTRs to hookups.

Early in the sexual revolution there was some level of stability for serial monogamy. This was because there was still some inertia keeping women from feeling comfortable hopping from man to man. But over time women have felt more and more free to enter and exit sexual relationships at will.

In reality, what exactly differentiates a LTR from a hookup? Is it fair for a man or a woman to have an expectation that their “Long Term Relationship” will be in tact an hour from now, tomorrow, or next week? Is either party judged for deciding at any moment in the relationship that it no longer exists? If either party can terminate the relationship at will simply by voicing their preference, where exactly is the commitment?

Long Term Relationships actually have no term and no commitment. The only way you can violate the agreement is if you get involved with someone else without a courtesy call to the other party first. Tell me if I’m getting this wrong.
Men are consciously or unconsciously starting to recognize this and acting accordingly. The hookup culture is really just men finally adjusting to the rules women have been playing by for quite some time. Now both will get what they want from the “relationship” for so long as it pleases them, and then end it when they wish. The only question is if it pleases them for an hour, a night, a month, a year, or a decade. As men become wise to the lack of commitment they are in turn withdrawing their investment.

Behold: hookup culture.

What clouds this issue is the near total denial of the reality of the situation. Even in the manosphere I’m not sure the true reality that women are the ones who fear commitment is really universally accepted. The pretty lie is that women do want commitment, but only sort of commitment. Intuitively this is an attractive idea. Why not have your cake and eat it too? But commitment turns out to be much like being pregnant. One can’t be a little bit of either one. But the lie persists. This is perhaps the most important message we need to send young men. Don’t fall for the sort of committed idea women and society would sell you. Don’t mistake having sex with a woman, eating dinner with her, living with her, going on vacations, or a long history with a woman to mean anything but she was horny, hungry, she needed a roommate, she wanted to go on vacation, or she didn’t see another option which struck her fancy. It doesn’t mean anything else. It can’t. Even if you are in love. Once a man understands this and truly internalizes it he can act accordingly.

It doesn’t matter if you like the new rules or not. They are here, and the only wise choice is to stop denying it. My wife’s mother told her when she started dating to not expect any commitment from a man unless she was married or at the very least both were actively and openly planning to marry; You could sleep with him and he would be perfectly justified in leaving you the next day.

**We need to start telling our sons the same thing.** They should feel no obligation whatsoever to a woman they are not either married to or engaged to, no matter how long they have been with her or what their shared history is. And they should absolutely expect her to act the same way.

**Example: Marriage 2.0**

We see the same thing regarding marriage. I think there is a federal law requiring that whenever I write a post about divorce that at least one woman loudly worries that women will be “trapped in marriage”.

And by trapped, they of course mean committed.

Marriage 2.0 is just the legal formalization of this kind of thinking. Men’s commitment is legally enforced, while women can no longer even be morally judged for deciding they no longer wish to honor it. Even churches have been cowed into not making moral judgments about those who decide to end their marriage for any reason. As J shared in her comment on my post about the devastating effect divorce has on children:

> I think that the reasons religious institutions of various denominations don’t tackle
the issue as directly as you would advocate is that they don’t want to be seen as mixing in inappropriately and alienating people. My own congregation has no stated policy on divorce, but efforts are made to support both parties and keep them involved in the congregation and guidance is given to those who seek it. Efforts NOT to take sides are made. I think divorce is a minefield for clergy.

To be fair to J she was only sharing what she had observed, and this sentiment is extremely common when I see divorce discussed even on Christian blogs. If anything her church should be commended for being honest about what its policy is regarding divorce. Most churches speak like Christ and act like Oprah when it comes to divorce.

A fellow blogger (whom I respect greatly) OneSTDV expressed a similar sentiment in a post back in August Eat, Pray, Love: What About the Husband? OneSTDV took issue with a post from Welmer on the Spearhead where Welmer (another blogger I respect greatly) asserted that the author had wronged her first husband by divorcing him without cause. OneSTDV felt that she had harmed society at large by doing this, but that it was taking it too far to say that she had wronged her husband personally when she decided not to keep her marriage vows to him:

Welmer’s “victim” carping assumes this man had a right to be loved, that he was actually worthy of anyone’s ardor. He knows nothing of this man’s venerable or disreputable attributes, yet Welmer presumes Ms. Gilbert’s wronged him in some manner:

like being abandoned by a spouse

If Ms. Gilbert felt as despondent as the novel claims, then she’s justified in ending the marriage. Do I advocate divorce and the attendant idea that marriage is a whimsical decision? Of course not, but sometimes, things don’t work out. Ms. Gilbert did not victimize Mr. Gilbert by not reciprocating his affections; one’s personal emotions (from men and women) are offered as a gift, bestowed upon those we deem worthy. If one parsimoniously refuses to extend such warmth, then too bad. A victim exists if unjustifiably imposed upon by some immoral act or actor, i.e. Madoff.

You’re not a victim simply because your wife no longer loves you.

I bring up OneSTDV’s comments only to make it clear how universal this view is. Men need to stop automatically assuming that a woman will feel any moral obligation to him to keep her wedding vows. Society no longer sees it that way, even when it recognizes the moral cost to society and children caused by divorce in general.

Men’s eventual rational response to the reality of the widespread lack of commitment from women will be to stop being confused by the term Long Term Relationship and also to choose not to marry. I think the former can’t happen too soon, but I have mixed feelings about the latter. I personally still advise (beta) men to marry, but only if the woman can demonstrate an exceptional power within herself to keep her end of the commitment. While I mourn the continuing destruction of the institution of marriage, I am also troubled that large numbers of men are marrying women who don’t deserve the honor.
So far we aren’t seeing a marriage strike, but we are seeing a remarriage strike. We are also seeing a change in popular opinion about marrying a woman in her 30s. The fact that the change in attitudes is happening first on the margins makes sense. As this understanding continues to grow we should expect it to eventually impact lifetime first marriage rates as well.
Amy Alkon is a 46 year old never married woman who writes a blog titled Advice Goddess (H/T Thag). Her recent post Settle Sore has a familiar question to which she whispers familiar advice. Letter Writer (LW) asks:

I’m a 23-year-old law student with a boyfriend who attends grad school 16 hours away. We’re both swamped at school, so we visit once a month. I’ve only been with one other guy, but I hate the dating scene. Still, maybe I need to date around to make sure he’s the right person. Then again, since you date to find someone you love, why would you leave someone you love so you can date? I’m pretty sure he’ll propose when we both graduate, and he’s theoretically everything I want, but it frustrates me that he has grand plans and never follows through. Also, he’s willing to move thousands of miles to be with me; I can’t say I’d do the same. I do love him, but I once read that once you doubt the love, you’ve stopped loving that person forever.

Advice Goddess opens her reply with:

Doubt gets a bad rap. Doubting love doesn’t mean you’ve stopped loving, but that you’ve started thinking. Sheep doubt nothing. Chances are you’ll get further in life by questioning things than by living like something that ends up dinner and a sweater.

Following some further words of wisdom, she then gets to:

Dating to find somebody you love is what you do after you’ve dated enough to get a handle on all the stuff you hate. Falling in love is easy; staying in love takes some doing

Really? Falling in love is easy for women? Then why do we read about so many women being forced to marry a man they didn’t love? Are they falling in love with Brad and then deciding to marry John who they didn’t fall in love with? I’m not sure that is the case, but if it is doesn’t that in itself prove that falling in love with a man isn’t something a woman should take lightly since she will likely struggle to fall in love again?

I do agree that staying in love is the trick, and that does take work (or more accurately not being a dumbass). But this comes back to the original folk wisdom that a life plagued by constant doubt is a sign of high intelligence and the path to ultimate happiness.

The Goddess continues:

At this point, a wiser approach would be a more Amish one — and no, I don’t mean tossing all your lightbulbs, donning a bonnet and churning butter. They have this practice called “Rumspringa” — a “running around” period for Amish teens to dabble
in modern culture: smoke, drink, date, and wear zippers. Experiencing what’s out there helps them make an informed decision — whether to stay modern or go back and live Amish. You, likewise, might propose a period of time where you both date around so you can get a better sense of whether you’re with him because you’ve been with him or whether you’re actually choosing him over a bunch of others.

Pretty boiler plate stuff, although the Amish rationalization was a nice touch. She finishes by advising her to string the guy along if she doesn’t want to take the initial advice:

If you keep seeing him, avoid pledging to be together forever until you’re reasonably sure you’ll still want to be together at 27 — tempting as it is to respond to “Will you marry me?” with something a little more romantic than “Um, uhhh...look! A UFO!”

As I said in the beginning, a familiar case with familiar advice. And as before, it is a case of the right answer for the wrong reason. I do agree that LW should break the relationship off. Not because she hasn’t learned to be sufficiently fickle, but because:

1. She is asking for advice on finding a husband from a 46 year old never married woman. If she wants to know what brand of clothes to dress her chihuahua in, Advice Goddess would be the right source. LW lacks the basic sense to enter into any sort of binding agreement. But I hear tramping around builds wisdom, so there is always hope.
2. She isn’t really interested in the guy. She says right out that she wouldn’t move to be with him. Her time is better spent finding the right guy instead of using this one as a security blanket.

I’m not sure which reason is the more important one. But I don’t know how to make frivolous people not frivolous, so I’ll address item 2. Finding the right person is not easy. I’m constantly reading in the comments section how hard women find it to find quality men. Not only are quality men rare, but it is even rarer still for them to find themselves attracted to them. Of course attraction to a nice guy also isn’t enough, he needs to be the right guy and she needs to fall head over heels in love with him.

Meanwhile her ability to attract the best men is slowly declining, and her ability to keep her virginity in tact or at least her partner count low is also at risk. Put off marriage for too long and chastity starts to seem less realistic and therefore less relevant.

Not all young women want to marry. For those who do, finding the right man is a huge challenge. Those who tell women you have all the time in the world are doing them a huge disservice. This is serious work, unless you are a frivolous person who feels that if they choose unwisely they can leave a trail of wreckage in their wake. For a woman who feels that divorce is a remedy to her failure to take her husband search seriously, I would reinforce the suggestion to take your time; wait until at least 45 to start looking for a husband.

For those who take marriage seriously, time’s a wastin.
In the spirit of Godwin’s Law, I present Dalrock’s Law:

The more obvious the fact one is in denial of, the more ridiculous the counterexample (or counterargument) will be.

I can’t be the first to notice this, but it strikes me that we really need a name for this kind of thing. We’ve seen this on this blog, but just yesterday I saw two great examples which are even more ridiculous that the examples/arguments I’ve seen in the comment section here.

**Example 1:** Catholic Answers Forum thread on the question of why so many Catholics are Living together before marriage.

The OP frames the question:

- why do so many couples, catholic and non catholic,,live together before marriage?
- The bible is clear fornication is wrong.
- So aren’t people reading their bibles or believing their bibles and what the chatechism teaches?
- do they think they are not sinning?
- It really annoys me!!

BlueShadow123 offers the following reasonable enough response:

- You know, I bet there is a small percent of people who live together before marriage, but are not having sex.
- Now chances are, if you are living together, you are probably doing stuff, but there is no proof that all of them are.
- but living together would seem to definitely give the opportunity, which is why it would be a bad idea to live together. Never put yourself in an easy position like that.

But this isn’t a case of Dalrock’s law. Offering a counterexample in context without trying to create a smokescreen around the original issue is something entirely different.

Then Prayer Warrior Ashurie joins the holy fray:
We have to remember that not everyone is Catholic, and also taking away the division of Religion...why assume that they are having sex before marriage while living together? Like what Charlotte said before me, there could be many other reasons why they have moved in together – other from sex.

I pray for those who are falsely accused.

I present to you Dalrock’s Law!

Example 2: A discussion on whether women pay any SMV price by waiting until they are older to get serious about marriage (from the Advice Goddess post I mentioned yesterday). Emphasis in bold is mine:

My mom was 69 when she I took her to a dating agency. Do you know what? I expected her to be in a big pool of other women with only a handful of men to choose from. So I was shocked when I was told that no, it’s actually the other way around.

And the woman at the agency wasn’t kidding. Within six weeks my mom was fixed up with 8 guys. (She chose the first one, but then decided to do a bit of shopping around.) He still calls her everyday at her nursing home, even though he lives a few hours away.

Things don’t conform to this so-called conventional wisdom nearly as often as people think. Really.

It is like they are actively competing for the award!
Anonymous Reader raised some great points the other day about the risk to a man of being fooled into marrying a woman who wasn’t worthy of marrying:

“Honest woman” isn’t enough. There’s plenty of nasty skunks in kitten’s clothing, SolomonII has just flushed one out. Any man who is actually looking for a woman to marry needs to know this, and we need further tests to separate the skunks from the house cats. It would be a good thing if men did not have to do this, but that’s unicorn / rainbow territory.

And:

Dalrock, SolomonII has found exactly what I was pointing out to you in another thread. That deacon’s daughter is a classic example of an “honest woman”; she’s church going, she surely participated in all sorts of youth activities in her church growing up, no doubt she can recite some Scripture, and she’ll drop her top for SolomonII after a handful of texts, followed by her panties.

I bet she could pass a majority of the tests you list in “how to find an honest woman”, too, and rationalize all the lies that she’d have to tell to do so. Maybe you get my point, now?

The context of his comments are my assertion in Gaming your wife that:

The foundation for her commitment to your marriage shouldn’t be your game. If she is only one, or a few, or even 50 failed shit tests away from walking away from her sacred vow and/or whoring around, then she isn’t a wife, she is a whore. Don’t marry a whore*. Game should be about making you and your wife happier with your marriage, not about putting the sole onus for the success of the marriage on you.

He was also referencing the questions I proposed in my Interviewing a Prospective Wife Part II post (if you haven’t read that post this one won’t make as much sense).

The first thing I want to stress is that the risk he is discussing is very real. Any man who decides to marry needs to seriously consider this possibility. In the end, the man himself (and his future children) will reap the fruits or bear the burden of the outcome. The risks and rewards are enormous. Only the man himself can make the judgment on whether to marry and if so which woman to marry.

As I mentioned in my Interviewing a Prospective Wife posts, the legal and social deck is stacked against men in marriage. Women are all but encouraged to break their most solemn promise for whatever reason strikes their fancy. This leaves only the woman’s own moral compass as the force compelling her to keep her sacred commitment. Fortunately such women still exist, and I do think there are ways to greatly increase your odds of finding such
a woman.

One thing to keep in mind is that while attitudes are changing the vast majority of other men still aren’t thinking perfectly clearly about this. Who reading this hasn’t cringed when a friend or relative rationalized away obvious red flags visible in their future wife? And how many other men have you tried to explain the things we discuss in the manosphere to, only to have them respond with vehement denial? This is all backed up by the marriage rate stats. Pretty much every slut, harpy, and morally flaky woman who chooses to marry is still able to find a sucker husband.

Applying this to Solomon II’s Deacon’s daughter (NSFW), I think a man truly looking for the signs would be able to spot them. Keep in mind that after taking an extended ride on the carousel what she is likely to be looking for is a beta provider, and unfortunately clueless betas still aren’t hard to find. While it is theoretically possible that she will put in the hard work to make herself seem just like the real deal, far more likely she will find some hapless beta who won’t look past the assets in the text message and the certified deacon’s daughter stamp of approval.

But not only is finding a sucker easy, credibly faking being a moral woman is not an easy task. In the interview questions one of the things I stress is will she judge other women who are promiscuous or divorce frivolously. You can take this a step further by testing her words with (hypothetical) future action. Would she drop her best friend if she divorced without very serious cause? Would she refuse to attend a second wedding? What if it was for her sister? Would she tell your children that parents who divorce frivolously are bad people?

Remember we live in a world where even religious people cringe at the very idea of passing any sort of moral judgment on women. Unless you give away the show in how you raise the issue, a faker is very likely to give herself away. A woman who holds in the back of her mind the right to divorce if she is unhappy/bored/etc isn’t going to want to teach her kids that doing so would make her a bad person. The same goes for her expectations in marriage. A woman not serious about marriage won’t want to accept clear obligations as a wife. Chances are she hasn’t even considered it.

Plus rationalization is the hallmark of a dishonest woman. Some may be outright sociopaths, but most have told themselves that what they did wasn’t really wrong. Asking them to judge women who first date bad boys and then find nice guys, or who slut around before deciding to marry goes against everything the hamster stands for. The reality is 99% of the time the hamster will eventually win. With the garden variety flaky woman/carouseler, you aren’t dealing with a diabolical schemer, you are dealing with an over fed and over-entitled hamster. Poor impulse control is the hallmark of such a woman. Tempt her hamster often enough and it will give itself away.

Also, don’t ignore the importance of making sure she really is in love with you. This will weed out almost all of the unsuitable women all by itself. Women who have been slutty or who have an unreasonable assessment of their own value are almost guaranteed not to fall fully in love with you unless you are super alpha. This is why I use the term head over heels in love. If she isn’t there and you have given it enough time to develop, drive on. Something is broken which no amount of future marriage counseling can fix.
H/T to Jack for coining the perfect title for this post.
My wife had a coupon for IHOP a few weeks ago, so we decided to go have breakfast for lunch and invite my buddy along. While we were there another couple sat at the booth next to us, and the man slid in on the woman’s side after she sat down. I didn’t really notice the guy because I was helping my buddy out with his drinking problem. He was wearing his new camo coveralls and looked ready to take on the world, but due to his situation he really needed my help.

My wife had a direct view of them since she was on the other side of the table so the description I’m sharing is from her. The man in the couple was a pretty big guy, built like a biker with a shaved head, wearing a WWE T shirt. At first glance he would have seemed like a tough guy, but he was constantly fawning over his girlfriend. He was rubbing her back, stroking her hair, and giving her little kisses. When it came time to order he made a big point of ordering apple juice to drink. A more alpha guy could have pulled this less than manly beverage order off just fine, but not this guy. His girlfriend looked like she was conflicted; she liked the idea of all of the attention he was giving her, but for some reason she really wasn’t enjoying it. I’m guessing my wife cringed subconsciously when she glanced over and saw him fawning on his girlfriend, because he started giving her man-bitchy looks.

On the drive home my wife mentioned the whole scene to me and said before learning about game she wouldn’t have understood what she had just witnessed. She would have known something was wrong with the picture, but she wouldn’t have known exactly what. We don’t eat out that often, but now she wants to go out just to see more examples of game in work (or examples of it lacking). It really is funny how simple things can become when you have the right model to process the information with. Too bad apple juice boy lacks that understanding.

Oh, and as for my buddy and his drinking problem, don’t worry about him. He should be able to handle it just fine without any help in a matter of months. In the meantime my wife and I are quite happy to help him out. He was quiet during lunch and on the ride home, but I think he saw the man bitchy looks apple juice boy was giving my wife. I snapped a picture of him while we were eating and when I reviewed the photos later I noticed he had adopted a protective posture.

He is a pretty perceptive fellow.
Isn’t it time you left your husband?
by Dalrock | December 2, 2010 | Link

In his recent post on the Spearhead, Jack Donovan linked to this stomach turning piece from July of last year in the Atlantic (be sure to watch the slideshow). What struck me first about the piece was the image above of women escaping the horror of being trapped in marriage as well as the unbelievably blunt subheading:

| The author is ending her marriage. Isn’t it time you did the same?

Normally the media takes the trouble to encode this bit of feminist wisdom more subtly before broadcasting it out for consumption by women of the west.

The piece is by Sandra Tsing Loh, just one in a long line of despicable feminist attention whore writers who seem to think that every time they blow their nose they are at the vanguard of some powerful new trend.

Prior to writing the above piece about how she cheated on her husband and then decided her marriage wasn’t worth working on, she was busy writing articles and even a book on motherhood.

In late January of this year, she wrote the following in an Op Ed piece in the NY Times:

| I am stricken with the peculiar curse of being a 21st-century woman who makes more than the man she’s living with ...

| I don’t know how it’s going for my sisters, but as my 40s and Verizon bills and mortgage payments roll on, I seem to have an ever more recurring 1950s housewife fantasy.

I’m truly at a loss for words.

I hope her ex husband is focusing on raising their two poor young girls and sheltering them from the unmitigated disaster they have for a mother. I also wish the national media would shelter the millions of other children she wishes to do the same thing to with her continuing attempt to transform millions of other women’s lives into the abject failure she has made of her own.
My wife watched a documentary yesterday on Amelia Earhart where they suggested that the famous aviator and feminist hero likely lost her life due to her unwillingness to learn how to properly use her radio. This made me wonder if Earhart was the real deal or another result of feminist myth-making. I did some quick searching on the question and while I didn’t find the specific facts they had referenced in the documentary, it does sound like she lacked the basic skills needed to effectively communicate with the Coast Guard ship which was helping her navigate; she communicated with them in voice mode on a Morse code frequency, and couldn’t understand their reply since she didn’t know Morse code. She may also not have known how to use the radio direction finding equipment she was using. Per Wikipedia:

Some sources have noted Earhart’s apparent lack of understanding of her Bendix direction-finding loop antenna, which at the time was very new technology.

The new technology excuse is rather strange, because that comes with the territory of being a pioneer. It also turns out that her failed attempt to fly around the world which resulted in her death and the death of her navigator was actually her second try. The first attempt was called off after she damaged the plane while still on the ground. Again per Wikipedia:

In addition to Earhart and Noonan, Harry Manning and Hollywood stunt pilot Paul Mantz (who was acting as Earhart’s technical advisor) were on board. Due to lubrication and galling problems with the propeller hubs’ variable pitch mechanisms, the aircraft needed servicing in Hawaii. Ultimately, the Electra ended up at the United States Navy’s Luke Field on Ford Island in Pearl Harbor. The flight resumed three days later from Luke Field with Earhart, Noonan and Manning on board and during the takeoff run, Earhart ground-looped. The circumstances of the ground loop remain controversial. Some witnesses at Luke Field including the Associated Press journalist on the scene said they saw a tire blow. Earhart thought either the Electra’s right tire had blown and/or the right landing gear had collapsed. Some sources, including Mantz, cited pilot error. With the aircraft severely damaged, the flight was called off and the aircraft was shipped by sea to the Lockheed facility in Burbank, California for repairs.

Ouch! Her own technical advisor said it was due to pilot error. But don’t worry ladies, all is not lost. She really was a pioneer. She was the first woman to cross the Atlantic in an airplane. But before we go into the details of her groundbreaking transatlantic flight, I thought I would share some of the history of transatlantic flight.

Alcock and Brown, June 1919

The first nonstop transatlantic flight was made by the British aviators Alcock and Brown in June of 1919 in a modified WWI bomber. You might have been thinking Lindberg was the first to fly the Atlantic, but his was the first from the US to the European mainland. This earlier flight was significantly shorter from Newfoundland to Ireland. Even so, it was a truly
groundbreaking flight for its day, on the cutting edge of what equipment and men were capable of. Per Wikipedia:

The flight nearly ended in disaster several times owing to engine trouble, fog, snow and ice. It was only saved by Brown’s continual climbing out on the wings to remove ice from the engine air intakes and by Alcock’s excellent piloting despite extremely poor visibility at times and even snow filling the open cockpit.

That’s insane. **He had to climb out onto the wings during the flight to chip ice off of the air intakes while flying over the North Atlantic!** Here is a picture of their plane on takeoff.

Charles Lindbergh, May 1927

Following Alcock and Brown’s flight the next truly groundbreaking flight was by Charles Lindbergh in May of 1927 when he flew nonstop and solo from Long Island New York to Paris. This was a far longer route of 3,600 miles compared to Alcock and Brown’s flight of 1,890 miles. In doing so Lindbergh won the Orteig Prize, which had been unclaimed since May of 1919.

Lindbergh won the prize in the now famous *Spirit of St Louis*, an aircraft which he had custom built for the purpose. As is typical with truly ground breaking feats, the machine he used sacrificed ordinary features in order to allow the pilot to achieve the extraordinary. Per Wikipedia:

The large main fuel tank was placed in the forward section of the fuselage, in front of the pilot, which improved the **center of gravity**. While locating fuel tanks at the front reduced the risk of the pilot’s being crushed to death in the event of a crash, this design decision also meant that there could be no front windshield, and that forward visibility would be limited to side windows only. A periscope was installed to provide a forward view, as a precaution against hitting ship masts, trees, or structures while flying at low altitude; however, it is unclear whether the periscope was used during the flight. Lindbergh also used special navigation instruments such as the **Earth Inductor Compass** as its main instrument, allowing Lindbergh to navigate while taking account of the **magnetic declination** of the earth. Lindbergh sat in a cramped cockpit which was 94 cm wide, 81 cm long and 130 cm high (36 in × 32 in × 51 in). The cockpit was so small, Lindbergh could not stretch his legs.

Amelia Earhart, June 1928

As promised, now we get to Earhart’s historic flight. This is the flight which won her the nicknames *Lady Lindbergh*, and *Queen of the Air*. Earhart made a flight very similar to Alcock and Brown’s flight nearly 10 years earlier, flying from Newfoundland to Wales. However, aviation technology had advanced rapidly in the intervening years, so instead of a modified open cockpit WW I bomber Earhart and her companion Wilmer Stultz were able to make this flight in comparative comfort using an early airliner called the **Fokker Tri Motor**.
Even though her flight was relatively unremarkable for its day from a technical perspective, the fact that she was the first woman to make the crossing made her an instant celebrity. She and Stultz were thrown a ticker tape parade in New York, and she was invited to meet President Coolidge at the white house.

Keep in mind when I say she was the first woman to fly across the Atlantic, I mean as a passenger. Per Wikipedia:

> Since most of the flight was on “instruments” and Earhart had no training for this type of flying, she did not pilot the aircraft. When interviewed after landing, she said, “Stultz did all the flying—had to. I was just baggage, like a sack of potatoes.” She added, “…maybe someday I’ll try it alone.”

As proof of how unremarkable the flight was for the day, the actual pilot is only noted for having her as his passenger on that flight. Eventually she did try the flight herself, but before we look at that I’ll share one more crossing by another pair of true aviation pioneers.

**Post and Gatty, June 1931**

Wiley Post and Harold Gatty flew their Lockheed Vega around the world in 8 days, breaking the previous speed record of 21 days held by the Graf Zeppelin. They made this groundbreaking flight in their Lockheed Vega named the Winnie Mae. One of the first legs of their historic journey was from Newfoundland to Wales.

**Amelia Earhart, May 1932**

Like Post and Gatty a year earlier, Earhart also flew from Newfoundland to the UK in a Lockheed Vega, although her flight was not part of a larger record breaking attempt. Per Wikipedia:

> At the age of 34, on the morning of May 20, 1932, Earhart set off from Harbour Grace, Newfoundland with the latest copy of a local newspaper (the dated copy was intended to confirm the date of the flight). She intended to fly to Paris in her single engine Lockheed Vega 5b to emulate Charles Lindbergh’s solo flight. Her technical advisor for the flight was famed Norwegian American aviator Bernt Balchen who helped prepare her aircraft. He also played the role of “decoy” for the press as he was ostensibly preparing Earhart’s Vega for his own Arctic flight. After a flight lasting 14 hours, 56 minutes during which she contended with strong northerly winds, icy conditions and mechanical problems, Earhart landed in a pasture at Culmore, north of Derry, Northern Ireland. The landing was witnessed by Cecil King and T. Sawyer. When a farm hand asked, “Have you flown far?” Earhart replied, “From America.” The site now is the home of a small museum, the Amelia Earhart Centre.

And thus, a mere 5 years after Lindbergh’s ground breaking flight from Long Island to Paris, Earhart followed in his footsteps by completing a far shorter flight comparable to the one made by Alcock and Brown 13 years earlier, using a plane two other men had used to fly around the world a year prior.
If you don’t catch the movie, you can always read the book (or just check out the customer reviews). From the Publishers Weekly review on Amazon:

Roberts’s sweetly vengeful dig at do-nothing husbands follows a smalltown knitting club of wives who are sick and tired of toiling over elaborate Christmas preparations that their husbands don’t appreciate. As they go on strike, the women try to stay in solidarity, while the husbands plan retaliation at the hardware store. Roberts revels in detailing the husbands’ awkward, often disastrous handling of tasks their wives habitually do for Christmas (taking the kids to see Santa, planning the party, doing up the house). By the end of this gently feminist sendup, each side learns to be grateful for the other’s efforts.
A post-marital spinster’s rationalization hamster in the final stages of exhaustion.

by Dalrock | December 7, 2010 | Link

What Men Are Saying About Women has a post about aging feminist Liz Jones and her poor me piece last December in the Daily Mail: Wish me a lonely Christmas and spare a thought for the millions of women like me. This is the ultimate red meat for the manosphere, including an aging feminist/post-marital spinster who’s social life revolves around her 17 cats. Liz hams it up in the photo for the column, posing with her cat and in rags with massive holes exposing both knees.

She holds herself out as an example, bravely baring her own pain so that others might better understand the plight of lonely older women across the UK:

As you all head home to your families for the holiday, spare a thought for the millions of women like me for whom it’s the hardest time of year

Later in the column she tells us how she has written only three Christmas cards, one of which is to her garbage collectors. Somehow along the way she forgot that she dedicated her life to not only making herself an aging spinster, but all of those other millions of women she mentions as well. As a former editor of British Marie Clare, author, and columnist she has been diligently poisoning the very well she now complains is not fit to drink from.

In August of 2009, her book The Exmoor Files: How I Lost A Husband And Found Rural Bliss was published. Then in December 2009 she published this piece, including:

I moved to the countryside, where I thought there might be more of a community (in London, I never did find out the name of the girl who lived next door).

I was wrong, as it turned out, and have found I can go from one week to the next without speaking to a soul.

Like Sandra Tsing Loh and the author of Marry Him, her life’s epiphany reads more like just another washed up attention whore desperately trying to turn the spotlight back on herself, if only for a brief moment. Following her December 2009 column, she revised the book and retitled the new edition: The Exmoor Files: How I Lost A Husband And Nearly Found Rural Bliss. Of course, before that she wrote Liz Jones’s Diary: How One Single Girl Got Married (2005). In between, she wrote regular columns complaining about her husband.
But a life of denial of reality and dispensing so much advice with so little wisdom is bound to catch up with someone eventually. Rationalization hamsters are an amazing thing, and if cared for properly they should last a lifetime. No one knows the exact number of revolutions a hamster is rated for, but most scientists agree the number is upwards of over 3.5 million for a western woman.

But Liz has kept her hamster running at full speed for over 50 years. Hamsters need a break, a time when logic and wisdom takes over to provide a period of rest. Her hamster is worn out. He can no longer keep up the pace.

Despite her hamster’s valiant efforts, moments of lucidity periodically break through.

Loneliness is a resilient, persistent little beast. For most of the year, those of us who live alone can rub along pretty well.

But then her hamster somehow finds the strength to spin just a little more, heroically protecting her from her crushing glimpse of her own reality. Surely her vacations alone must be better than the horrible fate of a woman vacationing with her husband and children:

To my mind, having seen the fatigue etched on the faces of parents waiting with their brood by the luggage carousel, this is far superior to the enforced camaraderie.
of the family holiday that frequently disintegrates into bickering.

That last burst took something out of her hamster. He can’t keep it up, no matter how hard he tries. Her thoughts turn to Christmas time and the grim nature of her reality seeps back:

Everywhere you look, you are reminded you are a pariah, that you have failed to even dampen life’s litmus test of happiness.

There is danger here, and the hamster knows no matter how tired he is he must protect her. He slowly struggles to his feet, and eventually manages another revolution or two:

This year, it is the ad for Coca-Cola that has me burping bile. You know the one: the handsome teenage son on his gap year somewhere far-flung and exotic, homesick for his dear old mum. The handsome dad, who returns home to sweep his long-haired daughter into his arms.

I comfort myself that scenes like these are mostly a lie. Twenty somethings might return to the fold to sleep in their single childhood bed, but they’d probably rather still be travelling or having sex. They have gone back home because they have run out of money and want a hot meal and someone to do their laundry.

Yes, thank you hamster! I had forgotten about all of the pieces I wrote telling women being a wife and mother is thankless and terribly unfulfilling! Inspired by this, her hamster once again finds his legs and trots along with splendor as he did when he was younger:

You know that if a dad did actually just turn up on Christmas Eve, there would be a shrewish woman waiting in the wings, all too ready to heap opprobrium on the scene.

She smiles at the thought of all of the marriages and childhoods she made miserable by advising women they needed to be shrews to be happy, and drilling husbands that their duty was to put up with it. It must have worked, right? She’s seen it not only on every form of media but in person as well. She dreams wistfully of her handywork:

Through choice or by accident, more women than ever are living alone: the number has doubled in three decades.

Yes! She has made a difference after all! She may die alone and unmourned, but no one can take this triumph away from her!

The column continues, with the hamster periodically losing his footing and then recovering at the last minute. She imagines that her mother misses her deceased father, but then assumes she must really be glad she doesn’t have the bother of caring for a man who is invested in her.

Her hamster somehow musters all of his remaining strength, and comes through for a magnificent finish:

At this time of the year, women far too often regress to a Fifties role of carer and nurturer, which makes the atmosphere do what it always does: simmer with
resentfulness and martyrdom. Being alone should be seen as an opportunity: to follow your passion, whatever it might be.

This Christmas, having received not a single invitation to join them from family or friends – I suppose a single, childless, ageing, vegan woman plonked in their midst is not everyone’s cup of eggnog – I am going to attempt to live out the rural ideal and spend the day feeding my animals.

I have 17 cats, all of whom worship at the altar of St Michael, my sheepdog. There will be sheep nestled like something from a nativity play, horses breathing steam with icicles in their manes.

And lonely as I may be, the thought of doing just that will, I’m sure, make many women, who are desperately trying to make everything perfect for a family who remain resolutely ungrateful, turn an appropriately festive shade of red and green.

Fortunately she ends it there, for her hamster has nothing left to give. This Christmas season, say a prayer. Not for the aging feminists and post marital spinsters who will spend it alone, but for their heroic hamsters who have given their all for so many years.

See Also: The Rationalization Hamster 500!

Standing hamster pic from Love hamster. Hamster in wheel pic from Mylius (license). Sleeping hamster pic from Emuishere Peliculas.
Perhaps feminists’ favorite moral admonishment to women and girls is *Be True to Yourself*. Solomon II touched on this in his post *Drive Thru Boyfriends*:

She does the same thing when she’s sad, lonely, happy, up, down, in, out, excited, needy, afraid, strong, weak, depressed, moody, joyful, exhilarated, stressed, etc. Any and every reason is valid because she’s being “true to herself”.

In the right context, the slogan has mildly positive value. Someone who already has strong morals and great capability can benefit from the self assurance embedded in this piece of folk wisdom.

However as a primary philosophy the slogan is merely the codification of childishness. They may as well come out and tell women and girls: *don’t let anyone tell you what to do*. For some reason, feminists are eternally fretting that women and girls won’t be sufficiently self centered. They are constantly reminding us how selfless women are, and that they really need to “take some time for themselves”, or “follow their hearts”.

They appear to presuppose that women lack the capacity to be selfish, or that they are innately less selfish than men. Reality stubbornly refuses to agree. So if I may offer some words of comfort to any feminists reading this blog; don’t worry, women (as a group) are now being immensely selfish!

While self-centeredness is unfortunately on the rise across our society, we do still teach selflessness to men and boys. While women and girls are in one room being drilled in “being true to themselves”, *girl power!*, and *it’s all about you!* boys and men are in another room being taught “your word is your bond”, “there is no *I* in team”, “duty, honor, country”, and “man up”. Churches fortunately still tell men they have a duty to God and their families. For example, organizations like *Promise Keepers* have been created to reinforce men’s *sense of duty* in response to women’s increasing *failure to keep their promises*. Some day churches may even create a group focused on telling women they need to keep their promises too. Or not.

It is worth noting that Shakespeare himself wasn’t being serious when he wrote his famous line for Polonius in *Hamlet*, and even then he had a very different meaning than feminists have twisted it into today:

This above all: to thine own self be true,
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man.
Farewell, my blessing season this in thee!

As the study guide *enotes explains*:
“To thine own self be true” is Polonius’s last piece of advice to his son Laertes, who is in a hurry to get on the next boat to Paris, where he’ll be safe from his father’s long-winded speeches [see NEITHER A BORROWER NOR A LENDER BE].

Polonius has in mind something much more Elizabethan than the New Age self-knowledge that the phrase now suggests. As Polonius sees it, borrowing money, loaning money, carousing with women of dubious character, and other intemperate pursuits are “false” to the self. By “false” Polonius seems to mean “disadvantageous” or “detrimental to your image”; by “true” he means “loyal to your own best interests.” Take care of yourself first, he counsels, and that way you’ll be in a position to take care of others. There is wisdom in the old man’s warnings, of course; but he repeats orthodox platitudes with unwonted self-satisfaction. Polonius, who is deeply impressed with his wordliness, has perfected the arts of protecting his interests and of projecting seeming virtues, his method of being “true” to others. Never mind that this includes spying on Hamlet for King Claudius. Never mind, as well, that many of Polonius’s haughty, if not trite, kernels of wisdom are now taken as Shakespeare’s own wise pronouncements on living a proper life.
Why do you care?

by Dalrock | December 9, 2010 | Link

Grerp has a powerful post up titled Thoughts on The Fourth Turning, part 2: Gen X’s childhood where she describes how the social changes ushered in by previous generations impacted Gen X.

The kids in Gen X experienced family breakdown, then, because their parents flaked, because they put themselves first, because the kids in our generation weren’t “worth the parental sacrifice of prolonging an unhappy marriage.”

Wow. Thanks. The adults around us preferred to deal with the divorce epidemic by producing after-school specials and writing stuff like It’s Not the End of the World rather than pressure Silent and Boomer parents to stick it out for the kids.

But anyone who has been to even the first day of Feminist Academy a major university knows that whenever one is confronted with negative outcomes from feminism there is only one logical argument:

Why do you care?

When overwhelmed by facts or logic, challenge why the other person even has a right to care about the negative outcomes of feminism. Ideally, do this in such a way as to suggest they are somehow defective as a person for caring about anything but what women want. And by women, they of course mean feminists.

Grerp preemptively answers that question:

And you may ask me, “grerp, why are you so angry about this? Your parents stayed together. You weren’t a child of divorce.” And that would be true. My parents didn’t divorce, and I had a stable, protected childhood. But my friends had parents who divorced and went through that nightmare in front of me. What do you say to someone you know and care about when their parents pancake? “Gee, I’m sorry your family is toast, and you only see your dad every other weekend, and your new stepmother treats you like an interloper?” “I’m sorry your mom decided having a new boyfriend was more important than seeing you every day?” One of my friends crashed and burned in college over her parents’ divorce, and she was 20 and not even living at home any more. What can you say when you watch someone’s family fracture and you see your friend mourn it while being told nothing truly terrible happened? It happens all the time, after all.

My teachers got divorced. The guidance counselor at my middle school got divorced and then killed himself. He had lived in my neighborhood, three doors down. It says something when the person who is hired to shepherd the youth into making better decisions decides checking out permanently is better than staying around for his young daughter.
Her point is so painfully obvious that it is hard to understand why it needed to be said. And yet it did. Who reading this blog of any generation hasn’t watched in horror as kids suffered in unspeakable ways because their parents couldn’t get their act together?

I don’t think the difference between those who care and those who mostly don’t is having witnessed the misery of the children impacted by these changes. I think instead the difference is who the person primarily identifies with, and therefore where the bulk of their empathy lies. Many people identify more with flaky adults than innocent children. I know that is harsh, but when all is said and done, isn’t it true?

I also think the difference is whether one was invested in the changes before witnessing the pain they caused. If you literally or figuratively marched for the cause, or if you at least liked the idea on paper, I think it makes it much harder to accept what the true results were. No one wants to feel responsible for causing the suffering of millions of children.

I think this is the real distinction between GenX and previous generations on issues like divorce, to the extent that the divide is in fact generational. Those who first witnessed men or women staying in visibly bad marriages for the sake of their children must have asked “how much worse would it be if they simply divorced”. Somewhere along the way for most I suspect this empathy morphed into a sort of pre rationalization for their own potential bad behavior. *What if I’m unhappy in a few years? What if I find a better deal. I shouldn’t be forced to suffer, should I?* I strongly suspect that men and women each secretly thought that by ushering in the sexual revolution and the divorce revolution that they (and only they) would be able to have their cake and eat it too.

So when the worlds of kids around them started falling apart, they had a psychological choice. Admit that they were wrong and likely even had less than pure motives, or rationalize it all away as entirely unavoidable and not that big a deal anyway.
What we need is more moxie!
by Dalrock | December 11, 2010 | Link

I took my daughter to fast food a few weeks back for lunch and to let her play in their play area. She had a blast in the play area, and we both enjoyed the father/daughter time. She even got a Moxie girlz™ purse with her kids meal (image at toyalert.blogspot):

For those not already familiar with moxie girlz, it is pretty much the standard mix of girlpower, be true to yourself, and hair and makeup you would see anywhere else. This message to girls certainly predates my time, but it does seem that they have upped the volume over the years. Here is a portion of their wisdom for girls from the home page:

Every girl has the strength to do something amazing. Anything is possible as long as you stay true to yourself & never give up on your dreams!

Their trademark is:
be true! * be you!™

You have to love traditional girl role toys packaged with feminist slogans. You can click here to read more about each of the moxie girl characters. Each one aspires to be just ambitious enough to say she had a career, without crossing over into anything traditionally masculine or which would require math or science skills. They are playful, silly, creative, sporty, and love to dance, and we learn why each one is loved by her friends.

The boys who had kids meals also received a toy, but without any slogans telling them how amazing they are or exhorting them to be true to themselves. Their toys were pro wrestlers.

It is pretty funny when you think about it, because you could probably go back to any point in human history and find little boys playing as warriors and little girls playing with purses and dolls.

Feminists have to be pulling out their hair saying why aren’t the slogans working? We must need more moxie!

Resident feminist Doomed Harlot even attributed mothers who feed their kids to predators to a lack of feminist moxie:

I used to prosecute criminal cases so I have personally interacted with women who have sided with their pedophile boyfriends over their own victimized daughters. It’s not a phenomenon I can pretend to understand. I attribute it to (1) denial based on fear of being without a man and (2) internalized misogyny and the resulting ambivalent feelings about their own daughters.

I’m not sure more moxie was what was missing. What if those mothers were just being true to themselves?
Some would likely claim that teaching girls moxie is strictly a new phenomenon, and girls will turn into boys in just one or two more generations. But this isn’t true. Amelia Earhart’s mother was raising her daughter with moxie over 100 years ago:

Their upbringing was unconventional since Amy Earhart did not believe in molding her children into “nice little girls.”

Much like today, the stress for girls was on attitude over actual competence. In Earhart’s case it payed off quite well. After her accomplishment of riding in a plane while two men flew it across the Atlantic, she went on a lengthy lecture tour and wrote a book. I haven’t read the book but I’m assuming she included recipes of the snacks she served the pilots during the flight.

Earhart certainly had the moxie to fly the state of the art Lockheed Electra purchased for her by Perdue University, but by many accounts she lacked the skill. Moxie alone won’t pilot a plane around the world. Moxie without the skill to back it up will get you killed.

Given how long we have been raising girls on a steady diet of moxie, why haven’t they turned into boys? I would suggest teaching girls actual skills and real values instead of focusing on self esteem and self centeredness. Psychologist Dr. Roy Baumeister offers another explanation in his lecture Is There Anything Good About Men?:

For women throughout history (and prehistory), the odds of reproducing have been pretty good. Later in this talk we will ponder things like, why was it so rare for a hundred women to get together and build a ship and sail off to explore unknown regions, whereas men have fairly regularly done such things? But taking chances like that would be stupid, from the perspective of a biological organism seeking to reproduce. They might drown or be killed by savages or catch a disease. For women, the optimal thing to do is go along with the crowd, be nice, play it safe. The odds are good that men will come along and offer sex and you’ll be able to have babies. All that matters is choosing the best offer. We’re descended from women who played it safe.

For men, the outlook was radically different. If you go along with the crowd and play it safe, the odds are you won’t have children. Most men who ever lived did not have descendants who are alive today. Their lines were dead ends. Hence it was necessary to take chances, try new things, be creative, explore other possibilities. Sailing off into the unknown may be risky, and you might drown or be killed or whatever, but then again if you stay home you won’t reproduce anyway. We’re most descended from the type of men who made the risky voyage and managed to come back rich. In that case he would finally get a good chance to pass on his genes. We’re descended from men who took chances (and were lucky).

The huge difference in reproductive success very likely contributed to some personality differences, because different traits pointed the way to success. Women did best by minimizing risks, whereas the successful men were the ones who took chances. Ambition and competitive striving probably mattered more to male success.
(measured in offspring) than female. Creativity was probably more necessary, to help the individual man stand out in some way.

Interestingly this model fits pretty well when we compare the Earhart girls and Charles Lindbergh. While Amelia died trying to fly around the world before she had any children, her sister Grace lived to the age of 98 and had 2 children and 7 grandchildren. Charles Lindbergh had a total of 8 surviving children (not counting the kidnapped baby), including 3 children from his German mistress. I haven't seen a full count of his descendants, but as of 1969 he had 9 grandchildren.
Stats on the reasons for divorce.
by Dalrock | December 14, 2010 | Link

One old saw when the topic of frivolous divorce comes up is *you never really know what is happening in someone else’s marriage*. The premise being that even those apparently frivolous divorces are likely due to serious cause. Interestingly the people most adamant about this also tend to be the ones most in favor of no fault divorce. A very common tactic by proponents of no fault divorce is to change the subject to abuse, addiction, and infidelity. These are of course the very reasons they are arguing one shouldn’t have to claim in order to divorce. It is possible that they lack the logical capacity to understand why this is a red herring, or perhaps they would just rather try to win the argument than make logical sense.

Moreover, I wish I knew what these people’s secret was to avoiding divorcée TMI (Too Much Information). I must have a sign on my forehead saying “Tell me about your frivolous divorce”. A typical encounter with a new divorcée who I have never met but mistakenly share an elevator with goes something like the following:

**New Divorcée:** I’m glad you asked. My ex husband was such a loser… [Cornered, Dalrock goes into his happy place imagining a flock of ducks (all green-heads) setting their wings in preparation to land in his decoys. An unknown period of time elapses as the divorcée continues sharing all of her ex husband’s faults and her complaints about each of the men she has dated since her divorce.] …and that is why I decided to take his grandfather’s war medals in the settlement.

**Dalrock:** Um, that’s very interesting maam. But all I asked was what floor you wanted me to push the button for.

As I’m sure is the case for many of this blog’s readers, I’ve learned to scope elevators very carefully for the telltale new divorcée haircut, crazy eyes, and inappropriate cleavage. Better to take the stairs than end up trapped in a steel box with a desperate cougar sharing TMI. **No means no divorcées!** As in, no I don’t want to hear about your divorce or your miserable dating life!

I’m sure there is a good deal of selection bias in effect here. Those women who tried to keep their marriages together in the face of true cause for divorce are almost guaranteed to be too dignified to air their dirty laundry with a complete stranger, especially one who is trying to pry the elevator doors apart between floors.

I do occasionally hear about men’s divorces as well, but usually this is either from someone I know fairly well or something I overhear a man telling to other men he knows well. Typically men don’t talk about the details of the marriage, but more about the injustices of the family court system:

**Newly divorced man talking to his buddies:** I can’t believe she took my work truck. It isn’t worth anything and I don’t believe her when she says she wants to drive it. She has both of our cars. Why not drive one of those? How am I supposed to pay all of that child support
and alimony without my work truck? I need it for my business!

**One of his buddies:** Hang in there. She’ll get tired of driving a septic pumping truck and is bound to sell it back to you for a good price.

Anyway, I promised stats in the title and I’ll keep my promise. The data below is from the AARP survey and therefore has the problem of being more reflective of reasons for divorce later in life. However, it isn’t as problematic as you might think because 73% of the divorces being measured in the survey occurred when the person was in their 40s. I don’t have stats on when people divorce, but given the fact that 80% of divorced (and not remarried) women in the US are age 40 or over and 89% are 35 or older, I’m guessing divorce clusters around age 35 to 50. Here are the top seven reasons from figure four on page 24 of the report:

![Chart showing most frequently cited reasons for divorce](chart.png)

Note that they are actually combining the answers to three questions in this one chart. They first ask what was the most significant reason for the divorce, then they ask the question two more times for the next two reasons. If we are looking for cases of justified divorce, I think we only need to look at the answers to the first question. If someone listed “No obvious problems, simply fell out of love” as the primary reason and then abuse as a second or third reason, I’m not convinced on the abuse answer. It is also possible that someone answered abuse as the first reason, addiction as the second, and infidelity as the third. However in that case we would still only want to count them once as a non frivolous divorce so adding in all three answers doesn’t make sense there either.

Also, while the chart shortens the answer to “Abuse”, the choice presented to the person taking the survey was “Verbal, physical or emotional abuse” (see P.68 for full wording of all categories). This is problematic because everything is now considered abuse. In addition, there is a psychological motivation to want to give an answer which is not frivolous, so I would say this data at best allows us to place an upward bound on the percent of divorce which was for serious cause. If you add up the percentages for the first answer of abuse, infidelity, and addiction, you end up with a total of 44%.
Interestingly, the responses vary greatly between men and women surveyed, even though the question asks why the marriage ended, not what the other party did wrong:

Of all the reasons listed below, which was the most significant reason for your last divorce? (Reason may apply to you or to your spouse)

Here are the summary results (P 68) including how it broke down by men and women.

Note that men were much more likely to say it ended for no obvious reason (17% vs 7% for women), much less likely to say it was because of abuse (8% vs 23% for women), much less likely to say it was for addiction (6% vs 18%), and somewhat less likely to say it was because of infidelity (14% vs 17% for women).

Men and women’s answers also differed on who was to blame (full data on page 72):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cheating</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied mostly to me</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied mostly to spouse</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied to both equally</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal, physical or emotional abuse</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied mostly to me</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied mostly to spouse</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied to both equally</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol or drug abuse</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied mostly to me</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied mostly to spouse</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied to both equally</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking at the discrepancies above it seems pretty clear that there is quite a lot of rationalization (or outright lying) going on by both sexes. Men seem more willing to cop to being the cause, but both men and women are claiming the other was at fault for concrete causes more than is possible. Interestingly of the three bad behaviors above, women seem to be most comfortable admitting to committing abuse.

From the data I’ve seen, men and women are unfaithful at similar rates (with men slightly more likely to cheat). However, the women in the AARP survey who said infidelity was a cause of the divorce attributed the infidelity to their husbands 92% of the time! We can cross check this to some degree by comparing the answers to the question of who it was who fell in love with someone else:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fell in love with someone else</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied mostly to me</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied mostly to spouse</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied to both equally</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My guess is that falling in love with someone else has less negative connotation than cheating, so both sexes were much more willing to be honest about their own fault.

Another question which jumped out because of the sheer improbability of the answers is the one on which spouse was gay (for the less than 1% who answered that homosexuality was one of the causes of the divorce):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homosexuality</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied mostly to me</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied mostly to spouse</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied to both equally</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly both sexes accused the other of being the gay one at roughly equal rates. However, men were more willing to admit they were gay while the women who didn’t claim their husband was gay simply refused to answer the question. **Edit:** I didn’t notice until after hitting “publish” that the actual numbers here were so small. One man admitted he was the gay one, and one woman refused to answer.
Note that the survey was conducted via web and the respondents were contacted by email and not by phone or face to face. Had this been a telephone or face to face survey one would typically expect even less willingness to be truthful about embarrassing questions. I think the discrepancies point out that divorce is a highly charged topic and that men and women both are very concerned with how their answers would look to others. This is something we should keep in mind whenever considering survey data like this.

One last result (and bit of rationalization) that I’ll share from the survey is who asked for the divorce (P75):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who asked for the divorce?</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Me</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My spouse</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both of us jointly</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you look only at the “me” responses, the results fit in the low end of the figures we commonly hear. 66% of the divorces were initiated by women, and this doesn’t seem entirely out of line with the figures on page 3 of this report (H/T Brendan). As I read the results in the table above, men and women were generally very clear about the answer when they were the initiators of the divorce; you can add up the “me” answers from men and women and it is almost exactly 100%. However, those who didn’t initiate the divorce seem to have felt tempted to rationalize their answer and often times responded that it was mutual.

Note: If anyone has any other data sources on this question, please share them in the comments section.
Which is worse, jilting at the altar or walking out on a marriage?

by Dalrock | December 16, 2010 | Link

There is a story in the news about a bride to be whose fiancé called off the engagement just days before the wedding. She is suing him for just under $100,000 for wedding expenses and emotional distress.

I don’t know enough about the case or the law to have an opinion on whether he should have to pay up, but it does sound like he treated her quite badly. Or maybe not. Perhaps he was just being true to himself. What if he wasn’t haaaapy?

What struck me about this was the moral outrage by the newscasters, especially the women. When grep or I write about the cost to kids and spouses when men or women decide to not honor their marriage vows, the seething response from many women is why do you care? It strikes me that for many people the idea of someone suddenly failing to honor their engagement is far worse than suddenly failing to honor the actual marriage vows.

We don’t see news stories with wronged husbands whose wives one day decided they weren’t happy. That would be passing moral judgment after all, and even a church can’t do that! Commitment is all well and good, but you can’t expect someone to honor their promise even when they don’t want to.

But maybe not. Maybe some promises really have to be kept, and others aren’t such a big deal. Jilting at the altar seems to be one the media and many women bloggers see as unacceptable. I’m not sure why this is. Perhaps because no kids are harmed? Anyway, there does seem to be much more sympathy for women left at the altar than for men who kept their promises only to be ambushed with divorce.

ABC News even did a piece a few years back: Jilted Bride: ‘In a Moment, It’s the Worst Day of Your Life’. The subtitle was Broken-Hearted Brides Faced Cancelled Weddings and Uncertain Futures. This is strange, because it almost sounds like not keeping a promise harms the other party.

While looking for news stories on the lawsuit I mentioned in the opening I found several blogs by women who felt that keeping promises was extremely important. Blogger Nicole Siaa explains:

But during all that planning, all the list-making, cake-tasting and tuxedo-renting, Buttitta’s fiancé had plenty of time to put a hand up and say, “Hey, maybe this isn’t the best idea.” When he finally did, it was at the 11th hour. That’s after the dress is paid for in full, the venue is paid in full, the florist has received the shipments of flowers, the baker has molded the gum-paste flowers, the guests have booked their hotel rooms — the point at which the absolute most amount of money that could be spent was spent without hope of recovery. And that, in this recessed economy, is an
even bigger humiliation than being abandoned by a guy with cold feet.

It turns out, the time to decide if you are being true to yourself, and if you aren’t haaaapy, or if you don’t love the person is before the wedding. Who knew? Would it be better if the guy then wrote a book and made a movie about how glad he was that he dumped his fiancée at the altar? Maybe men could take their fiancées to go see it for date night. Certainly that would make it better, right? Nicole adds:

The point is, Buttitta’s fiance lied. He tricked her into believing that spending that money was not for nothing.

Well, maybe not. From what she is saying this guy actually did something wrong. Maybe the more formal the promise, the less important it is?

Blogger Heather Murphy-Raines also feels the bride to be was wronged by the man who decided to be true to himself:

Good for you, Dominique Buttitta. Good for you. Breaking it off was his decision, but leaving you with the bill is just plain wrong.

I don’t call this sour grapes. I call this natural consequences. This is a lesson her ex-fiancée should have learned in the third grade. Do the right thing, or perhaps someone — in this case, a court of law — may do it for you.

Now I’m really confused. We should have courts decide who was wrong when we decide who should bear the cost of a flaked commitment? Now the man has to go explain himself to some guy in a robe?

Someone help me out here!
List of churches which have taken concrete action on divorce.

by Dalrock | December 17, 2010 | Link

In my post back in September on divorce and the impact it has on children I promised to create a separate post to acknowledge those churches which had made solid headway on the issue of divorce:

I’ll devote a separate post to sharing these success stories, so please include the name of the church and the (low) congregation divorce rate you were able to achieve.

Marriage is sacred to the church, and solving the crisis of divorce is a matter of great urgency to churches across the country. This is the post I will place those examples in.

These aren’t the lukewarm churches which want to talk about the issue but not take concrete action. These are the churches on fire with the spirit which have converted their fire into real results and are eager to tell the world about this. Check back often as I will update it whenever a new example is offered in the comments section.

While we are waiting for the examples to flood in, I thought the following totally unrelated video might help pass the time:
Are men morally obligated to marry?
by Dalrock | December 18, 2010 | Link

Ferdinand Bardamu has a post titled Ehe macht frei: why Laura Wood and other conservatives and traditionalists just don’t get it where he takes strong issue with conservatives shaming men into marriage:

What offends me most is that her contention that the commenter is “evil” for warning men against marriage due to the risks involved.

As a supporter of marriage I take great offense at this as well. I don’t agree with what appears to be the majority MRA view that all men should refuse to marry, but I resent the attempt to shame those men who choose not to. Given the likely results to innocent children, telling men they must marry despite radically changed laws, a complicit church, and a debased culture is what is evil. How many millions more kids are Laura and others willing to feed to the divorce wood chipper in order to keep up the facade of marriage and the church as a healthy moral institution in the west?

Simply put, we don’t live in a culture which can back up any assurances it gives to men who enter marriage in good faith. As I wrote in my previous post Old rules or new? there is no moral authority which is currently acting to ensure that women honor their side of the marriage contract. Therefore, there is no moral authority in a position to shame men for choosing not to marry. This fixation on the speck in the eye of unmarried men is wholly misplaced. They should be shaming the church for standing by for decades while the women (and men) in attendance divorced at the same rates as atheists.

Laura’s own Catholic church can’t be counted on to stand up for marriage, as Solomon II shares in Solomon II’s Confession. Solomon II’s eight year marriage was annulled by the Catholic church at the request of his wife’s powerful father following her miscarriage while Solomon was overseas on business:

When I landed back in the U.S., she was gone. Her parents had taken her back to Brazil to recover. I lost her father’s respect, which meant my marriage was over regardless of what she felt. “If a man can’t take care of his wife, then a father will take care of his daughter.” said the man who has a handwritten letter from Ronald Reagan saying “Thanks for letting me and Nancy spend the night” hanging on his parlor wall. He was a powerful man, so the papers were filed and a call was made to the Vatican faster than you can ever imagine. Just like that, I was single again in the eyes of God and the U.S. Government.

His isn’t the only story of a trigger happy Catholic church when it comes to annulments. What would you say Laura to those men who honored their vows and the church one day decided their marriage wasn’t really for life? Would you say man up and marry again in some grotesque game of Lucy and the football? Next time my church is bound to get it right. Or maybe double or nothing? What would you say to the other men you are trying to shame into marriage? Don’t worry it might not happen to you? Or When the mass is given in Latin all is
well? Is there some trick to getting a real marriage out of the Catholic church? Perhaps couples need to check that the priest who marries them doesn’t have his fingers crossed during the ceremony?

Rex makes a similar point in his letter to Laura which started the discussion:

It would be different, perhaps, if we were living in a non-atomized culture, a culture characterized by strong communal ties, a much higher level of homogeneity, etc. But that isn’t our situation. We don’t live in a culture where responsibilities can be ‘imposed’ on persons outside of voluntary choice.

Laura dismisses his point in her response:

The sphere of “direct voluntary choice” is significant but quite small. When I drive into a city, I cannot choose to drive anywhere I wish, but conform to roads already laid out. I am naturally obligated. Driving on the sidewalk or into buildings would not be to my benefit anyway. Similarly, all people are constrained somewhat by what society teaches them is good, by the roads that are laid out for them.

Telling men not to marry isn’t like telling someone to drive on the sidewalk or into a building. It is like telling someone to avoid a certain road due to an abundance of potholes or warning them not to move into a high crime neighborhood. The city might suggest steering around the potholes and not going out out after dark, but it doesn’t have the right to tell others they have a duty to take risks they are legitimately not comfortable taking. If the city feels that more people should drive on a certain road or live in a specific neighborhood they should focus on making those options more desirable. Likewise, if we want to encourage more men to choose to marry we need to focus not on shaming them but in creating an equitable framework for marriage.

Furthermore, even if you believe that men have a general moral obligation to marry, you can’t suggest that men have an obligation to marry a woman who isn’t highly likely to keep her vows. In fact, because of the likely future impact on children, men have a moral obligation not to marry a woman unless he can determine that she is highly likely to keep her vows. I’ve never found an example of someone shaming men into marriage which didn’t omit this crucial point. Additionally, unless you have a foolproof method to guarantee a woman has this quality you have to leave this assessment up to the individual man.

Given the state of our culture including encouragement and incentives to women to divorce, there will be a large number of men who won’t be able to find a suitable wife. If anything, far too many men are marrying now.

I have another moral objection to telling men (or women) that they have an obligation to marry. Doing so weakens the moral grounds for insisting that they keep their solemn vows. A marriage entered into under coercion has a significantly weaker moral underpinning than one entered into freely. Coercing men or women into marriage weakens marriage.

No one should feel obligated to make a promise. But once a promise is freely made they
should be expected to honor it. This is the exact opposite of the situation we have today; men are told they need to “man up” and marry, and women are told they don’t really need to honor their marriage commitment.

I encourage those men interested in marriage to marry, but only if they understand and accept the risks and can find a woman with the moral force to keep her side of the agreement.
Chivalry on the Titanic
by Dalrock | December 30, 2010 | Link

I’ve been thinking about chivalry lately, partly because of the focus this topic receives in the manosphere. Back in May grerp posted her take on chivalry (feminism killed it), and more recently Welmer had a post about a young man’s response to a young woman bemoaning the lack of chivalry. I also stumbled on an astounding column by our friend Liz Jones where she whines about the lack of chivalry men show today.

I approach this with mixed thoughts. By manosphere standards I’m probably more of a social conservative. Part of me mourns the loss of chivalry, even while I recognize that grerp is right; feminism has for the most part destroyed chivalry and turned what once was noble into farce.

I assume many of my readers are glad to see it go, and I can understand that as well. When I first considered writing about this my first challenge was even to identify what it was I somewhat ambivalently mourned. The biggest single example I can think of is the doctrine of women and children first. For the rest of this post I’ll share some of what I found about how this actually worked on the Titanic. I’ll follow up with a later post with more thoughts on chivalry and how I think men should frame the concept in the world reworked by feminism.

Probably the best known example of women and children first in action was on RMS Titanic on April 14th, 1912. More recently leftists have tried to spin the disaster as a situation where the wealthy were given preferential access to lifeboats, leaving the working class to drown in the frigid North Atlantic. However, an examination of the actual casualty figures by Chuck Anesi tells a very different story:

- First of all, if you were a man, you were outta luck. The overall survival rate for men was 20%. For women, it was 74%, and for children, 52%. Yes, it was indeed “women and children first.”

- But what about class? Well, third class women were 41% more likely to survive than first class men. And third class men were twice as likely to survive as second class men.
Anesi provides more insight into the lifeboat loading process a little further down:

All 14 lifeboats, the two emergency boats, and two of the Engelhardt boats were launched. These had a capacity of 1,084 passengers. Obviously, many boats were not loaded to full capacity. There were many reasons for this; at first, many women and children were simply unwilling to be lowered 65 feet from the boat deck to the water. Some of the men put in boats were put there simply to show it was safe, and allay the fears of other passengers. (The two Engelhardt boats that were not launched floated off when the Titanic sank, and were used as rafts.)

There were 1,690 men on board the Titanic, spread between the crew and the three classes of passengers. Only 338 of the men were saved. Those who perished and many who were saved clearly made a conscious choice to allow the women and children to evacuate before them, patiently waiting even as the women refused to board the lifeboats out of fear. Anesi suggests that more lives of men, women and children could have been saved had the captain not ordered the women and children first policy:

there was enough lifeboat capacity for ALL women and children (534 persons total), AND 550 men as well. (Total capacity of the boats launched was 1,084.) This explains why, especially as the situation became more urgent, more men were put in the boats. Indeed, if the boat crews had loaded one man for each woman or child loaded, they could have expected to save all women and children, plus as many men. [I believe that if this approach been adopted from the start, the boats would have been loaded more rapidly, passenger fear would have been reduced as families were kept together, and far more lives would have been saved in the long run.]

It is hard to fathom the amount of will it would have taken to stand by on a sinking ship and wait for those who were too afraid to board the lifeboats to go first. Often feminists try to claim that men were privileged back then, and that chivalry was merely ceremonial. But you won’t convince over a thousand men to step aside when their lives are in extreme peril unless they truly accept that they have a duty to protect others. No one knew the Titanic was going to go down. The men aboard were as close to a statistical sample of the day as one would expect to find. The Guardian reinforces this point in it’s article about the differing death rates between the Titanic and the Louisitania:

They noted that on the Titanic the women and children first order was enforced by the crew, and accepted by the passengers – “otherwise the passengers could have easily revolted against such a protocol”.

And by passengers, of course The Guardian euphemistically means the men who stood by while women and children boarded the life boats.

Titanic lifeboat photo from Wikipedia Commons.

See Also:

- The gift transformed into a debt.
- Why wasn’t it women and children first?
• We are all chivalrous now.
• Chivalry only comes from a position of strength.
• Chivalry and protecting the weak.
Happy New Year!
by Dalrock | January 1, 2011 | Link

Welmer’s post with the same title, grerp’s Merry Christmas post, and Athol Kay’s Status Report made me want to do a bit of bloggy reflection of my own. I’ve been AWOL for the better part of the last week and a half while I enjoyed the time with my family. The majority of the time I spent on the computer was editing home video clips for the yearly DVD I make for my wife’s folks. I’ve been making end of year DVDs for the last 5 years, and my father in law loves them so much I couldn’t stop if I wanted to. This year he is in for a treat because I have already put together almost two hours of edited video and I’m only up to June.

If you have ever considered making a year end family DVD I highly recommend it. If you take digital pictures you can pretty easily set up a nice slideshow with your photos. One great aspect of it is your pics and videos are typically happy moments throughout the year. It is a great way to positively reflect on where you have been.

I started this blog back in late June and never had any idea it would gain the quantity and quality of a following which it has. I know this sounds corny, but honestly you have to admit that the commenters here and on other manosphere blogs are generally pretty amazing. Lately I’ve found myself having to choose between responding in the comments and writing new blog posts with my self rationed blogging time, and I have generally chosen the latter. However, I always read the comments and thoroughly enjoy them.

As you can see the site has been gaining hits each month since I first started it up. What you can’t see is all of the help kindly offered by other bloggers in directing traffic here as well as readers who took the time to link to posts they liked on reddit or other sites and forums. There truly are too many bloggers to thank by name, but my blogroll is a good start. Ferdinand bears special mention because his listing his favorite posts has driven probably the biggest group of new viewers to this site over the past six months. OneSTDV was also extremely helpful both with his initial advice and the huge spike in traffic the then unknown blog received when he added it to his blogroll.

Thanks to everyone who has participated in this blog (including those who read without commenting), and have a Happy New Year!
Chivalry only comes from a position of strength.
by Dalrock | January 4, 2011 | Link

The concept of chivalry has been so twisted by feminists and their boot-licking white knight minions that it is difficult to even imagine that there might once have been a noble core there. The common view of chivalry today is placing men in a subservient position in society. One of the automatically generated wordpress links on the bottom of my first post on chivalry was from a homeschooled young man who believes that his role as a man is to protect any woman who lacks the sense to come in out of the rain (H/T Badger Nation):

We now live in a society where a girl can walk outside, in the pouring rain, without a coat or umbrella and is no one offers their own coat or umbrella. Oh but surely that wouldn’t happen! Yes it would. Well, surely the homeschool movement is producing young men that would offer a hand! The instance I’m referring to happened at a homeschool event.

His view of young men as personal bodyguards and valets for modern young women fits very closely with Zed’s brilliantly crafted rework of Asimov’s Three Laws of Robotics titled The Three Laws of RoMANtics:

1. A manbot may not injure a woman being or, through inaction, allow a woman being to come to harm.
2. A manbot must obey any orders given to it by woman beings, except where such orders would conflict with the First Law.
3. A manbot may protect its own existence as long as such protection does not conflict with the First or Second Law.

This farcical view is so common that it is hard to even imagine a scenario where chivalry might have some nobility to it. To see the potential for nobility we need to consider what knights were. Knights were powerful armed men of generally high economic and social status. An act of kindness or deference by such a man to someone weaker or lower in status to him is gracious in nature because of the real and immediate ability he possessed to do otherwise.

This is what chivalry looks like.

Click to see.

The photo linked above is the cover image for Moment of Truth In Iraq. Michael Yon wrote the book and was also the photographer who captured the famous image. He describes the events surrounding the photo in the book, which occurred immediately after a suicide bomber targeted a crowd of Iraqi children receiving candy from US soldiers in a Stryker:
An Iraqi woman rushed little Farah out of the smoke and flames to sniper Sergeant Walt Gaya who, instead of pushing into sniper position, rushed Farah back to the medics. Major Mark Bieger saw Farah and scooped her up and rushed to a Stryker, but along the way Bieger kept stopping to hug her. Some of Farah’s relatives loaded into the Stryker and they rushed to the hospital where Farah died.

See Michael Yon’s blog post on the topic for more of his description. He also tells us more about Major Bieger on a separate post on the battle for Mosul (emphasis mine):

Deuce Four soldiers earned three Silver Stars and numerous Bronze Stars for valor in what would become the most storied battle in Mosul, setting the pace for the months ahead. The days and nights became a blur of steady combat, sometimes leaving the guns white hot: so hot, the bullets were visible flying though the barrels. Americans began naming roads after battles and events, like Seven-Body Road, where they found seven Iraqi corpses one morning, or Bieger Road, where Major Mark Bieger shot an insurgent who had pulled a pistol on his soldiers.

One of Yon’s core points in his book is how the quality of the Coalition Soldiers and Marines impressed the average Iraqi civilians and eventually convinced the neighborhood leaders to back them over the insurgents. They saw the Americans and Brits as tough as nails fighters whom the insurgents feared to stand and fight against. At the same time, they witnessed these hard as nails men expressing sincere concern for the welfare of Iraqi children. The power was in the contrast. A group of hardened fighters who only cared about themselves would have earned less respect. Even more so for a group of weak social workers carping about the children. According to Yon, this powerful contrast was a key reason for the success that coalition troops eventually experienced.

The powerful appeal to chivalry also lies in the contrast. However, the feminists and the white knight boot licker brigade want to appeal to the power of the contrast (the bait) while substituting an obligation of subservience in its place (the switch). I think most of us sense this in our gut, and many of the commenters on my last post articulated this problem quite well. However, I strongly suspect those advocating chivalry as male obligation haven’t really considered the feminist water they are carrying. They are only repeating the anti male slogans they have been drilled in since birth. Our homeschooled blogger provides perfect examples of this frame of mind:

And guys for the most part (especially those of my generation) are a waste of skin.
Too harsh? I think not.

And later:

Why do we not see more gentlemen? Because men in general of zero character at best, and at worst are in the negatives (as in they suck what little character others have right out of them).

Fortunately our home-schooled blogging friend is by his own admission in the extreme minority in his acceptance of feminist-chivalric dogma. The vast majority of his peers (however schooled) have seen past the facade and haven’t been tricked into seeing their
natural role as a servant and protector of women. Ironically this very rejection is a crucial ingredient for any act of real chivalry. Since real chivalry comes from a position of strength, it can only be offered by a man who is actually powerful and offers his assistance with full freedom and knowledge of his own worth.

The **full freedom** part is as critical as the rest, and is the reason chivalry can’t be an obligation of men as so many desperately wish to convince us. It isn’t just that it is a bad idea; making chivalry expected of men removes the graciousness of the act. Chivalry is a special form of graciousness and like all acts of graciousness must be a gift freely given; the instant you think of it as an obligation you have destroyed the very concept.

When my wife and I were in our 20s we lived in an apartment complex where all of the other residents were elderly. One day my wife saw an older woman struggling with her groceries and offered to take them to her apartment for her. The woman was very thankful, but not long after other residents started buzzing my wife on the intercom letting her know they had left their groceries in the entry way and what apartment they should be delivered to. In that context it became impossible for my wife to offer gracious help to our neighbors, no matter how much she wanted to do so. Her choice was to either become subservient or stop entirely, and she wisely chose the latter. Men wanting to be gracious in our current society are in exactly the same position my wife was in all of those years ago, and our choices are the same as well.

The true enemies of chivalry today are the feminists (elderly neighbors demanding we carry their groceries) and the **white knights who would scold us for failing to snap to and serve our masters**. In this doubly poisoned atmosphere chivalry is all but impossible, and nearly all who attempt it will inadvertently play the fool.

**Note:** I’ll share some thoughts in later posts on men acting as protectors as well as rendering assistance to stranded motorists.

**See Also:**

- [We are all chivalrous now.](#)
- [Chivalry on the Titanic.](#)
- [Three Stooges Chivalry.](#)
- [Chivalry and protecting the weak.](#)
- [Why wasn’t it women and children first?](#)
Who shot Hasan?
by Dalrock | January 6, 2011 | Link

I’m working on another post on chivalry now and was looking for an example of a woman who acted as a protector. The police officer who shot the Fort Hood terrorist came to mind, so I searched for a story I could link to. I googled “who shot fort hood terrorist”, and the number one result was: Fort Hood hero is a mom – shot terrorist Hasan four times:

A police officer and mother of one was hailed a heroine yesterday after it emerged that she almost single handedly ended the massacre at America’s biggest military base.

That seemed to fit what I recall reading, but I was hesitant to link to Mommy Life and I was thinking I had read some controversy following the initial reports. So I looked for another article. Scrolling down a bit, I found a Nov 13 2009 article from the UK paper The Times titled Who really shot the Fort Hood killer?

It was a feel-good hero story that for several days gave Americans some comfort after the murder of 13 soldiers at Fort Hood, Texas...

Initially it was claimed that a slightly-built female police officer, Sergeant Kimberly “Mighty Mouse” Munley, opened fire on the suspect...

But at least one witness now claims that... it was her partner, Senior Sergeant Mark Todd... who actually felled [Hasan]

13 people were killed and many more were wounded. How was this a feel good story? And if so, why was it only a feel good story when they thought it was a woman who shot the bad guy? Either way the Times story doesn’t really solve the case one way or another, so I kept looking. Eventually I found a more recent Oct 20th 2010 story from CNN. They seem to go out of their way to be murky about who did what, but it sounds like the source in the previous Times story had it right:

Munley, who was widely praised for her role in ending the shooting, admitted that she did not know how many times she had hit the gunman.

“I did not see him fall from my shots. No,” Munley said.

Then on to several paragraphs of detail on the courtroom and Munley’s medical leave before the author tells us:

Asked whether he knew if he hit Hasan, Todd replied, “I see [sic] him wince a couple of times.”In the end, Hasan fell to the ground, and Todd ran up, kicked his gun away...

I don’t see any other way to read this than:
1. She was the first to confront Hasan, and fired her weapon.
2. She doesn’t know if her shots hit him or not, but he shot her three times before walking over and disarming her.
3. Officer Todd fired multiple times and several of them struck Hasan.
4. Some time after Officer Todd shot him Hasan fell to the ground and Todd disarmed him.

None of this would seem to challenge the fact that Sergeant Kimberly Munley acted heroically when she ran into harms way in her effort to save the lives of the Fort Hood soldiers. If two men had responded and one had been shot three times and the other had taken the bad guy down, we would rightly call both heroes. But it seems to me that the press has been far more interested in spinning a feminist myth rather than reporting the news accurately. This is a profound shame, since the heroic story of both Munley and Todd deserves to be told and to be told accurately.
We are all chivalrous now.

by Dalrock | January 6, 2011 | Link

One response I’ve noticed from many women when the topic of chivalry comes up is to suggest that chivalry isn’t really dead, it is simply a matter of gender neutral courtesy. In response to my post Chivalry on the Titanic, Big Little Wolf offered a link to her own post Chivalry: Here today, gone tomorrow, ALWAYS in fashion:

Chivalry is about courtesy and generosity. I say YES to chivalry on my planet which, incidentally, is neither Mars nor Venus, nor poor pitiful Pluto, tossed from the fold by hapless hacks with PhDs!

My planet is called Fred – where I get to pick and choose the typically masculine or feminine behaviors that suit me.

A bit later on she elaborates:

Pick up the tab for a date? Yes – I will expect that.

But I believe in high quality, low cost first dates – coffee or a glass of wine. And thereafter, cozy restaurants or even take-out to be shared is just fine by me, as long as it’s shared, mmm... chivalrously.

I’m not wooed by money or pretension, and not looking to break the bank as we get to know each other. That’s courtesy, generosity, and good manners on the woman’s side.

A little further down she reiterates:

What we deem as chivalrous behavior is about manners and upbringing. I often open and hold doors for people.

She also explains in the post that men opening doors is something she values but sees as optional. However, if you drive a truck or SUV she will expect help getting in not because she is a woman but due to her diminutive stature. One word of caution I would offer men who are confused about the whole business is not to apply this same rule to a short man; he is extremely likely to take offense if you offer to give him a boost. So don’t apply the same rule to a small man as you would a small woman. Just to summarize Big Little Wolf’s rule on women and trucks; chivalry means giving the little lady some extra help. I’m hoping that should be easy enough to remember.

Susan Walsh expressed the idea of chivalry being gender neutral courtesy more succinctly in her comment on my post Chivalry only comes from a position of strength:

It seems to me that in a post-feminism world, chivalry is an element of character that should apply equally to both sexes. It should mean taking responsibility for a
fellow human being, regardless of gender. Historically, men (the stronger sex) have
been chivalrous toward women. One could argue that today, women are in a
stronger position in some arenas – they certainly are stronger in higher education.

24 years ago I was riding the T in Boston, 8 months pregnant. I got on to a crowded
car and held on to a center pole as best I could. No one offered me a seat. After
someone got off the train, a teenage girl “saved” their seat for me so that no one
else could take it. Since then, I have tried to be generous (chivalrous?) to anyone of
any age that looks like they could use a break.

Chivalry is noble, but should not fall only to men.

I think Susan is on to something, and we probably should explore whether women are aware
of the obligations which come with their power. But I disagree that if a given courtesy or
gracious gesture is gender neutral that it should be called chivalry. Chivalry is inherently
masculine, and we already have generic terms for courtesy and charity. Rolling the general in
with the specific will only confuse things further, and the concept of chivalry in our society is
already messy enough as it is. This is especially a problem because real differences between
men and women do (and always will) exist. Susan mentioned graciously offering her seat on
a train to those who look like they need a break. As she says this kind of act is noble whether
performed by a man or a woman. However, I wouldn’t call this chivalrous when done by a
woman just as I wouldn’t call a man ladylike for being polite. Furthermore, while she might
offer her seat on a train she won’t be told she should expect to offer her seat on a lifeboat
should the ship she is traveling on experience a sudden loss of buoyancy. This is exactly what
Anonymous age 68 describes being instructed on a cruise ship in the 1990s:

The first thing we did was lifeboat drill. The men had to stand behind the line, while
all women went to the front. There were old men with canes, who had to step back,
and young, strong, healthy women who looked ready to run marathons who went to
the front. After 30 years of feminism, this was a perfect example of the hypocrisy of
the modern women, not one complained about the sexism involved.

Like it or not, there are still differences even at this extreme level. Rolling gender neutral
courtesy into the term chivalry denies this reality. It isn’t just that men can still be formally
required to give their lives so that women and children can live; there are and will always be
social expectations on men which women don’t have. No one ever questions why the
unsinkable Molly Brown accepted the seat on the lifeboat while half of the very sinkable
children on the ship didn’t get a seat. However, the 1,000+ men who stepped aside (and
died) so she could have that seat would have faced accusations of cowardice had they not
done so. As different as things are in many ways nearly 100 years later, that basic distinction
hasn’t changed.

In a more mundane example, while Susan would undoubtedly call 911 if she witnessed a
crime in progress or call a tow truck for a stranded motorist (assuming she could do so
safely), a woman is highly unlikely to ever be asked the following question by a member of
the opposite sex:
Why didn’t you stop that big guy from beating up the small guy?
Why didn’t you offer to fix that person’s car?
Why didn’t you stop them from robbing me?

I’m not suggesting men should feel obligated to act in the situations described above; as I said in my last post on the topic, chivalry is a gracious gesture only if it is freely given. However, this doesn’t change the fact that many do feel that men have a nearly unlimited obligation to put the wellbeing and safety of others (including strangers) above themselves. Saying chivalry is no longer associated with being a man denies this fact.

Beyond expectations, there is also the question of real world abilities and behaviors. Doomed Harlot envisioned a brave new world where gender neutral persons exchange acts of chivalry:

To go back to Susan’s point, however, there should be an ethic of the strong-helping-the-weak. It’s just that in our society strong and weak or no longer determined based on gender. I also note that a person who is strong in one situation may be weak in another. For example, I may know how to change a tire better than someone, but perhaps she knows how to rescue me from drowning. Or a big strong man who carries heavy boxes for women may one day become elderly or disabled, and need help from someone carrying boxes for him.

So basically chivalry means from each according to his ability, to each according to her need. As Doomed Harlot points out under such a reciprocal system a man gets to carry heavy loads of women and older men his younger life, and then have his heavy loads carried by younger men when he is older. She also clarified a bit more on a further comment:

Fun story: last year i was stuck by the side of the road for 3 hours while waiting for a AAA (for non-Americans that’s an organization that sends out roadside assistance). It seemed as though about 30 men stopped to offer to change my tire (one after another) and I kept saying, “No, thank you, AAA is on its way. I’m all set. Much obliged.”

I checked the IP addresses, and the Doomed Harlot who thinks women are likely to stop and offer to change a tire for a stranger is the same Doomed Harlot who has experienced exactly the opposite in real life. Her life experience (but not her theoretical musings) match my own real life observations. All of the difficult, dangerous, or expensive acts which we call chivalrous are almost exclusively performed by men, even after decades of moxie. For example, women can be protectors. However, if a non family member puts themselves in significant risk to save your life statistically they are almost always going to be men.

My suggestion would be to take those acts women are equally likely to perform or face equal expectations to perform and call them by the applicable gender neutral term (charity, courtesy, etc) whether they are performed by men or women. For those remaining acts which are performed almost exclusively by men or for which men face greater expectations to perform, we should call them chivalry when performed by men and use the generic term in the odd case where women do them.
See Also:

- Chivalry only comes from a position of strength.
- Chivalry on the Titanic.
- Three Stooges Chivalry.
- Chivalry and protecting the weak.
The car my wife drives broke down earlier this week and as a result I’ve been driving our daughter to and from kindergarten with my truck. Not having both cars working is a hassle, but the time with our daughter has been a real blessing. I took over the kid commute for a few weeks several months back when my wife broke a toe and couldn’t drive, but that time I used our car. This time around my wife commented on how excited our daughter is to have me drive her to school. My wife is kind enough to get up first and get our daughter ready for school so I can sleep in a bit. Normally she has a small battle on her hands getting her ready, but now our daughter is so eager to ride to school she gets up by herself at 6:00 AM and starts getting herself ready even though we don’t leave for school until 7:45.

I know how she feels. My father always drove a pickup truck, and there was something very special about that combination. Sometimes he would come home while it was still light out and take all of the kids in the neighborhood for a ride. We’d all pile into the back of the truck and he’d start driving up a nearby hill. It was always the same trick, but each time he would get halfway up the hill he would pretend the truck didn’t have enough power. He’d slow down and even let the truck start to roll backwards a bit. Then he would stop the truck and rev the engine and feather the clutch to get the truck moving again. He and his mechanic had replaced the original 6 cylinder engine with a V8 out of an old mustang. Between the V8 and the glass packs it made a beautiful sound. I don’t know why but it was exciting every time.

I was thinking about this a few months back when I took our daughter over to Bass Pro for some father/daughter time. After we parked I had her stay in the truck until I came around and opened her door. As she started to climb out I leaned forward to be ready to catch her in case she lost her footing. In a split second she had a glint in her eye and then launched herself straight at me. Luckily I caught her, but I’m not sure it was needed because she held on with her arms and legs so tight I don’t think she could have fallen. I started to scold her a little for not letting me know what she was going to do. I told her she could have fallen; she replied:

I know, but I knew you would catch me.

Sometimes it is a strange feeling to be the dad, and yet at the same time it feels so natural. I know exactly how she feels, because I would have had perfect faith that my dad would catch me in that same situation. The time will come soon enough for her to learn that I’m just a man, with all of the usual limitations. For now we both can enjoy me playing the role. When I pick her up from school I park the truck on the street and walk over to where she waits with her class and teacher. I make it a point to pick her up when she runs up to me, and I carry her a little way before I let her down; she absolutely beams. At home when she comes into my home office I sometimes have her give me a hug from the side while I’m in my chair at the computer. Then I pretend I forgot I was holding her and get up and tote her around the house as if she wasn’t dangling off of my side. I walk down the stairs and around the house, complaining of having gained a little weight. Then when she giggles I quickly turn so her legs...
windmill around, only to find the little girl giggling isn’t there. Just like my dad’s trick, it never gets old.

If you get the chance to become a dad I highly recommend it. We talk a lot about marriage and divorce here and elsewhere in the manosphere, but we don’t always talk about why it matters so much. The truck may be optional, but the father isn’t.
As you’ve probably already guessed, I’m taking a break from blogging for a bit. I should be back shortly with some new posts, but in the meantime you might want to check out Badger Nation’s new blog.
Always leave a note.
by Dalrock | January 29, 2011 | Link

When my wife was in her early teens she used to babysit for some extra money. One couple was looking for a babysitter for their young son for the occasions where the husband was away on business and the wife was doing charity work.

Actually it turned out that the wife wasn’t as into charity work as her husband (or my wife) had been lead to believe. My wife watched their son several times, but each time she did the wife was going out with the husband’s best friend. They weren’t very good at hiding what was actually going on, and even the young boy seemed to know something was rotten.

One night the husband called wanting to talk with his wife. My wife helpfully explained that she was out with his best friend, and based on previous nights they were likely to be out quite late. As you can imagine the wife was livid with my wife after she was confronted by her husband. When she took her home she insisted on speaking with my wife’s mother. After hearing the woman’s story my mother in law explained that it sounded like a big misunderstanding which would have been prevented if she had left a note.

My mother in law grabbed a nearby pen and pad of paper and pantomimed writing a note as she thoughtfully explained in her melodic German accent:

This is why you must always leave a note:

I will be out a whoring at [insert name of motel here].

From 6:00 PM until 10:00 PM. Be sure to leave the phone number of the place you are whoring at so you can be reached in an emergency.

Don’t forget to let the dog out.
I haven’t done a Brothers Grimm post in a good while, so I thought I would share this one. Like the last one, it is short enough that it doesn’t require me to summarize it. Also like the last one it features some dark humor along with the moral message.

There was once a tailor, who was a quarrelsome fellow, and his wife, who was good, industrious, and pious, never could please him. Whatever she did, he was not satisfied, but grumbled and scolded, and knocked her about and beat her. As the authorities at last heard of it, they had him summoned and put in prison in order to make him better. He was kept for a while on bread and water, and then set free again. He was forced, however, to promise not to beat his wife any more, but to live with her in peace, and share joy and sorrow with her, as married people ought to do. All went on well for a time, but then he fell into his old ways and was surly and quarrelsome. And because he dared not beat her, he would seize her by the hair and tear it out. The woman escaped from him, and sprang out into the yard, but he ran after her with his yard-measure and scissors, and chased her about, and threw the yard-measure and scissors at her, and whatever else came his way. When he hit her he laughed, and when he missed her, he stormed and swore. This went on so long that the neighbors came to the wife’s assistance. The tailor was again summoned before the magistrates, and reminded of his promise. Dear gentlemen, said he, I have kept my word, I have not beaten her, but have shared joy and sorrow with her. How can that be, said the judge, as she continues to bring such heavy complaints against you. I have not beaten her, but just because she looked so strange I wanted to comb her hair with my hand. She, however, got away from me, and left me quite spitefully. Then I hurried after her, and in order to bring her back to her duty, I threw at her as a well-meant reminder whatever came readily to hand. I have shared joy and sorrow with her also, for whenever I hit her I was full of joy and she of sorrow, and if I missed her, then she was joyful, and I sorry. The judges were not satisfied with this answer, but gave him the reward he deserved.
One of the amusing parts about blogging is seeing what search terms people use to find your site. The other day one in particular caught my eye:

| eat pray love slut goes round the world

Sounds like my kind of reader! I was curious how far down in the search results my site was for this term. Just how persistent was this person?

As it turns out, my post Eat Pray Love: Where are they now? is the first result for that search.
Feminist blogger Gooseberry Bush writes in her post G.I. Jane (emphasis mine):

There’s absolutely no reason why women can’t be drafted and no reason why they can’t serve in the military right alongside of men in every capacity. Israel requires compulsory military service for both men and women. If women defer to men who say that they want to exclude us in order to protect us, then we rightly deserve to have privileges withheld from us. We’ve given them that power by appointing men as our protectors while we cower in the corner and bite our fingernails, like some simpering love interest in a Hollywood action movie marketed to men, written by, directed by, produced by, and starring men. It’s time we got all Lara Croft on their asses.

Well, no reason except for the large difference between women and men, which is why feminists always lobby for different standards required of women at the same time they argue that women can be firefighters, police, or serve in combat positions in the military. For example, consider the Marine Corps Combat Fitness Test (CFT). According to Pfc. Michelle Mattei:

The Marine Corps’ Combat Fitness Test measures a Marine’s physical readiness for battle with three real-time combat drills. Each assessment is designed to determine various aspects of combat fitness. Every active-duty Marine and reservist is required to meet the Corps’ recently implemented CFT standard.

You hear that? Every Marine must pass this test, including the women. See, that proves men and women are equally fit for combat, right? Well, sure. So long as you fudge the test for women. I haven’t found the latest requirements, but here is what the minimum standard was for men and women as of 2008:
Note that while some account is made for age, the oldest, weakest, and slowest men must meet a higher standard than the youngest, strongest, and fastest women. In the case of the ammo can lifts, the lowest standard for men is more than twice that of the highest standard applied to women.

Despite all of our technical advances, combat is still a literal, physical fight. Michael Yon describes this frequently in his blogging on Iraq, as he does in his post Gates of Fire:

> When the bullet hit that canister, Prosser—who I thought might be dead because of all the blood on his leg—was actually fighting hand-to-hand on the ground. Wrapped in a ground fight, Prosser could not pull out his service pistol strapped on his right leg, or get to his knife on his left, because the terrorist—who turned out to be a serious terrorist—had grabbed Prosser’s helmet and pulled it over his eyes and twisted it.

> Prosser had beaten the terrorist in the head three times with his fist and was gripping his throat, choking him. But Prosser’s gloves were slippery with blood so he couldn’t hold on well. At the same time, the terrorist was trying to bite Prosser’s wrist, but instead he bit onto the face of Prosser’s watch...

> ...Prosser quickly reholstered his pistol and subdued him by smashing his face into

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>880 Yard Run</th>
<th>Ammo Can Lifts</th>
<th>Maneuver Under Fire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-26</td>
<td>3:48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27-39</td>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>4:19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46+</td>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4:28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>880 Yard Run</th>
<th>Ammo Can Lifts</th>
<th>Maneuver Under Fire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-26</td>
<td>4:34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27-39</td>
<td>4:40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>5:09</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46+</td>
<td>5:20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the concrete.

Even with all of our technology, that fight ended up as a no holds barred ground fight where the victor bashed the loser’s head into concrete. This brings me to an article from the *Cleveland Scene* about the death of a female Marine* titled *Fallen Angel*. Welmer linked to it in a recent post on *The Spearhead* about the deaths of female service members in war zones. In that story lies the full contradiction of the feminist view of women as warriors. It starts off spreading it thick about how tough the female Marine was. We are told those on base called her the *Fiery Angel*, and it is at first suggested that she made it a habit to hone her ground fighting skills by wrestling with men on base as just another one of the guys:

One day in October 2008, two months into her tour in Iraq’s notoriously bloody Anbar province, the feisty [redacted] wanted to try out some new grappling techniques, according to the story of a sailor who was also stationed on the base. It led to an impromptu wrestling match between the two, and [she] came away from it with an injury.

As improbable as this story might sound to anyone whose life experience isn’t limited to watching episodes of *Xena: Warrior Princess*, we learn in the article that it matched with what the Marine told her own mother:

the story closely matched what her daughter had told her on the phone the night before her death.

The Marine’s father found the story harder to swallow, and after keeping the pressure up he ultimately heard what really happened. The true story was a tale of feminist myth-making colliding head on with an ever stubborn and in this case fatal reality:

In a phone conversation with a female NCIS investigator, he learned that on the day before [she] died, she had been spending downtime with other Marines and a group of U.S. Navy sailors when one sailor snarled, “Marines ain’t shit” at them.

Armed with nothing more than the power of *moxie*, the former cheerleader and choir girl turned Packaging Specialist decided to physically punish the Sailor for his words. Borrowing a phrase from Gooseberry Bush, she decided to go all Lara Croft on his ass:

Enraged, [she] rushed the sailor. “I’m going to show you what a Marine is!” she shouted, and proceeded to knock the much larger rival to the ground.

Unfortunately for her, this was neither a video game nor a movie, and the man she assaulted had the bad taste to fight back:

the sailor then jumped back to his feet, grabbed [her], and body-slammed her. Her head whip-lashed onto concrete.

The scuffle was broken up by witnesses, and [she] retreated without seeking medical attention. But within a few hours, she complained to commanding officers and fellow Marines of a headache. The next day, she was dead.
Now all of a sudden instead of portraying the female Marine as a tough-as-the-guys modern day GI Jane, the tone turns to her as a helpless victim of the very Sailor she assaulted:

[her] father understands the law. What he doesn’t understand is why the sailor wasn’t held accountable for slamming a much smaller woman to the ground. He was never given the name of the sailor in question, and the name of the sailor and the eyewitnesses were redacted from the report.

“Shouldn’t the sailor at least be charged with manslaughter?” he asks today.

For those keeping score at home, the feminist line is:

1. Women are just as capable in physical fights/combat as men, and can perform the very same roles as men, even those which require significant physical strength.
2. When opening up traditionally male jobs to women, different physical standards must be established which apply only to women, because we all know women aren’t as big/strong/fast as men.
3. Men must continue to meet the same high standards they always have, because the job requires great physical strength and a weaker man couldn’t do it.
4. Men who hit women back are acting criminally, because that is no way to treat a lady.

*I’ve decided not to use the Marine’s name in this post so that it won’t come up under a search of her name by friends or family members.
Ferdinand is stirring it up over at his site, with a scathing post about the CBS Reporter who discovered that chaos reigned in the anarchic mob in Egypt’s Tahrir Square. Here is a picture of the reporter when covering the Iraq War from Wiki:

She didn’t deserve whatever it is that CBS hints at but won’t say happened to her, but anyone who has been to a Muslim country knows that women shouldn’t wear see through shirts there as a basic safety precaution. That goes double for western women in a war zone. Any time you have to use a bullet proof vest as a cover-up, you aren’t properly dressed. I’m just sayin. I say this as a man who traveled with his sister in Morocco and his wife in Turkey. I wouldn’t have let either of them go out in public like that.

However, before you accuse me of being an insensitive ass, in her defense the reporter was on a man hunt at the time, and married men can be an elusive quarry.

After seeing Ferdinand’s post, I saw this story from the AP linked from Drudge. This part in particular caught my attention:
Sexual harassment of women is an all-too-common occurrence on the streets of Cairo. But many women noted a complete absence of it in the early days of protests in Tahrir Square, where demonstrators made a point of trying to create a microcosm of the society without many of Egypt’s social ills.

However, in the final days, and especially after the battles with pro-Mubarak gangs who attacked the protesters in Tahrir, women noticed sexual assault had returned to the square. On the day Mubarak fell, women reported being groped by the rowdy crowds. One witness saw a woman slap a man after he touched her. The man was then passed down a line of people who all slapped him and reprimanded him.

Really?

Women went into the square expecting to be assaulted, and noted the refreshing change? And the crowd passed a groper down the line, each one slapping him and reprimanding him?
The feminist fantasy always runs the same way. A tough no nonsense woman tries to break in to an all male sphere. To prove herself she must first pass, no, exceed the ridiculous and unnecessarily high standards which men diabolically erected hundreds or even thousands of years ago in preparation for this very day. At first the 1 dimensional macho characters all mock and deride her. But eventually they come to learn that she is every bit as tough as the guys are, in addition to her extra abilities which she has by virtue of being a woman. Ultimately they can’t help but respect her determination and ability, and dare I say it, girl power. She’s “opened the door”, and now women eagerly flood into the previously all male sphere! Roll credits.

I’ll stop typing for a bit so the feminists in the audience can savor the moment… Smoke em if you got em.

Everyone back? Here’s the problem; most of the time it simply doesn’t work that way. At least, not for a long time it hasn’t. And quite often it is the feminists themselves who screw it up. They sell you Gi Jane, where Demi Moore shaves her head and knocks out one armed pushups like they are going out of style. But that is just the picture on the package. What’s inside the box is something totally different. And women and men fall for it every time. The thing is the feminists don’t really care if they deliver as promised. In fact, so long as they can make the package with an impressive picture they don’t care if anything is inside it. So they sell you a woman aviation pioneer, just as good as the guys. What they deliver is a woman who is almost all attitude, and very little skill. Then they lose interest as soon as they can check the box and say “See, women do that too!”

Strangely for feminists make believe is just as good as the real deal, and before you know it they are off focusing on the next item on the prove women are just like men to-do list. Actually maybe it isn’t so strange, because after all of the girl power cheering stops, being the only woman in the grease pit doing oil changes or any number of dirty, dangerous, and physically demanding jobs stops being exciting and glamorous.

More importantly, the initial high of being accepted as being as-good-as-the-men more often than not never actually happens. The men see the ridiculous contortions the employer was forced by feminists to go through in order for the woman to be hired in the first place. The woman gets as much respect as the nonathletic kid who everyone knows only made the team because his dad is the coach. In theory a truly exceptional woman would be able to make the cut without feminists butting in demanding they put their thumb on the scale. Such a woman in all likelihood would gain the respect of the men. But feminists always insist on screwing that up by demanding that the rules for women should be far less stringent. Or when a pioneering woman does manage to break some barrier, they ruin the moment by crying about how few other women actually made it, and demand the standards for women be rolled back anyway.

Think about it, your great great granddaughter will still be complaining that men won’t really
let her do x, y, or z. We have women today complaining about men not doing enough to encourage them to write open source software, or edit wikipedia.

But if women don’t even get to bask in the we-are-the-same-as-the-guys feeling, why must we continuously move heaven and earth for each new item on the to-do list? For example, why rework our nuclear sub fleet and antagonize the men who man them so a handful of women can work in stressful conditions and cramped quarters with men for months at a time? Per the US Navy Press Release:

On July 28, 1994, Congress was notified of policy changes to expand the number of assignments available to women in the Navy. At that time, opening assignments aboard submarines to women was deemed cost prohibitive and assignments on submarines remained closed. Currently, women make up 15 percent of the active duty Navy - 52,446 of 330,700. Integrating women into the submarine force increases the talent pool for officer accessions and subsequently the force’s overall readiness, ensuring that the U.S. Submarine Force will remain the world’s most capable for ensuing decades.

Women only make up 15% of the active duty Navy after decades of hand wringing and excuse making. With the opening of submarines, the only position in the Navy women aren’t welcomed into is the SEALs. My question to the women reading this is at what point is proving women can do x not worth it. Is any cost too high? What if only one woman at any given time ends up having the desire and ability to serve in the sub fleet, but the other 99% + of the submariner force is less interested in staying in the job because they no longer see it as elite, or because their wives no longer feel the same way about their service? Would the warm feeling of checking off the box marked __ Submarines be worth a billion dollars? How about 2 billion, or 10? 100 billion? Is any price too high to pay in order to check off the box?

This isn’t just a theoretical question. Consider the LA Fire Department. Women had to check the LAFD box, so in the 1990s LA County spent millions refitting fire stations. From Christine Pelisek’s LA Weekly article Women Firefighters: The Gender Boondoggle:

To prove its point, Los Angeles City Hall — just like Seattle, Miami, San Francisco, San Diego and other major cities, together with state governments — spent millions to recruit, train and house women. Los Angeles outfitted most of its 106 fire stations with costly women’s lockers and women’s showers, while politicians as well as fire chiefs Donald Manning and William Bamattre engaged in years of lip service, conjuring up an image of a new, professional class of woman firefighters.

Women came to figure prominently in the praise party on the LAFD’s Web site, http://www.LAFD.org, where the Hero of the Month, for six months running — in a department of mostly men — has been Tamara Chick, a woman so key to the department’s goals that she is now in charge of female recruitment.

They proved their point. Some women can be firefighters. I’ll pause so the feminists can get their pencils out to check the Firefighter box, high five each other, and bask in their accomplishment.
Pelisek continues:

There’s just one problem, and it’s a problem no fire chief, mayor or recruiter wants to admit. In a department of 3,940 people, the second largest municipal firefighting force in the U.S., the Weekly has learned that the women who work on the fire line could squeeze inside a Hummer limo.

Just 27 women are actually fighting Los Angeles fires.

This isn’t limited to Los Angeles:

No firefighting women died during the attacks on the World Trade Center, because New York City has just 31 women out of 11,600 firefighters. Women represent only 2.5 percent of the nearly 300,000 professional firefighters nationwide.

But wait, isn’t this proof that women are discriminated against? How hard can it be to hold a hose or climb a ladder? Men have hatched a diabolical plan to keep women from running into burning buildings! Except that isn’t true. Christine Pelisek interviewed the women who washed out of the training:

What these two women saw — and experienced — is not what you might think.

Nobody tried to make either of them fail. No “old boys” got in their way. Mary was admired by her male boss and encouraged at each step to be a firefighter. “I was just too slow,” she says. Firefighting equipment, like the one-man ladders, started “getting heavier,” and she began to realize she wasn’t strong enough to repeatedly lift it — a necessary skill. Eight weeks into the training — which causes plenty of men to wash out — Mary was stunned to realize that her body had begun “breaking down.”

Big deal you might say. So what if they demoralized the entire force with a game of make believe and blew millions of dollars on showers and locker rooms which now sit mostly unused. But those millions could have been spent in any number of productive ways. What training did the firefighters not receive which could have prevented injuries to them or the death of those they are charged with rescuing? What new equipment could the department have otherwise purchased which would have lessened the burden these men face? More importantly, what did the LAFD as an organization really get for its money? Can the 27 women fight fires any better than the men they displaced? That seems highly unlikely.

But what about the military, and combat in particular? How strong do you have to be to fire a gun? Maybe firefighters have a physically demanding job, but combat surely can’t be that difficult. After all, we have all of those nifty gadgets! Gooseberry Bush links to an article which makes much the same point in her blog post Soldier Barbie:

Heather Pfleuger — an exuberant, all-American, girl-next-door — was transformed when she arrived in Afghanistan. She’d shrug into her body armor, strap on her helmet, yank on gloves, goggles and scarf, and slide down behind her turret-mounted Mark-19, a 40mm grenade launcher. From there, she could kill an armored
vehicle and everybody in it a mile away.

When she whooped with glee and led a convoy outside the wire, local Afghan fighters, hard men who’d faced down the Russians and the Taliban, fell respectfully silent.

See! All we have to do is outfit each woman with a big enough truck and a belt fed weapon, and men will fear them! But the argument that women are already being allowed to do nearly all jobs in the military -including those which can involve firing a weapon- doesn’t prove that we should open the the few remaining all male jobs up to women. According to the article only 14% of the military are in jobs not open to women. Keep in mind that the services picked the jobs women were best suited to first, and even then had to massively lower the standards for women to put them there.

The military is the last area where women don’t have the same or better opportunity as men, and even there we are only talking about the last 14%! 86%, massively lowered standards, and a rework of the entire culture of the armed services isn’t enough. I’ll come back to this question a little later. Right now I’ll share some more information on the remaining 14%. I explained in my last post on the topic that Iraq and Afghanistan have shown that for the infantry war being a very physical fight hasn’t changed. Actually it has gotten more physical, partly due to those nifty gadgets. Per the Washington Post:

In Afghanistan, soldiers routinely carry loads of 130 to 150 pounds for three-day missions, said Jim Stone, acting director of the soldier requirements division at the Army Infantry Center at Fort Benning, Ga. In Iraq, where patrols are more likely to use vehicles, loads range from 60 to nearly 100 pounds, he said.

“It’s like a horse: We can load you down, and you just don’t last as long,” Stone said.

Injuries — the bulk of them muscular-skeletal — are the main cause of hospitalizations and outpatient visits for active-duty Army soldiers, leading to about 880,000 visits per year, according to Army data. The injuries include sprains, stress fractures, inflammation and pain from repetitive use, and they are most common in the lower back, knees, ankles, shoulders and spine. They are one of the leading reasons that soldiers miss duty, said Col. Barbara Springer, director of rehabilitation under the Army surgeon general.

Everyone seems to agree that our Soldiers and Marines are carrying too much, but what would you have them do without when out in the field and the firefight starts? Should they make do with less water? Food? Protective gear? Ammunition? Less powerful weapons? These men are working at the upper limit of what the human body -the male human body- can carry under battlefield conditions. No amount of impassioned argument about good ol boys will change the need for infantrymen to carry the implements of war. Men can barely carry the load. How many women can we honestly expect to do this? And why should we believe for a nanosecond that they wouldn’t insist on a separate standard for women, the same as they have for the other 86% of the positions.
The problem feminists have is a powerful case of diminishing marginal returns. The first barriers women broke down had lots of opportunity and were often things women were very well suited for. Over the decades, as they were more and more successful, they have had to shift their efforts to the much smaller opportunities where women are less and less suited for. So they had to fudge a bit, and then a lot, to keep opening doors for women. In a way I kind of feel bad for them. No amount of make believe will open these last doors. They may be able to dictate the change, but they won’t be kidding anyone.

So why do they do it? Why all of the knashing of teeth in an obviously futile effort, for a minuscule opportunity the vast majority of women would pray to never have to do? Feminists can’t help themselves. It comes down to who they are, and what makes them tick.

**Feminists lay awake at night consumed with the knowledge that somewhere out there there are men who are proud to be men, and there is no woman there to tell them she is just as good as they are.**

I almost feel sorry for them.
Earth needs dads.

by Dalrock | February 21, 2011 | Link

Another one my wife caught. Coming soon to a theater near you, courtesy of Disney Pictures: Mars Needs Moms

From the author's website:

Milo doesn’t get it: What’s the big deal about moms? They’re just slavedriving broccoli bullies. Yet they are worshipped the world over! Perhaps even the galaxy over—because here come Martians and they’re after one thing only: moms. Milo’s mom in particular. Who better to drive them to soccer practice and to pizza parties? That’s quite a long way to come for a mom—could it be that Milo has been overlooking something special?

And from the School Library Journal review on the Amazon page for the book:

Milo just doesn’t get what’s so special about moms. As far as he can see, all they do is nag you to eat your broccoli and send you up to bed when you tint your little sister purple. So who needs them? Well, as it turns out, Martians do (they grow motherless from the ground like potatoes) and one night, three Martians sneak into Milo’s house and steal his sleeping mother. The boy races after them, grabs onto the ladder of their spaceship, and boards it just as it blasts off. Once on Mars, he looks outside and finally understands why the Martians need a mom so badly—They needed driving to soccer! And to ballet! And to playdates, parks, and pizzas! Plus cooking and cleaning and dressing and packing lunches and bandaging boo-boos! Just then, he trips and falls and is saved by—you guessed it! And the sympathetic aliens take the boy and his mother home. The story ends with Milo waking up in his mother’s bed, cuddling next to her. In typical Breathed form, the illustrations are lush, plush, and over-the-top with color, attitude, and craziness. The picture of the Martians trying to bait a mom with what looks suspiciously like a brand name Grande coffee on a line is hilarious, to say the least. Share this witty and sweet tale with young readers and their moms for a wacky treat.—Lisa Gangemi Kropp, Middle Country Public Library, Centereach, NY

While I haven’t found any reference to the father in plot summaries, IMDB does show someone cast for the role of Milo’s father. Maybe they show his father in the trailer for the movie:

Nope, I didn’t see a father there either. But while this is ostensibly a movie about appreciating your mom, the part they want to show off appears to be more a young boy teaming up with an older male (father?) figure. Could it be that Disney knows many boys are craving a father figure, and chose to highlight this aspect in the trailer?

Maybe in the alternate trailer:
Nope, but we learn that Moms are Earth’s most valuable resource. Also, before you assume the author is either a feminist or a mangina (or both), you should know the following from his Bio on Wiki:

raised in Houston, Texas. Breathed attended Westchester High School. He was a cheerleader his senior year and graduated in 1975.

and

During the middle of September 1990, while visiting a factory in England, Mr. Breathed noticed he received odd, humorous looks from the workers upon hearing his name. After inquiring about the reason for their strange looks, he learned that his nickname, “Berke,” is a homophone with “Berk”, a vulgar term for a vagina in Cockney rhyming slang (“Berkeley Hunt”).
See Also:

- Chivalry only comes from a position of strength.
- Chivalry on the Titanic.
- We are all chivalrous now.
- Chivalry and protecting the weak.

by Dalrock | February 24, 2011 | Link

My wife is constantly finding absurd relationship and dating advice columns offered to women and sending them my way. She finds them whenever she logs into juno.com to check our old spam filled email address, but most of what she finds there is listed on the MSN.com portal as well. Both sites feature content from match.com.

One column in particular titled Single in the Suburbs by Sara Susannah Katz caught my wife’s attention. She received a teaser for the column as email in the juno account. In the column Miss Katz shares all of the gory details of her online dating experience following late life divorce:

Here I am: The 40-something mom of two, living in a tidy Midwestern suburban subdivision and working at the local university—and, at this moment, sitting here in front of my computer, determined to find a date. I’m searching within a 60-mile radius of my zip code for a single guy about my age who doesn’t smoke, is reasonably fit and, preferably, is not living in his mother’s basement.

Sure, I’d like to find the love of my life, my soul mate, my next husband, but I suspect that those goals are a bit too ambitious...

Still, I’m a little apprehensive about all this. I can’t believe I’m about to start dating again, after 23 years with the same guy.

She later reinforces her sense of apprehension with:

I admit it: I’m nervous about dating again. I literally have not kissed another man on the lips in 25 years.

Thus starts our intrepid dater. Much to her chagrin, the biker bad boy she picks first turns out to be short, old, bald, and doesn’t own a motorcycle. He drives a Taurus, and only posed for the pictures on his friend’s Harley. Making things worse, her ex-husband has been tearing up the dating scene:

They’d share accounts of my ex-husband’s escapades, which included dating three out of five waitresses at what used to be our favorite downtown seafood restaurant and a romp in the woods with a history professor at the departmental barbecue.

She tells us that her ex’s current girlfriend is more than 20 years younger than she is. She dates another guy who is perfect, but he only wants to be friends. Then she dates a doctor who lives in a nearby town and after a dinner date she agrees to go spend the night at his house. After a very disappointing date, she decides to have sex with him even though she isn’t attracted to him. Unfortunately, he realizes he isn’t in the mood after she takes her
clothes off. Ouch.

None of this so far should be particularly surprising to my regular readers. This fits with the findings of the AARP study on the dating prospects of divorced women in their 40s, and also fits with the real life stories behind Eat Pray Love and How Stella Got Her Groove Back. It also fits with what I found when I looked into the rosy remarriage rate statistics published around the web.

The story goes on. And on. And on. I don’t see any publishing dates on it but MSN refers to it as a weekly column. With 141 installments!

I didn’t read all 141 installments, but my take of it as I tried to click my way through the seemingly never ending story was the usual divorcée drama. Ex drama, kids drama, a health scare, drama with the women at work, financial worries, dating horror stories, etc. I was curious how it turned out though, so I skimmed through the summaries. Here is how it turns out:

She meets a hunky handyman named Ethan and starts dating him. Then her husband decides he wants her back. He confesses that he was an idiot for letting her go, and that all of the other women he dated only convinced him that she is the “sexiest, smartest, most loving person [he has] ever known”. He eventually begs her to marry him again, only to realize that she has a new life with Ethan and tells her that he is glad she is so happy even though he is miserable that he can’t have her. She gets laid off from her job and is at risk of losing her home. Tension builds. Then Ethan the hunky handyman tells her that he wants to spend the rest of his life with her. After professing his love for her Ethan reveals that despite the fact that he is anti-capitalist and trades handyman work for food, he is secretly a multi-millionaire. Then she gets a call from a publisher with an offer to write an extremely long and drawn out 141 part column on her experiences dating online after divorce, preserving her status as a strong independent woman. The end.

Do any of you buy this? The kicker is, match.com isn’t calling this fiction. Check the link yourself on match.com’s site, or check out the series on MSN. You can also find references to the series at MSN under their list of articles on dating. Moreover, they have a Q&A column (also on MSN) with Miss Katz where they ask her about her experience with online dating.

This is the first item listed under advice > love online:

> From her very first date to happily ever after, we’ve followed Sara Susannah Katz through all the twists and turns of being single in the suburbs. Now that her column has come to an end, we asked her to share her insights and advice about online dating.

They have another article where she responds to reader emails:

> Merlie, who describes herself as a “displaced housewife,” wrote: “I am Sara’s age and the stories helped me survive through so many nights I cried. Her attempts to enter the dating world mirrored mine. Instead of being sad or frustrated, I knew I could come home and read her articles. All of a sudden, I was laughing at myself and feeling like I wasn’t alone.”
and later:

Many of you felt bolstered by my weekly chronicles. Gigi wrote that she discovered “Single in the Suburbs” while contemplating her own “divorce/renewal/ liberation project,” adding, “When I found myself ready to make the bold/scary/crazy dive back into the dating world (especially the online part, which was not around when I got married), I was able to draw so much strength and comfort from a soul sister who was blazing the path.”

It gets better (emphasis mine):

It’s worth noting that, while my story inspired some readers to get divorced, it also convinced others to stay put in their marriages. “Reading this column reminded me how horrible the dating world can be,” wrote Karen. Instead of leaving her husband, she decided to work on her marriage. “We’re still together and happier than ever.”

It would be bad enough if this story is actually true and inspires women to divorce. It would be unconscionable if it was fiction presented as fact. Either way, the story presents an extremely unlikely ending given what we know of the actual experience of women dating later in life. Match.com must know this, since their competitor okcupid is practically begging men to date older women, luring them to date the neglected older women on their site with charts showing older women are more willing to engage in frequent sex, casual sex, blow-jobs and threesomes with other women!

According to the author this series inspired married women to divorce and try their hand at online dating. How many kids will be harmed because mommy read this fantastic story? How many women have made an irrevocable decision which the AARP study found often leads to a life of celibacy for women, with a surprising number not even receiving hugs from the opposite sex? It is bad enough that we have ordinary media outlets encouraging women to divorce, but here we have a company selling divorce to married women which is in a position to directly profit from it.

I contacted the match.com media room 24 hours ago to ask if this series is fiction:

Hello,

I write a blog about relationships, including dating after divorce. I’m writing a post to tell my readers about Sara Susannah Katz’s multi part column “Single in the Suburbs”. I noticed that she has written a similar series titled “The Devil Wears Dockers”, but that series is flagged as fiction. Your series appears to be presented as non fiction, including an interview with the author at the end of her experience. Can you please confirm if your series is fiction or not?

Best regards,

Dalrock
So far I haven’t heard back. In the meantime, here is what I have been able to find with a little searching. As I mentioned in the message to the Match.com media room, the author (pen name) later wrote a series very similar to this titled **The Devil Wears Dockers**. Unlike *Single in the Suburbs*, the *Dockers* series is clearly labeled as fiction: *The Devil Wears Dockers is entirely a work of fiction and any resemblance to persons living or dead is purely coincidental*. Sara Susannah Katz also wrote a novel titled *Wife Living Dangerously*, which was published outside the US under the name Debra Kent. According to Debra Kent’s linked in page, she also penned a similar series for Redbook from 1996 – 2005 titled *The V Diaries* under the name Valerie Ryan, *an independently wealthy single mother and a total chaos magnet*.

Redbook doesn’t state that *The V Diaries* series is fictional on their website, even though it does state this for selected other series (one of which is a spin-off from *V Diaries*). However, Debra Kent repackaged and expanded on the series publishing it under her own name as a fiction trilogy.

Also, per the linked in bio she does work for a mid-western university and have an employment gap from May 2009 to January 2010, so at first glance that part of the story would seem to match up. However, the reader comments article included a note from a reader who started reading the story in January 2009:

> Adele wrote, “In December 2008 my husband left me unexpectedly. Not more than a month later I stumbled upon this column.

Given that the events in the story are supposed to have happened before the series was published, this doesn’t fit with the story after all. For understandable reasons, her linked in profile doesn’t confirm or deny the existence of an anti-capitalist secret multi-millionaire hunky handy man who is madly in love with her.

It is theoretically possible that this woman happens to have experienced the same kind of incredible events which she has written before and since as fiction, in the same first person series format. I can’t prove it one way or another, so I’ll let you be the judge. I’ll write a follow on post when/if I hear back from match.com.

**Note:** While researching this I found another very similar serial by the name *Single in the Suburbs*, ostensibly written by a woman living in Marin county named Nikki Silverstein. I didn’t see any reference to the series being fictional, and Nikki Silverstein responds to reader comments and also writes current events articles for the paper.

**See Also:**

- Match.com responds, and a new pic of the author.
- Google censors my match.com exposé
Match.com responds, and a new pic of the author.

by Dalrock | February 25, 2011 | Link

Here is the response I received from Match.com Public Relations:

Hi Dalrock,
Thank you for contacting Match.com.

This series was presented to us by the author as a firsthand account of her own online dating experiences. In order to protect her own privacy, she changed several of the more easily identifiable details (including people’s names).

Warm regards,
Jaklin

I have to say this wasn’t the response I was expecting. I really thought they were going to say that they assumed their readers knew it was fiction all along. I don’t have any problem with her changing names and using a pen name, but I’m not convinced the story bears more than a passing resemblance to the author’s life.

I’ve found another blog post titled “Single in the Suburbs” really makes me irritated where they were discussing the series in May of 2008, so the series started at least 3 years ago. I’m guessing it is closer to 4 years ago, because the blog quoted the 49th installment of what MSN calls a weekly column. It may be even older than that, because there appear to have been significant periods of time where the series wasn’t updated. Interestingly fairly early in the comments section of the irritated blog someone stated that it was fiction:

Don’t know if this changes how you feel about it, but it’s a fictional column written by a novelist who’s written a romance novel on a similar topic [] Thank goodness.

The blog author and several of the commenters were surprised at this, but all seemed to accept it once it was stated. This seems to be fairly common from the threads I’ve seen discussing the series. Most of the women discussing it don’t have any doubt that it is real. For example, there is a comments to the author page on the site with her new series. The first few commenters write from the perspective that the events in Suburbs actually happened to the author. One even asks her how things are working out with Ethan:

So sad that Single in the Suburbs is over, but very happy for you and Ethan. Thanks for keeping me entertained every Thursday. I couldn’t wait to read whether you chose Ethan or Craig, but secretly wanted you to pick Ethan! I’m sure I’m not the only one who would love an update!

The next commenter agrees:

Seconding! I’d love to know what you and Ethan are up to now. Sounds like a great
guy!

But the next commenter writes:

"Thanks for sharing Single in the Suburbs with all of us for the past 2 1/2 years. I look forward to your future works, and I am supportive of the open ended way that you stopped the column. Life has no ending, and not all tales turn out the way we expect them to. It is best for your fans to keep that in mind when reading your “reality fiction”.

The author responds to a later question on that page, but doesn’t respond to the commenters who think the story is real or the one who suggests it is fiction.

Also, I noticed that Debra Kent has updated the picture on her linked in page since I posted on this yesterday. I’m guessing that isn’t a coincidence.

**Edit:** Her linked in page has since been removed so you can no longer see the new picture.

Lastly, my original post is now mid way down at the bottom of the first page of google results for *Single in the Suburbs*. I’m hoping as more visitors see that page it will keep moving higher up. Perhaps some of my fellow bloggers will be willing to assist by linking to my original post with the text *Single in the Suburbs*. Together we may even prevent at least a few kids from growing up in broken homes due to frivolous divorce.

**See Also:**

- *Google censors my match.com exposé*
The recent discussion of Emotional Pornography along with Welmer’s recent post on the Spearhead about the woman who went on her honeymoon without her husband reminded me that I had snagged this screenshot back in November:

As with nearly all emo porn, key to the plot is the premise that women don’t really ever have to choose, and that choices don’t have consequences. I was going to share the plot summary from Wiki, but I found the trailer on youtube instead. **I know it is painful, but sometimes we have to confront evil to truly understand it.** In addition to the standard chick crack warning, I’ll also advise my readers to have an airsick bag handy. If you think you can only handle one small segment of video, skip the trailer and look at the next one.

I know what you are thinking, they forgot to remind women to be true to themselves! What if she forgets and considers the needs of others or feels compelled to keep promises she makes? It could destroy her! Not to worry, I found the ending on youtube when looking for the trailer. Start at 5:00 in to see her vow to be self centered and shallow. Then skip to 6:00 to see her bemoan the fact that she gave up the chance to have a real wedding in order to be true to herself, only to have the guy come crawling back on a horse drawn carriage. Then she meets a secret-mulit-millionare hunky handyman, who– wait, that is another story.
I’ve been overwhelmed by the amount of support the manosphere has provided to my exposé on match.com’s far fetched Single in the Suburbs “column”. I want to sincerely thank all of the bloggers who have helped get out the word on this.

Unfortunately Google seems equally interested in making sure the word doesn’t get out. Until last night, my original post on the topic came up in the first page of results when I searched the words “Single in the Suburbs” in google. I can only speculate on the reasons, but google has removed that page from their search engine. Now if you google single in the suburbs, you will see many pages referencing my post, but not the post itself. The same is true if you search the other half of the title: how match.com sells your wife post marital spinsterhood. Note that the second search term returns multiple links to my site, but none to the original exposé.

For now Bing and Yahoo still will return the original page. And as a consolation, if I search the full title of the post in quotes google will return a link to the page itself.

My guess is Match.com or the author realized they had a problem and contacted google to help sweep it under the rug. However, I’m not the problem, and neither is my original post. Their problem is they sold this unbelievable story as non fiction for years, and even published the fact that it broke up marriages.

This isn’t one small article that ran on their site. This was a 141 post column they published over several years. And they can’t claim they expected their readers to know it was fiction, because they are now on record in their email to me that it was presented to them as non fiction.

Can you imagine being the match.com executive who has to figure out how to defend this?
Assuming they were the ones who contacted google to have this removed from the search results, this must have generated some high visibility attention within match.com’s managerial ranks. I wonder whose boss it is who has to explain how they hired a romance novelist whose specialty is *fiction framed as fact* multi part diary entries to write their true life dating column. As I showed in the original post, before writing *Single in the Suburbs* Debra Kent wrote a very similar fictional series for Redbook for 9 years running. After writing this supposedly true story which just happens to read like a romance novel, she started another weekly diary style fiction series called *The Devil Wears Dockers*.

I can certainly understand why Match.com would want to sweep this whole thing under the rug, but I think whoever contacted google made things worse for them. I was basically ready to move on with this. Now I’m angry. I may not be in a position to prove this is false, but that doesn’t mean no one is. Many of the key details of the story would leave a footprint in public records. I’ve already pointed out that the job loss doesn’t square with her linked in bio (don’t worry if you lose your copy Debra, I’ve made a backup). Off the top of my head one could readily investigate:

- The author claims she was married for 23 years.
- She claims she was recently divorced with two kids.
- The author claims she listed her home for sale during this period (I can’t tell from skimming the columns if the sale ever went through).

Does anyone know of an investigative journalist who would be interested in digging into this?

**Update:** Roughly a week after I published this post a reader noted that Google had stopped suppressing search results for this page. I don’t know why they first suppressed the page and later stopped, but the fact that they stopped suppressing it so quickly seems to weaken the theory of those who say this is all done without human intervention at Google.

**See Also:**

- *Match.com responds, and a new pic of the author.*
Children get frustrated when the grown up doesn’t know the way.

by Dalrock | February 28, 2011 | Link

Subaru understands this:
My recent post on Match.com selling divorce to married women in their 40s reminded me of this Brothers Grimm tale. If you prefer it with chickens instead of puppies, there is an alternate version. Enjoy:

A countryman one day said to his little puppies: “Come into the parlour and enjoy yourselves, and pick up the bread-crumbs on the table; your mistress has gone out to pay some visits.” Then the little dogs said: “No, no, we will not go. If the mistress gets to know it, she will beat us.” The countryman said: “She will know nothing about it. Do come; after all, she never gives you anything good.” Then the little dogs again said: “Nay, nay, we must let it alone; we must not go.” But the countryman let them have no peace until at last they went, and got on the table, and ate up the bread-crumbs with all their might. But at that very moment the mistress came, and seized the stick in great haste, and beat them and treated them very hardly. And when they were outside the house, the little dogs said to the countryman: “Dost, dost, dost, dost thou see?” Then the countryman laughed and said: “Didn’t, didn’t, didn’t, you expect it?” So they just had to run away.
Thanks for getting the word out!
by Dalrock | March 1, 2011 | Link

I wanted to thank all of the bloggers by name who assisted in getting the word out on the Match.com series Single in the Suburbs. Even though google is now suppressing the page from likely search results, with your assistance we succeeded in getting the word out. Sunday was the busiest single day this blog has ever had, with 3,539 hits. As I said before, I truly am overwhelmed by the help other bloggers have offered here. Given the number of people who now know about it, the information will undoubtedly spread regardless of google. The information we share in the manosphere has a way of trickling out to the wider web, and I have no question that the same will happen for this case.

If you linked to the page and I have left you off the list, please do me a favor and let me know so I can correct the omission. To my readers I’ll ask the favor of checking out some of these blogs, especially if you aren’t already following them. If you find you like one of these as a result, please leave a comment here as well.

- In Mala Fide
- Captain Capitalism
- Elusive Wapiti
- Hawaiian libertarian
- The Badger Hut
- Hidden Leaves
- Solomon II
- Game for Marriage
- Le Cygne Gris (Simon Grey)
- Gaming My Wife
- The Private Man
- 28 Sherman
- Amateur Strategist
- Girl Game
- Anarchy in Athens
- Game For Omegas
- Freedom Twenty-Five
- Dark Brightness
- Foseti
- NSFW Seduction
- The Unambitious Male
- Occultrick
- Finndistan
For those who prefer their humor less dark.
by Dalrock | March 1, 2011 | Link

A modern reinterpretation of The Crumbs on the Table:
What really happened to Lara Logan?

by Dalrock | March 2, 2011 | Link

I found this post by blogger Témoris Grecko who claims to have witnessed the events in Tahir Square (H/T AshCairo on Reddit). I obviously can’t vouch for his credibility, but it does strike me as far more credible than the mainstream news reports.

I witnessed part of the mob attack against CBS’s Lara Logan at Cairo’s Tahrir square on the evening of Friday, February 11th. I was struck when I read CBS’s February 15th communiqué describing the attack as a “brutal and sustained sexual attack”, and attributing her rescue to “a group of women and an estimated 20 Egyptian soldiers.” This account does not fit with what I, and others, witnessed.

A bit later he elaborates:

I was buying tea from a vendor in Tahrir with two friends, Amr Fekry, a 26 year old Egyptian call center agent, and Andi Walden, a San Francisco political science student. Then we heard the noise and saw the mob coming. A blonde woman, neatly dressed with a white coat, was being dragged and pushed. It didn’t seem to me she was panicking, but rather trying to control the situation. They passed us in a moment. They were yelling “agent!, agent!”

I tried to run to intervene, but some Egyptians I didn’t know prevented me from doing it. There was nothing I could do and, as a foreign journalist, I’d surely end up being accused of being an agent too, and attacked. Fekry did go there and dissapeared into the crowd, 50 or 100 people strong.

Later I spoke with two young male activists who helped the person I later learned was Lara Logan (I didn’t know her before, I don’t usually follow US networks). They were Omar El Shennawy, a 21 year old teacher of English, and Abdulrahman Elsayed, a 25 year old teacher of physical education. They said they had formed a human chain with other young men to protect Logan, and then delivered her to the Egyptian Museum military post.

When I read CBS’s story and it’s interpretation by other media outlets, I felt troubled. It seemed misleading. “It didn’t make sense to me”, said Benjamin Starr, from Boston who arrived as a tourist on January 24th, and stayed to witness the uprising. He also saw the mob pass by with Lara Logan. “I want to give her the benefit of the doubt, maybe something happened in another part of the square, but from what I saw, she was being taken by men to the soldiers, and her clothes were not torn off. There were no women, I didn’t see a single woman in the crowd around her.”

His full post is worth a read if nothing else.

Update: Témoris Grecko has posted a response to Lara Logan’s interview on 60 Minutes.
This is what a mangina looks like.
by Dalrock | March 2, 2011 | Link

On my last post regarding Lara Logan, commenter Danman left a link to an article from Mediaite.com which argued (but did not present any evidence) that the blogger I linked to was incorrect. The Mediaite article in question was written by Mediaite founder Dan Abrams. At least one commenter suspected that Danman was in fact Dan Abrams himself. Either way, Mr. Abrams turns out to be an interesting fellow. In addition to his gossipy website, he also wrote a book about how women are better than men at everything.

I know the ladies are wondering if such a magnificent fellow is still available. After all, all women dream of a man who would prostrate himself in front of their obvious superiority. Adding to this already hefty appeal, he also is willing to get his legs waxed.

Well I have good news for you ladies. Surprisingly this 46 year old white knight has somehow not been snapped up. Per his web page:

Dan has never been married, so despite his admiration for women, evidenced by this book, that does not mean he necessarily knows how to talk to them.

You don’t say?

Edit: Here is the video where he gets his legs shaved. H/T namae nanka.
Captain Capitalism addressed our current economic malaise in his recent post Economic Fail of the Century.

As some of you are aware, the price of oil has become somewhat pricey in recent months. It’s now around $100 and we get to pay approaching $4 a gallon in gas.

Accusations will be made. Big oil will be blamed. Investigations launched. But in the end it is the unstoppable forces of economics and the declining currency of a declining nation that will win in the end of the day and you will continue to have to pay $4 a gallon in gas...maybe $5 or $6 when summer rolls around.

He offers some instructive graphs, but I have a graph of my own that I prefer:

No offense intended to Erkel.

But the Captain doesn’t just come to us to state the obvious (that we have a problem), he comes with a solution. I have to say, I’ve been practicing his gas saving trick for nearly 6 years. Despite the fact that I drive a 13 year old 4x4 pickup, I use far less gas than the average Prius owner.

But I’m not going to give his secret away. You will have to check out his blog post for the answer.
Another gem from Match.com: Sex and the single mom

Have you ever called a condom a “balloon” or introduced your latest date as “Uncle Mike” to a kid?...
Here are five things you can do to be a great mom... but also get some satisfaction.

I really love the image that accompanies this article.

Sorry, back to being a great mom. And like any great mom, you need to remove all pictures of your children from your bedroom:

All women deserve to have a bedroom that sets the mood — but that’s hard to do if it’s littered with your kids’ crayons or action figures. So, establish a rule with your children that your bedroom is a toy-free zone. And — this tip is going to break a few hearts — consider moving any framed photos of you, your kids and their dad to a more neutral zone in your pad like the living room or kitchen.

And don’t forget, the revolving door works as an exit too. It’s all well and good for mommy to bring strange men home for sex, so long as they leave once they are done:

It’s 6 a.m. and your kids are waking up in an hour... only problem is, there’s a strange man sleeping peacefully in your bed, and no doubt your little tykes will freak if they see him. How can you get him to skedaddle without hurting his feelings?

All of this reminded me of a joke I saw.
More judging the performance.
by Dalrock | March 5, 2011 | Link

While checking out search engine results for Single in the Suburbs, I came across an interesting blog by the same name. The first post I saw was (at the time) the last post of the blog, and advised readers that it was unlikely to be updated regularly in the future:

**12/27/2010: The End of An Era?**

I started this blog in December of 2009, one year ago and I have yet to find any real connection...Hopefully 2011 will be better for me in the love dept. I still have my POF account, but am not checking it often. Perhaps once a week or so, and if someone strikes my attention, I may meet and write about it, but dating will no longer (for now at least) be a priority in my life. Obviously over 100 dates in one year is not the way to go...

The subtitle of the blog is *A journey through my dating adventures, one date at a time...* This kind of blog is evidently very popular, where women recount their search for Mr. right. Seeing how it ended made me want to check out the beginning:

Ever since I can remember, I’ve wanted to be married and settled down. I was a bride 4 Halloweens out of about 11 I celebrated as a child. Now, as an adult I am one of the only single people I know and have witnessed friends who at one point swore off men all together or didn’t believe in marriage, walk down the aisle with a smile. I no longer have single girlfriends to go on the prowl with and no longer enjoy the hunt. I want to find love.

Some of my readers are likely tempted at this point to guess the blogger’s age. But you can’t assume she is in her late 20s or early 30s just because she is on a *husband hunt*. The median age for marriage for women in the US is 26, which means half of all women who do marry have married by that age. While I’m at it, don’t assume that she *isn’t interested in commitment* or has created a long and unrealistic list of expectations. Nor should you assume she has viewed her experience with men as an opportunity to revel in attention or judge the performance of the men she dates. Now that you are properly chastised against jumping to conclusions, I’ll continue telling the story.

I was 13 years old and my group went to the high school football homecoming game. I was dared to kiss my “school boyfriend” for 5 seconds under the bleachers. I remember it was 5 seconds because my friend Erica had a stop watch. As our lips locked, my girlfriends shouted at the top of their lungs, “TOUCHDOWN”. It was both humiliating and fantastic. From those 5 seconds, I was hooked on kissing!

Ok, so maybe she likes a *little* attention. Who doesn’t? It doesn’t mean all of the other assumptions you jumped to are true. She continues, now recounting her experience as an adult:

Yes, that’s right...I was married at one time. I was 21 years old...
While, it did last longer than most expected, we were divorced 3 years later. I will spare you the details...3 months of partying with my single girlfriends later, I was in another long term relationship. This one lasting 4 years... So now, here I am at 28 and single for the first time in my adult life.

Ok, so maybe a few more turned out to be correct. Anyone ever tell you not to be such a smartass?

I have a long list of pre-requisites and I am super picky. My list gets longer and longer the more I date and I will not settle until I find the perfect guy for me.

I got nuthin’

*I decided not to hot link to the original blog, assuming this isn’t a discussion she would prefer to read as a source of traffic there. You can paste this URL directly into your browser and see her blog there: http://blog.kristinaking.com/2010/12/12272010-end-of-era.html
A Beginners Guide to Selling Divorce.
by Dalrock | March 6, 2011 | Link

If you’re reading this, I assume you are or want to be in the difficult business of marketing divorce. This is a beginners guide, but some of you veterans out there obviously need a refresher in the basics. For those new to the topic, I’ll point out that this is specifically about selling divorce to women. No one sells divorce to men; that would be in poor taste.

Many of you are no doubt aware of the troubling trend line above. As divorce sellers we have our work cut out for us. We are being squeezed between two negative trends. Not only is the rate of divorce declining, but our target market is shrinking as well. Try as hard as we might, we can’t sell divorce to women who aren’t married:
Step 1 for all of us needs to be to invest in creating the future crop of divorcées. I know this isn’t as glamorous as selling divorce itself, but if we fail to keep up the pressure here eventually there will be no married women left to sell divorce to. This is generally outside the scope of this guide, but you can find some excellent examples here, here, and here.

As I said above, many of you need a refresher on the basics. **Too often those selling divorce get caught up thinking only about the selling points:**

1. The feeling of power which divorcées initially experience.
2. The near universal assurance of child custody. ([Summary, Full Analysis](#)).
3. Divorce Fantasy.
4. Feeding choice addiction.
5. Financial gain.
6. Her friends egging her on.

The above is a pretty compelling package. **When it comes to divorce, all of the legal and social incentives line up in favor of the wife.** So why then is the rate of divorce per 1,000 married women declining? If anything, the incentives over the last 20 years have been increasing. We have no one to blame but ourselves. Our message has been slowly losing its effectiveness. This is proven by the fact that the percentage of divorces initiated by women has been slowly declining over time, as the chart below from the [NCHS Monthly Vital Statistics Report](#) shows:
As you can see, while we are still overall quite successful at selling divorce to women, over time we have been slipping. Why is this? The answer is that over time more and more women have become aware of the full effects of divorce and the harm this causes themselves and their children. Like many other marketers, we find ourselves trying to sell something which the target audience all too often already knows is the wrong thing to do. Fortunately for us, our target market is one of the most gullible in existence. The key to success is to understand the valid objections married women have to divorcing, and assisting them in rationalizing these objections away. Here is a list of the most common concerns women have about divorce, in no particular order:

1. They will likely lose the best friend they ever had.
2. They will cause great harm to their kids.
3. Morality (they made a promise in front of friends, family and God).
4. Loss of financial security, especially in retirement.
5. The bleak dating/remarriage market for divorcées and older women in general.
6. The risk that they will experience health problems and not have a partner to assist them.
7. The physical vulnerability experienced by single women.
8. The likelihood that she will be happier if she remains married.

This has been part 1 of a 2 part course on selling divorce. See also:

Intermediate guide to selling divorce; overcoming women’s better judgment.

---

Table 12. Percent distribution of divorces and annulments by petitioner, according to presence of children at time of decree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Husband and wife</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Husband and wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Includes cases where presence of children is not stated.
2Includes cases in the category "other parent" as petitioner.
Intermediate guide to selling divorce; overcoming women’s better judgment.

by Dalrock | March 7, 2011 | Link

In this course we will cover how to overcome the most common concerns women have about divorce, as defined in the previous course.

Objection #1: They will likely lose the best friend they ever had.

Your best bet here is to play up the myth of sisterhood. Keep in mind here that Hollywood is our friend, and science and reality are our greatest enemies. Another effective strategy is to pretend that by divorcing they won’t really lose their husband as a best friend. For example, in Debra Kent’s master work of marketing Single in the Suburbs, the main character’s husband remained her friend after the divorce. Don’t allow the manifest unlikelihood of this scenario to prevent you from suggesting it. Married women are inclined to believe this if given the smallest encouragement.

Objection #2: They will cause great harm to their kids.

There are two fundamental strategies to addressing this concern. The first is to pretend that it isn’t true. And as above, don’t allow the ridiculousness of the argument to prevent you from using it. State with a straight face that they will be a better mother if they are experiencing the bliss that is divorce. The second strategy is to appeal to your target audiences’ inflated selfishness. Society has really handed us this one on a silver platter, so all you have to do is remind your would be divorcée that she has a right to be happy no matter who this harms. This is where the genius of the argument that they will be a better mother if they are happy really comes in. With one argument you can implement both strategies at once. Don’t over-think this; remember, their rationalization hamster is your best ally.

Objection #3: Morality (they made a promise in front of friends, family and God).

At first glance this would seem to be a difficult sell. However, don’t forget that nearly every church and religious figure in the western world is in direct alliance with us. If you feel this isn’t enough, you can create a fantasy world where divorcing actually makes the woman more moral. Again, don’t allow the absurdity of this argument to prevent you from making it. There is a third option to point out that everyone is doing it. Yes, I know this isn’t a rational response to a moral argument, but what matters is the argument is highly effective. Don’t be afraid to use it.

Objection #4: Loss of financial security, especially in retirement

There are two schools of thought on how to address this obstacle. The first is to pretend the underlying issue doesn’t exist. Ignore altogether the fact that the cost of maintaining two households will inevitably lead to less money available for the niceties of life. Focus instead on the initial flow of cash she will receive in the divorce as well as the lack of restrictions on spending by her husband. This method works best on women who are generally
irresponsible. The other method is to create a fantasy world where women who divorce are magically rewarded by the universe with unexpected riches. Again, Debra Kent’s *Single in the Suburbs* is a great example of how to create such a fantasy. In her story, not only did the divorcée find out that the handyman who fell madly in love with her was secretly a multi-millionaire, but she also experienced an advancement in her career which happened as a direct result of her divorce.

**Objection #5: The bleak dating/remarriage market for divorcées and older women in general**

This objection represents an interesting paradox. While most women on a conscious level are eager to rationalize this reality away, they are still left with a nagging sense of doubt caused by both the obvious truth of the risk as well as the reality they see other divorced women experiencing. As with the other objections there are two primary methods you can use to overcome this. The first is to play on the “kiss a lot of frogs” rationalization that your target audience is eager to accept. Show a scenario where a string of extremely poor options suddenly leads to an unbelievably good option as Debra Kent did with *Single in the Suburbs*. Don’t get caught up trying to understand why women would actually believe this, or you are likely to give yourself a terrible headache. The other option is to pretend that the divorcée will find her dating/marriage market value skyrockets if she goes to some exotic locale, as is the case with the extremely popular “true life” books/movies *Eat Pray Love* and *How Stella Got Her Groove Back*.

**Objection #6: The risk that they will experience health problems and not have a partner to assist them.**

This is a tricky one, and most marketers elect to bypass it altogether. However, some marketers create a fantasy world where the divorcée experiences a health scare which ultimately turns out fine. Again, we can look to Debra Kent’s *Single in the Suburbs* as an outstanding example of this.

**Objection #7: The physical vulnerability experienced by single women.**

Your best weapon here is outright denial. Fortunately, feminists have already paved the way on this one. If anyone does point this out, simply call them a misogynist or accuse them of blaming the victim. For best results, follow up with a healthy dose of moxie and/or girl power.

**Objection #8: The likelihood that she will be happier if she remains married.**

This is the aggregate effect of objections 1-7, and therefore is best addressed by using the strategies above. If you encounter a married woman who is aware of this fact, your best bet is generally to move on to more gullible women. Your only other option is to appeal to her emotions instead of logic. This can be surprisingly effective and therefore is at least worth a shot.

**A note on returns:** Unlike other products, with divorce almost all sales are final. In theory many women who buy your arguments could recover their losses and remarry their ex husband if they acted soon enough. However, in those cases where the husband is gullible
enough to take them back, their rationalization hamster is almost guaranteed to run out the clock. You don’t have to make arguments which could withstand thoughtful analysis. You merely have to create enough comfort to allow the married woman to act on her own worst impulses. In 99% of the cases, by the time she realizes she made a mistake it will be too late.

See also: A Beginners Guide to Selling Divorce.
I have been struggling with my blog-roll lately. I don’t know if the manosphere is just getting better lately, or I’m just slow to figure it out. I’m guessing some of each. Either way, I’ve been holding off on announcing some additions to my blogroll while trying to come up with a credible story on how I make such decisions.

But I still don’t have one.

**New additions:**

- **Badger Nation (The Badger Hut).** No introduction needed, since Badger’s well thought out comments have appeared on my site from very early on. Badger’s interest in helping young people of both sexes always evident. I think if I had to pick where to send someone new to game and the manosphere first it would probably be Badger. He has a kind way of speaking the truth.
- **Crime and Federalism.** An interesting mix. I recommend you check out his post *Bipolar Disorder Meets “Eat, Pray, Love”*, as well as *What is a Beta Male*.
- **Dark Brightness.** Hard to describe. Maybe start with *If you are choosy, thee are very few mates*. I also enjoyed *Cellos resurrect Michael Jackson* (However I like the Cello even more than I dislike Michael Jackson...)
- **Gaming My Wife**. Pretty self explanatory title, but you have to love his choice of Lionidas for his moniker. *Come and take them*... I suggest *Fundamentals of Game* and *Don’t Bawl Like A Little Bitch* (with a great line from his wife)
- **Gucci Little Piggy**. I think everyone already knows Chuck. If not, what are you waiting for?
- **The Private Man**. Here’s your chance to get in on the ground floor of a great new blog. Check out: *Where Are The Men Online?* (great imagery in this one) *Her Toxic Female Friends* and *Mom Was Wrong – A Personal Narrative*. He also is collecting stories of men over 65, a noble effort. Can you help him out?

If you find yourself still looking for more new sites, periodically check out the blogrolls of grerp, Elusive Wapiti, and Hawaiian Libertarian (after first reading their excellent content). I really wish wordpress had the blogroll feature that blogspot does. I’m assuming everyone already looks at Ferdinand’s weekly link roundup. Ferdinand must be a voracious reader. Also, feel free to list any blogs in the comments which you think I or my readership would enjoy.

**The bad news:** As you probably already know Solomon II is hanging it up. Don’t blame me. We convened a *Council Of The Manosphere* to try to stop him. After a lengthy and heated debate over the proper way to execute the manosphere handshake, elders Zed and Anon 68 brought us to order. We unanimously voted that Solomon should keep blogging. However, he said something in Latin which (taking into account the hand gesture accompanying it) roughly translates to “pound sand”. Since we can’t make him keep writing, you may as well enjoy his final posts.
Chuck at *Gucci Little Pigg*y has a great piece titled *Insurance Men*, where he challenges a comment made on another blog that men’s role as protectors no longer adds real value. The original comment:

Excuse me, what? Are you arming yourself and standing watch at night while wifey sleeps? Are you accompanying her at all times whenever she ventures out of the house, armed and alert and prepared for hand-to-hand combat with your mad karate skillz? Do you live in Somalia, where death by firearm or mortar is a real threat? If not, then I propose that the value of such protection is zero and you don’t get to negotiate some sort of compensation for labor you perform only in your imagination. This is the Western world after all; most of us are privileged enough that direct threats to our physical survival are vanishingly rare.

Chuck points out that you can’t measure protection simply by attempted attacks which have been thwarted:

Britney Spears’ bodyguard rarely if ever has to spring into action to defend the pop starlet from violent attack. Spears is really paying mostly for the bodyguard’s mere presence which serves as a deterrent against attack or harassment. The bodyguard as deterrent is actually a more important role than bodyguard as Chuck Norris.

If we applied the same standard of thwarted attacks, one would have to deem the police themselves as worthless since the police rarely respond in time to disrupt an attack in process. Blogger *Suburban Sheepdog* makes this point in his blog post arguing against gun control titled *Who You Gonna Call?*

Go and find a cop. Ideally, find one with 20 or 25 years of service who has spent his entire career in a patrol division, cruising the streets in a prow car and answering calls. Now ask that cop these questions: How many armed robberies have you stopped while they were occurring? How many in-progress rapes have you broken up? How many times have you caught an armed burglar still in the house with the family he was victimizing? Then ask that cop this: How many reports have you written after the fact for armed robbery, rape, or home invasion?

I know to a metaphysical certainty that the numbers corresponding to the first set of questions will be vanishingly small compared to the numbers in the second set.* How could it be otherwise? Unless a lawman is on your block – or, for that matter, in your driveway – when the call comes, you cannot reasonably expect him to be there before the deed’s been done. It’s one of Robert’s Rules: When seconds count, the police are just minutes away. (I didn’t make that one up, but it’s one of the Rules nonetheless.)

Criminal violence is a very complicated issue, but at the very least we can say that criminals
are deterred from attempting rapes, robberies, and murder if they fear either getting caught after the fact or they fear significant force will be used to prevent them from being successful in the act. As with so much in life, avoiding crime isn’t about being perfectly protected against it as it is about making it difficult enough to generally not be worth the criminal’s while or at least seeming like a less opportune target than someone else.

If you have to choose between criminals fearing they might get caught if they rape, rob or murder you, or them fearing that you might kill them or seriously injure them in the process, choose the latter. Better yet, choose both. As an article from the BBC points out, burglars take much more care to avoid breaking into occupied homes in the US than they do in the UK, because they fear the occupants in the US:

A study found American burglars fear armed home-owners more than the police. As a result burglaries are much rarer and only 13% occur when people are at home, in contrast to 53% in England.

Criminals have every reason to fear breaking in to an occupied home in the US. I’ve now referenced three articles arguing against gun control, but for this post my argument isn’t about gun control. In fact, gun control makes my point stronger. My point is that criminals fear attacking when the victim or someone near them is in a position to respond with physical force. That someone doesn’t have to be Chuck Norris, they simply have to pose enough of a threat to convince the criminal to find a better opportunity. Someone who is bigger, stronger, and more prone to use violence in defense than they might otherwise face.

Someone like a man.

Yes I know some of my female readers are armed, and some others are sure they would go all Lara Croft on someone’s ass. But what if you live in an area with gun control, or you don’t live in a video game?

As Chuck pointed out, the majority of the benefit of safety accrued from men acting as protectors doesn’t show up in the form of attacks attempted and thwarted, it shows up in the form of attacks which aren’t attempted in the first place. It shows up in the form of a society so free from violent crime that the original commenter felt comfortable ridiculing the very idea of women needing protection from violent criminals.
Christian marriage only experiences catastrophic failure 38% of the time!

by Dalrock | March 15, 2011 | Link

Actually they had to cherry pick to get the number so good (H/T Kate):

The various findings on religion and divorce hinge on what kind of Christians are being discussed.

Wright combed through the General Social Survey, a vast demographic study conducted by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago, and found that Christians, like adherents of other religions, have a divorce rate of about 42%. The rate among religiously unaffiliated Americans is 50%.

When Wright examined the statistics on evangelicals, he found worship attendance has a big influence on the numbers. Six in 10 evangelicals who never attend had been divorced or separated, compared to just 38% of weekly attendees.

Even better, Glenn T. Stanton from the Baptist Press:

THE TAKE-AWAY

The divorce rates of Christian believers are not identical to the general population — not even close. Being a committed, faithful believer makes a measurable difference in marriage.

...Faith does matter and the leading sociologists of family and religion tell us so.

Really? That is the take away? I can only imagine the reaction if Glenn T. Stanton found that something important failed 38% of the time.

Marriage as an institution won’t survive with a 38% failure rate, let alone a church which sees a 38% divorce rate as something to brag about.
Her parents must be proud.
by Dalrock | March 17, 2011 | Link

I saw this by way of Drudge: U Of C Students Launch ‘Hookups’ Website

They interviewed some clueless beta guys, who all were of the expectation that this would mean more sex for them. But the female students were the ones which really stood out to me:

Freshman Lynda Lopez logged on but didn’t like what she saw.

“I was like, ‘This is not for me.’ I could do a lot better,” said Lopez.

She likes the idea of slutting around, but feels she can do a better job of it without the website. I’m sure she can. Two other female students had similar reactions.

There is much handwringing in the article that U of C students are “repressed”.

Clindaniel said the University of Chicago campus has been socially repressed for a long time.

Based on the responses from the coeds, I would say his lack of action isn’t due to the women on campus lacking sufficient sluttyness. If someone reading this knows him, please share it with him. Hopefully this will ease his concerns on the matter.
Raising Feral Females.
by Dalrock | March 21, 2011 | Link

I was talking with a good friend of mine roughly a year ago about what I had been reading in the manosphere. At the time I hadn’t started blogging yet and was primarily reading Roissy*. At one point in the conversation I asked him what it would look like if women lacked civilizational restraint. What would it look like if women went feral? After a significant pause, I re framed it and asked what it would look like if men weren’t properly civilized; What would they do if they followed only their base instincts? Pretty quickly he came up with a description which was roughly a cross between Animal House and Lord of the Flies, just as I was expecting. Then we went back to the same question for women, and he remained stumped. My guess is most of my readers could easily have the same conversation with the same results with most of your non manosphere involved friends.

I thought about this again when getting a haircut the other week. Two mothers with junior high aged daughters were talking about the kinds of clothing their girls were wearing. It fascinated me to hear how confused they were about what was actually going on. They were sure that the girls were only dressing like little hookers because of pressure society was putting on them. What they didn’t understand was the girls were dressing like hookers because society wasn’t putting any pressure on them. Female intra-sexual competition being what it is, this is what young women will devolve to if all restraints are lifted. Today’s crop of young women are perilously close to as Zeets would say* presenting like a red-assed chimp.

Commenter MNL responded to my post Her Parents Must Be Proud with a link to a WSJ article by Jennifer Moses Why Do We Let Them Dress Like That? which addresses the same question and suffers from the same flawed premise.

In the pale-turquoise ladies’ room, they congregate in front of the mirror, re-applying mascara and lip gloss, brushing their hair, straightening panty hose and gossiping: This one is “skanky,” that one is “really cute,” and so forth. Dressed in minidresses, perilously high heels, and glittery, dangling earrings, their eyes heavily shadowed in black-pearl and jade, they look like a flock of tropical birds. A few minutes later, they return to the dance floor, where they shake everything they’ve got under the party lights.

But for the most part, there isn’t all that much to shake. This particular group of party-goers consists of 12- and 13-year-old girls. Along with their male counterparts, they are celebrating the bat mitzvah of a classmate in a cushy East Coast suburb.

It is interesting that she herself makes the colorful bird analogy, but still manages to miss the underlying biology involved here. She also misses another glaring neon sign, which is the significance of the event she was witnessing. The description below the video explains that peer pressure is at the root of the issue:

Today’s teen and preteen girls are bombarded with images and products that tout
the benefits of sexual attraction. But must we as parents, give in to their desire to “dress like everyone else?” asks author Jennifer Moses.

But what if it isn’t the culture driving the young girls this way? What if the young girls are driving the culture? This is extremely important, because parents, schools, pastors, etc. can’t begin to address the challenge while in denial of what the real drivers are. We don’t assume a teenage boy caught with a *Playboy* was only looking at it to keep up with the other boys. But we can’t bring ourselves to be honest about the sexuality of women in general, and young women in specific. This is especially damaging because young women and men tend not to fully understand the forces they are operating under themselves. **Pretending that it is solely the work of some outside force only makes it more confusing and difficult for them to manage while robbing them of a sense of accountability.**

Moses moves to the next part of her question, which is why do parents in general (and mothers in specific) actively help their daughters tart themselves up? Her friend offers the first hypothesis:

“It isn’t that different from when we were kids,” she said. “The girls in the sexy clothes are the fast girls. They’ll have Facebook pictures of themselves opening a bottle of Champagne, like Paris Hilton. And sometimes the moms and dads are out there contributing to it, shopping with them, throwing them parties at clubs. It’s almost like they’re saying, ‘Look how hot my daughter is.’” But why? “I think it’s a bonding thing,” she said. “It starts with the mommy-daughter manicure and goes on from there.”

Thinking about the underlying biological principles involved, this makes sense. When not competing against her daughter for sexual attention the mother would have every reason to assist her daughter in competing against other young women for that same attention. The author agrees that she experiences a *thrill* when seeing her daughter tarted up, especially since she herself is *somewhat past the age to turn heads*. But she proposes a different answer:

I have a different theory. It has to do with how conflicted my own generation of women is about our own past, when many of us behaved in ways that we now regret. A woman I know, with two mature daughters, said, “If I could do it again, I wouldn’t even have slept with my own husband before marriage. Sex is the most powerful thing there is, and our generation, what did we know?”

We are the first moms in history to have grown up with widely available birth control, the first who didn’t have to worry about getting knocked up. We were also the first not only to be free of old-fashioned fears about our reputations but actually pressured by our peers and the wider culture to find our true womanhood in the bedroom. Not all of us are former good-time girls now drowning in regret—I know women of my generation who waited until marriage—but that’s certainly the norm among my peers.

Wow. This makes sense as well. A bit further down she follows up with:
I wouldn’t want us to return to the age of the corset or even of the double standard, because a double standard that lets the promiscuous male off the hook while condemning his female counterpart is both stupid and destructive. If you’re the campus mattress, chances are that you need therapy more than you need condemnation.

Swirling around in there amongst the biological imperatives is the extreme investment these women have in the ideology which lead to their own bad choices. Even as they acknowledge the badness of their own past choices they can’t stop promoting them, because they so loudly promoted them in the past. Note who they are looking to protect. Preventing their daughter from needing therapy by not letting her become the campus mattress would protect their own daughters, but at the expense of acknowledging the harm their own feminist ideals have created. **Given the choice, they will protect the young version of themselves instead of protecting their own young.**

Still, I highly recommend reading the full column and even more watching the accompanying video. The level of recognition of the harm these women caused themselves and (by being unwilling to let go of feminist ideals) will cause their own daughters is astounding.

*Note: Roissy/Citizen Renegade/Heartiste is a pickup site and is very crass. The chimp quote from Zeets is from this Heartiste post.  

See Also: Overcivilized men, uncivilized women.
Scientists have discovered that if you never have sex, you will live forever.

At least it feels that way.

(author of joke unknown)

Does marriage cause you to live longer?

Lily shared a link the other day to a post on The Atlantic Daily Dish titled Longevity Myths. They quote a larger interview in The Atlantic with the authors of The Longevity Project:

One of our longevity myths is “Get married, and you will live longer.” The data tell a different story. Marriage was health-promoting primarily for men who were well-suited to marriage and had a good marriage. For the rest, there were all kinds of complications.

For example, women who got divorced often thrived. Even women who were widowed often did exceptionally well. It often seemed as if women who got rid of their troublesome husbands stayed healthy—most women, it seemed, can rely on their friends and other social ties. Men who got and stayed divorced, on the other hand, were at really high risk for premature mortality. It would have been better had they not married at all.

I haven’t read the details of their study, but they seem to be dancing around the issue a bit here. It could well be that they found that divorcées lived on average longer than their peers who remained married, but this isn’t what they said. From the few articles I’ve seen on the issue, there seems to be broad agreement that marriage correlates with longer life for both men and women. The real issue of contention is whether marriage is the cause of the increased life spans, or both are influenced by some third factor. For example, men in poor health are less likely to marry in the first place, or perhaps might be more likely to experience divorce. Also, personality traits like industriousness, conscientiousness, and future time orientation could all to some degree influence both marital status and health.

I’ve never really dug into the issue because to me the “get married because you will live longer” argument always seemed like a very poor one. As the opening joke shows, quality of life should be part of the equation. If someone doesn’t see being married as a preferable state, why marry simply to live longer?

However, I was thinking about the overall issue even before Lily brought up the study because of the trends in the US Census data. For example, take the chart I made for my post Are Women Done With Men After Age 55?
Note how the percentage of women who are either divorcées or never married continues to shrink after age 64. This is at a time when their opportunity to marry is extremely restricted. As I have shared before, only 4 out of 1,000 divorced women 65 or over marry in any given year. This data is from 1990, and the long term trend for remarriage is declining. So we know they aren't getting married at the kinds of rates which would empty the pool of divorcées, even if no additional married women became divorced in this age bracket. So why are they declining so rapidly as a percentage of the population? Is there a mass emigration of aging divorcées to exotic lands à la Eat Pray Love?

Perhaps, but my guess is it is due to higher mortality rates for unmarried women later in life. Note that the same kinds of trends show up for men as well. As you look at older and older groups of men, the likelihood of never having married and the likelihood of having divorced and not remarried both approach zero:
Note that this can’t be explained as a vestige of previous marriage rates.

While I was playing with the data, I made another chart I thought my readers would be interested in. Here is the total number of white men and women by age bracket, along with the number of singles (unmarried) in each group. Note that the age brackets are 5 year increments in the center of the data set but not at the tails.
Marriage is bad for women.
by Dalrock | March 25, 2011 | Link

Well, this is embarrassing. I was going to do a satirical writeup on a group of news stories selling divorce, but no matter how hard I try it just isn’t working. I did some troubleshooting and found the problem. I’ve heard about this kind of thing happening to other bloggers, but I never thought it would happen to me:

But that shouldn’t stop you from enjoying a round of female martyrdom complex satire free.

**Entry #1:** New York Times *Once Rare in Rural America, Divorce Is Changing the Face of Its Families* (H/T Kate):

> “As we get more education we get more confidence and more income,” Ms. Vermeer said, “women are saying, ‘Look, she finally had the guts to stand up and walk out.’”

**Entry #2:** *The Atlantic* *Longevity Myths* (H/T Lily):

> women who got divorced often thrived. Even women who were widowed often did exceptionally well. It often seemed as if women who got rid of their troublesome husbands stayed healthy

**Entry #3:** *The Sunday Times* *All change* (H/T Dan S):

> In a new book, Dr Louann Brizendine explains how changes caused by the menopause weaken women’s instinct to hold a family together and liberate them from the need to put up with the failings of second-rate husbands

It goes without saying that any man considering marriage should have a keen eye out for the faintest hint of a martyrdom complex in his prospective wife. The media and others will be whispering this kind of crap for the duration of your marriage. Better to have her carping about why no one will man up and marry her than have her complaining about marrying you.

For those not opposed to leftover smartass, might I suggest:

- Men, stop tricking women into loveless marriages!
- Feminism and women’s happiness.
- Why is the marriage deck stacked against women?

You may also enjoy CSPB’s post on posts: *Which is More Important, the Post or the Hole?*
You can’t make this stuff up.
by Dalrock | March 26, 2011 | Link

- Selling divorce? Check.
- Eat Pray Love nonsense? Check.
- Female Martyrdom? Check.
- Aging Post Marital Spinster? Check.
- Ex husband who ended up better off? Check.
- Photos fit for a geriatric performance of Grease? Check! Check! Check!

Courtesy of The Daily Mail: Think it’s only middle-aged men who buy superbikes, and take young lovers? Meet the WOMEN having midlife crises too

‘I know it sounds like a cliche, but I was desperate to break out of my marriage and do something exhilarating,’ she recalls. ‘For three years before I left my husband I had growing feelings of doubt which, in the end, I just couldn’t ignore.

The thing is, women are waiting so long to marry now they really have to hustle to divorce in time while still playing the trapped in marriage card. Our poor trapped 38 year old heroine was married for a whole 2 years before firing up the script. After three years of melodrama, she pulled the trigger:

So Lucy left Mark, her husband of five years, and their picturesque cottage in Hampshire to embark on a year-long adventure that would lead her to a new life, in a new country, with a new, younger lover.

Now she is 45 and I’m guessing has burned through whatever savings she had. Oh well, I’m sure it will work out just fine for her. She probably will find out that her boyfriend is a secret multi-millionaire. Happens all the time.
Should you game your prospective wife into submission?

by Dalrock | March 27, 2011 | Link

Vox Day gives advice to a reader named LS in his post *Alpha Mail: to marry or not to marry*. LS feels like he has found a woman with unique qualities:

In short, she’s about as close to perfect as I feel I could hope to get, except that she’s not at all open to listening to any new ideas, such as homeschooling.

An even bigger red flag than the homeschooling question is her view on sex in marriage:

I said that I am taking a massive risk by marrying and having children with her. And that I was afraid of having a sexless marriage. She doesn’t see sex as a wifely duty. She didn’t wanna hear it and simply shut down conversation.

Vox offered LS sound advice:

This is not a hard question to answer, but it is perhaps a hard answer to hear. Never marry a woman who does not see sex as part of her marital duties, because she is a woman who does not believe a woman has any marital duties. Sex is the single most important aspect of a marriage, indeed, it can even be theologically argued that sex is marriage.

This woman is already telling LS that she will not accept him as the head of the household, will not put the academic interests of her children ahead of herself, and will only have sex with him when she happens to feel like it. I would be astonished if LS managed to stay married to her for four years, if he is sufficiently unwise as to propose to her.

A number of the commenters were critical of LS’s approach in asking her these questions in the way he did. They felt that instead he should have gamed her into agreement. Joseph Dantes kicked this off:

It’s so much easier to silently lead a woman in the desired direction than to logically pre-approve your course of action.

That’s why I’m tempted to suggest that the guy above simply take from and give to her exactly what he likes without asking first.

Hawiian Libertarian had a similar take:

Based on the way LS phrases this, he’s already off on the wrong foot in this relationship...hes playing into her frame, rather than establishing his own frame and inviting her to join him.
He’s asking her if she’d meet some goal of his...which puts her in the drivers seat; the de facto power holder.

He’s asking her if she’s willing to meet his standards, instead of clearly telling her what his standards are and what the consequences are if they are not met.

Both are probably right from a game perspective. However, I disagree that LS should be using game to achieve compliance from his prospective wife. What he needs to learn are her core values regarding marriage. The last thing he should be doing at this point is feeding her the right answers. If she doesn’t start off with the right view of marriage, Vox is right that their marriage is almost certainly doomed. As I wrote previously in Gaming your wife:

The foundation for her commitment to your marriage shouldn’t be your game. If she is only one, or a few, or even 50 failed shit tests away from walking away from her sacred vow and/or whoring around, then she isn’t a wife, she is a whore. Don’t marry a whore*. Game should be about making you and your wife happier with your marriage, not about putting the sole onus for the success of the marriage on you.

During the screening process for a wife I would say that too much game could actually be a great risk for a man. If she has all of the right answers simply because she is under your spell, this means she doesn’t really have the right core values. Or maybe she does, but you won’t be able to spot which is which. Keep in mind that it is a man’s sacred duty to his future children to do whatever he can to ensure that they grow up with the benefit of an intact family with a mother and father. He owes them the best mother he can find. If she only has the right answers because she was following her tingle, he has failed miserably.

Note: My wife took a quick look at this and said She sounds like the kind who would declare “I’m not haaaapy!” and divorce in a few years.

See Also:

- Women’s expectations in marriage.
- Interviewing a Prospective Wife Part II: Interview Questions
Starting young.
by Dalrock | March 28, 2011 | Link

See also: Supply and demand in the marriage market.
Supply and demand in the marriage market.
by Dalrock | March 29, 2011 | Link

My last post Starting young featured a five year old girl who was already practicing saying no to prospective suiters. As Elusive Wapiti pointed out, it is fairly evident that she has been coached, most likely by her mother. The sentiment is hardly new, and is a standard feminist mantra. The premise is not only that women are somehow demeaned by marrying at a young age, but that wives are the scarce resource and husbands are a dime a dozen.

While the idea is anything but new, the widespread postponement of marriage by women in their 20s is happening to a degree we haven’t seen before. What will be interesting is to see how correct the implicit assumption of there always being another man interested in marriage turns out to be. I’ve shared the US Census data before on marriage rates in table form in the past, comparing marriage rates for white non hispanic women in the 1999 and 2009 census. Hearing the 5 year old’s screed made me want to take a fresh look at the question, using data from the 2010 census as well as the same data from a decade ago. Here is what it looks like in graphic form:
I made a separate chart with just the deltas:
Interestingly women are still marrying at fairly comparable rates in their early twenties, but are falling much farther behind their sisters of 10 years ago by their late twenties. Those women in their early 30s today are the same ones who were in their early 20s in the 2000 census, so you can't necessarily predict that today's late 20 something women will catch up in their thirties. They are starting from a very different baseline.

In fact it would be quite surprising if they were successful en masse in their bid to postpone marriage past their most marriageable years and still marry at previous rates. All of the factors would seem to line up against them. The most marriage minded and eligible bachelors around their age range have either already been selected by their quicker to the draw sisters, or are interested in marrying women 5 to 10 years younger than they are. Additionally, the surplus of single men to women has largely disappeared by the time they are in their 30s. Add to this that a large percentage of available men have likely either learned to be a player or dropped out of the dating market, and the true uphill nature of their
path becomes painfully evident.

As a collective today’s unmarried twenty something women have made men an ultimatum: *I’ll marry when I’m ready, take it or leave it.* This is of course their right. But ultimatums are a risky thing, because there is always a possibility the other side will decide to *leave it.* In the next decade we will witness the end result of this game of marriage chicken.

What I think it will all come down to is who needs/values marriage (as currently defined) more, men or women. This isn’t something that we can think of in terms of absolutes, though. The same man may decide a feminine and chaste early 20 something woman is worth the legal risks men face in marriage, while coming to the opposite conclusion for her ten year older former alpha chasing career gal sister. The older sister is betting that at the end of the day enough successful men will blink when faced with the choice of starting a family with her vs not starting a family at all. We won’t have to wait too long to see if their gamble is right.

If it turns out their gamble was incorrect, this would seem likely to precipitate a wide spread power shift in the marriage market. Just like a real estate market can quickly shift from a sellers to a buyers market, we could see a sea change where men see themselves as the scarce commodity and women fear being the ones without a seat when the music stops.

**See also:**

- [Marriage Strike?](#)
- [Last one down the aisle wins](#)
It is interesting to me how much of what we are discussing and learning in the manosphere is actually relearning what our ancestors already knew. I’ve already shared examples of this with Brothers Grimm and DH Lawrence.

Quite a few of Shakespeare’s most famous plays also are very relevant from a game/manosphere perspective.

Take for example *The Taming of the Shrew*. This play is wildly popular and yet vexing for anyone with a feminist mindset. The quote below from Wiki perhaps best sums this up (emphasis mine):

> The history of the analysis of *The Taming of the Shrew* is saturated with controversy almost from its inception, something Stevie Davies summarises when she writes that response to *The Shrew* “is dominated by feelings of unease and embarrassment, accompanied by the desire to prove that Shakespeare cannot have meant what he seems to be saying; and that therefore he cannot really be saying it.”

When I studied the play 20 years ago in college we were taught that the seeming transformation of Kate from a shrew to a submissive wife surely was some sort of joke Kate and Petruchio were playing on the other characters in the play as well as on the reader. This explanation never made sense to me however, because it didn’t explain why the unruly and headstrong Kate would suddenly want to appear submissive for a man the argument assumes hadn’t *tamed* her.

Only with an understanding of game does the completeness of Kate’s transformation make any sense. In Petruchio we have perhaps the most alpha character in literature. His game is so good and his frame is so strong he can will Kate to redefine her own reality. By the end of the process she is *willing to say the sun is the moon*, or whatever he tells her it is:
PETRUCHIO

I say it is the moon that shines so bright.

KATHARINA

I know it is the sun that shines so bright.

PETRUCHIO

Now, by my mother’s son, and that’s myself,
It shall be moon, or star, or what I list,
Or ere I journey to your father’s house.
Go on, and fetch our horses back again.
Evermore cross’d and cross’d; nothing but cross’d!

HORTENSIO

Say as he says, or we shall never go.

KATHARINA

Forward, I pray, since we have come so far,
And be it moon, or sun, or what you please:
An if you please to call it a rush-candle,
Henceforth I vow it shall be so for me.

PETRUCHIO

I say it is the moon.

KATHARINA

I know it is the moon.

PETRUCHIO

Nay, then you lie: it is the blessed sun.

KATHARINA

Then, God be bless’d, it is the blessed sun:
But sun it is not, when you say it is not;
And the moon changes even as your mind.
What you will have it named, even that it is;
And so it shall be so for Katharina.

While *Taming of the Shrew* has a happy ending thanks to Petruchio's outstanding game, many of the more tragic Shakespeare plays are examples of the danger of a man becoming
too beta. The comments by Anonymous Reader on the Spearhead capture the essence of the problem:

Game makes it clear that any man who puts a woman on a pedestal, or who assumes that she’s more moral than he is, is not only fooling himself, he’s setting himself up for any of several bad results.

**King Lear**

Lear foolishly gives up his power to his daughters, thinking they will appreciate his gesture. He fails a series of shit tests from his two daughters, giving up the remainder of what Shakespeare would call his “power” (armed men). The famous quote from his daughter Regan sums it up quite well:

I pray you, father, being weak, seem so.

But as game would predict his choice to become weak is met with contempt. This leads to unspeakable cruelty, with Kent being placed in the stocks, Gloucester having his eyes gouged out, and Lear going mad.

**Romeo and Juliette**

Young Romeo’s oneitis for a 14 year old girl he has only met once ultimately leads to him committing suicide.

**Othello**

Alpha by position, the general Othello lets his beta side get the best of him when he pedestalizes Desdemona. All it takes are rumors that she loves another man and he strangles her, leading to his own downfall.
The ethics of pump-n-dump.
by Dalrock | April 1, 2011 | Link

I started to reply to this comment from Paige on Supply and demand in the marriage market, but decided to make this a post instead:

I have more respect for a man who Goes His Own Way than a man who pumps-and-dumps. The man-ho’s sexual exploits lowers the SMV of women and creates more bitter feminists. He pollutes the water that all men have to drink from.

I think I understand the emotional reaction this evokes, but logically I don’t see why a pump and dump is less ethical than other forms of uncommitted sex. If a woman wants uncommitted sex, she has to assume the risk that the other party will end the “relationship” before she is ready just like a man does. There seems to be an underlying assumption that women are the only ones with the unilateral right to end an uncommitted relationship at will. If not, why does this create such consternation?

See also:
- Do you love me?
- Why are so many traditional conservative women obsessed with making sure hookups are fair?
Frat boys act like a bunch of frat boys, feds investigate.

by Dalrock | April 2, 2011 | Link

Send in the feds! A group of frat boys have been insensitive to women! From the Yale Daily News:

The University is under investigation by the United States Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights for possible violation of Title IX stemming from an alleged mishandling of several instances of sexual misconduct in recent years.

It must be pretty bad to get the feds involved, right?

…public episodes of sexual misconduct on campus, such as the controversial Delta Kappa Epsilon chanting incident on Old Campus last fall.

Oh no! Not the dreaded Delta Kappa Epsilon chanting incident! This is serious!

Wait, er what was the Delta Kappa Epsilon chanting incident again?

a group of DKE pledges chanted misogynist slogans such as “No means yes, yes means anal” on Old Campus in October, provoking campus outrage

Before you scoff, this isn’t the only instance of frat boys acting with less than total respect towards women. There was another case of insensitivity two years ago, and yet another three years ago:

...a group of Zeta Psi pledges were photographed outside the Women’s Center holding up a sign that read “We Love Yale Sluts.”

[There was also the case of the] “Preseason Scouting Report,” an email circulated among several student panlists that ranked freshman women according to attractiveness

Tell me this is an April fools prank, please!
Thomas Robert Malthus is arguably the most misunderstood economist/philosopher of all time. His name today is synonymous with the antithesis of the point he was actually making; Malthus was not a Malthusian.

Malthus’ core thesis in An Essay on the Principle of Population was that institutions like marriage and parental responsibility functioned as a check against out of control population growth. He was also arguing that state welfare payments will ultimately make the poor both more numerous and worse off.

With regard to population growth, he pointed out that something must be keeping human growth rates in check:

- This implies a strong and constantly operating check on population from the difficulty of subsistence. This difficulty must fall somewhere and must necessarily be severely felt by a large portion of mankind.

That something he identified as misery and vice (emphasis mine):

- Through the animal and vegetable kingdoms, nature has scattered the seeds of life abroad with the most profuse and liberal hand. She has been comparatively sparing in the room and the nourishment necessary to rear them. The germs of existence contained in this spot of earth, with ample food, and ample room to expand in, would fill millions of worlds in the course of a few thousand years. Necessity, that imperious all pervading law of nature, restrains them within the prescribed bounds. The race of plants and the race of animals shrink under this great restrictive law. And the race of man cannot, by any efforts of reason, escape from it. Among plants and animals its effects are waste of seed, sickness, and premature death. Among mankind, misery and vice. The former, misery, is an absolutely necessary consequence of it. Vice is a highly probable consequence, and we therefore see it abundantly prevail, but it ought not, perhaps, to be called an absolutely necessary consequence. The ordeal of virtue is to resist all temptation to evil.

Misery as he uses the term could probably best be described as the privations of poverty, and the desire of parents not to bear children which they could not clothe, shelter, feed, etc. It also applies to the misery of those men and women who are unable to marry, must delay marriage, or if married, must abstain from sex out of fear of having children they cannot afford to care for.

Vice describes any number of immoral ways men and women deal with misery as defined above. Malthus doesn’t go into detail on this, but sex outside of marriage, prostitution, abortion, homosexuality, and perhaps birth control (depending on your view) all seem to fit his use of the term.
All of this strikes me as very relevant to the social and legal upheaval feminism in general and the promotion of female promiscuity in specific have created. With a large percentage of young women today electing to delay marriage and instead focus on their careers while indulging in alpha chasing and/or serial monogamous flings, it follows that an equally large number of young men must choose between misery and vice. This problem is made worse by the transformation of marriage to a wildly unequal legal framework which encourages women to divorce, as well as the fact that a large number of women prefer cads to the average nice guy beta.

In letting this happen, as a society we are insisting that a huge number of men choose between misery and vice. From a theological perspective the answer is easy. They should choose misery. This is true despite the fact that churches across the west can’t be bothered to take meaningful action to preserve marriage or call out young women on the immoral choices they are making. God defines what sin is, and His definition of sin doesn’t change even when Christians as a block can’t be bothered to stand by marriage in a meaningful way.

But the fact that sin is sin doesn’t change the fact that Christians have largely lost their moral authority to speak on the topic of sexual morality. I think this is at the heart of the backlash some Christians have received from men in the comments section of this blog recently. Those who stand by allowing the choices more and more to become misery or vice while tisk tisking those who fail to choose misery understandably evoke a degree of ill will.

Tangled within all of this is the question of whether men and women should be shamed equally for sexual immorality. From a theological perspective it would seem to me that both are equally sinful. As I say in my advice to men choosing a wife, the ideal answer from a prospective wife is disgust with promiscuity across the board. However from a practical perspective I see three problems with shaming men and women equally for promiscuity:

1. The focus of shaming men and women equally has in practice served to excuse female promiscuity instead of reducing promiscuity across the board. In practice once the focus is on fairness the result is lowered pressure on women to remain sexually pure, while not reducing men’s sexual immorality to a noticeable degree. This path leads to more misery and vice.
2. Small amounts of promiscuity do much greater damage to a woman’s eventual ability to remain happily married than it does to men.
3. Even Christian women want a man who has the benefits of the knowledge and confidence which come from sexual success.

I don’t know how to put all of this together in a neat consistent philosophical package. Sin is sin, but I’m interested in offering young men and women something other than a choice between misery and vice.

* Any reader who can point me to the specific quote in the text of his writings where Malthus predicted that population explosion would lead to famine in a traditional social structure would be doing me a great service.
Do you love me?
by Dalrock | April 6, 2011 | Link

Revisiting the topic of pump-n-dump, the key point I was making on my original post is that uncommitted sex doesn’t happen by accident. Both parties go in not wanting to make any explicit promises. If they wanted to, they could agree to stay together as a couple for 3 months, 3 years, or 3 decades. Likewise they can also decide they will be sexually exclusive for the term of the “relationship”. As Doug1 mentioned in his comment on the original post:

> Often a guy won’t know if he’s gonna want at least a fling or something longer when he ends up pumping and dumping a girl who’s not a complete slut. Depends on how much fun and compatible she is post banging, whether she’ll allow a non exclusive kind of relationship for a good while or semi permanently and so on.

Questions of commitment and exclusivity aren’t out of bounds to either party when deciding if they want to have sex. To the extent they aren’t mentioned, each party must feel it is to their advantage not to raise the point.

However, many women wish to have this both ways. Instead of asking the man if he will agree to mutually promise commitment and exclusivity, they will often ask him if he loves her. But make no mistake, this isn’t about *commitment*, it is about his *investment* in her. It is a subtle slight of hand, because investment is typically what a man would offer a woman in exchange for her *commitment* to him. The conflation of the two is a very neat trick, and one which I suspect most women do without consciously considering it. Paige’s recent comment had me thinking about this:

> Relating Pump-n-Dumping to Serial Monogamy assumes more self-awareness in the woman than she actually has. At the beginning the woman is convinced she will be in-love forever...if the romantic feelings decline she believes the relationship is no longer worthwhile for either partner. But she doesn’t just assume at the beginning that this will happen.

Not all women are like that, as Doomed Harlot demonstrated in her comment:
Yes, yes, 100 times, yes, any woman who has uncommitted sex assumes the risk that the man might end the “relationship” (to the extent there is one) before she would want to.

This seems blindingly obvious, to the point that I wonder who would say otherwise? It seemed perfectly clear to me when I first started having uncommitted sex at 18, and it was clear to all my female friends who were having sex at that time.

The fact is that men and women are free to make whatever informal agreement between themselves that they wish to. This doesn’t have the same meaning as marriage, but it is something different than uncommitted sex. On the Misery and vice thread, the topic of a virgin having sex with her fiancé was raised. Sweet As felt that this could make the woman a slut:

A man states that he wants to be married and he wants “marriage material.” He defines “marriage material” as a chaste woman (and/or virgin bride). He values this virginity until he wants to have sex with her, with the promise of marriage. If she gives in, and he breaks up with her, she is — to the next man with the same standard — a slut and therefore no longer marriage material. If she doesn’t give in, she doesn’t trust him.

But the woman in this example wasn’t looking for uncommitted sex. Calling her a slut is way over the top. So for my female readers I offer this handy rule: If you want investment from him without offering him commitment or exclusivity, make him say he loves you before you have sex. If you want commitment and exclusivity, well, ask for that...

Love me image created by Nevit Dilmen.
If you are like me, you know quite a few young men, parents, and young women who would benefit greatly from understanding the realities of attraction and the sexual marketplace. But even starting the conversation is very difficult. Once you see the bigger picture it is obvious, but how do you help someone understand something which goes against the grain of conventional wisdom? In reality most people aren’t open to change, especially if they are older.

But what if you know someone who is somewhat open to learning how things work? Where should you send them? There is an amazing wealth of knowledge in the manosphere, but sending someone to a blog is a dicey proposition. Blogs are a sort of ongoing conversation, so anyone new winds up feeling very much like they are coming in in the middle. By the time they understand enough of the jargon and concepts to understand one post, three more are already up. Plus many of the really good game sites are pretty edgy, to say the least. Someone who values marriage or long term relationships will have to sift through the more pickup focused stuff to find the nuggets of insight. Pretty much all of us went through this ourselves at one point or another, but convincing someone else to make the investment can be a difficult sell. You likely only get one shot, so you don’t want to risk them deciding they don’t want to hear any more about it.

So what should you do? What should I do? My wife and I know a number of men who really need to take the red pill. If my only choice was to send them to the manosphere, I would probably start with Athol Kay and Badger’s sites, and then expand from there after they got their feet wet. But as I said, this is a lot to ask someone new to walk themselves through.

Fortunately Athol Kay has solved my (and perhaps your) problem. As you no doubt already know he has written a book titled The Married Man Sex Life Primer 2011. Books are the perfect format to introduce someone new to a world they were never told about. The format forces the author to define the key concepts and terms upfront, and the reader doesn’t get the feeling that they came in during the middle of the conversation. Also, Athol Kay is pro marriage, so you don’t have to worry about the pickup side turning off your pro marriage and/or religious friends or relatives. Additionally, from reading his blog you already know he is a master of his topic and a gifted writer with a fantastic talent at teaching what would otherwise be fairly complex ideas.
I’ve just placed a copy of his book in my amazon.com cart. As soon as I can find something to make the order size over $25 I’ll pull the trigger. Then I’ll read the book and decide which one of my lucky friends/relatives I’ll grace with a copy first.

Thanks Athol for your incredible dedication to helping other men and marriages. I hope you are richly rewarded for it.
Doomed Harlot is a slut!
by Dalrock | April 10, 2011 | Link

But we already knew that. This is core to her online identity as a sex positive feminist. She feels so strongly about this that she incorporated it into her moniker. But in case we might not have gotten the message, she reminded us in a recent comment:

Sluts* like me opt out of that frame. I decided as a teenager that I was not going to pander to some hypothetical future groom by limiting my sex life, nor was I going to pander to any current boys or men in my life by engaging in sexual activity in exchange for affection. To me, the dignified path was always about having sex if and when it felt desirable and right to me (within certain ethical contraints, those being best summed up as “do no harm” — practice safe sex, ensure the consent of your partner, and be kind). In other words, I had sex because I wanted to have sex, and no other reason. If someone had expressed a concern about my value in the marriage market, I would have said, “Screw that.” Besides, I think that if a woman takes care of herself physically, projects confidence, and behaves like a decent and kind person, she will do just fine on the “market” anyway, so why should she wrap herself up in knots about whether she’s a “slut” or not?

Anyone surprised? Me either. What I did find surprising was the paragraph which immediately followed in the same comment (emphasis mine):

*I self-identify as a “slut” because I have always opposed the double-standard and the transactional view of sex, and have acted accordingly. On the one hand, I may not qualify under the standards set forth here. I never had sex with, or even kissed, anyone other than a premarital boyfriend of several years and my husband. With both men, I had sex with them immediately on a first date within a few weeks of first meeting them with absolutely no expectation of or desire for a further relationship. The fact that I wound up in long term relationships with both men does not change the nature of my initial encounters with them.

I teased her a bit about lacking sufficient initiative as a slut, but I do find this very interesting. I’m sure she has her own reasons (which she is of course welcome to share or not), but my own guess is that it fits with my assessment that the sexual revolution was (and is) more of a long term unraveling of the constraints on women’s promiscuity rather than an event which occurred in the late 60s and early 70s. I think this is one reason parents today struggle to understand how the promiscuity of their sons and daughters could be so different than the promiscuity they experienced and/or witnessed in their youth. We have a generation of parents who think they know slutty or even think they invented slutty, but they really have no idea.
At least the kid can count on his dog.
by Dalrock | April 11, 2011 | Link

I saw this on Drudge a little over a week ago Family dog kept watch over missing 2-year-old overnight:

A missing 2-year-old boy in Elgin was found Saturday morning after Kershaw County deputies say the family dog kept him warm and safe all night.

Pretty cool dog. It was cold out that night, too, with temperatures in the 40s. They don’t say it in the copy, but you can see from the video that the area is very rural. It looks like the kid was in a wooded area. Also one of the commenters on the story claims to live in the area and says the boy was farther from home than the story suggested. Hard to know if it is true, but it has a ring of truth to me:

Witchytiger
The child wasn’t “across the street”... I know this because he was found on my street, and he was actually found about 1/4 of a mile down from his own house...

But how did this happen?

Matthews said the boy’s mother, 25-year-old Jacklyn Marie Jacobson, and her boyfriend Jose Gloria told investigators Tyler went to get some juice and didn’t come back.

Hey kid, pick me up some smokes while you are out!

I know Captain Capitalism will be shocked to learn the father was not part of the household:

…the boy’s biological father is in the Army and stationed in Hawaii, and is currently on his way back to Kershaw County.

When reviewing the story for this post, I found a new one: Missing Elgin toddler seen wandering neighborhood again

The mother of an Elgin toddler that went missing a week ago and her boyfriend were arrested and charged with unlawful conduct toward a child Sunday morning.
Awkward Family Photos.
by Dalrock | April 13, 2011 | Link

Until this weekend, aside from my wife and daughter no one who knows me in real life knows about the blog. I told my sister about it over the weekend, and mentioned that it was listed in the Brainz top 100 Blogs list (which still has me floored). She wasn’t sure what a blog was, or how to access one. I sent her the url for this blog as well as the Brainz list, and waited for feedback.

Yesterday she texted me asking if I had seen the blog Awkward Family Photos on the Brainz list? It is so funny she can’t pull herself away from the computer!

So I checked it out, and she is right. Here are three which fit recent topics of discussion on this blog:

Chivalry

Caption from the AFP site: *All she wanted was a tire change, but she ended up with so much more.*

No Rings for Sluts.

Magineering:
Paige commented on the *Doomed Harlot is a slut!* post that sex positive feminists harm less attractive women by pointing out that the prettiest women don’t pay a price for promiscuity:

Alte has mentioend several times here and at her blog a very important truth when it comes to feminists and the sex-positive.

Not all women are as genetically privileged as other women. Woman A. maybe very pretty, very smart, very charming, and very accomplished. She can 1. be relatively content as a single woman and 2. probably get a man regardless of her behavior.

Woman B. is not very attractive, not very smart, and not very accomplished. Her only hope of a life outside of poverty (because she can only get a job in the service industry) is having a man to help take care of her. If she makes many poor choices it will take her out of the marriage market for all but the lowest quality men.

This is an interesting point, but I think it is even worse. Even a very pretty woman is likely to pay a price for being known as promiscuous. Commenter J mentioned how she met her husband on Susan Walsh’s post *The Importance of Location in Relationship Strategy*:

I was introduced to my husband in a bar at the b’day party of a friend of a friend. It was really *kismet* as I had never been in the bar before and hadn’t really wanted to go to the party. My husband checked out my previous history at the bar (or rather my lack thereof) with some of the regulars BEFORE he manuevered an introduction to me.

I mentioned to J on that same thread that had her husband received a different answer, she could well be posting as an unmarried woman fully convinced that her promiscuity had nothing to do with her life’s outcome:

My point was you never know who you might turn away. Had your husband received a different answer, from what he told you you wouldn’t have ever met him. Instead of a happily married mother of two wonderful sons, you could theoretically be another single woman on this board telling young women that men don’t care about your number so they may as well slut while the slutting is good. And if we hooked this *alternate universe you* up to a lie detector she would pass because she would have no idea that the man of her dreams had joined into another conversation instead of approaching her that otherwise uneventful day all of those years ago.

This is a point that I think nearly all sex positive feminists miss. This same topic came up in another post by Susan Walsh titled *I Earned a Denunciation from NOW.* Sex positive feminist commenter *switchintogliding* declared that her promiscuity hadn’t factored in her relationships with men (emphasis mine):
I’ve been with the same man for four years now in a mostly monogamous relationship, and I can tell you that our relationship was built on a negotiation of dreams, goals, lifestyles, cohabiting, non-monogamy/monogamy, sexual orientation/bisexuality, and all sorts of other things that arise in a long term relationship between equals. I don’t however, remember haggling over the price of my sluthood.

To explain the issue to her, I offered the following analogy:

When we bought our house it had really tacky wallpaper in the kitchen and master bath. It had been on the market for a year despite being reduced to a very attractive price compared to similar homes. My wife wouldn’t consider it at first until I explained that we could do what we wanted with those two rooms. Finally she imagined the home how we would change it and she started to really like the house. We got a great deal on the house, but we never haggled on the price of the tacky wallpaper. That would have been unkind of us. A year on the market with no offers forced the seller to first come down on the price all on their own and then accept our offer of a somewhat lower price than asking.

Women who pay a price for being perceived as promiscuous are highly unlikely to recognize that this is even happening. Furthermore, the idea that really beautiful women can get away with taking a hit to their marriage and/or relationship value only makes sense from the point of view of a less attractive woman. No matter how pretty a woman is, she is going to want the most attractive man she can get. A man who a really pretty woman finds attractive is by definition a man with options. And men with options can afford to be choosy. As we have seen across the manosphere, alpha men are some of the most reluctant to commit to a promiscuous woman. They won’t turn down a pump and dump, but they typically don’t see promiscuous women as marriage material. The problem will seem to her that men are “afraid to commit” and need to man up. Whatever her perceived reason, a pretty woman who can’t attract the kind of man she yearns for is no less unhappy than a woman of average attractiveness in the same boat.

Clouding the issue further is the widespread misunderstanding of what drives attraction for women. The promiscuous pretty woman may ultimately settle for a guy who on paper looks perfect. He might be tall, handsome, have a great job... and be very beta. The fact that her mother and aunts all think she found a great catch doesn’t make the fact that she isn’t attracted to him any less painful. Even worse, by riding the alpha carousel she raised her required threshold for alpha much higher than it would have been. Where greater beta might have been sufficient for a woman of her beauty, she now has developed a taste for full alpha.

I thought about the phenomenon of the perfect on paper only man when reading the WSJ piece My Perfect Honeymoon (That I Spent Alone) (H/T Welmer). In that article author and feminist Jennifer Belle smugly brags about leaving her husband behind on their honeymoon:

But my passport wasn’t missing. I had wedding money and an airplane ticket. So while he stayed home and called his mother to see if she had his birth certificate and made desperate plans to join me as soon as possible, I flew to Venice.
Doing just a bit of research, I found that Ms. Belle was writing about an event which occurred nine years ago when she was 34. On paper her husband would have seemed to be a perfect catch. He had a high status job as an entertainment lawyer. Their combined status as a couple lead to the *New York Times* writing a two page article about their wedding. Her mother and aunts must have been proud! However, Mr. Kent’s faults from an attractiveness point of view are featured prominently in that same wedding announcement. They open the piece by poking fun at his height. *He’s 5-foot-4, even when he’s claiming to be an inch taller, which he sometimes does.* Even Aunt Edna must have cringed at that one. But still, a short man can do quite well if he has good enough game.

This is where it gets worse; the wedding announcement goes into detail about how he failed her shit testing on their very first date:

> But when a playwright came by and offered "money" for her to kiss his ear, she negotiated for less money to kiss the writer’s neck — and did. “To make Andy jealous,” she said.

> Mr. Krents, who friends say has always acted 20 years older than his age, became slightly unglued. “Here we were just getting to know each other,” he said, “and you don’t know if you’re even going to get to a second date, and here are people doing unspeakable things that you do on the fourth or fifth dates.”

That can’t have done anything good for her tingle, but it would seem she didn’t have any better options. They continued dating and then she brought him into her world:

> A year later, Mr. Krents moved into Ms. Belle’s Greenwich Village apartment, where she freed the child within him, the boy who always wanted his own bulldog. They bought Sammy, a French bulldog.

I’m sure if you asked Ms. Belle, she would swear neither her sluthood nor her bitchy feminism had cost her anything when it came time to marry.

I’m also guessing she would change the subject and plug her new novel, *The Seven Year Bitch*. 
Has feminism jumped the shark?
by Dalrock | April 18, 2011 | Link

It strikes me that the widely panned Dear Woman video is feminism jumping the shark. The video wasn’t just panned in the Manosphere. Bloggers as divergent as Advice Goddess (H/T Deansdale) Manboobz, and The Frisky all had the same take; it was creepy.

What is interesting is what those guys were doing was buying into the basic selling point for feminism to men: Adopt this groveling world-view and women will like you. For single men the selling point has always been about sex, and for married men the pitch has been a blend of sex and a promise that it will make your wife happy.

Feminism has been so successful selling men on political groveling for sex and women’s approval that other left wing causes have joined the fray. They may be selling a different message, but the fundamental point is the same; follow the politics and world-view of women and you will be rewarded with sex. Blogger Big Little Wolf utilizes this argument when making the case for redefined chivalry.

Clearly the guys who made the Dear Woman video were just following the feminist message to its logical conclusion. How is it that even feminists found it creepy?

Sometimes you have to see an idea taken to its logical conclusion to really understand how ridiculous it is. In that sense we all owe the neutered males of Dear Woman a debt. They single handedly showed how ridiculous the foundation for selling feminism to men really is.

For feminists the problem is worse though, it isn’t just that their fundamental argument to men has been demolished; in many ways they are losing ground with women as well. Part of their problem is the spreading understanding of game. Right now only a small fraction of men or women understand the science of attraction. However, this is the kind of secret even the KGB couldn’t have kept from spreading. How long before nearly every high school and college age man has a basic understanding of game (even if many lack the skills to put it into practice)? Part of learning game is understanding how differently men and women think. The whole women are just men who sit down to pee argument of feminism goes straight out the window. And it isn’t just men who are learning about game. Women are learning about it too and from what I have seen after some confusion/denial they quickly grasp the truth of it. It may actually be easier for women to accept game than men, because they don’t have to admit that they have been doing it all wrong for so many years, and they also don’t have to overcome the resentment that men often feel when they realize that they were rejected for being too nice.

The other problem feminism has is momentum. What have they achieved in the last 20 years? What can they hope to achieve in the future?

Third wave feminism has largely focused on redefining terms they feel are harmful to women:

Words such as spinster, bitch, whore, and c*nt continue to be used in derogatory
ways about women. Inga Muscio writes, “I posit that we’re free to seize a word that was kidnapped and co-opted in a pain-filled, distant, past, with a ransom that cost our grandmothers’ freedom, children, traditions, pride, and land.” Third-wave feminists believe it is better to change the connotation of a sexist word than to censor it from speech.

They have been extremely successful here. The vast majority of women now either actively approve of female promiscuity or largely remain silent on the topic out of fear of promoting a double standard. We also have seen a general embrace of bitchiness and selfishness/entitlement driven by a concern that any social restraints on women are proof of a diabolical patriarchal conspiracy. Women generally also have a pathological fear of pleasing their husbands and boyfriends. We also see the vast majority of women defending divorce fantasy movies and accepting the selling of divorce to women, or at the very least remaining silent about them. Additionally, feminism has continued to successfully sell a sense of female martyrdom and unhappiness to women.

But all of the successes of feminism in the last few decades have been about changing attitudes. When it comes to achieving their stated dream of a world where women were just as competent as men, feminists have generally lost interest. I know a large number of women professionally and personally who are extremely capable and successful. I’ve worked with competent women, for competent women, and managed competent women as part of a project team. However, feminism isn’t about creating competent women. Instead it is about lowering standards for women and making any lack in competence up with moxie.

Even feminists struggle to define any real advances they have made for women in the last few decades. In Susan Walsh’s post I Earned a Denunciation from Now, commenter Jess set out to explain to non feminists how feminist activism had changed the world for the better:

People forget how things have changed due to feminist activism. Let me tell you about a case from the early 90s that I was involved with- a girl very nearly died due to a savage rape in London. Although the guy got a heavy sentence the judge actually said she had an element of blame because she wore a short skirt and get this, so did her mother! Naturally the feminist lobby went beserk and it was cases like this that did change attitudes. Any judge saying that now would be struck off in the UK.

So the real difference of 20 years of activism; the rapist would not get any harsher sentence, but the judge would fear losing his job if he pointed out common sense precautions which might prevent another woman from being victimized. In the area of women’s safety, feminists have generally chosen to pretend that women don’t face different risks to their safety than men do. If someone points out that it isn’t a good idea for women to get into cars with strangers, feminists will mock them and minimize the risk.

There are some other achievements feminists can point to. In many cases, men accused by women no longer have the presumption of innocence which until fairly recently was a foundation of our justice system.

More important than what feminists have achieved lately is the question of what they can
hope to achieve in the future. Feminists have a rather unique problem of having thoroughly conquered all social institutions in the west without having achieved their stated goals. This past thorough success ironically spells a problem for future progress, as Welmer points out in his post The Tide has Already Turned:

Speculation aside, the reality is that feminism has already begun to decline. That so many media outlets and women are declaring its victory means nothing; the fact is that they have far less of value to offer women than they did ten years ago, and they will have even less in another ten years. Every man who is ruined so that his hormonally deranged wife can realize her soap opera fantasies, every business dismantled by a sexual harassment lawsuit, every man tossed in prison at public expense, and every productive job replaced by a woman pushing paper at a government-funded nonprofit is a material loss for women in aggregate. Because we no longer have significant excess wealth, women are going to have to pay for each feminist victory with a decline in their wealth and standard of living. It may not be entirely obvious yet, but it will be soon enough, and at that point we will see a rise in anti-feminism amongst women themselves.
Newsflash: My marriage still doesn’t suck!

by Dalrock | April 20, 2011 | Link

I stumbled on a post by Captain No Marriage recently which makes me think I have been remiss: Newsflash: Marriage Sucks ……Still! (crass site warning). It starts off describing a scene all too familiar:

While talking to a buddy of mine today in my office, we heard the shrill sound of a old hag’s voice as it carried across the office “All men are stupid!”

Actually this particular warpig loves to frequently complain about how stupid her husband is and about how lost he’d be without her. This of course gets the other dried up hens echoing the same brainless chatter.

While I might have worded it differently, I have to say I’ve witnessed similar scenes. I even agree to a large extent with his next point:

The real joke is on these typical loud mouth American bitches, too bad they’re drinking too much of their own kool-aid to figure it the f*ck out. They don’t have a husband, they have a hostage. A hostage who if he did decide to leave would be stripped of not just his current assets, but his future American bitchassets including his retirement!

The irony is that these women are miserable precisely because they got exactly what they thought they wanted. Not unlike Ms Belle, they are in a hell of their own creation.

What made me want to post on this however was this next bit:

Trust me, if marriage kicked ass you’d be hearing about it from your married friends. We’re not sitting on some fucking golden ticket here, let me tell ya!!! Have you ever had one of your buds talk about how ever since marrying his wife she goes to the gym more, loves blow jobs, can’t get enough sex, cooks dinner every night, doesn’t try to change him........you get the point.

That shit NEVER happens, especially the so called “perfect couple”, if you get the guy off to himself and a few beers in him he’ll open up about how little sex he really gets, about how he’s one minute away from financial ruin because of all her spending, basically he’ll tell you just how perfect they are NOT!

While not denying the reality that the Captain has witnessed, this isn’t the world I live in. At least it isn’t a complete picture of the world. I won’t go into TMI territory, but I don’t have any of the complaints as a husband that he is listing. My wife cooks nearly every day and is a fanatic about keeping herself in shape. The sex is great in every way. We laugh all the time and even after 16 years of marriage still stay up late talking about any topic you can imagine.

Every night I put our son to bed; no matter what is going on he always makes me laugh. Actually I make him laugh first by tickling him and he makes me laugh by being so contagious with his wide mouthed grin. If I am fixing or working on something, our daughter
appears instantly to watch. It doesn’t matter if I’m fixing the dishwasher or tuning up the
lawn mower; it is all fascinating to her.

	My wife and daughter make me laugh too, especially when they play Barbies. It all starts
with one of the Barbies announcing that she is trapped in marriage and needs to divorce to
find herself. Then Hunter Ann lures the frivolous divorcée Barbie into the Divorcée Jam arena
with promises of more alimony before driving over her in Scarlet Bandit. Shoes, handbags
and designer hats all go flying in different directions. I need to get it on film one of these days
but as you can imagine a good time is had by all!

I don’t always write about this kind of thing because it strikes me as potentially in poor taste.
There are no shortage of men or women suffering because of the dysfunction feminism has
wracked on our larger culture. But I also think that not talking about these things can be in
poor taste as well. Blogger One STDV emailed me a while back asking if I wanted to weigh in
on the anti marriage attitude in the manosphere. I struggle some with this because I don’t
want to minimize the risks. As Athol Kay commented in response to my post on interviewing
a prospective wife:

| Good marriages are great. Bad marriages are terrible.

I would add that I also see a lot of marriages which are somewhere in between. I know wives
who put up with profound betaness in their husbands and yet aren’t looking to cheat or
divorce. I know other couples which are pretty happy, but could be amazingly happy if they
made some basic changes. I also know couples where neither one knows anything about
game but managed to achieve the same results just by trial and error.

For those of my readers who are happily married, I ask that you share your own experiences
in the comments. None of this is to deny the bad cases we all have seen and read about, but
we need to tell the good stories as well.
Changing attitudes of college grads about divorce.
by Dalrock | April 21, 2011 | Link

While doing some research for another post I came across some surprising findings by Dr. Steven P. Martin in his presentation Education and Marital Dissolution Rates in the United States. Dr. Martin is a professor of Sociology at the University of Maryland, and his speciality is Demography. On page 19 of his presentation he shows how the opinions of college grads on divorce have changed over time. Scores below 1 indicate that divorce should be made easier, 1 indicates it should stay the same, and greater than 1 indicate it should be harder to divorce.

Echoing grerp’s assertion of a generational shift in attitudes about divorce (page 17):

“(O)n the core social question of whether family fragmentation is a bad thing or a not-so bad thing, a steady shift in popular and (especially) elite opinion took place over the course of the 1990s. Denial and happy talk about the consequences of nuclear family decline became decidedly less widespread; concern and even alarm became much more common. As a society we changed our minds, and as a result we changed some of our laws. And now, it seems, we are beginning to change some of our personal behavior. This is very encouraging news.” — Blankenhorn (2002)
This book came out roughly a year or so ago, and while I recall some note of it in the manosphere I don’t recall anyone writing a blog post on it.

I should admit upfront I haven’t read the entire book (and don’t intend to). I have read most of Chapter 1 since it is available as a free preview, and I’ve looked at the table of contents and several sections of the book using the search this book feature at Amazon. They also have a website for the book which has some more information on it.

This post is part one of a two part series, and part two will address the statistic regarding divorce rates they use as the foundation for the book.

The fundamental premise of the book is that women shouldn’t marry until they are in their 30s and that having a fabulous single life leads to an even better marriage later.

They back this up with impressive sounding statistics and less impressive anecdotes. Two of the women in Chapter 1 who they use as examples of women who married before they knew who they were divorced largely because their husbands remained unemployed. A third example stayed married but they argued she would have been better at handling the stress of infertility had she married and started trying to conceive her 3 children later in life. In fact, they list mistaken concerns about fertility as one of the 10 reasons women wrongly marry in their 20s in chapter 2 (p 30):

“If I marry later, shouldn’t I be worried about infertility?” Not necessarily. How’s that for definitive? Seriously, though, we know hundreds of women personally and professionally who have struggled with infertility. But this is key: Some of the women married at twenty-three, while others married at forty-three. If a woman is going to have fertility problems before her late thirties, it doesn’t matter what age she starts trying to conceive--she will experience infertility.

They reinforce this later on page 31:

While it is true that a woman’s fertility begins to decline at age thirty-five, the risk of infertility doesn’t rise significantly until age forty. Data from the National Center for Health Statistics reveal that women between thirty-five and forty-four years old have a 78 percent chance of conceiving in a year. And don’t believe all the hype in the media about the epidemic of infertility--in fact, the cases of infertility have declined since 1965. Back then, one in nine couples were considered infertile; in 1988, only one in thirteen couples were infertile. Nowadays, in fact, there are plenty of role models of mature motherhood: Nicole Kidman (41), Minnie Driver (38), Gillian Anderson (39), Juliana Margulies (41)...
Fun Fact: If you wait until you are 35 to have your first child, and your child does the same you will be 70 when your first grandchild is born! I’m not an expert on fertility, but I think they are giving young women an unrealistic expectation regarding later life fertility and pregnancy. My wife was 20 when we married but we didn’t decide to try to have children until she was 29. It took us roughly a year for her to conceive, and then of course another 9 months until our daughter was born. By that time my wife was 31. After that my wife wanted to take a few years to get her body back and get our daughter out of diapers, etc before trying for our second child. Our son also took about a year to conceive and my wife was 35 by the time we found out she was pregnant. Because she was 35, they treated this pregnancy differently including visits to a specialist for extra sonograms. They did this because the risk for chromosomal defects increases as a woman gets older, as the chart below using data from Ask.com demonstrates:

I wonder how many readers of their book know that starting at age 35 doctors consider it a geriatric pregnancy? The term doesn’t come up in amazon’s search feature for the book, so I’m guessing they left that part out. Things worked out just fine for us, but if we had it to do over I think we would have started a few years earlier. Also, this assumes that they find Mr. Right and marry him the instant they decide they are ready to marry. I think it makes sense to assume at least 2-3 years to find the right guy, get to know him, get engaged, and get married. So a woman who isn’t ready to marry until she is 30 shouldn’t expect to be married until she is around 32 or 33 at the soonest. If she wants to wait until they aren’t newlyweds to start trying to conceive that would put her around 34 to start the process we started when my wife was 29. If she wants to wait a few years to make sure her marriage is solid before starting she will be in her late thirties when she starts trying to have her first child. Also, cutting things to the last minute on finding a husband carries its own risks.
As you might imagine this book is telling young women exactly what they want to hear. I can’t confirm the rumors of a planned follow on book where they advise young men to not waste their 20s establishing their career and instead have a fabulous single life playing video games and doing bong hits in their parent’s basement while working part time at the car wash. Here is the most popular review of the book at amazon:

This book is in competition with my laptop for “Most Important Possessions.” I’m no longer waiting around wondering if each guy is “Mr. Right.” I’m living- and Loving- my own life. This has been a revolutionary concept change. I love the exercises and questionnaires, and it addresses everything from wardrobe to finances to sex!! I especially liked the chapter about tapping into your adventurous side. This book helped me realize my own beliefs and feelings about things and realize that I’m not just waiting to get somewhere-I am Here...and I can grab the bull by the horns. Now when “Mr. Right” does come he’ll accent and enhance my life- he won’t BE my life. The authors have a witty yet insightful approach to some very real issues. I couldn’t put the book down. I bought one for my sister and my roommate (’cause I’m not sharing mine!!) -Jenn

Sorry gentlemen, she’s not on the market right now for anything serious. Uncommitted sex is ok, but don’t waste your time with her if you want commitment. However sometime down the road she will be more than happy to make you an accessory to her fabulous life.

Fertility and the attraction changes which accompany carousel riding aside, this really brings up the question of what they think Mr. Right will do while waiting to become an accessory in her fabulous life. Why won’t he marry one of her peers in the meantime who is more serious about marriage? Or if he waits, why will he want to marry her in her 30s when he can marry a woman in her 20s? This is of course assuming he doesn’t drop out or become a player, both of which are also likely outcomes. I don’t think they really address this, and this is what I think will be the biggest obstacle for the women the book takes in.

Put another way, they have written a recipe for how a woman should live in her 20s. Is this a recipe for a fabulous married life, or a recipe for disaster? If this were one of those cooking shows on TV they would have a version ready baked to pull out immediately after they put it in the oven.

As it turns out we are in luck. Even though the book is recent a large number of young women have been following their advice for the last decade. Why not see how it has worked for them? Lets start with the fine ladies at Date me, D.C.! and their post Precipice of Spinsterhood (H/T Frost):

You see, Megs and I — as well as a plethora of our other fabulous female friends — find ourselves in a precarious and perplexing position: We’re cute. We’re smart. We’re articulate, well-traveled (her more so than me), energetic, fun and down to explore. And yet, at 29 and 28, respectively, we are still single — standing on 30’s lonely doorstep — with ZERO reasonable prospects.

In the past, we would have resorted to self-flagellation — “What is wrong with me?” we may have asked through tears and a bottle of pinot. “Why aren’t there any guys
who want to stick around?”

I don’t get it, they sound like they followed the advice in the book to a T. Why aren’t men with engagement rings beating a path to their well-traveled doors? A bit further down she elaborates:

It is NOT us. It’s you people — you men and your wayward penises. Megs and I have spent enough time with you all to come to the depressingly stark conclusion that at our ages, there are simply no acceptable men to date.

It’s a strange phenomenon that slowly builds as you enter your late 20s/early 30s as a woman. We are watching the window of opportunity inch toward closed because from our vantage point, there is literally something entirely undateable about every single man we meet.

Echoing Solomon II’s post The Marriage Zone (crass site warning), she offers this handy chart:

But it isn’t just the fine ladies in DC and Solomon II who have made this observation. The blogger at Diary of Why makes the same observation on her post Why I’m not getting any less single here:

Here is my theory: I missed the window. I missed that crucial 24-27 window when everyone finds the person they want to eventually settle down with. Coincidentally enough, I too found myself in my most important and most enduring relationship so far between what ages? 24 to 27, of course, almost to the day. And didn’t I think I was sitting pretty, then, imagining our future together. And then of course, it all fell apart. Oh shit, I said, and I watched that window closing right before my eyes.

A little further down she adds:

Do I even have to mention that my window theory only applies to women? Think about it. If an even remotely attractive and intelligent guy for some reason finds himself single again at 29, just watch how fast he’s snatched up. So why is it that what for him is an asset becomes a liability for a woman of the same age? Because
it’s the law of supply and demand, people, and an unattached 29-year-old guy is a hot commodity. Meanwhile the market is saturated with women just like me. Intelligent, reasonably attractive women in their late twenties and thirties are a dime a dozen.

On the bright side I don’t think this book is telling young women to do anything they hadn’t already decided to do. Still, feeding hamsters is kind of cruel. Reading some of the reviews and skimming the book it doesn’t sound like all of their advice is bad. They pay lip service to stopping hooking up, and the basic advice that women shouldn’t marry until they are mature enough to make a commitment they are willing to keep is solid. Where they go terribly wrong in my opinion is giving young women the impression that they don’t have to grow up until they are 30, and that a line of men will be waiting to marry them when they do.

See also:

- Last one down the aisle wins part 2: The data
- Supply and demand in the marriage market
- 40 is the new 20!
In part 1 of this series I promised to go through the statistic shared in this book in a later post. The key statistic used to justify the arguments in the book is shared upfront in Chapter I (emphasis mine):

Here’s the key: Don’t Marry Young. In fact, don’t get married until you’re thirty. According to the National Center for Health Statistics, your chances of staying married more than double if you get married after the age of twenty-five. That’s right, the old “50 percent of all marriages end in divorce” statistic is literally cut in half for those who marry for the first time after twenty-five. And after thirty combined years of working with women on the verge of divorce, we’re taking it a step further and saying that you’ll have even better odds the closer you are to thirty.

Wow. That is a pretty powerful stat if it is true. But I’ve learned not to trust the headlines and to look at the source before taking this kind of statement on face value. They don’t reference which NCHS report they pulled their stats from, and so far they haven’t replied to my email Thursday asking them to point me to the specific study they used*. However, I was able to find a 2002 report from NCHS which covered the topic. Here is what it shows:

The only way I can torture these results to match the chances of divorce are cut in half if you marry after age 25** claim is if I compare the divorce rate (all races) of those who marry at age 25 or over with the rate of those who marry before age 18. But their book is specifically targeted to women in their 20s. From the Product Description on Amazon:

getting a ring on your finger is the last thing you should be thinking about when you’re in your twenties
To show how dogmatic they are on this point and how they use the statistics, take a look at this transcript at the Washington Post*** of a discussion they had with a young woman while promoting the book. One woman asks:

**Suburbs, VA:** I’ve been dating my boyfriend since we were 17 (we are 23 now). We went to college apart, have grown as our own people, and still have a great relationship that we know will result in marriage some day. While neither of us are in a rush to get married yet, it seems sort of silly to just wait until we are an arbitrary age (say, 27) before tying the knot, when we are already with the person we’ll marry. Do you see exceptions in this case?

Their answer is that “there’s nothing arbitrary about our recommendation to wait until your late twenties to marry”, and they then repeat the reference to the statistic from the NCHS. This woman wasn’t asking why she should avoid marrying when 17 or younger, she was asking what was wrong with marrying at age 23. **Not only did they not address her actual question, but they used scare tactics to frighten her away from marrying at her current age.** This makes me suspect that they are either incredibly dishonest or just plain don’t know how to read basic statistics. Who in the world is counseling women to marry at 17 or younger? And why would finding that marriage at such a young age often results in divorce cause them to suggest women wait until they are 30, when the data suggests that early 20s has a very similar divorce rate as later 20s?

In considering the 23 year old woman’s actual question, what we are left with is a mild correlation between lower divorce and a woman marrying in her later 20s vs early 20s. But correlation doesn’t prove causation. Just because people who marry later tend to divorce less doesn’t mean if everyone waited to marry there would be less divorce.

The key question is who marries later, and does this group tend to have lower divorce rates not explained by age at first marriage?

Historically those who complete college tend to marry a little later, for fairly obvious reasons. This gap has narrowed very recently, but any data analyzing divorce rates is backward looking so the gaps of the past are what matter. The 2002 report referenced above used data from a 1995 study (it is the same NCHS report we looked at here for remarriage rates), so what matters in this case is the trends in place around the 1980s. This is important because education correlates strongly with lower divorce rates, as Steven P. Martin shows in his research presentation Education and Marital Dissolution Rates in the United States. He not only found that women with a college degree are far less likely to divorce (pages 10-13), but that the difference in divorce rates isn’t explained by their later average age at marriage (p 14). The same connection with education and lower divorce rates was observed in the PEW research publication The Reversal of the College Marriage Gap.

In addition, there are other factors correlated with education (and thus later average marriage) which are known to correlate with lower rates of divorce including intelligence and income.

* It is possible they were referencing a different report which I couldn’t find. If they respond to my request I will do a follow on post.
** They actually make the claim that a woman’s chance of staying married will more than double, not that her chance of divorce will be cut in half. Since the lowest chance of (all races) staying married for 10 years in the chart is 52%, I’m assuming they actually meant it would cut the likelihood of divorce in half. I’m not sure where the “more than” came from unless they were only looking at the data for white women. They could of course make a case for this but they should have clarified the distinction when they made the claim.

*** Also see how they respond to another woman’s concerns about fertility in the same transcript.
Advice to a woman in her 30s looking to marry.
by Dalrock | April 26, 2011 | Link

Anonymous posed the following question in the comments section of Last one down the aisle wins part 1:

Dalrock – I understand the warning to the younger women to avoid this path, and the warning to mentors/society to quit giving this advice, but for the single women in their early thirties that have previously bought into the standard make-yourself-interesting-and-have-a-career mentality (but not the sex in the city mentality) and since realized it's a bunch of crap, what is your suggestion to them? We could use some honest advice. I realize it’s a very unenviable position, but assuming good intentions and kind demeanor, what's the best that can be done with what we have?

I decided to respond to this in the form of a post largely because I hope to enlist my readers in this process as well. If you have any kind wisdom to share with her, please do so. By the same token, while I normally am pretty wide open on comments I don’t want to tee her up for a series of cat food jokes. As Elusive Wapiti says, comment with honor.

My first thought is she is already ahead of her peers in both how she is considering the issue and the fact that she didn’t partake in the sex in the city mentality. My sense is that the biggest challenge women tend to face in her position is the change in attraction which can come from being with men who aren't likely to want to marry her. While eligible men may be harder to locate and attract for a woman in her 30s than they were in her 20s, I think her ability to pair bond within her own “marriage league” is the far bigger challenge.

Finding eligible men:

As many others have already said, your first challenge will be to figure out what your priorities are in a husband so you can make the best “deal” possible. A good way to do this is list what you would trade for what. Is a good job more important than height? Is a sense of humor more important than looks? How much game would you be willing to give up for some other quality. This is true for men and women of any age looking to marry, but given the amount of focus on women in their 30s in this regard I suspect there is at least a kernel of truth to the stereotype. If you have one of those famously long “must have” lists for your future husband you probably want to do some thoughtful pruning.
Keep in mind that this isn’t about *settling*, it is about getting the most bang for your SMV buck. If you can pull a man who looks like Brad Pitt, is 6 ft 6, has perfect game and earns like Bill Gates then of course you should do so.

As for where to look, in addition to the traditional methods I would be on the lookout for men who have been as focused on their careers as you have been. Depending on your field of employment you may find your best options are right in front of you. The other group of men I would consider are men younger than you and/or men who would traditionally have been marriageable in their 20s but essentially dropped out of the dating/marriage market due to lack of interest from women their own age. Dating is generally a big ego boost and a lot of fun for women in their 20s, but unless a guy is a player dating tends to be the exact opposite for men in their 20s. Some of these guys ended up playing video games in their parent’s basement, but not all have. There have to be quite a few unclaimed eligible bachelors out there whom the right woman could coax back into the game. The trick of course is how to find them. By definition they won’t be the guys at the clubs, online dating sites, or the guy who runs day game on you. But you might bump into him in any number of public spaces nonetheless. Just don’t expect him to start the conversation and generate instant attraction and comfort. If he is marriage minded and knew how to do that, he wouldn’t be single.

**Attracting men:**

In addition to your physical beauty, you can also make yourself more attractive to prospective husbands by your attitude. Keep in mind that you don’t have to be perfect; you just have to be better than your core competition, who are women roughly your age and of similar looks. *As the old joke goes:* you don’t have to beat the bear, you just have to beat the other camper. Based on what I have read from men looking for wives in their 30s or later the two key traits you can bring to the table are *humility* (to a degree) and a *serious attitude* about marriage.

**Generating attraction for your prospective husband:**

This seems to be the hardest part, at least for some women. Hopefully you won’t have any
issue here. I think there probably are some ways a woman can tune her tastes for men even in her 30s, but I’m guessing if someone found an easy way to make large shifts here we would have already heard about it. The humility I mentioned before and a painfully honest self assessment of your SMV will probably come in handy here. Also, I suspect that following some of the old customs women and men used to follow might help some. Simple things like having him drive, order for you at a restaurant, and deferring to him in appropriate areas, etc. Basically anything which would make a good feminist cringe. But if at the end of the process you can’t fall head over heels in love with the man, my advice would be to stop there. I have a post ready to go for later this week on the same topic; it just isn’t ethical for a woman to marry a man she isn’t truly in love with and attracted to.

I hope my thoughts on this are at least somewhat helpful. The last thing I will share is even though it is more difficult in your 30s it doesn’t mean it isn’t possible. My wife and I met a couple on a cruise a few years back who were newlyweds. The wife was in her early to mid 30s and the husband was in his mid 20s. He was a bit on the husky side (in an athletic way), but was extremely smart, funny, and had excellent natural game. I think they will be very happy together. Also, a number of commenters to this site have mentioned finding and marrying the love of their lives in their 30s or later. This of course is also borne out in the census stats. A significant number of women marry in their 30s and (to a lesser degree) in their 40s and beyond.

Information on chainsaw image available on wiki commons.
When writing the post on advice to a woman looking to marry in her 30s, I suggested she consider what good qualities in a man she would be willing to trade for more of some other good qualities. Part of what I was thinking about at the time is a tool used in project management called a Flexibility Matrix.

This is something a project manager fills out with direction from the sponsors when first starting the project. Sometimes the terms are slightly different, but the basic concept remains the same. If you have to choose, where are your priorities? Project sponsors are like everyone else; they want everything, and they want it cheaply (or for free) and they want it right away. No one can blame them, but sometimes reality doesn’t conform to their desires. This is where the flexibility matrix comes in. If the project represented in the chart above runs into problems, the project manager and the sponsor have already agreed that if needed they will add additional resources (funding, people, etc) to keep the schedule on time and avoid cutting features. If additional resources aren’t enough, their next decision would be to cut features to meet the project deadline. Deciding this upfront keeps everyone on the same page and makes the tough choices which can come up down the road easier to manage.

I know we are talking about a very subjective and emotion driven topic in a hyper rational way, but there is value in at least some careful planning. At the end of the process the outcome will be part plan, part emotion, and part gut instinct, and that is ok.

Anyway this is a fairly simple concept that I thought might add some to the existing discussion.
Received wisdom in the manosphere is that women need to settle. I have to say I enjoy a good hamster carpet bombing as much as the next guy. But in the end the entertainment value isn’t worth the human cost. I’ve touched on this before, but after seeing the article Did You Marry the Wrong Guy? from Marie Claire (H/T GudEnuf) I wanted to revisit it.

The problem with telling women they need to settle isn’t that they won’t listen. The problem is that they will listen, or at least use this message as rationalization for wrecking an honest man’s life. The problem occurs because women don’t think like men. If you tell a man he has too high a sense of his own value in the dating/marriage marketplace, he is likely to be humbled by this. Actually no one needs to tell the typical guy this because they tend to figure it out based on which women are and aren’t attracted to them.

Too many women (especially the kind of women the message is aimed at) however hear this message and decide this means they should marry the well off guy they aren’t attracted to, ultimately doing him the favor of taking his kids and half his stuff when they figure out they don’t love him anymore. According to the Marie Claire article this is quite common:

According to recent research conducted by Jennifer Gauvain, a therapist in Denver, 30 percent of now-divorced women say they knew in their gut they were making a mistake as they walked down the aisle — and kept walking anyway. Only a handful backed out.

Being a women’s magazine, the article goes on to explain that the women themselves aren’t to blame for leaving a trail of wreckage in their wakes because society made them do it. The reality is they feared loosing the option to choose, and wanted the status that came with getting married as well as his money. He wasn’t likely to give up half of his stuff and pay for her to have children if she didn’t pretend to be in love with him in order to marry him:

Clark had dated a handsome businessman for four years before they got engaged, and although he didn’t make her heart race, she still loved him. “We were best friends, and I thought he’d make a great husband and father, even though I wasn’t ‘in love,’” she says. “I walked down the aisle thinking, What the hell? During my vows, I wasn’t making eye contact with my fiancé.”

Five years and two kids later, their sex life nonexistent, Clark wanted out. “I’d often wish he would cheat,” she says. Finally, her husband, sensing her unhappiness, ended it.

I see this woman as beneath more traditional gold diggers and prostitutes. She isn’t just harming him, but putting her children through great pain as well. Aside from stealing his wealth and children, she also stole his opportunity for great happiness. The truth is another woman would likely have found this same man quite attractive and lovable. She had no right to rob him of that because she lacked the capacity to reciprocate love but still wanted all of...
the benefits of marriage. Some might say that he should have learned game and all would have been well. Aside from the fact that this isn’t common knowledge in our culture, had he learned game he would have been able to marry a much better woman. She wanted a man of his appearance wealth and status with game, but none of them wanted her or she would have married one of them.

My guess is the root cause of women who are incapable of experiencing reciprocal love and attraction is a blend of the mismatch feminism has created between men and women, the impact of alpha chasing/promiscuity, and an overall entitlement complex. Whatever the cause of the issue, it does appear to be real for a significant percentage of women.

Making things worse, older women consistently advise younger women to pass up men they are in love with and attracted to with the assumption that another better man will be along shortly. We have seen this with Advice Goddess, Amy Dickinson, and the authors of Last one down the aisle wins. The reality is that experiencing mutual attraction isn’t a given for women, and should therefore not be abandoned lightly. This also is why the advice to women to postpone marriage and “just have fun” for a decade or more is so detrimental to them. Finding a man who they can reciprocate love and attraction with is difficult for many women, and only gets harder the older they become.

So stop telling women to settle. I beg you! The innocent (but clueless) beta you save may be someone you know.

I think this is the single biggest risk a man looking to marry faces. This is even bigger in my opinion than a woman’s sexual history, although the two are often connected.

See Also:

- Are the vast majority of women truly incapable of experiencing reciprocal love and attraction?
- You are cordially invited to a hamster hunt
- Men, stop tricking women into loveless marriages!
- Why is the marriage deck stacked against women?
- Women’s expectations in marriage.
- Women shouldn’t settle
A heart felt thank you to everyone who shared their own stories of happy marriages, and to those who offered kind wisdom in the comments section of my post offering advice to a woman looking to marry in her 30s. In addition to the comments on the topic of happy marriages, three different bloggers wrote their own response in blog form:

- OneSTDV isn’t married but shared his thoughts in his post Anti-Family Attitude of the Manosphere.
- Elusive Wapiti wrote on the topic in his post My Marriage Doesn’t Suck Either
- Ulysses sounded off with his Double Entendre.

On the topic of advice, I should have another column out in the next few days responding to a reader’s question via email. I look forward to reading your thoughts in the comments section of that post as well.

Blogger Oz Conservative was kind enough to link to my posts on Last one down the aisle wins in his post Dalrock nails it. I thought I knew all of the big players in this space, but clearly I was mistaken. Oz has been blogging since 2004, and has excellent pieces like The silent apartment to show for it.

Since I have already linked to Frost’s Ask an A**hole post twice, many of my readers no doubt have already seen it. If not, it is an expert and entertaining hamster route. As Susan Walsh wrote the comment by Twenty is a perfect accompaniment to it, including this snippet:

> Yes, I read the second paragraph. It wasn’t exactly a searing self-examination, was it? For instance: Can you cook? Are you a bore? Do you whine a lot? Are you capable of forming a pair-bond? What are your macroeconomic views? Mac or Windows? Glock or H&K?

Speaking of Susan Walsh, my wife found the following USA Today/AP article: N.J. town limits chicken hookups

A New Jersey town has adopted an ordinance that regulates when chickens and roosters can hook up in backyard henhouses. Roosters must show they’re disease-free and they better not crow about their conquests.

Have a great weekend!
I came across an empowering story of divorce by Lorraine Berry at Salon titled How getting divorced revived my sex life (H/T Uncle Elmer).

At 38, my libido came roaring back.

What was her secret? All she had to do was divorce the man who had fathered her children and stood by her for years while she was not only injured but made herself as unattractive as possible:

By 30, I had turned into an invisible woman. I grocery shopped in sweatpants and hoodies.

Clearly what she needed was to get her groove back. Luckily her injury was remedied, a crucial step freeing her to the bliss that is divorce. Her improved health and the wisdom of her own writing lead to an epiphany:

That is, as much as I had once loved my husband — as much as he was still a good man, a great father — I wanted out.

However, like many late life divorcées, she feared she had lost her mojo. But this is where the article’s empowerment really kicks in:

...something amazing happened. Everywhere I went, people stared...

...the first man I became involved with was 24 — 14 years younger than me...

I did not need him to tell me I was sexy.

Lorraine Berry doesn't need a man to tell her she is sexy.

Click to see how sexy divorce made her.

For inexplicable reasons, her relationship with the younger man didn’t last, but her empowerment continued. In fact, her story of empowerment was just beginning:
Everywhere she goes, people stare.

Click to see why.

...my libido has become a permanent, prominent part of who I am now, just a few weeks shy of celebrating my 48th birthday.

I’ll take this as confirmation that women aren’t really done with men later in life. And don’t worry, just like EPL and How Stella Got Her Groove Back, this story ends with her finding commitment. Well, not exactly commitment, but an assumption of commitment:

For the past three years, I have loved and been loved by the man I assume to be my life partner.

Note: The original Salon article didn’t include photos of Ms. Berry. I know I’ll probably get some flack from some of my more feminist readers for gratuitously linking to them from my post: how dare you exploit her raw sexuality to drive traffic to your blog! The first photo is from a column of hers at Talking Writing. The second is from her profile at She Writes.

See Also: Lorraine Berry update.
Betty Friedan on domestic violence.
by Dalrock | May 2, 2011 | Link

If you can’t quite place the name, Betty Friedan is credited with launching the second wave of feminism with her 1963 book *The Feminine Mystique*. She was a co-founder of NOW and the organization’s first president.

The following section from Wikipedia caught my attention (emphasis mine):

The couple divorced in May 1969. Betty claimed in her memoir, *Life So Far* (2000), that Carl had beaten her during their marriage; friends such as Dolores Alexander recalled having to cover up black eyes from Carl’s abuse in time for press conferences (Brownmiller 1999, p. 70). Carl Friedan denied abusing her in an interview with *Time* magazine shortly after the book was published, describing the claim as a “complete fabrication”. She later said, on *Good Morning America*, “I almost wish I hadn’t even written about it, because it’s been sensationalized out of context. *My husband was not a wife-beater, and I was no passive victim of a wife-beater. We fought a lot, and he was bigger than me.*”

Wasn’t this Paul Elam’s fundamental point in his debate on domestic violence with manboobz?
The problem that has no name.
by Dalrock | May 2, 2011 | Link

Given the history of the last 50 years, it is funny to see the specific philosophical underpinning of modern feminism. From Wikipedia:

For her 15th college reunion in 1957, Friedan conducted a survey of College graduates, focusing on their education, their subsequent experiences and satisfaction with their current lives. She started publishing articles about what she called “the problem that has no name,” and got passionate responses from many housewives grateful that they were not alone in experiencing this problem.

Friedan then decided to rework and expand this topic into a book, *The Feminine Mystique*. Published in 1963, it depicted the roles of women in industrial societies, especially the full-time homemaker role, which Friedan deemed stifling. Friedan speaks of her own ‘terror’ at being alone, and observes in her life never once seeing a positive female role-model who worked and also kept a family. She provides numerous accounts of housewives who feel similarly trapped.

Oh no! Housewives feeling trapped? How could it be? Fortunately feminism slayed the evil patriarchy which was the root of this feeling. Otherwise we would be bombarded in the media with women carping about feeling trapped, bitching about their lives, and consumed with a constant sense that they are missing something.

The post feminist world is a world of constant bitching. Women are either not being treated as if they are the physical equals of men, or men are victimizing them by hitting back. Women bitch about men not doing the housework and they bitch about men doing the housework, calling them a kitchen bitch (emphasis mine):

I first heard this term in Sandra Tsing Loh’s recent *Atlantic* story about her divorce. She used it to describe a friend’s husband who was anal and fussy and altogether too feminine—he belonged to an online fennel club, for God’s sake. Loh’s bitch was wholly unsavory, a prop designed to justify universal divorce...
My husband is less likely to freeze and label porcini-infused risotto—the Loh version—than to hover menacingly two inches away while I am chopping vegetables. “Shouldn’t they be smaller?” he asks, restraining himself so he won’t grab the knife.

My mother would have been grateful. I am not. Instead, like Weil, I am often left seething with petty rage and self-pity.

They bitch about not being able to breast feed while working, and they bitch about having to work while breast feeding:

Still, despite my stint as the postpartum playground crank, I could not bring myself to stop breast-feeding—too many years of Sears’s conditioning, too many playground spies. So I was left feeling trapped, like many women before me, in the middle-class mother’s prison of vague discontent: surly but too privileged for pity, breast-feeding with one hand while answering the cell phone with the other, and barking at my older kids to get their own organic, 100 percent juice—the modern, multitasking mother’s version of Friedan’s “problem that has no name.”

I’ve gotta say, these patriarchy guys are good. I don’t know how they do it, but they have women trapped in unhappiness no matter what they do. Especially baffling is how all of the pressure to breastfeed in the article above was coming from other women.

Fortunately I did find one example of a happy feminist in an article in The Progressive titled Happy (Feminist) Mother’s Day. The author tells us about a recent conversation with her neighbor:

A neighbor and I were sitting on a park bench, watching our children play, when we got talking about the perennial issue of housework: all that thankless toil that takes hours out of your life you might have spent writing a great novel, or at least reading one. “I used to feel resentful about it,” my neighbor said. “But then I thought about my mother. She had eight kids, and her house always looked great. That was her art. She had such a beautiful life.”

Spending a lot of time caring for your children hardly makes people into more narrow, self-interested citizens.

Aha! Finally a woman who isn’t bitching about her lot in life! What is her secret? How did she outsmart the patriarchy and manage to find meaning in her life of drudgery and thankless toil? The author elaborates:

Before you start writing that outraged email, let me add: that neighbor is a part-time stay-at-home dad. His wife, a corporate lawyer, puts in long hours, and doesn’t have much time for cooking, cleaning, and daycare pick-up. He is a photographer whose flexible schedule allows him to be the on-the-scene parent weekdays. So not only does he proudly support his wife’s career, he genuinely admires his mom, and is following in her footsteps.

I’m starting to suspect the problem of women being unhappy with their lot can’t be solved by feminism.
Friedan photo from wikipedia commons.
Lorraine Berry update.
by Dalrock | May 3, 2011 | Link

Given the complaints I received after ambushing my readers the last time with pictures of the delightful Ms. Berry, I feel compelled to offer fair warning that there is another picture of her linked from this post. Be sure to take appropriate precautions.

Following my original post on Lorraine Berry, I found another entry by her at Talking Writing titled Smells Like Regret. It turns out there is more to her story of marital angst. From very early on in her marriage she was pining away for an alpha who had hit it and quit it when she was 19:

He was a disc jockey at the U-Dub’s KCMU...

One night, he asked me out. We split a bottle of Irish whisky and ended up lying on an outdoor basketball court—red and white in the floodlights—after midnight, making love.

For a while, we were lovers. And then, suddenly, we were not.

This guy went on to co-found the record label which signed Nirvana. Since he once rogered her while drunk on a basketball court she knew his secret dream had always been to marry her, but she had somehow let him slip away. Then her husband came along and trapped her
in marriage, forcing her to pine away (while nursing their daughter) for the man who once nailed her when she was 19:

I was a new mom. A graduate student. And an unhappily married woman.

Every time I heard “Smells Like Teen Spirit,” I’d think back to what had been. Wonder what my life would be like if I hadn’t drifted out of that relationship.

ok. Time to put the hoods down. Here is what appears to be a much younger Lorraine Berry.

Information on welding mask image available at wikipedia commons.
Corollary to Dalrock’s Law; The Law of Rationalization Hamster Strength.
by Dalrock | May 5, 2011 | Link

Reading Ms. Berry's descriptive essay on Salon has moved Captain Capitalism to wax romantic. Coming soon to a bookstore near you:

“I looked at her...my beautiful economics professor. Oh sure, she was 47, and sure, she had 4 children and two ex-husbands, and sure the other 23 year old trust fund baby men in my class wouldn’t find her attractive...but I loved her for her intelligence. Her unwillingness to conform and teach us economics as told by the establishment. No, she rebelled. She taught us Marx. She taught us Keynes. She showed me what true beauty was, and was meant to be. She was my liberator. She liberated me from the evil thinking that was foisted upon me by my evil multi-billion-dollar father. I didn’t have to work. But I didn’t care. I was burning for her, I needed to hear her intelligent words and see her exude independence.

I swore to myself, once I earned my A in class through intelligence and parroting, I would drive up in my 2011 Mercedes Series 7 and propose to my economics and romance professor and abscond with my father’s trust fund and we could live on the beaches of Gao and burn incense and make candles and eat organic grass shoots, and write environmentalist poetry.

And we’d get cats.”

Brilliant! Although I do think he should work in a secret multimillionaire hunky handyman for the final draft.

It has also inspired him to define a new law, The Law of Rationalization Hamster Strength:

The strength of a rationalization hamster is inversely related to the looks of its host.

Aside from corner cases of hamsters suffering from pure exhaustion, this appears to be right on the money. It also appears to be closely related to Dalrock’s Law:

The more obvious the fact one is in denial of, the more ridiculous the counterexample (or counterargument) will be.
How to encourage a husband to show more leadership.

by Dalrock | May 11, 2011 | Link

A reader who I’ll call Ann emailed me a while back asking for my thoughts on what she can do to encourage her husband to show more leadership. I’ll share parts of her message below but have left other parts out which might overly identify her. One thing which is clear throughout the message is that Ann loves and respects her husband; her message doesn’t have the feel of a wife who is frustrated with her husband or at her wits end. Ann is in her early 30s and she and her husband are fairly newly married. English isn’t her first language but she does an excellent job expressing herself in it anyway:

My husband and I love each other very much. In general we don’t have any problems in our marriage, and I am wondering what I can do to keep it that way for years to come.
What I would like to ask you particularly is, what can I do to treat him like a man? This is not to say I treat him like a woman (poor English issue) but I would like to “underline” his masculinity…To make him feel that his wife is proud to have him as her husband. To make him feel that it’s perfectly OK to do what he chooses to do even if it doesn’t make everyone happy.
I don’t know if I’m making myself clear... I am not the super assertive type, I don’t yell at him or humiliate him or anything like that...I just want to learn new ways to make him feel good and strong about his manliness.

One of her objectives is to encourage him to be more assertive:

...he usually prefers to avoid conflict. I am not saying that I want him to start punching everyone in the face, but I’m guessing you understand my point.
I don't want to “talk to” him about this, I don't think that's a good idea, instead I would like to find new ways to support my husband.

Anyway, I hope I was clear [] Please let me know your thoughts, if there are any books I can read, any tips etc.

I have framed the question as how she can encourage her husband to show more leadership. She may be asking something slightly different but I think this is what she is most likely to be able to influence, and it also should have the effect she is looking for outside of his dealings with her. Part of my assumption here is that what she is looking for is fine tuning instead of a total transformation. She loves him and is happy with him now, but she can see how they might both be happier with a small change in the dynamic.

My first thought is to implement the simple ideas I mentioned in a recent post. There are a number of customs which feminism has discouraged which should be able to help change the tone of your relationship. Many of these are simple and ceremonial like having him drive, order for you at a restaurant, etc. However simple gestures can be very powerful, and can help you fine tune this kind of thing. Greerp writes about the powerful impact seating her husband at the head of the table had on her husband and her son:
It really doesn’t matter to me who sits at the head of the table. Half the time I’m in and out of the kitchen getting stuff, so I sit on the side and that works fine. But it does matter to my son, who has shown a vaguely covetous attitude about that head chair, and it matters to my husband who actually said to me the other night, “It’s so nice to come home to dinner and to eat it as the head of the table. It’s such a good way to end the day.”

I also think it would be a good idea if she can find some activity which her husband would naturally lead in. This will vary based on the individuals involved. Several years ago my wife and I bought a boat for me to use fishing on the local lakes. She at first agreed to come along just to humor me, but soon found she loved the feeling of power when speeding across the lake as well as the calmness when stopped. It was natural for me to take the lead more when we were working with the boat because of my experience handling boats, trailers, etc. A few times we had mechanical problems which I needed to fix to get us home. But even though I was leading, it was also important that we had to work together. This was especially important when docking and trailering the boat. All of this lead to an improvement in our dynamic together; we were both happier with our marriage from this time on. Boating may not be the right answer for other couples, but any activity which forces you to work together while encouraging him to lead should have the same impact.

Athol Kay has a great post about the Captain and First Officer model in marriage which I think really nails the kind dynamic she is likely hoping to achieve:

I’ve always liked the dynamic on the Star Trek series between Captains and First Officers. It’s always been quite apparent that the First Officer is always competent and skilled, and if anything happens to the Captain, they step into the role of being in command immediately. The Captains always listen, sometimes the First Officer has a better idea than their own. Sometimes the First Officer actually overrules the Captain in a crisis and gives the crew an order, the Captain usually just trusts the First Officer isn’t doing this to make trouble and runs with it. But at the end of the day... the Captain is the Captain and leadership comes from them, and final responsibility for the ship lies with them. If it all goes to hell the Captain is last off the ship.

The whole post is worth reading, as is his book. For Ann what I would suggest is to pick certain areas she most wants to have him lead with and actively defer to her husband when a decision needs to be made. She might say something as simple to him as that is something I trust my husband to decide. Critical to this process is to pick something that he is good at and something that if he makes a choice she doesn’t agree with she can still live with the outcome. As the two of them become more comfortable with him leading she will become more comfortable with raising concerns without overruling him. But at first this might discourage him so I think it is best to try to avoid it if possible. Also, be ready for him to make a choice which turns out to be “wrong” at some point. Leaders make decisions, and some percentage of those decisions will be wrong. It probably makes sense to look at this as a critical opportunity to reinforce his leadership role, especially if he made a different choice than she would have (or did) counsel. From that perspective him making a wrong decision is something she should actually look forward to.
Both of them should get better at the process over time. It also is worth noting that it isn’t right to judge the validity of a decision based on the outcome. This is counterintuitive, but I believe it is actually correct. When making a decision you can only decide based on the best information available at the time. Sometimes this leads to the wrong outcome, but trying to do anything else will lead to never ending second guessing.

Hopefully this is at least a good start for them. I’m also looking forward to the thoughts of my readers, both men and women. Please share your wisdom in the comments section below. As with a recent post where a reader asked for advice I will ask that all comments be respectful and kind in tone. Normally the comments section is pretty much no holds barred, but in this case I will remove any comments which aren’t respectful of Ann or her husband.

See Also: Update from Ann.
Bad times to have children.

by Dalrock | May 15, 2011 | Link

Looking through Ferdinand's Link roundup I noticed Gorbachev has a post included titled Bad Times:

- It’s always terrible. Now is always the worst time.

Actual worst times?

- ca. 1300-1200 B.C. General collapse of Bronze-age civilizations; Sea Peoples and pirates and waves after waves of invaders washing over societies in the Mediterranean; whole ethnicities and nations exterminated; the Minoans devastated and dispersed; the Great Collapse, as it was called. 500 years of chaos, loss of literacy, etc. It became part of the “age of Legend” for later civilizations.

Upshot, though: The groundwork for classical Greek civilization 1000 years later laid. The whole civilizational calendar was reset. The Middle East retreated from the center of power.

Other worst times...

His point is something I have been considering while reading the frequent doom and gloom posts in the manosphere. It isn’t that I deny many of the problems we face, but from what little I know of history Gorbachev is right. There is almost always something very frightening going on. The question is, what can/should you do about it? Some will elect to enjoy the decline. This isn’t my personal preference but still a logical choice.

Often the question which comes up is why would anyone want to have children in a time like this? But as Gorbachev addresses in his post (worth a full read) there has never really been a good time. Echoing Dr. Roy Baumeister, we are descended from the men and women who experienced times of great economic and social upheaval and had children anyway.

I wouldn’t presume to tell anyone else whether they should marry and have children. For men there are additional risks with marriage which we have already discussed, so they of course need to take that into consideration and plan accordingly (no small task).

But what I would say is that it makes no sense to make this decision based on a current assessment of the national or global situation. There will always be some national or global catastrophe looming on the horizon. For as long as I’ve been alive, we have been:

1) On the brink of running out of oil (cue the peak oil posters...).
2) On the brink of war (more or less).
3) Involved in major economic transition/disruption.
4) On the brink of catastrophic warming (or cooling).
None of this is to say that the issues others bring up aren’t real. But one thing I’ve figured out in the last 20 years is that the events in your own life will far overshadow the impact of global events. So be generally prepared for difficult times (have some food, water, savings, means of personal/family defense, diversify financially, etc) and vote according to your beliefs; but don’t put your life on hold or worse give up on it because of a bad global prognosis.

When I was in High School many would have said “why have children to have them grow up in the post nuclear apocalypse”? Everyone knew that cowboy Reagan was going to start WWII. By the time I finished college everyone had forgotten about this worry. Consider your own parents and grandparents. How much of what they would have worried about on a national or global level even has any relevance any more? My maternal grandfather was a sharecropper during the great depression when my mother was born. Shortly before my father’s birth (also during the depression) my paternal grandfather was fortunate and found a temporary job as a butter maker. This allowed them to include the father’s occupation on the birth certificate. My wife’s maternal grandparents were in Hungary during world war II when they had their first child. Her grandfather was drafted by the Nazis and sent to the Russian front. Their first child died while still an infant due to some unknown disease (he had a fever and coughed a great deal). In a better time with ample food, heating and access to medical care he would likely have been just fine. After the war they fled the Russian occupation of Hungary and started their lives over in war crushed Germany. Her grandfather had a degree in engineering but it wasn’t recognized in Germany. Still they tried again and had my wife’s mother.

*If you want to marry and have children*, marry well and move forward. Live a rich and fulfilling life.
Vox Day’s most recent post The birth certificate is a forgery asserts that part of the recently released birth certificate for President Obama was entered after the page was scanned:

Karl Denninger declares that Mr. Farah was right again. The birth certificate released by the White House is a forgery.

The site he links to shows that the word “Male” doesn’t have the same curve as the word “Sex” immediately above it. This would seem to be impossible unless Male was added after the document was scanned:

In addition, WND has a column showing that the number assigned to the President’s birth certificate doesn’t fit the process which was used by the state at the time, and a youtube video which claims that parts of the recently released long form birth certificate have font characteristics which a typewriter couldn’t have created:

I don’t have any expertise in this area, but all of these at least seem compelling to my untrained eye. As I recall, Dan Rather was stung by forged documents containing similar anomalies.

Could this be why the president was willing to have Lt. Col. Lakin go to Leavenworth instead of simply releasing a document he first claimed wasn’t available, and later released due to mounting public pressure?
**Edit:** Josh suggested that the “M” in “Male” was higher than the other characters, which caused the word to look straight once the page was curved. Looking at the PDF file under magnification I think he has a good point here. I drew a line under the entire name of the hospital using the GIMP straight line feature:

If I blow that image up the M does look higher:
The Three Lazy Ones
by Dalrock | May 19, 2011 | Link

I haven’t done a Brothers Grimm post in a while, and I don’t have time today to write up some of the other posts I have in mind. Today’s tale is The Three Lazy Ones. Enjoy.
Jack Donovan wrote a while back about how feminists infiltrated and ultimately shut down a strongman class he created at a local gym in his piece *The Soft Shutdown*. All started off well, until a group of feminist women showed up and not only demanded *inclusion*, but insisted on radically changing the tone of the class:

The women were shouting each other in caricatured jock-talk all the way around the block.

“*Push it, push it push it!*”

“*C’mon, don’t be a sissy!*”

“We got this, we got this!”

“*Bring it, girl!*”

I don’t coach like that, and the men I coach never behave like that. Usually, we just shut up and do the work, offering encouragement and congratulations only when it is really necessary or earned.

About mid-block, the girls started letting out blood-curdling shrieks—which was embarrassing, because we were out on the street with people passing by.

Given the differences between men and women, simply adding women to a group of men will often radically change the tone of the activity. However, when the women are feminists the changes are not by accident:

As I got back inside and started pounding on the tire with Ms. Pink—who had at that point known me for approximately 7 minutes—she proceeded to make suggestions about improving the class.

She recommended that the name should be changed to “Strongman AND StrongWOMAN Sundays,” instead of just “Strongman Sundays.” She said she thought it would be “more inclusive.”

It is worth noting that from the first day of the class a woman had attended. This no doubt changed the culture of the class, but it wasn’t disruptive:

The tall blond woman was always polite and she just wanted to work out. I had no problems with coaching her along with the guys. In fact, she brought along a guy friend who then brought his son to the next class. Coaching a father and son together was definitely my most rewarding class. I could tell that it was a good day for them, and that made it a good day for me.
But with a group of feminists intent on ensuring that there is no such thing as a male space, any effort at inclusion will be taken as an opportunity to take over:

“How do you like that, Jack?!”

“The only ones who can hang with you for your strong MAN class are strong WOMEN!”

“How about THAT?!”

Then she turned back to the PPP and said something inane, like “How about THAT, girls! It’s all about the WOMEN!”

His story isn’t anything I’m guessing my readers haven’t witnessed multiple times in their lives. And as Jack described, feminists’ compulsion to invade all male spaces is typically as ridiculous as it is pathological. As I wrote before:

Feminists lay awake at night consumed with the knowledge that somewhere out there there are men who are proud to be men, and there is no woman there to tell them she is just as good as they are.

My wife and I recently saw this phenomenon while watching the sequel to the Long Way Round series. In the original series the two friends travel around the world by motorcycle. They started in the UK and rode east until they hit the Bering Sea, and after flying across to Alaska continued their journey across Canada and the US until they ultimately reached New York.

I’m not a motorcyclist, but I really loved watching the two friends enjoying the ride and each other’s company across incredible scenery. While they had some inevitable friction, for the most part the two embraced their adventure with a feeling of effortless camaraderie. The tougher the slog, the better they worked with each other and their support crew, not to mention the local men who helped them out:

While their bikes were designed for both on road and off road use, many of the roads were pushing the limits of both the riders and the bikes.

Recently I learned that they made a sequel titled Long Way Down, where they do a similar trip from the northern tip of the UK to the southern tip of Africa. Since we enjoyed the first series so much we added it to our Netflix queue. Much of the show was still enjoyable, but this second series was not nearly as good as the first in my opinion. The tone of the program changed a great deal when Ewan’s wife Eve made an impressive display of girl-power (much attitude with little to no skill); despite never having ridden a motorcycle she decided she had to join the men for part of the trip:

I should point out that the first series took place in 2004, and the second trip occurred in 2007. While Boorman is clearly the more talented and accomplished rider of the two, both men started the second trip with a great deal of experience handling motorcycles in extremely difficult terrain. Eve decided she would join them without ever having ridden a
motorcycle, or even a scooter. As she states in the video above, she did it out of jealousy that the two men were going to have an adventure that she wasn’t participating in. Throughout her meager efforts at training Ewan coddled her like a child; at the same time he was always seeking her approval. While much of the second series is still quite good, the parts with Eve were painful to watch. Charlie Boorman makes a valiant effort to appear supportive of Eve, but it is clear that he wanted a different kind of experience than the one they had when Eve was in the mix. Commenters on Amazon and Netflix had the same reaction my wife and I did. While reviewer Charlie at Amazon.com gave the sequel 5 stars and (unlike me) thought it was better than the first series, he too felt Eve was a distraction:

> Eva, Ewan’s wife, is shown learning to ride a bike, and tagged along for a portion of the journey towards the end. Although it must have been an exciting adventure for her, I felt she was just a third wheel in the whole scheme of things.

Third wheel indeed. The review voted most helpful on Netflix made a similar observation:

> The first parts of the series is too rushed to enjoy (a large complaint from the two stars) but they slow down and the series becomes as wonderful as the first. McGregor’s wife joined the duo for a section of the journey which took away from the feeling of comradeship between McGregor and Boorman.

Still, I highly recommend both series. Just have the fast forward button handy for when Eve shows up and starts spouting feminist platitudes like (paraphrase) “Strong women will solve Africa’s problems, so long as the men will follow”. If only all ridiculous girl-power feminists were so easy to ignore.
Professor Hale wrote a post a while back titled Saving Marriage: Grease the Rope. In that post he makes a compelling case for withdrawing support from an addict:

I once heard a lecture about how to save an addict who was at the bottom of his rope. The answer was to grease the rope. So long as the addict still had a rope to cling to, he believed he was in control and that he could pull himself back up. It wasn’t until he fell off the rope (metaphorically) that he would seek real life-changing solutions to his problems.

He uses this as an analogy of how we need to act if we are going to save marriage:

The same could be said of marriage. The state of marriage today has shifted from the traditional forms. Some people lament that while others are pushing for more shifts. Few people want to take on the church and the state at the same time since both are involved in marriage. So modern marriage continues to limp along under the momentum of thousands of years of tradition despite the damage done to it recently.

I think his analysis so far is spot on, and I generally agree with his list of what is wrong with marriage and how the typical solutions offered won’t improve the situation. However, I part ways with him on exactly what greasing the rope should look like. He wants to make marriage a private contract, removing the church and the state. I think his idea would work in a different context, but in practice neither the church nor the state are likely to be willing to allow this to happen. In the case of the state, we already see instances where it will deem people to be married where they have never brought the state into the mix.

But as I said I agree with how he has framed the question. What we need to do is stop comforting the addict. In this case the primary culprit isn’t a drug addict, but a choice addict. What we need to do is remove the current support system and rewards for choice addicts, so that women can make fully informed choices. I’m focusing on women here because the counterpart to the hypergamous female is the alpha male. While alphas are at the core of the problem right alongside a far larger number of choice addicts, marriage isn’t a motivating factor for them. Even if this weren’t the case, alphas aren’t fit for marriage. If you disagree, take it up with Roissy.

In a world where we have greased the marriage rope, we would see a different set of expected outcomes for choice addicts:
Many of the outcomes in the “greased rope” column either already represent current reality, or fit with current trends. Often the issue is that the actual likely outcomes are wildly different than the expectations choice addicts have (and are encouraged to have).

The fundamental problem we face however is the problem one always confronts when attempting to stop coddling an addict; there are a group of vocal (and often well meaning) people who are highly invested in enabling the destructive behavior. In the case of our choice addict, the key enablers are feminists and social conservatives. I don’t expect to influence feminists, so I’ll take them out of consideration for the moment. This leaves us with social conservatives, and if we are honest, primarily social conservative women.

If you doubt this, consider the fact that many of the outcomes one would expect for a greased rope are already becoming more likely. Now consider the reaction of social conservative women to these outcomes. Take for example the first item on the list, uncommitted sex. One of my readers posted a link to Women are the ones who want to avoid commitment on a prominent Roman Catholic forum. One woman in particular was outraged that I suggested men shouldn’t assume they had commitment where no such commitment existed. She claimed this went against the teachings of the Catholic church. I asked her if she could point out in scripture where it suggested that men should assume commitment without marriage. Not surprisingly, she didn’t have an answer and lost interest in the topic*. We have
seen similar arguments from Catholic women in the comments section of this blog. Paige argued passionately that women who chased alphas for uncommitted sex were actually good marriage material, and that the alphas who obliged them were ruining them for marriage. Likewise Kathy expressed outrage that Greenlander was harming *marriage worthy women* when he pumped and dumped them. Similarly, there was much hand wringing by traditional conservative women on the topic of Marcos allowing former carouselers to mistake him for a *beta provider*. These attitudes are what is enabling the bulk of the choice addict’s behaviors listed in the table above.

But while traditional conservative women are enabling the choice addicts, traditional conservative men are enabling the Trad Con women in their coddling. I mentioned before that I don’t think that feminists can be influenced; I don’t think this is the case for traditional conservative women. If enough traditional conservative men call them out on what they are doing, eventually this will have an impact. We already see a significant minority of traditional conservative women who aren’t willing to enable the choice addicts; these women deserve more than men staying on the sidelines in silent approval.

*A few weeks later the same woman declared to the forum that she was planning on divorcing her husband because he worked more hours than she wanted him to, and he had once scolded their children for being loud when he was working in his home office. One might think that this woman was outside the mainstream of Catholic thought, but I disagree. While those responding to her post on wanting to frivolously divorce her husband did work to discourage her from divorce, there wasn’t much of a sense of judgment for taking her vows (and the wellbeing of her children) so lightly.*
**Cruelty and kindness.**

by Dalrock | May 24, 2011 | Link

Through some mutual friends we know a young boy who I’ll call “Mark”. Mark’s maternal grandparents are independently wealthy, and by the age of 7 he already knows he won’t have to work to support himself when he is an adult. His parents are very liberal and don’t believe in discipline or telling him no. As a result Mark isn’t a kid many people want to have around. He even has relatives who genuinely enjoy kids who won’t babysit him. The kid is so spoiled and materialistic that when he is given a gift the first thing he looks for is a designer label.

Mark’s parents and grandparents think they are being kind to him. From where I stand they are being cruel.

The reality is cruelty often comes with good intentions. In my last post Greasing the marriage rope I included a table with two sets of expected outcomes. The first column of outcomes were the rosy view we typically sell to women and girls. Taken in their entirety, the first column’s outcomes send a message that women and girls won’t ever experience negative consequences for irresponsible behavior. No matter what choices they make, someone else is expected to pay or otherwise protect them. In this sense the first column of outcomes closely resembles the message Mark receives from his parents and grandparents.

However, as several commenters pointed out the outcomes in the second column are often the outcomes a woman will actually experience. I haven’t been blogging for a year yet and I have been able to debunk quite an astonishing number of myths commonly sold to women. The reality is making bad choices is never cost free, and no one can really insulate a person from the harm their own bad choices cause.

The kindest thing we can do for women of any age is tell them the truth. Part of this involves being honest about their own desires and their responsibility for the outcomes they receive. The fairy tale we tell young women is their sexual motives are naturally pure. If they have uncommitted sex with an alpha and wind up unceremoniously dumped, it is almost always described with platitudes like she loved too much and she was only following her heart. No matter the platitude, the implication is the negative outcome just happened to her and she couldn’t reasonably be expected to have made better choices. The Taylor Swift song 15 is an excellent example of this (H/T Paige). While the song ostensibly is a warning to young girls, the underlying message is essentially a pre-rationalization for a young girl’s hamster:

```
Cause when you’re fifteen and somebody tells you they love you you’re gonna believe them
when you’re fifteen and your first kiss
makes your head spin round but
in your life you’ll do greater than dating the boy on the football team
but I didn’t know it at fifteen

When all you wanted was to be wanted
```
wish you could go back and tell yourself what you know now
Back then I swore I was gonna marry him someday

Ah yes. All she wanted was to be wanted. For some inexplicable reason she wants to be wanted by a boy on the football team and not a member of the chess club. I’m sure someday someone will crack that mystery. But until then all we know is her desires are in no way sexual or selfish like those of the boys she interacts with. She is only offering sex with the hope of being loved in return. She even had him tell her he loved her.

I can think of no crueler message to send to young women.
Why are so many traditional conservative women obsessed with making sure hookups are fair?

by Dalrock | May 25, 2011 | Link

Hold it alpha! Your hookup partner didn’t get everything she wanted!

I should start by pointing out that not all traditional conservative women are like that. There are quite a few women in the manosphere who aren’t interested in defining and enforcing “rules of the road” for casual sex. But I would say a very vocal minority appear to be almost obsessed by this.

Many of my readers will recall that Kathy vowed to leave this site forever after I pointed out that she was far more outraged over the fact that an alpha was “getting some on the side” while “dating” a woman than she was over a sex positive feminist trying to normalize casual sex. Likewise Paige is very concerned in the comments section of my last post that 15 year old versions of Karen Owen might not be receiving a fair deal when they decide to have sex with alpha athletes.

I’m not condoning casual sex, I’m just very perplexed why so many otherwise traditional conservative (and religious) women are so driven to ensure that casual sex is as satisfying as possible for women. I understand why feminists feel this way, but I truly can’t understand why traditional conservative women choose to ally with them in this regard.

It is worth noting that I don’t see traditional conservative men wringing their hands over whether men are getting their needs met through casual sex. For example, I’ve never encountered a traditional conservative man who worried that Roissy might one day catch an STD from a woman who lied and said she was disease free. I certainly don’t lose any sleep over this prospect. It isn’t that I am pro lying or even that I wish Roissy ill, I just don’t have a compelling interest in trying to create an elaborate system of hookup etiquette. Instead I’m motivated to try to make marriage a viable option for as many men and women as possible, so I don’t see why I should focus on making being a pickup artist as fulfilling as possible. Pickup artists and the women who chase them are making their own choices. The ambiguity
of their “relationship” is a feature, not a bug. If they want to make a formal commitment, they are free to do so.

As I have pointed out before, this obsession with making sure hookups are “fair” is a reason many mothers won’t protect their daughters. Given the high cost these women are willing to have young women and girls pay, there must be an extremely compelling reason for them to focus so much energy on ensuring that casual sex is fair and fulfilling.

Female referee photo from 2for6.
A LTR is not a mini marriage.
by Dalrock | May 26, 2011 | Link

As I have mentioned before, the term Long Term Relationship is profoundly misleading in that there is no commitment and no term. While it is theoretically possible that a couple would pledge to be together and exclusive for a set duration of time, this is almost never the case. Additionally, when thinking about the concept of a LTR it is essential to think of it in the context of male and female preferred forms of promiscuity and the current “sexual marketplace”. The preferred strategies for men and women are different based on their different reproductive needs.

The preferred form of male promiscuity is to create a harem of women who are exclusive to him, with additional one off sex as the opportunity presents itself. This way he can sexually monopolize the women he is invested in, and additionally spread his genes through women he isn’t invested in. In this way he hopes to have his cake and eat it too.

The preferred female form of promiscuity is serial relationships with men who are invested in her. This way she keeps her options open to jump to a better man should the opportunity present itself, while still securing investment from the man. If she isn’t able to secure investment from the man she finds most attractive, plan b is to obtain sex from the most attractive man (or men) possible while securing investment from another man. Whichever course she chooses, like the male strategy she hopes to have her cake and eat it too. Note that her ideal form of promiscuity is exactly what LTR defines. The idea that promiscuous women have one night stands while good girls only have sex with their boyfriends is incredibly misguided. Given the option (in general), even sluts want the men they have sex with to become invested in them; they just want to keep their options open.

Next we need to consider the context in which men and women are coming together. For quite some time we have been in hookup culture. The term hookup is deliberately vague, and can mean anything from making out to having intercourse. As Susan Walsh explains young people generally aren’t familiar with dating, and instead “hook up” and go from there:

- Hooking up has replaced traditional dating on college campuses, and has also become prevalent in the general population and culture. The hallmark of hooking up is the clear understanding between both parties that the encounter will be free from any expectations for further contact. It is designed to avoid the possibility of commitment. However, hooking up is still the primary pathway to a potential romantic relationship.
- The hookup script reverses the sexual norm; the pair becomes sexual first, before emotional intimacy or a relationship is established.

This is the status quo that the gold diggers from DABA wanted to overturn when they said No more let’s start having sex and if it’s good then attempt to backtrack into a relationship. We see similar expressions of this around the blogosphere. For example, one of the women
commenting on Date Me D.C. complained:

Dating at our age is completely frustrating. I’m sorry, but if we’ve been on several dates and have taken our physical relationship into sexy town over the course of one and a half months, it is plain and simply disrespectful of men to refuse to label me as their girlfriend.

As Susan pointed out, the pattern is the reverse of what many people my age and older tend to assume. It is sex first, consider a relationship later. There isn’t a promise of commitment or exclusivity. This isn’t an accident, it was a deliberate move by feminists as they drove the sexual revolution. Who here doesn’t recall the feminists screeching you don’t own me just because we had sex! For those of you who had repressed memories of hairy legged women chanting that in response to innocent questions like does this bus go downtown?, my apologies for digging them up.

So this is where we are. The whole process is steeped in ambiguity by design. This provides women with the maximum freedom to choose and re-choose that they desire, but can make securing investment much more difficult. Alpha men are probably in the best position to navigate this landscape, since the ambiguity works in their favor. They can flip the female script of allowing their partner to become deeply emotionally invested in them while never promising investment, commitment, or exclusivity. The promiscuous women are trying to play their own game, which is getting the men to become emotionally attached without offering commitment or exclusivity themselves. Not all of this is always a conscious decision on the woman’s part. Sometimes they follow their biological programming while their hamster spins plausible explanations for why they happen to be repeatedly acting on animal instinct. Paige has described this best:

Relating Pump-n-Dumping to Serial Monogamy assumes more self-awareness in the woman than she actually has. At the beginning the woman is convinced she will be in-love forever...if the romantic feelings decline she believes the relationship is no longer worthwhile for either partner. But she doesn’t just assume at the beginning that this will happen.

Whether they are honest with themselves or not however, it is essential to remember that both the alpha and the promiscuous woman hope to exploit the ambiguity to their own advantage (and to the other party’s disadvantage). This is why an outsider coming in and trying to play referee is so ridiculous. Who is conning whom only tells us who succeeded in their plans.

Enter your typical clueless beta. He is generally unaware of the rules the promiscuous women and alphas are playing by. He’s stuck in a script which has remained largely unchanged since the 1950s. He is in this position because this is what he has been taught by his entire family, especially his mother. Possessing the standard beta traits of loyalty and rule following, he blunders in like a lamb to the slaughter. Naive betas don’t stand a chance against the promiscuous woman’s game. He typically falls in love and ends up either unceremoniously dumped when a better offer comes along for the woman, or playing the part of the chump in “plan b”.

---

www.TheRedArchive.com
This is the context that “Long Term Relationships” exist in. Most people are tempted to think of them as mini marriages. Far more often it is more accurate to think of them as extended hookups. Just like either party has the right to disengage mid make-out or intercourse, either party can jettison the “LTR” relationship for any reason at any time. You don’t have to like it, these are the rules.

It isn’t that no long term relationships are what most people would call “serious”, and “mutual”, it is just that it isn’t appropriate to assume such a thing. Some number of relationships categorized as LTR do resemble a marriage in many ways. To the extent that they do, the state will often declare them de facto marriages.

But not only are many people mis-characterizing LTRs as mini marriages, but they often are thinking of marriage as a sort of beefed up LTR. This is precisely why so many people (mostly women, but some men) feel perfectly justified terminating a marriage because the feeling is no longer there, or they think they can get a better offer.
Lightening things up a bit.

by Dalrock | May 27, 2011 | Link

Alte has a post dealing with IQ and women’s marriage market value and the comments somehow turned to the topic of editing wikipedia. This had me thinking of this video during my meetings today:

After reading about Greyp’s aging laptop, my wife reminded me of this video:

I don’t have a video to go along with it, but Captain Capitalism has a funny email he received with dating advice from a woman.

I’ve been too busy to see what Badger is up to today, but based what I have seen I’m guessing it is good.
Women with plenty of time to think about how men should treat them.

by Dalrock | May 28, 2011 | Link

I wrote this as a comment on the good Captain’s site, but since it is stuck in moderation I thought I would share it here as well.

In the Captain’s post 300 is NOT a Date Movie, he shares the rather prodigious advice he received from a woman after she set him up on a date. You have to read the whole spinster manifesto for full comic effect, but bullet point 37 caught my attention (emphasis mine):

Make a lady feel like a lady. I don’t know any woman who are over 30 and single that don’t want to be treated like lady. Open doors, pick them up, walk them to their doors, etc. Like the guys in the romantic movies. **Women over 30 who are single have had a lot of time to think about “how” they want a man to treat them.**

Having failed in their quest to find a man for over a decade, they of course spend their time contemplating... what men should do differently.

**See also:** Any blog by an unmarried woman.
The cost of cuckoldry.

by Dalrock | May 28, 2011 | Link

Last night my wife and I were watching a Forensic Files episode where a husband murdered his wife after she: 1) Decided to divorce him and take half of their assets and 2) Revealed that his oldest son wasn’t really his, and that she was going to announce this to the son and everyone at the son’s graduation party. The episode is titled Hell’s Kitchen. Skip to 3:30 to see the details of her despicable plan:

After seeing this my wife pointed out that if there is ever a reason for murder, this was a very good one. Not only was the wife intentionally humiliating her husband (who did nothing wrong other than trust her), but she was planning on humiliating the son as well. What young man wants his mother to announce that she is a whore and he is a bastard at his graduation party?

As has been mentioned many times on the manosphere, cuckoldry is an extremely vicious act, and roughly equivalent to forcible rape in the rage and humiliation it imposes on the victims. Both the child and the man tricked into false paternity are deeply harmed when the truth ultimately comes out.

My wife is a huge UFC fan, and her favorite fighter is Randy Couture. In his autobiography he talks about the impact his uncertain paternity has had on both his father and himself. His father had gone to his grave not wanting a paternity test, because he was too afraid to know the answer. This pain haunted the son as well, even though he is arguably one of the toughest men in the world. Cuckoldry is absolutely devastating.

We’ve seen another high profile example of this recently with the highly publicized Arnold Schwarzenegger case. While there is much deserved derision for Arnold and hand wringing for his wronged wife and bizarrely the woman he cheated with, there is little attention given to the maid’s cuckolded ex husband or her son (click for video of ex husband).

All of this raises the question of how often this kind of thing occurs. I’ve seen all sorts of estimates referenced in the manosphere, but very seldom is there a link to an actual study. The best article I’ve been able to find on the issue is from Psychology Today. According to the article, The standard nonpaternity rate that is most commonly mentioned across cultural settings is 10%. The article references a study which took this a step further, and looked at cuckoldry rates based on the confidence of the father:

Dr. Anderson gathered nonpaternity rates from 67 published sources, with a broad spectrum of countries covered. Prior to reading on, any guesses as to the nonpaternity rates of men who had high paternity confidence versus their low confidence counterparts? Here are the nonpaternity rates for the two groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US &amp; Canada</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High paternity confidence</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low paternity confidence</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There you have it. Note that for each of the two groups of men, the rates are roughly the same around the various global regions. The bottom line is as follows: If you commission a DNA paternity test, you have roughly a one-third chance of the child not being yours. On the other hand, if you are confident that your wife has not had any extramarital dalliances then the probability of your having been cuckolded is very low (but still far from negligible).

Whichever statistic you look at, obviously this is a huge problem. Furthermore, **it is a huge problem which can largely be avoided**. The bulk of financial fraud and the humiliation for both the child and the presumed father occurs due to the deception which is continued for years after birth. Additionally, men are further punished by the court systems and are forced to pay child support for children they can prove are not theirs. The current system is designed such that it inflicts maximum suffering on men and children, while offering the maximum incentive for women to be deceitful.

This isn’t just a problem of men having money fraudulently taken from them, they also face the risk of being sent to jail. Consider the case of Francisco Rodriguez (emphasis mine):

Francisco Rodriguez owes more than $10,000 in back child support payments in a paternity case involving a 15-year-old girl who, according to DNA results and the girl’s mother, is not his daughter...

Yet the state of Florida is continuing to push him to pay $305 a month to support the girl, as well as the more than $10,000 already owed. **He spent a night in jail because of his delinquent payments.**

Why is he in such a bind?

He missed the deadline to legally contest paternity. That’s because, he says, the paperwork didn’t reach him until after the deadline had passed.

The obvious answer to the problem is to positively identify paternity via DNA when filling out the birth certificate. A lawmaker in Georgia proposed a bill which would have done exactly this back in 2008. I don’t see any reference to it passing so I am assuming it failed. In the article on the bill, they quote two women who are adamantly against making such testing mandatory:

“I do not support a paternity bill,” said state Rep. Sherry Jones, a Nashville Democrat. “I think it’s a real affront to women to say that every baby born has to have a paternity test.”

Rebecca Kopp agrees. She recently finished filling out the birth certificate paperwork for her three-month-old son.
“I think it’s offensive because I am married,” Kopp said. “Even for women who aren’t married, if they want to get a birth certificate, I think that that should be their right. I don’t think they should have to prove who the father is.”

Ironically it is married men who are most legally susceptible to false paternity in the state of Georgia:

Right now, if a woman has been married for 300 days before their baby was born, the husband’s name automatically goes on the birth certificate. If a woman is not married and wants the father’s name on the paperwork, she has to get a paternity test and have it notarized before the father’s name is listed.

If you aren’t outraged after reading all of this, you are one cold and calculating person.

Taking this back to the conversation I had with my wife, while she was very sympathetic to the husband who murdered his cuckolding wife, she was very much against the idea of mandatory paternity testing. She felt that it was accusing honest women of being whores (she had the same objection to the mandatory blood test for AIDS when our son was born, but did submit to it). I pointed out that cuckolding occurs because honest women are inadvertently giving shelter to dishonest women by reacting this way. Any man who asks for a paternity test is risking massive strife with the presumed mother of his child. Honest women will be enraged because their honor is being challenged, and dishonest women will act the same way to prevent from being caught. After a fairly spirited discussion she changed her view and agreed that mandatory testing made sense, but she was very frustrated that we lived in a society where this was needed in the first place.

Part of what I explained when discussing this with my wife is how suspicious the attitude of most women on this is to men. Country Lawyer’s comment on my post on conservative women wanting to ensure hookups were satisfying to women probably best states this view:

It is quite simple Dalrock.

Does it advantage the man or the woman?

That is all it takes. I don’t care if its conservative, religious, secular, feminist, or moonbat witchery women, that is all the math they do.

If it advances women they are all for it (because they place themselves in the position of the woman) if it doesn’t they are against it.

That’s it. that’s as high as their moral development climbs.

This had me thinking of how one might prove this one way or another. Is this a case of honest women sheltering the dishonest in their midst, at great cost to innocent men and children? With this in mind, I propose an alternate policy as a sort of litmus test. The birth certificate
application section filled out by the mother should include an optional box for her to check if she swears under penalty of law that it is absolutely impossible that another man could be the child’s father. The law should require a minimum penalty of 5 years prison for checking this box if the child is later shown to not be related to the father. If the box is unchecked, a paternity test is required to put the father’s name on the certificate. Furthermore a man should never be jailed or forced to pay child support for a child he can prove he didn’t father. The man should also have legal recourse against the mother for any financial support he was tricked or legally forced into providing.

This would overturn the current dynamic. Women who declined to check the optional absolutely certain of paternity box would not be able to play the but don’t you trust me? card.

I ran this idea past my wife and she accepted it without hesitation. Her reply was:

If a woman isn’t a whore, she won’t have any problems with the law or with checking the box.
Father’s Day gift ideas.

by Dalrock | May 29, 2011 | Link

I know this is a bit early, but I also know that unlike men women tend to be impatient and shop for these kinds of things fairly early. More importantly, I only have a few ideas, so chances are the really good suggestions will be found in the comments section (which could take some time).

Suggestion #1: A next generation LED flashlight.

As you probably know, I always carry a flashlight. However, next generation LED flashlights are a very well kept secret so you may not already know about them. These new flashlights throw out incredibly bright beams and are extremely efficient. This is a huge leap in technology, and they are now available at very reasonable prices. These new lights are so much better and so reasonably priced I can’t imagine a reason to ever buy another flashlight with the older technology.

There may be other brands, but the lights I’m familiar with all have LED bulbs from Cree (the latest generation Mini Maglites appear to have their own brand of next gen LED bulbs, but I haven’t used them). No matter the brand of the flashlight, it should list Cree on the packaging or product description if it uses a Cree LED. From here all you need to do is decide what combination of brightness, runtime, and size best fit the needs of the father on your list. The last I checked Wal Mart had a good selection of Cree lights under the Coleman Max brand name. You can also find them online at Amazon.com and sites like dealextreme and creeledflashlights.net.

I just bought the flashlight pictured for under $10 with free shipping (two weeks from Hong Kong). It throws an extremely bright adjustable beam using a single Eneloop rechargeable AA battery (not included). They rate it at 120 lumens, but I’m not sure how accurate the figure is. Either way it is at least 10x brighter than my old Mini Mag flashlights and because it is so much shorter it is easy to carry in a front pocket. The only downside I’ve noticed is that it tends to get a little warm if left on for more than about 5 minutes. I’m guessing this is the battery getting warm due to the amount of current draw. However, given my normal use model for a pocket flashlight and how cheap and durable rechargeable batteries are I don’t see this as a real problem. It appears to be good quality and the product reviews were very favorable.

Suggestion #2: Craftsman 32 pc. Bit Screwdriver Set with Magnetic Screwdriver

Tool suggestions are tough, but I think most dads would find one of these useful. This should come in especially handy for fathers of young children, since nearly all toys have battery compartments with screws and no two seem to use the same size/format screw head. Additionally cribs and much of the other furniture often require specialty heads like allen wrenches. With this kit he pretty much has every option covered.

$22.99 from Sears
Suggestion #3: Hot Wheels Rev Ups.

This is a less serious suggestion, but I thought I would throw it in for fun. Our daughter plays with these, and I keep one on the steel filing cabinet in my home office. They have strong magnets and a flywheel which allows them to drive straight up or down a steel surface. This makes them a fun office stress buster. These little toys are pretty amazing. Our daughter has them start on the top of our chest freezer, and when they reach the edge they just drive down the side. If she starts them with enough of a push they then drive along the floor after getting to the bottom.

$4.99 at Toys R Us.

Note: I thought about doing a similar post just before Mother’s Day, but decided against it. My wife’s tastes in lingerie, UFC gear, and firearms are probably not representative of the tastes of most mothers.
Men have biographies, women have grandchildren.

by Dalrock | May 30, 2011 | Link

This is PA’s maxim, which he shared over at Gucci Little Piggy. He shared this following whorefinder’s comment:

Despite all their fronts, women have naturally low opinions of themselves. Perhaps another way to put it is that women don’t define themselves by accomplishments (the way men do) but where they are in the social strata. Of course, a man at the bottom of the social strata feels the pain too, but if that man is an expert video game player, dancer, earns a lot of money, builds coockoo clocks with his bare hands, etc., he can take solace in that.

Women, no matter how much the lesbo-feminazis try to pretend otherwise, take little from an accomplishment. A straight female CEO who is 40 and without a boyfriend...feels like a failure. A stragith male CEO wish 40 and without a girlfriend...feels great, because he’s either banging a new girl every night or hitting up a brothel (or both).

While both are taking it to extremes (and brothels aside), I think there is good reason to question feminism’s implicit assumption that what motivates and gratifies men must therefore be what motivates and gratifies women. At the very least, feminism’s tendency to downplay the importance of family to women can ultimately leave them very unhappy. PA’s maxim certainly is a powerful way of cutting to the heart of the issue.
Trapped in adulthood.
by Dalrock | May 31, 2011 | Link

My wife and I were talking about “being true to yourself” yesterday when she made the point that for women this always somehow meant not fulfilling their obligations and responsibilities (because it will destroy you). Being true to yourself is the exact opposite to being true to your word. I’ve made the observation before that the phrase as commonly used is a codification of childishness. However, this time it reminded me of a passage from Lorraine Berry’s Salon piece*:

Had that spark always been there? Had I had been too caught up in the mundaneness of married life? Had I really been yet another one of those women who had given away her identity when she said “I do?” And I don’t mean “I do” to marriage — but rather “I do” to adult responsibility, jobs, children, mortgage, graduate school, paying bills. Where was the me in all of that?

I’ve always had this sense, but Lorraine Berry doesn’t even try to couch it in feminist or woman’s magazine newspeak. There is no waxing mysterious about feeling trapped due to a problem that has no name. She actually comes right out and complains about being trapped in adulthood. This is a mother of two who is almost 50, writing about the unfairness of having been forced to grow up in her mid to late 20s. Some editor at Salon must have saw this and thought; this would make a great column. It speaks to every woman’s crushed dreams.

So here you have it. The evil patriarchy’s greatest crime is expecting women to grow up.

*For those prone to mix up their Lorraine Berry true life essays, this is the true life essay where she was happily married and attracted to her husband until just before the birth of her second child. It should not be confused with the true life essay where she was an unhappily married woman at a much younger age who throughout her marriage pined for the alpha who scored a same night lay with her when she was 19. I hope this clears up any confusion you may have experienced.
Reverse cuckoldry and court ordered allowances for adults living with their parents.

by Dalrock | June 2, 2011 | Link

Captain Capitalism linked earlier this week to an infuriating story in the daily mail.

The astonishing story begins in 1999 when the man was about to have drug treatment for crippling arthritis.

He stored sperm at the Bourn Hall Clinic in Cambridge to ensure that he and his wife, who married in 1979, could have a child if the treatment left him infertile.

In June 2000 the couple decided to divorce and weeks later she visited the clinic and forged his signature, allowing doctors to create embryos from his frozen sperm and her egg.

She gave birth to a girl in June 2001, claiming it was the result of a one-night stand, and a boy in September 2003.

I can’t say for sure, but typically “the couple decided to divorce” means the wife decided to divorce him. But had she left it there the amount of divorce theft she could haul in would have been too limited. Sure she got the house, but in order to be fully true to herself she needed to make him responsible for financing the children she wanted. Most divorcées are slackers and take the easy route. They wait until the youngest child is no longer in diapers and then “discover” that the man they married is unbearable. Hey, I’m a sucker for the classics, but you have to admire trailblazers. I’m guessing the judge on the case was giving her extra points (and pounds) for her creativity:

A judge ruled that a settlement he made after the divorce, in which the woman kept the family home, was unfair because it did not take the two children into account and the man was forced to pay out the cash. He says he has also spent almost £200,000 in legal fees over the years.

The man now has two daughters aged eight and seven with his second wife. He sees his other two children for two days every fortnight.

Yes, how terribly unfair of the man to not take into account that she would forge his signature and make him a father against his will. Give her an extra £100k. That should teach the smug bastard with his I’m so honest and upright that I follow the rules attitude. If there is a bright side to this story, at least the woman learned her lesson:

His ex-wife, now 51, said: ‘I don’t believe I have done anything wrong. It was getting later and later for me and I wanted to have a child. If I had not done it then I would not be blessed with my children. I have no regrets.’
It wasn't her fault; she was *trapped* outside of marriage.

This example of an obviously insane judge reminded me of a *story I read in the Telegraph* a few months ago.

The man from Andalusia in the south of **Spain** had taken his parents to court demanding a monthly allowance of 400 euros (£355) after they refused to give him anymore money unless he tried to find a job.

Instead the judge at family court number five in Malaga, ruled against the man, who has a degree in law, and told him he must leave his parents’ house within 30 days and learn to stand on his own two feet.

The ruling will send shock waves across Spain where it is not unusual for offspring to remain living with their parents until well into their thirties.

So far, it sounds like a pretty reasonable ruling. But then comes this:

The judge ruled that in this case the man had “sufficient ability to work” and could not expect his parents to support him, although they had taken over the monthly repayments on his car.

He did, however, order them to pay their son 200 euros a month for the next two years “to help with his emancipation”.

This kind of ruling isn't a one-off for Spain:

In 2007, a 22-year-old from Seville took his parents to court after they refused to up an allowance of 150 euros a month despite the father being out of work and only receiving unemployment benefit of 700 euros a month.

That judge also ruled against the plaintiff but ordered the parents to pay his university tuition fees and provide an extra 150 euros a month for books.
Lay down your arms.
by Dalrock | June 3, 2011 | Link

Brendan made an excellent point in the comments section of my Trapped in adulthood post:

The process of female reliance on peer group support and guidance will not be checked — it’s deep behavior, I think. The substance of the values of the peer group at present, however, are the problem.

This fits closely with a point my wife has often made; men have no idea how much their judgment of women impacts them. Women fear judgment from other women, especially those higher than them in the social hierarchy. However, even more than this they fear judgment from men. They don’t just fear judgment from men in the top of the male hierarchy, they fear judgment from any man who has the basic respect of other men (which is most men). Even women at the top of the female hierarchy fear the judgment of ordinary (respected by other men) men.

This is a form of power almost all men have but fail to exercise for a number of reasons, but of critical importance is the fact that most have no idea the power even exists. Feminists however do understand this, which is why they spend so much of their energy working to ensure that neither men nor women feel comfortable judging bad behavior from women. They have been wildly successful here, but they will always be extremely vulnerable to men figuring this out.

If you doubt this, consider the case of the slutwalks. Many (most?) have completely misunderstood what these are about. The stated point of the global demonstrations is to stop excusing rapists based on how women act or are dressed. However, note that there isn’t even a single case in the western world they can point to where a forcible rapist was let off or shown lenience because the woman he raped was a slut. If they had such an example, rest assured we would have heard all about it for months*.

So what is the global slutwalk temper tantrum really about? One respected man judged women in a minor gathering. Note that the officer who made the comments isn’t high ranking; when the feminists howled he was reprimanded and forced to attend “further training”. He didn’t even judge them in an overt way. The context of his statement acknowledged that there was such a thing as a slut, and that it isn’t a good thing to be one. Here are the exact words from a CBC article on the first slutwalk:

In January, Toronto Police Const. Michael Sanguinetti told a personal security class at York University that “women should avoid dressing like sluts in order not to be victimized.”

This is what the global temper tantrum is all about. A respected man acknowledged the existence of sluts. To men this is a throwaway comment. To sluts, it is a scathing indictment. It burns their souls and demands comfort to make the pain go away. They need the shelter of other women, but even more so they need to find a way to stop men from saying or even
thinking such things ever again (emphasis mine):

Sanguinetti apologized for his comments, but his apology failed to satisfy walk organizer Sonya Barnett.

“It was evident that if you’re going to have a representative of the police force come out [and say that] then that kind of idea must be still running rampant within the force itself and that retraining really needs to happen to change that mentality,” she said.

A statement on the event’s website says: “Toronto Police have perpetuated the myth and stereotype of the slut, and in doing so have failed us.”

Barnett said she wants to use the walk to reclaim the word and also demand that victim-shaming change.

Don’t be misdirected. This has nothing to do with an actual rape case. Oz Conservative quoted Bonald at Throne and Altar to make the same point in his post How do we explain the slutwalks (emphasis mine):

The rape issue is a red herring. It has nothing to do with the real issue, which is the social legitimation of female promiscuity. These marches are not meant to intimidate potential rapists; they’re meant to intimidate social conservatives. The sluts are only tying together the issues of social disapproval and sexual violence as a rhetorical trick to cast themselves as victims even as they go on the attack...

The sluts are not victims; they are aggressors. Their victim is society itself. Their goal is social approval for female sexual promiscuity.

Most men don’t recognize this because the idea that a few words of mild unintended judgment from an ordinary cop would spark worldwide discomfort amongst sluts and their enablers is preposterous on its face. Why would avowed sluts fear being labeled as sluts? But the fact remains that it is true. They fear this instinctively. No matter how much they claim to have “taken back” the word, it still packs a punch to the gut that men simply can’t fathom. This is why Doomed Harlot is so intent on sheltering would be sluts by taking on the mantle of the term. Note however that even while she is doing this, she made it a point to inform us that she isn’t actually a slut. She tells us she has only kissed one other man than her husband in her life.

Again, men don’t understand this; the women proclaiming to have “taken back” this word seem quite confident in their professed morality. How could an avowed slut fear being called a slut in our thoroughly libertine culture? It makes no sense, so men discard the idea without giving it further consideration. But don’t take my word for it, Roissy makes a sexual living by sluts. Part of what he knows is how to avoid triggering a slut’s slut shield. Yes, even sluts are terrified of being identified as sluts. As Roissy wrote in his post No You Don’t Sound Bothered At All (crass site warning):

Sluts know this is true deep in the crevices of their souls, which is why, despite (or
because of) their indignant protestations and transparent sophistry to the contrary, they really do get bothered when called out.

If Roissy’s word isn’t good enough for you, then consider the words of sex positive feminist and slut-in-chief Jaclyn Friedman. Jacklyn pleaded with the feminist community for moral support by posting the depths of her dysfunctional sex life for all to see. Of course begging for support for her actions wouldn’t fit her imagined mantle of feminist heroine, so she had to pretend she was being brave for others:

I’m telling you this because juries still think women who even look like they might possibly be sluts are “asking for it.”...

I’m telling you this because sluthood saved me, in a small but life-altering way, and I want it to be available to you if you ever think it could save you, too. Or if you want it for any other reason at all. And because even if you don’t ever want sluthood for yourself, you’re going to be called upon to support a slut. I’m telling you this because when that happens, I want you to say yes.

As you might recall, Susan Walsh instantly saw through this, which earned her a denunciation from NOW.

No matter how much formal power feminists wield, they are terrified of respected men judging them. They want nothing more than to convince you to voluntarily disarm yourself. Only a fool would do this.

Don’t be a fool.

*Note that even Jacklyn Friedman couldn’t find a legitimate case of a forcible rapist in the west being coddled because of the dress or actions of a slut. In her sentence above about women “asking for it” she is forced to link instead to a very strange corner case where one woman lifted the top of another. The author of the post she links to defines this as a “sexual assault”; feminists clearly have to dig deep on this one.
The contagious nature of divorce.

by Dalrock | June 5, 2011 | Link

I’ve linked to this study in the past, but I don’t recall anyone in the manosphere going through it. When a friend of my wife decided to divorce it prompted me to revisit the study. While I will share some of my own thoughts in this post, the bulk of it will be my synopsis of the study and selected quotes. Feel free to view the entire study yourself and share your own thoughts in the comments section:

**Breaking Up is Hard to Do, Unless Everyone Else is Doing it Too:**

*Social Network Effects on Divorce in a Longitudinal Sample Followed for 32 Years*

This paper used the data collected for the *Framingham Heart Study* to investigate the possibility that divorce spreads through networks of friends. This kind of longitudinal survey is essential for the type of research they performed. It allowed them to track both how a network of friends impacted divorce, as well as how divorce impacted the network of friends. The data set they had to work with is extremely impressive. It covers three generations and includes an incredible amount of detail. They can tell for example not only if two people are friends, but if they are neighbors or coworkers. They can also discern the direction of friendships; often one person would list others as friends who didn’t happen to list them back.

**What they found:**

One’s likelihood to divorce is increased by the divorce of either a friend or a friend of a friend. The impact is strongest with direct friends, but still significant for friends of a friend. Geographical distance doesn’t seem to reduce this effect, but it is increased if the person divorcing lives in the same household:

- The full network shows that participants are 75% (95% C.I. 58% to 96%) more likely to be divorced if a person (obviously other than their spouse) that they are directly connected to (at one degree of separation) is divorced. The size of the effect for people at two degrees of separation (e.g., the friend of a friend) is 33% (95% C.I. 18% to 52%). At three degrees of separation the effect disappears (-2%, 95% C.I. -12% to 9%), in contrast to the “three degrees of influence” rule of social network contagion that has been exhibited for obesity, smoking, happiness, and loneliness (Cacioppo et al. 2009; Christakis & Fowler 2007; Christakis & Fowler 2008; Fowler & Christakis 2008a).

Notice in the right panel of Figure 2 that the decline in the effect size with social distance contrasts to a lack of decline in the effect size as people become more geographically distant from one another. Although the association in divorce status is stronger among people who co-reside in the same household (category 1 in Figure 2, p<0.001) geographic distance appears to have no effect on the strength of the association among those who do not reside together. We confirmed this result by testing an interaction between distance and the effect size. These results suggest that a divorced friend or family member who lives hundreds of miles away may have
as much influence on an ego’s risk of divorce as one who lives next door.

They also found that while the social network impacts divorce, divorce also changes the structure of the social network:

Table 2 shows that the causal arrow also points in the opposite direction: divorce has a significant effect on the structure of the network. People who go through a divorce experience a 4% (C.I. 0% to 8%) decrease in the number of people who name them as friends. They also name about 7% (C.I. 3% to 12%) fewer friends on average. People who get divorced may become less popular at least partly because they likely lose members of their spouse’s social network as friends. In addition, newly single friends may be perceived as social threats by married friends who worry about marital poaching, or suspect their partner may be susceptible to infidelity. Table 3 shows that divorce also has an effect on the pattern of ties between ones’ friends. A measure of transitivity - the probability that two of ones’ contacts are connected with one another - is significantly related to previous divorce status (even controlling for the total number of contacts, which is structurally related to transitivity). The implication is that people who go through a divorce tend to immerse themselves in denser groups with fewer ties outside these groups. In contrast, transitivity appears to have no effect on the future likelihood of divorce (p=0.37). Moreover, we find that sharing the same friends with one’s spouse does not significantly mitigate the likelihood of divorce. The correlation between sharing at least one friend and getting divorced at the next exam is negative but not significant (Pearson rho = -0.012, p=0.20). Similarly, the correlation between fraction of shared friends and getting divorced at the next exam is negative but not significant (Pearson rho = -0.011, p=0.22). Taken together, these results suggest that divorce has a stronger effect on the structure of the network than the structure of the network has on divorce.

As I mentioned in the beginning, they were able to determine a great deal about the nature of the connections between people. This turns out to be very significant:

People who have named a friend who has gotten divorced are 147% (95% C.I. 13% to 368%) more likely to get divorced themselves by the time they come to their next exam. Among friends, we can distinguish additional possibilities. Since each person was asked to name a friend, and not all of these nominations were reciprocated, we have ego-perceived friends (denoted here as “friends”) and “alter-perceived friends” (the alter named the ego as a friend, but not vice versa). We find that the influence of alter-perceived friends is not significant (the estimate is 23%, C.I. -53% to 165%). If the associations in the social network were merely due to shared experience, the significance and effect sizes for different types of friendships should be similar. That is, if some third factor were explaining both ego and alter divorce decisions, it should not respect the directionality of the friendship tie.

We also find significant effects for other kinds of alters. People with a divorced sibling are 22% (95% C.I. 0.1% to 45%) more likely to get divorced by the next exam than those without a divorced sibling. And while neighbors who live within 25 meters do not appear to affect each other (23%, C.I. -18% to 77%), we do find a significant
association among co-workers at small firms (defined as those where 10 or fewer FHS participants work). People with a divorced co-worker are 55% more likely to get divorced at the next exam (C.I. 2% to 126%) than those with a non-divorced co-worker.

Interestingly they found that the role of children in preventing divorce seems very specific to sheltering the couple from the contagious effect of divorce:

We wondered whether children would have a protective effect by encouraging couples who would otherwise get divorced to stay together for the sake of raising their children, or to provide a self conscious role model against their children’s future prospects for divorce. As noted earlier, most literature and cross-sectional data suggests that children reduce the likelihood of divorce slightly, although childlessness, and especially infertility, can also sometimes precipitate divorce. In Table 6, we study the relationship between number of children and divorce and we find no such effect; in fact, the main effect of children on divorce is slightly positive, albeit not significant at conventional levels (p=0.13). However, we also include an interaction between the alter’s divorce status and ego’s number of children and we find that each additional child significantly (p=0.05) reduces the effect of alter’s divorce status on ego’s likelihood of getting divorced. For couples with no children the effect is much stronger than average—an alter who is divorced nearly sextuples the risk of divorce in the ego (593%, C.I.106% to 1593%). But by the time a person has a third child, the effect of alter’s divorce status becomes insignificant (84%, C.I. -33% to 306%) and by the fifth child it completely vanishes (-4%, C.I. -86% to 233%). These results suggest that the protective effect of children acts specifically on a parent’s susceptibility to influence by peers who have gotten divorced.

The most surprising finding of the study for me was that the effect was the same for men and women:

It is important to note that there are no detectable gender interactions with any of the effects shown (results available on request). Men and women appear to be equally susceptible to splitting up if their friends do it.

This last point wasn’t explored in the paper any further, and seems like an area worth much more investigation. How does this finding square with the fact that women generally initiate divorce at least twice as often as men?

They also explain why understanding the patterns around divorce is so important:

Divorce is consequential, and a better understanding of the social processes contributing to this behavior offers the promise of possibly being able to reduce the adverse effects of divorce. For example, one recent study showed that, on average, women’s standard of living declines by 27% while men’s standard of living increases by 10% following divorce (Peterson, 1996). Divorce also appears to exert a decisive effect on overall mortality; married people have higher longevity than unmarried (Ben-Schlomo et al., 1993; Goldman, 1993; Elwert and Christakis, 2006). These mortality rates typically differ by gender, such that men demonstrate greater effects
(Koskenvuo et al., 1986), but unemployed women and unskilled male workers in particular may suffer lower rates of life expectancy in the wake of divorce (Hemstrom, 1996). In addition, divorced people tend to have more health problems (Joung et al., 1997; Murphy et al., 1997; Elwert and Christakis, 2008)

**Edit:** Several commenters strongly challenged the standard of living statistics from the Peterson study the authors cite in the quote above. Namae Nanka linked to this article which appears to debunk the findings. Either way, note that in the above quote the authors are citing a separate study. This is entirely separate from their findings around the contagious nature of divorce.

I’ll close with one final quote which would be worth sharing with your pastor. On the discussions on my blog and others (Elusive Wapiti and Terry Breathing Grace) many Christians were hesitant to take a hard a stand on divorce within the congregation because it might discourage those who need saving the most from attending. I am by no means an expert in this area, but my understanding is that the biblical concept of rebuke is very fitting here. However, for those Christians who aren’t convinced by the *Bible*, perhaps *science* can sway them:

> If divorce can be understood as a public and social problem, rather than solely as an individual phenomenon, health interventions based on previous successful public health campaigns may prove beneficial for mitigating its effects, if not its prevalence.

**Churches have an extremely powerful tool at their disposal should they ever decide to take on divorce in anywhere near a serious fashion.** There are all sorts of opportunities to discourage the wrong behavior and reinforce the right behavior within the social structure of the congregation. Since women are especially concerned with social hierarchies, this would be especially effective with the group most likely to decide to divorce. Moreover, since the direction of the friendship (who has the social status/power) is crucial to the transmission of divorce, a solution could be crafted which changed the social hierarchy within the congregation of those who divorce. This would allow divorcees to continue as part of the congregation while muting their ability to transmit the contagion to others.
You are cordially invited to a hamster hunt
by Dalrock | June 7, 2011 | Link

Grab your riding gear (kit?) and your best tracking dogs, we are in for a hamster hunt. Being a gracious host, we won’t just be chasing one hamster, but two!

Talley-ho!

That cloud of dust you see was kicked up by the hamsters of two women Christian bloggers. They’re darting around, rationalizing how Christian women can marry men they don’t really love and everything will turn out just fine (for the women).

Haley kicked off the excitement with her latest in a long series of posts arguing the benefits of marrying a man she isn’t in love with or attracted to. This latest post is titled Companionship vs Sexual Attraction. In it she quotes Hana, another Christian blogger who will be competing alongside Haley in this hamster double. Hana’s hamster has turned out an impressive piece of rationalization, titled “Nothing but Heaven itself is Better than a Friend…

Haley opens her post with two quotes from Hana:

“…close friendship, where two people share common interests, a compatible sense of humour, and similar intelligence, etc. When a man and a woman are close friends in this way, the importance of sexual attraction seems to fade. Sexual attraction is still present…Still, sexual attraction becomes less important when a man and a woman are truly close friends.”

She then made an even more provocative statement:

“As long as you’re somewhat attracted to him or her, why not marry your best friend?”

Why not? Because you will make him miserable, and are very likely to commit the sin of divorce. By advising women to do this, she is putting them at great risk for the sin of divorce, and even worse further threatening the institution of marriage while it teeters on the brink. Alte informs me that good rhetoric includes both anecdote and data. I’ve already done that (also here), so I won’t bother rehashing it here.

Back to Haley’s post. She notes that this advice is very different from my advice, as well as Badger’s.

This seems like a pretty far cry from Dalrock’s and Badger’s insistence that a woman feel “head over heels” for any potential spouse, but in my opinion, it seems like a good recipe for a stable, enduring marriage.

she continues:

If women are able to grow in attraction to a mate and will feel more attracted and
more attached to him once they have sex, and the woman at least meets a man’s
minimum physical attractiveness requirements, and there is a preexisting
emotional/intellectual bond and the two enjoy each other’s company, then that
sounds like pretty solid grounds for marrying (assuming there are no red flags in
other areas).

Never mind that we don’t see women becoming more attracted to men after marriage. If they
did, Athol Kay’s book and blog wouldn’t be such big hits.

God willing, you’re both going to be old and achy a lot longer than you’re going to be
young and hot, so it’s worth investing in someone who will still be fun when your
collagen production has reached its nadir and you can’t see each other clearly up
close without bifocals anyway (not that you would necessarily want to, due to the
wrinkles).

I’ve only been with my wife for 18 years, so I hope Haley will look past my lack of experience
in the matter. But as a mere youngster, all I can say is my marriage is nothing like what
marriage is when she closes her eyes and imagines it. I haven’t checked my collagen
production, but I can still see my wife just fine without bifocals; she’s still hot. I’m going to go
out on a limb and guess that Athol would say the same thing about his wife too (that is if it
weren’t bad game form to do so).

Next Haley offers an anecdote. It turns out that there is a man who Haley thinks would under
different circumstances be a good marriage match for her because he doesn’t repulse
her:

Speaking anecdotally, I had a friend who fit this description. We attended the same
church and got along swimmingly. It was very easy for us to have lengthy
conversations, and our senses of humor meshed well. We weren’t superclose friends,
but I could tell that we were on the same wavelength. After knowing him for a couple
of years, I started to think that if he hadn’t been married with kids, he was someone
I probably could have married. I didn’t feel “head over heels” for him. I didn’t even
have a crush on him. I wasn’t physically attracted to him (but whatever my minimum
standard of physical attractiveness was, he met that, because I wasn’t repulsed by
him). He was just someone I got along with really, really well.

Nowhere does she consider what she would have done to this poor man had she had the
opportunity to marry him. She would have stolen his best chance at happiness, not to
mention his current wife’s chance at happiness. And don’t worry, if Haley ever does stoop to
marry a man worthy of the high praise of not being repulsive, she won’t make the mistake of
giving him a big head by telling him how non repulsive he is. She assured us of this in her
previous post, Why women are afraid to pump up men’s egos. Feel free to read the whole
post, but I would say you can boil it down to: The men she is attracted to she resents for
being successful, and the men who aren’t successful she resents for not being attractive.

And women think to themselves, “I’m working a full-time job and still living
respectably, but I’m supposed to tell this guy how wonderful he is and bring him his
slippers?!?”
Yup, that is the kind of love and adoration married-guy-who-didn’t-ask-anyway missed out on by marrying a woman who actually loved him.

But so far in this hunt I have been neglecting half of its quarry. My deepest apologies to Hana, I haven’t forgotten you. Hana appeals to the fear of lost opportunity to choose when rationalizing why it is ok for Christian women to trick men into loveless, sexless marriages:

If the person you’re dating walked out of your life tomorrow, how much would you miss him? If you’d miss him for a little while and then fill the void with other friends, maybe he’s not “the one.” If you’d miss him deeply and for a longer period of time, though, then maybe you have a friend worth committing to for the rest of your life.

Yes! Because marriage is only about what you, as the woman, want! Hana bolsters her argument further in the comments section of Haley’s post by offering an anecdote. While she evidently hasn’t actually witnessed a case where a woman married a man she didn’t love and it all turned out well, she once knew a guy who after being the victim of a frivolous divorce still managed to be happy after marrying a woman who didn’t divorce him:

Here’s a little anecdote: I know someone who, if not an alpha, is as close to an alpha as I’ve ever seen. He married a very beautiful girl who, several years later, left him...for his sister’s husband. She wasn’t a Christian when they met; she claimed to have become one, but obviously the conversion was only surface-deep.

Not long after they divorced, he married a Christian woman who is demonstrably less attractive than his first wife, though not unattractive. He seems very happy and, judging from his behaviour, attracted to his second wife. But I bet that if you had put the two women side-by-side when he was younger, he would have gone for the woman who was more attractive (his first wife).

The point I’m making is that you don’t have to compromise attraction completely – you just have to factor in other things (in this case, character), because they are what keep your relationship strong for the long haul.

Since we know God made man and woman exactly the same, if the marriage worked just fine for a man, it should work just fine for women, right?

Take over for me fellow hunters, I’m exhausted.

Note: Hana has written a response to this post: Head-over-Heels
Are the vast majority of women truly incapable of experiencing reciprocal love and attraction?
by Dalrock | June 8, 2011 | Link

The fishermen know that the sea is dangerous and the storm terrible, but they have never found these dangers sufficient reason for remaining ashore

–Vincent van Gogh

Hana makes the following argument in closing her rebuttal to my most recent post on the problem with women marrying men they aren’t head over heels in love with (emphasis mine):

The general argument seems to be that men shouldn’t marry women who are anything less than head-over-heels for them. At the same time, men also want to marry women they are head-over-heels about. Complicating matters further, some people – include myself – understand that most women may never find a man they are “head-over-heels” about. Yet many women, especially women in conservative Christian circles, deeply desire marriage.

This same point is made by many men of the manosphere, generally making the assertion that because of hypergamy women are naturally only capable of being attracted to and truly falling for 10-30% of men. This is simply not true (which I will show in a moment), but even if it were true it isn’t a valid argument for women marrying a man they aren’t attracted to.
Those who argue for marriage when the couple isn’t suited are essentially saying sure, when sailing out into open water you really should have something like this:

![Sailing boat](image)

But that isn’t easy and may not be available to everyone, so go ahead and use one of these and hope for the best:
It doesn’t matter how much they want to make the journey. **The fact is they aren’t equipped.** No amount of *but I want!, I want!* temper tantrums will change this fundamental fact. For those who still struggle with this, remember that this isn’t just about the couple. There are likely to be children involved as well. **Both men and women have a moral obligation to do everything in their power to give their future kids the best shot possible of growing up in an intact, functional home.**

But as I said, the premise itself isn’t correct. Hypergamy doesn’t mean that women can naturally only fall in love with or be attracted to the highest status men. As Hawaiian Libertarian explains in his recent post [Defining Hypergamy](#):

Hypergamy simply means women’s base sexual nature is attracted to a higher status *in relation to herself*. In other words, if she does not “look up” to a man in some way, she will not be attracted to that man. The higher status can be on one or more characteristics...which is why the unemployed musician can often date a woman who has job and disposable income. She may make more money...but she “looks up” to his musical talents, and he may be physically good looking to boot, despite not having a job, money or a car and so therefore her hypergamous attraction instincts are satisfied in mating with him, despite her higher socio-economic status.

It isn’t an absolute. While it is true that women generally do find the highest status men the most attractive, it doesn’t mean they can’t find men of their basic “marriage market value” attractive. I’m not arguing that those women who tell us they can’t fall in love with or be attracted to men in their own league aren’t telling the truth; I’m saying this isn’t the natural
state of things. These women have a serious problem, and we shouldn’t deny it or try to paper over it by pretending it is ok to find a guy they aren’t repulsed by and marry him.

The problem these women have is very similar to that of a man who has become addicted to pornography and can no longer share normal and healthy intimacy with real women. Something very important is broken. It needs to be fixed before moving forward if marriage is the goal. Anyone telling them otherwise is only enabling them. While this may be meant as kindness, it is in fact cruelty.

When addressing how men should respond to hypergamy, the obvious answer is to have them learn game to improve their attractiveness. This will allow them to attract a better woman, and to cause her to fall more deeply in love with him. This is the right advice for the right audience. But the message to women should be something different. If they are close to being fulfilled but just need some fine tuning, they can make things better by not comparing men in the wrong venues, practice self control, and encourage their mate to show more leadership by their own actions. But these are all about fine tuning for better results; if a woman finds herself unable to experience normal and healthy feelings of intimacy, she very likely needs to look much deeper.

If a woman is unable to experience love and attraction within her own “league”, then the most likely problem is she is greatly overestimating her own attractiveness. It isn’t that most men aren’t good enough, it is that she sees herself as above the vast majority of men. As Roissy has said, many women have too much self esteem*, and the amount of game a woman needs depends on the degree to which she overvalues herself, and this changes based on her life experience*. This last bit is key. Women are naturally learning to stop overvaluing themselves as they grow older. As they do this, it reduces the amount of alpha/game that they need to feel attraction. The problem is, by the time this typically happens the woman is already past her prime marriage and fertility years.

*Crass site warning

So the solution is both obvious and extremely unpleasant. Women whose ability to be attracted to normal men is malfunctioning can fix this by deflating their own egos. Some may look at this and decide they prefer to continue waiting or outright decide to remain unmarried. These are valid options. Some may be close enough to attracting the kind of man they are attracted to and decide to improve their own attractiveness and achieve their goal. This is also a valid option. A few will recognize the seriousness of their problem and decide to tackle it head on. But far too many will persist in a fantasy world where marrying without love and attraction is “good enough”. All I ask is that you not enable them in this destructive path. Marriage is too important to play make believe with.

Image information: Sunset is from Alvesgaspar. Sailboat from Xavier Snelgrove. Dinghy by Rootology.
More proof feminism has jumped the shark
by Dalrock | June 9, 2011 | Link

H/T Paul Elam by way of The Private Man:

We are living through one of history’s great transitions – a major shift in social and cultural consciousness where institutions and structures of the past have been turned on their heads.

The 5,500-year history of domination and control is coming to an end, and it’s clear we need a new model to replace it. Men seem to be caught between these two worlds: the old culture for which we’ve been trained, and the emerging culture we have yet to be prepared for.

Yawn. Feminism has already thrown all it has at us, and if anything the tide is turning the other way. They have completed their long march through the institutions of the west, and they hold all high ground. Yet they haven’t made the kind of radical change they have always dreamed of. These guys can grovel at the feet of feminists all they want. We already know that won’t do them any good.

What these guys really need to do is go out and kill something and eat it (In accordance with all relevant fish and game laws of course).
While the popular manosphere metaphor for understanding the realities of game, feminism, and the differences between the sexes is taking the red pill, I've always preferred thinking of it as putting on the They Live glasses:

I think this is just a matter of taste. Some prefer the rather metro Keanu Reeves* and butch Carrie-Anne Moss in the highly stylized The Matrix, while I prefer the cheesy Pro Wrestler Roddy Piper and the campy clumsily marxist They Live.

*Not that there is anything wrong with that. In Keanu’s defense, he doesn’t seem at all gay in Constantine and is instead surprisingly cool.
People sleep peaceably in their beds at night only because rough men stand ready
to do violence on their behalf.

_Attributed_ to George Orwell

Every time you engage in violence, no matter how small or trivial it may appear to
be at the time, it has the potential of escalating into something extraordinarily
serious. What is really worth fighting for when you might find yourself spending the
rest of your life behind bars, confined to a wheelchair, or trying to dig yourself out of
bankruptcy from beneath the crushing weight of a civil lawsuit? It is important to ask
yourself, “Is this really worth fighting over?” While in some instances the response
could legitimately be “Yes,” more often than not it ought to be “No.”

_The Little Black Book of Violence_ (H/T Thag)

Our feminized society is horrified by the tendency of men to protect themselves and others
using violence. This comes from the understandable feminine fear of violence combined with
a lack of understanding of the realities of violence. Blogger _Delusion Damage_ addresses the
differences in how the sexes understand violence in his post _Are You Asking to Get Killed?_
(link has graphic description of violence):

Those who are furthest removed from violence in their daily lives are the most
vulnerable to it when they suddenly run into it on a dark street precisely because
they don’t understand it and therefore act stupidly and end up “asking for it” and
getting killed. Most churchgoing taxpayers just have no idea how violent people
think. Women, especially. **If there are any women you give a shit about, you
will make sure they know about this stuff. They probably have no clue
about any of this, and it may one day save their lives.**

Men are usually slightly better prepared. It’s rather difficult for us to get through the
mandatory twelve years of school without participating in at least a few scuffles, or
at least learning how to avoid them in a male-group dominance hierarchy largely
based on the ever-present implicit threat of violence. We at least learn the
fundamentals. A woman can go through her entire life without ever as much as
punching anyone or getting punched, or even imagining that there exists a threat of
running into violence if she behaves badly.

Until that one fateful night when she’s walking to her apartment building through a
deserted parking lot and runs into one of the many people who walk the same
streets the rest of us walk, but **who live a life of violence all day every day.**

Women of either sex tend to want to _legislate_ away the possibility of _any_ violence, whether
aggressive or defensive. This pathological fear of all violence (both good and bad) is typically
aimed at the potential tools of violence, and the extent of the folly in this regard can be truly breathtaking.

However, this irrational fear of even defensive violence collides with the equally loud demands that men protect women from violence. The same forces which work so hard to make all good men entirely harmless also demand that good men defend women whenever the need arises. This gets extremely tricky, because men are also prevented by law and strong social taboo from using violence against women, even to defend themselves or others. Yet while the taboo against using violence against women is arguably stronger than it has ever been in human history, the historical social restraints against women using or provoking aggressive violence are at their weakest point in human history.

These contradictory rules often put men in truly no win situations, as we saw with the recent highly publicized case of two young black women savagely beating a white transvestite in a McDonalds in Maryland. The manager of the McDonalds in question has been widely criticized for failing to protect the transvestite from the two women, even though he repeatedly put himself at risk attempting to break up the attack (Warning: graphic violence):

When I first watched the gut wrenching video the bulk of the comments were condemning the manager for not taking aggressive enough action against the women doing the beating. After it came out that the victim was a transvestite and not a woman, some of this criticism has died down. The entire case is like a PC logic puzzle. Should a black man use violence against black women who are beating a white woman? Many saw that scenario and answered yes. But when the question was Should a black man use violence against black women who are beating a white man dressed as a woman who used the woman’s bathroom? What if one of the black women is only 14? Can he use violence against her, or just the one who is 18? The answer for many was less clear. I won’t try to solve the entire hierarchy of protected classes riddle this case represents, but hopefully it is painfully clear that the manager in question was expected to make a very complex value and legal judgment in the face of immediate violence and will be given no leeway by those who calmly judge what they think they know about the case at a later date.

When searching on this topic I found one blogger who came down hard with the standard Chivalrous party line (emphasis mine):

To begin with, the manager should have ordered his male employees to stop the girls from beating the victim, and eject the perpetrators. Then, if they persistently returned he should have locked the doors and waited for the police and ambulance if one was needed. The manage also should have stopped the employee from videoing the incident, an act that has since resulted in the employees dismissal. I feel for the owner of this business, because he could very well lose his franchise license with McDonald’s over this whole incident.

My last word on this will be that all the employees who stood back to watch are just as culpable as the girls who did the beating. From the manager on down to the lowly dishwasher who stood around and enjoyed the beating of a man dressed as a woman.
If you are still struggling with what the manager or other male employees should have done, imagine yourself witnessing that scene as a civilian legally licensed to carry a concealed handgun. You have sufficient violence at your immediate disposal to stop the attack; would you do so? Would it be legally wise to do so? For me and many others the answer is no. From Ten things you should know about CCW holders:

**We don’t think we are cops, spies, or superheroes.** We aren’t hoping that somebody tries to rob the convenience store while we are there so we can shoot a criminal. We don’t take it upon ourselves to get involved in situations that are better handled by a 911 call or by simply standing by and being a good witness. We don’t believe our guns give us any authority over our fellow citizens. We also aren’t here to be your unpaid volunteer bodyguard. We’ll be glad to tell you where we trained and point you to some good gun shops if you feel you want to take this kind of responsibility for your personal safety. Except for extraordinary circumstances your business is your business, don’t expect us to help you out of situations you could have avoided.

I’ve framed this deliberately as the choice of using (or at least displaying) deadly force or not, because there is a common misconception that one can use just a little violence in these kinds of situations. In reality this is seldom true. Threats of violence only work if you are ready to back them up with real violence. The manager in the video understood that any use of violence to deter the two women doing the beating would almost certainly have provoked a direct attack against him; if that happened he would have been forced to either take a beating like the transvestite, or risk legal and career jeopardy by striking the woman and girl in self defense.

Men’s challenge in performing their traditional role as protectors in our feminized society is made even more difficult by the fact that many women now feel justified in provoking and/or antagonizing would be attackers while still demanding the protection of men. We saw this to a lesser degree with the case of the slutwalks. Many women passionately argued that men should have no say in the kinds of risky decisions women make; yet men are still expected to come to their aid if the risks materialize. Again from Delusion Damage:

Most men learn in the schoolyard that there’s a point beyond which it’s not wise to annoy people, but women can sometimes get through their 12 years without acquiring that wisdom. To an outside observer, it can seem like some women just have no self-preservation instinct at all. We’ve all seen a woman just go off like a fire hydrant, running her mouth and spewing out insult after insult at someone who’s visibly getting madder and madder for every second, closer and closer to losing self-control, and yet the stream of bitching just doesn’t stop until eventually the recipient goes over the edge and unleashes a violent outburst. There’s no need to talk about whether short-tempered people “have the right to” get violent when angry – it’s just not going to stop happening no matter who says what. If you want to avoid it, you are going to refrain from pushing them over the edge. That’s it, there is no alternative solution.

The only rational response to this particular form of women’s empowerment is for men to
stop feeling a general sense of responsibility to protect women, especially those they don’t have authority over. This is difficult for men to do however, because of their sense of justice as well as the tendency to see this as a reciprocal act which they would want other men to do for the women they care about. Tspoon made this case quite well in his comment on my post On gun control and wimpy betas:

Also on another point, that of the expected underwriting of female safety, with that of the males own safety a la :
“If someone hurt me or my mom, he would kill them (not joking in any way — he honestly would find them and remove them from the planet)”

This is a subject that can be approached from more than one angle. Violence gets women wet. Let’s not beat around the bush on that. I’ve been in the company of females who enjoy provoking confrontation in public places, but who then expected that I should bear the fruits of their completely unwarranted aggression toward others. For her entertainment.
Let’s be clear, likely that is not what the writer was referring to. And as a father I know all too well how it is to be protective of daughters.
So yes I’m prepared to underwrite their safety with mine, but like any entity which undertakes to underwrite the risks of another, I have expectations for the behaviour of those I must protect.
Which is where it breaks down somewhat. Outside of my two daughters, it’s been over 20 years since I met or knew a female of whom I knew, without reservation - That I would in fact guarantee her safety as far as I could. Outside of a minor miracle, I have no anticipation of meeting another...

I’ll close with an example I read about on a gun forum several years ago. One of the regulars on the forum (a very level headed young man) wrote about a conflict he found himself in while walking back from an open air performance with his family and two other couples. He was legally carrying a concealed handgun, and found himself in a very difficult situation caused by the wife of one of the other men in the group. While they walked back to their cars on a dark street, a group of thugs were walking behind them loudly talking and cursing amongst themselves. The woman turned to the thugs and told them to stop cursing and learn some manners, since there were women and children (the gun owner’s son) present. Many of the men on the forum took a predictable “you go girl” approach, commending the woman for “standing up” to the thugs (which she clearly saw herself as doing). I and many others saw this differently; she was creating a situation where the group was at greater risk of violence, and where this man’s son was much more likely to at the very least have the memory of the day when his father was forced to shoot those men. Fortunately the situation only escalated to verbal threats by the thugs, and all of them were able to get to their cars without incident.

Conclusion

I don’t have a clean cut answer on what men should do given the conflicting expectations being made on them; each of us must weigh the realities and come to our own decision. I think Tspoon’s take is the wisest choice, but men need to understand they will still likely face a great deal of criticism if they don’t take on the role of personal bodyguard for today’s
empowered women.

So be it.
In my post on *Chivalry and protecting the weak* commenter Sean was troubled by the example I gave of a woman who put a group of families walking on a dark road at risk by calling out a group of nearby thugs on their language. She felt that not only was the woman in the right by creating a confrontation, but that any men she was with were in the wrong for allowing anyone in her vicinity to curse:

The example the man used of punks cursing and using foul derogatory language around his family and him doing nothing was appalling...

I call it a manitude. You should be able to exude enough manliness to make other men back down, especially if they know they are in the wrong. If you won't protect your own family from punks what good are you? And it's wrong to blame the woman for wanting to be able to walk back to her car IN THE COMPANY OF MEN, and not have her kids ears assaulted. My father, uncles, brothers and husband were never petty around women but would never have allowed that situation to happen...

My uncles, and brothers exhibit the same type of manitude, very few men will step to them much less be disrespectful around their families. The few who have tried usually back down quickly once confronted.

While I disagree with her position on this, I will do my best to break down her case for you:

1. Women need the protection of men because they are *smaller*, and therefore less able to defend themselves.
2. A *lady* should never have to hear foul language, even if the alternative is to put the group’s physical safety at risk.
3. The woman in the story should not have had to decide if it was *her place* to confront the thugs, or if one of the men would do so on her behalf. She shouldn't have been left wondering about this.
4. The men she was with should have acted in such a way that she would know that *everything would be ok*.

In summary, if you find yourself in a similar situation: **Make sure the little lady knows her place and everything will be ok.**

Marc ‘Animal’ MacYoung of *No Nonsense Self-Defense* describes a similar situation which he experienced many years ago. His drama queen girlfriend *put him in a very bad spot*:

my then-girlfriend had nearly put me into a situation where I would have to bust more than just a few heads. In fact, the odds were good I’d have to kill someone in order to save our hides.

She did this by plowing through a crowd of rough characters on a crowded sidewalk one night
She whirled and literally charged through the crowd — in a straight line. At this time I’d like to remind you that it wasn’t the daylight crowd. This was the nightcrew and the ‘boys’ were out in force. I watched in horror as she blew straight through a group of seriously not nice dudes. They reeled back in shock and confusion. Before they could regain their composure I hot-footin’ after her — right through their midst’s. As I was moving hard to catch up with my sweet beloved I looked back over my shoulders and saw a look I knew all to well … predators deciding whether or not to go to work.

The combination of the fact that I was obviously armed and my ‘I know she’s wrong, but you really want to let this one go’ expression convinced them that maybe a few more minutes off the clock wasn’t a bad idea.

What she didn’t understand is the reason the men she was antagonizing didn’t immediately physically stop her was they saw ‘Animal’ as the responsible party:

And once again, guess who was getting the hard looks? See along with that cultural bias about how women should behave in public, also comes the assumption that it’s the male who is responsible for a woman’s bad behavior. So although she had just insulted them, they’d be wanting to discuss the insult with me.

Fortunately having grown up on the street he knew what needed to be done:

I finally broke into a short dash and grabbed her by the shoulder and spun her around to face me. KNOCK IT OFF! I snarled. Giving our ethnic audience a “I’m handling this so you don’t have to” look, I grabbed her by the arm and dragged her towards the theatre.

As we walked side by side for a short distance I began to discuss her behavior under my breath: “We’re on the *%^$%!!! Boulevard! IF we &^%$*!!! need to cut through the *&&^^%$!! crowd, you *&^%$^&$!! follow me!!!! Now get behind me and don’t say a *&^%$!! word!”

He did this not just for his safety, but for hers as well:

In their little pea brains it was a simple equation, that was one hell of a woman, and they’d not hesitate to try take her. And if she objected, they’d take her by force. What was keeping her safe among the predators was the fact that they looked at me and figured that they could cut me off at the knees and call me a tripod. I numbered among those who you didn’t mess with without good reason.

However, what she had done by first moving ahead of me — is in their eyes — lessened my status.
Don’t be a tease!
by Dalrock | June 15, 2011 | Link

File under: Dalrock is easily amused.
I just found this article on *The Washington Times* Economy of sex: It’s cheap these days. It confirms much of what we have been discussing here. For example, not long ago I speculated that women delaying marriage past their most marriageable years could shift the marriage market power from women to men:

> Although plenty of women dabble in sexual-market relationships and then settle down successfully with life partners, he said, many women are “not witnessing marriage happening on the timetables they prefer and expected.”

> This is because, as economist Timothy Reickert has found, power shifts away from women as they move toward their 30s, Mr. Regnerus said.

The article also points out that women would benefit from a Sex Cartel as they did before traditional conservative women took the feminist bait and started worrying about the double standard instead of female chastity:

> “When women collude to restrict men’s sexual access to women, all women tend to benefit,”...
> However, he said, “none of these things are occurring today. Not one. The price of sex is pretty low.”

It turns out you can focus on making sure hookups are fair, or you can look out for marriage minded young women (but you can’t do both). Sorry marriage minded virgins, traditional conservative women have other priorities. Maybe you could try your hand at hookups instead?

Since the authors labor under some very outdated paradigms, they tend to misinterpret what is going on. I found this bit amusing:

> Say a young man wants to get to know his girlfriend of two months “more,” he said. If she says no, “then this tells the man, ‘The price is higher than you think.’ And he will have to figure out how high the price is: Does she need more time, more commitment?”

Sex after being a girlfriend for two months? Women wanting commitment? Tell that to the fine ladies at *Date Me DC*! They are still trying to figure out how to get a guy to call her his girlfriend after two months of sex. But at least we did away with that insufferable double standard, and women are no longer trapped in commitment.

They also misunderstand why women’s sexual power is high in their twenties and declines as they age into (and past) their 30s. They think this is solely due to a change in the numbers of men and women in the market:
The sexual market generally has more men than women in it, and rules of supply and demand operate, with the rarer sex wielding more power, Mr. Regnerus said.

If the authors hadn’t fallen asleep during Douchebag Math 101 they would understand that attractive women actually far outnumber attractive men when both are in their teens and 20s. So they are right for the wrong reason. Women in their 20s still have the power because they are in their peak years of attractiveness and can pick from attractive men of all ages.
Gone Fishin’
by Dalrock | June 16, 2011 | Link

I’ll be taking a blogging break starting tomorrow (or late tonight), and returning Tuesday or Wednesday of next week. When I do this I’ll turn moderation on for all comments, so any comments you leave will likely be held until next week. I thought I would give a heads up now in case there is a topic you wanted to make sure you comment on. I’ll edit this page once I turn comment moderation on.

**Edit:** I’m back. Moderation is now back to normal.
I’m back.
by Dalrock | June 21, 2011 | Link

I’m back now, but not sure how soon I’ll have a substantive post out. In the meantime I’ve read some excellent posts by other bloggers.

Alte has two posts which deal with the topic of women’s safety. The first is *So... why are women not afraid?* where she picks up where we left off discussing violence last week. She makes the inarguable point that from a historical perspective women (and men) are largely free of the risk of violent crime. As a consequence, she suggests that women are left craving the excitement which would normally be a part of their lives:

| There are no consequences. There just aren’t. No one is going to hit us, rape us, kidnap us, or murder us. We can do pretty much as we like, and we’re stifled by our very freedom. It’s unnatural. Our bodies and minds aren’t designed for such comfort and safety, and it frustrates us. So we instigate things. We shit-test, we push men around, we beg them to be rough with us in bed, we demand ridiculous things, we wander around town half-naked, we throw fits, we invite trouble, we play, “Let’s you and him fight.” Why not? There’s no risk involved! It’s like watching gladiators on television, dreaming about werewolves, or reading a Victorian novel. It’s harmless fun, meant to satisfy our natural appetite for violent excitement. |

I don’t agree with her entire argument, but I think there is at least a kernel of truth to what she is saying. I also think that both men and women tend to romanticize chaotic or end of the world scenarios when the daily grind of worrying about much more real (but mundane) problems like unemployment/layoffs, paying a mortgage, etc. is getting to them.

Alte’s next post on the topic covers *Arming your wife.* Again, my position is different than hers, but I often enjoy seeing how she goes about making her case.

I might go back to one or both of Alte’s posts in the future, but in the meantime I thought I would point them out for those who haven’t already read them.

Mike at *Crime and Federalism* has a *very powerful post about his father.* It adds perspective to a previous post of his: *Bipolar Disorder Meets “Eat, Pray, Love”*

Badger has a post you might enjoy titled: *Two Encounters This week*

Captain Capitalism has an interesting chart comparing the relative freedom levels of each of the U.S. states.

What have I missed? I’ll turn this over for DIY linkage. Share your own posts which you think I or my readers would enjoy, or the posts of another blogger.
I run across the strangest sites when searching the web for stats, like: Should I Divorce Him?

This lovely site is a place for women who want to thoughtfully discuss their soon to be ex husbands. I’ve searched for “Should I Divorce Her?” but for some reason there isn’t such a site for men.

One of the main sections of the site is the Hall of Shame, where women post Photos showcasing shameful behavior – husbands and marriage at its worst. These husbands are really bad! For example, there is the dastardly man who didn't take out the garbage:

99 bottles of soda in the can...

Ok, maybe there’s only 97. It’s plain to see that everything has its limits... including this recycling pail.

I apologize for not warning you in advance how troubling this man’s actions are. But now consider yourself forewarned. It gets worse. Another husband left the toilet seat up! And this other bastard failed to put the toilet paper on the dispenser properly! But all of these SOBs are mere child’s play compared to the man who sent his ex wife a box of chocolates!

I gave him my heart, and all I got was this lousy box of chocolates in return. Valentine’s Day sucks, especially when you’re alone. Out of the goodness of his heart, my estranged husband gave me a box of candy “from the kids.” It was thoughtful and thoughtless at the same time. The last thing I needed this holiday was a reminder that I no longer had a Valentine. Thanks for the memories.

But don’t assume the entire site is filled with women bitching about men. Seriously. Stop it.

In addition to the above section where women send in photos bitching about men, there is also a forum for them to bitch about men titled The Bitchin’ Boards. There are also blogs where women can bitch about men titled The Hag Rags. In the forum there is a section where women can emote on whether, when, and how to pull the trigger on divorce, as well as one for them to discuss their fabulous single lives after divorce. Unlike the very full forum for women to fantasize about their power to divorce, the latter section is surprisingly sparse with only three posts since 2007. The most recent one is titled The Difference Between Reality and Fantasy...

I have been divorced for three months now. I’ve used this site as a sounding board and it has helped me greatly to decide whether to leave my abusive 10 year relationship or stay with the bastard...

Physically, I get alot of male attention, so I pictured this lifestyle with thoughts of dinner and dancing with a hot stud...

Not!
I am back to reality, full force....
The new has worn off and I am home alone on a Saturday night with a lukewarm invitation from the man I’m dating to join him for drinks after he is finished with his family dinner. *sigh*.

Luckily her hamster regains his footing and rationalizes her back to being happy with her choice by the end of the post, but those brief glimpses of reality can be quite unsettling.

I think most women sense that this will be the case, which is why so many seem to relish in prolonging the process of deciding to divorce as long as possible. Once the button is pushed, they can’t relish the power any longer. Some women make the rookie mistake of staying married too long before discovering they aren’t haaapy, or failing to twist the knife long enough when deciding how to be true to themselves. These women could learn a thing or two about marriage from one of the bloggers on the site named Newlywed. She started bitching about her husband back in December of 2007. Here is an excerpt from one of her first posts:

Since I am newly married — for about 10 months now — everyone I talk to always asks, “So how’s married life?” I really don’t want to tell them the truth and say something like “It’s the biggest mistake I ever made.”

...Now I see him everyday so there is nothing special about the weekends. He is not even fun to be around anymore. Now I have to clean twice as much because he is a total slob who refuses to clean anything. I used to enjoy decorating my place. I liked picking out colors, hanging up pictures, and choosing items to display in my home. Now of course we share a place so we both get to decide how we want it to look.

Sounds like she had some unrealistic expectations. Go figure. As of her most recent blog entry in February of 2010, she is (still) going to give him another chance:

I have finally made decision. Prince Charming (P.C.) and I have been apart for quite a while now. We have been talking and emailing, and I have seen him twice, but we haven’t been living together. He’s been working out of town, and I have been going to school in another state. Now that P.C. has had some time to change, and I have had some time to focus on school we are getting back together.

Now that is how you string the guy along, ladies! And if it doesn't work out, just remember your secret multi-millionaire hunky handyman is only a mouse click away!

But not all guys are guilty of the above referenced crimes against humanity. Some guys are guilty of a totally different kind of offense. For example, in the section for women to bitch about their boyfriends, the lone post is by a woman whose boyfriend inexplicably won’t commit! meesha59 bravely bares her pain:

Been dating my boyfriend for approx. 7 years – still no commitment. How long is too long?

Seriously. What is wrong with these men who can’t commit?
Brown Eyed Girl
by Dalrock | June 24, 2011 | Link

I included Van Morrison's *Brown Eyed Girl* on the mp3 CD my wife and I listened to on our recent trip to/from Galveston. It is still a great song, but neither of us can ever hear it again without thinking about Armand Assante dancing in *Fatal Instinct*: 
Does divorce make people happy?
by Dalrock | June 25, 2011 | Link

One of the most common and typically unchallenged assumptions about divorce is that despite all of the destruction it causes, it at least makes people happier. Specifically, there is a feminist presumption that divorce makes women happier. Given the unfair nature of divorce laws and family court and the incentives the system offers to encourage women to divorce, this at first glance would seem like a reasonable assumption. Divorce should presumably drain off the most unhappy marriages, leaving the average married couple happier. But the data presented by the National Marriage Project (P 67 Fig 4) shows the opposite occurring:

![Graph showing percent of married adults in the US who answered their marriage was "very happy".](image)

Note that men and women were both happier with their marriages before feminists “fixed” marriage. This is especially surprising given the reduced social pressure for couples to marry following unexpected pregnancy. Abortion, readily available birth control, and acceptance of single motherhood have all but eliminated the “shotgun wedding”. In addition, with women having greater education and opportunity in the workforce they are under far less pressure to marry for economic reasons, as is borne out by the trend of women delaying marriage. Yet even with fewer presumably bad marriages entering the system and more unhappy ones exiting, married men and women are both less likely to report being very happy in their marriage. Something very powerful is clearly going on.

But this trend in itself isn’t proof that those who divorce aren’t made happier by it. What we need to evaluate is whether unhappily married people who divorce are happier than unhappily married people who choose to remain married. A team of sociologists lead by a professor from the University of Chicago has done this, and their findings destroy the conventional wisdom on divorce (press release and full study). From the Executive Summary:
• Unhappily married adults who divorced or separated were no happier, on average, than unhappily married adults who stayed married. Even unhappy spouses who had divorced and remarried were no happier, on average, than unhappy spouses who stayed married. This was true even after controlling for race, age, gender, and income.
• Divorce did not reduce symptoms of depression for unhappily married adults, or raise their self-esteem, or increase their sense of mastery, on average, compared to unhappy spouses who stayed married. This was true even after controlling for race, age, gender, and income.
• The vast majority of divorces (74 percent) happened to adults who had been happily married five years previously. In this group, divorce was associated with dramatic declines in happiness and psychological well-being compared to those who stayed married.
• Unhappy marriages were less common than unhappy spouses. Three out of four unhappily married adults were married to someone who was happy with the marriage.
• Staying married did not typically trap unhappy spouses in violent relationships. Eighty-six percent of unhappily married adults reported no violence in their relationship (including 77 percent of unhappy spouses who later divorced or separated). Ninety-three percent of unhappy spouses who avoided divorce reported no violence in their marriage five years later.
• Two out of three unhappily married adults who avoided divorce or separation ended up happily married five years later. Just one out of five of unhappy spouses who divorced or separated had happily remarried in the same time period.

But could it be that those who choose to remain married are fundamentally different than those who choose divorce? They address this question directly:

Does this mean that most unhappy spouses who divorced would have ended up happily married if they had stuck with their marriages? We cannot say for sure. Unhappy spouses who divorced were younger, more likely to be employed and to have children in the home. They also had lower average household incomes than unhappy spouses who stayed married. But these differences were typically not large. In most respects, unhappy spouses who divorced and unhappy spouses who stayed married looked more similar than different (before the divorce) in terms of their psychological adjustment and family background.

One might assume, for example, that unhappy spouses who divorce and those who stay married are fundamentally two different groups; i.e., that the marriages that ended in divorce were much worse than those that survived. There is some evidence for this point of view. Unhappy spouses who divorced reported more conflict and were about twice as likely to report violence in their marriage than unhappy spouses who stayed married. However, marital violence occurred in only a minority of unhappy marriages: Twenty-one percent of unhappily married adults who divorced reported husband-to-wife violence compared to nine percent of unhappy spouses who stayed married.

Note that those who chose divorce were typically younger than those who stuck it out. Since
we know that younger divorcées are far more likely than older ones to be able to remarry, the stats on the likelihood of the two groups to be happily married after 5 years (last bullet point above) are especially compelling.

So what was the secret of those who held it together to ultimately become more happy than had they divorced?

Many currently happily married spouses have had extended periods of marital unhappiness, often for quite serious reasons, including alcoholism, infidelity, verbal abuse, emotional neglect, depression, illness, and work reversals. Why did these marriages survive where other marriages did not? The marital endurance ethic appears to play a big role. Many spouses said that their marriages got happier, not because they and their partner resolved problems but because they stubbornly outlasted them. With time, they told us, many sources of conflict and distress eased. Spouses in this group also generally had a low opinion of the benefits of divorce, as well as friends and family members who supported the importance of staying married.

The secret to a happy marriage turns out to be extremely simple; stop thinking about divorce! This is why it is so critical to choose wisely when marrying. All marriages will run into rough waters; marriage will only work if both sides are fully committed to the institution. They also specifically tell us that marriage counseling wasn’t the solution:

Spouses who turned their marriages around seldom reported that counseling played a key role. When husbands behaved badly, value-neutral counseling was not reported by any spouse to be helpful. Instead wives in these marriages appeared to seek outside help from others to pressure the husband to change his behavior. Men displayed a strong preference for religious counselors over secular counselors, in part because they believed these counselors would not encourage divorce.

Their finding that the secret to a happy marriage is in large part due to an unwillingness to entertain divorce has been corroborated in a separate study. This is also an observation which Terry Breathing Grace made in the comments section to a previous post:

Surely you agree that abuse notwithstanding, the standard must be that marriage is for keeps. I can only speak for my own relationship when I say this, but in our marriage, the absence of an easy exit has made the rough patches significantly shorter and farther apart than they would be if either of us had harbored fantasies of how much easier it would be if we threw in the towel.

It’s amazing how quickly you can see the good in your mate and understand that happiness comes from within when you know that the mate you have today is the one you’ll have tomorrow, barring the unexpected tragedy of death.

The basic premise is also born out by other studies of general happiness. Harvard psychology professor Dr. Daniel Gilbert has written about why not reconsidering one’s choice of spouse makes men and women happier with their marriages (H/T Dex):
Consider the choice to marry one sweetheart over another. If you pick the genial, down-to-earth banker, will you forever regret letting go of that free-spirited artist who loves traveling as much as you? Probably not. The very fact that you’ll be living with — and experiencing — one spouse and not the other means that the passed-over option will quickly fade in your mind. “The people you don’t marry don’t move in with you,” says Gilbert.

Envisioning what life would have been like with an alternate spouse becomes difficult and increasingly irrelevant as you settle into the life you’ve selected. “Once you make a choice in life, the unchosen alternatives evaporate,” he says. According to Gilbert’s earlier research, which he featured in his 2006 book, Stumbling on Happiness, when faced with an irrevocable decision, people are happier with the outcome than when they have the opportunity to change their minds. “It’s a very powerful phenomenon,” he says. “This is really the difference between dating and marriage.”

This effect is removed however if one continues to reconsider the choice to remain married, as women are constantly encouraged to do:

But what if the person you didn’t marry moved in next door? Suddenly your attention isn’t completely collapsed on your own marriage, and every day you can witness the alternative life you overlooked.

The irony here is that the safety valve which feminists and others fought so hard for to avoid women being trapped in unhappy marriages has made women both less happily married and more likely to be unhappily divorced.

The escape route is the disaster.
If you didn’t read this blog it would be easy to have the impression that divorcées have the midas touch, and everything falls in their favor. Given how prevalent this misconception is it has surprised me how easy it is to prove the opposite. Often times the proof is in plain sight, and even located alongside the nonsense being peddled to married women in an effort to sell them divorce. This is the case for the article I am sharing today, titled Divorce Fantasy. This insight doesn’t come from a manosphere related blog, but straight from downtown hamsterville. The article is located in the divorce section of She Knows Love*. The most recent entries there include all of the standard nonsense. For example, in the post Eating your divorce cake, married women learn that if they divorce they will find themselves pursued by hot young men:

> Older women are having their “divorce cake“ and eating it, too! Countless stories keep surfacing about women in their 40s, 50s and even 60s, dating men 20-plus years younger.

I award this post extra irony points for using How Stella Got Her Groove Back as an example. That would make even Lorraine Berry proud.

Another recent entry in the same section is an outstanding example of Dalrock’s Law as it explains that women won’t necessarily lose their husband as their best friend after they divorce him. And why not? What’s a good legal ass raping between friends anyway? And besides, divorcing him will likely only make you better friends in the end:

> The “BFF with your ex” phenomena is not fiction. These days, in many post-divorce situations it’s become fact. Recently, I attended a friend’s daughter’s wedding. He had been divorced from his ex-wife for many years and didn’t speak much about her. At the reception, I was surprised to see that his relationship with the ex-spouse appeared to be sweeter than the wedding cake.

Yet another recent entry reassures women that divorce will work out well for them:

> So you married your best friend now you’re getting divorced — now what? As devastating as the idea of divorce sounds, it’s not necessarily going to pan out negatively. In fact, we found lots of divorce success stories out there.

Wait. Marrying your best friend and then divorcing him? Why does that seem so familiar? At any rate, she explains that she doesn’t know the stats on how often divorce makes women happier. She is in luck; I do.

But my favorite recent entry in this section is Newly divorced: Try a one-night stand?, which includes this nugget of wisdom:

> Is there anything you ever wanted to do with your husband but thought was a little
too kinky? Do it now! One-night stands are all about your pleasure; it doesn’t matter what he thinks of you.

But all of this is just good clean hamster rationalizing fun, right? Women don’t really fall for this nonsense, do they? The stats of course prove that they do. Interestingly one of the bloggers on their site gives us an inside look at what happens when divorce fantasy collides with reality:

During the twelve years I was married, I spent many hours fantasizing about divorce. At first it was just a whisper of an idea, held guiltily for a moment and then dismissed, but as the years passed it became something of an obsession. Whenever my marriage made me unhappy, which was often, I escaped in my head into the world of divorce.

It started as a whisper? You don’t say! Sorry for interrupting the fantasy ladies. I won’t do that again:

It was a place where women were free and could choose, where women decided everything from the mood of their day to what to watch on TV or where the family would go on vacation. It was a place where I didn’t have to compromise with a difficult spouse. It was a place where I could make my children infinitely happy, a halcyon world of simple pleasures and contented days.

But what drove her to this fantasy place? I was surprised to learn divorce fantasy is about power:

This fantasizing was the perfect antidote to a marriage that had become a struggle for power over the smallest of choices. The problem with my life, as I saw it then, was my husband, and I imagined divorce as a process that would remove him but change little else — a sort of neutron bomb that eliminated men but left the rest of the world intact.

She describes this fantasy as a sort of disease which is contagious:

[Divorce] has become so ubiquitous that it threatens even strong marriages, as if it were something that could be picked up in crowded malls or during the coffee hour at church.

She points out that despite the prevalence of divorce and the constant messages selling it, the reality of it is seldom discussed:

Yet despite the wide experience of divorce in our society, most people who’ve been through it don’t talk about it much — outside self-help circles and therapists’ offices — because other people don’t like to hear about it. They don’t like to think about how it happened to their parents or how it changed their friends, and they can’t bear the thought of what it would do to their children. It’s one of those taboo subjects — like cancer or war — too difficult to explain to those who stayed home, too depressing to ponder for more than a moment.
Next she describes how her fantasy turned into reality:

…I came to believe that I was prepared, that I knew what divorcing my husband would bring. I knew I would be alone. I knew I would have less money. I knew I would be a single parent, and that divorce would be difficult and painful for my children. I knew that, eventually, I would have to tell my husband what I was doing.

And that was when it all blew up.

Once she pulled the trigger on her fantasy, reality showed up:

…divorce threw me into a remarkable and unexpected emotional landscape, a place outside normal society. It is a shockingly unprotected place, windswept and empty. There is little to lean on for support.

She also tackles the pervasive myth that divorce is clean and simple:

Divorce robs you of much. It takes away your mid-career wealth. It takes away your place in society. It takes away the easy reassurance of two-parent child rearing and all the benefit of the doubt we give to intact families.

She closes by echoing the sentiment of another divorcée, describing it as a sort of death:

And make no mistake — divorce is a death. It kills the dreams of your youth, those innocent beliefs that your marriage can weather sickness as it can weather health, that life will be kind and fair, that the joys will be shared and the vicissitudes bring you closer.

*You have to love the fact that women’s sites always include divorce as a subset of *Love and Sex.*

**Edit:** H/T as well to Flavia for sharing this first.

I have only made my way through part one so far, but wanted to pass it on for those who haven’t already read it. I struggle to pick out quotes because every paragraph is quotable. But I’ll share a few teasers just to pique your interest:

Like other observers of the contemporary scene, the author notes the pervasiveness of female anger. “It’s impossible . . . to understand anything about women in this country today, unless you understand that a) they’re angry, and b) their anger is directed at men. Women today aren’t seeking equality. They want retribution—revenge.”

and

Langley is on firmer ground when she suggests women actually enjoy being angry because it gives them a kind of power: “Angry people not only spur those around them to walk on eggshells, they motivate them to do exactly what the angry person wants them to do. Some women stay angry long after divorcing their husbands because, as long as they’re angry and their ex-husbands feel guilty, they’ve got power over them.”

A third factor is the unrealistic expectations women now have about marriage: “their not getting the expected payoff [of] continued excitement over getting and being married.”

and reminiscent of the plot of practically every movie or TV show involving divorce (or threatened divorce):

Eventually, women do come out and tell their husbands they are “unhappy.” But this does not mean they have any intention of working on improving the marriage; women ordinarily make no overt, specific complaints until they are 100 percent done with the relationship—meaning [they] have lost all feeling. . . . It’s not uncommon for women to eventually feel less for their husbands than they would for a stranger on the street. . . . When women start being specific to men about their needs, it’s usually only to let their husbands know all the many areas in which they have failed. In other words, their husbands have already been fired; their wives are just giving them the reasons for the termination. . . . She already has another “Mr. Right” picked out or is eager to find one. She is looking for the feeling of excitement again.
Men rarely understand this. The author found that most men blamed themselves and “beat themselves up” for the things they thought they had done wrong in the marriage. Their initial response to their wives’ stated unhappiness was to try to make them happy. “In most cases, their husbands launched futile attempts to make their wives happy by being more attentive, spending more time at home and helping out around the house. Regardless of these women’s past and present complaints, the last thing they wanted was to spend more time with their husbands.” (Langley notes that wives do often complain that “my spouse doesn’t pay attention to me,” but calls this code for “I want another man.”) In fact, wives often became angry precisely over their husbands' efforts to please them, because this increased their own feelings of guilt for infidelity.

and finally, for all of those who are convinced that it is a man’s responsibility to keep his wife loyal and happy:

Langley reports that she interviewed just two men who responded effectively to the challenge of their wives’ disloyalty.

The first man took the initiative and filed for divorce after his wife expressed on several occasions that she was unhappy and considering a separation. Before the divorce was final, his wife was trying to reconcile, but he chose not to because of her [lack of interest] in working on the marriage prior to his filing for divorce.

The second case was a man in a second marriage who had made all the usual mistakes the first time around but, unlike most husbands, managed to learn from the experience. As soon as his second wife started talking about a vague “unhappiness,” he inferred that she had met another man. He put down in writing clear conditions for remaining married to her and refused to agree to any separation, knowing it would only be a prelude to divorce. Insisting she break off her extramarital affair at once, he wrote: “I will not allow my spirit to deteriorate because of your indecision.” Rather than attempting to remove all possible grounds for his wife’s discontent, he simply told her: “complaining is no longer acceptable. If you want me to do or not do something, you must tell me what it is. I do not expect you to read my mind and I will no longer try to read yours.” This worked.
Kathy and Flavia have both pointed out in the comments section of the last post that the description of women in Devlin’s article doesn’t apply to all women. Flavia put it quite well when she wrote:

Further, the nightmare stories you hear are only but a subset of women. Many women are able to lead very loving and stable marriages (as long as they don’t pay attention to the debased culture). I do not think that men are incapable of love because some cheat on and hit their wives.

NAWALT (Not All Women Are Like That) is a bit of a lightning rod in the manosphere because it is often perceived as an attempt to shut down discussion of some very real issues. However, I don’t think either Kathy or Flavia were trying to deny the fundamental issue or stop the discussion. Flavia was actually the first person to recommend the Devlin article to me.

I don’t know what percentage of women fit into the description of the article. I doubt it is even 50%. I especially doubt the part about women being naturally programmed to leave after 4 years:

Biochemical research points to a natural four-year sexual cycle for the human female. This apparently allows enough time after childbirth for the average mother in a state of savagery to regain her ability to survive without male provisioning. In the absence of any system of marriage, a woman’s natural tendency is to “liberate” herself from her mate after that point. When her hormones prompt her to reproduce again, she simply takes a new mate.

To clarify, it may well be that there is something biochemical in women that has been observed. But I don’t see this as a particularly strong force. Given that our culture is steeped in a pro divorce message for women complete with cheer-leading movies, websites, newspapers, and magazines, a church which looks the other way, as well as financial incentives, divorce rates should be far higher than they are if this is a universal and strong force. On the other hand, if this is all true, then I would say marriage is simply done for as an institution (which it may well be anyway). As a (cautious) proponent of marriage, I am admittedly less likely to want to accept such a position.

The biggest problem I have with the four year attachment theory is that it makes no sense from an evolutionary point of view. A stepfather is a greater risk to her children than the biological father. Also, women can have children more than once every four years, so one would expect another child to be in the works before the first four year term has expired. Lastly, there is no logical reason to expect that a woman who is older and has had children can attract a better man than she was able to when she was younger and hotter. Pick up a National Geographic if you want proof that women in primitive cultures/conditions don’t age well. Plus the man she attracted in the past is most likely a better catch now than when she
first landed him four years ago.

But at the same time something clearly is going on. Devlin’s article accurately describes the way a very large percentage of western women are behaving. Much of it is straight out of your standard movie or TV script (not even including chick flicks).

Last week I shared the Should I Divorce Him website. On that site there is a quiz for women to take to decide if they should throw away their marriage. After answering each question it shows you what the answers of other women were for that question. The questions about infidelity were telling, and in line with what is being discussed in Devlin’s article. Keep in mind that the quiz isn’t a scientific survey but it does come up as the top result to a google search of “should I divorce” (for me at least, try it here). Here is what the women who took the quiz answered regarding infidelity:

![Should I Divorce Him Quiz](image)

Question: Do you trust your husband around other women?

Just under 20% of women thinking about divorce thought their husband had cheated on them. Here is how they answered the question about their own infidelity:
Question: What are your thoughts on cheating?

A quarter of the women taking the quiz admitted to cheating on their husband. Another 31% have considered it. Only 43% of the women considering divorce answered that it wasn’t something they would do. Given the known tendency for people to be hesitant to admit moral failings even on an anonymous survey, if anything these figures understate the magnitude of the problem.

So while I don’t have a solid estimate on how many women are acting as described in Devlin’s article, it is at the very least an accurate description of a very large number of divorcées. And as Devlin pointed out, the false but near universal assumption in our culture that women are naturally monogamous makes the problem far worse:

Women, says Langley, enter marriage assuming they are naturally monogamous. “Trying to be faithful doesn’t seem natural to them.” They recite the wedding vow in much the same spirit as they wear “something borrowed, something blue”—it is simply what one does at a wedding. Of course, a vow is no very serious undertaking to one who assumes she will never feel any temptation to break it.

Accordingly, over time, most women begin to rationalize their extramarital erotic interests. If women simply want to be married and are not naturally inclined to be attracted to other men, “any unhappiness or infidelity on the part of the women is assumed to be due to the men they married.” This seems to me a critically important and easily overlooked finding: the widely propagated notion that women are naturally monogamous is helping to nourish the contemporary “blame the man for everything” mentality. Hence, odd as this sounds, in order to reestablish the
actual practice of monogamy, it may be necessary to discredit the notion that woman are naturally inclined to it.

My main takeaway from all of this is a reinforcement of the fact that we have a very real problem, and those of us who want to save marriage as an institution have an obligation to acknowledge the reality and help others do the same. If not, we will be the generation that history records as having fiddled while marriage burned.
I remember a story a friend of our family told me when I was maybe 11 or 12 years old. He was a young adult at the time, and was (I assume he still is) one of those people who seemed like he could do anything he wanted. He was tall, athletic, funny, and had a natural way with people. He had traveled around Latin America and Spain and had lived in both places for short periods of time. The story I remember was about the running of the bulls in Spain*. He said that young men would decide they were going to run with the bulls to demonstrate their courage, but once the bull was loose some would try to climb the barricades to join the spectators. When they did this they were pushed back by the men on the other side (I think he said the police), who would tell them:

| You wanted to run with the bulls. So run with the bulls.

The important part of the story is this wasn’t done with malice. The men pushing them back had no animosity for the frightened young men they were pushing back into harms way. They were helping these young men complete what they set out to accomplish. There is also a frame of mind here which men have (or should have) about finishing what you start, and living up to your boasts.

I think this story will resonate with most men reading this blog, because it captures the way men tend to see the world. I’m also guessing that to many women the actions of the men
pushing back will seem like pure cruelty.

I’m sharing this story because I’ve thought of it fairly frequently recently while reading in the manosphere. I think women could better understand men’s reactions to a large number of the issues discussed here by understanding this perspective. I think this colors men’s reactions to the complaint of withdrawn chivalry for example, or even the Lara Logan situation.

The attitude this story represents is part of what I think defines being a man. Since feminism has taught us to not see men as different than women, most men have probably internalized this as what it means to be an adult. However, while men are being taught that it is essential to finish what they started and accept the consequences of their own choices (and boasts), women are often taught to be frivolous so as to never be unhappy, and to reject adulthood. One of the more frustrating parts of feminism for men is finding out that most women never really intended for men to take them seriously on it, at least on the hard parts. Often men find this out only after it is too late.

I’m sharing this story to help men and women both understand each other a little better. Women can benefit from understanding that men think this way, and men can benefit from understanding that very often women don’t, so we shouldn’t assume they do.

*I can’t vouch for the authenticity of the story. Either way the basic lesson is true whether the parable itself is.
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New Blog: Traditional Christianity
by Dalrock | July 1, 2011 | Link

I noticed that I’m getting traffic from a blog I hadn’t seen before, so I just checked it out. Some familiar names have pooled their resources to create a new blog called Traditional Christianity. From the About page:

This is a multi-author blog of traditional Christians and their friends, who write about all sorts of topics from the orthodox and complementarian perspective.

The authors generally post according to the following schedule:

- Monday — Terry and Brendan
- Tuesday — Morticia and Clarence
- Wednesday — Alte and Cottage Child
- Thursday — Terry and ?
- Friday — Morticia and ?
- Saturday — Alte and ?
- Sunday — Guest contributors

Interesting concept. I wish them the best of luck!

Also, Hawaiian Libertarian has a powerful post up on fatherhood which is worth a read.
I started this blog back on June 19th last year. I’ve been very surprised at how quickly the traffic has grown, and was absolutely astounded when it was listed as one of the brainz top 100 blogs in 2010.

Understandably the blog took a big traffic hit in January and February as I struggled with an extended period of blogger’s block.

But the biggest surprise of all has been the quality of the regular commenters and the discussions we have had as a result over the last year. When I created the blog my conscious objective was to influence the conversation. I’m skeptical how much anyone can change the mind of any other person on the kinds of issues we discuss here. However I think individual bloggers and commenters can influence the larger conversation, and in this way ultimately the larger conversation will influence some people to change their minds over time. By larger conversation I mean not only what is discussed on this blog or in the manosphere, but in far off places as well. From watching where links come in this has clearly been the case. Our conversations here are referenced in far off corners of the internet. I assume this is true for conversations outside of the internet as well.

I know it is a bit corny for bloggers to thank those who have invested their own time reading the blog, but I really do appreciate it. I have by far learned more than I have taught over the last year, and I am very much in your debt for this. Even those who have read silently have contributed, as their hits show up in the statistics which motivate me to continue on days where I briefly wonder if it is worth the effort. These same hits help increase the site’s ranking in search engines. Ultimately this means countless people have found our conversations over the last year when searching for answers on google, etc. No doubt many have fled in horror at what they found here, but surely others have found clarity.

My debt of gratitude also includes all of the other bloggers who have influenced my own thinking as well as those who have graciously sent traffic my way either by referencing my posts within their own, or by including me on their blog-roll.
Readers often graciously share links to information they think I or the blog’s readers would find of interest. I always appreciate this, but at times I struggle to find those links later, especially if I was sure I would never forget the context at the time. If I remember to bookmark the link this helps in part but I still risk forgetting who to give a hat tip to if I use the link in a future post. Also, there is the understandable hesitation to post a link on an unrelated topic and risk derailing the conversation.

Back in November I created a placeholder page to list game resources for marriage. This is a similar page but here I'll ask for general links you think would be of interest to me and/or my readers. I've created a new category of Reference at the top of the site which brings up these two pages.

Feel free to share anything you think is related here. Other bloggers are welcome to point out their own posts as well (within reason of course). Think of this as a mini Dalrock reddit page.
Divorcée Retirement
by Dalrock | July 4, 2011 | Link

So long boring loyal dude!

If you are a regular reader of this blog you already know that our culture is obsessed with selling divorce to women. Of course, those selling divorce would love to see all women divorce their husbands, but if they have to choose I would say their primary focus would be convincing middle aged women to divorce. Women aged 35-55 seem to be the divorce marketer’s most sought after audience. The images which accompany the sale of divorce to these women show a special relish to the thought of older women sticking it to their loyal husbands. We saw this with the cover image for the AARP study on grey divorce, and you can see in the image linked above from the Daily Mail piece (H/T Lily) pitching divorce to women in their 50s.

These husbands need to be punished for their years of loyalty and boring planning for the future, and these still hot older babes are going to teach them a lesson!

While the loyal sticks-in-the-mud are bewildered and crushed with grief, their still hot wives are out living it up! Some take a year to travel the world, sample international cuisine, become more spiritual, and find new love! Others quit their jobs and go off on a motorcycle adventure, like the woman in this story (my take here):

‘I started to realise I actually could, and would, do the unthinkable: I would leave my safe existence, my great job, my marriage, family and friends, and take a year out to travel round the world on an adventure.’

Most ordinary divorcées aren’t quite as extravagant. In my observation divorcées more often resemble Interested’s description:

...in my neighborhood these newly divorced women quickly start blowing through the money and get tired of the pump and dump and then start looking for the next great guy. Most of these gals are prime candidates for having nothing saved come retirement. It’s all vacations, clothes, and nice cars. It’s almost like they share a book. Once the divorce is final go out and buy expensive luxury ride. Then take wonderful vacations (several) the first year and subsequent years. Shop for new clothes constantly.

But where does this new found money come from? Divorce theft is a great racket, don’t get me wrong. However there is only so much money to divide up. Divorce doesn’t create any new wealth; it destroys wealth while increasing expenses. The reality is quite often the only
reason new divorcées are able to go on a spending spree is they are no longer under adult supervision. Their time horizon is short, and retirement is something which doesn’t seem to cross their minds.

The blogger at since my divorce who is a gray divorce poster child has a suggestion to solve divorcée money problems:

What if some enlightened banker said, divorce happens and it’s OK to borrow money to get through the next X years. We believe that parenting is important, we’d rather you be actively involved in child’s life than work a second job. We’ll loan you the money you need at a reasonable rate of interest and allow you to pay it back over fifteen, twenty years.

Why didn’t I think of that? All they need is more credit. Then they can work less, spend more, and everything will be just fine! What could possibly go wrong?

Not surprisingly as Interested speculated these women often run into problems when it comes time to retire. In my observation they are very often caught in two conflicting mental paradigms. One says they don’t have to follow the old rules and can chart their own path. The other says they don’t have to be responsible for themselves because men (under the old rules) have the obligation to take care of them. My wife and I know two different retired women who are outright offended at any suggestion that they live on a budget. These women are in their 60s and 70s and have never had to be responsible with money. We know another woman whose life reads like a page out of this blog, who I’ll call Mary. Mary’s first husband was evidently an alpha, and she understandably divorced him after she came home early one day to find him engaged in a threesome with two other women. I actually met husband number two at a party about 6 or 7 years ago. He worked setting up stages for rock bands and had some great stories to tell. Unfortunately husband number 2 died of a heart attack a few years ago. Luckily he had life insurance to make sure Mary wouldn’t be in trouble if he wasn’t there to provide for her.

With her new found windfall, Mary quickly recovered from her grief and moved in alpha bad boy number three. She was living the dream, and her new arm candy appeared to be at least 20 years younger than her (he looked in his 40s, she looked in her 60s). Through our mutual friend we learned that Mary and her new man were going to open up their own restaurant and live the good life. However in no time at all (maybe 2 years), they had blown through Mary’s funds between the (failing) business, expensive bar tabs and lavish vacations. Mary couldn’t pay her mortgage and ended up losing her home. The boy toy is out of the picture now, and Mary lives with our mutual friend. She has been on Match.com and as of last week had a beta provider lined up who she expects to marry by the end of the year. He’s no secret-multimillionaire hunky handyman, but I guess he’ll do. They’ve only been on three dates, so I’m not sure how likely her plan is to pan out.

In addition to the situations I have seen, the media has been putting out pieces on the same issue. Anonymous Reader and Captain Capitalism both sent me links to a piece titled Single, female, retired, broke.

Female baby boomers shattered glass ceilings and enrolled in colleges that shut out
their mothers...

Single female baby boomers are the least-prepared of this more than 75-million-strong generation to financially navigate their senior years.

Now that these women are paying the price for following the media’s incessant divorce cheer-leading, we learn that divorce is something which just happened to them (emphasis mine):

And many who devoted their prime to motherhood find themselves divorced and returning to a workforce that doesn’t have space or patience for them.

Nowhere in the piece do they mention that retirement savings are typically divided up as part of divorce. These poor women are just dealt a bad hand, like Katrina Philips:

“I never thought about retirement. No one ever talked about it and what I needed to do,”
“I guess I was stupid about it.”

She wasn’t the only one who inexplicably found herself divorced and without retirement savings. They also interviewed Bette Lee Drake:

“I never thought I’d have to work,”
“I thought I’d be at home as a wife and a mother. I had no ambition. I figured I’d be a princess for the rest of my life.”

Following her divorce Drake’s plan of choosing a low paying profession and putting off saving for retirement until her late 40s didn’t work out as well as she had hoped:

“Retirement? How was I supposed to pay for that, too?”

Or as Lorraine Berry would say, where is the me in saving for retirement?

It turns out that it is the patriarchy’s fault that these glass ceiling breaking feminists didn’t take responsibility for their own retirement. Just because they were trailblazers who didn’t need a man to tell them how to lead their lives, doesn’t absolve men of the responsibility of telling them how to lead their lives:

“They were poorly educated about their retirement,” said Watkins. “There was this old mythology that women weren’t good with numbers and they shouldn’t fuss over them.”

Those patriarchy bastards are downright diabolical! They did it again! Now back to the saga of Katrina Philips:

Philips of Clayton said her retirement plan was her husband. She figured they would rely on his military pension. But he became an ex two years ago, and she said she got none of that…
Once upon a time, Philips, a former banker, did have a retirement account...

She cashed in her retirement to keep from losing her house.

A reader shared another news story about divorcées struggling in retirement. This one is from the *New York Times*, and is titled *A Homeowner With No Savings, but Some Options*. In this story we learn about twice divorced Susana Wilson. She is 70 and never saved a dime for retirement. Because of this she lives on $900 a month in Social Security plus additional income she makes sewing dresses. Luckily she inherited a fully paid off home from her parents, so she at least has a place to live.

I know what you are thinking: *why doesn't she just borrow money, like the blogger at since my divorce suggested?* I thought of that too, believe me. But it turns out she already tried this and somehow it made things worse. If Captain Capitalism weren’t getting ready to go on vacation, I’d ask him to explain it:

Ms. Wilson would probably manage on her current income, though not without sacrifice, were it not for the debt she had accumulated....

The balance of her income goes toward the monthly minimum payments on $9,000 in credit card debt, racked up for daily living expenses. “I think I might just have to declare bankruptcy,” she said. “I just can’t live with that.”

See Also:

- [Boring loyal dudes](#)
- [Divorcing under the influence](#)
- [Her husband was her best friend](#)
No, I will weep no more. In such a night
To shut me out? Pour on; I will endure.
In such a night as this? O Regan, Goneril!
Your old kind father, whose frank heart gave all—
O, that way madness lies; let me shun that;
No more of that.

–King Lear

An unnamed reader made a first and last comment on this site a while back to express his extreme disagreement at my stance that a man shouldn’t hold himself accountable for his wife’s decision to cheat or walk out on the marriage:

I spent two weeks delving into your blog. I unilaterally agreed with almost every post/point/blog entry that you made... until I saw this.

Never fail a shit test. Never bow down to it.

You fall into the mass of beta... “Don’t marry a whore...”

“My marriage is better than your marriage”

“My girl is better than your girl”

Thanks for the nice articles, I’ll not be reading again. You’ve fallen into the clever p**** trap, “NOT MY P****,” so deal with it.

I know you won’t care, but my god, such a horrid intellectual position? And you defend it?

The assertion of mine which upset him so much was an excerpt from my original post on Gaming your wife:

The foundation for her commitment to your marriage shouldn’t be your game. If she is only one, or a few, or even 50 failed shit tests away from walking away from her sacred vow and/or whoring around, then she isn’t a wife, she is a whore. Don’t marry a whore*. Game should be about making you and your wife happier with your marriage, not about putting the sole onus for the success of the marriage on you.

Presumably a game purist, the reader appears to believe that women are mere puppets to be controlled by the gamer. Any failures from this perspective are of course attributable to the puppet master, since it would be irrational to blame the puppet. I can see where a pickup artist could benefit from adopting this frame for hookups and LTRs. It certainly would be an
effective way to perfect one’s game in such scenarios.

However, marriage isn’t a hookup or a LTR. It is something else entirely. Hard core gamers want to apply the rules of hookup/LTR to marriage, and it isn’t appropriate. Many have already pointed out that there are virtually no benefits in marriage for a man. The law, family courts, the church, and society are all stacked against him. A man actually loses protection from cuckolding and is placed at a disadvantage regarding custody if he marries. The only potential benefit a man gains by marrying is the moral force the marriage vows hold on his wife.

Many hard core gamers want you to cede this last benefit as well, out of a sense of purity of game. This is absolutely insane. If you aren’t clear on whether it is morally wrong for your wife to frivolously divorce you or cheat on you, how is she supposed to be clear on this? If you aren’t comfortable making such a judgment, don’t marry; there is absolutely no benefit in marriage for you, and a world of downside.

Commenter Looking Glass makes a more thoughtful but still ultimately very troubling argument relating to his Grind Theory of relationships:

Except in the case of serial affairs (which means a bad marriage choice), cheating only happens in relationships that have been brought to the point where needs are met outside the relationship. This takes actions by *both* parties. No one is blameless in this situation. Choices have consequences, and not minding your marriage and grinding it to dust is just one of those choices.

While I absolutely agree that neither husband nor wife should neglect the needs of the other, this kind of thinking is extremely dangerous. If you open the door for her to blame you for her breaking her vows, you are inviting her rationalization hamster to do the rest. Even good marriages tend to run into periods where there is temptation to stray or to give up. Having perfect game or perfect communication doesn’t change this fact. Successful marriages make it past these periods often out of sheer will.
Commenter udolipixie was troubled by my post *Trapped in adulthood*:

...she’s just an immature complainer.

I’m not sure how her character is related to “So here you have it. The evil patriarchy’s greatest crime is expecting women to grow up.”

If anything it should be society’s crime is producing people who don’t take responsibility for their actions & influencing adults and even seniors to act like petulant children.

She is of course right. That is, if by *society* she means *feminism*, and by *people* she means *women*. The point of the post wasn’t *gee look, a woman who complains*. The point was how socially acceptable this is. In fact it goes beyond mere acceptance to celebration. Lorraine Berry wasn’t just whining about being tricked into adulthood on her facebook page or blog; her *poor me I had to become an adult in my mid to late 20s* essay was published in *Salon* as a story of empowerment, inspiration, and overcoming adversity.

This isn’t to say that there aren’t childish whiny men out there. They exist too. However, they aren't made into *folk heroes* for whining and/or shirking their responsibilities. They are seen as the whiny childish men they are; no one lauds their courage for “baring their pain” so that others may benefit. Very often the men who have made real sacrifices aren’t even the ones to tell their own stories. When their stories are told they are typically *told by others*, often by their children. Also, stories of men’s sacrifice have an entirely different message. They are examples of *courage* and manhood; something for other men to recognize and respect the will to do the right thing and *finish what you started*.

In stark contrast, women are continuously given public forums to complain about being the *victim of their own choices*. This is presented as them being selfless and courageous; speaking on behalf of self victimized women everywhere. A recent article in the *Femail* section of the *Daily Mail* exemplifies this. *Am I monster for wishing I’d never had children?* The confession that fills a mother with shame:

As I looked around at them, I should have felt a sense of pride that my husband of nearly 30 years and my two grown-up sons were together for a few convivial days.

Instead, I felt a stab of disappointment that this gathering was the sum total of what I have achieved in my life. One husband, two children, reasonable cooking skills. Not much to show for my 50 years.

Which is why I know I would have had a better and fuller life — had I never been a mother.
That is right. This poor woman was trapped in motherhood. Those damnable patriarchal bastards! They did it again! This time they have outdone themselves though. They stole this woman's chance for happiness:

Most perturbing of all, these narrow horizons were exactly what I had once wanted. The only future I ever envisaged for myself was as a wife and mother. I wasn't especially good at anything at school, and I was never going to have a career nor did I have any ambitions to one.

Clearly in order to pull off a crime of this magnitude, the patriarchy must have sent in one of their best men. How does the bastard live with what he has done? He preyed on her total lack of talent, ambition, and imagination, forcing her to live a comfortable life! I wish I could get my hands on this SOB and teach him a lesson. How could he do that? How could he steal the life of this unambitious talentless courageous woman? That's right, I said courageous. Instead of keeping her whimpering to herself, she has selflessly decided to share her story so that others might benefit:

And I have decided to share my experience here (under a pseudonym) because I suspect there are many other women who harbour such feelings of regret about motherhood, but dare not talk about it.

...So let me say it for all those who will not or cannot: I regret having had children.

We all owe her and her anonymous courage a debt of gratitude.
The Duchess of Post Marital Spinsterhood
by Dalrock | July 13, 2011 | Link

The Daily Mail published an absolutely scathing piece on Sarah Ferguson a few weeks ago. I was doubly surprised on reading this because not only is she royalty, but a woman!

It is the standard tale of a woman becoming bored, cheating on her husband, divorcing him, and ultimately ending up alone and destitute. Normally this would be just another feel good empowerment story with the whole alone and destitute part left out. In fact, Oprah has a new reality show in the US about Sarah Ferguson finding herself. My wife and I caught a bit of the show the other week, and it was extremely sympathetic to her. The true story is too well known for Oprah to frame this as another EPL, but she is predictably framed as a victim of her own choices. Here is a clip I found on youtube:

I don’t know how long ago the Duchess’ pattern of betrayal became something the British press could no longer excuse, because I’m not one to follow the royal family. From what I gather the press in the UK hasn’t liked her for quite a long time. At any rate, clearly she managed to find how far was too far. The Daily Mail piece is titled: The Duchess of Delusion: How Fergie’s shamelessly self-serving book is as airbrushed as the cover

Here is a taste of the way she is described in the article:

Who would ever imagine that these tear-stained words refer to a woman who has been given every possible advantage in life, including marriage to a prince and the styling Her Royal Highness — all of which she has only herself to blame for throwing away.

She even betrayed Princess Diana, breaking her promise not to write about her in her book:

Fergie told how, when she borrowed a pair of the Princess’s shoes, she caught verrucas. Diana never spoke to her again.

Here is how she describes her “perfect man”:

‘Someone who is good looking . . . with a good sense of humour . . . believes in old-fashioned chivalry . . . is confident, sophisticated, intelligent and athletic . . . who has integrity, honesty and is family oriented, and who knows me better than I know myself.’

‘I realise I have just described Andrew.’

For his part Prince Andrew seems to not have lost his patience with her. Despite her public humiliation of him by cheating on him with multiple men, divorcing him, and her most recent attempt to sell access to him, he keeps her at his home, and we are told that he still loves her. They still vacation together, and he even symbolically fights against the royal family ostracizing her. She wasn’t invited to William and Kate’s wedding, so Andrew carried a
picture of her when he attended. Someone needs to do a *mantervention* ASAP. The piece closes with the following quote:

‘I look at my ex, and how great he is becoming, more and more centred within himself. He is blossoming into the man I knew he was when I married him.

‘I keep thinking, why did we get divorced? In hindsight, I would say to anyone who takes impulsive, spontaneous giant steps, fighting for a change within a marriage, never be impulsive, because it might be irrevocable. I live in the grasps of the tentacles of regret.’
Misinformation on later life pregnancy.

by Dalrock | July 14, 2011 | Link

Note: I don’t have any malice for women who have children later in life, and I don’t want to cause women who are over 35 and pregnant any concerns. As I have written before my wife was 35 when she gave birth to our son, and we didn’t have any age related complications. I presume women in this situation have already discussed it with their doctor and don’t need any further information from me or anyone else in the manosphere. Nothing I write in this blog should be considered medical advice. Women of any age who have questions on the topic should consult their doctor. Please skip this post if you are a woman over 35 and pregnant or trying to get pregnant.

Commenter pirran linked to an article by Claudia Spahr on Yahoo Shine: Want to have a baby? Here are 5 reasons you should consider waiting. Most of it is the usual gems like this excerpt from reason #1:

After spending decades at fancy bars in treacherous heels downing chocolate martinis and other ludicrously-priced cocktails most women feel prepared to shift their focus from pumps to Pampers.

However reason number two is a classic example of Dalrocks Law:

2) The kids are healthier and smarter

I’m not making this up. Oh no! Studies show that older mothers have healthier babies than younger mothers. Women over 35 are shown to care more about nutrition, exercise and rest during pregnancy so this could be a good reason for the bouncy babes. Research also shows that older parents have more available time to spend with junior and the kids perform better at school.

She doesn’t name or link to these studies in the article (maybe in her book), but the basic premise is pure nonsense. My guess is that someone noticed that higher IQ women tended to marry and have children a bit later (on average), and that their children tended to be healthier and smarter. This doesn’t mean that any given woman will have healthier kids if she waits until after age 35 as the article suggests. In fact, it is exactly the opposite. There is a reason pregnancies where the mother is 35 or older are called geriatric pregnancies. As women get older the risks increase. There isn’t a magic year where it goes from being safe to unsafe to have a child; this is a case of gradually increasing risk. You can see this in chart at American Family Physician on the risk of down syndrome. For more information, check out the WebMD page Pregnancy After Age 35.

As I wrote above I don’t want to upset women who are in this situation, nor am I passing any judgment on their decisions. But it is outright cruel for feminists to lie to younger women in order to convince them to delay becoming a mother. The title of the article comes right out and tries to talk women who want to become mothers now into waiting until they are older. This isn’t an effort to give them all of the facts and let them make an informed choice. They
are trying to frighten women into following a more feminist approved life path. Just like the misleading use of divorce statistics by the authors of Last One Down the Aisle Wins, they are leaving women with a very inaccurate understanding of the risks involved. Who needs facts when you have ideology? Moreover, who still believes that feminists have women’s best interest at heart?
Dr Helen has a new post out titled “Burnt-out” or just working like a man? The evil patriarchy knows no bounds. They have women trapped in yet another way!

Funny, feminists have always told women they “could have it all.” Now that they do, they are all a bunch of martyrs, no different than the way the 1950s housewives were described by feminists. Have you noticed that women are always portrayed as a bunch of martyrs who “never put themselves first,” no matter the circumstances? The solution to their woes always seems to be to get more “me time.”

I often watch men drag themselves to work or do things that call for sacrifice without complaining or sometimes, they have a heart attack or other health problem that no one really cares about and certainly, they get little sympathy.

Men are also adapting to new roles and doing much more in the home as well as working. People just call that “life” if you’re a man. If you are a woman who works too hard, you are “burnt-out” and need help. Maybe “burnt-out” is just another phrase that means “work like a man.” Feminists and their suck-ups are always saying that women are “superior” to men, but when I read articles like this one, I’m not so sure.

Will no one help these selfless martyrs?

Also, the bloggers at Traditional Christianity have been quite busy. If you haven’t checked it out recently I highly recommend it. There is something for everyone, including a post by THECOTTAGECHILDB titled Are you tired of me, my darling? in response to my recent post on divorcée retirement.

Frequent commenter UncleFred has created a new blog with his first post on Game and being a man. Captain Capitalism has a new post up on Corporate Infidelity. Hawaiian Libertarian has a new post discussing opportunity cost and parenting. Also, Elusive Wapiti has a post up on women in the military. Feel free to point out any other posts you think I or my readers would enjoy in the comments section.
I will work harder!

–Boxer, Animal Farm

The breathless *Daily Mail* headline asks: **The 40-year itch: Divorce is falling in every age group except the over-60s – so why ARE so many couples splitting after a lifetime together?**

It turns out once a husband has put in his decades of toil supporting his wife and children, he isn’t needed anymore. But what to do with him? You can’t sell him to the glue factory. Luckily however you can divorce him for the crime of being boring, and start enjoying the bliss that is post marital spinster retirement!

And women, the prime instigators of this rise in late-life separations, are citing the deathly hush that descends on their homes when their children leave as one of the prime causes of marital breakdown.

For a glimpse into how this works, consider the case of Sarah and Thomas. Sarah used her impressive communications skills in an effort to save their marriage, but Thomas reacted in a totally unexpected way:

'I used to scream at him: “Talk to me!” But he’d just walk away.

Despite Sarah’s pleasant demeanour, Thomas inexplicably didn’t crave her constant company:

He had no interest in our doing anything together, even having a meal out or planning a weekend away.

But luckily for Sarah she is still a hot babe, who no doubt was anxious to dump her worn out workhorse of a husband and get on the hunt for a hot young stud!

And many women of Sarah’s age are staying fit and attractive for longer and are loath to settle for the quiet retirement their husbands – who, like Thomas, have often been their family’s main breadwinner – crave after they quit their demanding jobs.

These boring loyal dudes have victimized their wives with their insistence on working tirelessly for decades to support their family. The wives find themselves wondering; **where is the me in keeping my solemn vow?**

The majority of women who divorce in later life, she says, are trying to retrieve their identity.

...They often feel resentful that their husbands have invested so much effort in their work and so little time in them.
Another victim of a husband who selfishly slaved to support his family is Margaret White. She was forced to divorce her husband Peter and take hundreds of thousands of dollars which he thoughtlessly amassed for them over the decades. Despite Margaret’s obviously congenial disposition, Peter failed to sufficiently yearn for her delightful conversation:

‘He never talks to me, and if he’s in a mood, he’ll go for weeks without saying a word. Everything about him irritates me. I just want to get as far away from him as possible.

And what should stop her? Sure she made a solemn vow in front of God, their friends, and their family, but she didn’t know she was marrying a criminal. I hereby find her husband Peter guilty of the crime of boringness, with added charges of pre-meditated industry and loyalty:

‘I was brought up to believe marriage was for ever, but I was never told it could be so boring, particularly once he retires and is suddenly under your feet every minute of every day.’

I haven’t come to this ruling without evidence:

Peter retired as a City of London stonemason seven years ago and expected to live out his final years with his wife in their dream home...

...I thought when I retired that’s what we’d do...

The layabout quit being a stone mason in his youthful mid 60s. Now he thinks he has earned a time of rest!

Yet another woman victimized by a boring loyal husband is Trisha Watson. Her story is quite empowering!

‘I’m thoroughly enjoying my freedom. I have time and money to do exactly what I want, instead of having to worry about a man all the time. It’s a relief,’

I’ll bet it is a relief! Keeping promises is hard! And what is the point after the other side has already generated as much wealth as he was capable of? Luckily she has heroically reinvented herself!

‘I’ve changed everything about myself, from my hair to the way I dress,’

She won a victory for the sisterhood after her husband asked more of her than she had to give:

‘John felt that I no longer understood him or his needs and I thought he was acting like a big baby. I just got fed up,’...

‘I think women of my age are no longer prepared to endure immature men who erode our self-esteem.'
You go aging martyr girl! Their daughter kept up the momentum of the victory and dealt out her own punishment on her boring loyal father. She didn’t invite him to her wedding and instead had her mother give her away.

Sisterhood: 2 Patriarchy: 0!

So how has it worked out for our heroes of the sisterhood? Have they fallen prey to the strong statistical likelihood of ending up less happy and alone? Certainly not! First there is Sarah:

‘I’m sure I made the right decision...
‘I miss being part of a big family. I miss all the memories associated with our marital home. I keep very busy, but coming back to an empty house is lonely.’

Following up with her own ringing endorsement of the bliss that is late life divorce is Trisha. While she had to give up the vacations she used to take with her husband, now she has an exciting dating life:

In three years she has been out with several men, but she thinks it ‘unlikely’ she’ll marry again or sacrifice her financial independence to a new partner.

Have these boring loyal dudes learned their lesson? Do they acknowledge their responsibility for ruining a perfectly good marriage by working hard to provide for their wives and children? Fortunately, some do:

‘I was working 60 or 70-hour weeks in charge of commercial sales for a large firm,’
‘I simply wasn’t there while our three children were growing up, and my wife was resentful. She said it takes two to make a marriage and that I was not pulling my weight. I felt that I was doing my bit by supporting the family financially.

Unfortunately he didn't learn this in time to save his marriage. Now that he is retired and divorced he focuses on his passion, customizing and repairing electric guitars. If only he had made this change decades ago instead of frittering his time away in sales, he could have avoided his well deserved punishment:

‘I miss my children very much. I miss being part of a family,’
‘I find myself sitting and crying at romantic old films on the television. When an elderly couple walks hand-in-hand into the sunset, I think: “That’s not going to happen to me,” and, if I’m honest, it’s a profound regret.’

See Also: Divorcée Retirement
My last post painted a pretty bleak picture. As Greyghost put it:

 Quote

Well Dalrock for a guy that is blogging for marriage you sure have a knack for finding reasons for MGTOW. This article says I’m in big trouble because I am one responsible dude.

 End Quote

I think it helps to remember that while women like the ones in the original story are shown as representing the norm, thankfully they really don’t. The chart below is the one I shared when investigating if women are done with men after age 55. This covers white women in the US; you can get the same data for all races from the US Census. Data on divorce rates by age bracket per 1,000 married women would be preferable, but this at least gives us something to go on:

![Breakdown of Women by Relationship Status and Age Bracket](image)

Following a noteworthy bump in divorce between early and late 40s, the percentage of women married vs divorced remains surprisingly steady until around age 60, where the death of their husbands (and not divorce) starts steadily lowering the percentage of women who are married. Keep in mind that only 30 out of every 1,000 divorcées aged 45 to 64 remarry in any given year (source, P 148), so the pool of existing divorcées isn’t being siphoned off due to remarriage at a very fast rate. The stabilization of the percentage of divorcées after age 45
therefore suggests a very low divorce rate later in life. This is corroborated by the sampling the AARP found when they did their study on late life divorce. From my previous analysis of the AARP study:

73% of the divorces examined in the study occurred when the respondent was in their 40s. Another 15% of the divorces they studied occurred when the respondent was 50-55. Only 11% occurred when the person answering the survey was over 55.

Part of the skew was likely caused by the nature of the sampling they were doing, but putting all of the data together would seem to suggest that divorce rates drop significantly in the US later in life. At the very least I’ve never come across any data backing the common claim in the media of an explosion in divorce late in life. This also makes intuitive sense. Women’s incentive to divorce would seem much lower later in life given their slim and rapidly declining remarriage prospects, their increasing physical and financial vulnerability, and the fact that if they stay married they are likely to receive over half of the couple’s assets during retirement.

Since the Daily Mail story was about women in the UK, I did some digging for the data on this question there. The data in the chart below is from this report, specifically table 4 in this spreadsheet:

![Number of women divorcing by age bracket](chart.png)

Note that the age brackets expand starting at age 50, so the drop after their late 40s is actually much steeper than the graph would suggest. At some point mortality has to be playing a significant role here, but I don’t think it explains the number of divorces to women in their 50s being less than half that of women in their late 40s. This still doesn’t tell us the number of divorces per 1,000 married women, but it would seem to pour cold water on the media’s hyping of late life divorce in the UK as well.

Note: If you have any links to better data please share them in the comments below.

July 22nd 2011 Update: I found the UK data I was looking for.
Divorcing under the influence

by Dalrock | July 21, 2011 | Link

As I pointed out in my last post, there doesn’t seem to be isn’t a rash of late life divorce in either the US or the UK. This however doesn’t discourage the media from its full court press to sell divorce to older women. Most of their sales pitches are typical hamster food, like the article in *The Times* by Helen Rumbelow: *An inconvenient truth about late-life divorce*. The subtitle pretty much says it all:

The separation after 40 years of Al Gore and his wife Tipper reflects an increasing trend for splitting up in old age — but is it such a bad thing?

In the article we get the usual doses of “everyone is doing it”, along with female martyrdom, linking divorce with empowerment, and the empirically inaccurate assumption that divorce makes people happy:

In talking to people who escaped a marriage when they were issued with their Freedom bus pass, I realise that I kind of admire them for not crumbling away into her kitchen and his garage and silently rancorous mealtimes.

If I had to grade the author on her skills at selling divorce, I would give her a solid B. This kind of consistent plodding is how the war on marriage is won. There isn’t anything imaginative or flashy about it, but she has her fundamentals squared away and turns out a solid article selling divorce. She also does a bang up job of confusing her readership on what the AARP actually found when studying late life divorce:

A study of post-40 divorce by the American support group for older people, AARP, found that 60 and 70-year-olds appreciate life after divorce the most of any of the ages, citing a fresh lease of life from forging a new identity.

A rookie might have noticed that the AARP study actually found that women often fared quite badly after late life divorce, and avoided the study altogether.

But not everyone at *The Times* is satisfied with *good enough*. Dr. Louann Brizendine clearly has what it takes to go the extra mile. She came up with the ingenious plan of telling women that they will make their best decisions while in the grips of menopause! Her masterpiece is titled: *All Change* (H/T Dan S). The piece opens with a typical female martyr, who of course is fit and attractive and sure to find a better man:

Sylvia woke up one day and decided, this is it. I’m done. I want a divorce. It had become clear to her that her husband, Robert, was unavailable and ungiving. She was tired of listening to his tirades and fed up with his demands. But what really pushed her over the edge was when she found herself in the hospital for a week for an intestinal blockage and he visited her only twice. Both times he came to ask questions about running the house.
At least this is how Sylvia, an attractive woman with brown hair, bright blue eyes and a spring in her step, explained it to me during a therapy session. Since her early twenties, she felt she had spent most of her time taking care of needy, self-absorbed people. She had fixed their problems, pulling them out of alcoholism or abusive situations, and in return they had sucked her emotionally dry.

At 54, she was still very attractive and felt full of energy.

I know this is all standard fare, but even when creating your masterpiece you can’t omit the fundamentals. Next we learn that Sylvia’s new found marital angst is not due to her being in the throws of a life altering hormonal change, but in fact the opposite:

What astounded her more than anything was that she felt as though a haze had lifted recently, and she could see in a way she hadn’t been able to before. For 28 years she had chauffeured, nurtured and loved her three children, made sure homework was done, dinner was eaten and the house didn’t fall apart. Now, out of nowhere, she found herself asking, why?

If we took our MRI scanner into Sylvia’s brain, we’d see a landscape quite different from that of a few years before. A constancy in the flow of impulses through her brain circuits has replaced the surges and plunges of oestrogen and progesterone caused by the menstrual cycle. Her brain is now a more certain and steady machine.

Having explained that menopause causes women to make better decisions, the author masterfully ties this back to the themes of female martyrdom and women being trapped in marriage:

This can happen precipitously and the problem is that Sylvia’s family can’t see from the outside how her internal rules are being rewritten. One day she turned to Robert and said: “You’re a grown-up and I’m finished raising the kids. Now it’s my turn to have a life.” Robert couldn’t believe what he was hearing. For instance: “Make your own damn dinner or go out by yourself. For the last time, I’m not hungry. I’m happy painting right now and I don’t feel like stopping.”

Next the author takes on the common misconception that menopause can make women less rational. She explains that the real problem was in the past, when she was more likely to moderate her emotions:

But as Sylvia hit menopause, the filters came off, her irritability increased and her anger wasn’t headed for that extra “stomach” any more, to be chewed over before it came out. Her ratio of testosterone to oestrogen was shifting, and her anger pathways were becoming more like a man’s. The calming effects of progesterone and oxytocin weren’t there to cool off the anger either. The couple had never learnt to process and resolve their disagreements. Now Sylvia confronted Robert with regularity, venting decades of pent-up rage. The children were also affected. Sylvia had reported that her daughter had said: “Mom, you’re acting weird and dad is getting scared. He’s afraid you’ll do something crazy — like take all the money and run away.” Sylvia wasn’t crazy but she wasn’t the same woman. She told me that
her husband had once screamed at her: “What have you done with my wife?” Sylvia had changed the rules of the relationship and no one had told Robert.

Now it is time to weave in the “everyone else is doing it” argument:

It is commonly believed that men leave their ageing, chubby, postmenopausal wives for fertile, younger, thin women. This couldn’t be further from the truth. Statistics indicate that more than 65 per cent of divorces after the age of 50 are initiated by women. My suspicion is that much of this female-initiated divorce is rooted in the drastically altered reality of postmenopausal women. (But as I have seen in my practice, it could also be because they are tired of putting up with difficult or cheating husbands and have just been waiting for the day when the children leave home.)

Note that the author doesn’t get caught up trying to explain why menopausal women initiate divorce at the same rate as non menopausal women. This would only confuse her audience.

After some more female martyrdom and uplifting tales of how divorce empowered our menopausal hero, the author adds one final sweetener while removing another obstacle in many women’s minds. We learn that Sylvia ultimately gets back together with her husband, now having benefited from the power she gained by showing him she would divorce:

There’s a lot of life left after menopause, and embracing work passionately allows a woman to feel regenerated. Two years after their separation, Sylvia realised that she missed Robert. He was the only one she could talk to about certain things, including their children. One day he invited her to dinner and she decided to accept. They met, talked calmly about what had gone wrong and ended up apologising for the unhappiness they had caused each other. They also had new experiences to share and over time they rediscovered their friendship and respect for each other and realised that they had already found their soul mates. They just needed to rewrite the contract.

Other authors should use this technique more. Many would-be divorcées are deterred by the bleak dating reality they witness other women experiencing. While they likely haven’t given up their dream of a secret multimillionaire hunky handyman, at some level they probably know better. You need to remove their fear that they could be making an irrevocable decision during a time of great life change. If you feel that it is too much of a stretch to suggest that they could remarry their ex husband after divorcing him, suggest instead that it will make them best friends. Under no circumstances should you share the findings of the AARP study in this regard (P 41):

Divorcees may not have any contact with their ex-spouses at all, true among almost a third (31%). They may remarry the same person, but very rarely, as occurred among two percent. A total of about one in twenty (6%) either remarry the same person (2%) or had sex with their spouse either occasionally (3%), or often (1%).

In addition, 27 percent were friendly afterwards while 35 percent were not friendly but talked once in a while.
See Also:

- Divorcée Retirement
- Her husband was her best friend
The truth vs the hype: UK divorce rate data by age per 1,000 married women

by Dalrock | July 23, 2011 | Link

I’m pretty well done with this topic, at least for now. However I did find the data I was looking for in the UK in my previous post on how common late life divorce is. This data is from the same ONS spreadsheet as the other UK data I shared, but on tab 3b. The title had confused me at first which is why I missed it:

| Sex and age at divorce of wife (rates), 1950-2009

Aren’t all wives women? At any rate, the data is pretty interesting and blows away the media hype in the UK that late life divorce is frequent or an exploding trend. Here is the distribution per 1,000 married women for 2009:

Here is the trend for the last 30 years of available data:
If you want to see the data in table form here is an image (if you want it in spreadsheet form click on the spreadsheet link above).

To put the media’s spin on this into perspective, here is what The Guardian wrote in March of 2009:

Adult children of divorce, or Acods as they are increasingly known, are a fast-growing phenomenon. While the overall number of divorces has fallen for a third year in a row to its lowest level in 26 years, the number of over-60s choosing to end their marriages has increased by more than a third in the space of a decade.

They must be looking at total numbers of divorces for the age bracket or maybe older data, because the rate per 1,000 married women in that bracket went from 1.3 in 2000 to 1.5 in 2009. While proportionally it sounds like a huge jump, the values are so small here that it is misleading. Try to find a noteworthy bump in the purple line at the bottom of the last graph. This is what they are getting excited about. Also, the 1.5 per 1,000 married women value isn’t out of the historical range for this group. In 1972 it was over twice this at 3.2. How many people who read that article would have known that it was talking about something which is extremely infrequent?

Here is what The Daily Mail said about late life divorce in June of 2010:

Many couples of a similar age share Sarah’s sentiments. In 2007, the latest figures available in the UK, 50 per cent more over-60s got divorced than ten years previously.
In 1998 the value was 1.2, and in 2007 it was 1.6.

Here is what The Times wrote in June of 2010:

The Office of National Statistics shows that the rate of divorce is dropping sharply in every age group, except the over-60s — this includes every age over 60, because the statisticians never anticipated the need to start separate graphs for the seventies, eighties, and nineties. The world’s oldest divorcés, Bertie and Jessie Woods, made history last year by divorcing when they had both reached the age of 98.

So why, instead of cruising off into their dotage hand in hand, are the grandparent generation single-handedly dragging the average divorce age up every year?

Edit Nov 2011: The latest offering in this genre from the Daily Mail: Rise of the ‘silver separations’: Divorce rate for over-60s surges Note that this is referencing “new” data from 2009, the same year as the latest ONS data I was able to find.

Update: I now have data on 2009 US divorce rates per 1,000 married women by age.
The Private Man to the rescue!
by Dalrock | July 23, 2011 | Link

The Private Man recounts the dramatic rescue of an ailing hamster in A Woman Visits The Veterinarian...

You also won’t want to miss his take on Haley’s Can I get him? table titled Can I Get Him To Commit?

Mike at Crime and Federalism has an instructional video on why it is a bad idea to punch a woman in the face while she is walking arm in arm with her boyfriend the boxer. I saw this on one of those “worlds dumbest” programs a while back but at the time couldn’t find it on youtube.

On a more serious note, Badger has an excellent post up titled: 150 Years of the Civil War

As always, feel free to add your own links in the comment section.
Most folks are about as happy as they make up their minds to be.

— Abraham Lincoln

Dennis Prager is a conservative talk show host who is unique in my view for his intellectual heft. I first heard him talking about this subject several years ago and after considering it for a bit I realized that he is right. He has written a book on the topic, but his basic premise is summed up in his article Happiness Is a Moral Obligation:

Consider the effects of an unhappy parent on a child. Ask people raised by an unhappy parent if that unhappiness hurt them.

Consider the effects of an unhappy spouse on a marriage.

Consider the effects of unhappy children on their parents. I know a couple that has four middle-aged children of whom three are truly extraordinary people, inordinately well adjusted and decent. The fourth child has been unhappy most of his life and has been a never-ending source of pain to the parents. That one child’s unhappiness has always overshadowed the joy that the parents experience from the other three children. Hence the saying that one is no happier than one’s least happy child.

Consider the effects of a brooding co-worker on your and your fellow workers’ morale — not to mention the huge difference between working for a happy or a moody employer.

We should regard bad moods as we do offensive body odor. Just as we shower each day so as not to inflict our body odors on others, so we should monitor our bad moods so as not to inflict them on others. We shower partly for ourselves and partly out of obligation to others.

He makes the same basic point in the following youtube video:

**Note:** I went to his web site and noticed that one of his main topics is male/female relations, and he has a CD set out on Men’s Sexual Nature. I sent him a quick email to see if he has heard or read anything about game. I heard him speaking on the basic topic a few months ago while in the car. He is a solid thinker so his advice struck me as generally pretty good, but I think he is missing the pieces which game could provide. I’ll follow up in the comments section if I hear back from him.
Why China has to buy US debt
by Dalrock | July 27, 2011 | Link

Captain Capitalism linked to an article on CNBC the other day titled US Image in China Already Tarnished by Debt Fight. The basic premise of this article and countless others like it is that China might suddenly decide it didn't want to lend the US any more money. While this is something they could of course decide, there is some very important context missing around why China finds itself lending the US so much money in the first place. This is very basic stuff, but I've never seen it discussed anywhere in the media.

As almost everyone knows China has been running a trade surplus with the US since at least the 1980s. Every year they sell us more goods and services than we sell back to them. This isn't by accident or due to them discovering some economic principle the west hasn't yet stumbled upon. The Chinese government has deliberately managed their economy so that this will be the case. The thing is, under normal circumstances the currency markets will eventually adjust so that trade is balanced. Whenever Americans buy goods from China someone is taking dollars, converting them to yuan (or if you prefer renminbi), and then paying the factory which produced the goods. The currency exchange assumes someone else wanted to sell yuan for dollars in order to buy goods and services from the US. But the currency market can't clear without intervention because as we already know Americans are buying more goods and services from China than the other way around. If left alone (and without one country investing in the other), the currency market would adjust the relative values of the yuan and dollar until the total value of imports equals exports. This hasn't happened because China has been soaking up those excess dollars on the US/China currency market, supplying yuan in exchange. They have to do this, or they will suffer the unimaginable fate of having balanced trade.

Since China has been buying up excess dollars on the currency exchange market for several decades now, they have amassed a lot of the things. This creates a problem; what should they do with all of them? They could bundle $100 bills onto forklift manageable pallets and store them in a massive warehouse, but the darn things create a fire hazard, not to mention a security risk. If Chinese thieves were to break in and steal some of these dollars, someone in China would end up turning them back in to the US for goods and services. That's right! Now China is all of a sudden moving back towards an unimaginable state of balanced trade. China isn't about to let that happen, so they have decided to buy things with these dollars other than our goods and services. In practice this has been US Treasury bonds, but they could buy and hold any financial asset which is denominated in dollars.

To understand how unnatural this situation is, remember that China is (or was) a poor country continuously lending huge sums of money to a rich country (or at least we were). Or to put it another way, they are an undeveloped country investing capital in a fully developed country. This shouldn't be happening. It is the international finance equivalent of water running uphill; someone must be pumping it.

So when you read articles in CNBC and elsewhere like the one referenced above and they say
things like:

“The high-stakes political posturing is a shock to these countries,” said Jina Ventures’ Ron Shah, who said he’s heard the same thing from contacts in India and the United Arab Emirates. “The point for them is not about whether or not a deal will be reached. The chance that the U.S. will leave this issue lingering is creating material damage to the safety of the U.S. dollar and Treasuries amongst the emerging powers in Asia.”

And then follow with another statement like:

“The damage is done,” said Brian Kelly, head of Brian Kelly Capital and a ‘Fast Money’ trader. “Look at Aussie and Kiwi dollar today, that is where the buyers are.”

They aren’t telling the whole story. It is true that the US could take a hit regarding its credit rating and the dollar could be weakened in the process. However if China and other Asian countries want to maintain a trade surplus with the US, they will have to continue investing in the US. If they stop buying new dollar denominated assets, or even worse start selling the ones they have, they will necessarily switch from having a trade surplus with the US to a trade deficit. Since even balanced trade is something which has terrified them for 25 years, I’m guessing they will be very reluctant to do this.

I’m not saying the current model is a good idea for either country, I’m just pointing out the basic mechanics of how it works. What strikes me is that no one else seems to want to talk about this. On the left, the Keynesians don’t seem to mind one bit that China and other countries are distorting our economy to lessen demand for US goods, trampling the average US worker and environmental protections they profess undying love for in the process. If I didn’t know any better, I’d think that all they really cared about was a supply of cheap credit to continuously expand the US federal government just for the sake of having a bigger government. On the right, the Ricardians don’t seem to mind that instead of creating a mutually beneficial exchange based on comparative advantage, our so called free trade partner has been rigging the game for decades and the end result is massive federal debt and a larger government. If I didn’t know better, I would think they didn’t really care about comparative advantage and instead were merely interested in supplying business with cheap labor and a way to avoid first world labor and environmental regulations.
Finding your Heisenberg
by Dalrock | July 28, 2011 | Link

Note: This post contains spoilers for the first season (season 4 just started). The video segments are also is less safe for work due to language.

For those who haven’t watched Breaking Bad, there are two key characters you should know about. The first is Walt.

Walt is a middle aged beaten down beta high school Chemistry teacher. He also happens to be a Nobel Laureate. Everyone walks all over Walt, from his wife to his boss at his part time job at the car wash.

The second is Heisenberg. He is harder to describe. He isn’t an alpha in the Roissy sense, but he is in the more traditional meaning of the term. Heisenberg is a bad ass meth manufacturer who looks after his own and won’t tolerate any threats to his business:

Actually, they are both the same guy. Walt’s late life transformation from broken down beta to bad-ass Heisenberg is prompted by his terminal cancer. His cancer creates a need for money for medical treatment and to provide for his family after he is gone. He is forced to become the leader he has always shirked being. His transformation starts off small; this clip shows him standing up to his wife for what is likely the first time in their marriage:

Further on in his transformation Walt talks about overcoming fear with his DEA agent brother in law:

Here he is confronting a potential competitor:

Here he is taking care of business with a distributor who beat up his partner and stole his product (skip to 4:15 for the scene. The exchange at 1:34 is also good.)

Obviously this is just TV, and I wouldn’t advise manufacturing drugs or killing people. But within reason there is something we can all learn from Walt and his transformation.
Top 10 most annoying parents
by Dalrock | July 29, 2011 | Link

Dr Helen (here and here) and Captain Capitalism both have recent posts on parents being incensed when their poorly behaved children aren’t welcome. They have inspired me to write my own post on the topic.

My wife and I were married for 10 years before we had our first child. During that time whenever we witnessed out of control kids the standard refrain was you’ll understand when you have kids. When our daughter was about three we were at a restaurant when a mother (passively) sent her 5 year old daughter to our table to investigate the toys our daughter was quietly playing with. I must have given her a look, because her comment to me was you’ll understand when you have more than one child. Now that we have two, I can honestly say that I still don’t allow our daughter to join other diners at their table or even stand in the booth and turn around to stare at the family on the other side. Obviously I can’t guarantee that I wouldn’t change my view on this if I had a few more kids, but I’m pretty confident this wouldn’t be the case. Either way, I’ve compiled a list of the top 10 most annoying types of parents for your reading enjoyment. I haven’t assigned them numbers, because really they are all winners. Feel free to add any I’ve missed in the comments section.

The world is my babysitter. These parents range from the ones who pretend not to notice as their young child joins you at your table at the restaurant (often begging for food) to the ones who actively encourage their children to attach on to you while they are shopping or perhaps reading a novel on a long flight. When my wife worked for a department store one mother told her young son to talk with the nice lady while she went about her browsing. The child was learning his ABCs, and was singing a song to help him remember. By the time his mother returned he was singing a slightly different version of the song: K is for cookie, that’s good enough for me! Cookie cookie cookie starts with K! His oblivious mother of course was the epitome of etiquette: Now thank the nice lady! Another great trick is to teach the child foisted on you some new form of bodily function humor. It doesn’t have to be creative; barfing sounds or armpit farts will do just fine. Then tell the delighted child go show mommy and/or daddy!

Don’t worry, I have a gun. I don’t have anything against children at shooting ranges, so long as they are safe and under the control of their parents. My father started taking me shooting when I was in the third grade. It was serious business and I was always under his control. Fortunately, irresponsible parents at shooting ranges are very rare, and no range-master worth his salt will let this kind of thing get by. I was a member of a sportsman’s club many years ago which had a private self policed range. It was out on the prairie and had a combination lock on the gate. One day I was sighting my rifle in when a truck pulled up with a 10 year old boy riding on the back bumper. The father then proceeded to hand his hyperactive son all manner of uncased firearms for the boy to put on the shooting tables. I don’t know what happened next because I gathered my stuff and left. Another time at a public range an unattended young teen set up shop at the station immediately to my left. I was in a right handed station and his was a lefty one. This wouldn’t have been a problem if
he was shooting a lefty rifle, but he proceeded to drop hot brass down my collar with his right handed rifle. I mentioned this to him several times, and each time he stopped long enough for me to let my guard down before starting back up. I’ve since found a better policed range.

**What crash? I didn’t hear anything.** Whenever you see unattended children running around in public, wait a few minutes for the inevitable crashing sound and/or blood curdling scream. Then look for the only people who didn’t seem to notice. The ones who didn’t turn their heads or even wince are the parents. Often times these parents fear that their children won’t be able to achieve the velocity required to create a spectacular enough crash, and equip their children with roller skates disguised as sneakers.

**I couldn’t find a sitter.** These parents are most often found bringing their young children with them to wholly inappropriate movies. When my wife and I watched Saw 37 (or maybe it was 38) there were more children under 10 in the theater than there were adults. I also distinctly remember watching a horror movie about an evil tooth fairy with 4 and 5 year old children in the audience. Yes, I know, I’ll understand if I have more kids. Or not.

**The world will now stop while my 4 year old ponders the menu.** I’ve never been a waiter, so my only direct experience with this is being behind these parents at a fast food restaurant. Little Billy has ordered the same thing the last 20 times they were here, but his parents want to make sure he takes his time ordering to get the most out of his dining experience. Crucial to the process is that he not consider what he wants until the family is actually ordering. Asking him to make up his mind while in line would harm his delicate sense of self, potentially scarring him for life. For extra points, many moms will wait until precious little Billy has made up his mind and then suggest maybe he would like something else better: *But you always get chicken nuggets. Wouldn’t you rather have a hamburger?* Lather, rinse, repeat. The only thing which will convince these parents to speed the process along is if another cashier becomes free and the people behind them will no longer have to wait.

**The rules don’t apply to me, my child is disabled.** Some kids have special needs; we all get that. But some parents take this understanding as an invitation to be irrational. The neighbor down the street has a son who is deaf. When we moved in she made it a point to visit with me to warn us of the risk that he wouldn’t hear us when we were driving through the neighborhood. So far, just a concerned parent taking extra precautions. But then we notice that she has set up a basketball hoop on the curb facing the street. The only way her son can use it is to stand in the street next to a (busy enough) intersection while facing away from all traffic. At one point she walked down the street on the sidewalk while her son rode his bicycle at a walking pace in the middle of the street. I’m told she looked annoyed when my wife laid on the horn behind him.

**The rolling road block.** I always picture this family as three generations all holding hands. But in practice they are careful not to hold hands, because this would limit their ability to fully spread out while walking in a parking lot, crossing a street, or walking in a store. Key to their strategy is to place the most indecisive member of the family in the leadership position. This could be an aging grandparent, but works just as well with a 4 year old. Age doesn’t matter, so long as they don’t have a plan. Then the rest of the family fans out to make sure no one can get around them. Some families will run faking plays where the 4 year old
appears to be the leader and fakes right but then at the last minute granny or mommy turns left. When this play is properly executed, half of the family briefly follows the false leader and then mills around in feigned confusion for a while before rejoining the herd. Toddlers are best employed in the cleanup position, waiting until the rest of the family has finally cleared out of the way before deciding to join them. Remember, don’t cross in between the toddler and their inattentive parents; this would be rude.

**Your kids are my babysitter.** This is a special variation on *the world is my babysitter*, but worthy of separate mention. These parents watch with delight while their children place their hands on your very young child’s face. Your asking them not to do this or moving your baby out of reach is considered extremely rude by these parents. Once at an airport my wife had to remove a young girl’s hand which was covering our 1 year old daughter’s mouth and nose. The father was outraged. Evidently his daughter wanted to see what would happen if our daughter couldn’t breath.

**If you keep acting up, I’m going to have to buy you a toy.** There are many variations on this theme, but all of them involve a parent who loudly tells their child not to do something and then never follows through. When our daughter was three my wife was shopping with her at Target. A boy around 4 or 5 years old was playing with the phone reserved for associates. His mother told him repeatedly that if he didn’t put it down she wouldn’t buy him the DVD he had picked out. After a while our daughter observed “He won’t get the DVD now because he didn’t listen to his mommy”. The little boy was horrified and ran off. My wife bought her a special toy that day.

**Your mouth is writing checks your ass can’t cash.** This is a similar parent to the one immediately above, but instead of coming across as pushovers they come across as bullies. The child is constantly harangued with threats of what will happen to them if they don’t shape up, but no effective discipline is ever enacted. When my wife and I were dating there was a family at the table next to us in a coffee shop where the father (or perhaps mother’s boyfriend) kept telling the boy at the table that his mouth was writing checks his ass couldn’t cash. I could never tell if the kid really was acting up or not, but either way the man kept repeating the same phrase the entire time we were there.
W.F. Price has a new page up at The Spearhead to gather material on Marriage Reform. He explains his intent in a post announcing the new page:

I’d like to invite others who have some interest in the issue, especially those who have written on the subject, to visit the page and post links. Attorneys with experience writing prenups or simply in contract law are also very much welcome.

The goal is to give people who want a better form of marriage the guidance and tools to make it possible. Default civil marriage as it exists today has become an evil and destructive institution that must be changed. People who remain in civil marriages do so despite the incentives to divorce and engage in gender warfare. For the weaker and less sensible it is too often a disaster that literally ruins lives, including those of the most innocent — our children.

Feminism may have done a wrecking job on the Western family, but I am optimistic that this can be turned around. The fight against feminists must continue, but it’s time to start discussing reconstruction, and reforming the devastated institution of marriage is where it should begin.

In a previous post on the same topic he described the fundamental problem with the current legal definition of marriage perfectly:

Whether written down or not, marriage has always been seen as a binding contract, and it is only in recent times that this universally accepted basis for marriage has been undermined and rejected in favor of the modern civil marriage, which cannot be called a marriage at all, but rather more of a tax classification. Marriage does still exist, but none of its conditions are fulfilled by what is known as marriage under Western civil law. It is the only contract that rewards a party for unilaterally breaking it: a wife is under more of an obligation to fulfill the terms of a cell phone contract than to fulfill her marriage vows.

He also argues that marriage is a natural state for men and women:

Marriage is the natural state of relations between men and women who cohabit and engage in sexual relations, and has been for thousands of years across a wide variety of cultures, races and faiths. It comes in many different forms, but in all cases there is a contractual element, and the needs and feelings of each spouse are taken into account.

His proposed solution is for men and women to enter into their own specifically defined contracts which define the rights and obligations of each spouse:

Although laws surrounding domestic relations – VAWA and other incentives to accuse
in particular – present some obstacles to marriage contracts, prenuptial agreements could remove some of these incentives and remain enforceable. Men and women can still enter into legally binding agreements under civil law, efforts of feminists notwithstanding, and many of the incentives to unilaterally break promises and vows could be removed with well-conceived contracts.

Furthermore, in the free societies of the West, contractual marriages could render the arguments over the definition of “marriage” moot, as the state’s role in defining the institution would decline as people increasingly defined it themselves. Lawyers who now profit from dissolutions could turn their efforts toward strengthening marriage and defending agreements, therefore contributing to families’ well-being rather than living off their destruction.

In the comments section, he acknowledges that this plan isn’t without risk:

The problem is that feminists will try to come up with ways to undermine the contracts, but they can’t undermine contract law too much without doing MAJOR damage to civil law in general.

I agree with him on the source of the risk. This is the fundamental problem. Unfortunately I don’t share his optimism that that the courts will honor marriage contracts. If the courts held private contracts relating to marriage as sacrosanct then a good prenup would seem to solve most of the problems with marriage 2.0. I’m not an expert in the law, but as I understand it this isn’t the case. Either way, I applaud him in his noble efforts. I sincerely hope he is correct. If you feel you could be of assistance in this worthy endeavor, please drop by the Marriage Reform page and share your thoughts.
Trapped in a not unhappy marriage!

by Dalrock | August 1, 2011 | Link

A new spectre is haunting marriage. Just when you thought you understood all of the diabolical ways women could be trapped in marriage, we learn of the most insidious trap of all; the trap of not unhappiness! Our friends at the Femail section of the Daily Mail breathlessly ask: Not bad enough to leave, but not good enough to fulfil you... are YOU trapped in a half-happy marriage? (H/T W). Yahoo Shine sounds the alarm with Are you stuck in a semi-happy marriage? (H/T Interested). USA Today warns of this problem with ‘Marriage Confidential’ exposes scandalous reality. The Daily Mail weighs in again with: Are you semihappy or a workhorse wife? Five different kinds of modern marriage.

The evil genius of the patriarchy is breathtaking. They have lulled women into a false sense of security, comfortable in the knowledge that her moral obligation to honor her sacred vows could at any time be instantly dissolved if she only uttered the three magic words. Three ancient words with a mystic power so great they cause God Himself to forget about her promise:

I’m not haaaaapy

Now we learn from the Daily Mail that women around the world have been caught unsuspecting by this latest trick:

‘It’s these low-conflict, amiable, but sort of listless marriages that actually contribute the lion’s share to the divorce rate. It’s not the couples who are throwing dishes and screaming.’

That’s right, millions of women are suffering this very day from the fate of not being deliriously happy. Evil patriarchy, I tip my hat to you.

All of these articles and many more like them are prompted by the book Marriage Confidential, written by radical feminist Dr. Pamela Haag. This worry by Dr. Haag that women might not be happy enough seems out of place; in March of this year she argued that while feminism made women less happy, it is more important for women to be radical feminists than to be happy. She closed that piece with:

I pull out Gloria Steinem’s 1973 essay, Sisterhood, from my private archive. She wrote, “I have met brave women who are exploring the outer edge of human possibility, with no history to guide them and with a courage to make themselves vulnerable that I find moving beyond words.”

Cool. That beats happy any day.

This radical feminist longs for the simpler era of the 1950s, when women were free to devote their energy to roles such as decorator, hostess, and being volunteers. Again from the Daily Mail:
She writes: ‘Parenthood is swallowing marriage... Children are at the center of a family now.

‘From a historical perspective it’s a departure. Go back to the Fifties and husbands and wives had many different roles – as hostess, decorator, breadwinner, volunteer. They weren’t just parents. Today, parenting is the sole priority... It crowds out other functions.’

In another *Daily Mail* piece we learn more about how the patriarchy is making women unhappy:

Haag argues that the dynamic of marriage has changed since the Fifties, when the majority of women did not work and could devote themselves to their marriages and pleasing their husbands.

Husbands kept their marriage alive by giving their wives flowers, complimenting them and treating them to new dresses and meals out, for which they was grateful.

She is also deeply troubled by a modern trend of undetermined origin, where women are trapped working like men. They don’t work simply to entertain themselves or fulfill their own egos, but instead are tricked into having to work to support their family. This has lead to one of the five traps of modern marriage, that of the *Workhorse Wife*:

Where a wife works a corporate job that she doesn’t necessarily like in order to fund the pro-golfer or musician dreams of her ‘Tom Sawyer’ husband.

Whenever women are on the cusp of having it all, the patriarchy always finds a way to thwart them.

For those men who having learned about the delightful Dr. Haag now nurture dreams of making her your wife, I have good news and bad news:

She admitted that even she herself was semihappy in her marriage, writing in the book: ‘I have a nice marriage, a lovely husband, but you never know. On other days and in other moments I think that this could very well be the last year of our marriage.’

But she won’t be wooed easily. Her brave mangina of a husband is a worthy adversary:

‘I do think that our marriage is better because of this,’ she revealed. ‘We’re paying more attention to each other. I think my husband’s very brave to allow me to write about it!’

Brave indeed. It takes courage not to stand up to your radical feminist wife. But don’t lose heart; even if you can’t make her your wife, you might still have a shot with her:

For some couples she says the answer is to become a ‘new monogamist’ – her term for what is effectively an open marriage, or an ‘Oreo Marriage’ where the couple...
looks traditional from the outside yet might enjoy something untraditional, such as swinging, in private.

She told the Huffington Post: ‘Many marriages are practising “Free Love Version 2.0,” in which spouses are actually trying to be honest and have decided that their marriage can tolerate some other attachments.’
Markets can remain irrational longer than you can remain solvent.

- John Maynard Keynes

Note: I’m very busy right now but should have a more substantial/on topic post up later in the week. In the meantime, I thought this was an interesting topic which fits with my post on China last week.

Mannerheim’s comment in response to my post on why China has to buy US debt reminded me of the at times bizarre overbuilding which has been documented in China:

You allude several times to China’s fear of letting their currency rise so trade with the US will balance; this is because they’ve designed their economy entirely around low-wage manufactured exports to the West and therefore need to keep their currency artificially weak to keep their products cheap for Americans. If the yuan rose against the dollar Americans would switch to buying goods manufactured in Southeast Asia or Mexico, and millions of Chinese would lose their jobs and have a serious bone to pick with their ruling elites (off topic, but these are the same frustrated young men who will never find wives due to the one-child policy and the penchant for aborting daughters). I often see the figure cited that China’s leadership feels it must grow its economy by 8% annually just to maintain social stability (and even so riots are not uncommon in major Chinese cities), so a sharp revaluation of the yuan could very possibly lead to economic collapse and all-out insurrection.

This need to continuously post spectacular growth figures has been speculated as the cause of what are known as China’s ghost cities. These are entire cities or developments within cities which are wholly or mostly vacant. The Daily Mail ran an article back in December with satellite photos. The Atlantic ran a piece back in June titled Why China’s Ghost Towns Matter for Our Economy. There is also a popular video on Youtube by the Australian program Dateline on this:

I’m personally not sure what to make of all of this. At one level given the size of China and its economy, these monstrous vacant developments are probably exactly what a tiny error in planning would look like. On the other hand, my experience is that any visible corporate or government absurdity tends to be just the tip of the iceberg. Inefficient systems tend to do a better job of keeping up the facade of efficiency than they do at actual efficiency. So glaring visible failures like this make me suspect that there is far more of this kind of waste which no one on the outside can see. I also am skeptical that any country can keep up China’s level of growth long term. If one is looking for symptoms of cracks in the system, these would seem to fit. However, bubbles (assuming this is one) have a tendency to make fools of us all. My personal long term bet is that China eventually runs into a wall very similar to the one Japan ran into in the late 80s and early 90s. But as the Keynes quote mentions, this could be a long way off.
At long last, match.com solves the mystery of why men date younger women. 8 men reveal: “Why I date younger women”:

Ever feel like all the men your age are dating women half your age? OK, maybe not half your age, but you get the idea. What makes men attracted to younger women? Is it just about looks and our youth-centric culture? Well, that’s part of it. But you might be surprised to learn the real reasons that go way beyond physical attraction: as it turns out, men are a bit more complicated than that!

I’m guessing it is because older women have had a long time to think about how they want a man to treat them. Let’s see if I’m right:

It’s all about the law of averages as you get older
“When you reach your late thirties, it’s not so much that dating a younger woman becomes more attractive, it’s just harder not to date them. The law of averages means that proportionately fewer women your age are single. But dating a woman in her twenties when you’re approaching 40 is also less demanding; you’re not faced with the same requirements to make a decision about your future. When your new girlfriend is 36, she expects you’re thinking about the next few years, not just the next few dates.”
— Colin, 38, Chicago, IL

Well, not exactly I guess. It sounds like they would prefer to be dating older, less hot women, but no matter how hard they try they can’t find any. Plus the hot young women keep throwing themselves in the way! I really feel for these guys. Where have all the older less hot women gone? Now they have to settle for young hotties. That and older women want commitment for what they gave to other guys for free when they were younger and hotter.

Let’s see what the next man thinks:

Their carefree attitudes make younger women more appealing
“I’d say the allure is that younger women are less judgmental and less set in their ways. They don’t have a laundry list of what they want in a partner, a career or even life just yet. Younger women are more friendly, I suppose. I think that kind of attitude appeals to thirty-something guys who want a relationship to really be on their terms.”
— Larry, 35, Edison, NJ

Wait, maybe I was right after all.

They let me embrace my inner goofball on dates
“Honestly, younger women are sometimes more open to having goofy good times than a woman who has a few years on her. You can invite them to the midnight
showing of *Kung Fu Hustle* without getting a skeptical look.”
— Mitchell, 39, Baltimore, MD

Sounds like more of the same. Women are more fun before they have a decade or more to think about what men should do for them. But can that be all?

**Fewer years of dating equals less emotional baggage to carry**
“The appealing thing about younger women is their outlook on life. They tend to be untainted by experiences that have hardened older women. For example, when a woman’s been lied to a lot after years of dating, she always thinks you’re lying to her, too. And that’s a turn-off. Younger women are less cynical, and that’s a big draw.”
— Alan*, 46 New York, NY

For those taking notes, evidently hotter women with less baggage are more enjoyable to date than the other way around. Perhaps. I think this guy might be jumping to conclusions though.

The next man weighs in:

**Dating without an agenda means having more fun together**
“What makes a younger woman a good catch? She’s not itching to have a ring on her finger. She’s interested in the here and now, in going out, in having fun. It may sound like a cliché, but it’s reality. I’m not anti-marriage, I’m just anti-agenda. A younger woman seems more willing to let things take their natural course.”
— Roger, 35, New York, NY

Yet another man who thinks that younger, hotter, less demanding women are preferable. Could there be some truth to this, or is he just compensating for having a small penis?

Here’s the next man:

**The ego boost helps me maintain my health and vitality**
“When a guy reaches a certain age, he worries he will see his youth and vitality wane. A younger woman reaffirms for me that I’ve still got it going on.”
— Mike, 40, Orlando, FL

Ha! That proves it. Men don’t really prefer younger, hotter, nicer, less demanding women. They only date them because of their fragile male egos!

Well, we already know the answer is because the men are insecure, but we may as well hear the last one out just to be polite:

**Impressing a younger date is easier**
“One advantage of dating a younger woman is that you can play ‘cruise director’ — i.e., show her all your secret favorite places that she probably hasn’t experienced yet. They’re easier to impress and very willing to be escorted around. Women like it when you have a plan and it’s well-executed.”
— Bill, 33, New York, NY
Sure they are easier to impress. They haven’t had much time to think about how men should treat them!

The author is right, men really are complicated!

**See also:**

- How to child proof the revolving door to mommy’s bedroom.
The plankton generation
by Dalrock | August 5, 2011 | Link

Oz Conservative has an excellent post up titled Struggling in a wilderness:

Who is the Plankton? She is a woman pushing 50 who decided to divorce her husband a few years ago. She has written a blog detailing her unhappiness in being unable to find another man.

The Daily Mail has an article about her, but her blog itself is even more interesting.

He expertly takes on the blog itself in the remainder of his post. Go ahead and read his post now: I’m happy to wait for your return. Since he focused on the blog, I thought I’d share a bit on the Daily Mail article he referenced. The title of the piece is The Plankton Generation – that’s women who are barely visible and at the bottom of the food chain for romance – just because they’re over 45. It opens with:

The woman, who is divorced but says she would love to be married again, describes herself as being ‘on the wrong side of 45 with a brace of kids’ and bewails her place in ‘relationship no-man’s land’, condemned to be alone for the rest of her days.

Obviously this is familiar territory. Just a few weeks ago I wrote about how the very same Daily Mail was encouraging married middle aged women to dump their Boring loyal dudes. Less than a week ago I showed how the very same Daily Mail had devoted no less than two articles whispering in women’s ears that they might need to divorce if they were Trapped in a not unhappy marriage. I’ve lost track of how many times we’ve discussed the Daily Mail selling divorce. They certainly provide the manosphere with rich fodder. But as we’ve seen before with the Mail, sometimes reality momentarily bleeds through. Today the Mail isn’t selling divorce, and instead turning its gaze on the realities the women who they egged on are experiencing.

Next we learn about Ruthie, an attractive aging baby momma. According to the article she is 47 and has been looking for a long term relationship for 10 years. The author explains the thought process which lead to Ruthie’s current predicament:

‘I always had boyfriends when I was younger and assumed I would again after James was born,’ she says. ‘When he was three, I started chatting online. These chats were fun — and sometimes quite flirty — but if I ever suggested we meet, the men would often back off, saying they were not looking for a relationship.

I’ve been called cruel in the past for bursting the bubble that women’s sexual power never declines, but I think the real cruelty is the misinformation we feed younger women which inhibits their ability to make better choices. It isn’t that all women should marry young or necessarily even marry at all, but those who want to marry are best served to take the search for a husband seriously early on. Those who choose to delay marriage or remain unmarried entirely would be much better served to understand the truth upfront; they won’t
be in the SMP power position forever, and dating won’t always be a fun round of judging the performance.

The reversal in the SMP power position causes women’s experiences of dating later in life to mirror men’s dating experience earlier in life. Just as we often hear from men that younger women are flaky and will treat them as a backup plan or cancel at the last minute, older women experience the same things from the men they date. We saw this above with Ruthie, and we see the same occurring with 46 year old Sarah Browne who works in communications for a skincare company:

‘I keep trying to date men over the internet, but it is often hopeless,’ she says. ‘I can’t count the times a guy has seemed really keen to arrange a date, and then, with sometimes only five minutes to go, I get a text saying sorry, he can’t make it. I’ve been told they cry off as they have met someone more suitable.’

The author miss-attributes this to the cruelty of internet dating culture, but it is much better explained by the dynamics of the sexual marketplace (SMP).

This isn’t the only thing the author misreads. The author infers that since there are roughly equal numbers of men and women aged 45 to 64, that there shouldn’t be an imbalance in dating fortunes for men and women of that age bracket. Additionally, the piece suggests that the reason for the imbalance past age 64 is due solely to higher mortality rates for men.

I don’t have the data for the UK, but I’m guessing it roughly parallels the US Census data I pulled for my post on the shifting sexual marketplace. It isn't just a case of women moving from a position of relative strength to weakness in the SMP, the numbers go from being wildly stacked in their favor to ultimately being stacked against them. Even when the numbers are roughly even in their late 30s and throughout their 40s, this is a huge change from when they were in their 20s:
This is of course magnified by the direction each sex tends to date age wise. Women in their 20s are not only outnumbered by single men their age, but they have the option to date men older than them as well. This same trend works to their disadvantage later in life.

Another bit of misinformation is this blurb from the margins:

| Divorce in England and Wales in the 45- plus age group rose by more than 30 percent between 1997 and 2007 |

I’ve already addressed this here, but if you want to just see the chart it is here. The next blurb in the margins also caught my attention:

| Many studies suggest men who become single after years of marriage are quick to find a new mate, while women are more cautious |

This is the old women are done with men after a certain age rationalization. The reality is the quality of their choices tends to be much lower after a certain age. We also know from the AARP study that women who divorce late in life are often shockingly alone, especially if they don’t remarry (emphasis in quotes is mine):

| Almost 9 in 10 men (87%) dated after their divorce, compared to 8 in 10 women (79%)... Among those who dated after the divorce, more than half of men (54%) but fewer women remarried (39%). (Page 39) |

| Many women, especially those who have not remarried (69%), do not touch or hug at all sexually. An even larger majority of women who have not remarried do not engage in sexual intercourse (77% saying not at all), in comparison with about half of men (49%) who have not remarried. (Page 6) |
Note that while the study was of late life divorce and done by the AARP, 89% of the people surveyed divorced between age 40 and 55. The author of the Plankton blog herself addresses this question:

- Show me a (straight) woman of my age who is alone and who says she doesn’t want a man.
- Show me a liar.

One thing which made me chuckle about the article was the appeal to authority when establishing that the SMP really does shift from women to men as time progresses. She turns to no less than a researcher from Oxford. But he points her to the same OK Cupid blog post which I shared months ago:

It’s good to know the folks at Oxford are starting to catch up with the manosphere!
This will be a short post, but may well be the most important thing you take away from my blog. Every woman considering divorce without serious cause should make up two lists, a sort of pros and cons:

**List #1: Women who have your back, and know you can do better.**

**List #2: Women who will forever taunt and torment you for letting such a good man go.**

I’m guessing by now you can already see the benefits of having these lists all sorted out. You have to know who you are dealing with. The first list is pretty easy. You know which of your girlfriends, female coworkers, and female relatives are sure you could do better than mister boring loyal dude. Don’t forget about women on Facebook, too. So write out the top 10 women and sort them in the order that they voice this opinion. The louder the voice, the higher the number (up to 10). Feel free to take a bit of time sorting this out. You really want to know who has your back.

Now that you have this valuable list, you really ought to make a copy for safekeeping. Go ahead and do this now. The internet can wait.

Now take the copy you just made of list #1 and cross out the title and replace it with the title of list #2; this isn’t *really* a backup copy, this is your list #2. There is one last change you should make though; find your mother on list #2 and bump her up a few slots. I’d say at least 2 or 3, maybe more. If she was already number 10 or wasn’t on the list at all, go ahead and put her down as #11. While you are at it, go ahead and bump the rest of them up a number as well.

Oh, and don’t worry about keeping backup copies of list #2. The women on the list won’t ever let you forget, so in a sense it will always be handy.
I found the paper *Marriage and Divorce: Changes and their Driving Forces*. This excerpt from their analysis of the chart in Figure 1 surprised me:

Yet when viewed over a longer time period, we see that while the 1970s had exceptionally high divorce rates, the low divorce rates in previous decades were also somewhat exceptional. Fitting a simple trend line to the divorce rate between 1860 and 1945 (thereby excluding the post–World War II surge in divorce) as shown in Figure 1, suggests that some of the run-up in divorce in the latter third of the twentieth century reflects the divorce rate simply reverting to levels consistent with earlier trends, following unusually low divorce in the 1950s and early 1960s. Indeed, based on extrapolation, family scholars as early as the turn of the last century had predicted future divorce rates like those actually witnessed in the 1980s (Coontz, 2005). While the 1970s overshot the trend, the subsequent fall in divorce has put the divorce rate back on the trend line, and by 2005, the annual divorce rate projected by the pre-1946 trend is quite close to actual divorce rates.

I think they are putting too much weight on the extrapolated trend line. I don’t believe our current divorce rate is pre ordained, and I especially don’t believe that divorce rates are something which should naturally go up for well over 100 years without reaching a natural limit which drives them back down. I’m also not very impressed by the “unusually low” divorce rates in the 50s and early 60s or convinced that divorce in the 70s and 80s was a sort of reversion to the natural trend. The divorce rates of the 50s and early 60s aren’t really that striking compared to the trend, and if anything appear to be a hangover effect from the very impressive spike in divorce just following WWII.

The post WWII spike is very interesting, and it almost appears as if there was a one time shuffling of spouses after the war. If I didn’t know better I would guess someone had proclaimed a one time divorce/remarry amnesty. Unlike the bulge which peaked in the 80s, the post WWII spike in divorce corresponds with a spike in marriage. The two lines move so closely together after WWII that they are nearly impossible to distinguish during the peak of the spike. On the other hand, with the bulge that peaked in the 80s marriage rates began to fall around the same time divorce was on the steep incline, and have continued this steady fall ever since.

They have another chart which I found very interesting. I can only imagine that those who married in the 1960s assumed they were signing up for the same deal as the people who married 10 years prior. Obviously this was not the case. Also note how little the much vaunted reduced divorce rates have improved the outcomes of those who married in the 1990s in Figure 2.

The length of the line for the 1990-1999 cohort appears short at first, but given that the data source is from 2001 it actually strikes me as being too long. While the divorce rate for the first few years includes all or nearly all of the marriages which occurred in the decade, the
latter part of the line has to be made up only of those marriages which occurred in the very beginning of the decade. Assuming things are improving, this would overstate the longer term divorce rate for that cohort. Either way, the authors put what I consider to be a happy face on some very troubling data:

Figure 2 analyzes data from marital histories to assess the fate of first marriages, grouping them by the decade in which the wedding occurred. For those marriages that occurred in the 1950s through the 1970s, we know a lot about their eventual outcomes, and the figure clearly shows that the probability of divorce before each anniversary rose for each successive marriage cohort until the 1970s. For marriages that occurred in the 1970s, 48 percent had dissolved within 25 years, roughly confirming—for this specific cohort—the popular claim that “half of all marriages end in divorce.” Yet for first marriages that occurred in the 1980s, the proportion that had dissolved by each anniversary was consistently lower, and it is lower again for marriages that occurred in the 1990s. While it will take several more decades for the long-term fate of recent marriages to be realized, it appears likely that fewer than half of these recent marriages will dissolve.
$46k a month child support
by Dalrock | August 9, 2011 | Link

18 years, 18 years
She got one of your kids got you for 18 years
I know somebody paying child support for one of his kids
His baby mamma’s car and crib is bigger than his
You will see him on TV any given Sunday
Win the Superbowl and drive off in a Hyundai
She was suppose to buy you shorty TYCO with your money
She went to the doctor got lypo with your money
She walking around looking like Michael with your money

–Kanye West, Gold Digger

*Business Insider* had an article last week titled *Model Asks For The Biggest Divorce Child Support Sum Ever*. Despite the title, from what I can find the model (*Linda Evangelista*) never married the purported father (French billionaire François-Henri Pinault) of her four year old son. The two were together while he was briefly broken up with his future wife, feminist actress Selma Hayek (source). Despite keeping the paternity of her son a secret and specifically denying through her agency that Pinault was the father, she is now taking him to court complaining that he hasn’t provided for his son. According to *Business Insider* she is suing for $46,000 a month in child support (just over half a million per year):

Evangelista’s lawyers claim that Pinault has given zero support to the child. The $46,000 that Evangelista is demanding will go towards nannies, drivers, and security detail for Augustin James, the model’s son. The judge seems to be sympathetic to the demands because of the press this case will generate, apart from the $7,500 [per month] she wants for “vacation expenses.”

One of the comments on the *Business Insider* article caught my attention:

Tell me, if you father was a billionaire how would it make you feel once old enough to realize that your father paid $500 / month in support

That child should have the same lifestyle as if he were still living with dad. But that’s impossible seeing as dad was married and having an affair and oops! Should be 100K / month.
Keep you wiener in your pants.

I wonder how much Arnold is paying?

I’ve found this concept of child support as punishment for men to be a very common sentiment from women. I seriously doubt that the woman making the comment would change her view if she knew that in this case the man wasn’t a cheater, and the woman was a divorcée who had previously tried to have a child out of wedlock with another man. However,
what struck me more than her *hurt the man* sentiment is the very valid question of how all of this will shape the child’s perception of and relationship with his father. None of this money will be seen as showing the boy his father cared about him because it was forced from him by the court. Plus, while the claim is that this money is *for the child*, most of it looks to me to instead ensure that his independently wealthy mother doesn’t have to modify her existing lifestyle while raising her son. Per the *New York Post*:

> “She testified that she wants to have a 24-hour nanny because she does not want to be alone with the child . . . Miss Evangelista, you should understand, has a worth of more than $8 million, and she earned, last year, $1.8 million.”

And a little later:

> It’s understandable, too, for Evangelista to want another adult — a nanny — to be on hand given her security concerns and travel requirements of her job, the judge said.

> “How many hours a week do you work?” the judge asked the model at one point.

> “On days when I do not work, I am working on my image,” Evangelista answered, her voice soft, and tinged with defensiveness. “I have to hit the gym. I have beauty appointments. I have to work toward my next job and maintaining my image,” she said, “just like an athlete.”

> “When I work, it can be a 16-hour day,” she added.

All of this would seem to poison the father-son relationship from the beginning. His mother kept the name of his father secret for four years until she sued his father on his behalf. From the father’s perspective, his first knowledge of his son appears to have been when this woman sued him essentially under his son’s name. The father and son may ultimately be able to overcome this, but I can’t imagine what Miss Evangelista could have done further to ensure that her son will never have a positive relationship with his father.

You go girl.
Our favorite paper the *Daily Mail* has an article out filled with pictures of the disturbing riots which are occurring in the UK. One thing which really struck me was the *small stature* of the riot police in the photographs. Maybe it is just me, but these don’t look like a very intimidating lot. Then I saw this picture, which is even more surprising. I think an appropriate caption would be: *We’ll have this riot sorted out in short order!*

I know this was an emergency, so perhaps they were *short staffed*? Or could it be that they had to assemble a riot squad on *short notice*? Perhaps this is a demonstration of their new *small unit tactics*? Feel free to play at home and suggest your own explanations in the comments section. Some of those riot police are so small, it reminded me of a *jackass skit* (NSFW):

Elsewhere in the article they show this picture of what they call a *female robocop* standing watch. I’m guessing the editors saw this as projecting an exciting image of girlpower. To me she looks unimpressive, and in fact appears frightened. I’m sure the feminists in the audience will disagree, but to me it looks like she is *playing riot squad*. Shouldn’t she have been equipped with a *big enough truck* and a *belt fed weapon*, so she could whoop with glee and intimidate the rioters?

All of this reminded me of a story *Oz Conservative* noted in his recent post on the topic of the riots. As the *Daily Mail* explained several months ago, Insp Diane Bamber sued for discrimination because she felt that the physical requirements for the riot squad were unfair to a woman of her age:

> For 30 years it has been used to test the fitness of officers who police riots and other outbreaks of serious public disorder.

> The so-called ‘shield run’ involves officers covering a distance of 500 metres in less than two minutes, 45 seconds while wearing full riot gear and carrying a shield.

> But when Inspector Diane Bamber, 51, failed to meet the time limit, she claimed she had been left humiliated.

That’s right! Physical standards humiliated her! Unconfirmed reports have it that her girl power and moxie were both seriously bruised by having to actually do more than dress up and pose in the gear of a riot officer. She was further aggrieved by the officers who would have to make up for her unfitness *serve with her* should a riot ever occur:

> When Insp Bamber applied to retake the shield run, it is alleged that one of her colleagues remarked: ‘She’s got no f****** chance.’

Fortunately, this travesty did not stand and the tribunal ruled in her favor.
Judge Hilary Slater said Insp Bamber’s claims of indirect sex and age discrimination were ‘well-founded’.

Noting that the officer had ‘suffered humiliation at being sent away from the course’, Judge Slater added: ‘The tribunal concludes that the claimant was put at the disadvantage suffered by women and persons of her age group in that she failed the test and was not able to complete the training.’

She could receive up to £30,000 for her bruised girlpower and the department has now lowered the standard enough that even she was able to pass the newly watered down test. This opened the floodgates for similarly unqualified discriminated against women in the police force:

The Mail on Sunday understands that the Association of Chief Police Officers is now reviewing the lawfulness of the physical training formats for 13 specialist operational roles, including those for firearms officers, which could discriminate against women and older officers.

**Edit Aug 11:** Commenter ruddyturnstone pointed out that the picture I linked to from the original article is not in fact of Insp Bamber, but of her neighbor. From the bottom of the *Daily Mail* article:

The newspaper version of this article on June 12 carried a picture said to be of Insp Diane Bamber. In fact the photograph was of a neighbour. We apologise for the mistake.

**See Also:** Dying to be treated like one of the guys.
What do you think she is seeing that none of her fellow officers are seeing?

by Dalrock | August 13, 2011 | Link

Comment on the WSJ blog post where the picture of a female riot officer is displayed:

love the first one with the female police... what do you think she is seeing that none of her fellow officers are seeing?

The topic also reminded me of this quote from Affirmative Action and Cops by John Lott:

Increasing the number of women officers under these reduced strength and size standards consistently and significantly increases the number of assaults on police officers. In general, every 1 percent increase in the number of women in a police force results in a 15 to 19 percent increase in the number of assaults on the police, because women tend to be weaker than men.

Why? The more likely that a criminal’s assault on a police officer will be successful, the more likely criminals will do it. The major factor determining success is the relative strengths and sizes of the criminal and officer. The 200-pound Nichols might have decided not to try to escape had his guard been closer to his own size.

My research uncovered another interesting finding. Female officers are more likely to accidentally shoot people. Each 1 percent increase in the number of white female officers in a police force increases the number of shootings of civilians by 2.7 percent. Because of their weaker physical strength, female officers have less time to decide on whether to fire their weapon. If a man makes a mistake and waits too long to shoot a suspect who is attacking him, the male officer still has a chance of using his strength to subdue the attacker. Female officers (as was the case in Atlanta) will lose control of the situation at that point.
Child support is typically framed as state intervention on behalf of children. However, it is more accurately an alternative to marriage for women. Traditionally, women would find a man willing to formally commit to them before having children. By marrying (and staying married to) the man who would be the father of her children, women would ensure investment from the man and the provision of resources both to her and her children. Note that child support isn’t needed in the traditional model, and that it isn’t relevant in the case of the death of the father. Even in the case of divorce, child support isn’t needed if parents share equal custody. Where child support is needed is if women want to expel the father from the household (or never bring him in). When the facade of *It’s for the children!* is stripped away, child support is all about removing fathers from the lives of their children.

If anyone has any doubt as to the true purpose of child support, they need only look at how it is enforced in practice. In theory whichever parent can better raise the children should be given custody, and the remaining parent would then be compelled to pay child support. In practice it is almost exclusively a way for women who expelled their children’s father from the home to extract money from the man. While the law is written under the guise of being gender neutral, this is a sham; the system is strongly biased towards women at nearly every step of the process. I’ve created a separate post to share all of the data, but here is a quick summary:

Mothers are far more likely to receive custody (over 80% of custodial parents are mothers). Those few fathers who receive custody are less likely than custodial mothers to have support awarded to them. Those fathers who have support awarded to them have less awarded on average than mothers. Due to all of the biases in the system, roughly 90% of all child support dollars are paid from fathers to mothers.

But still there are those who will claim this isn’t about money, it is about the best interest of the child. They say this even though the money goes to the mother, not the child, and the mother is under no legal obligation to spend the money on the children. If it were about the best interest of the child, the system would concern itself with maintaining the child’s relationship with the non custodial parent. But while the system is draconian in its enforcement of money (which almost always goes to the mother), it is generally uninterested in enforcing visitation (which almost always would be for the father). If the system were about protecting the child, it would enforce support and visitation equally. A parent who denies visitation is denying their child access to their parent. A system acting on behalf of the child would work vigorously to ensure that the child isn’t denied something which money can’t buy; access to and guidance from their father.

Not only does the system not take vigorous action to ensure that visitation orders are enforced, the system is designed to estrange fathers from their children. It uses draconian measures on the father while acting in the name of their children. Support is said to be based on the income of the father, but often it isn’t the father’s actual income which is considered.
The court will often make up a figure which it assumes the father should be able to earn, and assign (impute) that income to him when setting the amount of support to be paid. W.F. Price described his own experience with this in the comments section of a recent Spearhead post:

There is really no cap on % of income a man can be ordered to pay. Being unemployed when my ex divorced me (she demanded I indulge her and help her get the job she wanted by watching the kids, and I stupidly went along with it thinking this would be temporary and would save my marriage), I was imputed, and therefore the child support was infinity percent of my income. I was imputed at the standard earning for a man my age in Washington state, despite the fact that we were in a recession and nobody was hiring.

There is no limit, therefore. Inability to pay is no excuse. You might as well be asking for mercy from the mob. I watched “The Departed” recently, and when one of the bookies said he didn’t have the money the enforcer said “this is America — make it” after beating the crap out of him. This is exactly how fathers are treated.

Keep in mind that men can be thrown in jail for failing to make these payments. Fathers all around the country are put in jeopardy of going to prison for money they don’t have, based on actions which are taken in the name of their own children. Undoubtedly the vast majority of fathers make every effort to not allow this injustice to poison their relationship with their children, since they know that their children are merely pawns being used by the child’s mother and the system. However, this kind of heavy handed tactic combined frequently with denial of time with and influence over their children has to impact the relationship negatively. Not surprisingly fathers who are less cut off from their children are more likely to pay support. In 2007 the Census found that 78% of non custodial parents who had joint custody and/or visitation privileges with their children made their payments, compared to 67% for those who didn’t have either (source, P9).

But the ultimate proof of what child support is all about is the end result for children. While there is a grain of truth to the old canard that divorce is caused by philandering or abusive men who either abandon or mistreat their children, the vast majority of divorces are actually requested by women. Professors Margaret F. Brinig and Douglas W. Allen set out to understand why this was in their paper “These Boots Are Made for Walking”: Why Most Divorce Filers Are Women:

Because of the financial and social hardship faced after divorce, most people assume that generally husbands have instigated divorce since the introduction of no-fault divorce. Yet women file for divorce and are often the instigators of separation, despite a deep attachment to their children and the evidence that many divorces harm children.

Here is what they found (emphasis mine):

Our results are consistent with our hypothesis that filing behavior is driven by self-interest at the time of divorce. Individuals file for divorce when there are marital assets that may be appropriated through divorce, as in the case of leaving when they have received the benefit of educational investments such as advanced
degrees. However, individuals may also file when they are being exploited within the marriage, as when the other party commits a major violation of the marriage contract, such as cruelty. Interestingly, though, cruelty amounts to only 6% of all divorce filings in Virginia. **We have found that who gets the children is by far the most important component in deciding who files for divorce,** particularly when there is little quarrel about property, as when the separation is long.

Keep in mind that getting custody not only determines which parent has their children ripped away from them, but that because of the child support system the children also often come with a hefty payment stream the ‘winning’ parent can spend however they want. The ‘loser’ on the other hand is compelled at risk of imprisonment to pay amounts which can exceed their actual ability to earn. While this money is extracted from them in theory on behalf of their children, it robs them of their ability to be seen as wanting to take care of their children. Fathers can’t spend money on their children which the mother has already taken by force. Making this winner take all game even more lopsided, in the US the receipt of the payments is considered tax free, since the support payer must pay the income tax on it.

This system which is supposedly about the children encourages mothers to expel their children’s fathers from their lives. One divorcée explains how many women think about this:

> The problem with my life, as I saw it then, was my husband, and I imagined divorce as a process that would remove him but change little else — a sort of neutron bomb that eliminated men but left the rest of the world intact.

But divorce is only one way that child support encourages women to become unwed mothers single parents. The direct route to unwed motherhood is to simply get knocked up without getting married. This wouldn’t have guaranteed unwed mothers child support in the past. However, the rules were changed in the latter part of the 21st century, as Betsey Stevenson and Justin Wolfers explain in their paper *Marriage and Divorce: Changes and their Driving Forces*:

Supreme Court rulings in the 1960s and 1970s also changed the nature of family relationships by eliminating many of the legal distinctions stemming from the marital status of a child’s parents. In 1968, the Supreme Court ruling in Levy v. Louisiana (391 U.S. 68) granted equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment to “illegitimate” children. Five years later, the 1973 ruling in Gomez v. Perez (409 U.S. 535) overturned state laws exempting men from financial responsibility for “illegitimate” children. These rulings reduced both the social and economic cost to women of bearing a child out-of-wedlock...

Not surprisingly, this along with welfare payments has lead to an explosion of children being born out of wedlock. You can see the impact in the chart below from NCHS Data Brief No. 18 May 2009, *Changing Patterns of Nonmarital Childbearing in the United States*:
The 2011 Statistical Abstract of the United States provides the breakdown of out of wedlock births by race (Table 86 pdf or image) for 2007, the latest year data is available. 40% of all babies born in the US in 2007 were out of wedlock. This figure was 51% for Hispanics, 28% for whites, and 72% for blacks. The US isn’t exceptional for its out of wedlock birth rates either:

![Graph showing number of births, birth rate, and percentage of births to unmarried women: United States, 1940-2007](image)
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But the direct approach to unwed motherhood isn’t preferred by all would be baby mommas. Some have a strong sense of tradition, and prefer the classic approach of marrying the father and then divorcing him after the children are born. Fortunately for them child support along with biased family courts makes this nearly as easy as the direct approach. As an added bonus, they get to attend a big party held in their honor, where they (get this!) promise in
front of everyone they know to stay married to the father for life. This more classic approach to baby mamma-hood is also on the rise, as you can see in Figure 1 in *Marriage and Divorce: Changes and their Driving Forces*.

Divorce has gone from almost unheard of to extremely common. According to the US Census 2009 SIPP data, 39% of all white women aged 50-59 had divorced at least once. This works out to 42% of all white women that age who ever married. For Hispanic women the figures are 27%&30%, and for Black women the figures are 38%&48%.

All of this action supposedly in the interest of children has resulted in millions of kids growing up with little or no access to their fathers. A small percentage of these kids are better off because of the system. They had fathers who either abandoned them or were abusive. Far more have lost something irreplaceable; the chance to grow up with both their mother and father. There is a huge body of research showing how detrimental this is to children. In the interest of space I’ll only share one small quote from *Dan Quayle Was Right* (emphasis mine):

> Even for fathers who maintain regular contact, the pattern of father-child relationships changes. The sociologists Andrew Cherlin and Frank Furstenberg, who have studied broken families, write that the fathers behave more like other relatives than like parents. Rather than helping with homework or carrying out a project with their children, nonresidential fathers are likely to take the kids shopping, to the movies, or out to dinner. Instead of providing steady advice and guidance, divorced fathers become “treat” dads.

Apparently—and paradoxically—it is the visiting relationship itself, rather than the frequency of visits, that is the real source of the problem. According to Wallerstein, the few children in the California study who reported visiting with their fathers once or twice a week over a ten-year period still felt rejected. The need to schedule a special time to be with the child, the repeated leave-takings, and the lack of connection to the child’s regular, daily schedule leaves many fathers adrift, frustrated, and confused. Wallerstein calls the visiting father a parent without portfolio.

This is built into any child support scenario, and simply cannot be changed or wished away. The profoundly negative result of fatherless children is widely acknowledged, even by those who enthusiastically support the new family structure child support encourages. However, instead of blaming the process which created the problem, most now blame the very fathers who had their children ripped away from them. This is the final insult by a system which sees fathers as no more than a walking wallet. Instead of blaming the concerted social push to allow women to raise children outside of marriage, the fathers themselves are blamed for being absent! Following the London riots many have pointed out that a major cause of the out of control youths is a lack of fathers. The headline of *The Telegraph* reads:

**London riots: Absent fathers have a lot to answer for**

**Edit Aug 15:** Updated with more recent US Census Child Support Data.
In my post The child support catastrophe I originally referenced US Census Statistics from 1991. At the time I wrote the post, this was the most recent data I could find. This is obviously very old, and much could have changed since then. I spent some more time searching and finally found new data. The PDF version of the report is here, and I’ve created an image of the source table you can view here. I’ll update the original post to reflect this new data, but I wanted to call out this most recent data in a separate post. In the 1991 data, every step of the process was biased against men, with the end result being that women received over 94% of child support dollars paid. This new data is very similar. All of the steps of the process are biased against men except the percentage of support due which is collected (the two are now roughly equal).

It starts with who is granted custody:

For those few fathers granted custody, they are less likely than mothers who are granted custody to be awarded support:
For those few fathers who are awarded support, they are awarded less on average than mothers who are awarded support:

In the past the system was also biased against fathers in the percent owed which was collected. This looks to be a wash now:
However due to bias in amount awarded, the average amount received by fathers is still lower:

As a result of all of these biases against fathers, the percentage of all child support dollars paid is extremely biased:
Looking at the figures for 2007, it appears to me that there may be a sampling anomaly. The percentage of custodial mothers awarded support dropped by 4% between 2005 and 2007. This is 3% lower than any other year in the series. I’m not aware of any sweeping changes which occurred in this time frame, and since parents receive child support for between 18 and 21 years it seems highly unlikely that the makeup of the population would change this much in just 2 years. I ran the same data using a 2 report moving average to smooth out sampling variability some:

I’m not sure why they don’t have data beyond 2007. Since they publish this every other year they should have data out for at least 2009. Once they publish the 2009 and 2011 data we will have a better understanding of if the 2007 data shows a trend towards slightly less bias against fathers or if it was in fact a sampling error.
Update June 2012: The 2009 data is now available. It appears that the 2007 data was in fact an anomaly due to sampling error.
I found this chart in the Census paper *Living Arrangements of Children: 2009*.

The sudden drop in the percentage of children living with both parents starting in 1970 is profound but not unexpected given the changes which began around the same time with regard to out of wedlock births and divorce. We are clearly in uncharted territory. The plateau starting around 1990 is very interesting, and at first glance looks like fairly good news. Here is the yearly breakdown between married and unmarried couples in Table 1 from the paper (note table is in reverse chronological order and is split between all races on the left and white on the right):
The leveling off in the living arrangements chart appears to be entirely due to the drop in divorce rates which started in the 1980s, because out of wedlock birth rates continue to increase at an alarming rate. Given that 40% of all babies born in the US in 2007 were out of wedlock and the very small percentage of out of wedlock children who live with both parents, even if divorce rates and out of wedlock birth rates remained constant moving forward I think we can assume that the percent of children in two parent homes would continue to decline to below 60% before leveling off again. The only way we could avoid this level or greater decline would be if divorce rates continue to fall and/or unmarried parents became a more stable relationship.

Your guess is as good as mine on what we will see in the future.

**Edit:** Based on the data in Table 1, the “two parent” figure includes 7.5% of children living with at least one stepparent. Subtracting this from the 68.6% “two parent” figure, this means the real figure is 61.1%
White Knight extraordinaire Nathanial Hawthorne’s *Scarlet Letter* is cherished by feminists and English teachers alike. In his magnum opus, protagonist Hester Prynne marries a beta provider and cuckolds him with an alpha. But I’m getting ahead of myself.

As with many Romantic novels, the plot starts with a miscommunication. Hester marries her beta provider (Chillingworth), and he sends her to the new world ahead of him. It isn’t clear exactly how long it takes for Chillingworth to join her, but we do know that Hester wrote to him upon arriving in the new world:

```
Dearest Chillingworth,

I am writing to inform you that I have successfully arrived in the new world. I hope you fancy the illustration on the back of this note. There are many strange beasts in the new world, but Jackalopes are the strangest of them all.

Please write immediately with your planned arrival date. In the meantime, I need your guidance. Should I:

__ Remain faithful to our marriage vows?
__Cuckold you with the local alpha?

Unfaithfully yours,

Hester
```

Unfortunately Chillingworth either never received the postcard or failed to respond in time. One popular theory is that he did reply, but failed to use a #2 pencil. However, this theory isn’t supported by the text. Either way Hester was forced to make this difficult decision without his guidance. Our heroine decided to go with cuckolding him with the local alpha, the famous Reverend Dimmesdale. Unfortunately Chillingworth was delayed approximately a year and didn’t return in time to allow Hester to conceal her cuckoldry. When he finally arrives, it has been approximately a year since Hester conceived the alpha’s child; her daughter is now 3 months old, and Hester is forced to wear a scarlet A, which stands for Apex Fallacy. Chillingworth understands that her fate is largely his fault, since she only married him for his money and status, and he didn’t return in time for her to conceal the cuckoldry and raise the alpha’s child as if it were his:

```
“Hester,” said he, “I ask not wherefore, nor how thou hast fallen into the pit, or say, rather, thou hast ascended to the pedestal of infamy on which I found thee. The reason is not far to seek. It was my folly, and thy weakness. I—a man of thought—the book-worm of great libraries—a man already in decay, having given my
```
best years to feed the hungry dream of knowledge—what had I to do with youth and beauty like thine own? Misshapen from my birth-hour, how could I delude myself with the idea that intellectual gifts might veil physical deformity in a young girl’s fantasy? Men call me wise. If sages were ever wise in their own behoof, I might have foreseen all this. I might have known that, as I came out of the vast and dismal forest, and entered this settlement of Christian men, the very first object to meet my eyes would be thyself, Hester Prynne, standing up, a statue of ignominy, before the people. Nay, from the moment when we came down the old church-steps together, a married pair, I might have beheld the bale-fire of that scarlet letter blazing at the end of our path!”

“Thou knowest,” said Hester—for, depressed as she was, she could not endure this last quiet stab at the token of her shame—“thou knowest that I was frank with thee. I felt no love, nor feigned any.”

Hester admits that cuckolding him in such an obvious way was wrong. Chillingworth isn’t angry with her but instead the alpha she continues to protect:

“I have greatly wronged thee,” murmured Hester.

“We have wronged each other,” answered he. “Mine was the first wrong, when I betrayed thy budding youth into a false and unnatural relation with my decay. Therefore, as a man who has not thought and philosophised in vain, I seek no vengeance, plot no evil against thee. Between thee and me, the scale hangs fairly balanced. But, Hester, the man lives who has wronged us both! Who is he?”

Still loyal to the alpha, Hester refuses to tell. This is the aspect of the book which feminists cherish, the dreaded double standard. How is it fair that when one conspirator is caught and refuses to name their partner in crime, only the one who is caught is punished? Why doesn’t society punish the alpha whose name she keeps secret?

Fortunately we now live in more enlightened times, and do not judge women who bear children out of wedlock, cuckold their husbands, or frivolously divorce. Hawthorne is long gone, and unfortunately was never able to witness our society’s advanced progress. However, his spirit lives on, and a new breed of white knight has filled his worthy shoes. One of these white knights is Maury Povich, who assists women with similar problems to that of Hester Prynne. As he does so he shelters them from any moral judgment. We now know that women should not be judged, and that men should be judged by whether they man up and do their duty (pay child support).

Here Povich comforts a woman named Ruth who wishes to solve the mystery of her child’s paternity. She arrives with a list of 5 prime suspects. A modern day Hester Prynne, Ruth is a victim of her own bad choices.
Povich: Are you ashamed?

Ruth: Yes.

Audience: Awww

Povich: You know you don’t have a right to be ashamed. You have a right to be proud. You have a right to be brave to come on a show nationwide, throughout the country, and admit these things.

Next, Povich comforts Tiffany who has been wronged by her boyfriend Chris. Chris failed to man up when Tiffany told him she was pregnant. He refuses to accept that the child is his, and has made awful accusations against her.
Complaints of breadwinning wives.
by Dalrock | August 19, 2011 | Link

Doomed Harlot made the following comment in the discussion around The child support catastrophe:

Men benefit more from marriage than women, especially in more patriarchal societies. It is much easier to be content in your marriage when the other spouse is cleaning up after you, feeding you, taking care of your kids, handling your social obligations, cleaning your clothes, doing the shopping, and taking care of the myriad other tasks of daily life. I myself have often said, “I need a wife!”

I know this is boilerplate feminist martyrdom, but I have to admit I have a weakness for the classics. Those who have children know they are prone to think that they received the short end of the stick on any deal. The way around this is to offer to reverse the terms. Let them have your half, and you take their half. If the deal was unfair, they should be delighted. If they are just being childish, they will still feel cheated. Shortly after reading her comment I came across Alpha Women, Beta Men in New York Magazine. It opens with two women discussing an embarrassing secret. They are the sole breadwinners in their families, and support their stay at home husbands. One of the women compares it to the shame of being married to an alcoholic:

It’s like one of those things,” she says, “where you realize you’re married to people who drink.”

Like Doomed Harlot, these women wanted to trade places with men. They wanted wives, and they got them. But of course feminism is about being in a perpetual state of unhappiness. If women aren’t oppressed, how can they fight their oppression? And if they are happy, how can they know they are oppressed? Now that they have what they wanted, they of course aren’t happy. These husbands earning less than their wives are freeloaders! We learn about a public relations executive named Anna, and her husband:

He’d pay for groceries. He was running up credit-card debt to make it appear he had more money.

Can you imagine if a husband treated his wife that way? She kept her income to herself and her husband had to borrow money just to buy groceries! The line to shame a man who treated his wife like that would stretch around the block. You would have to take a number and wait your turn.

It also turns out that women aren’t wired to find men in a supporting role sexually attractive.

“Sex was not a problem for him,” she goes on. “It was a problem for me. When someone seems like a child, it’s not that attractive...”

Predictably, this is all caused by our patriarchal culture, since women are really just men who
sit down to pee:

...as hip and open-minded as they like to think they are, they were, after all, raised on the same fairy tale as the rest of us—the one where Prince Charming comes to the rescue of Sleeping Beauty.

Going back to the analogy of offering a child the other half, it turns out that our divorce laws are somehow unfair. A divorce lawyer explains what happens when couples with breadwinner wives divorce:

“...the court bends over backward to be gender-neutral, and it is possible the bum is going to be rewarded for sitting on his hands. You do a flip-flop and make believe she is a guy.”

See Also: The problem that has no name
The blurry line between the welfare state and child support

by Dalrock | August 22, 2011 | Link

One thing which struck me when I started looking into the issue of child support is how difficult it is to distinguish between child support and the welfare state. For example, in 2007 47.6% of all custodial parents with support agreements in the U.S. were on public assistance. In cases where the custodial parent is on welfare, child support payments are paid to the state which may or may not pass a token amount of the funds on to the custodial parent. The interrelationship between public assistance and child support in the U.S. is described in the paper Child Support Harming Children: Subordinating the Best Interests of Children to the Fiscal Interests of the State (2007):

Out of the $105 billion in child support debt nationwide, the government claims half so it can seek to recoup the costs of welfare benefits provided to low-income families. Our current welfare program, called Temporary Aid to Needy Families (“TANF”), requires custodial parents applying for benefits to cooperate in establishing child support obligations against the absent parents and to simultaneously assign the resulting child support payments to the government. Mothers, fathers, and children all become government debtors—the mothers and children owe their child support rights and the fathers owe the payments until the welfare benefits are repaid in full. This system of welfare cost recovery is a side of child support that is largely unknown to the public. Rather, child support is generally perceived as a pure good: a benefit to children, families, and society, as well as a moral and legal obligation of absent parents. But for the millions of children whose child support has been assigned to the government, the reality of child support is anything but pure or good.

This blurry line makes sense when you consider that both have the same basic objective; both are designed to shelter children from the poor choices made by their parents. Moreover, in both cases this almost exclusively means providing benefits to mothers. However, safety net programs are supposed to be something only used in a true emergency. If they are made too generous, too readily available, or without stigma they will inevitably be abused. With this in mind one key problem with the current system in the US is it allows welfare mothers to rationalize away their welfare dependency; they only need welfare because the baby daddy isn’t sending them a big enough check. Perhaps worse, middle class baby mamas are painted as a sort of heroic victim for receiving child support payments. They don’t need to apply for welfare benefits, and no one questions the life’s choices which lead to a situation where they are dependent on a third party for monthly checks. As long as they got knocked up by or divorced a wealthy enough man, there is no stigma to them raising their children out of wedlock. The only irresponsible party is the man.

The paper I mentioned above also corroborates a point I made in The child support catastrophe. The adversarial and high stakes nature of the child support system is damaging to the very relationships the child needs most:
Poor mothers are forced to name absent fathers, and then sue them—and sue them again and again. Because the fathers are often also poor, the vast amount of assigned child support goes unpaid and insurmountable arrearages quickly result. The fathers who try almost always fail as the automated enforcement mechanisms throttle endlessly: a trucker’s license is suspended, so he cannot work; a laborer’s wages are garnished at sixty-five percent, so he cannot afford to pay his own rent; a father obtains a new job and then loses it after being incarcerated for contempt because of his child support arrearages. The relationships between the mothers and fathers, fragile at their beginnings, can be obliterated through the process. The hopes of children to have fathers who are supportive and involved in their lives are often dissolved.
Thoughts on the future of marriage
by Dalrock | August 24, 2011 | Link

Commenter davver made the following point in the discussion on Alpha Women, Beta Men:

Without disregarding feminism, I really doubt any ideological movement could explain the huge change in behavior we’ve seen throughout the developed world in regards to marriage. The truth is things like modern economic automation, technological advancement, globalization, and the pill have all had such radical effects on gender relations that the traditional model probably won’t survive. If I had to guess monogamy as we know it will probably not survive, irregardless of whether everyone all decides to abandon feminism.

While there are undoubtedly powerful disruptive forces at work against traditional marriage, this is only looking at one half of the equation. These powerful forces are lined up against biological reality. Children need fathers; those who embrace the culture of single motherhood will tend to devolve down to the underclass. We are already seeing very strong evidence of this on both ends of the SES spectrum. Upper class more intelligent parents are much more likely to do what it takes to raise their kids in an intact household. On the bottom end of the SES spectrum we see high rates of out of wedlock births and divorce.

The other biological reality I think we will see is the strong desire of women to have the status and validation which comes from having a man invested in them. Serial monogamy has the allure of offering women this investment without their own commitment, but this isn’t a viable long term plan. As women come to understand this better this will influence their choices more and more. We already see women acting accordingly, even though the pro divorce message is deafening. We can see this in the data demonstrating that divorce rates drop dramatically as women get older. Despite all of the nonsense about how women are done with men after a certain age, etc. women’s likelihood of divorce strongly tracks their perceived ability to remarry or at least achieve something approximating marriage. The original post davver made this comment on is another example, albeit less direct. The ultra competitive career women in the article are extremely unhappy that they didn’t wind up with the traditional arrangement, even though they followed an extremely untraditional path. They still want a worthy man to demonstrate that he is invested in them, even though it is extremely unlikely.

Right now marriage is assumed to be something every woman can have once she is ready. So far the data (at least for white women) has proven this correct. Instead of a full fledged breakdown of the institution of marriage, I expect that eventually we will see husbands (and marriage) becoming something more scarce, and therefore more valued by women. We already see hints of this with the completely out of proportion gnashing of teeth about where have all the good men gone. Imagine the reaction if there actually was a shortage of eligible men willing to marry. In the meantime I expect that we will see even more social upheaval, with children and unsuspecting honest men continuing to be the ones who bear the brunt of the cost.
See Also:

- Women are the ones who want to avoid commitment.
- Commitment as a form of female investment.
- Romance as a form of male investment.
- A LTR is not a mini marriage.
- Supply and demand in the marriage market.
Women today assume they can have marriage merely for the taking

by Dalrock | August 25, 2011 | Link

In the discussion on my post Thoughts on the future of marriage, Ricardo di Matteo shared a link to an article on the Daily Mail: I’m childless because I haven’t found Mr Right – and it hurts as much as infertility. This article reinforces four of the points I made in my post on the future of marriage:

1. Women today assume that marriage to a worthy man is an absolute given. This is why so many assume women don’t really benefit from marriage. They value it so little because it is thought to be so plentiful, not because they don’t want what it brings to them.

2. There is a significant class divide between women who are willing to raise fatherless children and those who feel that doing this is a mark of low status.*

3. Serial monogamy presents the allure to women that they can have investment from men without offering men commitment. This works in the short term, but evaporates as the woman ages and her SMV wanes, and the men she is with have been around long enough to understand the rules women like her are playing by.

4. Even though assumption #1 is/was almost universally true for women today in their 30s and later, we already hear a hue and cry by the small number of exceptions to the rule. If it ever becomes such that the average woman has good reason to doubt that marriage is hers for the taking, the hue and cry from women will be deafening. If husbands become more scarce they will become more valuable as well.

The Daily Mail article opens with:

When I was younger, I always expected to become a mum…
As far as I was concerned, the day I became a mum was just out there waiting for me to reach out and embrace it.

While she refers to the chance to become a mother, she isn’t talking about fertility per se. She always assumed a man willing to commit to her as a father of her children was as easy to obtain as a dish at the local buffet. She is looking for a man who will financially support her as a mother. As she has been an adult for over 20 years, obviously marriage was not a priority for her:

During my 20s, I put in long days as an aspiring journalist, and at night I partied with the best of them. In my mid-30s I battled an addiction to alcohol…

Note that the role of husband (or something very much like one) is so taken for granted, even now it isn’t worth mentioning. Such a man was simply to be plucked out of central casting to fit the role she defined for him once she decided that was what she wanted. She expected to hail a husband when needed as one does a taxi. When the time came she snapped her alcoholic party girl fingers, but for some reason no husband appeared:
Like a lot of women my age, I’d thought 30 was probably an ideal age to settle down. But once I hit 30, it’s was if I hit an oil patch and the years just slipped away. The men I dated either weren’t at the same life stage as me, or simply didn’t have the money to commit to a baby.

But never forget that this woman is the victim here. She and other women like her put marriage and motherhood last, and for some inexplicable reason are less likely to be mothers:

According to a recent study, 48 per cent of university educated women born in the late Sixties and early Seventies are childless.

She tells us that friends jokingly suggest that she has it made, since she can live the fling filled lifestyle of Sex and The City. But this isn’t what she wants now; she asks “But where’s the fun in that?” I assume the flings were fun enough in her 20s, since she postponed marriage in order to enjoy a full decade of them. I strongly suspect her beef isn’t with flings, but with what flings are like with her declining SMV and men who have learned that women like her see men as disposable.

Not only do we owe her sympathy for the fact that she is inexplicably childless, but we owe her sympathy for the fact that she hasn’t been offered sympathy. She complains that women who are biologically infertile are offered sympathy, but not women like herself who waited out the clock. She reinforces this by quoting another woman who made the same choices, with the same results, and feels the same way:

‘As I saw couples younger than I getting sympathy for their biological infertility, I wondered why all I got were accusations of not doing enough, not trying hard enough. Trying too hard. Being too picky. Not being picky enough . . . And the hardest comment to defend: “You’d better hurry up!” (Hurry up with what? Falling in love?).’

She even appeals to the authority of an expert who tells us that the “circumstantially infertile” experience “disenfranchised grief” due to them being seen as having chose their fate. We are all guilty of blaming the victim. The victim of her own choices.

Maybe not. She then changes course and admits that those who lack sympathy may have good reason to (emphasis mine):

...a year ago, I wrote in this very newspaper about how I liked being ‘sassy and single’ and felt no significant yearning to have children. Yet after spending time with my cousin’s adorable little girls this summer, I realised I’d been putting on a brave face.

Fortunately she now understands that men are human beings with hopes and dreams of their own, and not just sperm donors and walking wallets:

Instead of getting to know someone slowly, I find myself sizing them up. Would they make a good father? Are they solvent enough? Could I wake up next to them each
morning without wanting to strangle them?

If so, would they be willing to just get a move on and impregnate me?

*Somewhere in the middle are women who would be mortified at the thought of having children out of wedlock but don’t feel the same about kicking the father out after the kids are born.
Why a woman’s age at time of marriage matters, and what this tells us about the apex fallacy

by Dalrock | August 26, 2011 | Link

In my second post on Last One Down the Aisle Wins, I shared a chart on the effects of age at marriage on divorce rates from the NCHS:

![Chart showing divorce rates by age at marriage](chart.png)

The basic relationship between a woman’s age at the time of marriage and her likelihood of divorcing is fairly well known. However, what is seldom discussed is why this is the case. The standard assumption is that women who wait longer are more mature, better able to pick a husband they can remain faithful to, and more ready for marriage. Also, women who attend college generally marry a bit later, and college attendance correlates strongly with IQ, which has a very strong correlation with divorce. Undoubtedly there is some truth to these reasons, but there is something else very important going on. A woman’s likelihood of divorcing in any given year is highly correlated to her age. Young women in the peak of their sexual marketplace power are far more likely to divorce than older women are. I shared the chart below for the UK in a previous post:
Note how aside from the very youngest age brackets, a woman in the UK’s likelihood of divorcing correlates strongly with her perceived ability to remarry. The UK under 20 and 20-24 age brackets are perplexing, because they defy conventional wisdom on very young marriage, the US data on early marriage divorce rates, as well as expectations based on the sexual marketplace. With this in mind, I suspect that women who marry that young in the UK are bucking the trend enough that they are a much more dedicated group regarding marriage. The last chart was just a snapshot in time, but the basic effect has been remarkably stable in the UK for as far back as data is available:
Leaving aside the volatile under 20 age bracket, the lines almost never cross. The only change is that the 20-24 year old bracket has moved between being the most likely to divorce, the second most likely to divorce, and the third most likely to divorce. But the trend for women starting in their late 20s has always been the same; the older they are, the less likely they are to divorce. This has remained the case even as the age of first marriage has continued to grow. This isn’t simply about divorces occurring in the very beginning of marriage. There is a much stronger pattern involved here.

Until just recently I’ve had to speculate on what this same pattern would look like for the US. I have yet to find anyone who splits the US data out this way, but just this week I found the missing component I needed to roll my own chart:
The chart above combines data from the 2009 spreadsheet from the US Census (all races) on the percentage of women by age bracket who were married, with the data on divorces by age in 2009 from Table 2 in this recent census paper.* Notice that while US divorce rates are significantly higher than UK divorce rates across the board, the same basic pattern we saw in the UK data exists in the US data minus the unexpected behavior for younger age brackets.

Taken together, this data soundly disproves the apex fallacy regarding divorce. The common belief that divorce rates are driven by men discarding older wives for a younger model simply doesn’t fit with the data. This is reinforced when you consider that the AARP found that 66% of the divorces in middle age were initiated by women (figure 2 on page 15). This fits with the historical trends of women of all ages initiating divorce, as shown in page 3 of this paper. **Even in middle age women are still the ones driving divorce rates.** The myth of the unloyal husband dumping his hapless wife once he feels it is to his advantage is generally just that (a myth). This won’t stop women from pointing over and over again to the rare case they know of in the media or in person where this has occurred, but in the scheme of things this is clearly an outlier. Across age ranges divorce is being driven by women, and the likelihood of a couple divorcing in any given year tracks very strongly with whether the wife feels it would be to her advantage not to keep her promise.

*The specific rates for each group in the US chart may not be exact. The figures in Table 2 from the new report on the total number of women in each age bracket vary slightly from the figures in the 2009 census report. This appears to be due to the nature of the sampling they did. Also, table 2 shows slightly different numbers of women and men divorcing and marrying in the same year. This would be expected when looking at different age brackets, but not the overall figures. At any rate, the differences aren’t large so the data still appears to be generally valid. Lastly, using the figures in Table 2 I calculated the overall rate of divorce per 1,000 married women in the US in 2009 at 19. This other source calculates it at 16.4 for the same year, however that report omits data from California, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Louisiana, and Minnesota.

**Update:** The National Center for Family & Marriage Research (NCFMR) at Bowling Green
State University used ACS data to calculate divorce rates by age in the US for 2010. Their calculations are nearly identical to my own above. Also note that the ACS is a more complete data source than the one the National Marriage project uses, which explains the differences in overall divorce rate calculations referenced above. See this post for more information.
The economics of divorce theft and exploitation, and why we should repeal unilateral no fault divorce.

by Dalrock | August 28, 2011 | Link

Divorce theft is a common term in the manosphere, but I have noticed that there is some skepticism amongst our feminist guests on this concept (who often use the term in quotes). I suspect they would be very surprised to learn that this is a commonly accepted concept among economists studying the issue of marriage and divorce. It also is at the core of one of feminists’ most cherished fallacies about marriage, the fallacy that divorce is driven by men who dump their wives and trade her in for a newer model once they feel it is to their advantage.

Here is an economists definition of divorce theft from the working paper No-Fault Divorce and Rent-Seeking:

Let us take a look at the family from a contract-theoretical point of view. Before doing so, it is important to define a concept used in contract theory, namely quasi-rents. Quasi-rents are defined as “a return to one party to a contract, above what the party could receive if the contract could be dissolved at will at that moment” (Cohen, 1987).

Marriage is intended to be an agreement for life, so it makes sense that during any given period one party or another will be getting more benefit out of remaining married than the other party does. Quasi-rents are the benefits a spouse experiences if the marriage vows are honored. The whole point of marriage is to create a condition of trust where both spouses can work towards the long term goals of the couple. The changing quasi-rents creates a changing incentive to break that trust by divorce or exploitation. Basically, if there is no method to enforce honoring the contract, at any given time one spouse will have the opportunity to hold the other spouse over a barrel. They use the apex fallacy of a husband waiting until he has received the early benefits of marriage and then divorcing his wife as an example:

Let us consider the traditional family as described in Becker (1991). In the traditional family wives focus on domestic production whereas husbands focus on labour market production. Thus, as Cohen (1987) and Parkman (1992, 2002) point out, in the beginning of the marriage the husband will enjoy more quasi-rents from marriage since he can focus on a career while caring less about e.g. childrearing. The wife on the other hand will enjoy more quasi-rents in a later stage of marriage when the children are more able to maintain themselves and she can benefit from the larger family income and/or a higher social status. Thus a husband has a clear incentive to appropriate the wife’s future quasi-rents, by divorcing her unilaterally after having extracted most of his quasi-rent from the marriage. This is called quasi-rent destruction.

While the example is provably the exception, it still is helpful in illustrating the concept. Clearly if a man was able to get away with this he would be rewarded materially for betraying...
his wife. But divorce theft isn’t the only option available to the spouse which has the other one over a barrel. They could also use this change in fortunes to renegotiate the terms of the marriage in their favor under threat of divorce, which economists call exploitation:

Brinig and Allen (2000) argue that there are two different types of quasi-rent destruction. First of all, quasi-rents could be appropriated within marriage through the renegotiation of the rent distribution. They call this exploitation. Secondly, and more important in this paper, quasi-rent may be appropriated through divorce. This is what they call appropriation. Renegotiation of the rent distribution within marriage may lead to divorce if one of the spouses has too little bargaining power, which leads her or him to perceive divorce as a better alternative to being married and heavily ‘exploited’.

Brinig and Allen may seem familiar to you, because they wrote the paper I quoted in The child support catastrophe (the same paper these authors are citing above). The Brinig and Allen quote I shared from the previous post is right on topic here (emphasis mine):

Our results are consistent with our hypothesis that filing behavior is driven by self-interest at the time of divorce. Individuals file for divorce when there are marital assets that may be appropriated through divorce, as in the case of leaving when they have received the benefit of educational investments such as advanced degrees. However, individuals may also file when they are being exploited within the marriage, as when the other party commits a major violation of the marriage contract, such as cruelty. Interestingly, though, cruelty amounts to only 6% of all divorce filings in Virginia.50 We have found that who gets the children is by far the most important component in deciding who files for divorce, particularly when there is little quarrel about property, as when the separation is long.

What Brinig and Allen found is that children are typically a marriage’s most valuable asset, and that women are using the near guarantee that they will get custody against their husbands.

Making matters worse unilateral no fault divorce laws give the upper hand to whichever party wishes to engage in divorce theft or exploitation, as the authors of the working paper explain:

If only one of the spouses wants to divorce, spouses engage in ‘bargaining in the shadow of the law’ (Mnookin and Kornhauser, 1979), where the existing law becomes a threat point for one of the spouses. In a legal system with only consensual divorce the spouse not seeking divorce has the bargaining power....

When the law allows for unilateral divorce the bargaining power shifts to the partner seeking divorce, who can always threaten with unilateral divorce (Fella et al., 2004).

Under a consensual system, the process naturally deters the would be divorce thief or exploiter. The shift to unilateral no fault divorce shifts the power to the spouse who wishes to abuse the system. This is bad for marriage as an institution, and therefore bad for children, as Brinig and Allen explain:
The legal ramifications of the no-fault variable are perhaps the most interesting. In the jurisdictions we studied, even taking into account the higher divorce filing rates, women take advantage of the no-fault option more than do their husbands. From the woman’s perspective, repealing no-fault laws may cause harm as compared to passing reforms that will make marriages better. However, if filing behavior is mostly driven by attempts to exploit the other partner through divorce, tougher laws may be socially more beneficial. Because the custody coefficients were the largest by far, family law reformers may want to concentrate on formulating custody rules that will alter the spouses’ relative gains from marriage. The authors favor custody rules that replicate the patterns in marriage as closely as possible while giving each spouse a meaningful role (i.e., not zero) after divorce, as opposed to either a “winner takes all” rule like “maternal preference” or “primary caretaker” or a presumption of equal joint custody shares. A replication rule would not make either spouse better off divorced than during marriage (Altman, 1996).

Interestingly, the authors of the working paper touch on the issue of declining sexual marketplace power (SMP) for wives as they age. This reduces women’s opportunities to engage in divorce theft and/or exploitation:

Other authors point out that during marriage the sex ratio – the ratio of single women to single men per age cohort – evolves unfavourably over time for women (see Browning et al. (2008), Chapter 1; or Chiappori et al. (2002) who uses the evolution of the sex ratio to identify the distribution rule in the collective model), reducing the outside options for women, and thus further limiting their bargaining power. As Chiappori et al. (2002) point out: when there exists a relative abundance of women, bargaining power and therefore the gains from marriage will shift in favour of the husband. This may in turn affect the behaviour of the husband who might engage in exploitation or appropriation. The figure below clearly shows that from the age of 40 the sex ratio rises steadily indicating relatively more and more single women.

Unfortunately they are laboring under a very limited understanding of the SMP since they lack knowledge of game. They see the changing sex ratio as the cause and not the symptom of women’s changing SMP options. They also assume that men turn around and use their opportunity to engage in divorce theft and exploitation against women as their wives age. We know from Brinig and Allen that who files is a strong indicator of which party is attempting to engage in divorce theft and/or exploitation, and that while divorce rates fall dramatically as wives age women are still initiating divorce twice as often as men. If men were truly taking their turn at divorce theft and exploitation the way women are, we would expect to see divorce rates spike when women reached middle age. We would also expect to witness a corresponding flip in the ratio of initiation with men initiating divorce more often than women. But we don’t see this. What we see instead is steadily declining divorce rates as the potential for women to engage in divorce theft declines, and a constant relationship regarding who initiates divorce. While fewer and fewer women are attempting divorce theft and exploitation as they get older, the pattern remains the same.
Susan Walsh tried her hand at defining sluthood back in June with her widely read and thought provoking post What a Slut Is. She had drawn the ire of feminists on the topic ever since she proudly earned a denunciation from NOW. Her definition begins with:

**After some thought, I would like to offer the following definition of a slut:**

a. A slut is a person of either sex who regards sex strictly as a physically pleasurable activity. Sex in and of itself does not include an emotional, spiritual or practical component. Love, emotional intimacy and reproduction are sometimes associated with sex, but are in no way necessary or even desirable as a precondition for sexual activity.

She follows up with bullet points b through d, and attempts to create a gender neutral definition of sluthood, which she addresses in bullet point d:

d. Male sluts are generally found highly desirable by many women, and prefer promiscuity to a committed, monogamous relationship. Female sluts are generally found temporarily desirable by highly desirable men, and have few opportunities for committed, monogamous relationships. Some female sluts feel fine about this, others feel regret.

I’m sympathetic to Susan’s ambitious goal here. I can see why she wants to create a sort of unified theory of sluthood. But I think this makes the definition overly complex, and misses the essence of slut. In doing this she has also inadvertently fallen into playing into the female preferred version of promiscuity. Note the focus on whether one associates sex with love, not commitment in the beginning of the definition.

I had a roommate in college who was a natural PUA. We often laughed at him because he would come home on a regular basis and profess that he had fallen in love. The thing is, he wasn’t lying. At that moment, he really was in love with whomever the flavor of the week was. Before too long of course he would fall madly in love with yet another woman, and the old one would generally find her way into the hierarchy of his soft harem. I’m not even sure he didn’t continue to love all of the women in his soft harem. If he were a woman we would say he loved too much, which of course is often a euphemism for a slut...

The concept of slut is specifically female for a reason. Making it gender neutral denies the very nature of what slut means. Sluts are defined by and reviled for the threat their actions pose to the social order, and to a lesser degree to themselves. Much like an arsonist, sluts are defined not by an objective metric (the hard fast partner count feminists screech for) but by the destructive threat they pose to themselves and society:
1. Sluts threaten to disrupt in tact relationships and (especially) families.
2. Sluts destroy their own ability to be trusted as a wife and mother.
3. Sluts devalue the sexual currency of women in general, making commitment more difficult to obtain for those who want it.

Before I continue, I want to assist with the acute hyperventilation some of my readers are no doubt experiencing right now. In addition to breathing into a paper bag, note that while the first item is in fact an example of the ever dreaded double standard it is still accurate from the perspective of other women. Yes, apartment buildings should be built with sprinkler systems and otherwise up to fire code. Likewise, women should avoid relationships and especially marriage with men who are predisposed to cheat. And yes, the man who cheats is morally responsible for his actions. But this doesn’t change the fact that the residents of the local firetrap get extremely nervous when someone starts playing with matches.

Having hopefully addressed a potentially serious medical emergency for some of my readers, I’ll continue. Susan quotes fellow blogger Elusive Wapiti in making a very similar point as I did above about sluts:

Sluts don’t threaten men—they may offend us, or tempt us, amuse us, or irritate us—but sluts very much threaten non-slutty women, the security of all women’s relationships with the men around them, and the very fabric of our communities.

...by slutwalking, these women continue to pick at the very social fabric upon which they depend for their own safety. Slutshaming does indeed boost women’s security, and is most effectively employed by more upright women whose objections keep their wayward sisters from polluting the air which we all breathe.

Elusive Wapiti is undoubtedly correct, except upright women are generally loath to shame sluts out of their displeasure at the double standard. Furthermore, men could have a huge impact here by merely being willing to judge sluts. However, most of the men who are aware of this have a vested interest in keeping a plentiful supply of sluts available, and those who have a vested interest in the traditional family are generally unaware of this power.

Revisiting the dreaded double standard, Susan points out in her follow on post Manwhores: For Casual Sex Only that women aren’t the only ones who are damaged by promiscuity. She referenced a study which found that men with high partner counts were less likely to be satisfied in marriage. While I’m skeptical of parts of the study’s findings (it claimed the effect of partner count on women was less important), the basic premise makes sense. I have previously advised men not to marry sluts and women not to marry alphas, and I think this is sound advice all around. Interestingly this advice is taken differently by men and women. Men enthusiastically agreed with my advice, while women were often very troubled by it. Perhaps there is something to this double standard after all...
I’ve mentioned before that my wife often finds great blog fodder from Match.com when checking her Juno email account. Earlier this week I sent one such article to The Private Man, and he used it for his excellent post, *Match.com Hates Happy Relationships*. 

She told me about another one last night, titled *Why your forties are prime time for love*. Read this article by Debbie Magids, Ph.D. and you will learn that the laws of nature have been repealed:

**Today, turning 40 signals that you’re at the prime of your life**

Well, today is definitely nothing like your parents expected it to be. You’re living in a post-millennium world now. Society has evolved, along with the individual notion and perception of what constitutes “age.” Forty is — by anyone’s standards — considered to be young, smart and sexy; just look to Hollywood for myriad examples. Several “older” leading ladies have taken up with much younger men, sparking the cougar phenomenon.

It isn’t just appearances which have changed, but biology itself (emphasis mine):

A woman doesn’t need to rush into pregnancy for fear of becoming too old, rendering her infertile. **It’s actually common now for couples to marry and have children in their thirties and forties**...

I knew many are able to marry and have children in their 30s, but I wasn’t aware it was common for women to do this in their 40s! I also seem to recall a bit of discussion on this in the comments section of my post on *why age of marriage matters*, so I thought I would see what data I could find in the 2011 Statistical Abstract of The United States. Table 80 ([image](xls)) had the data I was looking for. She is right, things have changed quite a bit in the last few years! Between 1996 and 2007 (the first and last years we have data for) the percentage of births by mothers who were 40 or over has increased by 35%! That is right! Just a fifteen years ago, only 1.9% of all live births were to mothers 40 or older.

Now, it is 2.6%
The average age of mothers at first birth has steadily grown over the last 30 years too. In 1980 it was 22.7, but now it is 25.

Not all of the article is awful. I agree in general that keeping a youthful attitude is a good thing. But there is a difference between keeping a positive youthful attitude, and outright denial of reality. As The Private Man noted in his post, this stuff is almost exclusively aimed at women. How many young women today are reading this article and the hundreds just like it (not to mention the books) and setting themselves up for failure?
Too pretty to do homework!
by Dalrock | September 1, 2011 | Link

We live in a strange time. Female entitlement is rampant as a result of feminism, yet sometimes the female entitlement message runs afoul of feminists. JCPenney™ recently pulled the this shirt from its online store following a petition drive and outrage from feminists. The shirt said:

| I’m too pretty to do homework so my brother has to do it for me |

The copy on the page said:

| Who has time for homework when there’s a new Justin Bieber album out? She’ll love this tee that’s just as cute and sassy as she is. |

The strange thing is this kind of I don’t have to do anything because I’m a woman theme is extremely common today exactly because of feminism. Given the choice between teaching women and girls real skills and teaching them moxie, feminists chose the latter. Feminists didn’t think Amelia Earhart needed to do her homework and learn how to use navigation equipment or communicate in Morse code; there were men for that. All feminists cared about was that she was cute and sassy, just like the girl the shirt is aimed at.

See Also: To thine own self be true
Badger had several excellent posts last week about a woman named Alyssa Bereznak who very publicly shredded her OKCupid date (Jon Finkel) on the blog Gizmodo. Check out Badger’s posts here and here for the full story, but my sense in reading about the situation was that Bereznak was offended that someone like Finkel considered himself in her league. The Australian edition of her blog post closes with:

…all you world famous nerds out there: Don’t go after two Gawker Media employees and not expect to have a post written about you. We live for this kind of stuff.

As Dave Chappelle would say, she keeps it real!

But as Dave points out, sometimes keeping it real goes wrong.

The internet has had a field day with Bereznak, including Gizmodo Australia and quickmeme. The man she thought wasn’t in her league is a wealthy hedge fund manager. His geeky hobby that so offended her was winning hundreds of thousands of dollars in a card game called magic. Susan Walsh of Hooking Up Smart pointed out in the comments on Badger’s blog:

He is far more attractive than she is, IMO. Just saying.

Mr. Finkel for his part is playing it cool. In an ask me anything thread on reddit, he wrote:

It’s nice to know the internet has my back, so in total it looks like it was a net positive, though I still feel oddly creeped out by it.

He has even graciously accepted a date request from Playboy model Sara Jean Underwood, but only on his terms:

I would definitely be down to go on a date with her, but not if it’s televised (sorry everyone). Just not my thing.

At the end of the day, Finkel has gone from attractive wealthy hedge fund manager and magic tournament winner, to famous and pre selected attractive wealthy hedge fund manager and magic tournament winner. Meanwhile, Bereznak has gone from unknown intern at tech blog Gizmodo, to infamous bitch with a lazy eye who will potentially publicly shred any man dumb enough to go on a date with her. All of this makes her own words prophetic:

So what did I learn? Google the shit out of your next online date. Like, hardcore.

See Also: More judging the performance.
Thou shalt be true to thyself

by Dalrock | September 11, 2011 | Link

Terry Breathing Grace tipped me off about this great video blog by Sheila Gregoire of To Love, Honor, and Vacuum. Sheila has commented on this site from time to time, and has also referenced this blog in her own posts here and here. One thing which strikes me about Sheila’s work is how incredibly gentle she is in her pro marriage message to Christian women. At first I thought she was only lukewarm on the topic of marriage, but after further consideration I am convinced that she is accurately assessing the nature of her audience. What she considers “harsh” I would consider walking on eggshells. But as I said I think she has accurately gaged her target audience. Christian women as a group are not used to being told they have any obligations. Ever. Even obligations resulting from a sacred promise they made in the church in front of God and everyone they know. This simply isn’t the way of the modern Christian church*.

But this isn’t Sheila’s fault. She is trying to strengthen Christian women’s commitment to marriage and has to work with reality. As a near lone voice amongst Christians she is doing an incredible job. This is an uphill battle, especially since Christian women have discovered the 11th commandment:

★ Thou shalt be true to thyself

Here is another video blog she did, which may be the one which generated the letters she mentioned in the video above:

*I know it often isn’t fair to make blanket accusations, so I’ll offer a caveat; if your congregation is actually different, I would love to help you tell the world about it! Keep in mind I’m not talking about churches which speak like Christ but act like Oprah. Those are a dime a dozen. I’m talking about a church which actually believes the bible so much they are willing to take action, and even make women uncomfortable with the idea of not keeping their sacred promise. And I’m not talking about lecturing men on keeping their promises as a response to women not keeping theirs either. I’m also not talking about a church which tries to find legalistic ways to claim they are different without doing anything which might make sinners uncomfortable. Yeah, sorry for getting your hopes up. I know I just excluded 99.99999% of Christian congregations. But on the bright side, I hear most churches have good news to share on the topics of offerings, new members, and the number of missionaries they have sponsored. Plus I hear the choir and the pot lucks are great! So while God’s plan for the family may not be important enough for your congregation to take real action on, at least you have the other things! Besides, I’m sure the millions of kids being put through the meat grinder will get over it some day. When they do, perhaps they can join the church and sing in the choir, or bring something tasty to the pot luck!
Can you help the Captain out?
by Dalrock | September 12, 2011 | Link

Captain Capitalism has sent out a request for help:

The Captain is being held hostage.

He will not be released, and therefore not be able to make any new posts, until he receives 100,000 new hits (or he raises $5,000 from book/kindle sales, *ahem ahem, cough cough!*)

The following brilliant posts (full of super-awesome economic genius) will be forwarded, linked to, facebooked, “reddited,” etc., BY YOU until our 100,000 new hits demand is met.

The “Great Liberal Economic Oort Cloud.”

A “Cold Detroit”

My “Bondage A Go Go Girl Story”

Women’s Rights Movement Felled By a Collapse in the Division of Labor

Since Christmas shopping season is coming, You WILL Buy Your Children TOYS!!!!

And at the request of our good friend Sr. Ortega, “Unfortunately, Men Do Exist.”
Back in February of last year Aol News ran a piece about a Latin teacher named Cord Ivanyi at Gilbert Classical Academy who was teaching chivalry to the boys in his class (see also this piece from ABC). At the time Ferdinand ran a post titled Castrated by chivalry which called this out. Ferd then outed what he believed to be Mr. Ivanyi commenting on his blog as a sock puppet. Welmer also wrote on this topic in The Spearhead in his post Training Boys to be Dogs. This all came back into view when Mr. Ivanyi’s students started writing Ferdinand letters again the other week, I presume related to the return of school following the summer break. Ferdinand followed up with another post titled Cord Ivanyi, World’s Biggest Mangina, Sics His Students on Me (language warning). Check out Ferdinand’s latest post for the whole exchange.

This post is intended for Mr. Ivanyi, his students, or anyone else who is otherwise familiar with his class. I assume you heard about the controversy and searched on his name. If you are looking for a place to defend Mr. Ivanyi, you are in luck. Before you do so, however, I ask that you first consider what I and others here in the manosphere have to say. There are good reasons why Ferdinand and Welmer reacted to the AOL News story with so much contempt. Chivalry can only exist in the proper context. Implementing chivalry outside of context creates a mockery of the very concept, and makes the man or boy attempting it a fool. It doesn’t just make him a fool, but it tends to make him a lonely frustrated fool, because women aren’t attracted to men who put them on a pedestal. This is what chivalry out of context does, and the end result is a group of very frustrated young men who can’t figure out why all of the girls only want to be friends with them. These nice guys will quickly tire of being the soft shoulder his female friends cry on after the latest bad boy they threw themselves at treated them badly.

Note: If this doesn’t have a strong ring of truth to you, don’t worry about it. Just remember this page and come back after you have completed a few years of College. In the meantime, isn’t there a hot girl at your school whose books need to be carried?

The good news is you have come to a place with much knowledge. I don’t mean my blog, but the larger environment the blog exists in, which we call the manosphere. If you want to understand what attracts women, what you need to learn is game. Note that this is true whether you want to be a pickup artist or simply a happily married man. Female psychology and how to seduce women is something all men should understand, even if the only woman you wish to seduce is your wife.

I’ve created a page to list all of the different game resources out there. But if you are looking for a place to start, I would suggest the famous Dave From Hawaii post at Heartiste. I would also suggest this post of my own.

If you are a female student of Mr. Ivanyi, you may want to learn more about game as well. For example, you will be glad to know that you aren’t defective for not being attracted to really nice guys. Weird how I knew your deepest, darkest secret like that, isn’t it? But don’t
take it from me, take it from Susan Walsh of Hooking Up Smart. While I have your attention, I would be remiss if I didn’t warn you about the awful advice many older people are likely giving to you. Conventional wisdom is that women who want to marry don’t have to take searching for a husband seriously until they are 30. This works for some, but many women have found out too late that it can fail miserably. Leaving this to the last minute can also leave you vulnerable, so be on the lookout. Additionally, your fertility will be declining sooner than you are being told. Also, if you do marry, be aware that divorce is regularly sold to women in the media. Once married you will be bombarded with messages suggesting that you would be better off divorcing. Don’t fall for this. You will watch movies with absurd stories like Eat Pray Love and How Stella Got Her Grove Back. You may even read what is claimed to be a factual column by an online dating site where a middle aged divorcée meets a secret multimillionaire hunky handyman. This isn’t likely in real life.

But misunderstanding female psychology is only one half of what is wrong with what Mr. Ivanyi is teaching. He is also ignoring reality. This is the generation of women he wants boys to revere. Even their own mothers know something is terribly wrong.

Additionally, women today are anything but oppressed. For example, while it is generally assumed that divorce is driven by men dumping their wives for a younger model, the opposite turns out to be true. Men are treated like second class citizens by family courts all too eager to rip their children away from them, and transform them from a father into a walking wallet. Men can even be thrown in jail for failing to pay child support for a child fathered by another man.

Young men don’t need to be taught to treat women as if they are superior beings. They need to be taught how to navigate the reality of the post sexual revolution and post feminist world. They are at a legal disadvantage to women in everything from domestic violence to getting a job. The last thing they need to be taught is to pretend nothing is going on, and to offer themselves up as the servants of women.

I say all of this as a strong advocate of marriage. Teaching young men to self sabotage makes them less likely to be able to find a worthy wife. This leaves worthy women having to choose between spinsterhood, pretending to love a man in order to marry him, and being pumped and dumped by players. If they are truly good women they will of course choose spinsterhood, but why force such a choice on them in the first place? Men and women both deserve better than the catastrophic failure Mr. Ivanyi is setting our young people and their future children up for.

And now having seen the error of his ways after reading this post and the comments below, my hope is that Mr. Ivanyi will finally understand why he was in fact being a mangina. As a result I am confident that he will change his ways sufficiently to make the title of this post an accurate statement.
Feminist nostalgia for traditional gender roles.
by Dalrock | September 15, 2011 | Link

After writing my last post on Cord Ivanyi teaching boys chivalry I found a story on the same topic by ABC News. It had a hilarious quote by the acting VP of NOW:

NOW Unsure of High School Etiquette Lessons

But Erin Matson, acting vice president of the National Organization for Women, said she wonders if singling out the boys for good manners is the way to go, even though she called the idea of old-fashioned manners “adorable.”

They had a quote by the mother of one of the girls in the same class which was similar:

“I was a little torn to begin with as a child of the 1970s and growing up with women’s lib and women’s rights,” she said.

But now, she said, it’s almost like a “lost art form” seen only in old movies.

This nostalgia by feminists for the good ol’ days is surprisingly common. In December of 2009 Hanna Rosin, perhaps the most hairy legged feminist of them all, bemoaned changing gender roles in her article The rise of the kitchen bitch. She opened the article with:

Ladies, it’s time to reclaim cooking.

A little later on she writes:

I first heard this term in Sandra Tsing Loh’s recent Atlantic story about her divorce.
She used it to describe a friend’s husband who was anal and fussy and altogether too feminine—he belonged to an online fennel club, for God’s sake. Loh’s bitch was wholly unsavory, a prop designed to justify universal divorce.

Granted, many would argue that her feminist credentials come out entirely untarnished. After all, she was emasculating her husband in the feminist submagazine he let her create after he became editor of *Slate*. Plus, feminism’s core philosophy is about women bitching. Still, I find this rather strange.

Loh wrote about her own nostalgia for traditional gender roles in her *NY Times* Op Ed piece *My So-Called Wife*:

I am stricken with the peculiar curse of being a 21st-century woman who makes more than the man she’s living with ... 

...I seem to have an ever more recurring 1950s housewife fantasy. In this magical Technicolor world, the breadwinner husband, Brad, leaves home (where his duties are limited to mowing the lawn and various minor home repairs) at 7 a.m. When he returns from work at 6 p.m., aside from a savory roast with mashed potatoes, his homemaker wife, Nancy, has pipe, slippers and a tray of Manhattans ready.

And who can forget the quote by feminist Pamela Haag from the *Daily Mail* piece I referenced in my *Trapped in a not unhappy marriage* post. Ms. Haag complains:

From a historical perspective it’s a departure. Go back to the Fifties and husbands and wives had many different roles – as hostess, decorator, breadwinner, volunteer.

Likewise all of the women complaining about reversed gender roles in *Alpha women, Beta Men*. You may also recall how blogger *Big Little Wolf* feels that men should offer women chivalry, although she feels this has nothing to do with gender roles:

My planet is called *Fred* – where I get to pick and choose the typically masculine or feminine behaviors that suit me...
Pick up the tab for a date? Yes – I will expect that....

Guys – is opening doors not your thing? No problem. I’m not going to hold it against you.

I’m capable of opening doors, pulling out chairs, and so on. However, if you drive a truck or SUV, given my diminutive stature, you are going to have to offer me a hand to climb up into the seat, and a hand to get back down. (At five feet, it’s either that or a step stool.)

I was confused by this at first, because if you offered a short man a boost into your truck or SUV you would have a fight on your hands. After much consideration, I came up with a handy way for men to remember what she expected:

[...] chivalry means giving the little lady some extra help

I thought she would be delighted that I had made sense of her seeming contradiction, but later in the day I noticed she had a new post up about how people can be mean on the internet. To this day I’m at a loss as to how she ended up with a picture of me.

But I have saved the best for last. I found a blog by a women’s studies major discussing Cord Ivyanyi teaching boys chivalry titled, Bringing Old-School Back (emphasis mine):

...when I read the article “Teacher Emphasizes Old-Fashioned Etiquette” by David Knowles, I couldn’t help but hope that Old School was trying to make another comeback.

...the boys became accustomed to anything from pulling chairs out for the girls to sit, to standing up whenever a girl entered the room—something I hadn’t come across since I read Pride and Prejudice last year. And I was happy to read that the girls loved it.

Happy indeed. Men waiting on women, what’s a feminist not to love? She continues:

As a women studies major who is familiar with feminist criticism, I have a good feeling that many would view these practices as sexist. Such behavior from men may imply that women are weaker and more helpless. That if women begin to accept this behavior as normal, they will believe in and become comfortable with their dependence on men.

She is of course right. The charming ladies at Feministing may have required medical attention after reading about this. But as I said, I saved the best for last. The women’s studies major blogger continues (emphasis mine):

But I would like to offer another level of insight. When men and women are seen as the same, men somehow always seem to get the upper-hand...

More than ever now we are realizing that men and women are not quite the same,
after all. And Ivanyi’s lessons from the past are finally being called in to shed light on a problem we have been unable to solve.

Knight image modified from image by David Ball & PRA. Manhattan and cake image by Quinn Dombrowski.
Total douchebag domination
by Dalrock | September 19, 2011 | Link

If we don’t take action soon, we are going to be in for an era of total douchebag domination. More and more nice guys are going to figure out that with an attitude and poor treatment of girls they are going to get what it is that they want. Every day we are losing more good guys to the dark side here.

–Susan Walsh

That classic quote is from *Douchebag Math 101 (8:15 in)* by Susan Walsh of *Hooking Up Smart* (some language NSFW):

Susan’s demeanor is a combination of business school and married mom, and makes her the perfect person to deliver this message to those who are unaware of the current SMP.
The culture war is over. Feminism won.

Feminism has completed its long march through the institutions of the west. Even the church is collaborating with an enthusiasm which would have made the Vichy French blush. The war is over. It is time to accept facts. Its all over but the crying.

Those looking for a leader to rally our forces and launch a bold new counterattack on feminism are misguided. There will still be opportunities for individuals and small groups to win isolated victories, but neither men nor women are going to take any meaningful action en masse. There simply are no institutions left which could facilitate this.

But the completeness of feminism’s victory is also its core problem. They control all of the institutions, but we are still here. Millions of men and women still haven’t accepted the mantra of feminism. Despite all of their efforts and having all levers of state and society available to them, the glorious new breed of woman they envisioned hasn’t come to be. And she won’t come to be. What more can feminists try except more of the same?

Now is the time for the insurgency. While there won’t be mass coordinated action, this doesn’t mean that individuals won’t respond to the post feminist reality and make choices which are in their own best interest.

For men the key will be to avoid the worst effects of the sexual revolution and the corrupt family law system. This means only marrying a woman if she demonstrates the ability to keep her promise. Many men who understand the current landscape will choose not to marry. For such a man the options are to disengage from women entirely (MGTOW) or to learn enough game to tilt the uncommitted sexual marketplace in his favor. To the great dismay of sluts and social conservative women, those women looking to use uncommitted sex to manipulate men into falsely believing they have commitment will find the men with game (the men they most want) turning the tables on them. Their planned McFling with an unsuspecting paypal will turn unexpectedly into joining a soft harem or pump n dump. Their attempt to snare an unsuspecting beta provider after riding the carousel will be haunted by
the prospect of the men who might turn their own con against them. But not all men will immediately learn about the realities of the post sexual revolution sexual marketplace (SMP), and still others will hear the truth but refuse to believe it. We can only try to educate men to make better choices. Some will listen, some will not. All we can do is remain prepared to patiently share the message to those who are ready to hear it.

For women the choice will be to make a conscious decision about how they want to participate in the SMP as well. Some will undoubtedly decide that marriage isn’t important to them, and will knowingly ride the carousel. Others will decide that marriage really is important to them, and will take it seriously early on. Some will marry but then falsely assume they can continue to re-choose without consequence. Just like men, many will either not hear the message, or will refuse to accept the reality of it.

So the bad news is not all men and women can be helped, and we won’t be able to spawn a mass cultural movement. The good news is we don’t need to convert anyone else to be successful. We have an essential advantage; our message happens to be the truth. We don’t need to win the argument. The truth is the truth, whether others believe it or not. Feminists need to convince everyone that their view of the world is correct, or individuals will continue to peel off to follow their own best interest. All we have to do to win is accept the truth, and act in our own best interest. Ideally we should attempt to help others with this as well. If we can do this, we will change the culture one good choice at a time. However, we don’t need to convince others of anything to take practical measures for ourselves.

This isn’t to say that all of the effects of feminism and the sexual revolution can be merely ignored. The laws and courts are still biased. Men will continue to have their children taken away and their role as father reduced to that of walking wallet. Other men will be forced to pay support for children they never fathered. Other men will be falsely accused of rape or domestic violence, and face a legal system designed to placate feelings over justice. This is all true, and will remain true until and unless enough of the population acknowledges the truth. In the meantime, all we can do is figure out the best way to protect ourselves, our families, and (if they are willing to listen) as many other men and women as possible.

But what do you say to a man who is about to marry an alcoholic party girl, foolishly thinking that putting a ring on her finger will turn her into a wife? And what do you say to a young woman who is ready to choose the allure of the carousel instead of taking the search for a husband (and her own chastity) seriously from the beginning? You of course should try to help them see the light, and try to be patient as they resist the uncomfortable truth. If you can convince them, fantastic! This is one more life spared (or at least somewhat sheltered from) the awful effects of feminism. If not, their election not to take the wise path actually makes it easier for another man or woman to do so. Each man who marries a party girl leaves a virtuous woman available for another to marry. Each woman who rides the carousel leaves another greater beta available for a virtuous woman to marry.

Life’s wisdom delivered in a joke.
there were two hikers, and one of them spotted a bear. His partner immediately knelt down and started retying his bootlaces. The other hiker chuckled at his folly:

- You fool. You can’t outrun a bear!

His partner replied:

- I don’t have to outrun the bear. I only have to outrun you.

You don’t have to outrun the bear, you just have to outrun the other hikers.

Destroyed tank image by Mika Rantanen. Bear image by Vern Hall. Boot image by Rama.
Badger has an outstanding post up today titled Spinster Math where he suggests we could be witnessing a very important change regarding involuntarily unmarried women in the US. I'm not going to quote anything from it; you have to go there to read it. All I'll add are some graphics. The first is the chart I created for Supply and demand in the marriage market:

The second is an artists rendering I was able to obtain of an aging feminist spinster for my post New battle cry of the aging feminist:
I created the chart age_of_marriage.jpg using data from the US Census. The original dinosaur image comes from Julie Patricia, who released it into the public domain. I hereby license both the chart and the modified dinosaur image (over30feminist1.jpg) as Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported.
Evidently I’ve hit a nerve!
by Dalrock | September 23, 2011 | Link

The recent comments to an older post caught my eye. The post is from March of this year, and is titled Are Women Done With Men After Age 55? I did some investigation, and found that this is surprisingly one of the blog’s all time most popular pages:

Top Posts for all days ending 2011-09-23 (Summarized)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home page</td>
<td>356,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What really happened to Lara Logan?</td>
<td>18,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When judging the performance goes wrong</td>
<td>8,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are Women Done With Men After Age 55?</td>
<td>8,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Lindbergh and Amelia Earhart</td>
<td>8,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A post-marital spinster’s rationalization hamster in the final stages of exhaustion.</td>
<td>7,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single in the Suburbs: How Match.com sells your wife post marital spinsterhood.</td>
<td>7,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat Pray Love: Where are they now?</td>
<td>6,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Phase of the Hypergamous Arms Race: Revenge of the Nerds?</td>
<td>5,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should I divorce him?</td>
<td>5,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing a Prospective Wife Part II: Interview Questions</td>
<td>5,354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of those pages aren’t surprising. Lara Logan continues to be a top search term used to reach this site, and in the runup to the 60 minutes piece on her that post was getting incredible traffic from search engines. Somehow my post ended up being one of the main search results on Google for that. The post When Judging the performance goes wrong was popular in its own right, and then Heartiste linked to it the other week sending almost 3000 hits my way. Should I divorce him is evidently a commonly searched term, and Google has my post of the same title on the first page of results.

But the over 55 page has me perplexed. Normally I can see where the traffic is coming from. I don’t see either large numbers of hits via a link or a search engine. Wherever these hits are coming from, it is clearly a popular page. One thing I did notice is that Google and Bing both have that page high up in the search results for “women over 55 remarriage”. Google has it as the first link, and Bing has it at the bottom of the first page.
Wherever the traffic is coming from, I guess it shouldn’t be a surprise. Women’s declining marriage/remarriage rates as they get older are a lightning rod, as you can see in the post Rationalization Hamster 500! Few topics generate more hamster spinning than this one.

While searching around I noticed one of the top search results for the topic is an article on babyboomercaretaker.com titled How Many Divorced Women Over Age 55 Remarry? I don’t want to keep you in suspense, so here is what women who click on the link learn:

As a woman over 55, if you feel that divorce is your only option, then go for it without any doubts or qualms. You should not feel insecure because there is life even after 55. You can get into the dating scene without feeling bad as many women of the same age are doing so...

...very few women over 55 remarry because they love their independence and do not want to make changes so late in life. They are content being in a relationship but not in a marriage.

Spin glorious hamster! Yes, the reason women are less likely to both divorce and remarry as they get older has nothing to do with their declining power in the sexual marketplace. They are really just loving the dating game! Forget that the AARP survey found that middle age and older divorced women who don’t remarry are very often terribly alone (emphasis mine):

Almost 9 in 10 men (87%) dated after their divorce, compared to 8 in 10 women (79%)... Among those who dated after the divorce, more than half of men (54%) but fewer women remarried (39%). (Page 39)

Many women, especially those who have not remarried (69%), do not touch or hug at all sexually. An even larger majority of women who have not remarried do not engage in sexual intercourse (77% saying not at all), in comparison with
about half of men (49%) who have not remarried. (Page 6)

Check out some of the other articles linked from that page for amusement. I suggest Biblical Advice Second Marriages, which opens with:

Having a second marriage is not always wrong. This is especially so when you are sure that your first marriage was a mistake and was not meant to be. Maybe, you will find your true love and the right person meant for you the second time round...

As says the Bible, learn to find happiness in your second marriage, if not your first marriage.

Both articles have an English as a second language feel, so perhaps this is a site designed to game the search engines for hits. Either way, it is sadly very standard fare.

The US Census Hamster Gets Into the Act

I noticed another prominent link when searching on remarriage rates for women over 55. This one is a poster from Rose Kreider at the US Census, titled Remarriage in the United States. It has a chart on page 4 which shows that remarriages are making up a smaller percentage of yearly marriages over time:

Then she shares data on remarriage rates for people who divorced over 20 years ago:
As I’ve shown before (here, and update here) we know that remarriage rates have been falling in the US over time. This is clear in both charts from the poster, yet the author claims on page 7 that:

Most men and women marry within 5 years of divorce.

She makes this assertion even though her own data shows that this hasn’t been the case for women since the 1960s! She’s trotting out a myth that hasn’t been true for 40 years. While I (and evidently she) can’t find recent statistics on remarriage rates, we can see the footprint of the new reality on the system in the same SIPP data she is referencing. Per the 2009 table for non Hispanic whites, 39.4% of all white women in their 50s had ever divorced, and 18.3% of women in this demographic were currently divorced. Nearly 20% of all white women in the US in their 50s are experiencing Post Marital Spinsterhood. Given that these women came up during a time when remarriage was much easier, the future will likely be much worse for those women divorcing now. One other factor which would seem to make this worse is that remarriage opportunities for women decline greatly with age. This shows up in another chart from the same poster:
What is the age composition of spouses in recently remarried couples?

This is especially bad news for future Eat Pray Lovers who are delaying initial marriage today. Later marriage will likely mean they divorce later as well.
Dragging your kids through the meat grinder; practice makes perfect!
by Dalrock | September 24, 2011 | Link

Captain Capitalism has a new post titled The Arrogance of Divorcées about a woman named Cherie Bowser who is offering advice on the best way to drag your innocent kids through divorce. She should know, this is her second go at it. The double divorcée’s pearls of wisdom are offered in her Yahoo Shine piece Maintaining happy, healthy children during a separation and divorce:

“Divorce is never easy the first time around, but learning from your mistakes can make the second divorce a lot less stressful.”

I don’t know. Maybe she should have waited until she dragged them through a third divorce before lecturing the rest of us on how to be good parents. This woman clearly lacks initiative; many women are able to drag their kids through 4 or more divorces without breaking a sweat. Write back when you have some real experience, piker.

Having never done this to my own children, I may not know enough to comment on it. However my guess is her daughter [redacted] can’t be thrilled that her mom wrote about all of this using her full name, and included a picture of a smiley face [redacted] drew as proof of what a great mom she is.

But a great mom she really is. Just this January [redacted]’s mom wrote an article titled Mother’s Good Examples Will Pass Down to Children from Generations to Generations.

Yes, I’m afraid mother’s example is very likely to have a lasting generational impact. This woman’s frivolity is so profound it reaches through time, haunting innocent children who are yet to be born.

In the January piece Ms. Bowser tells us more about herself:

“I’m a full-time Mom of 3 girls ages 4, 9 & 13 & 1 step-son age 13. I have a wonderful devoting husband who is a chiropractor in Orange County.

I think I need a shot of Rumple Minze after reading this woman’s work.

If you are reading this [redacted], please know that others know you don’t deserve this. I know it won’t help, but I’m deeply sorry for what your mother is dragging you and your sisters through for the second time.

Update: Ms. Bowser appears to have removed her daughter’s name and artwork from the article, so I have redacted her daughter’s name from this post.
Terri has a great new post up titled Your Wife Needs To Read This Blog. In it she points out how the media is hyping a new website named My Husband Is Annoying by this lovely woman:

Be sure to see Tiffanie Wong and her husband Mark Joyella in action in this video. At first I thought he was Dan Abrams, but I think this is just because all manginas tend to look alike.

When I visited her most recent post I was shocked to learn that her first husband wasn’t thrilled to be with such a woman:

When my husband at the time told me he no longer wanted to be married a couple months shy of our 2 year anniversary, I felt as if my world were falling apart.

Why would any man give up such a great catch? I’m sure she was an absolute delight to be married to. What man doesn’t dream of being publicly emasculated by his wife?

Interestingly she actually has nice things to say about her current husband on the site she dedicated to ridiculing him:

as I look at my amazing husband and my beautiful daughter who both give me more joy than I ever thought possible, I know that this is where I’m supposed to be.

Edit: I just saw from her About Me page that they were married in March of 2009. Her first post on the blog is dated July 2009, so she started writing this only four months after they were married.
Sheepdog photo licensed as Creative Commons by Just chaos.
Let thy fountain be blessed: and rejoice with the wife of thy youth.

-Proverbs 5:18

I’m not normally one to quote Bible verses. However, someone quoted the proverb above somewhere in the manosphere a few months back, and this one has stuck with me. The sheer beauty of it came to mind as I was scanning our old wedding photos about a month ago. All of our wedding photos are prints, and I wanted to make a digital copy while I know they are still in good shape. Seeing us both so unbelievably young was extremely moving and helped me appreciate the wisdom of the proverb even more.

We talk a good deal on this blog and across the manosphere about the realities of women’s sexual market value/marriage market value (SMV/MMV) as they grow older. This reality is denied to the great detriment of many women, old and young. But a loving wife who spent her youth with her husband and remains faithful and committed is in a very special position. To me my wife is just as beautiful at 37 as the day I married her when she was only 20. I would try to explain this, but I really don’t have the words. I’ll wager that most married men here will understand this, and maybe even some of the unmarried ones as well; Solomon II understands it. I’ll also bet most women will struggle to truly accept it.

One of the things which can at times be lost when discussing game is the positive side of beta. Too much beta and the man is unattractive, and a woman shouldn’t marry him. But as Athol Kay points out what is ideal (for marriage at least) is a delicate balance of alpha and beta traits. The often fierce loyalty and kindness of a beta which can so easily morph into farce when misapplied can also be incredibly noble.

This beta loyalty and attachment is the primary reason divorce tends to be so devastating for men even if they don’t have their children taken from them and aren’t abused financially by the process. Frivolous divorce blindsides these men exactly because of their kindness and loyalty; they simply can’t fathom a mind of selfish treachery because it is so foreign to their own way of thinking. These men usually do recover after a year or two, and from a SMV/MMV perspective generally have a significant advantage over their treacherous ex wife. Unlike in the movies, these men very seldom take their frivolous ex wives back once they recover.

To women of any age who are either hoping to marry or are already married, my request would be to accept that most husbands really do feel this way about a wife who took a chance on him when he was young and shared her own youth with him. It may not make sense, but then so much about men and women doesn’t make sense to the other sex. Men seldom discuss this, and my guess is we instinctively understand how risky this is from a game perspective.

For young women who wish to marry my advice would be to take your search for your future husband seriously now. Don’t waste your youth with men who won’t care about you but for a
moment, even if that moment extends for several years. Just as important, don’t conduct yourself in such a way that will skew your ability to experience attraction for men to those with excessive alpha qualities. Each additional increment of alpha you find yourself needing means an equal loss in loyalty and kindness you will be able to find attractive in a husband. The way to avoid the less kind forms of game and/or the infidelity of a man with too much alpha is simply not to need this much alpha in the first place. Feel free to get as much alpha as you want (and can attract) in a husband, but understand the trade-offs.

For married women my advice would be to find any way you can to block out the whispers, and take great care of who you take counsel from; resist the urge to view your husband’s loyalty and kindness as weakness.

To unmarried men who wish to marry, use great caution and be sure to find a woman who is truly worthy of marriage.

To married men with worthy wives, my advice is that of Proverbs 5:18.

| Rejoice with the wife of thy youth. |
Forbes.com has a new article up titled: Men Cooperate More with Each Other than Women Do (H/T Uncle Elmer). The article is by Victoria Pynchon, who is responding to a meta analysis of studies which looked at the differences in cooperation between men and women. The press release for the study which found that men and women have different patterns of cooperation is helpfully titled: Men and Women Cooperate Equally for the Common Good. Of course. What else could they have titled it? Here is the key finding from the meta analysis:

While there was no statistical difference between the sexes when it came to cooperating when faced with a social dilemma, when the researchers drilled down they did find some differences. Specifically, women were more cooperative than men in mixed-sex studies and men became more cooperative than women in same-sex studies and when the social dilemma was repeated.

The lead author of the study offers an explanation for why men are more cooperative with each other than women:

“The argument is that throughout human evolutionary history, male coalitions have been an effective strategy for men to acquire resources, such as food and property,” said Balliet. “Both hunting and warfare are social dilemmas in that they firmly pit individual and group interests against each other. Yet, if everyone acts upon their immediate self-interest, then no food will be provided, and wars will be lost. To overcome such social dilemmas requires strategies to cooperate with each other.”

Evolutionary theory may also explain why women are less cooperative with other women when faced with a social dilemma, according to Balliet. “Ancestral women usually migrated between groups and they would have been interacting mostly with women who tended not to be relatives, and many were co-wives,” he said. “Social dynamics among women would have been rife with sexual competition.”

The Forbes author concludes that since the differences between men and women are biological, this is something women can fix:

There you have it, ladies. Proof that we are more competitive with one another than we are with men. This explains so much, including the bitter complaints of women in business and the professions about the lack of support they feel from their female colleagues.

This is something we can change. It is completely within our control. And if you say, I’m cooperative but she’s a bitch, then you have some conflict resolution work to do.

Makes sense to me. You ladies should get right on that. I’d offer to help, but it would be sexist of me to do so.
What they were looking at is a series of studies involving the prisoner's dilemma. This is classic Game Theory (think Nash, not Mystery) and it involves the ability of multiple individuals to have enough trust to cooperate when there is an incentive for cheating. If one party convinces the other to cooperate, and then cheats, the cheater wins big and the sucker loses. If both parties cheat, they both lose. If both cooperate, they both win modestly.

Crucial to this process is to be able to trust the other party. Being trusting in the face of treachery means failure; if you can’t trust your partner you may as well cheat. But both cooperating is a better mutual outcome than both cheating, so if trust can be achieved then both parties win.

So what does this really mean when we strip away the feminist doublespeak? Both men and women were more willing to trust a man not to sell them out. Women didn’t trust women. Men didn’t trust women. Men trusted other men. Women trusted men.

Is it even possible the academics who did the study didn’t understand this?
I have been very busy and haven’t done a new post for several days now. I have a few post ideas I’ll write up and publish as soon as I have the time. In the meantime I thought I would share some linkage.

David Martin wrote an interesting piece on the Spearhead a while back titled Violence and “Real Men”.

Also on the Spearhead, W.F. Price pulled out some of the best comments describing the problem with Social Conservative Bill Bennett’s Man Up piece. See also Bill’s post on Mexico City considering offering a two year renewable marriage.

Badger probes the question of marital happiness with two different posts, An Elder’s Wisdom on Mediocrity and Marriage, and “How Do You Like Being Married?”.

Captain Capitalism has an illustrated treatise on the war of the sexes titled You Started It, But We’ll Finish It.

As always, feel free to suggest any others in the comments which you think I and/or my readers would enjoy.
As so often happens the discussion in the comments section to a recent post turned to the issue of delayed marriage & motherhood*. In this specific case we were discussing how a woman’s circle of friends and acquaintances is impacted by her own decisions in life, and how this nonrandom group tends to provide an inaccurate sense of what is normal for women. The basic phenomenon happens for all of us. Our choices in life tend to have the effect of surrounding us with others who have made very similar choices. This is only natural, but it can leave one with a skewed perception of the larger world. An unmarried woman focused on her education or career in her mid 20s is very likely to be surrounded by women of the same demographic, and very much unaware of how many women of her cohort are already starting their own families. The media can reinforce this sense by reporting statistics out of context on how many women are delaying marriage and childbirth.

Sometimes simple statistics can give us a very inaccurate impression of what is going on around us. The most common statistics around motherhood are the mean or median age women are having their first child, as well as the percentage increase in the number of children born to older mothers. As I’ve pointed out in the past, the breathless headlines about women having children ever later in life obscure the larger picture. Births to women in their late 30s are up, but births to women 40 and over remain extremely rare:

What statistics often fail to tell us is how the shape of the curve changed. The following charts are from the OECD publication SF2.3: Mean age of mothers at first childbirth (H/T Lavazza)**. The OECD retains the copyright to the charts. When we hear about the age of childbirth being delayed, I think it is normal to unconsciously presume that this involves a shift in the curve of childbirth and not a reshaping of the curve. For some countries this is certainly true (live births per 1,000 women):
But for other countries the change is much more about a loss of births to women at a younger age with little or no increase in births to older women:
Greece

Hungary
thing which is common throughout all of the charts is that the most recent curve shows a peak in births no later than the early thirties (Ireland appears to be the max at 33).

The other problem with statistics on late life childbirth is it doesn’t tell us how many women waited too long and didn’t become mothers at all. I found a Pew Research Center report titled Childlessness Up Among All Women; Down Among Women with Advanced Degrees with some data from the US Census on this. One thing I found interesting is the definition of “childless”:

This report uses the standard measure of childlessness at the end of childbearing years, which is the share of women ages 40-44 who have not borne any children.

So much for 40 being the new 20!

Not surprisingly, the overall percent of women who are childless has increased over the last 30+ years:

Among all women ages 40-44, the proportion that has never given birth, 18% in 2008, has grown by 80% since 1976, when it was 10%.

But as I mentioned at the beginning of the post, the group one is part of can be very different than the average. Here is what it looks like broken down by level of education (following charts were made by me using their analysis/presentation of US Census Data):
Interestingly women with masters degrees and higher seem to have made adjustments towards having children recently. This makes me suspect that they learned from a percentage of their predecessors who inadvertently waited out the reproductive clock.

Even though out of wedlock births are much more common now than in the past, married women are still much more likely to have children than their unmarried counterparts, especially for women with some level of college or higher education:

The reluctance of college educated women in the US (and the UK) to have children out of wedlock could make for some interesting choices for the group of women currently in their 20s who are delaying marriage. This puts additional pressure on their need to find a beta provider in their 30s.

They also broke this out by race and education. Here is the breakdown for white women:
*I hesitated to do yet another post on this topic because discussions on this often turn personal. However, the data was simply too tempting. Please avoid bringing up another reader’s choices in the discussion on this unless they specifically bring them up first in response to this post. Even in cases where the reader brings up their own choices first, please avoid making this personal as much as possible.

** Update Aug 13 2013: ** The updated version of SF2.3 is located here (the old link automatically redirects though), and the xls version of the publication is available here.
That’s why guys get married, so they can stop wooing. It’s exhausting to woo, you woo, you woo, and you woo, and then you’ve got to go: Whoa!

–Paul Reiser, Mad About You

Badger made an excellent point in his post Cattiness and the un-selected-man. He pointed out that when women like the Gizmodo blogger shred a date they deem unworthy they raise the risk level men perceive in traditional dating:

It’s not enough for a man to be politely rejected and sent on his way; you have to be humiliated, placed in the virtual stocks so that the world knows the insufferable wrong you’ve inflicted on her by not being good enough for her dreams.

…it only has to happen once before a guy replays the movie in his head every time he considers approaching a woman, and oftentimes decides not to even when he might be slated for success.

What women like Alyssa Bereznak are doing by punishing men they deem unworthy is raising the searching costs associated with finding a mate in the traditional way. They don’t perceive a loss to themselves by doing this because searching costs are born almost exclusively by men when women are young (at least under the traditional model). It isn’t just the threat of nuclear rejection which has raised the cost of traditional dating for men however, it is the additional uncertainty which men experience as women move more and more towards full fledged choice addiction.

Women traditionally were able to bask in the courtship process because they were the center of attention and men bore the financial, emotional, and social costs of the selection process. What men typically find grueling women find delightful.
However, in cultures with traditional courtship men perceive the rewards to be high (lifetime commitment). In addition, in such cultures the risks are moderated by rules of decorum and formal and informal pressure on the woman to minimize the number of men she allows to court her. While the average woman might wish to be courted by 50 men, the average man is in no position to bear the expense of courting 50 women in order to find a wife.

Ever since the beginning of the sexual revolution women have perceived the incentive to prolong courtship in one way or another. The old rules no longer restricted them from extending the courtship period or required them to keep their lifetime commitment, and many men initially continued to play by the old set of rules. This is at the very heart of choice addiction.

Badger astutely points out that the changing sexual marketplace leaves unattached men who are interested in women with two main options. Option 1 is to continue bearing all of the risk and costs by dating in the traditional way, even though the costs are much higher and the rewards (in terms of commitment) are now much lower:

...take the initiative to set up a date doing something you hope she might enjoy, go on the actual date (hope she doesn’t flake), talk to her, try to figure out what she’s like and whether you’d be interested in a long-term partnership (and oh by the way pick up the bill with no expectation of her investment), and hope you don’t slip up and say something she’ll sneer at and have to start all over with somebody else. Then do the whole thing all over again two, three, four times until you no longer have to convince her every time you want to go on a date with her. She might hold off on sex saying “I don't want to rush it because you're so special,” when you suspect she had a one-night stand with an Axl Rose impersonator a month before she met you.

At best, you’ll suffer a long series of rejections - mostly silent ones, where your online messages go mostly unread and unreturned, your texts and phone calls fall on deaf ears and your invitations for follow-up dates go into the aether never to be accepted, never really knowing what straw broke her back.

But men have another choice aside from continuing to play by the old rules while women play by the new. Badger describes how men can use game to limit their searching costs:

Pursue a pump-and-dump lifestyle. Go hard into PUA game praxis, building a toolbox of seductive skills in accordance with your God-given personality while you emotionally firewall yourself from the betatizing effects of romance. Pluses of this strategy:

Within five minutes, you’ll know if she has rejected you out of hand.

Within thirty minutes you’ll have a pretty good idea if she finds you attractive.

Within two or three meetings (Mystery posits a seven-hour acculturation period) she’ll sleep with you, if she’s going to sleep with you at all.
Roosh advises this strategy for men in his post The No-Dating Challenge For Intermediate Players:

For three months, I don’t want you to go on a single date with a girl you haven’t already had sex with.

...

I undertook this challenge last summer, and the results were telling: I got more bangs with the prettiest girls than any other summer in DC. Remember that I did all this without having to seduce a girl on a date (the “dates” I went on were with girls I had already defiled).

Note that in this scenario men are both reducing their own investment as well as forcing the woman to bear some of the searching costs. Women who don’t put out in a short period of time are written off by the man, who continues on his low investment search. Putting out becomes a sort of Sexual Market Place (SMP) earnest money, proving that the woman has some, er, well, skin in the game. I suspect the fact that women now bear some of the searching costs is what bothers traditional conservative women so much. It is bad enough that men come in with a lower initial investment, but not allowing women to string along man after man basking in the attention of being eternally chased is unacceptable!

Yet no one seems to come right out and say it. What is striking about the loss of courtship is that:

1. It is largely un-mourned.
2. It was lost by the choices and actions of women, not men.

I suspect there is a relationship between 1 and 2 above, plus a heavy dose of denial. Women fixated on the opportunity to string out the courtship process like an addict looking at a crack pipe. And as with crack, the first hits were free. Young women are diving enthusiastically into the hookup market because while they aren’t getting the full courtship deal, they are getting the excitement of attention from the most popular men.

Not all women looking to extend the courtship process choose to engage in hookups however. On the other end of the spectrum we see religious women saving their virginity (or sort of virginity) through their late twenties and even early thirties. They proudly wear the traditional mantel even though in a traditional society they would be considered old maids for extending their search for a husband for so long. Some of these women are simply too picky and being unrealistic about their own league. Others are also extending the process because at some level they enjoy the process more than they anticipate enjoying being married to their suitor. Other women marry and enjoy the attention, validation, and intense investment which comes with making a lifelong commitment, only to eject from the marriage when they become bored.

Whether the woman is a forever chaste damsel, carousel rider, or divorcée however, she will almost always grow exhausted by her own choice addiction. We hear most often from divorcées, who start with the assumption that their past failure to keep a lifetime promise won’t deter would be suiters from seeing them as a good potential investment for courtship.
The blog *Post Divorce Chronicles* probably sums this frame of mind up best with the post *Divorce: No Stigma – Just Four Rs* (H/T slwerner):

The ideas that have been instilled in society that people who are divorced lack commitment and should feel shame and guilt need to be thrown out. There is no stigma in being divorced - instead, it should be considered an exciting period of rebirth...

Before you were married, you were single. Now that you are no longer married you are “re-singled.” This is where you have come full circle in the life that you were meant to lead.

What a wonderful marketing pitch! Divorce your husband and become re-singled, so men can start courting you again! But as with anything else often reality is different than the exciting brochure. Divorced women and women dating past their early 20s are finding that the men they want to date aren’t willing to foot the searching costs. All of a sudden finding a new mate goes from a process to be savored to an exhausting one. Divorced blogger *Big Little Wolf* describes this in her post Page 19:

You *coffee date* which really ought to be a verb because there’s Coffee Dating at Starbucks and Coffee Dating at Borders and Coffee Dating at Starbucks again because by this time the Bulgarian Barista knows you by name and the Poet Barista knows you from Open Mike Night and you feel safer with this parade of coffee dates at “your” Starbucks and finally one of the dates leads to a little *something* and it’s been years since *anything* and you’re relieved that *something* still works and then there’s a flurry of somethings.

But.

You weary of that pretty quickly because you’re not a kid and you *have* kids and it isn’t really your thing and you’re out of babysitting money anyway and losing your taste for Double Venti Skinny Lattes.

Of course, now the kids fly off for their dad’s wedding and you tell yourself *Okay, maybe he’ll leave me alone*...

She tells us in a separate post that it wasn’t always like this:

Once upon a time, I had a life as a woman. You know. Dates. Romance. Sex. And there were tokens of affection – little notes and cards, love letters, and even flowers. Signs of wooing, and eventually, love.

She isn’t the only divorcée to mourn the loss of courtship. Juliet Jeske describes how men are no longer willing to bear the cost of courtship in her *Huffington Post* article *Dating After Divorce In a City of Sluts* (H/T unclefred). Serial monogamy stops being so enticing when *women* bear the searching costs:

I have made failed attempts of hooking up with partners for something casual, but
every time the results have been disastrous. For the most part I am let down by an experience that was supposed to be fun, and which ends up making my life more complicated….

So I realized, I am not this person, I need to be true to myself so I went back to my committed relationship roots. But no matter how much I keep trying to go for a relationship, the hook-up scenario keeps rearing its ugly head. I might start talking to a guy only to see him leave with a woman who has made it perfectly clear that a hook-up is about to happen. A situation I like to call survival of the sluttiest.

We see the same scenario described in the New York Post article Cheap dates How the ‘price’ of sex has dropped to record lows:

researchers found a full 30% of young men’s sexual relationships involve no romance at all — no wooing, dating, goofy text messaging. Nothing. Just sex.

While this starts off as exciting and fun for young women, before very long they are no longer at the apex of their sexual power and hooking up stops being so appealing. By this time however, it is too late to go back and effectively pursue a traditional strategy. They may find a sucker willing to pay filet mignon prices for ground chuck, but these aren’t the same class of men they could have attracted for marriage or a LTR when they were younger.

What makes all of this more interesting is the slow motion changes to the SMP post sexual revolution. Men have been slow to adjust to women’s changing strategies, and likewise women have been slow to acknowledge that men’s behavior has finally changed. The whole process has taken decades. While hamster driven denial is a stubborn trait, eventually most women will have to acknowledge that men have adjusted and their dream of forever courtship is once again impossible. As this occurs I would expect women to more and more value their existing relationships. Women who overplayed their marriage hand may decide they are lucky to have a LTR at all, especially considering the cost of reentering the SMP looking for another man; serial monogamy just suffered a price shock. I don’t think many women are at this place of understanding yet, but over time it seems all but inevitable.

Flowers image by Ian Muttoo.
Why won’t these Peter Pan manboys man up and marry aging flighty selfish career gal sluts already?

by Dalrock | October 11, 2011 | Link

The funny thing about conservatives is most have no idea they are raving feminists. Part of the problem is that social conservatism is much like a sea anchor. They exert constant force against the prevailing direction of social change, but they aren't anchored to a specific point. At best So Cons will claim they are against feminism, but what they mean are the feminists of today. They have fully bought in with the feminist ideas they fought against 20 years ago.

I think their fundamental problem is they have bought into the lie that you have to be feminist for women to like you. They fear that not being feminist will be a political death sentence with an electorate with a majority of women. It will be interesting to see a new batch of conservative men come into power in the decades to come who have a sound grasp of female psychology in the form of game; they will understand that prostrating yourself in the face of childish demands doesn’t make women like you. In the meantime, we have the old guard of social conservatives who are so clueless they risk becoming caricatures of themselves.

But what would a social conservative who wasn’t a feminist look like? Lacking a defined anchor point to try to move society back to, how would they respond to the world we live in? I think this is an easier question to answer than it might seem at first glance. When they aren’t groveling to feminists, conservatives have a fairly clear cut philosophy. Think about how conservatives view business. They understand the need for fair, predictable, and consistent contract enforcement. Anything less is an obstacle to conducting business. They are acutely aware of unintended consequences. If you want more of something, subsidize and deregulate it. If you want less of it, tax and regulate it.

Fox news has an opinion piece by social conservative Penny Young Nance titled Why Does America Have So Many ‘Peter Pan’ Men? (H/T dragnet). She opens with:

Working in an office full of women, many of whom are young, single gals, I hear all the time, “Where are all the good men out there?” Even in this post-feminist age of asserting independence from men and having both a career and a family, women still want their prince and these days, he can be really tough to find.

If Ms. Nance was a conservative and not a feminist, what she would point out is that it is perfectly fair for women to unilaterally dictate the terms on which they will become wives, but it is also perfectly fair for men to decide what is in their own best interest in response. Women are free to assert their independence; men are free to let them have it. Women are free to try to extend courtship into a lifelong process, but men are free to make their own adjustments. But of course Ms. Nance isn’t a conservative when it comes to issues of the family, she is a feminist.

The feminist in conservative clothing continues:
[Men] have fallen behind in college where women now surpass men in getting their college degrees. These women are getting jobs in the workforce while the men are lingering in dead-end jobs — if they are working at all. While opportunity for women is a good thing, men should not take this as a cue to coast.

Men have fallen behind in college and the workforce? You don’t say? A conservative would look for (and find) government interference and regulation which could be removed to solve the problem. A conservative would also ask why a group of economic actors didn’t feel that expending effort and taking additional risk was worth the reward of doing so. If you told her that entrepreneurs were no longer starting up new businesses, holders of capital were keeping their money on the sideline and corporations weren’t hiring, would she write an opinion piece shaming them, accusing them of coasting? Of course not; that is what the left would do. She would demand lower taxes and less regulation on business. But this isn’t something important like business. This is only the family. If it were important, she would demand the courts stop restricting private parties from mutually defining their own terms upfront on how a potential divorce will be settled. She would push for an overhaul of the overwhelmingly biased custody process, and stop punishing men for marrying when considering the issue of cuckoldry (reproductive fraud). She would want to stop (or at least greatly reduce) subsidizing women who have children out of wedlock or kick the child’s father out of their lives in the form of welfare and child support.

If she were a conservative her shame would be directed at a generation of women who are delaying marriage past their most marriageable years, and the authors of the books which advise them to do so. She would be shaming the women who are making motherhood a last priority. She would be shaming the mothers who raised a generation of sluts who prefer hookups to having a boyfriend instead of shaming the men who don’t feel motivated to work hard to support one of these sluts in a legal arrangement where the deck is stacked entirely against him. And finally she would be shaming a church which is too afraid to hurt the feelings of women who commit divorce theft and feel that they don’t need to compromise at all in marriage.

Like a good leftist, she knows better than individuals how they should lead their lives:

And don’t even get me started on the maturity level of these Peter Pan-like boys. The statistic from Bennett’s book that perhaps struck me the most is that teenage boys, ages 12-to-17 years old, actually spend less time playing video games than 18-to-34-year-old men. I can understand the desire to play a video game here and there as a kid, but as an adult? Grow up.

If she were a conservative her shame would be directed at a generation of women who are delaying marriage past their most marriageable years, and the authors of the books which advise them to do so. She would be shaming the women who are making motherhood a last priority. She would be shaming the mothers who raised a generation of sluts who prefer hookups to having a boyfriend instead of shaming the men who don’t feel motivated to work hard to support one of these sluts in a legal arrangement where the deck is stacked entirely against him. And finally she would be shaming a church which is too afraid to hurt the feelings of women who commit divorce theft and feel that they don’t need to compromise at all in marriage.

Like a good leftist, she knows better than individuals how they should lead their lives:

These men should be studying in college, getting a job, and contributing to society through the workforce and family. How in the world do they have time to play video games for hours? The answer is that they just don’t ever grow up.

She knows more about what is good for them than they do themselves:
men should man up, take on the responsibilities of an adult, get a job, have a family and be a contributing member to society. The benefits to being a married man are huge.

A conservative would ask if the deal is so sweet, why do you have to shame men into it? This idea that men universally benefit from marriage is a So Con unquestioned truth. It is the So Con equivalent to green energy and jobs on the left. Most So Cons ignore the legal nightmare of marriage 2.0 and the very high probability of divorce theft when espousing the benefits of marriage. This is Ms. Nance’s approach. Fellow So Con Dennis Prager takes it a step further, and argues that it is good for men to marry and then have their wives divorce them, even though he acknowledges the extreme bias in the system:

as a rule, it is far better for society to have people marry and divorce than never to marry.

Lest you think Ms. Nance only takes men to task, she takes women to task as well. These independent career gals need to stop discouraging men from opening doors for them and paying on dates, so long as there is no sense of reciprocity. Just because these women play by the new rules, it doesn’t mean they should discourage men from continuing to play by the old rules:

Feminism has been detrimental to the identity of the American male. Men have been rebuked if they pull out a chair or open a door for a woman. If they offer to pay for dinner (which they should), their date may be offended and demand to split the check because she can pay her own way. — Ladies, it’s not such a bad thing to be treated to dinner unless that meal comes with sexual expectations, which is another column.

Ms Nance closes her piece with an acknowledgement that men should make their own choices, so long as they choose what she tells them to:

But women also need to let men be men. Men don’t have to linger between college and well, college, forever. They can make choices to take control of their lives and be the men they are called to be if they just put down the game controls and choose a better direction. Sadly, at the moment, American women are apparently still in need of a few good men.

For a picture of Ms. Nance see Ferdinand’s post on the topic.
Outstanding reader comments
by Dalrock | October 12, 2011 | Link

This is one area where as a blogger I have an embarrassment of riches. Excellent comments are so common that I more often than not don’t acknowledge them even in the discussion itself. There are simply too many great insights to try to acknowledge them all.

As Looking Glass pointed out, this last paragraph from Brendan’s comment on my man up post concisely distilled the issue in just four sentences (emphasis mine):

As for Bennett et al, they would do well to understand that the reason why men are underachieving is because they can. If liberation for women meant liberation from accountability to men, liberation for men meant liberation from responsibility to women. Again, these are two sides of the same coin. For some reason the numbskulls who pass themselves off as public intellectuals in this culture can’t seem to wrap their puny minds around that truism.

As a recovering So Con myself, I will venture that the instinctive So Con response to Brendan’s point is something to the effect of:

 But what if I’m against feminism?

or (more to the point)

 But what if we pretend feminism didn’t happen?

But of course feminism did happen, and denying it or not agreeing with it doesn’t change the fact that it did.

Commenter Woof corrected me on my misinterpretation of Dennis Prager’s position on marriage (followed by divorce) being good for men:

In the text you quote, Dennis Praeger does not argue “that it is good for men to marry and then have their wives divorce them”. He claims instead that it’s good for society. He’s not saying the fatted calf benefits from the slaughter. He’s saying the guests do.

Johnycomelately very kindly characterized my post fisking Ms. Nance with:

WOOOOOSHHHH

That’s the sound Dalrock’s response has to conservatives, just goes over their heads.

I can see their counter, what are you unpatriotic?
As much as I appreciate the intended compliment (and I truly do), I’m hoping that my post will be able to sway at least some social conservatives. I really meant it when I said that they don’t know what raving feminists they are. If you know some diehard So Cons, that probably would be the post to send to them and test their reaction. Realistically nothing I or anyone else can write is likely to change many minds on such strongly held beliefs, but I think if we can point out to So Cons (and everyone else really) that they have unknowingly swallowed feminism whole there will probably be at least a few on the margins who we can swing. We don’t have to win the war of ideas, but it is a nice bonus and hopefully we can speed up the process of returning to sanity.

Chels asked an excellent question:

Most of the MRAs seem to be against traditional gender roles—the man brings in the money, while the woman stays at home, raises children and takes care of her family. I’ve always been curious, what gender roles do you propose? (if any)

I don’t have the time or energy to write a reply which would do this question justice. I had some fun with the question here, and that plus having read some of my other writing hopefully gives you a rough sense of where I’m coming from. I may devote a separate post to this in the coming week or so. What I will say for now at least is that I don’t see us making radical changes in this area. I think there will be and should be plenty of opportunity for men and women to define how they want to live their lives. Some women are born to be CEOs, and I say more power to them. But this doesn’t mean we have to pretend men and women are the same, or that we should deny what we know about the mechanics of male-female relationships, or that we should create lower standards for women in order to make them or politicians feel good. And it doesn’t mean that we should lie to women about the real trade-offs they need to be prepared to make when deciding what they want to do with their lives. It also doesn’t mean we shouldn’t roll back the incredibly biased laws and institutions feminism has erected against men. I’m sure I’m missing a great deal here, but hopefully you get the gist of it at least.
I’ve lost count of the number of commenters who referenced the new *Atlantic* piece by aging feminist Kate Bolick titled *All the single ladies*. Once I clicked on it and started to read it it was instantly clear why so many readers suggested that I look at it. Bolick opens the piece telling us how she broke up with a great man ten years ago when she was 28, because she was suffering from a problem with no name:

My friends, many of whom were married or in marriage-track relationships, were bewildered. I was bewildered. To account for my behavior, all I had were two intangible yet undeniable convictions: something was missing; I wasn’t ready to settle down.

She tells us that she immediately had second thoughts about breaking up with the man she calls “Allan”:

The period that followed was awful. I barely ate for sobbing all the time.

…I feared I would be alone forever. Had I made the biggest mistake of my life?

Ten years later, I occasionally ask myself the same question. Today I am 39

At 28 what she didn’t know was her dating/marriage market power was already on the decline. She had taken it for granted that there would always be another quality man eager to be in a relationship with her, since it had always been this way. Her life was structured as one giant ultimatum to men, who of course she knew with certainty would comply:

We took for granted that we’d spend our 20s finding ourselves, whatever that meant, and save marriage for after we’d finished graduate school and launched our careers, which of course would happen at the magical age of 30. That we would marry, and that there would always be men we wanted to marry, we took on faith. How could we not?

This fantasy world view is now of course being actively sold to young women by women the author’s age. She tells us how her feminist mother used to dress her in shirts with feminist slogans, of the fish/bicycle variety starting in the third grade.

But the core of the story is about the brutal intrusion of reality in the ten years following her decision to kick Allan out of her life with no real reason, shortly after he had moved with her from Boston to New York so she could attend grad school. As I am sure will come as no surprise to my readers Allan of course did just fine without that particular aging feminist in his life. He met and married another woman while Kate bounced from unsuitable man to less suitable man. Like a scene out of a chick flick, Kate found herself tasked with taking the man of her dreams to pick out the suit he would wear to marry another woman. Kate is convinced that this is proof of how strong her post breakup friendship is with Allan as well as his new
wife’s open mindedness. I suspect if we could learn more about Allan’s wife that it would be obvious that it was in fact a cruel joke his younger hotter bride was playing on her vanquished bitter older rival.

when he got engaged, his fiancée suggested that I help him buy his wedding suit. As he and I toured through Manhattan’s men’s-wear ateliers, we enjoyed explaining to the confused tailors and salesclerks that no, no, we weren’t getting married. Isn’t life funny that way?

Funny indeed. She describes the choices available to herself and other women in her situation:

We’ve arrived at the top of the staircase, finally ready to start our lives, only to discover a cavernous room at the tail end of a party, most of the men gone already, some having never shown up—and those who remain are leering by the cheese table, or are, you know, the ones you don’t want to go out with.

Who would ever have thought that picking last when your dating market power is much lower would be a bad thing? Clearly not our intrepid aging feminist Kate.

But this much painful truth with insufficient rationalization is truly dangerous to an aging spinster. Fortunately her hamster rationalizing endorphins kick in before the pain becomes unbearable, and she spins a detailed yarn about how her personal misfortune was caused by tectonic social changes which she was powerless against. I have no question that it would crush her if she had to confront the fact that she failed at something with a 90% success rate for her peers:
A quick look at the chart above makes it clear that while all of the current gnashing of teeth from 40ish spinsters is in response to a minuscule bump in the percent of never married women of that age, the real tectonic shift has yet to be felt. Like she did at the same age, the women currently postponing marriage are certain that a worthy husband and father for their children will instantly appear once they are ready to make him an accessory to their fabulous lives. They assume that marriage is theirs merely for the taking. This nonchalance by women regarding marriage is widely misunderstood however. The great lie of our day is that women don’t really value marriage, and that tens of thousands of years of programming to fear spinsterhood has magically been erased. But the already hysterical cries over a small sliver of 40ish white women in the US who haven’t married expose the lie. Kate gets tantalizingly close to this truth when considering history, although she mistakes primal programming as being purely economically motivated (emphasis mine):

...in 1860, there were 104 marriageable white men for every 100 white women; in 1870, that number dropped to 87.5. A generation of Southern women found
themselves facing a “marriage squeeze.” They could no longer assume that they would become wives and mothers—a terrifying prospect in an era when women relied on marriage for social acceptability and financial resources.

Speaking through this long lost generation of women is easier than admitting her own fears, so she projects her voice onto them:

they were forced to ask themselves: Will I marry a man who has poor prospects (“marrying down,” in sociological parlance)? Will I marry a man much older, or much younger? Will I remain alone, a spinster? Diaries and letters from the period reveal a populace fraught with insecurity.

The parallels between the two postwar periods are uncanny, one a Civil War between men of the North and the South, and another a civil war between men and women (or more accurately waged by women against bewildered men). Like the current post civil war period, in the past there was mass hysteria by women even when roughly 90% of white women were still able to marry:

Their fears were not unfounded—the mean age at first marriage did rise—but in time, approximately 92 percent of these Southern-born white women found someone to partner with. The anxious climate, however, as well as the extremely high levels of widowhood—nearly one-third of Southern white women over the age of 40 were widows in 1880—persisted.

The crucial difference being that in this postwar period instead of a glut of widows unable to remarry, today we have a glut of divorced women unable to remarry. However in both cases the glut was a direct result of the nature of the war. Men were killed in large numbers in the Civil War, while most men who are casualties of the war of women against men find themselves divorced and expelled from their families. One striking difference is the women without men today are almost exclusively so due to their own selfish choices. Instead of their would be husbands having died in a far off battlefield, most of these women killed their own marriages in divorce court, in a futile effort to celebrate the mythical Sex and the City lifestyle. By the time they realized the folly of their ways, it was too late. Now as the AARP survey tells us, most of them are slated for a life of unimaginable loneliness (emphasis mine):

Almost 9 in 10 men (87%) dated after their divorce, compared to 8 in 10 women (79%)... Among those who dated after the divorce, more than half of men (54%) but fewer women remarried (39%). (Page 39)

Many women, especially those who have not remarried (69%), do not touch or hug at all sexually. An even larger majority of women who have not remarried do not engage in sexual intercourse (77% saying not at all), in comparison with about half of men (49%) who have not remarried. (Page 6)

She continues on, comparing the current situation with other historic catastrophes. She compares the great spinsterhood today with the post WWII shattered Soviet Union. In doing so she stumbles on another accidentally relevant parallel. As the Soviet state jealously
crushed the rights of men as husbands and fathers, the men found themselves no longer obligated to act in those roles:

...men moved at will from house to house, where they were expected to do nothing and were treated like kings; a generation of children were raised without reliable fathers, and women became the “responsible” gender.

But even imagining herself as the heroine of some sweeping historical drama and not the victim of her own bad choices is not enough to dull the pain. Her hamster kicks in after she details how all the men she really wants feel no need to commit since they are now the scarce commodity. She promises herself that there are hordes of worthy men eager to win the prize of her commitment to them:

another of my anecdotal-research discoveries is of what an ex calls “marriage o’clock”—when a man hits 35 and suddenly, desperately, wants a wife. I’ll never forget the post-first-date e-mail message reading: “I wanted to marry you last night, just listening to you.” Nor the 40-ish journalist who, on our second date, driving down a long country road, gripped the steering wheel and asked, “Are you The One? Are you The One?” (Can you imagine a woman getting away with this kind of behavior?) Like zealous lepidopterists, they swoop down with their butterfly nets, fingers aimed for the thorax, certain that just because they are ready for marriage and children, I must be, too.

If any of you happen to speak to Ms. Bolick, please reassure her that she can now rest easy; any men anxious to marry and have children are aware of her rapidly declining fertility and can do the math. She is finally safe from their butterfly nets.

As many have noted Ms. Bolick references fellow manosphere blogger Susan Walsh of Hooking Up Smart. Unfortunately Ms. Bolick managed to terribly misunderstand Susan’s very clear description of what is going on on college campuses*. Instead of acknowledging the mechanics of hypergamy where 20% of the men are having sex with 80% of the women, she contorts it to:

...only 20 percent of the men (those considered to have the highest status) are having 80 percent of the sex, with only 20 percent of the women (those with the greatest sexual willingness); the remaining 80 percent, male and female, sit out the hookup dance altogether.

While she has a mental block when it comes to hypergamy, she does recognize the loss of courtship. Susan has written her own take on the article, which includes a very active discussion in the comments.

*Edit: Susan has clarified that she has changed her view on the statistics. See her comment below for details.
Do women want to get married?
by Dalrock | October 16, 2011 | Link

Several of the commenters in the discussion on my post All the lonely feminist spinsters challenged my assertion that women want to get married. Krakonos accused me of being old fashioned:

You seem to be trapped in old fashioned thinking. First of all you suppose the women will want to get married. No, they will just become single mothers. With enough single mothers in society the government has no option but provide for them whatever it costs, literally (even things like destruction of society). Second thing you suppose is monogamy. This is false even these days. If you look at male part of the marriage charts, you will see significantly more never married men then women (in 30s and 40s). It proves existence of serial monogamy – factual polygyny. It is not too far away polygyny is institutionalised in the west.

Women cannot lose, only society can (compared to other societies).

Zed was a little more circumspect:

Frankly, I don’t think you understand the point of view of women delaying marriage well enough to talk about it.

As I said in the original post:

The great lie of our day is that women don’t really value marriage, and that tens of thousands of years of programming to fear spinsterhood has magically been erased.

The proof of this is overwhelming. Kate Bolick was a fish/bicycle feminist starting in the third grade, yet she tells us in the article that she always planned to marry at 30. The whole article is about how much she regrets not having married, although she doesn’t come out and say it. Why else would she devote so much time to the man who got away, the man she took shopping for the outfit he would wear while marrying another woman? Does anyone who read that doubt that this crushed her?

But it isn’t just Kate. As Zed can attest, the women who are 40ish now grew up steeped in feminism from day one. Yet 90% of white women of the same age in the US have married. This isn’t 90% of white women who said they wanted to marry, excluding the morbidly obese, lesbians, homely women, and hairy legged feminists. This is 90% of all white women by age 40. Think about this. How deep did some of those women have to dig to make sure they didn’t lose out on their ceremonial trip down the aisle?

And as Interested pointed out, all of the young women Kate spoke with at Susan’s house were horrified at the idea of not being able to eventually marry. From the original Atlantic article:

...when I asked if they wanted to get married when they grew up, and if so, at what
age, to a one they answered “yes” and “27 or 28.”...

“Take a look at me,” I said. “I’ve never been married, and I have no idea if I ever will be. There’s a good chance that this will be your reality, too. Does that freak you out?”

Again they nodded.

“I don’t think I can bear doing this for that long!” whispered one, with undisguised alarm.

I REMEMBER EXPERIENCING THAT same panicked exhaustion around the time I turned 36, at which point I’d been in the dating game for longer than that alarmed 22-year-old had, and I wanted out.

Again, the author is a fish/bicycle feminist from early childhood; she has her advanced degree and her high status job as a writer in the big city. What she doesn’t have is a husband and a baby, and this is killing her. It isn’t that she didn’t want marriage, it is that she thought it would always be there for the taking. The idea that it might not be is what freaked the young women out at Susan’s house.

On the subject of babies, Krakonos asserted that the women will just become single mothers. From a practical (male) perspective this might make sense, but from a status (female) perspective it misses the mark by a mile. Having a child out of wedlock is low class. The aversion by non low class women in the US to have children out of wedlock shows up in the data I shared previously:

On the subject of babies, Krakonos asserted that the women will just become single mothers. From a practical (male) perspective this might make sense, but from a status (female) perspective it misses the mark by a mile. Having a child out of wedlock is low class. The aversion by non low class women in the US to have children out of wedlock shows up in the data I shared previously:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Ever Married</th>
<th>Never Married</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school grad</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced degree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Women in general want:

1. Sex from the most attractive, powerful, highest status man they can get.
2. Maximum investment and commitment from a man (love, courtship, romance, his
3. Children.

What often throws men off when considering this is that if women can’t get all of the above from the same man (plan A), they will often resort to getting these things from different men (plan B). But this doesn’t change the fact that plan A is the preferred plan. Slutting around with alphas who won’t commit and then marrying a beta provider at the last minute isn’t plan A. The sluts would far prefer to have the investment and commitment come from the alphas, as Roissy points out in The Duke Rejection List (crass site warning):

this chick was rejected by each and every one of these high status men she banged.

“But how can that be?”, some of the duller among you will ask. “None of the men turned her down for sex.”

Don’t you know it’s different for women? Failing to get laid is not how women are rejected; they are rejected when they don’t receive romance, love, and long term commitment from the men who f*** them.

The reason women don’t want to commit while seeking commitment from the man is not because they want to hop from man to man. It is because they are afraid they will want another man more down the road. Paige described this mindset perfectly in her comment on my post The ethics of pump-n-dump:

Relating Pump-n-Dumping to Serial Monogamy assumes more self-awareness in the woman than she actually has. At the beginning the woman is convinced she will be in-love forever...if the romantic feelings decline she believes the relationship is no longer worthwhile for either partner. But she doesn’t just assume at the beginning that this will happen.

Susan described this in the comments section of the last post:

In fact, young women do want boyfriends, they’re just not seeking to march down the aisle right away. The average woman will spend 8 years between high school and marriage. Dalrock has written before about LTRs not being a form of real commitment, and I agree. Still, many college women do want LTRs – they want serial monogamy. I am speaking in the abstract here, not describing who they want. That is another question.

What is unspoken is that these women are holding out for a bigger better deal. The longer they delay marriage, in their mind the more courtship they can accrue and the better man they can expect to marry. Just because the idea is absurd, it doesn’t mean they aren’t thinking this way. The only thing which keeps women from extending their search forever is the fear of losing the option to choose. This fear is the foundation of endless chick flick and chick lit plots, and the reason the label of spinster hasn’t lost it’s massive punch to women in this “enlightened” age. Note that both Kate Bolick and the girls at Susan’s house expressed feeling this terror. The only thing which holds this terror at bay is the expectation that the woman can get off the carousel at any time she wants. So long as she believes that all she
has to do to get married is click her heels together three times and say \textit{there's no place like home} and poof she is married, she can keep the terror at bay and feels safe remaining on the carousel. Take this comfort away, and you are left with sheer panic.

This panic has always been there and will always be there; all that is different today is \textit{when} this panic tends to set in. In previous generations young women feared being left behind in the great husband hunt as early as high school. As they witnessed other young women paring off with the best men in serious relationships with the potential to lead to marriage, they were motivated to do the same. Over time this was pushed out to just after high school, then college graduation, and eventually met the fairly immovable boundary of their declining fertility in their 30s. This fear is what keeps women from aimlessly searching forever for the mythical better man they know has been secretly pining away for her, but for some reason hasn't yet appeared in her life.

The extended delay of the timing of this alarm for women is why ordinary high school and college men today find it so difficult to find a woman who wants to be in a relationship. So long as they aren't faced with an immediate need to secure commitment and investment from a real life man, many women are content to live in a fantasy world where a \textit{long list of poor to mediocre choices magically leads to the best option imaginable}. Ordinary men are mentally compared to the fantasy man, and of course can't hope to compete. Only the fear of losing the option to choose brings these women down into the real world, where their own attractiveness determines the quality of man they can attract.
Our daughter is of the misconception that I can fix anything. Whenever anything is broken, she says to my wife:

| Don’t worry, daddy can fix it! |

This came out in an unexpected way the other day when the two of them were out looking at garage sales. The hostess of one of the sales commented that her cell phone wasn’t working any more. Our daughter offered helpfully:

| You should have your husband fix it. |

The hostess replied in a stern but somewhat embarrassed tone:

| I’m divorced! |

Our daughter replied with a frown:

| Oh, I’m sorry. |
The endless courtship fantasy.
by Dalrock | October 20, 2011 | Link

Commenter Desiderius pointed out a very common movie theme in the comments to my post Do women want to get married:

If I’m the only one seeing this phenomenon, why does it show up in so many movies targeted at males? Moneyball, 2012, War of the Worlds, Lincoln Lawyer, that train movie with Denzel, etc..

All alphas with a heart of Light Triad rejected by hot wife/girlfriend who is often now with total herb and longing for the alpha back. Kids want mommy and daddy back together.

While I disagree with his characterization of the women in these movies as typically “hot”, this theme is so common as to be painfully cliché. At one level I think this is just Hollywood selling divorce. The women in the audience see the divorcée as being empowered, and can revel in the divorcée’s opportunity to prolong the choice. Pushing the eject button has no risk for her, since her ex husband remains available in an endless waiting pattern should she find herself terribly alone. This is no doubt reassuring to the Future Divorcées of America Club members in the audience, because the husband is almost always shown as more attractive than the ex/estranged wife. He is also generally shown as still fulfilling the husband’s role of protector, even though she is no longer fulfilling the role of his wife. Additionally, the divorce in these movies is almost always hinted as the “I’m not haaaaapy” variety of divorce. Hollywood shows these frivolous divorcées as being empowered, enjoying the full security benefits associated with remaining married, as well as never being negatively judged for failing to keep their lifetime commitment.

All of this is sufficient explanation to see why Hollywood writers would want to push this message. As with the rest of the media, they are enthusiastic marketers of divorce. But I think there is another reason why this particular theme is so popular. This also plays into the endless courtship fantasy. The husband is essentially forced to reprove his worthiness to her all over again. Typically he is required to perform a feat of daring or great cunning (or both) in order to rescue her, or at the very least prove himself to her. He is also shown actively seeking her affection in the process. We can see this in many examples (plot spoilers for *Diehard 1 & 2, Killshot, Unstoppable*, and *Fireproof* to follow):

**Die Hard**: Bruce Willis’ character (John McClane) travels across the country in an attempt to reconcile with his estranged wife (played by a frumpy actress 7 years his senior) who is not haaaapy. Once he arrives she is taken captive by a gang of international terrorists. McClane single handedly defeats the terrorist gang and rescues his frumpy old estranged wife.

**Die Hard 2**: Online summaries suggest that McClane is now back together with his wife, but as I recall it they were still shown as at least having problems. At the very least this is an extension of the original movie’s courtship following her not being haaaapy. Terrorists strike again while McClane is waiting for his wife’s flight to arrive, and he is forced once again to
perform superhuman feats to save her.

**Killshot:** Thomas Jane’s character (Wayne) has been kicked out of the house by his not haaaapy estranged wife Carmen (played by Diane Lane, 4 years his senior) after he lost his job. Armed men (one a mafia hitman) show up at Carmen’s workplace, posing a threat to Carmen. Wayne is coincidentally there and lures the two dangerous men out into the parking lot and defeats the men single handedly armed only with an iron rod. The couple is forced into witness relocation together, where Wayne continues to woo his wife in an attempt to reconcile. Carmen ultimately rejects him again and returns home without him once the FBI tells them it is safe. The FBI had been fooled however, and Carmen is held captive by the two men and under direct threat. Wayne travels to Carmen and yet again saves the day.

**Unstoppable:** Will Colson (Chris Pine) teams up with Frank Barnes (Denzel Washington) to stop a runaway train. Will is estranged from his wife Darcy (Jessy Schram), who took out a restraining order following Will threatening a man she provoked him into believing she was cheating with. In this case the wife is actually hot and played by an actress who is 6 years younger than the actor. Will and Frank have to risk their lives to prevent the train from crashing, preventing a major disaster which would have threatened Darcy as well as Will and Darcy’s young son.

**Fireproof:** This is the Christian contribution to the endless courtship genre, and is celebrated as exemplifying modern Christian’s commitment to marriage. Hero fireman Caleb Holt (Kirk Cameron) must convince his wife Catherine (Erin Bethea) not to frivolously divorce him. To do so he undertakes a 40-day test to prove his worthiness to his unhaaaapy wife. While he is doing this his wife is busy flirting with other men, and is no longer wearing her wedding ring. A doctor she is flirting with unexpectedly learns that she is married when the hero arrives at the hospital with an injured arm after rescuing a young girl. From the plot summary on Wikipedia:

> As he continues his 40-day challenge, Caleb begins doing more household chores and running more errands for Catherine, and leaves her roses. Caleb even smashes his computer to pieces with a baseball bat in order to remove the temptation of viewing internet pornography. Nevertheless, Catherine, who is led by some colleagues to think that Caleb did all these things with an ulterior motive in mind, is still intent on divorce. When she later learns that the equipment needed for her mother’s medical care has been paid for in full, she arranges a lunch date with Dr. Keller, thinking he was the benefactor. Caleb discovers Dr. Keller’s relationship with Catherine and immediately informs him that he won’t let him have Catherine without a fight. Catherine’s friends misinterpret the confrontation as a threat, but they do not tell her since the Holts’ marriage doesn’t concern them. Dr. Keller (who is actually married) breaks off his relationship with Catherine.

Eventually Caleb completes the test to his whorish wife’s satisfaction, and she gladly takes him back.

All of these movies are a play on the mythological theme where the hero must accomplish some great feat to woo his would be wife. However, in these cases the hero has already wooed her; she just turned out to be flaky. He finds himself having to woo her again, and
again, and very often the hero still faces rejection at the end of the story or at the very least ambivalence.

More straightforward versions of the endless courtship fantasy theme are the movies 50 First Dates and Groundhog Day. In these movies there is a plot device which causes the man to have to continuously start over, re-wooing the woman each day because she has no recollection of his past efforts at courtship.

I suspect that movies with this theme if anything will become even more popular as women slowly recognize that they have cut open the goose which laid the courtship golden egg.
One of the more common misconceptions in the manosphere is that women don’t place any cachet in being married. A surprising number of men have inadvertently swallowed the feminist misdirection on this issue. This is somewhat understandable, since there is a paradox involved here. Yes women are divorcing frivolously at alarming rates as well as delaying marriage. Yes most women seem to enjoy (or are at least very open to) messages glorifying divorce as empowerment. But anyone who has studied game even a little knows that what women want doesn’t always make sense from a man’s perspective. An obvious case in point is that women want commitment from an attractive man, despite the fact that a man offering commitment tends to make the man less attractive to women (but it does build comfort).

Even prior to my coming to the manosphere my wife has pointed out the cachet the term husband has with women. Very often when women invoke the term there is a subtle status message, a sort of bragging right. The wife of one newlywed couple we met on a cruise several years ago used the term fairly conspicuously in this way, although many would likely have missed the subtext.

One way my wife uses the cachet of the term is when other women are trying to pressure her into something she doesn’t want to do. She has found that if she tells a saleswoman she doesn’t like a particular scent, for example, that the woman will just continue trying to talk her into it. The same goes for girlfriends trying to talk her into a different style or a new product. One day a woman was trying to sell her something that she knew I wouldn’t like, so she said My husband wouldn’t like that. The phrase was like a magic incantation; the saleswoman immediately dropped the issue. She has found it works just as well with girlfriends. It is the one thing which will stop the constant pressure from other women to get her to conform on something.

Just the other week my wife was looking at Halloween candy at Oriental Trading Company. She noticed that many of the reviews showed a kind of wifely pride which many in the manosphere wouldn’t believe is possible. One woman shared her thoughts on Oozing Eyeballs:

I was alittle disappointed in these because I purchased them to put on top of cupcakes. I thought the eyeball design was on the product, but it’s on the package. My husband says they taste good though...

And another review on the same product:

Actually my husband requested these. We bought them several years ago and he ate them ALL before Halloween!!! So, bought them just for him this year.

Somewhere a feminist’s head just exploded. But what can they do? They’ve already tried moxie.
That women can take pride in their men and the inherent status for women associated with relationships is denied by feminists and many MRAs alike. Denied or not, it remains the truth. Heartiste touched on this in a recent addition to the collection of Maxims:

Maxim #1(a)(2): Men want to be turned on by their women. Women want to be proud of their men.

What do I mean by proud? It doesn’t necessarily mean she’s proud of your career success. It could mean something as simple and endearing as installing a mantle over her fireplace, so that when her girl friends come over for a party and ask about the fantastic looking mantle, she can tell them, with no uncertain amount of swelling pride, that her boyfriend did it. For her.

This is undoubtedly true, but husband would carry much more cachet than boyfriend when she is talking to another woman. What woman can’t even get a boyfriend, after all? Even the term fiancé has lost its value over time because so often there really is no commitment involved. Ironically as women on average spend a smaller and smaller percentage of their adult lives as wives, having a husband if anything is growing in status. Not only does it signify the ultimate in investment/commitment from a man, but it is now somewhat rare as well.

Related: Intrasexual Competition and the Strong Independent Woman.
Susan Walsh of *Hooking Up Smart* took a high volume of aimed fire in the comments section of my post *All the lonely feminist spinsters*. I’m still working on my take on the 80/20 question the dogpile discussion was about. To Susan’s great credit she hung in there and defended her own point of view. Following that she even had some fun with it in her own post titled *Dating Back in the Day*:

Yesterday commenters on another blog described *Hooking Up Smart* as a finishing school for hos, and me the headmistress who hasn’t been on a date since the Eisenhower era.

I’m about to turn 55 – there’s no question that my knowledge of hookup culture is entirely second hand, thankfully. Just for fun I’ve put together some images that describe my prime dating years.

In the discussion on that post the conversation turned to the topic of men refusing to date women they haven’t already had sex with. I summarized my argument from my recent post *SMP searching costs and the unmourned death of courtship*. After reading this, commenter *Megaman* galloped into the conversation:

Very romantic. This seems ideal for a demanding boyfriend who wants a desperate girlfriend.

Seriously though, if the woman gives the man what he wants first, what guarantee does she have that there will be any dates? This sounds more like dangling a carrot, so to speak. A pretense to get her into bed, nothing more. I can understand feeling resentful for being strung along (never had that experience), but to assume every woman will act that way seems extremely paranoid. It’s seems doubtful that guys who use this method actually want a serious relationship. I’ve never met one who did.

I reiterated my basic point, explaining that past a certain age the women who are likely to form lasting commitments have generally already done so:

Many women are looking to swing from man to man in “serial monogamy”, which is the female preferred form of promiscuity. Plus you have women abusing the courtship tradition. Susan referenced a woman in a post a while back who had been on *87 first dates in two years*. Men don’t do that, because they foot the bill both financially and emotionally in that situation. Smart men will get wise to this and not waste their time with this sort of woman. The best way to manage this is to make sure she is taking some of the risk. Sex in the uncommitted market (which is what we are talking about, these aren’t Amish women choosing a husband) works as a sort of relationship earnest money. It separates the serious buyers from the lookilos, and proves the woman has some skin in the game before the man invests.
in her emotionally and financially.

Susan replied with an excellent question:

Do you think that a man will ever invest in her emotionally? Will he not hold that easy access against her, earnest or no, because it looks like (maybe is) promiscuity?

This really is an excellent question. My best guess is emotional investment from men is highly unlikely. I base this on the woman in question’s past history. After divorcing at 45, Ginger Emas tells us on her Huffington Post profile that she went on a manhunt:

In the years since her divorce she’s been called a muse, a MILF and a cougar; she’s sped through speed dating and been unlocked at lock-and-key parties. She went on 87 first dates in two years, joined half a dozen dating websites and received 48,000 views on Match.com -- the groundwork for Back on Top.

After failing to make a committed connection with nearly 50,000 men (nearly a hundred of whom she went on dates with), Ms. Emas felt like she had become an expert on women finding commitment after divorce; so she wrote a book. To be fair, she had even more experience than the quote above references. She also had a great deal of previous experience:

Ginger left her corporate job to move to Atlanta, telling everyone she wanted to go out on her own, but the truth is she had dated all of the eligible men in the tri-city Mecklenburg area and needed a larger pool. She met and married her husband in Atlanta, but after thirteen years of marriage (and 14 years of couples counseling) they divorced, and Ginger lost a husband but created a divorce so friendly that her dad often forgets she’s no longer married.

This isn’t dating, this is an industrial scale mining operation.
So this brings us back to Susan’s question; how likely is a lasting emotional attachment? Based on the sheer numbers of men this woman doesn’t connect with, I would say for any given man the likelihood is vanishingly small. Granted not all women operate on this scale. But if you are a man in this kind of dating environment, the sheer numbers of dates women like this rack up means they are the ones men are most likely to encounter. We’ve seen this before with the dater from More judging the performance. She went on over 100 dates in just one year, and is still at it. Blogger Big Little Wolf doesn’t tell us in her post Page 19 how many men she has dated looking for one she can have a connection with, but she does tell us that it is enough to leave her exhausted.

The other part of the equation is who will form an emotional attachment first, thereby taking on the emotional risk? Women who are waiting for emotional attachment before offering sex are requiring the man to prove his emotional investment upfront. This is the whole point. But these same women are going through large (sometimes massive) numbers of men in the process. They expect each man to try to develop an emotional connection with her so she can determine if she wants to have sex with them and/or form some sort of uncommitted relationship. From her point of view, this is rational. Moving the risk to another party makes sense, especially in such an incredibly low yield activity. But it is just as rational for men in this scenario to want to do the same.

Mining picture by Randi Ang (more info).
Thoughts on the 80/20 college hookup question.
by Dalrock | October 23, 2011 | Link

In the conclusion to my post All the lonely feminist spinsters I mistakenly stated that Kate Bolick had misquoted Susan Walsh on the statistics of the college sexual marketplace (SMP). It turns out that I was incorrect, and that Susan’s view of this has changed. Initially Susan believed that 20% of the men on campus were sexually monopolizing 80% of the women. She shared this perspective in a youtube video which I previously embedded here. Since then she has reviewed the data on this at the urging of some of her readers, and has changed her opinion on the question. She describes her thought process here, but her conclusion is that:

20% of both women and men are quite promiscuous, and that 80% of women and men are very dissatisfied in this SMP.

The essential distinction for Susan is whether the 80% of women who she identifies as not highly promiscuous are in fact having sex with the top 20% of men or not. She clarified this in a comment defending her position a bit further down:

...as Badger claims, 80% of women give “disproportionate attention” to 20% of the men. I don’t doubt that if you asked every woman on campus who she’d most like to get with, 20% would get the most votes. That is not the same thing as what percentage of women are having sex with those 20%. This question of semantics is critical.

This sparked a heated debate with a number of my readers. Commenter Basil Ransom did his own analysis of the data, and concluded that it wasn’t trustworthy enough to draw any hard conclusions from. I think there is general agreement that the available data on partner counts is very problematic. I haven’t taken the time to dive into the data myself, in large part because I don’t believe that it is credible enough to provide greater clarity.

Perhaps more importantly, I don’t think the passionate disagreement from many of my readers is truly about the data, since unreliable data can’t be used to bolster either side’s views. I also don’t think the core disagreement is with Susan’s assertion that 80% of the women in college are very dissatisfied with the hookup culture. I think the frustration is that the original 80/20 representation, while likely flawed numerically, provided a generally accurate impression of the basic dysfunction taking place in the college SMP. Leaving aside the actual numbers, I do think that a large number of college women are ignoring average (beta) college men and only considering a small group of the most attractive men (alphas). Susan’s re-characterization of the numbers is most problematic because it gives the impression that 80% of college women aren’t focused on the alphas, but that somehow they can’t connect with the betas they crave so much.

To reiterate, to the extent that I am correct in my argument immediately above, this isn’t really an argument about the correct data/statistics. One could accept Susan’s interpretation of the data entirely and still vehemently disagree with her on her conclusion about how this describes the college SMP.
I think the final conclusion Susan draws is the true weakness in her argument. If 80% of men and women are left out of the SMP, one side or the other (or both) must be refusing to connect with their SMP counterparts. Someone must be holding out. Young people will naturally pair off even in the total absence of a functioning courtship tradition. While I can’t prove this with data, I believe that the holding out is being done by the women. The alternative is to believe that the beta men are refusing to match up with their SMP peers (the female 80%), and instead are holding out for the most slutty 20% of women. I posed this challenge to Susan in the discussion of one of her blog posts:

I think suggesting that 80% of college women are “sitting out” the carousel because they aren’t having frequent sex with alphas is misleading, but I also don’t think that is your intent. The economist in me sees a market that won’t clear, and I think we would agree that it is the women who are holding out; I don’t think the 80% of men on the sidelines are there because they are holding out for the sluttiest 20% of women. The original 80/20 stat captures this sense, even if not all of the 80% of women are racking up douche-bag frequent flier miles.

Susan agreed that the beta men weren’t likely doing this. She pointed out that the culture has feminized men and masculinized women, which has created an attraction mismatch (I agree). She also thinks that something else in the dysfunctional SMP is keeping a large percentage of college women away from the beta men they really want. She sees this as an opportunity (emphasis mine):

I agree that 80% of men are not holding out for the sluttiest women. Female commenters sometimes claim that unattractive males demand hot female companions, but that is not my sense at all. If anything, I’ve learned that men are quite malleable in their perception of female attractiveness [Good news for us!]

I also believe that quite a few women are what we might call “beta females.” They would no sooner bang a frat star as climb Mt. Everest. They would love to meet a nice, earnest boy. These are not the women who appreciate Dark Triad traits. So there is a real opportunity, I am certain! To get these beta women with beta guys. But right now they’re like the kids at the middle school dance standing against the wall and not interacting. We have to find a way to bridge that gap. Or they do.

I think Susan is right that there are a significant group of women who aren’t pursuing alphas. However, I don’t think that these women are being prohibited from finding suitable beta mates. I think these women are operating outside of the visible SMP. They aren’t hooking up, and they very likely aren’t going on many “dates”. Despite all of the dysfunction in our culture, young women interested in long term relationships and especially marriage are still in a very fortunate position in the SMP. They can pair up with men their own age or men who are older than themselves, and are at the height of their attractiveness. Additionally, a young woman looking for a mate has the numbers in her favor. Because there are slightly more boys born than girls, and because women tend to prefer to marry men who are older than them, there are more young single men than young single women. The numbers advantage is even bigger however, since a large percentage of women are not interested in the majority
of men at this time. Young women looking for a husband are essentially able to find them at fire sale prices.

In addition to the three advantages mentioned above, young women looking for a mate have another great advantage; they are surrounded by large numbers of single men their own age and older in normal social settings (work, school, church, etc). This allows them to gain the benefits of casting a wide net, without dating large numbers of men or going to keg parties and/or bars to meet men. There is nothing magic about eating dinner or watching a movie with someone which allows us to get to know them.

Take a young woman like Susan described (not chasing alphas, attracted to beta men in their own league), and she is bound to find a man to pair off with. While these women don’t attract much attention when the dating scene is being discussed, they definitely show up in the numbers. The same US Census data which shows that many more women than in the past are postponing marriage also shows that a significant number of women are still marrying in their early 20s:
The age brackets in the data above make it impossible to know the exact percent of women who married at any given age. However, I think the figures for each bracket very likely are close to the figures for the average age in each bracket. Therefore, we might assume that roughly 22% of 22.5 year old white women in the US have already married, and roughly 56% of 27.5 year old white women in the US have married. If you wanted to tune this a bit to account for the fact that marriages are likely taking place at a faster pace in the end of each bracket than in the beginning, we might adjust these estimates out another 6 months, which would give us 22% of white women marrying on or before their 23rd birthday and 56% of white women marrying on or before their 28th birthday. Any way you slice the data however, a large percentage of women are still marrying in their early 20s.

This is important because marriage is typically preceded by several years of engagement in the monogamous relationship SMP. A woman who marries on her 23rd birthday will generally have spent several years assessing her options, finding the right man, getting to know him, being engaged, etc. Riding the carousel not only doesn’t bring her any closer to marriage, it generally will make this goal harder to achieve since it will inhibit her ability to bond with a
prospective husband.

The weakness of the census data is that it doesn’t just focus on women in the college SMP, which is where the 80/20 assertion has been made. I did some searching on this and found statistics specific to college graduates in the paper Who’s Getting Married? Education and Marriage Today and in the Past by Stevenson and Isen:

College-educated women rapidly began postponing marriage after birth control became widely available. In 1970 the vast majority of those who would ever marry had done so by age 25. This was even true among college-graduates, for whom nearly three-quarters had married by age 25. By 1980, only about half had done so and that proportion fell further to around a third in 2008. In comparison 90% of 25-year-old high school graduates had married in 1970 and this fell only slightly to 83% in 1980. The postponement in marriage among white high school graduates has happened only recently with a fall from nearly three-quarters marrying by age 25 in 1990, to only half having done so last year.

So roughly a third of women who graduate from college are married by age 25. I would suggest that this isn’t a group of carousellers suddenly snagging a beta provider for marriage. They don’t fit with the description of carousellers in the manosphere, since they are marrying in their early 20s. As I mentioned before, the year a woman marries represents the end of a process which likely started several years earlier. The vast majority of these women must have been involved with betas while still in college.

But this still leaves two thirds of college women unaccounted for. A small group of them likely are in the same camp as the women who are married by 25; they just haven’t married yet. I would guess that the bulk of the remainder however are either active carousel riders, or passive ones. One of Susan’s recent posts has an example of what I would consider a passive rider of the carousel. She quotes a letter from a 22 year old virgin to Dear Margo:

I chose not to lose my virginity in high school; my mother always told me not to settle. I went to college, and a voice in my head told me to wait. I was not interested in one-night stands in a fraternity house. I was mysterious, an enigma.

The “virgin thing” went from enigma to stigma in the real world. I’ve been working for a year, and I’m 22 and still a virgin. My confidence makes me attractive to men, and I have a head-turning, Kim Kardashian figure. Desirable men flirt with me, but I know they are only after one thing. Men don’t ask me on dates; they just invite me to their humble abodes. I don’t accept any of these offers because of my “secret.” All I really want is for someone to see me for me.

The only men this woman is aware of are player types. In her world, beta men simply don’t exist. I would say this woman is passively riding the carousel without even knowing it, as are undoubtedly many others.

Note: I was hesitantly to reopen this topic yet again as the discussion in the last two posts which touched on this turned in large part to personal attacks on Susan. However, I think it makes sense to go ahead and get this out now verses dig it up again at a later date and I do
think the basic question is worthy of discussion. Feel free to disagree vigorously with Susan’s analysis and/or position, but personal attacks on Susan or her blog will be deleted and the commenter posting them will be placed in moderation. There has been plenty of opportunity to air these opinions.
Sudden outbreak of patriarchy in the occupy wallstreet camp.

by Dalrock | October 24, 2011 | Link

Several readers have pointed out the news stories on the woman who has ditched her roles as wife and mother for the excitement of tramping around in the Occupy Wall Street movement. Even Captain Capitalism saw this story and was kind enough to think of me. The story is like wildfire in the media, with multiple outlets telling the same basic story as the NY Post does in its piece Florida banker’s wife left family to join Wall Street protesters:

A married mother of four from Florida ditched her family to become part of the raggedy mob in Zuccotti Park — keeping the park clean by day and keeping herself warm at night with the help of a young waiter from Brooklyn.

“I’m not planning on going home,” an unapologetic Stacey Hessler, 38, told The Post yesterday.

“I have no idea what the future holds, but I’m here indefinitely. Forever,”

Stories like this are almost too easy to take apart, as they so often follow the same script; flighty middle aged woman decides she isn’t haaaapy and abandons her husband and children, with the lack of foresight to consider the long term implications of her choice. At some point it almost becomes unsporting. What strikes me about this story and the Occupy Wall Street movement as a whole however is how quickly traditional gender roles have sprouted up in this oh so enlightened community. This woman is a prime example of this. While presumably fleeing the confining bourgeois roles of wife and mother, she immediately cozies up to another man*. Where’s the free love? Why would a protesting fish immediately acquire a bicycle?

One likely reason is the general lack of security in the camp itself. It turns out that a mob of anarchists can at times be somewhat unstable. The hard left finds its romanticism of the homeless and disdain for institutions of harnessed male power in direct contradiction. News stories like this one and this one tell us how the movement has created a security nightmare by inviting the homeless into the camp. We learn of nighttime shouting matches over property and space, the occasional knife threat, and even threats by one homeless man to spread HIV via a syringe. The AP story tells us:

Last week, a homeless man menaced a crowd of spectators with a pair of scissors.

I know what happens next! A 5 ft 4 tall man with wide hips and some sort of mask/helmet obscuring his face dove into action making short work of the threatening man. Only then does the short man with wide hips take off his helmet/mask, shaking free her long feminine hair in the process. We were all duped! It was really a bad-ass woman saving the crowd with an amazing display of moxie! Lets see if my years of watching feminist TV and movie action scenes has lead me to make an accurate prediction:
Micaiah Dutt, a four-tour veteran of the Iraq War, and two other former soldiers had no problem tackling and subduing the man. Other members of the protest’s volunteer security detail have been punched and threatened with knives.

See! I was right. These badass women warriors swooped into action and went all Lara Croft on his ass!

Dutt said he felt helpless at times and noted that the man he helped subdue could, in theory, press assault charges against him.

“I served four tours in Iraq, and I felt more safe there at times than here,” he told a gathering of protest organizers under a drizzly evening sky. “There, I had a weapon and knew the people around me were with me. Here, I don’t know.”

Oh, that’s strange. I’m guessing all of the Xena types were busy with real security threats, and left the men to mop this one up.

Either way, the news stories I’ve read show a fair degree of insecurity in the Occupy [insert name of place here] movement camps. The housewife turned tramp in the original story quickly finding herself a man in camp reminded me of the movie Defiance, and how quickly the women in the camp attached themselves to “camp husbands” for security in a very insecure environment. Heartiste has written about this basic phenomenon in his post Tough Times Are A Bounty For Betas.

But just because she felt the need to get herself a man amidst the insecurity of the camp, it doesn’t mean she is following traditional gender roles in other areas. For example, she makes it a point to contribute her gender neutral talents to the good of the community. Per the NY Post article:

She got coffee and a granola bar from the protest kitchen before sorting laundry for two hours.

And she isn’t alone. From the examiner.com article Night and Day, Life at Occupy Wall Street:

It is about 11:15 am and a woman takes her place in a lawn chair knitting hats and scarves for the protesters, keeping track on a board of how many she has already made and donated.

*Edit: Chels linked to an article in the Village Voice which claims that Ms. Hessler’s sleeping arrangement with the waiter are non sexual. The original NY Post story contains the phrase “she plans to stray awhile” in the url for the story, but also includes the statement “She swears she’s not romantically involved with her new friend.” I’ll leave it to my readers to come to their own conclusions on this.
Better late than never linkage, and a quick note on who is welcome to read and comment.

by Dalrock | October 26, 2011 | Link

I didn’t notice until recently that grerp had written her own take on Kate Bolick’s *Atlantic* piece titled *Piece of Advice #97: Look farther into the future*:

The problem with this whole thesis is that while being permanently single may be a fulfilling and rich way for women like Bolick to lead their lives, it doesn’t work as well for women who are 1) dumber, 2) poorer, 3) less intrepid/independent or 4) not possessed of generous friends of significant means. And it works really badly for women who want to raise healthy, well adjusted, non-poverty stricken children. The fact is, most women aren’t very much like Bolick at all – which is why most women want to get married, because subconsciously they know, despite all the feminist propaganda that portrays marriage as a one-way trap to stifling, abused servitude, that marriage is a good deal for women. Women are smaller, weaker, more risk averse, more comfort seeking, and are rarely the kind of trail-blazing, money-making geniuses who can sit alone atop a heap of money and adulation.

This is just a teaser. Check out her entire post for her usual outstanding work.

I also noticed a bit late that our very own Anacaona has written a guest post at *Hooking Up Smart* titled *Eve’s Illness*, or alternatively *How to Alleviate Suffering From Female Hypergamy*.

The old saying “I can do better” is practically taught since birth to women as a way to empower them: you can have a better job, a better car, a better home and better, better, better... The problem is that modern society doesn’t say to women that they could also “do a lot worse” and more often than not they have no idea how to change a pattern that keeps taking them to the same failed place. Sadly, many do not realize their self-destructive choices until it is too late.

Eve is whispering in your ear, telling you to look for the “better” man. But what is better in terms of mating? The tallest one, the handsomest one, the one that seems confident and strong? This is where Eve is still eating the forbidden fruit.

You think you know everything you need to know but you don’t understand your own desires, and so cannot guard against them.

Whispers? You don’t say! Again, this is just a teaser. See the full post for more excellent insight from Anacaona.

Our latest installment of *what is wrong with teh men* touched on the topic of men falling behind in college degrees. This is of course not a new theme, and *Captain Capitalism* was curious about this several years ago (2006). He did his own research and not surprisingly
found that while women outnumber men in the total number of degrees earned, if you look at the most difficult (and valuable) majors men still have the lead. Check out his full post for the charty goodness. Feminists have packed universities with additional women who are largely getting low (or no) value degrees. I would suggest watching out for those student loans men when looking for a wife.

**A note on who is invited to read and comment on this blog:** There has been a surprising amount of discussion in the comments lately about whether given bloggers or commenters are sufficiently orthodox to participate in the discussion. This is just a reminder that there is in fact no *Team Dalrock*, and no orthodoxy is involved with this blog. This is a conversation on the internet. With this being said, if you choose to tangle with another commenter don’t expect me to bail you out. My basic expectation is that everyone knows how to handle themselves in an appropriate manner. I very much dislike moderating the comments, so I’m more inclined to set a problem commenter to “always hold for moderation” and if needed ultimately ban a troublemaker than edit comments and/or provide warnings.

One more critical rule: Always honor the rules of copyright when posting comments.

Carry on!
Unwed mother? Blame feminism.

by Dalrock | October 27, 2011 | Link

Unwed Mother

Baby Mama

Single Mother

Choice mother

Failure

The label is a matter of personal preference, but if you aren't married to the father of your children and you aren't a widow, you have no excuses.

For this you can blame feminism.

No, I don’t mean you can blame feminism for the fact that you have failed as a mother by severely disadvantaging your children. As I wrote above, you have no excuses for that. What you can blame on feminism is the fact that you have no credible excuse for the great harm you have caused your children. But I sense some skepticism on your part, so let's walk through the possible excuses. Unwed mothers are of course always chock full of excuses, so this is not a short list:

1. I didn’t have any choice, I couldn’t [insert pathetic helpless woman excuse here]. Feminism is all about making sure women have choices. Women now graduate college at higher rates than men, and young women now out-earn young men. Women also have more choice than men regarding birth control and adoption. Women even have the hard fought choice to kill their own children solely at their own discretion, provided they do so before anyone sees the child’s face.

2. I didn’t know I had choices. One of the excuses for unwed motherhood which holds a great deal of nostalgia is the idea that women become mothers without knowing they had a choice to. Tales of Happy Days past abound where women didn’t know that if they allowed a man to insert Tab A into Slot B, they could become pregnant. Frequent readers of this site already know I have a real weakness for the classics, but even I can’t say this one with a straight face. Feminists have been busily stamping out this particular patriarchal bogeyman with mass education programs for the last 50 years. If you didn’t hear the message, you simply weren’t listening.

3. I was too young. Another classic, but this one went out of style with bell bottoms and tie-dye. Feminists have made sure that women feel free to delay pregnancy for decades after coming of age. They have been so successful, they are now focused on making women feel comfortable becoming mothers past menopause (H/T RL).

4. I got bored and/or felt trapped! Don’t you want me to be haaaapy? I would love for you to be happy. Even more I would love for you not to send your kids through the meat grinder. You are the only one who could choose which man to marry. It was your
responsibility to choose one who you could be happy with, and failing that, choose to be happy with the one you chose.

5. **The father wouldn’t marry me.** Feminism removed much of the stigma for promiscuous women (spelled S-L-U-T), but it didn’t make you have sex with men you weren’t married to. Unless you were actually raped (no, not the new feminist definition of rape, but the real kind), you made the choice to have sex with a man you weren’t married to.

6. **The man I chose to father my child is an addict/abusive/irresponsible.** See above. You are the one who chose him. As with the excuse that women didn’t know how babies are made, feminism has been very successful in removing all plausible deniability from this excuse as well. If you didn’t know that some men are like this, and that they posed a great risk to you and your children you simply weren’t listening. Feminism accidentally made this even worse. Pickup artists are a natural byproduct of the feminist war on the stigma against sluts (see pathetic excuse #5 above). Thanks to pickup artists, we now know that women are actually sexually attracted to men with these negative traits. Before you could blame a bad relationship with your father, or just men in general and no one would know your secret. Now everyone knows you were actually just thinking with your genitals. Ouch.

7. **My mother set a bad example by having me out of wedlock or divorcing my father.** Yes, it is true that one of the many ways you have failed is by making your grandchildren and even great grandchildren less likely to have a father as well. But you still made your own choices (see above). However, feminism pushed for all of the above empowering choices to be available to you and your mother, so you can blame feminism for that.

8. **I can’t possibly be responsible, don’t you know that I’m a woman?** While it is true that feminism has crafted a culture where women have choices and men have responsibilities, the reality is that choices *always* come with responsibility. But deep down you always knew that, didn’t you?

9. **I didn’t know choices come with responsibility.** Yes, feminism has a huge amount of blame here, but deep down you really knew better. I’m trying to help women better understand this, and this post is a step in that direction. You now have the choice to either admit the painful truth and help other women, or choose your own feelings over the wellbeing of other women and innocent children. I can’t make this choice for you.

**See Also:** Authority always comes with responsibility, whether you accept it or not.
Authority always comes with responsibility, whether you accept it or not.

by Dalrock | October 29, 2011 | Link

Women in our culture have become incredibly nonchalant about raising children without a father. We have gone from seeing this as a failure compared to the traditional model (where single mothers are forced to make the best out of a bad situation) to women arguing that this is superior to raising children in an intact family. From commenter Lisa:

as a divorced mother, I’m deeply offended by this post. You have no idea what went on in my marriage, or why it ended. Nor do you have idea how my daughter has turned out. For every example of a “screwed up” child of divorce, I’ll give you 10 examples of spoiled rotten, entitled children from “normal marriages.”

Keep in mind that the criticism from most on my previous post was that I unfairly claimed that a fraction of a fraction of unwed mothers had responsibility for their own choices. The only excuse that was commonly considered to have an exception was excuse #6, and there seems to be general agreement that the excuse is bogus for either 4 out of 5 or 9 out of 10 women who would claim it. I’m all for being precise, but there is a larger point here. Tens of millions of children are being denied the benefit of growing up with their father in the home. The response from our culture ranges from a collective shrug to blaming the fathers who have been kicked out of their kid’s lives.

This all stems from our overwhelming fear of hurting women’s feelings. 50 years ago a very small percentage of women were subject to the dreaded double standard when it came to shaming unwed mothers. Our society took pity on them, and rolled back the social disapproval. Now 40% of all children in the US are born out of wedlock, and this only continues to grow (original post with more info on chart):
We did the same regarding the stigma for divorcées around the same time. As a result, a large part of the 60% of children fortunate enough to be born to married parents have their fathers kicked out of their lives by the mother some time after birth. The end result is an unprecedented pandemic of fatherless children (more info on this chart from the US Census):
The chart above actually understates the problem, because there is a lag in the data since the majority of current children were born during the lower out of wedlock birthrates of past years. It also counts children growing up with mommy’s latest man (stepfathers) as being with “both parents”. Certainly not all stepfathers are created equal, and many do everything in their power to fulfill the role of the man the mother kicked out.

I have a question for each of you. Which outraged you more, the reality of the charts above or my previous post? Are you more troubled by my making some adults uncomfortable, or the fact that millions of kids are now growing up without fathers?

More to the original point, women have demanded and been given the ability to make every conceivable choice about how, when, and by whom they become a mother. Being the one who makes the decisions is called having authority. Women now have as near total authority on the conception and raising of children as is possible. This is an incredible amount of authority, and having an incredible amount of authority comes with an incredible amount of responsibility.

Anyone who has been trusted with a very large amount of responsibility knows that it is a very heavy burden if you are taking it seriously. Yet women don’t feel this burden. Commenter Chels was outraged at the very concept that she was responsible for picking her
future children’s father wisely. How could she possibly be expected to do that? Yes, this is an extremely difficult task. If women were truly embracing their responsibility here it would be a very heavy weight on them. Young women would feel a solemn sense of duty.

But for the vast majority of women this simply isn’t the case. The search for the father of their children isn’t undertaken with a solemn sense of responsibility. It is taken as a time for fun and excitement. The overriding feeling is no matter what choices they make, if there is a bad outcome it isn’t their fault. Someone else needs to take responsibility. One commenter on Reddit captured this sense perfectly. FlagonOfMead was sure that my insisting that responsibility accompany authority made me a woman hater:

I do believe the author must hate women. He is very judgmental of women and their perfectly normal choices, like the choice to have sex with men, a mutual decision which is both perfectly healthy and acceptable.

“You deserve to be abandoned as a mother because you are a slut who had sex outside of marriage” is ridiculous. Yeah, I’m sure this author loves women.

Actually I do love women. But I’m not so heartless as to not care about the nearly 2 million innocent children born each year in the US with the disadvantage of not having married parents.

How about you?

You can try to spin it all day long that these kids really benefit from not being “spoiled” by having a father in the house. I simply won’t buy it. Again, we have given women as near total authority on the matter of children as possible. Where is the feeling of responsibility?

In my post on interviewing a prospective wife, one of the sections was:

Does she see divorce as failure? Is she willing to make judgments about others who divorce?

Many women today don’t and won’t, as was made painfully clear in the discussion of the last post. Don’t overlook this when considering a wife. A woman who doesn’t feel the weight of the burden of her own immense responsibility is simply irresponsible.
Last week I had a discussion with two Christian women on another blog about my criticism of the movie *Fireproof* in my post *The endless courtship fantasy*. The women took issue with my characterizing the wife in the movie as whorish. They felt that since the husband had viewed porn on the internet this was grounds for the woman to divorce him. They didn't see the wife’s pursuit of a doctor she worked with while still married as a real problem, because she had already decided to divorce and it was really the husband’s fault after all. They were also adamant that the wife planned on waiting until she had divorced the first man and married the second one before consummating the affair with sex, even though I could find no mention of this in the movie.

I should acknowledge that I run the risk of creating a straw man of their argument, but these points were made by them. I’ve decided to not link directly to the blog, and directly quoting them would with the help of google create a de-facto link*. I don’t want to send an angry mob their way, but I do want to address what I see as glaring problems with the movie. Since I will ask them to read the post, I will also ask as a courtesy to me that you avoid any personal attacks on them in the discussion. However, feel free to take issue with their arguments as I have presented them, the Christian fawning over this movie in general, and the incredibly weak Christian support for the concept of marriage vows.

The women challenged me to actually watch the movie, so I took their challenge and added it to our netflix queue. We watched it last night in fast forward with subtitles turned on, and I stopped it periodically to repeat the dialog so I could take what ended up being 7 pages of notes. Since I’m dissecting the movie it should go without saying that it will pretty much spoil the whole plot. If you want to watch the movie without it being spoiled first, stop reading now. For those of you who are like my wife and I and would rather snack on broken glass than watch a gussied up chick flick, read on and I’ll spare you the need.

The movie starts 25 years ago when the wife (Catherine) is a young girl. She wants to marry her daddy when she gets older (we see in a picture that he is a fireman). Her mother says that she can’t marry her daddy, and has to find her own husband. The girl asks *Will we live happily ever after?*, and the mother replies:

| If you marry someone who really, really loves you.

Fast forward 25 years, and the little girl turned wife of a fire captain isn’t haaaaapy. Whenever her husband Caleb comes home, he is walking on eggshells for fear of setting her off. She has a laundry list of standard issue complaints. He doesn’t do the housework, and she is too busy to do it now that she has a high status job as head of PR for the local hospital. She has a list of needs which he isn’t spending money on, which he points out are actually *wants*. He is very clear that his primary complaint is that he is respected everywhere but in his own house. In the marital fight which stages the fundamental conflict for the movie, we learn that she has been denying him sex because he isn’t doing what she wants, and that he has been viewing online pornography (direct quote from the subtitles):
Catherine: If looking at that trash is how you get fulfilled, then that is fine. But I will not compete with it.

Caleb: Well, I sure don’t get it from you!

Catherine: And you won’t. Because you care more about saving for your stupid boat and pleasing yourself than you ever did about me.

When she taunts him with her manipulation of him through withheld sex, he flies into a rage and calls her a “disrespectful, ungrateful, and selfish woman”:

Catherine: I’m not selfish. How dare you say that!

Caleb: If you can’t give me the respect I deserve, then what is the point of this marriage?

Catherine (bursts into tears): I want out. I just want out.

Caleb replies that if that is what she wants, then it is fine with him. Immediately after the fight she takes off her wedding ring, and begins actively flirting with a doctor at the hospital which other women have already noted seems interested in her.

Her objection to him saving for the boat is that she has other plans for the money. Her mother had a stroke a year prior, and Catherine has gone to a medical supply store and picked out a sort of stroke bridal registry of things she wants to give her mother. She specifically mentions a new wheelchair and a “hospital bed”. By pure coincidence, this totals to the exact twenty four thousand dollars the husband has set aside to buy a boat. Interestingly the movie authors clearly expect us to see this as a “need”, but we never hear this from a medical professional. Her mother has already moved back home, and is sitting up fine in a normal chair when we see her. There is never a discussion about why top of the line equipment is the only way to help her parents, or how any of this will help her mother be able to speak again. The flimsy nature of this is important, because it sets the tone for the movie. Even if the wife’s demands are suspect, the right choice for the husband is to give her whatever she demands.

Money is fundamental to the plot, and the movie makes repeated reference to the husband’s need to spend money on his wife. Him spending money on her is so important it is one of the first parts of the Love Dare. Caleb makes the mistake of sending her flowers which aren’t expensive enough, and the movie grinds in the point that this makes him a bad husband. When the flowers arrive, they are actually fairly nice (but nothing extravagant). His unhappay wife rolls her eyes and walks away. Later a more expensive bouquet of red roses arrives with a note which says “I love you more”. She appears to think this is from the doctor at the hospital she is trying to start an affair with, and instead of rolling her eyes lights up. Her very next move is to put an envelope marked “Caleb” on the table, which turns out to have divorce papers in it.

But none of this deters our husbandly hero in his pursuit of ever greater feats of betatized groveling. After she gives him the divorce papers, the Love Dare tells him he needs to give
her an all out romantic dinner. He learns his lesson from the flowers incident and it is made clear that he spared no effort or expense. Catherine comes home and sees the dinner he prepared for her, candles and all. She treats him with her standard contempt, and asks what this is all about. He answers pleadingly “Maybe I want to have dinner with my wife”. She goes into her bedroom for a minute to get what she came for, and before she walks out the door tells him:

Let me be real clear with you about something.

I do not love you.

But our hero is still undeterred. He knows from his wise father (who sent him the love dare), that he needs to love his wife unconditionally. Even when she is starting an affair with another man and tells him she doesn’t love him and gives him divorce papers, it is his job to try harder to please her.

Around day 20 Caleb is trapped in a burning house while trying to rescue a young girl. He uses his axe to chop through the floor of the house and pulls the unconscious girl into the crawl space. Here he very nearly ends up trapped again, and is forced to remove some of his protective gear. The scene ends with other firefighters dragging both Caleb and the girl out of the crawl space, and both appear to be unconscious.

This puts Caleb in the very hospital Catherine works at, being treated by the doctor she is starting an affair with. Catherine briefly stops by to check on him, but is extremely cold and walks away after the nurse tells her she is welcome to stay with her “hero” husband. Her specific words to him are “You look terrible. You gonna be ok?” This scene contrasts with a later scene where Catherine is in bed with a fever. Caleb runs out and buys her food from Chick-fil-A to nurse her back to health. It turns out that men who were nearly killed with first degree burns don’t deserve the same level of caring a woman who has a fever does.

Later in the movie Caleb finds a greeting card/love letter from the doctor who treated him which Catherine is keeping on her dresser (he finds this while doing the housework he has taken over). This sets up the ultimate frivolous divorcée fantasy, where two alphas (in status at least) compete directly for her heart. Caleb tells the doctor that he will “compete for her heart”. As Caleb leaves the Dr. opens a drawer with his own wedding ring in it, but we aren’t told whether he is divorced or currently married.

The concept of two high status men fighting over the would be divorcée’s heart is at the core of the movie. Even the plot device, the Love Dare, is all about him convincing her to love him. It isn’t about him convincing her to honor her wedding vows. This is standard issue divorce porn, and tells women that divorce gives them power to get what they want. No woman who watched the movie would fail to get this overriding message. If you aren’t haaaapy, threaten divorce and let high status men compete for your heart!

The core reason the Christian women thought the wife’s actions were morally justified is the husband’s ostensible addiction to pornography. Interestingly the first time we hear the word addiction in this context is from the instructions from his father. His wife never uses this term, and we aren’t shown him being obsessed with it. At one point he is on the web looking
at something else, and he gets a popup for porn. With his new faith in God and his desire to
prove himself to his wife he resists the urge to click on the popup. From here he smashes the
PC with a sledgehammer and says “no more addictions”.

The conflict is finally resolved when Catherine is talking to the woman who runs the medical
supply store. She wants to pick out some more odds and ends for her mother. She mentions
the Dr. and when she does she lights up and starts playing with her hair the same way she
has been doing while flirting with him (the whole hospital knows she is after him). The woman
corrects her, explaining that the Dr. only gave $300, and her husband gave $24,000.
Suddenly Catherine realizes she misunderstood who was the winner of the bidding war for
her heart. She races home and puts her ring on and tarts herself up before going see Caleb at
the fire station.

At this point I was expecting her to apologize not only for being a ball busting harpy, but
more than a little whorish as well. But all she says is:

- If I haven’t told you that you are a good man, you are.
- If I haven’t told you that I have forgiven you, I have.
- If I haven’t told you that I love you, I do.

With those magic words, all of her awful behavior is forgotten. Shortly thereafter she is
treated to a second wedding ceremony, but this time they stress that she actually means it
for life.

**Update:** The Christian blogger (Sheila Gregoire) later made the same argument on another
post on this blog, and I responded with this post. Here is the link to her blog post where we
had the exchange I referenced in this post.

**See Also:**

- How Fireproof lowers the boom
- Shattering the forcefield of denial
The latest Wal-Mart Halloween commercial here in the US reminded me of grerp’s post Piece of Advice #74: Do not confuse being difficult with being strong:

If only girls have more moxie then they will become men!

Too bad it isn’t true, since all we are getting from this mass experiment is a group of unpleasant irresponsible women instead. On the bright side, for those of us with daughters this is an excellent teaching moment. What better way to teach her not to be a bitchy little girl than by noting it when commercials like this come up?

**Edit:** One of the comments on youtube captures the feminist infatuation with moxie perfectly:

I love the girl’s attitude when she says “I can’t read”
Good ol’ boys of the patriarchy sweep rape under the rug.

by Dalrock | November 2, 2011 | Link

And by good ol’ boys of the patriarchy, I of course mean the radical leftists of the Occupy Wall Street movement. Another article from the NY Post (H/T Professor Hale) tells us that the OWS crowd responded to a man allegedly raping a woman in her tent with overwhelming use of shaming language, and a good strong light shining to boot:

“Pervert! Pervert! Get the f-k out!” said vigilante Occupiers, who never bothered to call the cops.

“They were shining flashlights in his face and yelling at him to leave,” said a woman who called herself Leslie, but refused to give her real name.

She said that weeks earlier another woman was raped.

“We don’t tell anyone,” she said. “We handle it internally. I said too much already.”

The alleged rapist may well have suffered hurt feelings along with temporary night blindness. All without due process! I can only imagine if there had been a short man present with wide hips and a mask/helmet obscuring his face. It could have gotten ugly.

Denying reality gets expensive when there aren’t any adults in the room to protect you from the consequences of your own stupidity. Say what you will about the mother and wife from Florida, but she appears to have sensed the risk inherent in being a woman alone in a camp of vagrants and leftists with a pathological fear of using force against criminals.

On the bright side, at least the women in the Occupy Wall Street camp aren’t suffering from the traumatic experience of receiving victim blaming advice on strategies they can employ to make themselves less vulnerable to rape.

Blogger Derek Hunter reported several weeks ago on the security pamphlet he found being circulated in the Occupy Baltimore camp. According to him, the hard copy pamphlet stated that the preference was to keep the police out of such matters:

Though we do not encourage the involvement of the police in our community, the survivor has every right, and the support of Occupy Baltimore, to report the abuse to the appropriate law enforcement.

I checked the Occupy Baltimore website, and they have a posting up today titled Sexual Offense Policy which addresses the same issue. This public version however is more open to involving the police:

Instances of sexual abuse and assault will be handled according to the expressed desires of the victim. The Security and Medical teams are equipped with a list of
resources, including contact information for the police, hospitals, sexual assault hotlines, and women’s shelters. In these instances, #occupybaltimore welcomes the involvement of the Baltimore City Police and encourages victims to report crimes. We also recognize that the U.S. Justice System is flawed, especially when it comes to cases of sexual assault. If for any reason the victim feels uncomfortable with police involvement, their wishes will be respected.

Fortunately the members of the Occupy Baltimore camp can now rest easy. Help is just a call away. If you find yourself being assaulted, all you have to do is call out the magic word:

Procedure

Victims can alert the Security Team using the all-purpose call, “Round-up!” to ensure immediate physical protection and subsequent enforcement of our policy.

Update: A commenter identifying himself as Stephen Tish has asserted the following regarding the hard copy memo Derek Hunter shared:

The “security memo” was never an actual proposal put forward by Occupy Baltimore. It was an individual’s proposal for policy that never got accepted by Occupy Baltimore.

I did some more searching on the Occupy Baltimore website, and found a discussion of what looks to be the same memo (don’t worry Occupy Baltimore webmaster, if the page is somehow lost I’ve made a backup copy):

The smear campaign on Breitbart’s website is a gross example of outright media misinformation. I post below, in full, the draft statement on sexual assault circulated by our security team for consideration by the General Assembly:

I haven’t checked it word for word, but the quote I referenced appears to be the same. Someone with the username admin identifying himself as Dan from the media team responded, including the statement:

As far as I know, there have been no reports of rape at OB. Our awesome security team drafted this with the idea that anything can happen, and wanted to throw as much support towards survivors of violence as possible.
Boundless is their foolishness.

by Dalrock | November 5, 2011 | Link

Captain Capitalism has a post up on a topic I have been mulling over. The post is titled The Lord Will Not Provide and refers to a post on Boundless by an unmarried 29 year old seminary grad student titled Out of Control:

I am the type of person who usually goes out and gets what she wants. I wanted to go to a good college, so I worked hard in high school. I wanted to be a writer, so I studied journalism and did internships with magazines. I want to write a book someday, so I write daily and I’m going to grad school to get credentials that will put some authority behind my name. For the most part, I feel in control of things. But being a wife, being a mom seem so far out of my control. I wait on God, hoping He’s listening to the true desires of my heart, and grappling with what it means if He hears those desires but has a different path for me.

When it comes to her real priorities in life, she is all about the plan. But when it comes down to becoming a wife and mother, she is sitting around waiting for God to deliver a beta provider. This seems to fit both with the general advice Haley relays from the church, as well as what I hear many Christians discussing. If I’m understanding the general Christian message to young women correctly, it is:

Don’t worry, God will guide your heart.

I’m not challenging the premise of having faith in God, but the whole thing strikes me as terribly passive. Is this how they approach other less important life decisions, like whether to attend college, which one, and what to major in? Would they simply tell her to trust in God if she were buying a car or taking out a loan? Or do Christian parents only reserve their lack of instruction and guidance for matters of the utmost importance? Yes she is the one who must make the choice, but it is cruel not to warn her of the pitfalls so many other women before her have fallen into.

I don’t see how this kind of advice is even biblical. I think the core problem is that modern Christians are so incredibly bereft of wisdom when it comes to issues of love and marriage. This is a group which set out to create a pro marriage movie, yet somehow ended up making divorce porn. Even worse, no one noticed! At some level they must know this. They are likely looking back on the mystery of their own experience finding a spouse and attributing it to divine providence. God may well have had a hand in the process, but the stakes are incredibly high for both men and women. Having good sense, a feeling of profound responsibility, and a basic understanding of the process shouldn’t stop God from intervening where He sees fit.

The fact is that leaving young women to their own devices has created an unmitigated disaster. Don’t worry, it will all work out according to God’s plan may work just fine for some women, but it fails spectacularly for large numbers of others. Given our culture’s pedestalization of women and misunderstanding of their sexuality, telling them to follow their
heart often means turning them feral.

I don’t claim to have all of the answers here, and I acknowledge that this is a very difficult question. My fundamental advice to women in this regard is:

| If you want to get married, take your husband hunt seriously from the beginning. |

If dating is intoxicatingly fun, you aren’t doing it right. This is a profoundly serious choice you are considering. You have been given great power as a young woman in the sexual marketplace; don’t squander it by playing a game of judging the performance. Don’t mistake your selectivity when it comes to sex partners or your desire to have the man tell you he loves you, or your preference for serial monogamy as signs that you aren’t promiscuous. And don’t ever assume marriage is simply yours for the taking.

But taking your husband hunt seriously upfront doesn’t mean you have license to marry before you are wise enough to choose, or (just as important) ready to stand by your life long vow. It also doesn’t mean you are free to marry a man you don’t really love.

Adding to the difficulty, many women seem to struggle to discern between real options and fantasy. They also face increased searching costs due to their mother’s generation being uncomfortable with slut shaming. Given all of these difficulties, it is amazing that any young women successfully navigate this challenge. Yet many seem to do so without fanfare, and one thing we know is that for women looking to marry, fortune favors the decisive.

Ah, forget it; I’m sounding like Polonius. Get out there and have fun ladies! God will guide your heart.
Promiscuity is good, so long as it is done on the woman’s terms.

by Dalrock | November 5, 2011 | Link

I’ve touched on this basic issue before, but it strikes me as important enough to create a separate post on it. One of the more bizarre beliefs of our time is that there is some moral value to the statement:

| No sex before monogamy!

I see this everywhere, including from Christians. What this statement is really saying is that promiscuity is good so long as it is happening on the woman’s own terms. This is similar to the argument by the Christian women that the wife in Fireproof wasn’t being whorish because she planned on divorcing her husband and marrying the other man she was after before having sex with him.

There is no moral basis for serial monogamy, otherwise known as monogamy without a lifetime commitment. All there is are male and female preferred forms of promiscuity.

Men’s preferred form of promiscuity is to have a soft harem (which he is invested in but not committed to) along with one-off sex with women he isn’t invested in. We call men who act on this preferred form of promiscuity players, cads, pickup artists, etc.

Women’s preferred form of promiscuity is to have sex with the highest status man she can (at the time), while also securing investment and commitment from him (but without offering commitment herself). The confusion occurs because the woman is being selective about who she has sex with and at any given point in time the woman appears to be in something resembling a marriage. Even more confusing, many women go through the motions of having a wedding but leave out the actual lifetime commitment. However, seeing these women as anything but promiscuous is a foolish mistake. When you look at the big picture it becomes painfully clear that what they are doing is nothing like marriage. We used to have terms for women like this, but conservative women are now uncomfortable with them. Whatever term you use, it is essential not to mistake these women as being any more moral than players or pickup artists. They are acting on animal instinct just like the players are. The only difference is their instincts are different and therefore their expression of promiscuity is as well.
Submitting to the patriarchy in their heads
by Dalrock | November 6, 2011 | Link

Don’t miss Laura Grace Robins’ excellent post Christian Manning up. Just a teaser (emphasis mine):

You can’t insist on being an independent career woman and take on the values of the modern world yet also shiver into an 1800 timid, Christian girl when it comes to dating. He insists these women are not feminists, but as my readers know there are also sheep that insist they are not wolves. A career woman with a cross around her neck does not negate her feminist choices.

As I mentioned the discussion on my own post on the topic, it strikes me that these suddenly passive Christian husband searchers are being too clever by half. They loudly proclaim that they are dutifully awaiting the orders of their Father. In doing so they are creating a faux patriarchy, substituting God for their earthly father (and later their husband) because submitting to the authority of the latter would have the practical effect of constraining them. To borrow a phrase which has become popular around here, they are submitting to the patriarchy in their heads.

Of course, all God needs to do is serve them with a duly notarized and processed command telling them whom to marry and they will gladly follow. I presume they expect it to transpire something like this:

God’s Process Server: Are you Cindy Christlike?

Cindy Christlike: Why yes, I am. Why do you ask?

God’s Process Server: (puts papers in her hand) You are hereby commanded to stop pining away, quit your high status but surprisingly unfulfilling career, marry that man over there and start making babies.

Cindy Christlike: Well, um, what kind of car does he drive? Is he the secret multimillionaire hunky handyman I have prayed for?...

[God’s Process Server becomes impatient]

Um, sorry, old habit. I’ll get right on that. How long before I dust off the Fireproof script and threaten divorce so that multiple worthy men compete for my heart?

God’s Process Server: Wait at least 3 years. 4 or 5 is better. Ideally you should wait until your youngest child is out of diapers.

Absent that, many will no doubt follow their tingle only to blame God for steering them wrong with regard to excuse #6.
Warn men: Beware Christian marriage doublespeak and hair trigger for wife initiated divorce.
by Dalrock | November 8, 2011 | Link

This issue is so important I’m asking my readers and other bloggers to do whatever they can to help spread the word and protect men and their future children. Any blogger who wishes to is free to repost this entry in part or its entirety on their own blog with a link back to this page. Literally millions of men are at risk here, and we can help them understand the reality they face.

One of the more dangerous assumptions I see men making is that if they marry a Christian woman they will be somehow shielded from the epidemic of divorce. I’ve stated in the past that most churches talk like Christ but act like Oprah on the issue of divorce. I’ve also shown how Christians like Glenn Stanton from Focus on the Family are actually proud that devout Christians only divorce 38% of the time. More recently I’ve shown that the movie Christians cherish for representing their values on marriage is actually barely dressed up divorce porn for women.

Yet with all of this even I was stunned by comments left on my blog yesterday by a respected Christian author and speaker on the topic of marriage. In my post Promiscuity is good, so long as it is done on the woman’s terms I pointed out that there is no backing for the popular belief that the female preferred form of promiscuity (serial monogamy/serial polyandry) is more moral than the male preferred form of promiscuity. I used the example of Christians arguing that the wife in Fireproof was justified in her attempt to swing from marriage to marriage:

This is similar to the argument by the Christian women that the wife in Fireproof wasn’t being whorish because she planned on divorcing her husband and marrying the other man she was after before having sex with him.

Sheila Gregoire is one of the Christian women I had in mind when I made that statement, and she noticed the post and defended her position:

But I just want to clarify: I do believe that she had grounds for divorce because of his pornography addiction. I think that’s where the fundamental disagreement comes in. I don’t think she SHOULD have divorced him, anymore than I think a woman should leave a guy because of a one-night stand. Jesus never said that we SHOULD divorce. He only said in cases of affairs, divorce is permitted.

And so in the movie Fireproof, she was in a relationship where divorce was permitted, and she was planning on divorcing, and planning on remarrying. Thus, I wouldn’t say that’s whorish. He’s the one who cheated.

I’m just uncomfortable with you saying that Christians are allowing people to “whore” around because we’re permitting divorce, when I don’t think that’s the
I believe there are very narrow grounds for divorce: abuse, affairs, and in some cases, addictions. In many of those cases, I’d argue that they should separate and not remarry, such as the case of addictions.

Note that she states that there should be only a few very defined reasons for divorce, and then proceeds to expand the definition to the point where nearly every wife initiated divorce is justified. Adultery is expanded to the point where a man watching porn qualifies: He’s the one who cheated.

While Sheila uses the term pornography addiction in her comment, this is outside her primary justification (porn as adultery) for the wife’s plan to line up husband number two while still married to the first one. She states that addiction would be grounds for separation without remarriage, not to divorce and find another man. Based on her own standard even if the husband had indeed been shown as a porn addict, the wife’s actions would not have been justified on those grounds. Her justification is that watching pornography is adultery. This may be why the creators of the movie Fireproof were so murky on exactly what the husband’s transgression regarding porn really was. They didn’t feel the need to make a solid case for porn addiction before they showed the wife shutting off entirely towards her husband and actively pursuing another man. As I pointed out in my review the wife didn’t even accuse the husband of being a porn addict, and while the term was used later in the movie there was nothing which showed the husband as being an addict. Here is the exchange from the movie where we are told the husband is viewing porn:

Catherine: If looking at that trash is how you get fulfilled, then that is fine. But I will not compete with it.

Caleb: Well, I sure don’t get it from you!

Catherine: And you won’t. Because you care more about saving for your stupid boat and pleasing yourself than you ever did about me.

The fundamental problem is that Christian women are being given get out of marriage free cards while Christian men are being told man up and marry these Christian women. This selective moral softness from Christians combines with our legal system which rewards women who commit divorce theft and creates millions of fatherless children. Your husband looked at porn? Dump him and find another man! Keep in mind this isn’t some corner case example I’ve made up. This is from the movie Christians profess shows their views on marriage. Moreover, Sheila isn’t just another commenter on the internet, she is a respected author and speaker on the topic of marriage for Christian women. All men need to understand this; if your wife decides to divorce you for another man, there will be well respected Christians lining up to justify her decision and place all of the blame on you. If that means conflating viewing pornography with actual adultery, so be it. This is true even in cases where the wife was withholding sex in an effort to control the husband. She even excuses the wife lining up the other man while still married.

It isn’t just men viewing porn which gives women a get out of marriage free card though. Sheila also listed abuse as the other fundamental justification for divorce. In one of Sheila’s
video blogs she reminded women that they shouldn’t assume husbands are the only ones with obligations. This brought her a chorus of emails from angry Christian women complaining that she was telling them not to be true to themselves. That Christian women would feel comfortable spouting such nonsense to her should be proof enough of what is so terribly broken in Christian culture. To Sheila’s credit, she did a follow on video blog post where she gently reminded these women that being true to yourself is not actually a biblical value. One of the youtube commenters on the original video countered with the following:

Your advice is nice, in thought, but unrealistic in practice. I did that exact thing for 7 years, as a married Christian woman. It got rough after the first year. I doubted my marriage. But I stuck it out. I convinced myself it was ME who needed to change. So I did. I completely revamped my entire being. And I did it several times over the next 6 years.

I will say, I was extremely emotionally abused. What do you suggest in those circumstances? I got out. And my life is happier than ever.

What exactly is emotional abuse? I’m not sure, but ladies you will be excited to learn it also counts as a get out of marriage free card! Sheila responded with the following:

Of course, if there is abuse going on, that is a totally different story. But changing yourself doesn’t mean that you change who you fundamentally are. It just means that you change your expectations and go to God to help you be the person He wants you to be. That’s a good kind of change. Changing so that you tolerate abuse is something else entirely. But abuse was not the issue in this woman’s letter; she just felt like she didn’t love him.

So now we know emotional abuse fits in her definition of abuse. Again, she states that only two very specific reasons justify divorce and then proceeds to expand the terms to the point where nearly every wife initiated divorce is justified.

Sheila also had the following criticism for my approach in this blog:

I find that you talk a lot on this blog about how people should never divorce (which I more or less agree with), and that women shouldn’t expect so much from their husbands (which I also agree with), and that women are asking their husbands to be both betas and alphas at the same time (which I also agree with), and that women leave their husbands too much (again, in agreement). But what I don’t find is you dealing honestly with genuine problems that couples have with communication, with distance, with betrayal of trust, with porn, etc. I agree with everything you’re saying, but I don’t think marriages can be fixed with a simple “suck it up and put on your big girl panties”. That might make someone STAY in the marriage, but it won’t make the marriage thrive, and what I’d like to see is couples who are genuinely attached and intimate.

Sheila misunderstands me. I don’t believe people should never divorce. My concern is that
the definition of justified divorce has been so expanded as to make a mockery of the concept of marriage. She is also missing a fundamental point; putting on your big girl panties really does lead to happy marriages, at least in the majority of cases. Moreover, if Christians were serious about holding men and women to their vows they would then have the moral authority to try to assist these couples in good faith. While religious leaders may disagree, secular scientists have studied the issue and found that brute force willpower to stay married actually solves surprisingly difficult marital problems. It’s almost as if God designed marriage that way. I’ve covered this in detail here, but here is one of the key quotes from one paper which studied this:

Many currently happily married spouses have had extended periods of marital unhappiness, often for quite serious reasons, including alcoholism, infidelity, verbal abuse, emotional neglect, depression, illness, and work reversals. Why did these marriages survive where other marriages did not? The marital endurance ethic appears to play a big role. Many spouses said that their marriages got happier, not because they and their partner resolved problems but because they stubbornly outlasted them. With time, they told us, many sources of conflict and distress eased.

One factor which undoubtedly plays a role here is the widespread adoption of feminism by Christian and secular women alike. The knee jerk blame the husband tendency which I have described above shows how immersed modern Christianity is in modern feminism. Fellow blogger Laura Grace Robbins captured my own thoughts when she wrote:

I’m starting to think the feminism in Christianity cuts much, much deeper than I originally thought.

This is relevant both because a general sense of unhappiness is the philosophical foundation for modern feminism, and because we know that women who try to be the leaders in their marriage are very likely to be unhappy as a result. As I mentioned earlier, Christian women hold some truly outrageous beliefs when it comes to marriage and being “true to themselves”. It is no wonder that millions of these women are unhappy. Like the wife in Fireproof, many have decided that their husbands should submit to their leadership. Christians could of course address this if they weren’t deeply mired in the very feminism at the source of the problem.

I’ll close with a brief defense of both Sheila Gregoire and Christian women in general. Sheila is actually one of the stronger pro marriage voices in modern Christian culture. This is what makes her fundamental weakness on the issue so deeply troubling. She isn’t on the pro divorce fringe, she is one of the speakers churches bring in to strengthen marriage. She writes some of the books Christian wives read on the topic of marriage. I have focused on her arguments because she is proof of how incredibly soft on marriage Christians in general have become. If this weren’t the case, she wouldn’t be seen as pro marriage by mainstream Christians. As for defending Christian women, there are many women who comment on this blog who do not believe that a woman is justified in divorcing one man and marrying another because the first husband viewed pornography. Single men looking to marry shouldn’t write off all Christian women. Just like there are atheist women who truly believe in marriage there
still are Christian women who feel the same, and the statistics bear this out. What a man looking to marry needs to do is test for this trait in the woman herself, and not assume it comes with regular church attendance or even a seeming deep devotion to Christianity. More difficult is the question of church attendance itself. Studies have shown that divorce tends to spread like disease. Attending a church which is soft on divorce puts a man’s marriage (and therefore his children) at risk. Unfortunately no one has yet been able to identify a congregation for me which isn’t soft on marriage. I have seen one so I do know they exist. Christianity doesn’t have to be soft on marriage, the vast majority of Christians have merely chosen to be.
How the sin of addiction can lead to seduction and abandonment.

by Dalrock | November 9, 2011 | Link

The topic of pornography addiction in Fireproof has me thinking about the issue of addiction in general. Addiction is serious business. The addict loses all sense of perspective, and will do anything to get their next fix. This profoundly corrupts their sense of morals, and therefore makes them untrustworthy. Very often the thing which the addict craves is something which would be healthy in the right context. The power of their addiction however can turn what should be wholesome and beautiful into something dark and shameful.

There is one kind of addict which we have discussed but haven’t given enough attention to in this space. This addict is on an obsessive search to secure as many notches as they can. They are fueled by the high they receive when they convince their victim to go all the way. Taking what they want by force wouldn’t have the same impact; the rush comes from the victim’s willing consent. In their amoral attempt to get their next fix, they will say or do anything to seduce their mark. The mark for their own part typically never sees this coming. They think if they offer themselves in good faith they will be loved and accepted as a result. But while the addict isn’t acting out of malice, once the mark has gone all the way the addict has no more use for them. The mark is left bewildered, hurt, and rejected. This experience can be absolutely devastating and life altering. What did they do wrong? Why did the addict drop them as soon as the deed was done, only to pursue fresh meat? Did the discarded mark never really mean anything to them after all? Was all of the wooing and effort to make them feel at ease only a ruse to get them to consent? Unfortunately, often the answer is yes.

We’ve all known the victims of this kind of cruel use of the innocent. We’ve seen the life long pain this can inflict. I must stress that there is nothing inherently dirty or wrong with the victim’s choice to consent. They were merely offering their most precious gift, hoping to be loved and accepted in return. Their only fault is having been too trusting of those who said all of the right words but never really meant them. Had the addict not discarded them once it was done it could have been something of great beauty.

I assume everyone reading this knows exactly what I’m talking about. The church’s addiction for grooms is a not well kept secret. They most often woo the young, promising acceptance if he only does this one thing for them. While innocent the young mark still might sense something is amiss with the seducer. Many will offer to give up something lesser instead, keeping their one true gift for when they are certain their love will be returned. What if I call her my girlfriend, maybe even live together with her? I promise to remain faithful. But the seducer is adamant; he must go all the way, and it must be done in public. Once you do this, they tell him, you will be loved as one of us. But the mark is suspicious, he’s heard of other men who went all the way only to be treated with contempt afterward. This is all part of the game for the seducer, who knows the conquest is near. This time it’s different. Those other grooms meant nothing to me. The mark still isn’t sure, but the seducer knows all of the right words. I’m not that kind of church. I’m the kind which actually values marriage. You can trust me.
How can they ever trust again?
Glenn Stanton of Focus on the Family praises “heroic” unwed mothers

by Dalrock | November 10, 2011 | Link

Baby mamas of the world rejoice! Glenn Stanton of Focus on the Family thinks you are a hero!

They are largely single moms, I mean very few kids are being raised in dad only homes. It’s typically mom doing that heroic work of raising the kids by herself.

...single moms know that, they know that “my kids are facing a tougher time”, that they themselves are facing a tougher time as a single parent because for some reason dad is not around.

On the odd chance that Mr. Stanton notices this post while searching on his own name (or notices a spike in traffic from my readers clicking on the link to his blog above), I’d like to unravel the mystery for him. Our culture has created an epidemic of fatherless children by paying cash incentives to unwed mothers and lionizing them as heroes instead of shaming them. Furthermore, Christians have a hair trigger for wife initiated divorce and are looking for any excuse to blame the husband/father the wife kicks out. I hope this clears that otherwise murky matter up for him.

He goes on to suggest that single mothers can teach their sons and daughters about the difference between good and bad men by watching TV and movies with them and telling them what qualities about men she likes and dislikes:

Use it as a time to have conversations about what are those qualities about men that she as a woman yearns for, looks for, appreciates, and what are those qualities that she doesn’t like as much. In those conversations she can teach her kids really in wonderful ways, ok this is what a good man looks like, this is what a good guy looks like. And so the boy starts to learn, “mom seems to like that kind of guy, I want to be that kind of guy. Mom doesn’t like that kind of guy with that kind of attitude, you know what I don’t want to be that”. The little girl learns that by saying “thats the kind of man I should be looking for”.

The absolute foolishness of Christian leaders is breathtaking. He closes with a call to action. Not a call for women to stop having children out of wedlock or stop kicking the husband/father out of the house. No, that would be absurd. He closes with a call to action to men to fill in the gap in the child’s life caused almost universally by the poor choices of the mother:

I would encourage men out there that as you look around within your community, your church body, and you see young boys being raised and dad gone because of his death or because of his desertion or because of a divorce or maybe
he just never was on the scene, you've got to be considerate to the mother, but try to be a good example to those boys and try to encourage them.... Mothers can do that, women can do that, but there is nobody like a man telling a young boy “You know what, I was really proud of how you did that”...

Note how fatherless children are either nobody’s fault or the father’s fault, but never the mother’s fault. Start at 50 seconds in to skip past the book plug and the number to call in for the radio show:

The only thing I’ve read from Glenn Stanton in the past is how proud he is that devout Christians divorce 38% of the time. I was curious if this show was an anomaly, and maybe he has held unwed mothers accountable in the past. I did some searching on this, and while I couldn’t find any instances of him holding them accountable for their choices I did find this strange passage from his book Secure Daughters, Confident Sons:

| Jackie and I try to watch the movie As Good as It Gets once a year. |

I’ve never seen the chick flick in question, so I looked up the plot on wikipedia. According to wiki, it is a movie about how the wisdom of a gay man and the love of a single mother redeem a man.
This is one meme which simply will not die. On a logical level it makes no sense; why does nearly everyone feel so strongly that the carousel should be a forgiving, enjoyable experience for women? But on another level it does make sense that this meme is so hard to destroy. This is an idea that I would argue nearly all of us hold or have held at one point in time. It is something unchallenged, planted there fairly recently by the prevailing culture. No doubt generations prior recall watching this meme being planted and fighting against it then.

For the vast majority of people today including Christians, Christian leaders, and leaders of Christian leaders this is for all intents and purposes gospel. We need to face this; most of us either believe or have believed at some point that women have a right to enjoy their preferred path of promiscuity; anything which stands in the way of that path is nearly universally accepted as an injustice. The fundamental belief is universal, even if the manifestations of it vary. Many believe that women have the right to swing from marriage to marriage, so long as they can gin up a suitable pretext for divorce.

Many others believe that women must be ensured the experience of swinging from monogamous LTR to monogamous LTR in their teens and early 20s, until they decide one of those LTRs should be converted into marriage and/or motherhood. Commenter PA felt so strongly about this that he argued women who were in danger of being denied the full experience to which they were entitled should resort to any measures required:

I am around a lot of smart, attractive late 20s / early 30s girls who have long term boyfriends that to my best judgment are greater betas to lesser alphas, but no marriage or children on the horizon. Further, those girls are really wanting to get that ring and start a family. I talk to a few of them, and overhear conversations of others. The boyfriends won’t shit or get off the pot. And I want those girls to have children.

... 

Seriously, those girls ought to tell their boyfriends that she wants to start a family, and to give him a way out if he is unwilling; And if he doesn’t take the exit door, to just get herself pregnant with him. I’d rather those girls have out of wedlock children than no children at all, especially knowing that the boyfriends would come around to assuming the responsibility of fatherhood.

It’s a tragedy that the “Knocked Up” movie is a model for girls who look like Katherine Heigl to not go extinct.

He elaborated his fundamental argument further down in the comments section. It boiled down to an argument that the last in a series of boyfriends for these women had somehow stolen her youth and therefore must pay.
Another manifestation of this view is that women should be able to have sex with men they don’t really even know and expect this to lead to marriage. We’ve seen this view in the outrage over Marcos’ con, and more recently over the claim by PMAFT that he is attending the Sunday Morning Nightclub (crass site warning).

It isn’t just women making this argument. I’ve seen this argument made by fathers. One MRA commenter on the great game debate started by pointing out how he had been chewed up by women playing by the new rules of the sexual marketplace (SMP), but then fretted that his daughters might not get to fully enjoy their own promiscuity. And besides, what if women don’t approve?

…I believe most mra’s at one point played the “game”as I once did. Then the game got old, I settled down with “the one”and when she got bored…I got burnt. I get to burn for another 8 years or so before those flames with burn out...

Having three daughters who are entering the dating years also scares me on the affects that pua’s will have on how they view men in the future. On that angle alone, I would tend to argue that pua’s do not help the mra’s....... what do they say about a woman scorned?

Commenter Escoffier (after offering some excellent advice to women to stay off the carousel entirely) criticized Roosh at Hooking Up Smart for giving brotherly advice to his sister (and women in general) to avoid the worst parts of the carousel yet not working to make the carousel a kinder, gentler, more rewarding experience for women:

There’s something skeevy about all these game guys who nail anything they can but who would naturally feel very protective of their own sisters or daughters. Ideally, I’d like to channel that protectiveness into better behavior on their part, a la Kant’s Categorical Imperative (a concept I otherwise have no use for). But for now, that’s clearly a pipe dream, although it was part of the old order. Roosh at least is not a hypocrite. He knows what he’s doing and he tries to protect his own from it. It’s better than nothing and the implicit recognition that all this is very, very wrong is mildly encouraging.

I should clarify that I’m not making a moral justification for pickup artists. What I’m saying is they are on the same moral plane as the women who are having sex with them. Serial monogamy for women is no more or less morally justified than a pickup artist pumping and dumping and/or having a harem. Just as important, nothing I can say or do will ever make the carousel a safe place. Part of what makes alphas so attractive to these women is that they are rule breakers. Normal men with self control seem meek to these women because they aren’t in control of themselves.

The most bizarre part of all of this is while nearly all of us either do or have at some time taken the preferred form of promiscuity as a right owed to all women, there is no historical precedent to this in western civilization which I’m aware of. When besides now and maybe one or two generations back have women been generally free to have sex with one or more boyfriends before deciding one of them should marry her? Likewise when except in recent history have married women been able to expect to divorce when not haaaapy and marry
another man? I'm not saying promiscuity never happened in the past, but today nearly everyone sees this as a *divine right of women* which needs to be protected at all costs. When in the past was this even a significant minority belief in the western world?
When I was young my father ran a fleet service out of his service station. It was basically a tow-truck business minus the tow-truck. Stranded motorists would call and he would go help them on the spot. If he couldn’t fix the problem there he could arrange for a tow truck to bring it back to his mechanic’s bay. Most of the issues were very basic; he would go out and change a flat tire, jump start a dead battery, or unlock a car with the keys locked inside. To unlock cars he carried a tool called a slim jim much like is pictured to the left. It is essentially a kind of lock pick for cars. I bring this up because to a police officer some of the things he carried could look suspiciously like a burglary kit. The same tool which can help a stranded motorist is also used by car thieves.

However, owning or even carrying a slim jim didn’t turn my father into a car thief. They are just a tool; how the user utilizes the tool determines whether it is a positive or a negative. Likewise when most people think of game they think of pickup artists. There is some reason for this since from what I can tell pickup artists are generally the best teachers of game out there. If you really want to understand the intricate details of game, they are probably your best bet. But this doesn’t mean that learning or using game will make you a pickup artist. Athol Kay uses game to improve his marriage and teaches other men how to do the same. This post is about how a pastor might benefit from understanding game. Some of the links for more explanation of the theory go to pickup oriented sites, so bear that in mind when deciding on whether or not to follow them (especially Roissy/Heartiste). Also, please note that
I don’t claim to be a game expert. While I understand the basics, the truly elegant implementation ideas are more likely to come from those commenters who have more experience with game.

In the discussion following my post on Focus on the Family lionizing unwed mothers, the question was raised why 90%+ of churches today have replaced biblical teaching with feminist thought. The generally accepted answer was that since women are the primary attendees and are seen as the primary source of church revenue, churches have done this out of fear of hurting their business model. As Brendan pointed out on a separate thread, the right answer is for churches not to be afraid of teaching the Bible as it actually is, and they should be willing to accept a smaller but sincere congregation. If pastors had enough conviction in their faith and were willing to stand up to women in the congregation, this would not be an issue. However, as we have seen such pastors are vanishingly rare.

But how could game help a pastor teach the Bible as it is without cowering in fear of the majority of the congregation? Commenter Deti described the basic problem perfectly, which we can use as an example. Here is what happens when a pastor teaches that wives are to submit to their husbands, or holds women accountable to their marriage vows (emphasis mine):

> Pastors have to walk tightropes with their congregations. I’ve seen this happen so many times: some pastor says something which calls out women in general, or which criticizes women in general. And predictably, the women are up in arms. Letters are written. Names are called. Threats and recriminations are exchanged, privately and publicly. Meetings are held. Women show up to weep, wail, complain and gnash their teeth at the pastor, his supporters, his detractors, the church’s men. The pastor and the men are called sexist, incompetent, pigs, uncaring, unfeeling, heartless, and “incapable of showing Jesus’ love and understanding” to the less fortunate of the flock. Women threaten to leave the church. Men (prompted by their harridan wives) also meekly say they’ll leave if things don’t improve right away. Families get in the pastor’s face, demanding things change or by golly, they’ll stop writing those tithe checks. And inevitably a few families leave.

Most pastors will see this as a test of their leadership; are they able to hold the congregation together during times of strife. Being afraid in general to displease women, they then tend to find a way of compromising. Maybe we can say all of the right words on marriage but not actually hold women accountable. Maybe we can find a way to pretend we still believe in the doctrine but explain it away as something no longer applicable in modern times. This is of course exactly what is happening.

A pastor who knew game however would understand that this isn’t a test of his leadership, it is a challenge of his authority. It is testing to see if he is fit to be a pastor and lead the congregation. This is what is called in game a “fitness test”, or in more coarse parlance a “shit test”. This is a test to see if the man will bend as a leader (he “passes” by not doing so). It is a test of his strength. Will he leave his frame (this is the Bible and it is the Word of God) to placate their emotions? Or will he maintain his authority as the pastor of the congregation.
Roissy’s 15th commandment applies perfectly here:

**Maintain your state control**

You are an oak tree. You will not be manipulated by crying, yelling, lying, head games, sexual withdrawal, jealousy ploys, pity plays, shit tests, hot/cold/hot/cold, disappearing acts, or guilt trips. She will rain and thunder all around you and you will shelter her until her storm passes. She will not drag you into her chaos or uproot you. When you have mastery over yourself, you will have mastery over her.

The truly counterintuitive part of fitness tests is the woman wants you to remain in control despite her often desperate efforts to knock you out of the frame of leader. She needs to know you are strong and in charge. She can’t find this out by asking you; every leader will claim they are as solid as a rock. She needs to test you to see if you are the real deal, or just another faker in a robe (in the case of a pastor). When you pass, she is actually very pleased that you did so. This is why all husbands have experienced that madening moment when they gave into their wife’s emotional demand in an effort to make her happy, only to have her become even more furious with him than before. Moreover, she typically is unaware she is actually doing this. Roissy discusses this in the context of a man meeting a woman in a nightclub:

> Remember, the worst/best shit tests are those that FOOL THE GIRL herself. If she doesn’t even know what she’s doing, how will *you* know when she’s weighing your stones? The “hold my drink” shit test frequently falls into this category of “subliminal but deadly”. She may honestly need you to hold her drink. But you still shouldn’t do it.

I like this example because on the surface it seems incredibly petty. Why not help the woman out? The problem for the man in the nightclub/drink scenario is he would be following her lead during a time in the relationship when he has yet to establish himself as the leader. This is especially problematic because feminism teaches women to always try to be in control to show they are the equal of men. Later in the relationship this small issue might be of little importance, but at this stage it is critical that he not follow her lead. The fitness test example Deti provided is of course much more serious, but the basic response required is no different; the pastor must not relinquish his authority. He must maintain the frame of leadership, bringing the weeping women into his frame instead of joining theirs. If he does this without losing his frame as a confident leader, he will find the majority of the women in the congregation will be surprisingly pleased with him.

However, this is where it gets counterintuitive again. If he is being strong in an effort to please the women, it is unlikely to work because they will sense this. He needs to truly be unafraid of their reaction to be able to pass the fitness test. Roissy explains in his 16th commandment:

**Never be afraid to lose her**

You must not fear. Fear is the love-killer. Fear is the ego-triumph that brings abject loneliness. You will face your fear. You will permit it to pass over and through
you. And when your ego-fear is gone you will turn and face your lover, and only your heart will remain. You will walk away from her when she has violated your integrity, and you will let her walk when her heart is closed to you. She who can destroy you, controls you. Don’t give her that power over yourself. Love yourself before you love her.

Note that when applied to the Word of God and women in the congregation, this is the same exact advice that Brendan offered. The pastor shouldn’t fear teaching the Word because it might offend those he is teaching. Only a craven weakling would fear teaching the Word of God because some women might cry and complain. These women are actually doing the congregation a great service. They are testing for a fake, a pastor who has no business being up there. Unfortunately 99% of the pastors today are failing this test and cowering to the women.

Think about it; how craven do you have to be to be a pastor and yet afraid to teach the Word of God for fear of offending someone? Every pastor who fails this test is obviously unfit to lead.

Note: In part two of this series I will offer a hypothetical method a pastor might use to regain frame in the situation Deti described. Those with game experience are free to suggest how they would respond if they were the pastor in that situation, and I may use one or more of the commenter’s suggestions in part two.

Slim Jim image from Pro-Lock
Women have been continuously renegotiating the social contract in their favor for over 40 years. They have been incredibly successful by making never ending incremental demands. When you consider the full scope of their success it is truly awesome.

Normally when progressives and cultural marxists make demands for change conservatives point out that by changing the terms of the agreement there will inevitably be unintended consequences. Demanding that insurance companies cover preexisting conditions means health insurance premiums must increase. Rent control eventually leads to housing shortages. Minimum wage laws and union negotiated pay and benefit increases mean employers are less willing to hire local workers. These changes are to some degree inevitable, and for most people the only question is the actual scope of the unintended consequences and whether they are worth the improvement gained.

However, in the case of the gender war feminists have made an unspoken agreement with traditional conservatives:

| You hold him down while I rob him.

Not only have Social Conservatives agreed, they were so eager to assist that they even volunteered to [create an alibi](#) for the crime. Whenever anything goes wrong with the heist, conservatives [loudly blame men](#).

Feminists sternly tell us that 40 or so years ago women looked to their husbands as the rightful leader of the family. Men and women both married young, and with generally little previous sexual experience. Marriage was almost universally seen as a partnership for life.

Now women are actually proud to call themselves sassy. [Lack of self control](#) is now a virtue for women, and is [openly celebrated in very young girls](#). This new high attitude woman however [doesn’t come with the increased ability](#) which would back it up. Women are being told they should [delay marriage until they are at least 30](#) and many are following that advice. Yet after waiting so long to marry, women are now as likely as not to decide that they either don’t want to be married or have married the wrong man. Those who do stay married are very likely to feel justified to deny their husband sex and generally usurp his traditional role as head of the household. In the years prior to marriage women no longer feel that they must abstain from sex. Social conservatives have signed off on removing slut shaming, with the pretext that women’s preferred form of promiscuity is [more moral](#) than mens and any women who are slutty are merely innocent victims of the men they have sex with.

In fairness to feminists they would argue that this is all a matter of perspective. To them all of the changes listed above are great achievements. Sassy brassy career women are far better than submissive wives from the feminist perspective. Women embracing their sexuality and enjoying it to the fullest on their own terms is something they worked decades to achieve. Women putting education, career, and [personal development](#) before marriage is a great
improvement in their eyes over women marrying while young. Furthermore, women having the right to divorce at will and have the state force the costs onto men is a monumental achievement. If we are honest, feminists have a lot to be proud of. They created a wish list and have achieved nearly everything on it.

But what have men received in return? Their wives often come with a decade or more of kinky sexual experience with exotic men. That has to be worth something. While she is more likely to deny him sex, at least he can take comfort in the knowledge that she isn’t frigid. Women now make more money than they did in the past; this has to be a major benefit, right? Unfortunately the career woman also often comes with student loans to match or exceed her career, which need to paid off whether she continues focusing on her career or not. She also comes with expensive tastes developed by spending a decade or more with a large amount of disposable income. Furthermore, women are being told to get a career so they can be comfortable kicking their husband out should they ever feel the need.

Don’t get me wrong. Women should be free to make all of the changes listed above except for the unfair treatment men receive regarding child support, custody, alimony, divorce theft, presumed guilty rape laws, and out of control domestic violence laws which make it a crime for a man to even be rude or insulting to a woman.

While women have every right to pile on the ultimatums, men must also have the right to say no thank you. That deal is no longer attractive to me. After all, an ultimatum means take it or leave it. Yet the men who more and more say leave it are the people in our society we are criticizing the most. We made the terms of the deal unpalatable, and instead of understanding when they walked away we are furious with them. Take the simple issue of women postponing marriage while feeling free to be true to themselves with the most alpha men they can land. In the US the median age of first marriage is 26.5 for women and 28.4 for men. Since we are in the middle of a large jump in the postponement of marriage these figures likely significantly underestimate the reality we see. Even taking them at face value, half of men are having to wait until they are 28 or older to marry. Large numbers of men can’t marry until their mid to late thirties. At the same time they are surrounded by large numbers of promiscuous attractive women being as true to themselves as they can possibly be. Men in this position have three options:

1. Stay celibate by choice.
2. Stay celibate or close to celibate due to being rejected by hypergamous young women.
3. Learn how to have sex with the hordes of young women riding the carousel.

This isn’t a question our society has spent much energy wrestling with. The underlying feeling is; who cares, so long as they man up and marry these women once they are done riding the carousel. It turns out however that the men themselves very much do care. This is an extremely long time we are expecting men to go before marrying. During this time we have the unspoken expectation that they will work their tails off to be ready to act as a provider while not getting too used to being single. Each decade we have pushed the envelope a little further, and we expect each new generation of men to simply suck it up a little more and fill in the gaps. One can argue that they should have beat another man to the punch and married one of the small number of chaste young submissive women who were
looking to marry. But this is just shuffling the deck chairs around. At the end of the day this will only determine which men marry in their early to mid 20s and which ones are forced to wait it out; the overall numbers won’t change because the change is being driven by the choices of women, not men.

Social Conservatives and Feminists have been pretty happy with this deal for the last 40 years. What could possibly go wrong? Now along come men like Roissy and Roosh who say to young men not only do you not have to spend your youth in grinding celibacy, but you don’t need to sign up to marry a brassy sassy career gal slut who just as likely as not will deny you sex and/or take you to the cleaners while ripping your children away from you. They will teach young men how to pass the decade or so they would otherwise wait for their wife to tire of slutting around. Even better, they will teach them how to have all the sex they want with the youngest, prettiest women, all without having to knock themselves out career wise. Feminists and Traditional Conservatives gave men lemons; Roissy and Roosh taught them how to make lemonade.

Who reading this doesn’t understand that this was absolutely bound to happen? Why is anyone surprised at this? After 40 years of cumulative one sided demands (and concessions), men now see another option. Feminists and Traditional Conservatives are furious. How dare they choose something else! But they are the ones who turned marriage from a lifetime partnership to a way women can defraud men. They are the ones who told women to slut it up in their 20s and told men to wait for marriage until the women were done. They were the ones who denigrated the status of husband from leader of the family to cowering scapegoat. All I can say is they should get used to it. If it took 40 years of one sided demands to get here, it could easily take as long to move back to equilibrium (assuming it does).

*Banging men in exotic locations.
I know for many of you this really isn’t a bad place. If you are a feminist or a player, this is pretty close to paradise. But if you are like me you very much want to leave. Everyone always asks, why don’t we just build a boat and sail away from here? We could make it to the land of sanity. But it isn’t that simple I’m afraid. Every time it looks like we are about to make it home, one of the Gilligans manages to screw it up.

Keep in mind that Gilligans aren’t malicious by nature. They also want to leave the island. But unfortunately they are rather simple and easily distracted. It wouldn’t be such a problem if there weren’t so many of them.

Take for example the issue of out of wedlock births. Gilligans are especially susceptible to what I call the it takes two fallacy. In the proper context it isn’t a fallacy at all. If an individual woman has a child out of wedlock, it is a fact that there is somewhere a man who is also responsible for the problem. So far, no problem. But the Gilligans want to use this to form social policy. They mistakenly apply at the macro level what is only true at the micro level. They assume this means if you have 100 baby mamas, that there must also be an equal number of baby daddies. They took this logical error and combined it with their natural sympathy for sluts, and decided to create a social order where only men are punished for out of wedlock births. What they didn’t understand is that it only takes a small number of irresponsible men to sire all the bastards the baby mamas could ever want. No matter how draconian our child support laws become, there will always be a small number of irresponsible men who are willing to play their part.

We’ve tried the Gilligan way for over fifty years now, and even though it has brought us from single digit illegitimacy rates to 40% and climbing, no one can talk any sense into them (chart source).
You explain it to them slowly and carefully, and they nod at all the right moments indicating they understand. Then a feminist comes by and whispers “double standard” or “it takes two” in their ear, and the Gilligan instantly forgets everything you just explained to him.

The same thing applies to slut shaming. Gilligans love their rule of it takes two, and they apply it there as well. Again at the micro level if we are considering the issue of individual sin this would make sense. But Gilligans live in fear of the dreaded double standard. It keeps them awake at night with visions of unhappy sluts crying out to them. Why do we have to shame sluts? they plead, Let's shame the players instead. They are the really bad ones anyway. We know from the history of civilization that slut shaming is what works. But the Gilligans are haunted by the faces of the unhappy sluts which fill their dreams. They are desperate for another solution, any solution, so long as it doesn’t mean unhappy sluts.

**The tried and true approach: Slut shaming.**

Assume we are starting off with 100 sluts and 30 alphas/players. The sluts are happily riding on the alpha carousel. Now we introduce slut shaming. It isn’t fully effective of course, but it manages to convince 15 of the would be sluts not to be sluts after all. This means an additional 15 women are again potentially suitable for marriage. This directly translates into fewer fatherless children. This also makes the next round of slut shaming easier. Instead of having 99 peers eagerly cheering her on her ride, each slut now has 15 happily married women shaming her and only 84 other sluts encouraging her. After the next round this becomes 30 happily married women shaming the sluts, and only 69 other sluts cheering them on, and so on. This process continues until all but the most die hard sluts are off the carousel. You will never discourage them all, but you can do a world better than we are doing today.

**The Gilligan approach: Shame players.**
Start with the same base assumption of 100 sluts and 30 players. Now apply shame to the players. Unfortunately shame is less effective on players than it is on sluts, so instead of discouraging 15% of them (4.5) in the first round, it only discourages three of them. **No problem!** says the Gilligan, **at least there are now three fewer sluts now that three of the evil alphas have been shamed away, and all without creating any unhappy sluts!** But unfortunately it doesn’t work that way. The remaining 27 players are more than happy to service the extra sluts. They are quite maddeningly actually **delighted** with the new situation. Even worse, the next round of player shaming is even less effective than the first. This time only 2 players are discouraged, and one of the other 3 realizes that his player peers are picking up the slack anyway and reopens for business. This means in net there are still 26 players, more than enough to handle all of the sluts you can throw at them.

But it gets worse yet. Now that the ratio of sluts to players is even less in the sluts favor, the sluts actually get sluttier! They now have to **compete even harder** for each player’s attention. **Now we have 100 even sluttier sluts!**

**But what if we could shame all of the players?** the Gilligan asks. **That way we could still achieve our objective and I wouldn’t have to be haunted by unhappy sluts!** In theory of course the Gilligan is right. If you could shame all of the players into hanging up their smirk, you would then be able to stamp out sluthood forever. However, the Gilligan is once again barking up the wrong tree. Shame only works on those who are susceptible to it. Unfortunately players tend to possess the **dark triad** personality traits. It is actually a large part of what makes them attractive to the sluts in the first place. Our little buddy won’t hear of it though, and presses on with his plan to shame a group of narcissistic psychopaths to forgo their own pleasure for the good of society.

**The hybrid Gilligan approach: Shame them both equally!**

While the Gilligan would prefer not to have to shame sluts at all, his mortal terror of the double standard compels him to hold out for player shaming, even when agreeing to shame sluts (at least in theory). The problem is shaming players has the side effect of reducing the impact of slut shaming. This is rationalization hamster steroids. The moment concern for the double standard is introduced into the mix, even a little bit, sluts, their moms, and white knights will all rationalize that it wasn’t really the sluts’ fault. We’ve seen this with Jennifer Moses, the mother who wrote the *Wall Street Journal* article on the damage promiscuity is doing to young girls. Even after acknowledging the great harm this is causing young women she wrote:

I wouldn’t want us to return to the age of the corset or even of the double standard, because a double standard that lets the promiscuous male off the hook while condemning his female counterpart is both stupid and destructive. If you’re the campus mattress, chances are that you need therapy more than you need condemnation.

Better your daughter need therapy than commit the dreaded sin of the double standard! Anything but that! We see the same rationalization in pop music as well. I could go on, but you see it simply doesn’t matter. I could show charts and stats and tell them about the millions of innocent children and even the sluts themselves who are harmed by not shaming
sluts. I could have every Gilligan on the island fully convinced. But after all of that it would only take one slut or feminist to walk by and whisper “double standard” and it all would wash away.

Welcome to my hell.
Blogger Dennis Mangan kindly linked to my post 40 years of ultimatums in his post The Backlash Against Feminism:

Most conservatives just haven’t understood this, mostly in my opinion out of willful ignorance, and we’re regularly treated to columns by the likes of Kay Hymowitz and William Bennett telling young men that they need to “man up”, do “the right thing”, and marry. Conservatives through the years have generally offered only the most token opposition to feminism, said opposition appearing to be nil these days. (This is one factor in the emergence of an alternative right.)

This is of course just a teaser. Check out his full post. I’ll still be here when you get back.

As has happened here, the topic spurred on a vigorous discussion in the comments section. One thing which struck me reading the discussion however is how difficult it can be to distinguish Feminists from Traditional Conservatives. Things have been fairly heated here in the last few weeks, so I thought I would lighten things up just a bit with a blogging version of a TV quiz show. Help me out here; which commenters are Traditional Conservatives, and which ones are Feminists.

I’ll start with commenter Severn, who responded to a quote of me stating that Feminists and Traditional Conservatives had formed a tacit agreement:

I don’t buy it. The people I see on the right making the “why do men suck so much?” argument are always neocons, people like Kay Hymowitz and Bill Bennett. Neocons usually seem to borrow their views – apart from those on foreign policy – from the left.

Sorry, blogger’s prerogative. I’m going to go ahead and call this one. He has to be a Trad Con since he is defending them. I’ll let the rest of you have a shot at the next one, I promise. Next up is Dan:

There is a solution, and it is as radical as feminism. That solution is hard religious orthodoxy to the point of fundamentalism.

I am in a religious marriage and I would have to call myself thoroughly happy. I went to an Ivy League University and graduated with honors. I am a fairly successful federal employee. We will soon have four kids so far and she is just thirty. There are no plans yet to stop having kids. My tribe is increasing. My parents delightedly help with every bone in their body. They love the grandkids.

I know I promised, but at first I didn’t think it would be this easy. Dan is clearly a Trad Con. We could quit now but I’ll go through a few more quotes just for entertainment’s sake. Here is another excerpt from the same comment by Dan:
Men can take control of this. Just don’t be afraid to be single for a while. Work your butt off to get degrees and a good job and otherwise become desirable and then make traditional-mindedness a core criterion. Don’t dabble with dating anybody who is not a good candidate your traditional wife. And tell her your plans for her to be your stay-at-home-while-the-kids-are-small motherly wife clear early. If it scares her away or freaks her out, good. She won’t waste your time or your money...

P.S.
This business about men being taken to the cleaners in marriage is BS. If she is willing to have your kids, and you can continue your lineage through her, that is massive! I’d much rather get married and have kids and get divorced than never have kids at all. Although I also hope not to see divorce. Still, people who shy away from the whole thing are weenies.

Yup. I called it! Make sure she knows upfront she will be staying at home. Also *Suck it up men, even if your wife does the worst to you, you should call yourself lucky*. That has Trad Con all over it.

Here’s the next one, and it’s Dan again!:

I am the earlier poster, happily married, growing tribe etc. Those who think in terms of male superiority, and misogyny will get you nowhere.

Think of orthodox Jews. Women have equal importance and value, just different goals.

The stiff cultures of Italy, Japan and Korea, where you often just try to shove male superiority down women’s throats rather than have equal but different roles are dying out. Heck, even in Iran the women have clamped their uteri somewhat shut.

Ya gotta have a shared religious vision and its gotta be sincere or you are out of the game. Faking it for misogyny’s sake just puts you in league with *those* people.

Is it too late to change my vote? That sounded almost Feminist. Well, even if this Dan guy goes Fem, at least I can count on Severn. He is up next, and shares his impression of me:

Yeah. Sounds to me like the usual game boy hostility towards Christians. I clicked through the links of his argument with the Christian women, and I don’t think he got the better of it.

Women who divorce and remarry are “whores“? Really? I think it’s more than possible to argue that no-fault divorce has been a bad thing for men, women, children, and society in general *without* claiming that women (but not men) who divorce and remarry are whores. There’s way too much emotional hyperbole surrounding these topics.

And it’s not just a one off instance of rhetorical excess. Words like “whores” and
“whorish” come up again and again in his and his commenters remarks. Along with the “cock carousel!” which all those dirty dirty whores are supposedly riding.

I had such high hopes for Severn, but then he broke out the *Womens Studies* phraseology and even endorsed serial polyandry. He followed up in a later comment:

Less measured that “whorish whores riding the cock carousel”? What exactly would this less measured response look like – killing prostitutes and dumping their bodies in the forest?

I used to wonder about the mentality of guys who did that. It’s all become a lot clearer since I started reading game blogs. There are some very warped men out there whose image of women is based entirely on porn, girls-gone-wild videos, and *Sex In The City*. They’re dirty, dirty, *dirty* sluts and they deserve to be punished!

No worries though, because Orthodox Dan will redeem himself. I just know it:

I don’t know this Ferdinand Bardamu guy but he seems like a whining loser.

If you are a winner, you can make a marriage work and have a large clan of your descendants to love you in your old age. I have to say, good girls are not impossible to spot and if you’ve got it, you marry such a girl and Ferdinand Bardamu emphatically does not have it. Sucks to be Ferdinand Bardamu...

(1) Not all churches are the same. If a church has a weak marriage culture, change churches. There are tons to choose from. Most people know 10x more about car models than they do about church models, which is lame.

(2) A 62% chance of success is tolerable. (Remember that these Christians are marrying much younger; account for that and the D-rate would actually be much lower.) If you get divorced, you won’t die. You’ll just get back in the saddle like a real man. Besides, if misfortune has you back on the market in your forties, you will find the numbers are strongly in your favor as a man and love will be yours for the taking.

Finally! I never thought I would be so glad to read *man up and marry those future divorcées you loser!* Dan is clearly a Trad Con who was suffering from a temporary moment of Feminist weakness. More likely someone else was just posting under his name to confuse us. Either way, Dan assumes the problem is people just aren’t finding the good churches. I’m not convinced, because I have a standing offer on this blog to give free publicity to any church which is serious about marriage and none have yet come forward. I’m so pleased with Dan I’ll let it slide though and even put him up next (emphasis mine):

In Japan the religion is work and then the men drink with their coworkers until 1 am every night of the week. *Japanese men help with nothing at home — they are one more kid to take care of, while American husbands help a lot. Doing housework is a good way for a guy to have lots of kids in 2011*. Let her pop out babies while you do a lot of chores.
It is not womanly for a woman to be barren. Likewise, it is not manly for a man to be childless.

Ouch. Is it just me, or did Dan just mix Feminist slogans with his man up shaming language? And didn’t he say his wife is a traditional stay at home housewife? Why is he taking on the role of traditional provider and doing the housework? I mentioned this to Mrs. Dalrock, and she replied:

It’s nice when you help out a bit like when you clean a difficult pot, but if a husband does much more it just says kitchen bitch.

Next up is Severn, riding to the rescue of sluts everywhere with some expertly crafted shaming language:

It’s not the language which I find excessive, it’s the shrieking emotionalism. That’s expressed via language of course, but the language is not the problem.

Guy’s who go on (and on, and on, and on, and on, and on) about “dirty whorish sluts who ride the cock carousel while also being fat and ugly unlike those cute Asians, and by the way, why don’t they sleep with ME?” not only come across as losers. They come across as irrational and unstable. I certainly do not expect people to only say things which I agree with. I do expect people to have at least a tenuous grasp on reality and to say things which can be objectively analyzed and intelligently discussed. “Cock carousel”? It’s like referring to Jews as “blood-sucking parasites”. The idea is not to stimulate thought but to shut it down.

And it succeeds, just look at the comments on this thread. A lot of heat and not much light.

I have to confess I’m stumped on this. I don’t remember if this is Feminist or Trad Con. I’m thinking both. At any rate, Severn weighs in again with a helpful clarification on which camp he is in:

Since I’m one of those social conservatives, perhaps you can tell me which wrong tree you think I’m barking up.

(The phrase “social conservative” is redundant, btw)

That would seem to settle the matter. Except then Dennis Mangan called him out on comparing the psychological mindset of gamesters to serial killers. This brought the following doubling down:

No, this comes from the commenter who noticed the distinct psychological similarity between men who see all women as “dirty whorish sluts and slutty whores who love COCK!” and the actual men who are serial killers of prostitutes.

I don’t think I’ve ever seen a Gilligan more upset at slut shaming.
There are a couple of unfair criticisms of game which I see fairly regularly. The first is the idea that what game teaches is painfully obvious. Deti took some heat on a previous post for pointing out that what game teaches goes against the programming men today are given:

...most men who came of age in the 1980s and 90s were not learning these things to be attractive to women. We were not taught any of these things.

I was taught there are absolutely no differences whatsoever between women and men wrt thought patterns, perceptions, the way they experience events, the way they process information, or their feelings. I was taught that any man who pursues women aggressively or goes after what he wants is a pig, a chauvinist, a possible rapist, and probably a criminal. I was taught that women find soft, caring, good-hearted, kind, and nice men attractive. I was taught never, never, NEVER to escalate sexually without express permission, and that doing otherwise would subject me to possible criminal prosecution.

I was taught that a woman’s thought processes are never to be challenged. I was taught that a woman’s feelings are paramount and that you must do everything possible to “make your woman happy”. I was taught that any man who challenges a woman is an aggressor, is probably physically violent, and is overbearing and domineering. I was taught that if my woman was unhappy it was because I was not being “nice” enough to her; I was not “doing enough” for her; and/or I was not being “sensitive enough to her needs/wants/feelings”.

In response he received a fairly standard rebuttal that of course everyone knew that women don’t like men who follow those rules. But I agree with Deti, beta men have been taught exactly the kind of nonsense he describes; because we are polite rule followers who want to please our wives and the other women in our lives, we very often follow the terrible advice nearly everyone would give us. Once you understand why the advice is so terrible it is painfully obvious why it is wrong. But for me, Deti, and I would guess a large number of other men this isn’t obvious until you learn game.

The other unfair indictment against game which I see fairly regularly is that it teaches men not to love women. Blogger Bonald from Throne and Altar made this basic point in his recent post Pile up on social conservatives (emphasis his):

When we realize that true eros desires an I-Thou union, we see that Game is actually hostile to eros because it teaches the man to regard his partner as an It to be manipulated rather than a Thou to be communicated with.

As I mentioned in one of my very first posts, I’ve been married to my wife for over a decade and a half now and we have grown so close over the years that friends and relatives often tease that we are really one entity. Even so, there have been times where our marriage has
been under strain. Even at its worst it has never been the kind of truly difficult marriage that I often read about though. The first difficult period came fairly early in our marriage. My wife was still in school and I had slipped into a more beta frame. The combination of my increased betaness and her being surrounded by other men created some strain on our marriage. She fitness tested me with some regularity, and while I generally passed them I didn’t always come through with flying colors. During this period my wife actually figured out part of what was going on. She would lay into me for something trivial, and after a period of trying to placate her I would eventually find something else to do which was away from her. My thought process wasn’t to try to game her, but I figured *why hang around the apartment for the weekend to get bitched out when I could be hunting or fishing instead?* On the weekends where she wasn’t testing me we were very close and I would stick around. Then at some point she would test again and I’d be out the door with a gun or a fishing rod. She actually figured out the pattern at some point and came to me about it. She said she would get into a mood where she felt absolutely *compelled* to piss me off. Every cell in her body was telling her she would feel better if only she provoked a fight. Then she would do it, and I’d be out the door. Once the fight was started but especially once I had left she felt miserable. So she made a conscious effort not to give in to the urge; we fought less and as a result spent much more time together.

After that things improved a great deal, and by normal standards we had a very good marriage. However, for the first seven of the last ten years she was telling me she didn’t feel loved. This was maddening to me because no matter what I tried it didn’t help. I knew enough game intuitively to not go overboard on flowers, cards, etc, but when I surprised her with those it still didn’t help. She is a natural leader so I also tried letting her make more of the decisions; any time an opportunity came up I would make it a point to defer to her preference to show her that I loved her. This only *made the problem worse*, although I didn’t make the connection at the time. This wasn’t an acute problem, but it was a chronic one and I absolutely hated it when she brought it up because nothing I could do would make her happier. She knew I loved her, but she didn’t *feel* it the way she wanted to. It of course was equally frustrating for her as well because she kept telling me something was wrong and I wasn’t making it better.

About two years ago I stumbled onto Roissy’s site. I knew some game informally from having watched my natural PUA roomate in college but I had not learned any of the theory. What I had put into practice when I met my wife I had mostly lost in an effort to make my wife feel more loved. Roissy was extremely painful to read. I kept finding myself wanting to unknow what he had just explained, but I couldn’t stop myself from reading more. My curiosity was more intense than my desire to hold onto the pretty lies. After about four months of reading Roissy and the comments I had a rudimentary sense of how game worked and started experimenting on my wife with it (she didn’t even know I was reading about it). I stopped sending her the frequent “I love you!” texts* which I had been doing in an effort to make her feel more loved. Instead I started shooting for upped attraction. I’ve never experienced the *sexual denial* that I’ve read about other husbands experiencing, but I figured a little more attraction wouldn’t hurt anything anyway. I started objectifying my wife more, and treating her more like a possession. *I love you* was out, *C’mere woman!* and *Hey sexy wife!* was in. Instead of loving gentle hugs, I’d forcefully grab her and pull her into me; I would mischievously cop a feel from time to time as well.
It wasn’t just my actions and words which changed however, my frame changed as well. Had I tried these same things from my old more beta frame, they might have backfired spectacularly. I struggle to define it, but my frame was more of a playful cocky/funny one. This was actually fairly natural for me, but I had made the mistake of listening to the conventional wisdom on how to please my wife. The results were as expected more attraction from my wife. As I mentioned this wasn’t ever a real problem before but I could tell a difference in her response to me. Then something very startling happened; she thanked me for finally making her feel more loved! I had given up on that goal for the time being, and yet along with more attraction I had also inadvertently filled that nagging void which she had been feeling for so many years.

This was a huge breakthrough for me, and as I’ve learned more about game I also am able to mix in more of the comfort/beta traits. I still tell my wife I love her, and I do surprise her with flowers from time to time, but I also gently tease her and make sure she knows she is my woman. We are both far happier now; game has truly done incredible things for our marriage.

*Yeah, I know. I hate to admit that I was that guy.

See Also:

- Gaming your wife.
- That way rationalization lies
- All posts on the topic of game.
Playing career woman
by Dalrock | November 25, 2011 | Link

When Atlas set down the apples and took the heavens upon his shoulders again, Heracles took the apples and ran away.

Atlas’ encounter with Heracles

Commenter Escoffier asked an excellent question in the discussion of my post Traditional Conservative or Feminist? I assume by UMC that he means Upper Middle Class (emphasis mine):

Here’s the question I have. I have no idea what the answer is.

There are many reasons/factors for why we are where we are. One of the most important, if not THE most important, is “feminism 1.0”, i.e., encourage females to get educated and pursue careers in the same way that men do. Women could of course do this before the mid-’60s but it was understood by society that she would be giving something up, the most important thing. Women who pursued careers (apart from traditional female roles such as teaching, and even that many women dropped out of altogether once they had children) were considered at best sort of harmlessly odd, fine, do what you want lady, but we know that family life is superior and more important.

That’s changed. Now it’s “You MUST do this for own sake, not to do it is to not realize your potential.” And that change is a direct cause of much of what you diagnose.

The way the UMC has “solved” this problem is to send girls to college, let them launch their careers—whether in soggy girly stuff like PR or crunchy stuff like business and law—and then they marry late (~30), have kids a few years later and drop out of working at least until the kids are grown. This answers a couple of needs, not least the need for two incomes to accumulate assets so that the couple can eventually buy into a UMC school district. But the real importance of this solution is to her psyche. Getting the education and career are a way of telegraphing “I am a complete person, not some drone like June Cleaver. I am just as smart and capable as any man. In my altruistic concern for my children, I choose not to use my talent in the marketplace but to devote myself to them.” In other words, she needs that education and early career to mark her as better than a mere housewife, even though she will eventually choose to become a housewife. (It’s actually very high status in these places to stay home with your kids—IF you once had a career—and subtly frowned upon for mothers to work. A woman who never had a career is low status in the blue state UMC.)

So, 1) do you think the solution to the problems you describe requires going back or can reform be accomplished with the basic tenets of feminism 1.0 still intact? And,
2) if you think going back is essential, how would you handicap the odds?

Escoffier has done an outstanding job of describing this phenomenon. What he is describing aren’t women who work primarily to support themselves and their family, but women who use their education and career as a way to check off the box to prove their feminist credentials before settling down into an entirely traditional role. To answer his specific questions, I think we can manage this issue without formally rolling back feminism 1.0. As I see it, to the extent that this is a problem it will generally tend to resolve itself. As I said in 40 years of ultimatums, women are and should be free to pile on whatever demands regarding marriage which they see fit. If this means demanding that their husband to be wait until they have tired of playing career woman and even assuming a significant accompanying student loan debt and expensive tastes, so be it. But this must be accompanied by the freedom for men to decide whether marriage under these terms is something they want to enter into. The problem isn’t that women are making expensive demands in an effort to prove they are feminist before demanding a traditional role as wife and mother, the problem is the Social Conservatives who are standing by insisting that men marry women under these terms.

So far the much fretted marriage strike hasn’t yet materialized. However, I do think these women are taking a significant risk. To the extent that the whole “Peter Pan” meme is accurate, the current cohort of mid to late 20s women delaying marriage until their 30s have laid the groundwork for their own potential spinsterhood. Men in their age group aren’t getting as strong a signal that working hard to become a provider will result in first a LTR and later marriage. While there may be a growing number of successful men who aren’t willing to marry a woman who waited until her late 20s or early 30s to marry, I suspect the bigger issue is that a significant percentage of men haven’t felt the incentive to prepare themselves as a provider. Even worse, these women playing career pushed out men from their slots in school and the workplace. So the men they one day hope to marry both have less incentive to do the extra work and planning to become a provider and face additional obstacles to do so. Compounding this is the very strong desire these women have to marry a man who is at least as well educated and financially successful as they are. The higher their own achievement, the smaller their pool of suitable potential husbands becomes.
So what if they don’t marry? you might be asking, these are after all feminist women. They don’t need a man anyway, they have their careers! But this is where we separate the real deal feminist career women from the fakers and posers. Men and women who work hard to support themselves understand that they are in it for the duration. There is a determined realism to them. Likewise the women who work to survive until they marry and after marriage until they have children are being pragmatic and working to meet the needs of their family. These aren’t the women we are talking about. The women Escoffier described see having a career as a badge of status to be collected on their way to their ultimate goal of stay at home housewife. They aren’t really career women, they are playing career woman much the way that Marie Antoinette played peasant and Zoolander’s character played coal miner.

It is striking to me how many women my wife and I know who are roughly our age and have already burned out and abandoned their careers. These women stand out the most when they are married but don’t have children. Some time in their 30s their infatuation with the professional world evaporates and they either trade down to a more fulfilling and less demanding job or stop working altogether. Recently Forbeswoman had a piece which was long on anecdote and short on statistics claiming this is a common trend: Why Millennial Women Are Burning Out At Work By 30 (H/T W.F. Price). While I didn’t find any corroborating data in the article, enough of the women who read the article identified with the feeling that the author wrote a follow up piece just on the comments. One commenter wrote:

Sent this to my millennial gf who is a high school teacher she replied with “The author has been stalking me, apparently. Spooky how accurate this is for my life.

What happened to her can do attitude? Doesn’t she know she needs to teach men a lesson? Another commenter was more ambitious, and pursued a career in law, only to find out that it was, surprisingly, hard work and not as glamorous as on TV:

You really captured how I feel about my career. I went to college and law school with
the intent of becoming a lawyer. I had never had a full time job until I graduated and I was truly shocked when I realized I had to go to work EVERY DAY ALL DAY! I had no idea what kind of lawyer I wanted to be nor that I even needed a career path once I got my first job.

As I mentioned above, I don’t worry about the trend Escoffier is describing. The path entails a fair amount of risk, especially since the woman won’t know if her plan will be successful for over a decade when she sets out for it. She may find that marrying at a later age is more difficult than she expected. Even if she achieves this part, she may find that she has outlasted her own fertility (H/T Bill). Lastly, the status Escoffier is talking about depends on the woman being able to claim she really wanted to be a career woman, but was somehow drafted into the stay at home mom role by her husband and children. It allows her to both frame herself as a feminist and a victim of the patriarchy, all while enjoying the benefits of the traditional role she really wanted all along. The Social Pathologist described how the women of his generation managed this in a post this summer (emphasis his):

Fifty percent of my medical course was composed of women, usually women who had been groomed in high school for a “power girl” existence. These were women that were going to take on and change the world. The funny thing is though, is that the vast bulk of them, once they had gotten married and had children, actually wanted to stay at home and look after the children. (Much to the disappointment of their husbands) To their surprise, they found the experience of motherhood enjoyable, even though they did not expect it to be.

The problem is this trick requires a sort of plausible deniability which becomes more and more difficult for each new generation of working women; if men like Escoffier can see it, how long before others start to get wise to the plan as well? This is after all an extremely expensive feminist merit badge to pick up prior to becoming a housewife. It only makes sense if the status of feminist martyr is actually accorded to them. If perspectives change and these women are seen instead as fakers, all will be for naught. Even worse, the men of their generation may just call their feminist bluff, leaving them to continue carrying the weight of the world on their own shoulders.

*We can do it* poster from [Wikipedia Commons](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Category:We_can_do_it_posters)

**See Also:** [Running with the bulls](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Running_with_the_bulls)
Shattering the forcefield of denial
by Dalrock | December 2, 2011 | Link

One of my readers was kind enough to link to my post on Fireproof on a Christian forum thread where the movie is being discussed. I was pleasantly surprised by the reaction of many of the readers there. However, commenter JaneFW (avatar to right) made a fairly standard denial of my point that the movie sends a message to wives that threatening divorce will give them power:

If you aren’t haaaapy, threaten divorce and let high status men compete for your heart!

I never, for one moment, ever, thought this – and have never heard anyone else say it. What a horrible concept.

For most normal people? Divorce is the last resort when the marriage is obviously in the dumpster. I would never hand over divorce papers expecting someone to fight for me. I would hand over divorce papers because we were done.

Just ugh.

And yet some people around here have said that it’s sinful to assume the worst about other people’s motives. Hmmm.

If I’m reading her correctly, not only is she denying that the movie contained this theme, but she is also suggesting that it might be sinful of me to point this out. The real problem with her statement however is it simply isn’t true. The theme that divorce gives women power and they can use it to invoke a fresh round of courtship from their husband and/or other men is extremely common. This is actually how I first started discussing this movie. Fireproof was
one of five movies I pointed out which had this extremely common theme. Readers identified many other movies with this theme in the comments section of that post as well.

This message is most dangerous because it is communicated without the idea itself ever being directly stated. These kinds of themes in literature and movies can at times slip past our conscious thought process, and thereby prevent us from logically or morally evaluating them.

I mentioned these scenes previously, but you really have to see them for the full impact (warning the volume varies greatly on these clips). Here is a scene where Katherine is carrying on with the doctor. Shortly after this she tells Caleb that she doesn't love him. Just in case the audience doesn’t understand that she has stopped caring about her husband, we then have this scene where she expresses almost no concern for him after he is dragged out of a burning building. Then we have the scene where Caleb finds the love letter she kept from the doctor and confronts him about it. Note that he doesn’t say what the man is doing is immoral or against God’s will, but instead he says he will fight for her heart. After that she learns that he has not only been doing the love challenge, but has exceeded the actual 40 day term and isn’t giving up. She isn’t impressed.

Finally we have the climax of the movie, where she learns that it wasn’t the doctor who was the highest bidder for her heart, but her husband instead. Note how her body language changes during this scene. She lights up and plays with her hair when talking about the doctor. Then when she learns it was from her husband there is a look of great confusion:

What is so troubling is that this idea has become so accepted that it found its way into a Christian movie which is supposed to strengthen marriage. Not only that, but apparently this wasn’t noticed by millions of Christians who watched it.

See also:

- How Fireproof lowers the boom
- Husbands, submit yourselves to your wives
- Firebombed
In one of the early scenes of *Fireproof* we witness the first of two marital fights which sets up the primary conflict of the movie. Much has been made about the husband’s viewing of pornography, but the movie goes to great pains to make it clear that the real problem is that Caleb isn’t submitting to his wife’s leadership.

He isn’t following her leadership on how they spend their money. He also is failing to do the housework as well as the chores she has set out for him. Here is the dialog from the first scene in the movie where the two are together (modified from this source). Watch it here for full context and to see the amount of contempt Katherine has for her disobedient husband:

**Caleb:** You have breakfast already?

**Katherine:** Yes.

**Caleb:** What’d you eat?

**Katherine:** I had the last bagel and a yogurt.

**Caleb:** Are you planning on making a grocery trip soon?

**Katherine:** Caleb, you work 24 hours and then you’re off for 48. You’ve got more time to go than I do.

**Caleb:** I asked a simple question. You don’t need to get smart with me. At least save me some breakfast.

**Katherine:** I never know when you’re coming or going. You don’t tell me.

**Caleb:** Catherine, what is your problem? Did I offend you by walking in the door?

**Katherine:** You can’t expect me to work every day and get the groceries... ...while you look at trash on the Internet dreaming about your boat.

**Caleb:** You chose to take this job. No one said you had to work full-time.

**Katherine:** We need the income. Especially since you tuck away a third of your salary... ...saving for a boat we don’t need. You’ve got $24,000 in savings when things in our house need fixing.

**Caleb:** Like what?

**Katherine:** The back door needs to be painted, the yard needs landscaping. And I
wanna put more shelves in the closet.

**Caleb:** Those are called preferences. Those are not needs. There’s a difference. If you wanna spend your money on that stuff, fine. I’ve been saving for my boat for years. You’re not taking that from me.

**Katherine:** This is so pointless. I don’t have time for this.

**Caleb:** Yeah, shut the door on your way out.

As you already know, fortunately the wayward husband is finally brought to heel through the wisdom of modern Christianity and the wife graciously accepts him back.
Women tend to fear a lot of different things. This makes sense given their vulnerability. Most men are wired to want to protect women and this includes protection from living in fear. In the right context this is a very beneficial trait.

One way to look at the history of feminism is consider it as men and women working to remove women’s fears. I had been considering this issue when by an incredible stroke of luck one of my readers found the transcript of the actual conversations which lead to our current state. I won’t reveal my source, but it pays to have readers who have access to the official white knight archives:

**Woman:** I’d like to have sex with men I’m not married to, but I’m afraid I’ll be judged. I’m also afraid the man won’t provide for me and my child should I become pregnant.

**White knight brigade:** That is unacceptable! Don’t worry, we’ll make him pay, and in accordance with our rule of it takes two, we’ll reserve any judgment solely for him.

**Woman:** Oh, thank you! But what if I’m more traditional, and prefer the classic route to baby-mama hood? It would be trashy to raise a child on my own having never married. What if I want to pretend to marry him for life, but then later realize that I’m not happy and divorce? My fellow churchgoers might judge me, and I won’t have the benefit of his wealth or paycheck any more.

**White knight brigade:** Don’t worry ma’am, we will still make him pay. We’ll also find a way to claim it was his fault so you don’t get judged. In fact, whichever route to unwed motherhood you choose, we’ll call you a hero!

**Woman:** What if I know he doesn’t want to be a father, and I trick him into it anyway?

**White knight brigade:** Don’t worry, we won’t let your bad choices have any consequences. We’ll make him pay even then. In fact, we’ll make him pay even if you become pregnant from statutory raping him.

**Woman:** Oh, thank you white knight brigade! I’m so excited! Now I can safely have sex with men who aren’t suitable fathers, and then I can marry a man I don’t really love risk free!

**White knight brigade:** Our pleasure ma’am, that’s what we are here for!

Elsewhere in the transcripts was this exchange when the woman returned with more fears about choosing the wrong husband:
**Woman:** Choosing a husband involves risk, and this makes me afraid. What if the alpha bad boy I’m attracted to turns out to be an alpha bad boy?

**White knight brigade:** Sorry delicate flower, I’m afraid we don’t understand.

**Woman:** Well, I’m attracted to men with the dark triad traits. But what if living with or marrying a narcissistic psychopath doesn’t turn out to be a good idea? What if he hits me?

**White knight brigade:** Don’t worry, just leave him and we’ll make sure he is punished!

**Woman:** But what if I don’t want to leave him. Can’t you just tame him for me?

**White knight brigade:** (following a short conference) We have decided it isn’t your fault; some other man (most likely your father) must be to blame for you wanting to stay with an abuser. Therefore we have decided tame him for you.

It turns out there was still more to fear though. She returned later with an unforeseeable concern:

**Woman:** Everything was going according to plan, but after I kicked the father of my children out of the house he isn’t working as hard as he used to. He says since he is no longer the head of the family he should no longer have the responsibility to work like one.

**White knight brigade:** This is an outrage! We’ll figure out how much money we think he should make and impute the income. If he doesn’t pay up, we’ll throw him in prison!

**Another woman:** I have a similar problem, but my ex isn’t working because he lost his job and the economy is bad. Can you still help? I really need the money for a planned trip to Europe and India where I can pray, eat, and love.

**White knight brigade:** Of course, we’ll still make up a figure and put him in jail if he isn’t able to pay it.

**Both women:** But if you throw him in jail, who is going to pay me?

**White knight brigade:** We’ll pay you out of welfare and bill the man for it.

**Third woman:** But what if, and this is just a hypothetical, the man I’m making pay child support isn’t really the father. I’m afraid he might find out and I’ll be out of luck.

**White knight brigade:** As long as you were married at the time and he was dumb enough to trust you, we’ll enforce your paternity fraud as if it was the real deal.
But even this wasn’t enough. Our heroes in the white knight brigade have worked tirelessly to remove the risk from women making bad choices. Consider the following:

**Woman:** I’d really like to go to secluded places with strange men. How else am I supposed to be a proper slut? But what if I change my mind just before, during, or after sex? It will be his word against mine. And what if he uses his strength to overpower me?

**White knight brigade:** We’ll change the definition of rape so you don’t have to actually resist or tell him to stop. The burden of proof will be on him. We’ll also pass special laws which protect only you.

**Woman:** Speaking of rape, I’d like to wear revealing clothing in bad parts of town and/or at night. But if I make bad choices and am raped I want everyone to insist that I didn’t use bad judgment.

**White knight brigade:** We’ve created a new slogan just for this. We will call anyone who suggests that you use good judgment “blaming the victim”.

**Woman:** What if I’m living with a man and want to provoke a fight with him? I love drama, but sometimes I go too far. Is there any way you can make baiting men into violence safe?

**White knight brigade:** Yes. You have an unqualified right to slap, shove, yell at, and physically block your man. If he ever does anything in response, we will put him in jail without considering your own actions.

**Woman:** What if he doesn’t actually hit me, but is rude or insulting?

**White knight brigade:** Let’s call that a misdemeanor.

I can hear the outrage from some of my female readers already:

> Dalrock just said he hopes I am [raped, abused, abandoned]!

No, what I am saying is:

1. It can happen.
2. It is a bad thing

Therefore you should fear it and take appropriate precautions. Just like pain, fear serves an essential function; it discourages us from making bad choices.

We can’t really make the world safe for women to make bad choices. All we are doing right now is shifting as much of the burden as possible away from the women making bad choices onto men, society at large, and the woman’s children. In the end even this won’t really protect women from making bad choices, it will only make them appear safe. Often times assuaging women’s fear involves outright denial of the risks which accompany bad choices.
Most often all this does is delay the experience of the bad outcome until it is too late for the woman to make better choices.
Men acting like chicks: Jesse James “lost himself” in marriage

by Dalrock | December 11, 2011 | Link

Oh no! Jesse James wasn’t haaapy! Being married caused him to lose his identity! Jesse James Blames Marriage to Sandra Bullock for Losing Himself

I became a big shot and married some Hollywood actress and didn’t talk to anybody anymore, so I feel bad…I feel obligated to reconnect with all these people and show ‘em that I’m still the same fabricator motorcycle guy. I’m not what I became.

The sad thing is I think we can look for much more of this. The well worn theme of female martyrdom combined with the fantasy that men and women are identical will tempt more and more men to start talking like pathetic helpless women.

Less striking but along the same lines is Newt Gengrich’s more subtle appeal to the “I was focused on everyone but myself; I gave too much!” excuse for cheating on his second wife as described by USA Today:

In an interview with the Christian Broadcasting Network this year, Gingrich said his marital infidelity was “partially driven by how passionately I felt about this country, that I worked far too hard and things happened in my life that were not appropriate.” He went on to say he “felt compelled to ask God’s forgiveness.”
New addition to the blogroll: Complementarian Loners
by Dalrock | December 12, 2011 | Link

Many of you already know the two bloggers at Complementarian Loners from their previous handles as Thag and CSPB. Their new handles are CL and 7Man, but their writing is just as solid as it always has been. Enjoy.
There are two competing narratives when it comes to women divorcing. The first is the feminist narrative: *I don’t need a man! or A woman needs a man like a fish needs a bicycle!*

The other way to see it is in the context of women’s preference for serial monogamy with a *divorce theft* sweetener. Divorce isn’t intended as a final act, but instead sets the stage for entry into an expected new and better relationship while collecting cash and prizes.

Surprisingly the feminist narrative is extremely popular in the manosphere. The basic premise here is that men are dead weight to women, and that women receive nothing of value to being (some would even argue getting) married. Not surprisingly, the language the men of the manosphere use when making this feminist argument often is boilerplate feminist. For example, which of the following comments is from a man in the manosphere, and which is from a feminist explaining that *marriage is bad for women*?

The men are content. Anytime [women] ask them to pull their weight, they are the ones who piss and moan. All of my friends are tired of raising their man along with their children. Thus is life. If I could offer young women advice: Don’t get married. You’ll be better off living alone, doing what & when you want to, learn handy work yourself... or hire an electrician or carpenter because a husband will never get around to it.

and

‘Manliness’ is gone, it’s left the building. It’s even criminal. Women don’t really want that, or need it. It’s useless. They’ll either move back in with the parents after they get the sperm or they’ll move into subsidized housing. To be brutally frank, not even Game will keep your wife in these circumstances. A woman with two small kids doesn’t really want to be gamed. All she knows is there is some dude who she had kids with and all he does is come home from work and plops down into the couch like a sack of potatoes. She’d rather be alone or move back in with her parents.

...It’s ordinary men – most men – that are the new ball and chain.

Likewise, blogger Whiskey offered the following *rebuttal* to my post *Do women want to get married?*

I would submit however that the test of Dalrock’s assertion would be Britain and the Scandi Nations. There, marriage collapsed almost overnight. Britain went from the land of Mrs. Miniver to that of Clockwork Orange, and then straight to Harry Brown, in about three generations. Over 50% of White births in Britain are illegitimate, if anything Hindu/Muslim births are propping up the national legitimacy rate. In the Scandinavian nations the situation wrt legitimacy is even worse.

I’d say that women want a variety of things. When given a choice: marriage and
nuclear family, vs. sexy Alpha guys and kids with them even as single mothers, they choose the latter at least over half. At least. After all, what is better, a loser beta male who is a good father and provider but unsexy and with no harem, or the excitement and domination and sexual thrills of an Alpha and bearing his kid? Particularly when there is no need for a provider, the government plus a woman’s own earnings can substitute for that.

Like it or not, legitimacy and the nuclear family are ending. The nuclear family is dead, dead, dead in places like Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and even the Netherlands. Certainly in Britain. Dying rapidly here.

So I guess the matter is settled. Both feminists and men in the manosphere are convinced that women no longer need men, and they specifically no longer want or need husbands or their children’s father in the household.

However the data and our understanding of female psychology both contradict this widely and deeply held belief. Whiskey claimed that we could see proof of his thesis in the stats for Britain and Scandinavia; yet Lavazza offered a link to statistics which contradicted this in Sweden:

Whisky: You’d better look at the percentage of children living with both their parents rather than OOW births. In Sweden 90% of 1 YO live with both their parents. For 17 YO it is 60%.

http://www.scb.se/Pages/TableAndChart____151501.aspx

I was able to find stats from the UK which dispelled the claim that women there no longer feel compelled to either marry or at least do the next best thing before having children. See Table 5 from This report from 2003. For whites in the UK, just under 60% (58.9%) of babies were born to married parents. If you add in cohabiting parents it is just over 85%. I also found this report from 2011, appendix table A1 (last page). 84.2% of all women (all races) in the UK had ever married by the age of 40 in the last time period they have data for (2004-2007).

Previously I’ve shared data proving that a woman’s likelihood of divorce tracks closely with her perceived opportunity to remarry. As women grow older their chances at remarriage drop dramatically, and so does coincidentally their likelihood of divorcing. This is reinforced by the findings of the AARP survey. They found that a woman’s age at time of divorce correlated with her likelihood of dating:

Their age at the time of divorce also impacts dating, especially among women. Eighty-eight percent of women in their 40s dated (35% did before the divorce was final), while 79 percent of women in their 60s and older did the same (13% did before the divorce was final). (Page 39)

But for middle age and older women, their post divorce romantic lives are nothing like they are in the divorce fantasies:

Almost 9 in 10 men (87%) dated after their divorce, compared to 8 in 10 women
Among those who dated after the divorce, more than half of men (54%) but fewer women remarried (39%). (Page 39)

Many women, especially those who have not remarried (69%), do not touch or hug at all sexually. An even larger majority of women who have not remarried do not engage in sexual intercourse (77% saying not at all), in comparison with about half of men (49%) who have not remarried. (Page 6)

The divorce fantasies themselves offer a strong indicator that women aren’t divorcing with the hopes of living their lives alone. Divorcées want the next stepping stone on the path of serial monogamy. Otherwise, why is it nearly universal that the heroine divorcée ultimately winds up either remarried or with another worthy man promising commitment? Eat, Pray, Cats wouldn’t have been a bestseller or a box office hit. Likewise, it isn’t an accident that Single in the Suburbs ended with the divorcée receiving a profession of love and commitment from a secret multimillionaire hunky handyman. Even Lorraine Berry ended her tale with an assumption of lifelong commitment. I’ll also go on the record predicting that a sequel to How Stella Got Her Groove Back titled How Stella Died Alone With Her Cats wouldn’t have the same panache.

Equally telling is how far the women in the “true life” divorce fantasy stories have to stretch the truth in order to make their story fit the mold. In EPL, the heroine met a hunky exotic successful import/export businessman. In real life he is in his late 50s and nearly 20 years her senior. The dashing businessman of the book and movie now asks her permission before he spends money:

Elizabeth Gilbert’s husband rang her from Vietnam and asked, “Do I have permission to buy a 7,000-pound marble Buddha?”

Her answer: “You don’t need permission, ever.”

It gets even more romantic, the reason the old man proposed is he wanted to live in her house but he needed a visa to enter the US. The real Stella story is arguably even worse. Unlike in the movie, the hot young Jamaican stud the divorced author married was visibly gay, and ironically she later accused him of marrying her for a visa as well. Adding injury to insult, the author was then forced to pay him spousal support even though he had signed a prenuptial agreement.

If the celebrated success stories are so brutal, one can only wonder how bad the failures or even just ordinary endings must be. Certainly the AARP study gave us a grim look at this. Surprisingly however this is generally a topic researchers lack interest in. Finding data on what I’ve coined as post marital spinsterhood is very difficult. A few months back I found some data from the US Census SIPP tables on marriage and divorce. They break their data out by race, and the following data is all for White Non Hispanic women. One key benefit of looking at a single race is that it avoids shifts which might be due to changing racial demographics. I chose to look at White Non Hispanic data because White women are amongst the most likely to remarry after divorce. There is evidence there that post marital spinsterhood amongst white women is indeed on the rise:
While this isn’t a huge jump, it does confirm the general trend. Even though the latest data is from 2009 the bulk of the divorces for the women then in their 50s would have happened decades earlier. Since we know that remarriage rates for women are declining over time and with age and women are marrying and divorcing later now than in the past, there is every reason to expect that these figures will look even worse for women divorcing today when they are in their 50s.

One startling thing I noticed when looking at the data is that the percentage of women who have ever divorced drops dramatically as the age brackets increase. Either this is an artifact caused by past low divorce rates, women who ever divorced leaving the country in droves, or women who ever divorced dying at significantly higher rates than women who haven’t divorced. I don’t have any data disproving a mass divorcée expatriation, but my gut tells me this isn’t the case. Looking at the shape of the curves over multiple points in time it appears that this isn’t an artifact of past low divorce rates either:
The curve appears similar for men. Ever divorced men also drop out of the older age brackets.
This paper may already have made its rounds through the manosphere, but I stumbled onto it a few months back and I think it is very much worth sharing here. Dr. Dutton is the head of the University of British Columbia Forensic Psychology lab. From the short bio at the end of the paper it is clear that Dr. Dutton has been involved in the domestic violence field since the early 1970s:

In 1974, while on faculty at the University of British Columbia, he began to investigate the criminal justice response to wife assault, preparing a government report that outlined the need for a more aggressive response, and subsequently training police in “domestic disturbance” intervention techniques. After receiving training as a group therapist at Cold Mountain Institute, he co-founded the Assaultive Husbands Project in 1979, a court mandated treatment program for men convicted of wife assault.

The full paper is titled Domestic Abuse Assessment in Child Custody Disputes: Beware the Domestic Violence Research Paradigm. I’ll share some choice quotes but the full paper is really worth reading.

The focus of the paper is specific to how agents of the court are being taught to view domestic violence when considering child custody. To explain the issue he delves into the research and literature which these agents of the court are using to understand domestic violence:

Two recent publications (Jaffe, Lemon & Poisson 2003; and Bancroft & Silverman 2002) have linked domestic violence and custody assessment. Both are written with professional audiences in mind, both cite research studies on domestic violence with a view to expanding the awareness of “professionals, therapists, child protective and court personnel, battered mothers and to anyone else who is in a personal or professional position to touch the lives of children of battered women”. (Bancroft & Silverman p. xiii). Both provide one-sided analyses of domestic violence based on self-selected and non representative samples. It is the purpose of this paper to alert custody assessors to a more accurate data set on domestic violence incidence with a view to improving protection from threats to child safety.

He describes in detail how the whole mindset is stacked against men (emphasis mine):

Jaffe et al. then go on to define abuse, using the “Duluth Power and Control Wheel” that includes “Using Male Privilege” as a part of an octant of abusive strategies used against women. Jaffe et al. then list, under “whom to assess”: Victimized mothers (p.44), Battering fathers (p.46) and “war torn children” (p. 49). Jaffe et al suggest using an Abuse Observation Checklist (Dutton 1992) and asking the victimized
woman to describe the “first, worst and last” incident, followed by allowing the “alleged perpetrator an opportunity to respond". It is not clear what response, apart from denial might be expected from an accused male. Indeed, the authors warn an assessor that (p. 42) the male perpetrator may “minimize their abusive behavior by blaming their victims or proclaiming that the abuse was uncharacteristic". It seems that, once accused, the male can only use responses that the evaluator is already primed to see as disingenuous.

Not only is this unfair to men, but it is dangerous to the very children the profession is ostensibly protecting:

In addition, this view blinds assessors to another source of threat to children; their mother. As we will see below, severe physical child abuse is more likely to be perpetrated by mothers than fathers.

But abuse by mothers is something the profession all but ignores:

...there is a priming of assessors to look only at the male as the abuse perpetrator, and having done so to suspect his denial of abuse. Denial of abuse will not exonerate him because really abusive men deny abuse as well. Although Jaffe et al tell evaluators to ‘review allegations with each party and give each side an opportunity to explain what happened” (p. 47), or to “have the alleged perpetrator complete a standard inventory about the abuse, to engage him in a discussion about what transpired during the course of the relationship”, they provide this suggestion to a reader who has already been informed that males are the perpetrators and that perpetrators lie. No algorithm is provided through which the truth might mystically emerge. Essentially the authors develop skepticism about male accounts and then advise the evaluator to use a clinical judgment already primed to disbelieve the alleged perpetrator.

The “researchers” don’t even bother to hide their bias behind gender neutral terms:

Both Jaffe et al and Bancroft & Silverman use “he” to refer to perpetrators of abuse and both are convinced that male abuse is by far the more serious. Jaffe et al’s section (p. 46) on battering fathers has no counterpart called “battering mothers”.

and

Bancroft and Silverman express many of the same concerns about batterers as parents as do Jaffe et al. Both Jaffe and Bancroft are aware of the deleterious effects of a battering personality on vulnerable children, however, throughout both books, the terms “batterer” and “he” and “victim” and “mother” or “she” are used interchangeably. The eventual mindset is that abuse perpetrators are almost always male, and when they are not, the abuse is not serious. What Kahneman & Tversky (1982) call a “representative heuristic” is developed; batterers have the attributes of maleness and they alone pose a risk to the child.

and
McCloskey et al, despite their claim of examining “different forms of family violence”, go on to say “our study examines domestic violence and psychopathology from the child’s as well as the mothers’ perspective”.

This massive scholarly blind spot results in studies which use demonstrably biased samples:

Another example of the problem in applying the woman as victim paradigm based on shelter samples to the general public can be seen in a paper by Appel & Holden (1998). These authors found, in a review of 31 studies that wife assault and physical abuse of children occurred from 20% to 100% when the sample selection basis was either battered women or abused children (average of 40%). However, in “representative community samples” the overlap was only 6%. In other words, the assumptions drawn from a shelter sample or a male perpetrator sample do not apply to community samples.

Another methodological problem is the gratuitous expansion of the term “abuse”:

Overlap rates diminish when items like physically coerces (as the authors point out, a legal form of punishment) were dropped from the study. The item “pushed, grabbed or shoved” generated the highest overlap followed by “slapped and spanked”. While these actions too, are problematic (Douglas & Straus 2003), they do not constitute “battering” and they inflate overlap rates for apparent abuse. However, they do so by including corporal punishment of children in the equation even though this corporal punishment is not legally or technically abuse (so long as it does not injure the child as is done for correction). As the authors put it “some of the highest rates of overlap came from reports of children of battered women but these reports included slap/spank”. (p 585). This argument creates an erroneous impression that spouse assault is mainly husband to wife and that such assault has a high likelihood of being accompanied by physical child abuse.

The academic blind spot for female initiated violence comes despite solid studies proving they are equally likely to be violent as men (bold text italicized in the original):

The argument is also made by advocates that women’s violence is self-defensive. However, Stets & Straus (1989, 1992) reporting the results of the 1975 national US incidence survey found a pattern of female severe violence –with a non violent male occurred in 11.8% of 5,768 couples (and 9.6% of married couples), the reverse pattern (male severe violence –female non-violent) occurred in only 4.4% of couples (and 2.4% of married couple). For all kinds of violence across relationship types, females were unilaterally more violent than males to nonviolent partners (32% vs. 18%).

He traces the path of the bias in the research as it influences the very system which the next round of academic studies will use as data:

Researchers who focus on women from shelters or batterers groups samples have, unfortunately, had influence on the laws and legal process. The Judicial Council of California has a policy document called Parenting in the Context of Domestic
Violence which was written by Edelson (March 2003). This document is available on a government website and although it reads in fine print that the views “do not necessarily” represent the official position of the Judicial Council of California, it is presented as to the public without any contradictory information. It represents a source for the public of information on domestic violence...

In the California Judicial Council report, victims of domestic violence are “battered mothers”, perpetrators of domestic abuse are “controlling and authoritarian compared to that of nonviolent fathers” (p.3, i.e. perpetrators of abuse are male)...

Edelson cites Bancroft & Silverman (p.5, another court mandated male sample) to support his checklist for continuing risk to the children (from the father). Edelson does a literature review but raises none of the issues I raise here. Appel & Holden’s (1998) work is cited uncritically and “often the perpetrating male beats the woman, who then abuses the child, or that both parents abuse the child” (p.10). No possibility of female initiated abuse is raised. Victims (who are battered mothers) parenting skills are reviewed (p. 13) and a concern is raised that mothers’ skills may be devalued because of a lack of information about male perpetrators. The male perpetrator- female victim model is now enshrined at the policy level.

A study of police response in Detroit found that when men asked for police assistance in domestic disputes, the incident was trivialized and the men belittled by the officers ((Buzawa, Thomas, Bannon & Jackson 1992). This happened regardless of the degree of injury. “...for example, one male reported requiring hospitalization for being stabbed in the back, with a wound that just missed puncturing his lungs. Despite his request to have the offending woman removed (not even arrested), the officers simply called an ambulance and refused formal sanctions against that women, including her removal.” (p. 265). A similar result was found by Brown (2004). Brown found that women were only arrested and prosecuted on domestic calls when they inflicted high levels of injury on male victims. Women were more likely than men to use weapons, typically a knife. This finding was replicated by Henning & Renauer (in press). It is possible to trace the pathway of disinformation here: unwarranted generalizing from a non-representative sample creates the view that only females are abusers, this becomes enshrined in policy and eventually in practice. Female violence is simply not perceived nor treated comparably to male violence. Hence, basing conclusion on “police statistics” is itself misleading.
Anyone who has ever done any off-roading knows the danger of inadvertently becoming committed to a trail. If you aren’t careful you can become too focused on overcoming the obstacle ahead of you without understanding what lies beyond. Before you know it you can end up boxed in, unable to turn around and go back the way you came.

This happened to a friend and me about ten years ago. We were up in the high country in Colorado and thought we would have more options to return than ended up materializing. We started off with an extremely steep uphill climb, and after that we were hoping not to try the same hill on the way back. When we came to the expected return trail it was closed off however, so we pushed on for the next one. We didn’t have much choice because the trail was so narrow turning around wasn’t an easy option. A little further down the trail we slid down a grade strewn with softball size loose rocks. There was no way we could drive back up that hill even if we could turn around. We were now committed to the trail.

From there the trail only got worse. It got even narrower and there was a large drop-off on one side. It was narrower than the trail in the picture and had no guard rail. At one point there was even a natural spring emptying right into the road creating a muddy section of the trail yet with the drop-off still there. Somewhere along the way we bottomed out hard and the fuel gauge started dropping very quickly; luckily it was only an issue with the gauge which later fixed itself. Around the same time the check engine light came on due to the lack of oxygen at altitude. Both were false alarms but given the context they definitely got our attention. We ultimately made it through to a paved road many miles from where we had started. However, we could have easily ended up spending the night sleeping in the back of my buddy’s SUV at 10,000 feet had we become stuck, broken down, or the trail had become impassable or closed.

I thought of this experience when reading Susan Walsh’s excellent post The Grim Beeper. Susan shares stats on women in the US continuing to delay marriage and childbirth. These
women are betting that the trail ahead is passable and will lead them where they want to go. If they are right they will be able to “have it all”. If they are wrong, by the time they figure this out it likely will already be too late. They will be fully committed to the trail by then.

Susan points out that there are signs of trouble on the trail ahead. Women are graduating from college at higher rates than men:

The current sex ratio nationwide in American colleges and universities is 57% female, 43% male, and the gap is widening. This means that among today’s college graduates, 25% of women will not marry college educated men. Let me say that again.

**Among today’s college graduates, 25% of women will not marry college educated men.**

That estimate is actually rosy because it assumes that men will want to marry in equal numbers to women. The data was not analyzed by sex, but in an era of misandrist family law that’s a dubious claim.

This likely over predicts the differences in future earnings power between college age men and women because women tend to be underrepresented in higher paying majors and overrepresented in unproductive majors. Still, women tend to be more concerned with credentials than men, so many of the college educated women Susan mentions will not be willing to marry a man without a degree even if he out earns her. Add to this the likelihood that a sizable number of men could see the lack of weddings and LTRS amongst their peers as a signal that their 20s would be better spent working the minimum and hanging out with friends instead of knocking themselves out to become a provider. Lastly, as Susan points out the extremely biased social and legal environment could cause many good husband candidates to decide marriage isn’t for them.

Susan points out that women are surprisingly unaware of the reality of their own limited fertility:

During a recent story that aired on NPR one infertile woman in her early 40s couldn’t understand it. She insisted that she works out regularly, does yoga, even has a personal trainer. She eats well and is healthy. She never knew that her ovaries were becoming less productive in spite of those measures.

This is a classic case of a missing fear. Feminists worked to remove the fear even though the risks are real. From the NPR story Susan quotes (emphasis mine):

A decade ago, a campaign by the American Society for Reproductive Medicine sparked a vicious backlash. Ads on public buses in several big cities featured a baby bottle shaped like an hourglass, to warn women their time was running out. But women's rights groups called it a scare tactic that left women feeling pressured and guilty.
While it may make some women uncomfortable, the reality is fertility declines much sooner than most women understand (data from chart in this page H/T Bill):

![Changing Fertility as Women Age](image)

However telling women the truth is cruel, as one woman in the NPR story complained:

> I just feel like it’s something else they lump onto women that we have no control over,” says filmmaker Monica Mingo, who’s [blogged](#) about her decade-long effort to conceive.

Land Cruiser image from [Axel Hammer](#).
In Susan Walsh’s recent post The Grim Beeper, Doug1 made a comment about frivolous divorce (H/T Rmaxd):

Men are shattered and blind sided by divorce far more than women are. Usually the woman you files for divorce has slowly been making up her mind to do it for some time with much consultation with her girl friends. Maybe because she cheated and thus dissolved her feels of bondedness when married women have good emotional sex with another man, but not when men do.

She has in mind the much rarer kind of divorce where the husband divorces his wife for a younger, hotter model.

Susan took issue with his comment, and replied specifically to Doug1’s first paragraph:

Provide stats for this or shut up. Men cheat more than women do. How do you account for that in divorces initiated by women? He breaks the contract, she files. Sounds fair to me. Yes, there are frivolous divorces, but I’d like to know what percentage of female-initiated divorces they are. I think this theme is exaggerated and overblown in the manosphere echo chamber.

Hard stats on male vs female infidelity rates are surprisingly difficult to come by. If Susan has stats to back up her own assertion, I’d love to see them. The consensus seems to be that men cheat slightly more often than women, but that when women cheat the implications to the marriage are more severe.

One source which backs Doug1 up is Michelle Langley, author of Women’s Infidelity. I’ve touched on her in this post and this post previously. On her website Langley states the following:

Women’s relationships today follow a very predictable pattern:

- They push men for commitment
- They get what they want
- They lose interest in sex
- They become attracted to someone else
- They start cheating
- They become angry and resentful
- They begin telling their partners that they need time apart
- They blame their partners for their behavior...and eventually, after making themselves and everyone around them miserable for an indefinite, but usually, long period of time, they end their relationships or marriages.

I don’t buy all that Langley is selling, but I think there is a kernel of truth to this. I’ve certainly
seen the basic pattern. My issue with Langley is I think she has latched on to a sense of exaggerated biological determinism to absolve her own infidelity and divorce.

Devlin wrote the following about Langley’s book here:

The women sometimes responded with a kind of countermanipulation: “they thought if they were cold and treated their husbands terribly, the men would leave, or ask them to leave.” Sometimes this happens—which, incidentally, explains why divorce initiation statistics can be misleading. A significant portion of the roughly thirty percent of divorces which are formally male-initiated result from the wife deliberately maneuvering her husband into taking the step.

The issue of who really initiates a divorce is a difficult one. As Devlin and Langley point out, women are often the initiators of divorce even if the husband files, and sometimes even if he cheats. The woman from the Marie Claire article who married a man she didn’t love and then realized she didn’t love him after her children were born comes to mind:

Clark had dated a handsome businessman for four years before they got engaged, and although he didn’t make her heart race, she still loved him. “We were best friends, and I thought he’d make a great husband and father, even though I wasn’t ‘in love,’” she says. “I walked down the aisle thinking, What the hell? During my vows, I wasn’t making eye contact with my fiancé.”

Five years and two kids later, their sex life nonexistent, Clark wanted out. “I’d often wish he would cheat,” she says. Finally, her husband, sensing her unhappiness, ended it.

In the case of Clark, had her husband done as she hoped and cheated this still wouldn’t have fit Susan’s characterization that the reason women initiate divorce twice as often as men is due to the husband’s betrayal. She wanted out and was hoping to drive him to cheat as an excuse to divorce. While she wasn’t able to get him to do that, she was able to make him be the one to file.

As I’ve shared previously, Professors Margaret F. Brinig and Douglas W. Allen set out to understand why women file for divorce twice as often as men in their paper “These Boots Are Made for Walking”: Why Most Divorce Filers Are Women:

Because of the financial and social hardship faced after divorce, most people assume that generally husbands have instigated divorce since the introduction of no-fault divorce. Yet women file for divorce and are often the instigators of separation, despite a deep attachment to their children and the evidence that many divorces harm children.

What they found is divorce theft and the legal incentive women perceive to divorce is the primary driver (emphasis mine):

Our results are consistent with our hypothesis that filing behavior is driven by self-interest at the time of divorce. Individuals file for divorce when
there are marital assets that may be appropriated through divorce, as in the case of leaving when they have received the benefit of educational investments such as advanced degrees. However, individuals may also file when they are being exploited within the marriage, as when the other party commits a major violation of the marriage contract, such as cruelty. Interestingly, though, cruelty amounts to only 6% of all divorce filings in Virginia. We have found that who gets the children is by far the most important component in deciding who files for divorce, particularly when there is little quarrel about property, as when the separation is long.

I’ve elaborated on the topics of divorce theft and exploitation here, but in summary during marriage there are periods when each spouse benefits more from honoring the agreement than the other one does. In the early stages of the marriage when the wife is young men benefit more if the agreement is honored. Later in the marriage when the wife is older she benefits more if the agreement is honored. Because of this, women have the incentive to commit divorce theft and exploitation when they are younger, and men have the incentive to do so when their wives are older. The latter scenario is best described by the common tale of the husband who dumps an older wife for a younger woman after years of loyal marriage. Women’s window of opportunity for divorce theft and exploitation is primarily when they are young, although the biased legal system would seem to extend this somewhat.

Knowing when each spouse has an opportunity for divorce theft gives us an opportunity to corroborate the findings of Brinig and Allen. If divorces occur more frequently when wives are young, this would agree with their finding that women are initiating divorce in response to the incentive to commit divorce theft, or driving their husbands to file due to exploitation (see this post for an academic explanation of the terms). If divorces occur more when the wife is older, this would indicate that husbands are doing what conventional wisdom suggests and dumping their older wives for a younger model.

As I’ve shared previously the data shows divorce rates are highest when the wife is young and has the incentive to commit divorce theft, and lowest when the wife is older and the husband has the incentive to commit divorce theft. Divorce is actually least likely when conventional wisdom suggests it occurs most, when the wife is older and the husband has the opportunity to dump her for a younger woman. Here is the most recent data from the UK:
same pattern exists for the US:

The data I have on infidelity driving divorce is less comprehensive, but certainly doesn’t fit with Susan's characterization and it doesn’t refute what I’ve already shown. I’ve shared before the results from the AARP survey of men and women who primarily divorced in their 40s. There appears to be some rationalization going on with regard to the “both of us” answer from men and women, but women responded that they had initiated the divorce 66% of the time, which is in line with the historical pattern Brinig and Allen showed:
They also asked what were the primary and extenuating reasons for the divorce. At least for men and women divorcing primarily in their 40s (and with a much smaller part of the sample in their 50s and older at the time of divorce) infidelity was the third most frequently cited reason, named as the primary reason for divorce by 16% of respondents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who asked for the divorce?</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Me</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My spouse</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both of us jointly</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also shared previously the results from the non scientific poll of women considering divorce at the website *Should I Divorce Him*. At the time of that post, 25% of the women who took the poll admitted to cheating on their husband one or more times. Only 19.4% of the women stated that their husband had cheated on them. Given the tendency of people to understate their own culpability and overstate the other party’s culpability, this is an astounding result.

My final observation contradicting Susan’s assertion that men are driving the divorce epidemic through infidelity is the full court press our media is giving to women encouraging them to divorce. Open nearly any Sunday paper and in one of the sections targeted to women there is almost guaranteed to be an article discussing how empowering divorce is to women. The same goes for women’s magazines and movies. The same isn’t true for men. Women are willing customers of divorce fantasies in a way that men simply aren’t. To suggest that women are unwillingly divorcing while simultaneously devouring divorce porn is quite simply ludicrous, especially given all of the other corroborating information.
This is what I had readily at hand regarding the question. I’d love to see Susan’s data backing up her claim that women’s 2-1 push for divorce is driven by men cheating in far greater numbers. In other words,

| Provide stats for this or shut up.

**Note:** As I’ve stated previously, I respect Susan as a blogger. I think she is in error on this issue and I have backed my position up. This isn’t an invitation for commenters to attack Susan personally, or to engage in “Lets you and her fight”. Feel free however to disagree with either Susan’s or my own position and make your own case.
My good friend the Captain has a new book out. The cover image alone makes it a win:

It is available in paperback and kindle formats. Check it out. It might help someone you know avoid making an expensive mistake!
The Player’s Anthem; It wasn’t me
by Dalrock | December 22, 2011 | Link

My wife pointed this video out as an example of game. The older man (Shaggy) is an extreme example of unshakable frame.

His advice to the young player caught by his girl (not wife for those prone to confuse the two) is to deny the obvious; It wasn’t me. He even takes on Shakespearian overtones:

| To be a true player you have to know how to play |
| If she say a night, convince her say a day |
| Never admit to a word when she say makes a claim |
| And you tell her baby no way |

The young player is confused; how could she possibly believe him since she saw him with another woman on multiple occasions? After each line Shaggy interjects with his unshakable frame (It wasn’t me):

| But she caught me on the counter (It wasn’t me) |
| Saw me bangin’ on the sofa (It wasn’t me) |
| I even had her in the shower (It wasn’t me) |
| She even caught me on camera (It wasn’t me) |

| She saw the marks on my shoulder (It wasn’t me) |
| Heard the words that I told her (It wasn’t me) |
| Heard the scream getting louder (It wasn’t me) |
| She stayed until it was over |

| Honey came in and she caught me red-handed |
| Creeping with the girl next door |
| Picture this, we were both butt naked, banging on the bathroom floor |

Shaggy explains that if the young player keeps his frame and remains attractive the woman will most likely overlook his blatant transgression:

| Whenever you should see her make the giggolo flex |
| As funny as it be by you, it not that complex |
| Seeing is believing so you better change your specs |
| You know she not gonna be worrying bout things from the past |
| Hardly recollecting and then she’ll go to noontime mass |

The last line is especially interesting because it suggests that the woman’s own morality is purely superficial. She is having sex with a man she isn’t married to, and once she is convinced of his alpha cred shrugs the issue off by going to mass. Obviously this isn’t married man game, and while the lie is deliberately obvious he is still lying. Ethical issues aside, this is an excellent (albeit extreme) example of the power of frame.
From *Real Clear Politics* (see the video there):

- Barbara Walters, ABC News: “What is your biggest peeve of each other?”
- President Obama: “I don’t have one.”
- Walters: “Aww.”
- Michelle Obama: “My list is too long.”

She is married to arguably the most powerful man in the free world, and he has just graciously passed on the offer to complain about her. Yet she *still* feels compelled to get in her gripes presumably in the name of girl power. I’m not a fan of Obama, but if he doesn’t deserve respect from his wife, specifically in public, what husband does?
One of the fascinating things about men and women is how often each sex fails entirely to understand the intra sex interactions of the other. Many of the men commenting on this site were initially baffled by my post Two lists every woman should make before frivolously divorcing. This is understandable, because men often only see the subtext of Team Woman, which while certainly a factor can blind men to the often more subtle reality of female intra-sexual competition.

As I explained in the comments section of that post, women are extremely competitive and often vicious with each other, which is why they try to trick other women into getting boy haircuts, sabotaging their love lives, etc. Once the woman has been tricked into sabotaging her own love life, the torment begins.

The torment will often be subtle, something most men would misread as acts of kindness. What looks to us like commiseration or even a compliment can often be pouring salt in the wound: I admire you so much. You are so strong and independent. I’m too weak and always need a man in my life. By the way, did I show you the pictures of my latest (child, vacation, date with her husband, anniversary)? It could even be framed as a complaint about a bad day: Did I tell you that my car broke down? I don’t know what I would have done if my husband hadn’t been able to come fix it for me. Or concern: It’s so good to see you get out of the house! You need to go out and celebrate your independence girlfriend! Again, men don’t see this; this is why it isn’t uncommon for a man to be accused of cruelty by a woman when he was actually trying to help. To a man it really is intended in an understanding way, but women don’t think like men, they think like women, so they interpret it the way it would be meant if they said the same thing.

It isn’t just men who misread women’s interactions though. Commenter Sean’s misunderstanding of how men interact lead to my post Lets you and him fight:

I call it a manitude. You should be able to exude enough manliness to make other men back down, especially if they know they are in the wrong...

My uncles, and brothers exhibit the same type of manitude, very few men will step to them much less be disrespectful around their families. The few who have tried usually back down quickly once confronted.

This poses a dilemma; if the average man should be able to make other (average) men back down, then the men backing down are by definition substandard, and therefore, below average. The reality is very few men have the luxury of going around forcing other men to back down. This is a combination of apex fallacy and failure to understand the context of the exchange below the surface. After much discussion Sean offered some further clarification:

Gosh you guys must live in a constant state of fear. For your information, I have never asked the men in my life to put their life in jeopardy for me, they provide
protection because that is what they were taught to do. And the situations you guys
described is not deadly. Since some of you think it’s a big deal to ask people not
curse around your family let me give you what my husband usually says that works
fine “Yo dog, my kids?” or he has said “can you tone it down? my kids?” to which
the answer has always been “aww dog, sorry man” and guess what the foul
language stops.

After this the men on the board formed consensus around my assertion that what Sean was
describing was something else entirely:

I’m surprised that you characterized this as your husband “making the other man
back down”. There is a lot tied up in just those few words, but I would characterize
the exchange more as him offering the other men respect and asking for it in return.

The problem is worse for women misunderstanding men’s interactions because it is
extremely common in entertainment to present women as interacting as one of the guys.
One example which comes to mind is in the opening episode of a Canadian TV show my wife
and I have been netflixing titled Flashpoint. Early in the episode we meet the lone female
member of the team, who looks like a Mighty Morphin Power Ranger dressed in SWAT gear.
In fact, the same actress played Pink Ranger in the 1990s series. But of course we need to
know she is as tough as the guys, so she is busily boasting about her rappelling prowess and
calling out other members of the team in one form of challenge or another.

I’ve written previously about the danger this can pose to women who can’t separate this
fantasy from fact. They don’t understand that their aping of male intra-sex challenges
resembles the real deal about as much as an English speaking child who mimics speaking
Chinese. Actually it is worse, because along the way they may inadvertently get just enough
of the process right to get themselves into a conflict they didn’t anticipate. The example I
shared is of the high school cheerleader and choir girl who joined the Marines and became a
Packaging Specialist, and thought this made her one of the guys. When a member of another
service was talking smack about Marines, she followed what many women learn from
watching real and imagined male interactions and decided to call him out and make him
back down:

Enraged, [she] rushed the sailor. “I’m going to show you what a Marine is!” she
shouted, and proceeded to knock the much larger rival to the ground.

As I mentioned in that previous post unfortunately for her this was neither a video game nor
a movie, and the man she assaulted had the bad taste to fight back instead of backing down
from her imagined display of Alpha Maleness:

the sailor then jumped back to his feet, grabbed [her], and body-slammed her. Her
head whip-lashed onto concrete.

The scuffle was broken up by witnesses, and [she] retreated without seeking medical
attention. But within a few hours, she complained to commanding officers and fellow
Marines of a headache. The next day, she was dead.
Once he learned about this, the woman’s father played the Don’t Hit Me I’m A Girl (DHMIAG) card:

[her] father understands the law. What he doesn’t understand is why the sailor wasn’t held accountable for slamming a much smaller woman to the ground.

Unfortunately this instinct isn’t limited to understandably grieving fathers. The problem with DHMIAG is it tends to come out at exactly the moment when Team Woman is at its strongest and Team Man is at its weakest. This happens despite the woman’s often very man like actions which precipitated the event, and despite decades of women exclaiming take me seriously!

The female Marine was an extreme example, but we see the basic misunderstanding play out on a much lower stakes scale. Women now fairly routinely use the language that one man would use to call another man out, only to be shocked at the response they receive. In other cases they don’t mimic the language but they still set themselves up as leaders while they or others feel compelled to shelter them as women. When I called Sheila Gregoire out for claiming that serial marriage was biblically justified if a woman could point to the flimsiest of pretexts, fellow manosphere blogger Morticia felt that this was inappropriate. She felt that Sheila must have been mislead by someone in authority, and that is whom I should have called out. However Sheila holds herself out as a Christian leader, referring to her work as a ministry. If anything I treated Sheila with kid gloves. Sheila had made the same biblical defense of divorce and remarriage in the case of a husband viewing pornography on her own blog. In my initial rebuttal to the Christian acceptance of Serial Polyandry I had elected to refute the idea without calling Sheila out by name. At the time I emailed Sheila to let her know I had afforded her this courtesy. I didn’t receive an email reply from Sheila, but not long thereafter she came to my blog and made the same defense of Christian Serial Polyandry. Only then did I call Sheila out directly. In a later blog post I teased Morticia about what I considered to be her expecting me to find a man to blame when a woman was out of line, and inadvertently caused her great distress. At that point she withdrew the challenge and I removed the teasing note at the end of the blog post.

More recently we saw this same dynamic play out in my post last week titled Is frivolous divorce overstated in the manosphere? Doug1 had upset Susan Walsh at her blog and she called him out man to man:

Provide stats for this or shut up.

The thing about this kind of challenge is you can’t be sure who will actually pick it up. We saw this recently with Paul Elam’s challenge to Heartiste in specific and the gamesphere in general with his post Chateau Bullshit. In that case it was actually blogger Frost who formally replied to the challenge, with as I understand it some assistance in the discussion section from other bloggers. This is part of the danger of making bold pronouncements like this; you set yourself up as having to take all comers. Often times this results in a mismatch where you have much more to lose than your adversary, who has the luxury of deciding he likes the matchup. A much more serious example of this is evident in perhaps the most famous cautionary tale to men on this topic, the story of David and Goliath. Goliath made the mistake of challenging the manhood of all Israelites in an effort to make them back down. The result
of his hubris was being killed by a lowly shepherd boy armed only with a sling.

In Susan’s case she actually expanded her challenge at the end of her comment from just Doug1 to the larger manosphere:

I think this theme [wife initiated frivolous divorce] is exaggerated and overblown in the manosphere echo chamber.

It is the very nature of a challenge like this that news of it travels extremely fast. Given that I have written extensively on the topic, I doubt there was a man familiar with my blog who saw Susan’s comment and didn’t think I’ll bet Dalrock would be interested in a piece of that. In fact, given that this is a signature issue for me as a blogger in the manosphere, they could even be forgiven for seeing this as a direct challenge to me. At any rate, it should have come as no surprise that news of this challenge quickly made its way to me, nor that I chose to respond.

Yet Susan appears to have felt completely blindsided by my response. Hawaiian Libertarian has convincingly argued that Susan probably felt attacked by my responding to her challenge. Some of my own readers argued that Susan was likely speaking out of a place of emotion, and shouldn’t be expected to either back up her assertion or withdraw it as we would expect a man to do in the same situation. I have a problem with this because while Susan is often at odds with feminists, she very much strikes me as the take me seriously! type.

I don’t have an easy answer for all of this. So long as women demand to be taken seriously, I’ll reserve the right to take them at their word. If they put themselves in a position of leadership and/or make direct challenges to me or a group I’m part of, I’ll reserve the right to respond. I’ll do this understanding full well that many will feel that I’m unfairly picking on a poor defenseless girl in doing so. So be it.
Marriage lite: mistaking “No sex before monogamy” for a moral statement
by Dalrock | December 30, 2011 | Link

One of the more dangerous concepts of our time is the conflation of serial monogamy with actual marriage. Once this fatal mistake is made, the foundation is set to presume that serial monogamy is therefore more moral than other forms of promiscuity. The idea is both seductive and nearly universal, and we see it from Christians and secular people alike. The problem is if you are thinking this way you are miles away from understanding what marriage really is, and are almost certainly providing moral cover and even moral encouragement for immorality.

I think the basic mistake comes from looking at serial monogamy from a snapshot in time. Look, there are two people who love each other and are having sex only with each other, just like marriage! This same error would cause one to falsely conclude that this man is levitating while relaxing with a beer. Only a fool would think this.

The Christian sanctioning of serial monogamy tends to favor serial marriage over pronouncements of “No sex before monogamy”. Sheila Gregoire is an excellent example of this frame, although if you note the lack of controversy about her statements outside of the manosphere you can see that she isn’t outside of mainstream Christian thought:

The wife had decided to leave, and was interested in another doctor for a second marriage (not just an affair, and she certainly was not going to sleep with him until they were divorced. She also considered her marriage over). So I don’t think it’s that she was “whoring”, as much as it was that he had broken the vows and was completely unrepentant (at the beginning of the movie) and pushing her away.

Key to the Christian implementation of morally sanctioned serial monogamy is to find some pretense for divorce. This pays cursory respect to the Scripture so you can still claim you are talking about Christian marriage. Fortunately as Sheila explains “emotional abuse”* or a husband viewing pornography (which she categorizes as an affair) qualifies as a woman’s ticket to ride the serial marriage train:

Yes, she’d taken off her wedding ring, but I would argue that he had already had an affair (with porn)

In the secular world the moral elevation of women’s preferred form of promiscuity is most often phrased as I described in the title. No sex before monogamy is actually good practical advice for women who are pursuing promiscuity. It fits with their natural urges and all else being equal sets them up for a more pleasurable experience. It also slows the rate of damage they are doing to their own marriage value, should they want that as an option once they tire of the carousel.

The fundamental problem comes when this practical advice for getting the most out of
hookups is mistaken for a *moral* path. It has to be seen within the proper context. If you are
going to hookup, you should do so smartly. Morality aside, this is sound practical advice.
Roissy and Roosh advise men on how to navigate the promiscuous SMP on their own terms.
Susan Walsh and Patti Stanger do the same for women. In Susan’s case to her credit she is
often very open about this being a purely pragmatic issue. For example, in her post last
month *Tough Call: Sex Before Commitment*? she advises women to be true to themselves,
choose monogamy if they want it, and to only have sex with men they really like:

Be Authentic

There’s a difference between employing sound strategy by not showing your hand
too soon, and being an impostor in your own life. If you’re not a casual kind of girl,
don’t have casual sex. The odds of feeling regret are extremely high, and it
complicates any subsequent communication as you try to sort out what it means.

Have Sex Only If You Really, Really Like Each Other

Hopefully, you know if you like him. If he’s not the only guy you like, don’t go there.
If you’re dating multiple people, as in online dating, and you’ve gotten intimate with
someone else recently, don’t go there. If he’s great but probably not right for you,
don’t go there. If he’s great for you, but you’re still getting over your ex, don’t go
there. Don’t have sex with a man unless you are emotionally available and know
what you want.

Again, this is all sound practical advice for the woman who has decided to be promiscuous. If
you are going to hookup, hookup smart. *Find out if you like him first. Get him to invest in you emotionally first.* This is the same kind of practical advice Roissy and Roosh offer men. The
problem is noone mistakes Roissy and Roosh for offering (traditional) moral advice. As a
result we have many people who without really considering it are presuming that Roissy and
Roosh are offering advice to men on how to be immoral, while Susan is countering them with
her own *moral* advice. Susan herself may be partly to blame here, because at times she
seems to frame her practical advice to women on how to hookup as moral in nature. For
example, earlier this month Susan explained her *mission* for *Hooking Up Smart*:

That is all filtered, however, through the mission of this blog. I am biased. I want
people to be in relationships. I want them to get married. I want them to be loyal,
faithful spouses who stay together through the rough times. I believe that is what
most people want in life. I also believe marriage is good for society, good for
civilization, and even good for the economy.

If you don’t believe in monogamy, fine. If you want to advise men to never marry,
that is your right. If you believe I’ve climbed onto a deck chair on the Titanic, you’re
entitled to your opinion. You may even be right. But I don’t want to hear about it. It’s
not my thing, and it’s counter to the mission of what I’m trying to accomplish here.

This is a blog to help people figure out how to navigate the hostile terrain
of the contemporary SMP to get a relationship.

Note how “relationship” “marriage”, and “monogamy” are all offered on the same plane of thought. I don’t doubt that Susan sees marriage as the most moral of the three, but it does seem that she attaches significant moral weight to the other two terms outside of the context of marriage. She also has a tendency to use the word commitment to refer not to a couple committing to stay with one another, but to describe a man becoming emotionally invested in a woman and/or promising (for the moment) monogamy. From her Tough Call post:

Some men happily commit to women they have first night sex with. Even if the odds are against it, there’s a potential opportunity cost to rejecting those men.

This terribly muddies the waters, because when most people read commitment they are thinking of the word in the context of marriage for life. This is something else entirely.

As I’ve written before, there is much which I agree with Susan about. For example, I agree with her assertion in her post Manwhores: For Casual Sex Only that women shouldn’t marry alphas. Likewise I advise men not to marry sluts. This isn’t moral advice, since it isn’t even addressing the question of repentance. The advice is practical; don’t marry someone who is likely to struggle to keep their commitment. I take this a step further and tell men they have a moral obligation to not marry a woman who isn’t extremely likely to be able to keep her vows, but this is a moral imperative to be practical when choosing a wife, not a conflation of the moral and the practical.

Part of what makes this confusing is the practical advice to promiscuous women is at direct odds with the practical advice to promiscuous men. This creates an apparent contradiction, which many take as a sign that one set of advice is practical and the other must therefore be moral. We can see this clearly though when we look at the advice men like Roissy and Roosh offer to women. Roosh’s practical advice to his own sister is an excellent example:

Understand that before sex, you have all the power, but afterwards you have very little. A guy who was jumping over himself to hang out with you will be more nonchalant after sex, like he doesn’t even care.

The only way a man will value you is if you made him put in a lot of investment before sex. The more work he puts in, the less he can rationalize that you were meaningless to him, and the more likely he will continue to pursue because he considers you above the rest. Each man you have sex with that doesn’t call you back will kill a part of your soul, and it’s your job to guard against that. Only have sex with men who earn it.

He is telling her how to keep the power position as a woman in the sexual marketplace. Not surprisingly Susan agreed with this. Almost two years ago Roissy offered his own advice on when women should put out to get the most from men:

Coy is good, but don’t be a cocktease. A greater beta, (if all things go in your favor, the best I believe you can shoot for), will quickly tire of you if your goodies aren’t parceled out on a fairly brisk timetable. So pace your makeouts. Aim for closing the
deal around date #5 or 6. Any earlier than that and your dreamboat may decide you were under his maximum potential since you gave it up without much work on his part. Any later than that and he may decide you are too much work for the deal you are giving him.

Note how similar this is to Susan’s recent *Tough Call* post. It is not a moral argument, even though many mistake this kind of advice for one. The reality is that someone is going to be in the power position in the SMP, and someone is going to be getting the short end of the stick. Depending on who you are talking to (man or woman), the tactics of how to avoid being the chump in the bargain are very different. But the goal is still the same; utilize the strategy which is to your own advantage. *No sex before monogamy* is sound practical advice to women, just as advising men to avoid all investment in women they haven’t already had sex with (outside of a narrow and very rare case where the woman is truly following the old rules for courtship and marriage) is sound practical advice for men.

Unfortunately this moral confusion is so deeply ingrained in our culture that even men who are accomplished at game find themselves feeling that they are being immoral not for being promiscuous, but for failing to volunteer to be the chump in the arrangement. Blogger Rivelino recently wrote about his own conscience nagging him for keeping himself in the casual sex power position:

```
i think i just feel guilty — again! — that i am having blondie come over to cook me dinner when i would much rather be alone.

although that’s not true.

i want to F*** blondie but i don’t want to spend any time with her.

see the dilemma?

but when i AM f***ing her, i do feel emotionally attached to her — i feel grateful.
```

Commenter Sinjun puts it in perspective:

```
You’re over analyzing. A perfectly f***able girl wants to come over and make you dinner. Let her.

A perfectly f***able girl is bringing her work clothes with her for the next day, telegraphing that she wants a good rogering. Don’t disappoint, and f*** her!

She KNOWS where she stands with you. Women are extremely intuitive, don’t think she can’t FEEL the vibes you subconsciously emu mating. THAT’S why she’s trying so hard. The ironic part is, if you were to start exhibiting beta like behaviors and being needy, the relationship dynamics would change; and I don’t mean in your favor.

I think your letting your conscience get the best of you here. Think back to your beta
days and how the chicks were merciless. Do you want to go back to that? Remember the pain?

Sinjun is absolutely right. There is no moral reason men should offer to play the chump in the freewheeling SMP. It would be good advice to tell Blondie to be smarter about the way she hooks up, but it would be wrong to tell Rivelino that he has an obligation to offer this woman (temporary) exclusivity and emotional investment. Sinjun reminds Rivelino that this woman is an active participant in all of this:

I’m NOT advocating bitter revenge, far from it. But don’t let yourself go soft. Live with integrity. Do what pleases YOU, and let her do what pleases her. If she doesn’t like something, she’s an adult and can disengage herself from the situation. This girl’s been with at least 20 guys right? Well guess what? She knows the deal. This isn’t her first lap around the track.

Do you, and let her do her.

*Note: I quoted Sheila’s statement on “emotional abuse” from the comments section of one of her youtube videos on this post. I now see that she has disabled comments for the video and all previous comments are removed.
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Related
As regular readers already know, the Daily Mail is a tabloid paper in the UK targeted largely to women. They have a specific subsection for women called the Femail. Feminists have long accused female targeted publications of making women obsessed about relationship status by focusing so much on it. What feminists fail to consider is that these publications aren’t tools of the patriarchy with a devious plan to change women from just like men into women; they are motivated to sell copy. What sells copy to women is the relationship and/or motherhood status of other women.

Usually this all plays out with a wealth of pictures and articles about a woman kissing her high status husband in public, another strolling along the beach with her man, and mothers with children or expectant mothers. They are true to this same pattern even when selling divorce. Sometimes however they mix it up with a bit of feminist girlpower, and do a story on how a particular woman doesn’t need a man. These latter stories tend to be somewhat convincing when the woman is young and hot. She has opportunity coming out of the woodwork, why should she tie herself down?

Recently the Daily Mail ran a piece about an aging former Page 3 model spending Christmas without a man in her life: She won’t be lonely this Christmas: Katie Price parties with family for her first Christmas as a single woman. As hard as they tried to make this a story of empowerment however, the pathos of reality bled through. Reading the article I learned that Katie Price is the twice divorced unwed mother of three. They claim she is only 32, but if this is true time has been extremely unkind to this woman who at one point at least relied on her looks professionally. I looked for a younger photo of her and found this one taken by Phil Guest in 2004:
While she looked better back then, the contrast between the woman in person and the pictures on the cover of her book is quite striking.

But what struck me most wasn’t Ms. Price’s unfortunate high velocity meeting with the wall. Nor was it a professional model trying so hard to look sexy while doing it all wrong. What struck me was how much the photos in the article were at odds with the title and text. I won’t show them here; you have to go there to see them for yourself. We are ostensibly viewing pictures showing how much she doesn’t need a man in her life. Yet we see her in sexually suggestive poses with both her stepfather and her cousin. Don’t blame the paparazzi for taking these candid shots, these are the photos Ms. Price posted on her own Twitter page. But don’t look too hard at the pictures, focus on the copy instead:

| Having split from Argentine model Leandro Penna in September, Price is embracing life as a single woman. |
| She said recently: ‘I’m not frightened, because I’ve got so many friends around me and family and I’m so busy. But you know at night time, when you watch TV and stuff, you want that bit of companionship.’ |

Um, you go girl?
Newspeak: scrubbing the English language.

by Dalrock | January 4, 2012 | Link

I did a search on the term *unwed mother* when writing my post on Katie Price. I wanted to make sure I wasn’t using the term incorrectly. Click here to see the definition I found. I did a double take to make sure I had typed in the correct term, but if you look closely you will see that I did.

Obviously this is a term which makes unwed mothers uncomfortable. They would prefer a term which is more vague and less truthful. With this in mind, I suggest we make it a point to use it when referencing unmarried women with children (excluding widows and rare exceptions to excuse #6).

Along the same lines, commenter tweel used a term I wasn’t familiar with in the discussion on Marriage Lite. The term is *grass widow*, and I chuckled when I looked it up:

> The term *grass widow* cries out for explanation of what *grass* means and how *grass widow* came to have its varied though related senses. *Grass* probably refers to a bed of grass or hay as opposed to a real bed. This association would help explain the earliest recorded sense of the word (1528), “an unmarried woman who has lived with one or more men,” as well as the related senses “an abandoned mistress” and “the mother of an illegitimate child.”

We’ve worked extremely hard to forget what our ancestors knew. The bright side is this will only work with our willing cooperation.
The one that got away.
by Dalrock | January 4, 2012 | Link

My wife has been suggesting that I write a post on Katy Perry’s song/video:

In the video we see an elderly Katy Perry who still mopes around pining for a high school boyfriend despite having grown old with a loyal husband. My wife was disgusted by the message of this video having known women in real life who thought and acted in this way. This should serve as a warning to men considering marriage; check very carefully for this sort of vibe. Women often feel entitled to nurse this sort of “poor me” feeling, regardless of how good a husband you are. This is also why you need to take your potential wife’s past sexual history very seriously.

My wife wondered if this song/video wasn’t at least in part an explanation for why Katy Perry’s husband Russell Brand filed for divorce. She thought the timing was suspicious, since he filed in December and the video was released in November.

Rollo Tomassi beat me to the punch on this with his excellent post Five Minutes of Alpha. He astutely points out that Roissy nailed this back in 2010 with his original post by the same title (Five Minutes of Alpha). Back then Roissy pointed out that Katy appeared to not have gotten over the alpha who snubbed her in high school. It was Katy’s own on stage attempt to show that she really had gotten over him which tipped Roissy off. Here is a quote Roissy shared from this story:

As the crowd laughed and cheered, she adopted a bit of swagger and added, “Oh yeah, you really chose right, honey. What’s up now, playa?” Becoming an international, Grammy-nominated pop star evidently does wonderful things for your self-confidence.

As Janet Reno would say, Money and fame takes away alpha! Roissy quoted the following a bit further down:

At the end of the tune, she looked directly at Lopes, held up her hand — which prominently displays her engagement ring — and said, “That’s cool, I got mine,” and mockingly blew him a kiss. The singer is set to marry raunchy British comic Russell Brand...

Now just a few years later comes this video for a previously released song about a high school heartbreak. Note the reference to money and rings, in direct contradiction to her original quote:

All this money can’t buy me a time machine (Nooooo)
It can’t replace you with a million rings (Nooooo)
I shoulda told you what you meant to me (Wooooow)
‘Cause now I paid the price
In another life
I would be your girl
We’d keep all our promises
Be us against the world

It is worth noting that while the video was only released in November of 2011, the song itself was released as part of an album back in August of 2010, which was two months before she married Russell Brand and a month before she gave the concert where she confronted the alpha she ostensibly had gotten over.

What up now playa?
The more I think about the way women approach the question of sexual morality and women’s sexual history, the more I’m convinced that women strongly tend to boil all of this down into two categories:

1. Good girls.
2. Sluts.

So long as they can convince themselves they are in category #1 they are happy. If she can say to herself and others I’m a good girl, that’s all that matters. Well, not quite. She also wants to know the specific definition of sluts, so she can say:

| I’m a good girl, unlike those sluts.

I don’t mean this in a derogatory way. This is natural, and the underlying impulse is an extremely beneficial one. When this powerful desire is harnessed correctly it prevents the kinds of disasters we are currently witnessing. I certainly wouldn’t advise marrying a woman who lacked this impulse, although keep in mind that this is the stuff rationalization hamster epics are made of.

Feminists have worked for decades to eradicate the concept of slut, yet it still has immense power. You can change language, but you can’t change the underlying reality. On top of that, women will always want to know the definition of the terms so they can place (or rationalize) themselves in the former category and at least some other women in the latter. I think you can see the truth of this in how much more successful feminists have been in convincing ordinary men to abandon the word slut (for the time being at least) than ordinary women.

I’m not old enough to have been around for the beginning of the sexual revolution, but my sense is it played out as follows. Feminists and others wanted to change the culture and used their considerable influence in academia and the media convincing people (especially young people) that sex outside of marriage wasn’t immoral. This along with the newly available birth control pill left women with a problem: How to enjoy this new found freedom while still remaining in the good girl category? This was uncharted territory; they knew there was danger in the seductive call to let down their inhibitions, but they didn’t know exactly where that danger was hidden. This left them hesitant to get too far off the beaten path, even though they wanted to explore.
I came of age some time after the original sexual revolution, but some of the actions I observed of women when in college give me a hint on what came before. I noticed quite a few college age women mentioning that they lost their virginity to their College Boyfriend. They didn’t give it up at some drunken frat party, nor did they give it up for a guy in high school, unlike those sluts who did. There was something very special to these young women about the idea of losing their virginity to their College Boyfriend. It was almost mystical. I was very bewildered by it at the time. These weren’t necessarily special relationships to these women, although the guy they chose for the honor could be forgiven for misunderstanding. The guys they chose were all clean cut nice guys. This was essential I think, otherwise it didn’t fit the ritual. Shortly after their virginity was lost (maybe at the end of the semester or year), so too tended to be the College Boyfriend. Having anchored themselves firmly in the good girl camp, they were now free to chase the alphas they craved and join the drunken frat parties. Not all of these women went to this extreme after losing their virginity, and many other women had lost their virginity prior to college but still considered themselves good girls, but the basic ritual was surprisingly common.

I think the mystical value of the College Boyfriend came from the way these young women heard “good girls” from previous generations talk about their own sexual history. Sure they had sex before marriage, but they weren’t sluts. They were good girls, they only had sex with their College Boyfriend and later married after maybe an LTR or two. This may or may not have been the whole truth, but I’m guessing it was the message many of my female peers received.

My guess is this has all continued to shift and young women are looking for another seemingly hard and fast marker to ensure that they aren’t straying too far from the safety of the ever widening good girl path. One thing my wife heard from a divorcée who is a bit younger than us is that she always stays with a man she has had sex with for at least six
months (unlike those sluts who don’t). She really believes this, and has avoided breaking up with (and continued having sex with) several men she was tired of until they crossed the magic 6 month mark. We see the same thing with those who now earnestly proclaim that good girls only have sex within the confines of serial monogamy. This is closely related to the large number of women who feel that marrying before having children and then divorcing the father puts them on a different moral plane than those trashy unwed mothers.

In the end for all of the hue and cry about how unfair and arbitrary it was to draw the line at having sex with only one man barring his death or gross violation of the marriage vows (once and done marriage) the great irony is that women are now left having to create their own arbitrary markers instead. These have a seeming immovability to them and therefore provide comfort, even though across generations they are quite malleable and have no true moral value. This very malleability though could leave a large number of women who thought they were in the “good girl” category at risk of reassignment should the pendulum swing in the other direction.

Feminists and their allies have been able to drive changes to the cultural definition of “good girl” largely unchallenged for around 40 years now. However there are signs that men, especially younger men with an understanding of game, may start to push this back in the other direction. These men have this power because they are the ones who can decide which women are worthy of marriage or even an exclusive LTR. Men only lost the power to define this because they were tricked into believing they didn’t have it. Whether this will happen in our lifetime is an open question, but it strikes me that many women are taking a risk based on a set of very changeable rules which they have assumed to be permanent.

If and when the pendulum swings back, my guess is that older men and women are likely to find a way to “grandfather” in previously assessed good girls of the older generations, and younger women will see the changing rules and adjust accordingly. However, it also seems likely that women in their 20s and early 30s when the social mood shifts could end up being retroactively judged by a more stringent standard.

Minefield photo by Christopher Michel.
Paul Murray recently made a comment which fits with a theory of mine on how men and women decide when to get married:

PA is reading the situation at work completely wrong. I guarantee you that when one of the girls at PA’s work gets engaged, they all will.

First: women control relationships with betas, not the betas. If they are not married, it’s because they (the women) don’t want to be.

Second, they are herd creatures. These discussions about how the guys are not popping the question are actually discussion amongst themselves as to whether it’s time for them all to stop playing musical chairs and all sit down with the ones they have.

When the girls as a group decide that its wedding time, then all the various guys will be issued their ultimatums and most will fall into line. Until then, the guys will carry on in blissful ignorance.

(oh: and they’ll all get their divorces at around the same time, too)

His last statement is of course backed up by science. I experienced something similar to what he is describing right around the time I graduated from college. In this case however the women didn’t know each other, yet they all seemed to be triggered to start pushing for marriage around the same time.

My PUA roommate was surprisingly the first to get married. We all thought he was joking when he brought his latest girlfriend home and announced not only that he was in love (as he always did), but that he was going to get married. In retrospect it probably would have been nicer of us not to laugh when he told us this, or at least to have waited until his fiancée was out of the room. Likewise for starting up the betting pool for how long before he found another woman. I honestly thought it was a practical joke, as we were constantly playing jokes on each other. It wasn’t a joke and I later took my then girlfriend/now wife to their wedding. True to form he hit on my now wife as he greeted us in the line of guests making our way into the church for the ceremony.

Not too long before this I had a girlfriend for a short while who was treating me with the kind of contempt reserved for a boyfriend who has become too beta. I had within the previous few years just gone from not being able to get a date to save my life to having the odd girlfriend. Given this and her obvious contempt for me, marriage was the last thing on my mind. Yet she actually raised the issue of us getting married. I was incredulous. As with my roommate announcing his decision to marry, I admit I shouldn’t have laughed.
I remember around the same time a girl I met at a bar who I called a day or so later. We hung out for a little bit and she made it clear that she was looking for a husband. I had just met her. At a bar. This really surprised me. No laughter this time, but it was still bizarre. Along the way other friends of mine married within a year after we graduated. None of us had planned it this way.

My wife was four years younger than the other women in the pattern, but I do think that me graduating college was a signal that caused women to suddenly see me as marriage material. Likewise I think seeing friends of mine start to marry or at least be in relationships which seemed headed towards marriage had primed me to change my thinking on the issue over a fairly short period of time. My wife was also in an entirely different category as well. Since she was a beautiful young woman who hadn’t been with another man and had fallen for me as hard as I had for her, her broaching the topic had a very different feel to it.

While I think it is a bit more complex than Paul describes, I do think that men and women both tend to respond to the actions of others in their peer group as well as those just a few years older than them. If a woman starts to see other women her age marry this seems to cause her to pursue marriage with newfound urgency. In this sense I think we pay too much attention to whatever the proximate milestone is (graduating, turning a specific age, etc). These milestones play a role, but the specific trigger strikes me as being more about what others in their peer group are doing. As proof of this see the continuing delay in the median age of marriage.

I also agree with Paul that women are generally the ones who are driving this. In my experience the women were always the ones to bring up the issue first. I have always thought that only a fool would propose to a woman if he didn’t already know this was what she wanted with him. The same goes only to a slightly lesser degree for even discussing marriage in the abstract. If she isn’t the one driving this the mechanics are all wrong.

The reason I think all of this is so important is I think the bubble of white women* in the US in their 20s and early 30s delaying marriage are greatly weakening the signal to prepare for marriage that the cohort of men they would traditionally expect to marry are receiving. I’ve shared this chart before, but it serves to describe the cohort of women whom I’m referring to:
These women aren’t just delaying marriage; they are collectively weakening the signal which in past generations has told men to prepare for marriage both mentally and professionally. I haven’t seen hard stats on the number of Peter Pan men** who are coasting professionally while playing video games with their buddies, but to the extent that this is in fact occurring the missing/weakened signal strikes me as a significant cause for this. Men in their 20s are now seeing far fewer of their peers getting married or even involved in “serious relationship” LTRs. These things are of course still happening since not all women of this cohort are delaying marriage, but the strength of the signal is much weaker. The specific peer group a man is in will make a big difference here, but overall large numbers of men are receiving much weaker signals indicating that they should begin preparing for marriage.

The problem here for those women hoping to only delay marriage is there is generally a limited window for young men if they are going to become candidates for marriage. A man who spent his 20s coasting instead of developing his professional skills can’t immediately make up for that lost time, even if he wants to. At the same time, there is a window of opportunity when men are most interested in marriage. As Solomon II pointed out fairly
crassly in his post The Marriage Zone, the changing fortunes of young men and women in the Sexual Market Place (SMP) as they age creates a limited window when men are most likely to be eager to try to “lock in” a woman who shows interest in marriage.

All of this is of course assuming that the unmarried women in question are only trying to delay marriage and haven’t decided that they don’t need a man. If they truly don’t feel the need for the commitment and investment which women can receive only in marriage, the limited prospects they will likely face for husbands in the future won’t be an issue.

*I haven’t run this data for other races, but marriage rates vary greatly by race so the normal practice of averaging all races together can be very misleading. If you have this data charted out and published for other races please let me know so I can include a link here.

**I use the term “Peter Pan men” to reference the hysterics coming from the Where have all the good men gone? crowd. As I’ve written previously women had the right to change the rules, but men have every right to decide how they want to respond.
Why have misandry delivered when you can bake it at home?

by Dalrock | January 13, 2012 | Link

Misandry in commercials is standard fare, but every now and then a commercial manages to catch my attention. I always mute commercials and as a result the visual impact of the commercial is heightened. I suggest watching this one with the volume off to see what I mean.

Take note of the submissive expressions on the men’s faces. Also note the closing image (pause it at 27 sec) where the wife is sitting on a chair (slightly resembling a throne) queen of the castle, while the men are on their knees. Imagine what would happen if they made this same commercial with the genders reversed. How would it fly if the husband was smugly sitting in a chair eating while two submissive women were on their knees scrubbing the floor having been successfully chastised like children?

Aside from the blatant misandry, the other thing that comes to mind is that women have pushed so hard for this frame of mind (where women are the parents and their husband and other men are children), yet they still bitch about it. A recent commenter to the women over 55 being done with men post is an excellent example of this:

‘Forgiveness’ is a funny word for me too. At 52, I don’t want another man – I took care of him (I was his “mother with benefits”)...

Another commenter agreed with the sentiment:

I had to laugh at your comment, “Mother with benefits”! That’s exactly what I felt like in my marriage.

As I pointed out in a previous post women are trained to bitch about any outcome. Let them trade roles with men and they have been slighted. Let them have traditional roles and they are slighted. Let them be on their own and men have failed them for not manning up and marrying them.
Mark Driscoll’s feminist foolishness posing as Christian wisdom.

by Dalrock | January 16, 2012 | Link

Several readers have asked that I share my perspective on Pastor Mark Driscoll’s recent Washington Post piece Why men need marriage. Driscoll opens his contribution to the man up and marry career gal sluts genre with an anecdote about a middle aged career woman who never married:

She was smart, funny, interesting, successful, attractive, kind, in her 40s, and still single.

A man of biblical wisdom would recognize that this woman had squandered her youth chasing a feminist dream of career and/or fornication. Were he a wise man, a story starting this way would be a cautionary tale to young Christian women not to make the same mistakes this woman did. However Pastor Driscoll is steeped in the foolishness of our feminist culture and not biblical wisdom. He finds no fault worth mentioning in this woman’s own choices, and instead looks for a man to blame for her terribly mismanaged life:

After my wife Grace and I spent some time with the woman from our church, we could not fathom why no one had married her.

She has been of marriageable age for over twenty years, yet she never married. Pastor Driscoll seems to think this is because men have failed her. It is far more likely that she followed the feminist advice to delay marriage until at least her 30s, while in all likelihood riding the carousel. As a result she may well have lost the ability to experience love and attraction for a normal man. Note that amongst the marriageable attributes he mentioned about this woman he left two out; he didn’t say she was a virgin, and he overlooked entirely the fact that she is almost certainly no longer able to bear children. In fact, notice that all of the attributes he lists are what one would normally advise a woman to look for in a husband (smart, funny, interesting, successful, attractive, kind). He seems to have gone out of his way to cleanse his mind of traditional views of the sexes in marriage. Why else would he refer to a woman using only terms which would apply to a man?

Driscoll then goes on to badly mangle the available statistics on marriage in the US:

And, she’s not alone. For the first time in the America’s history there are more single adults than married. Statistically, the women are more likely than the men to attend college, be working a career track job, and attend church.

What are the guys doing? Often, they’re acting like boys who can shave, getting drunk, watching porn, attending sporting events, and treating responsibility like Superman does green kryptonite.

Statistics on marriage rates vary widely by race, but the fact is that over 90% of white
women currently in their 40s have already married. The decline in the number of adults currently married is driven not by a lack of weddings, but by women following the feminist message to delay marriage as long as possible, by higher divorce rates, and by declining rates of remarriage after divorce.

According to the US Census 2009 SIPP data, 39% of all white women aged 50-59 had divorced at least once. This works out to 42% of all white women that age who ever married. For Hispanic women the figures are 27%-30%, and for Black women the figures are 38%-48%. The problem isn’t a lack of men willing to marry, but a lack of women willing to marry while young and stay married.

But Driscoll is apparently entirely unaware of the trends of the last 40 years. Instead he coins a new euphemism for the carousel (fools parade) and ladles out a healthy serving of the Apex Fallacy.

Eventually, some get tired of the fools parade and settle for some guy who is more likely to act like a baby than help raise a baby. These guys make the worst husbands: gambling away the money, out late with the boys a lot, unfaithful, can’t seem to fit a full-time job in around his hobbies, and eventually trading in their 40-year-old wife for two 20-year-old girlfriends.

He sees women thinking with their genitals and seeking out men with dark triad traits and instead of holding them accountable for the devastation they cause their children he blames men in general. Then he trots out the canard that men are driving the divorce epidemic by divorcing older wives when the data proves that divorce rates plummet as wives age.

He ignores the epidemic of women kicking fathers out of their children’s lives committing frivolous divorce and divorce theft and doesn’t warn men to be extremely careful when choosing a wife. Like any other form of addict, he will do or say anything to get his next fix.

Men are like trucks: they drive straighter with a weighted load. Young men are supposed to load themselves up first by being responsible for themselves and not expecting their mom to fill up their sippy cup with beer and push them in a stroller to the unemployment line. Young men who take responsibility for themselves are then ready to marry and take responsibility for the life and joy of their wife.

Modern churches have turned their backs on biblical marriage. Instead of holding wives to their biblical marriage vows they preach that it is a husband’s obligation submit to his wife and to make his wife love him more than any other man she happens to be pursuing. In the place of biblical marriage they now hold up serial monogamy as the key to sexual morality. Driscoll even touches on this. He finds fault with women who are fornicating. Don’t worry, he doesn’t chastise them for sinning. He just wants them to pressure the men they have sex with into marrying them:

Are you the girlfriend who has allowed one of these guys to be with you although there is no clarity regarding what your relationship is or direction for where it’s going?
Imagine what a real Christian pastor instead of a feminist would say to these women. I’m guessing it would go something like:

Are you squandering your youth and fertility chasing the feminist goals of career and casual sex? Are you making yourself less marriageable by not keeping your virginity? For those who are married, are you refusing to submit to your husband as the Bible commands?

If anyone here knows an actual Christian pastor who is serious about biblical marriage and not a feminist wrapped in faux Christianity, please let me know and we can ask him what he would say. In the meantime I’ll close by posing Driscoll’s own question back at him:

Are you a fool? Was your father a fool? When will the folly stop?
This at least seems to be the consensus amongst his defenders on my last post.

While you ponder this, I’ll offer some more Mark Driscoll gold courtesy of Relevant magazine: Mark Driscoll Says Just Grow Up (H/T Smithborough). Fortunately for us, he has cracked the code on our epidemic of unwed motherhood. Thanks to Mark we now know it isn’t the fault of the unwed mothers themselves, and it certainly isn’t due to feminism or our creating direct incentives for unwed motherhood. *Men* made them do it (emphasis mine):

The number one consumer of online pornography is 12- to 17-year-old boys. What that means is he’s home eating junk food, drinking Monster energy drinks, downloading porn, masturbating and screwing around with his friends. That really doesn’t prepare you for responsible adulthood. That’s a really sad picture, especially if you’re a single gal hoping to get married someday. *You’re like:* “Seriously, that’s the candidate pool? You’ve got to be kidding me.” *That’s why 41 percent of births right now are to unmarried women.* A lot of women have decided: “I’m never going to find a guy who is actually dependable and responsible to have a life with. So I’ll just get a career and have a baby and just intentionally be a single mother because there are no guys worth spending life with.”

*What causes these young men to be unsupervised?* you might ask, why unwed motherhood. *What originally caused unwed motherhood?* Divorce, which as we know from his Washington Post Op Ed piece is driven by men trading in their 40-year-old wife for two 20-year-old girlfriends, regardless of what the lying data shows:

Part of it is the unintended consequences of divorce. Forty percent of kids go to bed at night without a father. Not to be disparaging toward single moms, but if you’re a single mom and you’re working 60 hours a week, and you’ve got a boy, and he’s home all by himself with no parents and no dad, he’s just going to be hanging out with his buddies, feeding himself pizza rolls.

Phew, I was afraid he was going to disparage heroic unwed mothers.

It would be unfair of me not to mention the defense others have provided for Pastor Driscoll at this point. Sure he is saying incredibly foolish things now, but if you look at his past writings and sermons he has said some really great stuff. They touched on this in the interview:

> Several years ago, you were regularly in the press for your controversial statements on gender roles, but now it seems like you’re steering away from those conversations. Was that intentional?

> I don’t know, I’m always getting in trouble for something. I’m just really focused on, at this point, men and women. It’s really interesting because if you took all the women in my church who were sexually abused, raped, molested, assaulted in some...
way, I’d still have a megachurch. I’d have a couple thousand victims. So a lot of my
time is spent with women who are abuse victims, it’s a huge part of what we do, and
guys who are totally responsible and part of the problem. That’s where my focus has
gone in part because of the demand that’s in our church and because of the people
who I’m dealing with.

Forget all of that stuff he wrote and said in the past. Now he knows that women are really just
innocent victims of mean men, who are driving all of the dysfunction in our sexual
marketplace. They ask him if he regrets “any of those statements about gender roles and
Jesus’ masculinity?” Here is his reply:

Oh my gosh. I have been preaching and teaching now for 13, 14 years. In Malcolm
Gladwell’s book, he says it takes 10,000 hours of something to become an expert.
Preaching and teaching, I’ve gotten in about 10,000 hours. I’ve published I don’t
even know how many books, blogs—it’s a crazy amount of content. If I could hit
control-alt-delete and go back and do like they used to in Men in Black and just hit a
button to make certain people forget certain things, that would be awesome.

My hope, my prayer, my goal is to do better, by God’s grace, to learn, to grow, to be
sanctified and mature—to be less shock-jock and more Jesus-centered. I’m turning
40 this fall, so I can’t get away with, “Oh, he’s young.” I’ve got five kids, I’m not
young anymore, I’m a tired old man. But I’m hoping God gives me enough years,
maybe 30, 40 more years of service, that when it’s all said and done, I will have had
enough time to correct some mistakes I’ve made and learn how to more clearly
articulate some things I believe. So I’m trying to learn as I go.
I’ll share this first bit of linkage on the condition that you not tell anyone else about it. I don’t want everyone knowing about Rebellion University, but I trust you so I’ll share the secret. Professor Hale has an engaging writing style and an unusual combination of no nonsense seriousness and irreverence. For example, in his post Arts and Crafts: Fixing the Oil leak he describes in detail the work he will do when repairing the transfer case on his 4Runner. Included are the risks he will face when doing the job:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dropping the TC may result in it falling on my head and killing me. More likely, it will just leave me in a vegetative state (as in coma, not Florida) trapped within my body, staring out at the world while an underpaid Medicare nurse blows smoke rings in my face for the next two or three decades until a government bureaucrat decides that my quality of life is insufficient to warrant my further care. Or I will die from infected rat bites. I suppose I could reduce this risk by wearing a safety helmet, but then I would look like a dork. I would rather take the risk. I will be wearing gloves and eye protection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He follows up on this project here and here. You may also like his post Stupid News. The other thing I like about the professor is I never know what I’m going to get when I click on his blog. The topics range far and wide, but I always know it will be some combination of entertaining, funny, and thought provoking. I don’t always agree with him, but he often makes me reconsider what I thought I knew.

This next bit of linkage is one which I’m guessing Professor Hale would also like. If you aren’t interested in guns, skip this one. It is the age old debate between the fans of the M-16 and the AK-47, but done in the form of Dr Seuss on an internet forum and shared on the blog Huey’s Gunsight. Click for the whole thing, but here is an excerpt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you use it in a pinch?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will you not budge a single inch?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will you set aside this dross, and accept Eugene as boss?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m sure if you weren’t quite so crass, you’d love to cook with DI gas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And the reply:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I would not use it as a bat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would not use it to shoot rats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like your M16, That will not shoot if not kept clean, Plastic and alloy’s not as good As rifle made of steel and wood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I’d like to say that I knew Badger before he was cool, but that would be a lie. Badger has always been cool. Check out his post A Reply To Cadence on Sex, Commitment and Spinning Plates, including this insight:

As I see it, “spinning plates” is not about polyamory or cheating, it’s really about not committing until you’ve actually committed. This is a really key lesson for beta men to internalize. Sometimes it’s an active process of not allowing yourself to fall too hard. I can recall times in my life when I was pursuing someone as if they were my one and only, a do-or-die option, while they were fielding the advances of other men. And then I’d get butthurt about it, angry that I’d been more willing to forsake other options than they had been. But as I got older I realized how unfair that was on my part. I had not earned their commitment and we hadn’t discussed it; they had no obligation to me that restricted them from other people.

This is something that causes many beta men to get eaten alive in the SMP. These men follow the advice that they should play by the woman’s rules, even with women who are so “openly flirty” with every man they meet that it is impossible to tell if she is truly interested. When men are taught to play the strength of their own hand with flaky women, other women are often outraged.

Also don’t miss Badger’s Bizarre Encounter With A Married Over-Sharer.

Rapid fire linkage:

- Dr Helen: “...an estimated 50,000 persons are kept in jail or in prison on any given day in the U.S. for child support arrears.”
- Elusive Wapiti: Bankrupt
- Haley’s Halo: Boundless blogger considers first anniversary a “miracle.”
- Grerp: Piece of Advice #99: Don’t expect only adulation when you attention whore
- Do women sin? (H/T empathologicalism and Kupo)
- Captain Capitalism: The Lost Art of Cocktailing and (with charty goodness) The Attention Bubble.
Why wasn’t it women and children first?
by Dalrock | January 21, 2012 | Link

Shortly after the sinking of the Costa Concordia we started having a low level grumble in the media about the failure to implement a “women and children first” evacuation policy. Others including Elusive Wapiti and Vox Day have rightly pointed out that it is wholly irrational for our society to expect men to follow cultural norms which have long been invalidated by feminism. As Brendan put it in a different context:

If liberation for women meant liberation from accountability to men, liberation for men meant liberation from responsibility to women.

It turns out that feminists actively derided this policy following the sinking of the Titanic. As one article from the Daily Mail points out:

...such an attitude provoked sharp responses from early feminists, who believed that ‘women and children first’ infantilised women, and it gave rise to the slogan ‘Votes not Boats’ for the female sex.

Even worse, feminists of the day denied the unbelievable sacrifice of the men who gave their lives so that mostly women (and a much smaller percentage of children) could be saved. The Daily Mail tells us of the famous feminist of the day wrote:

...the men who perished in the Titanic disaster achieved a mercifully quick death and instant glory whereas their wives were left to grieve and fend for themselves.
There may well be no constant greater than feminist female martyrdom.

As I wrote in the beginning the complaints strike me as fairly muted. I think those who are criticizing the male passengers at some level understand the absurdity of their position. Most of these complaints also tend to conflate the failure of a sufficient number of men to volunteer to be the last to enter the lifeboats with the alleged abandonment of the ship by the captain. The charges against the captain do appear quite serious. An editorial in USA Today opens with:

You can say one thing about the captain of the cruise ship Costa Concordia: He’s no stickler for traditions. Women and children first? The captain goes down with his ship? They’re not for him. While frightened passengers scrambled to escape his capsizing ship, Francesco Schettino was safe in a lifeboat, resisting orders to get back aboard.

Mark Steyn is even more damning in his piece:

The miserable Captain Schettino, by contrast, is presently under house arrest, charged with manslaughter and abandoning ship. His explanation is that, when the vessel listed suddenly, he fell into a lifeboat and was unable to climb out. Seriously. Could happen to anyone, slippery decks and all that. Next thing you know, he was safe on shore, leaving his passengers all at sea. On the other hand, the audio of him being ordered by Coast Guard officers to return to his ship and refusing to do so is not helpful to this version of events.

Yet the charges against the male passengers on the ship are much more murky. They seem to all come back to the same assertion that a few men weren’t entirely courteous in making their way to the lifeboats (again from Mark Steyn):
On the Costa Concordia, in the words of a female passenger, “There were big men, crew members, pushing their way past us to get into the lifeboat.”

The fact I see very little attention being given is that “Women and children first” is an incredibly disruptive way to load lifeboats. When a ship is sinking time is of the essence. The captain of the Costa Concordia in all likelihood saved incredible numbers of lives by not implementing this foolish policy. There were 4,200 passengers and crew on the ship (source), and so far we only know of 11 dead and 21 missing (source). Even if we assume that all currently missing are in fact dead, this still means that 99.24% of the passengers and crew made it out alive. Given this incredible survival rate alone, the complaints that not enough men chose to give up their seats on lifeboats is downright bizarre. I doubt those disappointed that more men didn’t die have really considered this.

We know from historical implementations of the policy that it creates a great deal of additional complexity at a time when there is already more than enough stress and confusion. The Daily Mail describes the famous original implementation of the policy on HMS Birkenhead:

Some women did not want to go on their own — they had to be torn away from their husbands, carried over to the bulwark and dropped over the ship’s side.

The original Birkenhead drill was effective because the captain and crew were military and there was a way to enforce the order with lethal force. The idea that a civilian cruise ship crew could even enforce this kind of policy is laughable. While there are some accounts of crew members firing into the air on the Titanic to restore order, if a significant number of the men on board had chosen to disregard the policy it seems unlikely that the crew could have prevailed.

Additionally, there is going to be enough confusion on a sinking ship. This call to add additional complexity to the process only makes sense if one is absolutely wedded to a rule which has only rarely been implemented. Keeping men off of lifeboats only throttles the lifeboat load and launch process. Put this practice in place on a sinking cruise ship, and you’ve just created over a thousand heart rending farewell scenes smack in the middle of your lifeboat staging areas. Unless the crew is prepared to forcibly pick up women and throw them physically into lifeboats as they did on HMS Birkenhead you had better hope you have plenty of extra time. The same problem came up on the Titanic when implementing this policy. Many lives were needlessly lost in order to achieve the desired sex ratio of survivors on the Titanic.

The only answer given both the realities of feminism and the logistical nightmare of this policy is to acknowledge that this historically short lived practice is something from the past. This doesn’t mean that no men will ever sacrifice for women, but that men will not be expected to sacrifice for women, especially those women who have no obligation to the men themselves. Individual men will continue to protect their own, but the idea that men in general have an obligation to women in general is dead. Another article in the Daily Mail describes a husband on the Costa Concordia giving up his life jacket to save his wife of 40 years:
‘There weren’t enough life jackets. I can’t swim so he gave me his life jacket. ‘He shouted “jump, jump, jump”.

‘I froze and couldn’t jump, but he jumped off the ship and shouted upwards “come on, don’t worry”.
‘I jumped off and the last thing I heard him say was that I would be fine.

‘Then I never saw him again.’

See Also:

- The gift transformed into a debt.
- Chivalry only comes from a position of strength.

Night time and day time photos licensed as creative commons by Rvongher.
How should Christian men respond to slutty women?
Marry them!

by Dalrock | January 23, 2012 | Link

Commenter Bob asked the following on Badger’s A Reply To Cadence on Sex, Commitment and Spinning Plates:

I just have to say, as a Christian man, I find it near impossible not to have sex with Christian women by like the 5 date. This is because they seem to expect it and reject you if you don’t make a move. I don’t get it. Most Christian women aren’t better than nonchristian women. I’m dating 3 Christian girls now and one is already inviting me to basically get drunk and stay the night (explicit invite) for the second freakin date. If I tell her no I want to wait, I’ll lose her altogether. It’s similar with the other women. Women want passion, and if you don’t provide it and escalate they lose interest. It sucks because I just want a Christian wife and I get caught up in banging women who aren’t even my girlfriend yet. I don’t know how to go about this. It sucks being alone and on a carnal level it feels great to sleep with women, but I hate offending God and feel guilty about it. Do I just sleep with 1 then try to artfully escalate to marriage ASAP? Seems like a bad idea but anything beats sinning or being lonely and needy.

This is a tough question. Let’s consult the wisdom of modern Christian leaders. Here is what the Purity Bear has to say (H/T Rollo Tomassi):

According to that video, if you find a woman who wants to have sex on the first date, marry her!

I still wasn’t sure, so I thought I’d get a second opinion from he-man Mark Driscoll:

There you have it. Most men are pigs, and the handful of men who aren’t are tired of picking up after the rest. Man up and marry those sluts!
Blessed is he who expects no gratitude, for he shall not be disappointed.

– W.C. Bennett

Back in 1852 the troop ship HMS Birkenhead sank in shark infested waters off the coast of South Africa. There weren’t enough lifeboats to save everyone, and the captain made the extraordinary decision to reserve them for the women and children aboard. The crew followed the captain’s order even though it meant his and many of their own deaths. This incredible example of men sacrificing for others has made what otherwise would have been an obscure shipwreck a famous event in history.

Even a century and a half later, women still understand the meaning of the profound sacrifice made by those brave men:

| Men owe us.

A similar event occurred in 1912 when RMS Titanic struck an iceberg. Well over a thousand men stood aside and died so that mostly women (and a lesser percentage of children) could survive. Women understood the meaning of that sacrifice as well:

| You got off easy. The women who survived are the ones who had to suffer. We didn’t ask you to do this for us anyway.

And of course:

| Men owe us.

One of the videos I saw after the sinking of the Costa Concordia had an overweight American woman with a short haircut complaining:

| It certainly wasn’t women and children first!

She said this in the form of an indictment, with the obvious expectation that all listening would see it as proof of an outrageous dereliction by the men on the ship. She and countless other women believe that since some men have volunteered to die in shipwrecks in the past, all men will forever have an obligation to do so. What men in the past did was an incredible act of graciousness; it has been met with an equally incredible lack of grace in return.

I’ve searched the web looking for a copy of the video to share, but unfortunately I couldn’t find it. What I found instead was even more powerful however. Sheila Gregoire wrote a post/syndicated column shortly after the Costa Concordia went down titled: Women and Children First? A Feminist Tragedy (emphasis mine):

| In the comments I’ve been reading on the news reports, people seem to agree that
children should be given priority, but there’s a heated debate about the women. We’re equal, so why should a man lose a place to a woman? Why should a man have to help a woman when he’s in danger, too?

And, as disgusting as I find that question, it makes sense. In 1912 it was a different world. Personal responsibility was still the main ethos of the day. People took care of their neighbours; they did not wait for government to do it for them. And people had a code of honour that included helping others when you could.

Somehow we have lost that. It is no longer about honour and what we should do for others; it has become what others should do for us.

I assume the irony is lost on her that her response to men having shown incredible selflessness is to be upset that men might at times elect to take care of themselves instead of focusing on people like her. As I have written before, making chivalry mandatory or expected destroys the very concept. It isn’t just feminists who destroyed chivalry, but feminist-lite women who view themselves as traditional.

Even so it wasn’t Sheila’s blog post which really startled me, it was the comments from many of the women who read her blog. Several of the women understood the issue and why men made different choices on that wreck than on certain shipwrecks in the past. But others took an attitude of incredible entitlement, assuming that men in general exist to serve them. Commenter Rachel started by explaining that men owe this to women because women’s lives are worth more than men’s:

Women and children do not go first because they are weaker; they go first because lets face it, you need more women than men to keep the population going (men can make millions of babies in a day, women can only make 1-2 per year at best and our fertility is limited) and children are our future to continue the human race.

She then describes how she rudely bumped into a man in an elevator because she assumed he would understand that she has a special right to exit elevators first, even though of course she is his equal:

That being said, I was just thinking of this topic last night. I was sharing an elevator with a man about my age. When the elevator stopped, I automatically started to get off and he almost ran into me! I am so used to men letting me get off the elevator first, it hadn’t occurred to me that he wouldn’t. Once I righted myself, I got thinking about it and why would he let me off first? I am his equal. I started to think if there was a scientific reason, and I could not come up with one. In fact, I thought maybe the man should go first to let him see if it’s safe (I’ve watched too much late night drama and seen too many people get attacked getting off elevators).

Even though the uppity man in the elevator didn’t know his place, she graciously suggests that there are times when it is acceptable for a man to enter a lifeboat:

The thought process led to thinking about the “women and children first” policy and I do still think that applies, unless the child who is getting on the life boat is only
accompanied by his/her father. I think then the dad should be able to get on the life boat with his child(ren).

I want to back up and remind you that before 1852 there was no such expectation that men should stand by and drown in order to save women who in most cases are strangers. The sense of entitlement so many women now have because of acts of incredible selflessness by men in the past is astonishing.

Another commenter named Britiney who writes a blog called Consider the Lillies read Sheila’s post and it reminded her of a time recently when men she didn’t know failed to snap-to and be her personal unpaid valet. It happened when she exercised poor planning while taking her computer in for repair:

Along the same lines and under the heading of “Chivalry is dead” I had to take my computer to the repair shop last week. I took it to the Apple store in our local mall and, not knowing that there was a “secret” entrance close to the store, I lugger it all the way through the parking lot, and then all the way through the mall and then BACK because I decided to take it somewhere else. I don’t know how much it weighs, but by the time I got all the way back to my car I was nearly in tears because it was SO heavy and I was SO frustrated. And here’s my point: I cannot even tell you how many able-bodied young men I passed while I was carrying something that was OBVIOUSLY too heavy for me. When I finally got to my car I called my husband and told him that my boys will NEVER pass someone who needs help and not offer to help them. I was so disgusted that not one single man offered to help me! So so so sad. I can’t influence any of the men who passed me by, but I can certainly influence the 3 young men God has entrusted to my care and if I have ANYTHING to do with it, they WILL put women and children first!!!

This reminded me of a comment Hestia made on a previous post on this topic about a woman who saw a group of servicemen returning from active duty, and was upset that they didn’t volunteer to carry her load for her:

 Basically here is a group of largely men who have been sacrificing on behalf of the nation (or so the story goes) who haven’t done enough for this pampered princess. So it seems to go not only with soldiers in particular but men in general when it comes to chivalry.

One thing men need to understand is that in the event that they make the kind of sacrifice women are demanding, not only will it lead to even more entitlement, but many women will still detract from the noble nature of your choice. Commenter Amanda wrote:

 Not to undermine your point, but when the Titanic sank, women and children were NOT put first. Sure, they started the evacuations like that, and there were men of honor, but there were also the men who locked the doors to the third class section so that those people wouldn’t take up lifeboat space, and the coward who pushed women and children aside in their haste to get into a boat.

After Sheila challenged her on the historical accuracy of this claim, Amanda replied with:
Well, it's been a few years since I did all the reading I did on the Titanic, but I was pretty interested as a youngling, and the picture I got from the books was one of polite, subversive cowardice slowly escalating to outright anarchy and panic.

Understand that if you sacrifice yourself for women you don’t know that most women will simply take your act of ultimate selflessness as proof that men owe them. A significant number will also deny the bravery of your dying act.

**See also:**

- Why wasn’t it women and children first?
- Chivalry on the Titanic
In my last post The gift transformed into a debt I pointed out a group of traditional conservative women who were shamelessly discussing what men owe them, even down to when it might or might not be appropriate for a man to enter a lifeboat. I have to say I’m still stunned at the discussion. I can’t understand how a group of people can so casually discuss the way others must sacrifice for them, because those others aren’t worth as much as they are. The thing is, these conversations feel very normal for most women. I doubt they have ever been called on how incredibly crass it is. How can they possibly think this is ok? Do they have no shame whatsoever?

Commenter Deti entered Sheila’s blog and had a polite exchange with her:

There’s a difference between a man holding a door for his wife, and holding the door for a stranger woman. He has moral obligations to protect his wife. He has no obligations, moral or otherwise, to the stranger.

It used to be that men came to the aid of women — any women — who obviously needed help. Any man who does this now might find himself scolded, excoriated or even accused of harassment.

No one should be surprised that it has come to this. Feminist society has made sure that men feel wary of ever interacting publicly or privately with any woman they are not related to. And frankly, the church has done scant little to combat this, instead in many instances joining forces with feminism to promote female “equality” over biblical principles.

Sheila replied:

Deti, I’d disagree with your assessment that he has no obligations to the stranger. By saying that, then you’re giving in to the feminist mentality.

If honour and respect are universal, then we do have moral obligations to each other, even strangers. We have obligations to honour and respect them, and one of the ways to do that would be to hold a door open. If feminists get mad about that, that’s really their problem, because they’re the ones who are forgetting the universal and timeless principles, not the one holding the door.

Yes, feminists have created this society, but that does not mean that we have to give in to it.

The false claim here is that women like Sheila are different than those feminists who want to free women from accountability to men. Because of this, men must still be responsible for women like her. The truth is that Sheila and arguably most traditional conservative women are really just feminist-lite. For example, consider her post When the world isn’t safe for
women, where Sheila contemplated the Laura Logan incident:

I think sometimes we forget how vulnerable women can be. I am not saying that Ms. Logan acted foolishly; she likely knew what she was risking, and CBS likely did, too, and she chose to go anyway. That is what reporters do, and it is a risk they are willing to take. Male reporters and cameramen have been attacked, kidnapped, beaten, and killed, too, in the Middle East this year. It’s a dangerous job, but a lucrative and rewarding one, and I guess she took a risk that in retrospect was too much.

*Laura Logan is a woman, what’s wrong with a little roar?* you might say. *After all, women are adults who can make their own choices and accept the accompanying risk.*

Not quite. To Sheila women are adults *until they need men*, in which case they more resemble an unattended eight year old. From her exchange with Deti:

...given how vulnerable women are, I do think that men should watch over women if they’re in a potentially dangerous situation, in the same way that if I see a child under 8 walking around alone in a mall, I immediately stop what I’m doing and make sure there’s a caregiver in sight. That child is nothing to me, but what kind of person would I be if I didn’t check to make sure the child was safe?

Isn’t that just a little bit *paternalistic* to compare women to unattended children? Why yes, but only if we are talking about limiting women’s choices. Sheila explains in her Lara Logan post (emphasis mine):

...I don’t think we should kid ourselves about women in combat. They aren’t safe; they just aren’t. And women are at a far greater risk when they are in combat than men, because if we are captured, far worse things are almost guaranteed to be done to us than will ever be done to a man.

Should a country allow women to be raped or killed, when there are able bodied men not serving in the military? Even if those women are willing to take the risk?

That’s a tough question. Lara Logan was willing to take the risk, and it didn’t turn out well. *But it was still her decision, and to say that she can’t go because she’s a woman seems paternalistic.* It’s like saying that a woman can’t decide to be a missionary in a dangerous land, even if she feels called to do so, because it may be dangerous. We applaud women who risk their lives for the sake of the gospel; obviously no gospel is involved in what Ms. Logan was doing, but I don’t think we can say one is wrong and the other right. In both cases, women are taking the responsibility for themselves on themselves.

For those in the TLDR camp, I’ll summarize:

I want! I want! I want! *See, women can do that too!*
Men behaving badly, or speaking ill of the dead?

by Dalrock | January 25, 2012 | Link

With all of the hand wringing about the lack of an official women and children first policy on the wrecked Costa Concordia, one would think that the ordinary men on board had acquitted themselves with selfish cowardice. One Daily Mail article captioned a picture of the wrecked ship with:

Where was the chivalry? Describing the panic on board, one passenger said there were people screaming and women and children weren’t given priority.

Where was the chivalry? I would direct them to the story of the man who gave his life to save his wife, but I’m assuming they already know about it since they wrote the article. Perhaps they would be interested in this story from the New York Daily News: Drowned violinist on doomed cruise ship helped children to safety before he was lost.

Yet only two men losing their lives after putting women and children first simply isn’t enough. Another Daily Mail headline shouts: ‘Forget women and children first, it was every man for himself’: Cruise liner survivors describe nightmare scenes as people fought to escape sinking ship. In the article they back up this damning claim:

Fabio Costa, a crewmate, said: ‘We were giving priority to kids and women and trying to leave the men until last, but they were not accepting it because it was their families.’

Men wanted to stay with and protect their families during a disaster. Those bastards.

We also learn of this father:

‘He said, “Take my baby”, Georgia Ananias said, covering her mouth with her hand. ‘I grabbed the baby. But then I was being pushed down. I didn’t want the baby to fall down the stairs. I gave the baby back. I couldn’t hold her.’

Her daughter Valerie whispered: ‘I wonder where they are.’

How many men need to die protecting women and children in a shipwreck before women and white knights will be satisfied? Clearly two isn’t enough. As we’ve seen from commenter Amanda on Sheila’s blog, even the thousand plus men who stepped aside so that women and children could be saved on RMS Titanic didn’t do so with enough courage or honor to suit her tastes.

The message to men is clear:

We expect more from you next time. More death, more sacrifice, more flair.

Please keep this in mind should the ship you are traveling on experience a sudden loss of buoyancy.
Does Sheila Gregoire think her own life is worth more than yours?

by Dalrock | January 27, 2012 | Link

In Sheila Gregoire’s post and syndicated column Women and Children First? A Feminist Tragedy, she is outraged that men didn’t offer to follow a women and children first (WACF) policy on Costa Concordia:

Many female passengers this week are disgusted with the males on board, as well they should be.

She offers the Titanic as an example of how things should work on shipwrecks:

When the Titanic sank, the men followed the “women and children” first rule. In fact, you were more likely to survive as a third class female passenger than a richer male one. But that was a century ago.

She is a bit murky on exactly why men have an obligation to do what the men on Titanic did. She makes vague references to honor and personal responsibility:

In 1912 it was a different world. Personal responsibility was still the main ethos of the day. People took care of their neighbours; they did not wait for government to do it for them. And people had a code of honour that included helping others when you could.

But if the reason men should sacrifice and even die in the place of women is due to honor and selflessness, a woman writing this is being incredibly rude and crass. If men have no obligation to sacrifice for unknown women but often do anyway out of graciousness, women demanding more of this is quite simply despicable. Women demanding that men give up their seats in lifeboats is the life and death equivalent to showing up at someone’s home and demanding hospitality (especially if the person doing the demanding knows they will never be in a position to have the same demand made of them). While Sheila and several of the women commenting on her blog are essentially asking men “Don’t you think you should be brave and selfless and offer to die for me now?”, an uncouth and entitled houseguest might only ask “Don’t you think you should loan us your car? Don’t you think we should sleep in your bed instead of in the guest room?” Even if you are a strong proponent of hospitality, once this attitude of unbelievable entitlement by guests takes hold you can no longer be a gracious host. This profound ungraciousness by women like Sheila is as much to blame for the death of chivalry as feminism is.

It is worth noting that Sheila makes these demands from men while accusing them of being selfish and worrying about what others will do for them:

Somehow we have lost that. It is no longer about honour and what we should do for others; it has become what others should do for us.
Telling others *they need to do more for you* (or people like you) while lecturing them in this way is the height of hypocrisy.

Another possible argument for WACF is that *men owe this to women*, and it therefore isn’t a gift men can give any more than paying the rent is a gift to one’s landlord. This would fit with the unthankful and demanding attitude we see. Sheila’s syndicated column might not be her being profoundly ungracious, it could be simply a case of the landlord demanding the rent. A commenter on Sheila’s site named Rachel *made this very argument*:

> Women and children do not go first because they are weaker; they go first because let's face it, you need more women than men to keep the population going (men can make millions of babies in a day, women can only make 1-2 per year at best and our fertility is limited) and children are our future to continue the human race.

**She just said that women’s lives are worth more than men’s lives.** It also implies that fathers aren’t all that valuable beyond walking wallets and sperm donors. This blazes entirely past radical feminist all the way to **female supremacist bigot**. Sheila didn’t challenge this assertion, and my initial take was that it wouldn’t be fair to question Sheila’s stance on this simply because she didn’t refute it. The internet is a big place, and just because someone says something on your blog and you don’t refute it doesn’t mean you agree with them. However, a reader named Fidel did challenge Rachel on her argument:

> Keep the population going ... I get it.

> Rachel, look up stats for abortion in America since Roe vs Wade ....

Sheila was outraged that Fidel challenged Rachel on her *women are worth more than men* argument. Unlike her (non) response to Rachel on the topic, she not only responded but actually **scolded Fidel**:

> Fidel, what is the matter with you? Are you insinuating that Rachel doesn’t know about abortion? Of course she doesn’t support abortion. This is a Christian blog; many here have worked in the pro-life movement. If you want to participate in a conversation, that’s fine, but just insulting people is not helping anything, and is just showing that you want confrontation rather than a real discussion. To insinuate that Rachel is somehow ignorant of abortion is ridiculous. If you want to insult the commenters (and Rachel is a frequent one), perhaps it would be better for you to read more of this blog and see more of what she stands for.

Why should Fidel have assumed Rachel was a good Christian woman? Rachel’s Darwinian female supremacy argument wasn’t Christian in nature. And by defending Rachel’s good standing on the blog in this specific context she also seems to be lending her weight to Rachel’s argument. She actually says Fidel was **insulting** for the way he challenged Rachel’s *men are worth less than women* argument. Does she not feel that Rachel’s original statement was far more insulting than Fidel’s very measured response?
Sheila didn’t just defend Rachel’s comments once, she did so twice. Commenter Tom directly quoted Rachel’s women are worth more than men argument in his comment:

“They go first because let’s face it, you need more women than men to keep the population going (men can make millions of babies in a day, women can only make 1-2 per year at best and our fertility is limited) and children are our future to continue the human race.”

That might matter if women weren’t aborting their unborn babies to the tune of a million per year.

Perspective, please.

As she did with Fidel, Sheila scolded Tom:

Tom, this point has already been dealt with. Did you read the comments? This is a pro-life blog, and just because abortion is now practiced (an abhorrence and a tragedy) does not give anyone else the excuse to not do the right thing. It looks like you’re advocating a race to the lowest common denominator.

Elsewhere in the comments Sheila indicates that she isn’t completely sure WACF is merely about Rachel’s Darwinian logic:

I’m not completely sure that was the origin of WACF. I think it was more an acknowledgement that men were stronger, and that honour demanded it. For instance, it applied to older women, too, even those who were past childbearing age.
I’ll have to think on that more.

Sheila isn’t sure why women like her shouldn’t be called on to do what she so crassly demands from men, but she’ll rationalize a reason and presumably get back to us. But this still leaves the question; why does Sheila feel that men owe her this? She obviously feels strongly about this, or she wouldn’t have made this the topic of her syndicated column. Does she agree with Rachel that men’s lives are worth less than the lives of women, and that “less valuable people” need to stay away from lifeboats until all of the “more valuable people” have been rescued? Is her disagreement with Rachel merely on the logic used to determine that men’s lives are worth less, and not the fundamental conclusion? Or does she believe that men aren’t actually obligated to die in the place of women but have done so anyway out of an extreme sense of graciousness, something she demands more of in a most ungracious way? If Sheila doesn’t agree with Rachel that men’s lives are worth less than the lives of women, why did she so passionately attack those who criticized this line of argument while not bothering to point out the error in the argument itself?

I still want to give the benefit of the doubt to Sheila on this. I would prefer to assume that she simply has astonishingly bad manners, and not that she is a female supremacist bigot. Yet the combination of her own words as well as her selective silence makes me wonder. She can of course clarify this for us if she wishes to on her own blog.
Will the real Sheila Gregoire Please Stand Up?

by Dalrock | January 28, 2012 | Link

I’ve always assumed Sheila Gregoire was a naive, sheltered housewife who didn’t really understand that our society and the church is in the final throes of a massive culture war. Almost all of her writings are from the frame that Christian women haven’t been tainted by feminism. For example, commenter Jack wrote on her WACF blog post:

And let’s face it. Feminism has trained women to treat men like dirt, or like expendable appliances created only to please them.

Men respect the humanity of women.

Women duhumanize men far more often than the reverse. Feminism has made women childish and selfish, and many Christian women have fallen into this attitude as well.

Evidently this is something Sheila has never encountered, because she responded with (emphasis mine):

Jack, this was the point that I was making in the column, so I’m glad you agree. Feminism started the trend.

What I really don’t appreciate, though, is all of the comments today saying “many Christian women have fallen into this attitude as well.” How? What are we doing? What am I doing wrong? I write this blog specifically to help Christian women understand men, validate, support, and respect the men they are married to, and to think of those men’s needs and to try to meet them. I write a lot about understanding that men are different than we are, and that we are to respect and honour that difference. And what I write is really no different from what is preached in the pulpit and what is written in the women’s blogosphere that I am part of.

I just don’t want people slandering “Christian women”. If you want to say explicitly what you are upset about, then we can talk, but please do not slander those who come to this blog. 😊

She makes a careful distinction between Christian women like herself and the women in her audience, and those awful nasty feminist women. How dare Jack insinuate that Christian women are childish and feminist? How dare he suggest that the Church and Christians in general give women a pass? She had a similar exchange with Deti on the same thread, who wrote:
There is much talk of how men are to act honorably and respectfully. But there is no reciprocal expectation that women act similarly, with grace, humility and submission. At least that was not mentioned.

It pains me to say this as a Christian man, but the Christian church no longer dominates western culture. It’s been discarded in favor of secular feminism.

Sheila responded (emphasis mine):

Deti, I understand your point, but here’s the trouble I have with the way that it is often phrased: I often hear people in the “manosphere”, or whatever you want to call it, criticizing the church for not teaching women to be submissive or graceful or whatever. But they say “the church” does it. How? There’s a very large female Christian blogosphere, for instance, and Darlene Schacht from Time Warp Wife came out with an ebook this week doing exactly that. All of the women’s Bible studies that I’ve read focus on developing godly character. In my church, godly character development and humility are taught. At the marriage conferences where I teach, run by FamilyLife, one of the largest family ministries in North America, all of these things are taught explicitly.

So I guess I have to ask: who, exactly, are you criticizing? I think it’s an easy criticism to make, but I personally do not see it. I don’t see it in the women’s Bible studies that happen at churches all over the continent on Wednesday mornings, or Thursday mornings. I don’t see it in Christian books written for women. I don’t see it in the Christian blogosphere. But I do see the criticism often.

In another response to Deti, Sheila also wrote:

Of course feminism has eradicated that; no one is questioning that. But I fail to see why we should permit that to happen, or not stand up for honour, that’s all.

Poor sheltered Sheila has never seen the kinds of attitudes Deti and Jack describe in Christian women. Perhaps it is because such attitudes are so foreign to her that she simply can’t imagine other Christian women holding them. You know, her being a sheltered non feminist Traditional Christian woman and all.

Except I know for a fact that Sheila runs into the exact attitudes in Christian women and easy treatment of women by the church that Deti and Jack were describing. How do I know? Here is what Sheila tells us in her video log Should You Change to Improve Your Marriage? (emphasis mine):

I did one of these vlogs where I was talking about how it is important if you are upset in your marriage not to think about all of the stuff that he is doing wrong, but to look at what you can do to make the marriage better. And I had a lot of emails after that from women saying:

“Thats telling women that they can’t be true to themselves. If you say that
you need to change in order to be happy in a marriage then you’re not being true to yourself and that is wrong.”

One of my readers pointed out this vlog and I wrote a post about it. At the time I assumed that Sheila was treating this kind of attitude amongst Christian women so gently because she understood that anything but kid gloves would result in rebellion (emphasis added):

One thing which strikes me about Sheila’s work is how incredibly gentle she is in her pro marriage message to Christian women. At first I thought she was only lukewarm on the topic of marriage, but after further consideration I am convinced that she is accurately assessing the nature of her audience. What she considers “harsh” I would consider walking on eggshells. But as I said I think she has accurately gaged her target audience. **Christian women as a group are not used to being told they have any obligations. Ever.** Even obligations resulting from a sacred promise they made in the church in front of God and everyone they know. This simply isn’t the way of the modern Christian church*

Sheila referenced my blog post in a post of her own back in September. Commenters Joy and Lori on Sheila’s blog both stated that the bolded part of my comments above were unfortunately all too accurate. Sheila agreed:

Joy and Lori—I know. That is an OUCH comment, isn’t it? **But I do think it’s true. In general, the church is very hard on men and very easy on women, and yet it is women who instigate most divorces.** We need to get back to the message that we have a responsibility and an obligation to make our marriages work, even if those marriages do not make us happy. But that goes against conventional wisdom, and seems mean. **We really are fighting upstream!**

I know this is some heavy quoting to read through, but I wanted to show beyond question that Sheila absolutely has run into the kinds of things Deti and Jack were describing. When she claims on the WACF post that she doesn’t run into childish entitled Christian women and that she doesn’t see the church giving women a pass, she is directly at odds with what she wrote and said previously.

But it gets worse. Sheila isn’t the sheltered Traditional Christian woman I took her for. Readers CL and Anonymous Reader brought to my attention that Sheila has a masters degree in women’s studies (emphasis mine):

I’ve had a ton of visitors from sites lately that have been mocking the Christian view of marriage, and that’s one of the primary lines of attack: I’m telling women it’s okay if their husbands rape them. Give. Me. A. Break. Now, I know where they’re coming from, since **I’ve done a Masters in Sociology with an emphasis on Women’s Studies,** too. I’ve read all that feminist literature that calls all sex rape, and while it totally messed up my sex life in the early part of my marriage, I’ve thankfully been able to leave it behind and realize how great sex in marriage is.

Unless she was a child prodigy, **Sheila spent her mid twenties as a raving feminist.** Not only that, **she only tepidly rejects the label feminist today.** We learn this from an
exchange she had with commenter Rachel back in December. Rachel wrote (emphasis mine):

One thing I don’t agree with you on is YOUR generalization of “feminists”. I am a feminist, meaning I believe I have equal rights to a man, I should have equal pay for equal work, I should have a choice about whether I want to have children or what religion I practice, I should be allowed to vote, I should be allowed to choose whether or not to work and in what field. That doesn’t mean I hate all men, think women’s “rights” trump men’s rights and it most certainly does not mean I think all sex is rape...

I don’t know how to determine if this Rachel is the same Rachel on Shiela’s WACF post who argued that women’s lives are worth more than men’s, but it doesn’t seem unlikely. It would be more than a little ironic if this is the same Rachel on the WACF post Sheila was scolding commenters for implying that she might be a feminist and not a Traditional Christian woman. At any rate, Sheila replied and clarified why she no longer calls herself a feminist (emphasis mine):

As for the feminist critique, I see your point. I have stopped calling myself a feminist, although I do believe in equality, because the term has become so tainted politically. I believe women should have opportunities and choices, but I do not believe that we are superior. And I was so poisoned in my postgraduate work that I have come to really hate the term. But perhaps I should have qualified that better.

She doesn’t call herself a feminist anymore because the word carries too much political baggage.

Hawaiian Libertarian had Sheila pegged for a feminist back in November with his post To Love, Honor & Vacuum…unless he looks at teh Pr0n!:

Sheila is a feminist….the worst kind. A wolf in sheep’s clothing.

Note: Don’t be surprised if one or more of the pages on Sheila’s blog I link to above are scrubbed after I post this. In my Warn Men post I quoted an exchange Sheila had with a woman on youtube who claimed she was emotionally abused. Sheila responded to the woman on youtube as if emotional abuse was real abuse. Some time after I wrote that post the comments were deleted from Sheila’s youtube page. See for yourself. Now see this google cache page of what the comments for that video looked like on November 10th, 2011, two days after I quoted them. If you are interested in keeping a record for posterity, you can take a screenshot of the comments in the google cache page or print it to a pdf file. At some point google is likely to update the cached version to the one with the comments deleted.

Edit 3-15-12: Shortly after I posted this Google updated the cache of the page. Here is a PDF copy I made of the previous cached version.
Intermission
by Dalrock | February 4, 2012 | Link

I’m taking a bit of a blogging break. I have several ideas for new posts but lack the time and focus to write them up. I’m not sure how long I need, but I’m guessing a week should do it. In the meantime, I hope you will enjoy Mischa Maisky performing the Prelude to Bach’s Cello Suite 6.

Feel free to note/link to posts you feel I or other readers may find of interest in the comments section.
It’s just like running a restaurant
by Dalrock | February 11, 2012 | Link

I took the family out for breakfast this morning and the place was unusually packed. At the end of our meal I took the kids out to the car and my wife settled up the bill. At the cash register the manager was apologizing to a woman for the slow service this morning. He explained that they were much busier than usual which had the entire staff running around. The woman accepted his apology, explaining with pride:

I understand, it’s just like being a single mother!

My wife chimed in helpfully with a big smile, matching nonsense for nonsense with: Or an old blind woman! The heroic unwed mother clearly wasn’t pleased but didn’t know what to say. Somehow failing to provide her 5 year old daughter with a father had suddenly gone from something to speak proudly of to something else entirely.
New commenter thule222 shared a link the other day to a blog post on the “balanced”* “religion and spirituality” site Patheos by Elizabeth Duffy titled Complementarity, Not Competition. I’m alarmed at the emotionalism of Ms. Duffy’s post along with the lack of intellectual rigor it displays. It contains a number of vague statements, a quote from the Pope about how some men are bad and others are good, and a picture of a man who appears to be taking the risk of launching a new business venture. After reading the post several times, my best take on what she is trying to get across is Shame on you if you read (or write) blogs in the manosphere. She could of course have had another point in mind entirely. Instead of my take on her blog post, she may have actually meant I like pizza. Her lack of specific assertions backed up by facts and logical argument makes this impossible to know. This is tricky business, and I’ve learned recently that you can’t take a woman’s own written claims as indicating her own opinion. It could even be the case that I need to tell her what she meant before she can decide if she will or will not back up her own assertions.

It may also be that her point was that as a man I shouldn’t be alarmed by the very lack of logical thought she was cleverly displaying throughout her post (emphasis mine):

Some personalities in the manosphere write mainly to other single men, but there are married proponents as well, who suggest that becoming more of an Alpha male will improve their marriage.

I don’t disagree. Husbands should know how to lure their wives happily to bed. They should know how to lead a family with authority and respect. They should understand women’s hormonal cycles and respond accordingly, or refuse to respond with alarm, as is often the more appropriate course of action. And above all, they should be happy about being men.

While I’m pleased to have Ms. Duffy’s permission to be happy about being a man, I do have some concerns about her assertion that men shouldn’t be concerned about women’s lack of control of their own hormonal cycles. I don’t mean this from a game perspective; proper game form in response to a woman behaving irrationally is often a posture of amused mastery. But this frame of mind is specific to a context where the woman’s emotional whims can safely be disregarded. This was generally the case prior to feminism. Aside from being about a general sense of unhappiness, feminism at its core is a rejection of the patriarchal view that women at times behave like children, and a deep desire of women to be taken seriously. With this in mind, I can only assume that Ms. Duffy very much wants us to take her seriously when she tells men not to take women too seriously.

Women have demanded and been granted the right to have their finger on the nuclear button and the unchecked power to destroy the nuclear family. How can we not be alarmed at the thought that they might not have the capacity to keep their emotions in check?

The promise from feminists as men have agreed to grant women greater and greater power
has always been that women weren’t really slaves to their feelings and hormones. They argued fairly convincingly that women could and would act the way men are expected to act if we only took them seriously and allowed them into previously male only positions. Unfortunately as women have checked off each item in their be like men to do list, feminists have generally lost interest in holding up their end of the bargain. Instead of teaching women to be the real deal they have focused on creating separate lower standards only for women, and teaching women to fake it.

It hasn’t been this bad from the beginning though. The first feminists felt (and many women still do feel) that they needed to keep their emotions in check and perform up to high male standards in order to blaze the trail for other women. However, they either never figured out how to transfer this ethos to the larger population of women or never really intended to deliver on this promise. What has made this much worse is newer generations of feminists don’t consider themselves feminists, they consider themselves traditional conservatives. This gives us women who have post grad degrees in women’s studies who also expect men to at times afford adult women the understanding and protection granted to an eight year old.

At the same time, the feminist line has morphed. Many feminists simply ignore the issue. Others deny that this is an issue, and even claim that it is men and not women who need to learn to keep their hormones in check. This has lead to the popular memes of testosterone poisoning and Lehman Sisters. Additionally, the same feminists who tell us that women can and should be in positions of authority and leadership also tell us that it places women under undue strain to expect them to make decisions requiring trade-offs. This contradiction very much should alarm all of us. I don’t see how it can possibly end well. Either women are capable of behaving like rational adults and we decide to hold them accountable as such, or they are something like children who require adult supervision. The current path of women demanding and receiving the option to have it both ways is an unmitigated disaster, and in my view will only get worse.

For her part Ms. Duffy appears to absolve herself of any responsibility for the great harms of feminism while both defending it and enjoying the benefits of it. At one point she uses standard feminist language to shame men who raise concerns about it (emphasis mine):

```
There is a corner of the internet known as the “mansphere.” In a backlash to perceived cultural bias against men due to the mainstreaming of feminist principles, some men, feeling oppressed and trampled into submission by strong women...
```

Elsewhere in the post she writes:

```
The married portion of the manosphere has gained traction among some Christian and Catholic men, who—perhaps raised in broken homes—are looking for male role models as they strive to build a marriage and a family that will last.
```

Not only does she ridicule and belittle those who voice concerns with the immense damage caused by feminism without seriously addressing the actual issues, in the subtitle of her post she washes her hands of any responsibility for the harms of feminism. In truly childish form, if there are any negative outcomes to the changes women have demanded she decides that it
must be men who are to blame:

For feminism to have gained a foothold, men had to collude with it, and it has been in their interest to do so; this leaves the message of the manosphere ringing hollow.

*Patheos appears to strive to have something for all faiths and “spirituality”. If you aren’t satisfied with Ms. Duffy’s Catholic non feminist feminism, you might instead try this article on the search for love by lesbian and straight Muslim women in the U.S. If neither of these strike your fancy, you might try this article from the Evangelical Portal on the appropriate response to Christian sexism and lack of acceptance for homosexuality by the author of the book The End of Sexual Identity.*
A case for anger.
by Dalrock | February 22, 2012 | Link

In my last post Do not be alarmed some commenters pointed out that Ms. Duffy isn’t just dismissing the concerns of men in the manosphere because she felt men were to blame for feminism, she is dismissing these concerns because men (and women) in the manosphere are angry:

The married portion of the manosphere has gained traction among some Christian and Catholic men, who—perhaps raised in broken homes—are looking for male role models as they strive to build a marriage and a family that will last.

So what’s the matter with the manosphere?

Like most reactionary philosophies, an undercurrent of anger informs its theories and practices. The manosphere is not just pro-man; it is really mad at women.

Several commenters felt she had a point. It is one thing to talk about the problem of divorce and broken homes, but why all of the anger? This is very similar to a question posed by a commenter named Brigitte on the blog’s about page:

Why does a “happily married father” spend so much energy on the topic of divorced women?

Both share the same basic premise; so long as it isn’t you or your own children being sent through the meat grinder, who cares? My response back to Brigitte was:

You are asking why I care. I would ask why you don’t.

I’ll pose the same question back to Ms. Duffy and the commenters who are troubled by the fact that people are angry with the gross injustice which is being done to men, children, and the very institution of marriage: Why don’t you care? Why aren’t you angry?

Anger is an entirely healthy response to gross injustice. Apathy on the other hand is an indication of a profound inability to feel empathy, perhaps even masking a strong level of personal investment in maintaining the injustice itself.

A commenter named John wrote the following back in May of last year:

I recently discovered your site while searching the net about frivolous divorce and I think it is great you are trying to educate people about the realities of divorce in America. I went through a divorce two years ago, although I did nothing “wrong” so to speak, but rather because my wife was bored. Under my questioning, she said there was nothing I could have done to have prevented the divorce, which I believe to be true. I was not really lacking “game” (hadn’t heard of the term until recently, but I was manly and attractive), but she was very tired of the routine and banalities...
of married life, and wanted to, in her words, “find herself”, whatever that means.

As is typical, she did very well in the divorce and got the house, car, most of our assets (she cleaned out our bank accounts and savings and stripped the house bare while I was on a camping trip with a friend which she encouraged me to take - I should have been suspicious as it was the first time she had ever wanted me to do something like that, but I was overjoyed, and of course, completely taken by surprise when I returned to a house empty save for the divorce papers; I was never able to recover any of the things she took preemptively), full custody of both children, alimony until remarriage, and I got a disproportionate amount of debt and had to pay for the entire divorce, both lawyers. I have very restrictive visitation, usually I only get to see my children two days per month. I knew women usually were favored in divorce, but had no idea how unjust it was until it happened to me. In addition, I was completely blindsided. She was still very affectionate and sex had not dropped off at all. I never saw it coming.

I am a traditional Christian man, and had always looked forward to fatherhood and raising my children. In fact, I would say having a family was my dream ever since I was little (I never felt “defined” by my career or that it was anything other than a means to an end, but I am not a CEO or doctor). Now I am watching my children grow up in fast-forward, without any say in how they are raised. I have missed all of the birthdays and Christmases (and other holidays) for the past two years, not by choice. It is truly devastating to spend a month not hearing my children’s voice, or even touching them (let alone any human being) for weeks at a time, to say nothing of losing (who I thought to be) my soulmate after 15 years of marriage.

What is the most painful realization is that I have lost my future. I make $70,000 a year, but have to live on $15,000 after the payments (which I pay the taxes for, can you believe it? - I am in the $70,000 bracket!). I went from a decent house to a $500/month apartment in a bad part of town, and now live alone. I realize that I am becoming estranged from my children (I don’t really know anything about them) and my wife tries to make visitation difficult for me – it is awkward for her to arrange and for her new lover to deal with. I tried to be just a “fun dad”, who takes the kids out for a day of fun and doesn’t really “parent” besides providing paychecks and phone calls, but that is becoming difficult. Having a family is still my deepest longing in life, and I am so lonely, but I am unable to move on financially and start a new family with another woman (I am attractive enough and have the personality to get women quite a bit younger than me), because no woman wants a man that keeps $15,000 a year and goes deeper in debt every month to make ends meet. I could never support a family. I really see no hope of getting out of this vicious cycle – by the time all the payments stop I will be in my 50’s and I will have missed my opportunity, and be forced to live alone until I die. I can’t even have the dignity of a retirement, because my wife took half of my retirement fund which I had been contributing to since I was 22, and now I am so far in the red I have been forced to withdraw rather than contribute under severe penalties in order to make ends meet.

I have come to terms with the fact that this story can’t possibly have a happy
ending, and my life is so far removed from what I envisioned and planned it would be like during my youth that it is unbelievable. I feel like a fool for having done everything “right”, because it ultimately made no difference in my happiness and fulfillment.

I wanted to thank you for being a force promoting honoring commitments and discouraging divorce, because it seems like a rare opinion to take in today’s society. You are helping the community by performing this service. I decided to relate my tale here for much the same purpose – if someone reads this and is able think more critically about what the legal implications of marriage are for men and be more cautious it will have served its purpose – I know as for myself I was really too overjoyed to be spending the rest of my life (ha ha) with the woman I loved to really understand what I was getting myself into, in addition to being ignorant and naive about the realities of divorce. If I had to do it all over again I would rather have remained single. It is truly better not to have known paternal and marital love than to have felt it and had it ripped away, regardless of what that folk wisdom quote says about loving and losing.

Please men, think very critically about what you are getting into. The laws are equal, but in court it won’t come out that way.

I’ll offer my standard disclaimer that I can’t vouch for what someone I don’t know writes on the internet. However, his story fits exactly with what all of the data are telling us. John’s story is the story of countless millions of fathers and their children. This story isn’t about a failure of the system, it isn’t about an unexpected outcome. This is exactly what the current system is designed to do, as Stephen Baskerville explains in the excellent Touchstone article Divorced from Reality (H/T empathologicalism):

Under “no-fault,” or what some call “unilateral,” divorce—a legal regime that expunged all considerations of justice from the procedure—divorce becomes a sudden power grab by one spouse, assisted by an army of judicial hangers-on who reward belligerence and profit from the ensuing litigation: judges, lawyers, psychotherapists, counselors, mediators, custody evaluators, social workers, and more.

Further down he explains:

By far the most serious consequences involve children, who have become the principal weapons of the divorce machinery. Invariably the first action of a divorce court, once a divorce is filed, is to separate the children from one of their parents, usually the father. Until this happens, no one in the machinery acquires any power or earnings. The first principle and first action of divorce court therefore: Remove the father.

And remove the father they do. Here is the US Census data on who gets custody (more data here):
We can corroborate John’s story and the *Touchstone* article further with academic studies which have found that the biggest single driver of divorce is the ability to steal the most valuable assets of the marriage, the children. We can also confirm the fundamental corruption in the system from the *Seattle Weekly* exposé *Ripped Apart* (H/T W.F. Price):

**Rhea Rolfe**, an attorney who once taught a “women and the law” class at the University of Washington, recalls sitting with a male client in a commissioner’s courtroom one day. There were maybe seven or eight cases heard. “She ruled against every single man,” Rolfe recalls, “and two of them were unopposed.”

“In any other arena, the evidence gets you the ruling,” observes attorney Maya Trujillo Ringe. “But in this particular arena, the dad has a much bigger uphill battle.” So much so, she says, that she and other attorneys often joke that “if you put a skirt on the dad, same facts,” he’d win primary custody.

For those who weren’t angry before, I ask: Are you angry now? This is an important question, because the current system of divorce and custody has a massive entrenched constituency. Millions of women now take it as a fundamental right to divorce their husband, kick him out of the home and take over the raising of the children, all with a guaranteed income stream from the now ex husband. Our current system is as one divorcée brilliantly put it, a neutron bomb for men. Even those women who don’t actually plan on implementing this process are typically highly invested in it because it gives them power, a trump card she can pull out whenever she decides her husband isn’t following her leadership. On top of the average woman, there are an army of professionals who make their very living from breaking up families and managing the aftermath. As I’ve shown in numerous posts, even the church is highly invested in the status quo.

We won’t take this highly prized process away from these groups if we and other ordinary people aren’t highly motivated to achieve change. For this reason anger is an effective litmus test to determine if someone really supports traditional marriage or is merely paying lip-
service to reform. No one wants to come out in the open and claim they support nuking families and turning men’s and children’s lives upside down on a whim. Only the most hard core ideological feminist will say they support the current system outright. Again from the 

*Touchstone* article:

“Opposing gay marriage or gays in the military is for Republicans an easy, juicy, risk-free issue,” wrote Gallagher. “The message [is] that at all costs we should keep divorce off the political agenda.” No American politician of national stature has ever challenged involuntary divorce. “Democrats did not want to anger their large constituency among women who saw easy divorce as a hard-won freedom and prerogative,” observes Barbara Whitehead in *The Divorce Culture*. “Republicans did not want to alienate their upscale constituents or their libertarian wing, both of whom tended to favor easy divorce, nor did they want to call attention to the divorces among their own leadership.”

In his famous denunciation of single parenthood, Vice President Dan Quayle was careful to make clear, “I am not talking about a situation where there is a divorce.” The exception proves the rule. When Pope John Paul II criticized divorce in 2002, he was roundly attacked from the right as well as the left.

Fortunately if you want to support the status quo and still sound like you are for traditional marriage, all you need to do is say you support reforming the system while downplaying or ignoring the gross injustice involved in the current system. Only a motivated and large movement poses any threat to the current racket, so one can have their cake and eat it too in this fashion. If this is too close to actually supporting reform for your comfort however, your next best bet is to dismiss the gross injustice entirely because, well, others are angry about it.
For those not already familiar with Glenn Stanton, he is the **Director for Family Formation Studies at Focus on the Family**. He writes with great pride about the **38% divorce rate amongst the most devout Christians**. He also praises **heroic unwed mothers**, or as I like to call them, **Stanton’s Heroes**.

Slate has a new piece up by Jessica Olen on her desire to join the ranks of Stanton’s Heroes, titled **Single motherhood by choice: I don’t want the complication of a partner (H/T Gucci Little Piggy)**. This had me baffled, because I know from Pastor Mark Driscoll that the reason **41% of births today are to unwed mothers** is because men aren’t worthy. But this Stanton’s Hero is confused; she doesn’t know it is a man’s fault that she wants to be a baby mama.

I crave the closeness of single motherhood—without the complications a husband can bring.

I know what many of my readers are thinking:

What is wrong with this woman? Doesn’t she know there is a right way and a wrong way to do this kind of thing? The right way is to marry a man, have children, and then divorce him. This way we can pretend what she practiced was actually marriage, if only a **slightly modified form**, and we can all get on with the business of blaming the husband for **failing to make her love him more than the man she left him for**.

But Ms. Olen is putting the cart before the horse. She is saying “I’m not haaaaapy being trapped in marriage” before she gets married. This ruins the whole thing:

It isn’t conventional wisdom, but in many ways it seems easier to raise a kid alone. Being a single parent by choice would mean not having to deal with another person’s sets of demands or expectations of what child-rearing means. I wouldn’t burden a child with the emotional baggage of divorce or the highs and lows of an unhappy relationship. It would just be the two of us and a supporting cast of extended family.

Yes, yes, yes! Of course you are right Ms. Olen. Having to answer to a husband is an abomination, something no woman (let alone mother) should have to suffer, but **this is what divorce is for**. Those of us who are traditional stand on ceremony, and marrying first and then kicking the father out later with the full moral backing of the church and state is how this **must** be done. Don’t worry if this makes some people angry, we Traditional Christians will marginalize anyone who takes issue with this.

But please, since we are going to carry your water, throw us a bone! Please, please, pretend you aren’t actually doing exactly what you want to do when you become an unwed mother. Please pretend that as a woman you have no moral agency, and that someone else with a Y
chromosome must be to blame. You don’t have to make it convincing, we’ll buy whatever you say and pass it on as if it was the truth.

We’ll even call you a hero.
Programming note.
by Dalrock | February 29, 2012 | Link

I have a large high profile project at work and a number of things I need to focus on outside of work which will limit my focus on blogging for at least the next month. I’m guessing this will mean some combination of shorter/lighter posts and less frequent posting. It will also mean (as you may have already noticed) me only participating in the discussion section sporadically.

Luckily in the meantime there are plenty of interesting bloggers in the manosphere, many of whom are listed on my blogroll. In fact, I’ve added two new blogs to the blogroll: Patriactionary, and Suz’s blog Shining Pearls of Something.
Bargaining in the shadow of the law.
by Dalrock | February 29, 2012 | Link

One common bit of misdirection I see when the issue of unfairness in the divorce/custody process is discussed is the argument that men are voluntarily agreeing to the terms. How can the process be unfair if men agreed with the result? Just the other day commenter bonifacii used this argument when discussing the case of Hulk Hogan’s settlement (emphasis his):

...indeed, she got 70% of the money they had in bank (which actually translated to $7M – a pretty modest amount in celebrity divorces), but she got only 40% ownership in his companies (less than half) and no alimony. However this is a moot point because this wasn’t awarded by a judge – it was the result of settlement, and you can settle on whatever terms you want.

This seem to be typical in the manosphere – most of the things people got “a case for anger” is something which is either completely made up, or had nothing to do with the law. I’ve been a member of several forums for a while, Lack of credibility is what I see as the main issue with the whole manosphere.

Likewise a commenter at Dr Helen’s blog post on “persons” being imprisoned for failure to pay child support helpfully explained why fathers are almost never granted custody:

Men are much more likely not to ask for custody. They feel culturally the kids would be better off with the mother, or they don’t want the responsibility of full-time raising the kids. Because of the hesitancy to ask for custody, judges have been convinced that the children are better off with mom. So the cycle perpetuates itself. If more dads asked for custody the courts would change their tune.

Now it all makes sense. If men would only ask for custody, they would get it!

This same issue came up in a Huffington Post article titled What are the custody patterns in Washington State? The article discussed data from this 2010 report and details how mothers are given preferential treatment for custody. However, it also notes (emphasis his):

So how were these parenting arrangements decided? Almost 9 out of 10 cases (88%) were decided by the parents themselves. Only 2% were decided by the courts through a trial and another 10% were decided by default. In those cases, decided by the parents themselves, 22% of the parents chose equal time. In the contested and default cases, only 5% of the cases resulted in equal time for both parents.

A reader with the handle Morrisfactor responded to the bolded section in the quote above:

The author might give readers the impression that child custody is amicably decided by the parents in Washington state when this is not really the case.
Washington REQUIRES a pre-divorce seminar, with divorcées attending separate classes. When I attended, a large sign was prominently displayed at the front door which read: DO NOT FIGHT OVER CHILD CUSTODY, IT WILL HARM YOUR KIDS.

Since about 90% of children are in the care of mothers at the start of divorce proceedings, this message was clearly directed at fathers. The seminar itself repeated these tenants, along with a healthy dose of “abuse” warnings (all directed at men). I, and other men, left the seminar with the feeling there was no way we would get our kids – as the seminar apparently intended.

As shocking as his experience was, the problem is even more fundamental. Divorce and custody negotiations are what economists refer to as Bargaining in the shadow of the law. From the working paper No-Fault Divorce and Rent-Seeking which I also discussed in my previous post on divorce theft (emphasis mine):

This paper falls in a different strand of the literature that investigates the effect of unilateral divorce on transfers between divorcing spouses from a bargaining perspective. If only one of the spouses wants to divorce, spouses engage in ‘bargaining in the shadow of the law’ (Mnookin and Kornhauser, 1979), where the existing law becomes a threat point for one of the spouses.

This is so obvious it would seem not to need to be stated, but in fact as I have shown it truly does. Men know that the family court process is stacked against them, as do their lawyers. This gives their soon to be ex wife a huge advantage. She knows she shouldn’t settle for any less than what the courts are extremely likely to give her. This is made even worse in the cases where the husband is forced to pay for both sets of legal fees. Given this kind of situation men are being forced to “voluntarily” accept the best compromise they can for themselves and their children. The judicial process doesn’t need to be actually used for the gross injustice to occur.
World Net Daily has a story on a man who was arrested after his four year old daughter drew a picture of him with a gun (emphasis mine):

...Sansone’s 4-year-old daughter had drawn a picture of a man holding a gun. When the teacher asked her who the man in the picture was, the girl replied that it was her daddy, and that he uses the gun to shoot bad guys and monsters.

The teacher alerted child protective services based on concern that the little girl and her siblings might be living in a home with an unsecured firearm in it. The folks at children’s services called the police because guns are a police matter, and the police went to the school and arrested the father when he came in.

When our daughter was four she asked me what I would do if a bad guy broke into our house. She wanted to know if I had any superhero moves like on the cartoons she watched. Sadly I don’t, but fortunately as the saying goes:

| God made men, but Samuel Colt made them equal.

I explained to her that while I lack any of the powers of Superman, I’m prepared to protect her and the rest of the family in the unlikely event that any bad men decide to break into our home. I haven’t taken her to the range yet, but she has watched me clean my .45. She was satisfied with my ability to protect her and didn’t wonder any further about the question.
Fortunately in the *World Net Daily* story it was all a misunderstanding. The Canadian police determined that her father posed no credible threat to any bad guys or monsters who might want to harm her and let him go:

Everyone was eventually allowed to return home, and they were even allowed to keep the clear plastic suction dart pistol Daddy used for shooting bad guys and monsters...

**See Also:**

- On gun control and wimpy betas
- The value of men as protectors
empathologicalism suggested that during my limited blogging time I consider posting on several old threads he linked to on Christianforums.com. I took a quick look at one of them (Is Marriage Meant to Make You Happy?) and decided to take him up on the suggestion*. The OP framed the question as:

- What do you say? Is the reason for marriage to make you happy. If you aren’t happy, should you just divorce?
- Or is there more to it than [that]?

I’ll start with my own brief answer. Lifelong marriage is the cornerstone of Christian sexual morality. It is also God’s design for the family and the structure in which children should be conceived and raised. If you want to have sex and/or have children, lifelong marriage is the only biblically sanctioned way to go about this.

Love and happiness are benefits which very often come with following God’s plan, and there are specific commands to men and women as to how they are to treat their spouse. I also have argued strongly that in our current legal and cultural climate it is wrong to marry someone you haven’t been able to fall in love with. But making marriage about love and happiness inevitably turns it into something different, especially in a world where the law provides direct incentives to wives who manage to become unhaaaaapy.

There are as one would expect a range of answers to the question on the forum thread, but not surprisingly quite a few of the Christian women posting have very modern views on what God has in mind regarding sexual morality and the family. For Mkgal1, God seems to be all about the freedom. Her moniker quote is “His perfect way sets me free. 2 Samuel 22:33”, and her view on marriage fits right in:

- I don’t see how it *can’t* “be about love”….not when our entire “mark” as Christians is “about love”.

Commenter jennimatts has a different take:

- It seems too many have a selfish/lackadaisical approach to marriage. They don’t have a proper sense of commitment.
- If someone isn’t happy so they just get a divorce, they are being selfish. This is simply not a justification to break your vows.

Dreamer1982 weighed in with her take, scolding those who frown on frivolous divorce:

- I think it’s shortsighted to judge people who divorce because they have been very
unhappy for a long time. The unhappiness is the symptom of what is seriously wrong with the relationship...and if that can’t be fixed (because one spouse is unwilling) then it can feel quite soul-destroying to stay, stay, stay. I believe in commitment and working for the marriage in the face of all kinds of adversity, BUT i think there needs to be more love and grace offered to those IN or even LEAVING unhappy marriages. “I’m unhappy” may sounds trivial on the surface, but that feeling is generally just the result of something more seriously wrong.

So now we know, I’m not haaaaapy is a valid reason for divorce. No Christian woman would ever divorce for frivolous reasons, and never mind the cash and prizes she just happened to collect on her way out the door. She follows up with an anecdote of a woman who was happy to learn that her husband was cheating on her which permitted her to exit her “loveless marriage” (no doubt with cash and prizes). We of course have seen this sentiment before. She closes with:

And I can’t emphasize enough that IMO, discounting LOVE as the purpose and foundation of marriage is seriously flawed.

Next commenter WolfGate tried to steer the conversation back to the original question:

All the happiness talk is nice, and I without doubt agree it is good to strive for and have happiness in marriage. Seems that is a different concept for the question initially posed though.

Ask yourself the original question worded slightly differently – “Did God create marriage primarily so men and women would be happy?”

Sapphire Dragon, whose moniker quote is Discovering my True Journey with Him has evidently discovered that God doesn’t want her to follow His commandments if it doesn’t make her happy. She replied:

I think so. After all, women were created because Adam was lonely, so God made Eve... this set a precedent for all pairs afterwards, that women and men would keep each other happy.

Next up is JaneFW, whom you may recall as the woman with the plunger. She reiterates the point that if someone isn’t haaaapy, the validity of the marriage is in serious question:

I think it’s a more difficult question to answer than it seems to be at first glance.

Marriage vows in the UK for the past 500 years have been : “To have and to hold from this day forward, for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, till death us do part”

So, love actually is stated as an expectation. So is being cherished.

She backs this up with Ephesians 5:31 and then states:
IMO, I don’t believe that people divorce because of “unhappiness”. There may be something in the marriage that is causing people to be unhappy, but that’s not the same thing.

She then seems to suggest that someone being unhappy with keeping their vows is a sign that the other spouse is deliberately making them unhappy:

Happiness should come from within – joy from so many other sources. But a spouse deliberately working at making their spouse unhappy – that’s an all other ball game.

Dreamer1982 chimed in again asking what is the point of marriage if it doesn’t make people happy?

So people who don’t think marriage is about love and happiness, what IS the purpose? No one has really answered that.

She is right. While several men and women commenters have suggested that love and happiness isn’t the core purpose of marriage, none so far have managed to point out what possible other purpose marriage might have. She follows up with a comment which momentarily veers towards the crux of the issue, but then recovers and manages to miss the point entirely:

Personally, I think the purpose of marriage is not a simple one-word answer. I think it’s a way for Christ’s love for His people and the Church’s love for Him to be demonstrated in a tangible, here-on-earth way...I think it’s for companionship...to allow us to experience sex and have children and raise them in a home that demonstrates Christ’s love to them via their parents....I think it can cause us to grow and learn to love through adversity...to honour our commitments to God and others....

Is it to make us happy, end of story? No...our TRUE inner joy and peace is to be found in Christ...but a marriage that is functioning as God intended it will certainly contribute to the happiness of both spouses. So I do believe that God wants marriage to be a happy thing, something that is ALL ABOUT LOVE. Love is not a yeah, sure, that’d be nice too, bonus thing...it should be the crux of the whole relationship.

Wolfgate responded with:

God created everything not for us but for His purpose, for His glory, so He would be worshipped. That includes the things on this earth that may have been designed in a way that they could bring us happiness. The primary purpose of what he creates for us was never to make us happy – it was to make us more like Him and therefore more capable of worshipping Him the way He deserves. If making us happy is a means to that end, that is great (from our perspective). But the happiness is not the purpose.

There are other effects. Marriage in the correct design is a great model of the love...
God has for the church. But even that is part of us growing to worship Him more.

Dreamer1982 was troubled by Wolfgate’s departure from her Jesus wants to be your boyfriend (great post) view of Christianity, and responded with:

Your description makes God sound like a self-centred egomaniac! Honestly I believe that God is as interested in us as He wants us to be in Him. I DO think he cares about the states of our hearts and spirits...not just whether we’re worshipping Him, but whether we’re doing so with true joy and love...as anything without love is empty and meaningless.

So I agree with you to a degree...but I think you left about the part about how He cares about us and wants us to experience peace, joy and love too. I don’t think He wants emotionless slaves who worship Him because He is so awesome...I think He wants a RELATIONSHIP with us...a Father-child relationship. And the truth is, a healthy relationship always brings happiness to those in it. If it doesn’t, something is missing. And that something is probably true love as God created it to be.

JaneFW chimed in again, reinforcing the point that if keeping your promise and following God’s rules isn’t enjoyable, something is seriously wrong:

If God is love, it makes sense that love is important and a vital part of our lives. If we look for Christ in others, we look for their love as we see it shown to others. If we see harshness, judgement and cruelty, we generally do not expect them to say they are Christians - at least I don’t. No, I don’t expect perfection, but I do expect to be able to tell the Christians from the non-Christians to some extent. If not, then what the heck is the point?

I stopped reading after 4 of 35 pages, so it is very possible that somewhere along the line someone pointed out that marriage is the bedrock of Christian sexual morality, and not just a beefed up form of serial monogamy.

As I wrote above I don’t disagree that love and happiness are likely and extremely important benefits of marriage (when done right), but I think statements like the ones above show clearly that Christians as a group have abandoned lifelong marriage as the cornerstone of sexual morality. If you abandon the cornerstone, then any other talk about sexual morality is simply nonsense. If Christians really considered this it would be a sea change. It goes directly back to the problem of seeing marriage as on the same plane as serial monogamy. Marriage becomes just a more formal stepping stone along the path, one to be lingered on so long as it is enjoyable. But if marriage is just a stepping stone then it never was marriage in the first place.

All of this reminds me of Sheila Gregoire scolding me (while making a moral case for serial marriage on flimsy pretexts) for focusing on holding women to their lifelong promise instead of making them haaaapy with actually keeping their promise.

I’ll leave it here and encourage any interested readers to try to make it further through the thread than I was able to and share what you find.

*Way to sucker me into writing a full post empath!
See Also: The women at Christianforums are outraged!
Badger has an excellent post up titled Treating Her Like A Guy (check it out, I’ll wait). He makes the point that pedestalization is often about treating women as if the rules don’t apply to them:

In this case, the answer is to use the opposite mental technique – adopt a bit of a sense that she is just one of the guys, and don’t treat her with any special favors you wouldn’t give a guy in a similar situation. In other words, “are you doing things for a female prospect that you would never do for a male friend?”

Does she say something silly? Call her on it, just like you would with the guys, and get her to laugh at herself.

I don’t have any insight to add beyond Badger’s wisdom, except to note that one complaint I’ve seen about those teaching game is they don’t always offer enough concrete examples for men to use as a how-to. After you’ve read Badger’s worthy post, you might benefit from this fairly crass but still instructional video. In the video a young man makes the exact mistake Badger is referring to. He supplicates to the young woman when he should be demonstrating his higher value. He is unfortunately but not unexpectedly quickly placed in the friend zone. However, he soon recovers and learns to treat her as if she were just another one of the guys. Here is another scene (with the same warning of crassness) where they meet again.

I hope this helps shed some light on what can be an otherwise difficult to grasp concept.
Pathological denial
by Dalrock | March 8, 2012 | Link

The interesting thing about so much of what we discuss in the manosphere is that while it is very often diametrically opposed to conventional wisdom, the data to back up our positions is typically relatively easy to locate and share. Our problem generally isn’t that we lack the data or the logic to win the debate, but that we are challenging fallacious beliefs which are deeply held by very large portions of the population.

While everyone knows that divorce is driven by men dumping older wives for a younger model, the data shows it is quite the opposite. While everyone knows that divorcées become the life of the dating party after they dump their loser husbands who were holding them back, the data shows something much more bleak. Even the “true life” divorce empowerment stories of Eat Pray Love and How Stella Got Her Groove Back are based on experiences which tend to disprove this common fallacy. Elizabeth Gilbert’s study latin romeo turns out to be just shy of 20 years her senior, and according to her follow on book he married her for a visa. By my estimate Gilbert is 43 years old now, while her second husband should be celebrating his 60th birthday very soon if he hasn’t already. By all accounts Stella lost her groove when she found out her Jamaican adonis is gay, and (coincidentally) married her for a visa. One might even suspect that divorce didn’t really make Lorraine Berry sexy, despite her breathless tale of how divorce empowered her.

The pathology is highest when the question is about women divorcing frivolously. We can make an extremely strong circumstantial case that frivolous divorce is indeed quite common. We have the motive, in the form of divorce theft and (while unfounded) the commonly held expectation that divorcées experience magically better dating and marriage options than they experienced when they were younger and more attractive. We have the means, in the form of an incredibly biased family court structure. We also have the opportunity, in the form of no fault divorce and a church which looks the other way. We also have a society cheer-leading women on to divorce. Elizabeth Gilbert wrote about her own frivolous divorce and became a hero for women everywhere. Women even thought it was appropriate to see EPL as a sort of date with their husbands. This extremely strong circumstantial case is confirmed by the expert witnesses.

But the level of denial is profound. While it is absurd to argue that women aren’t routinely engaging in frivolous divorce and divorce theft given the explosion in wife initiated divorce concurrent with the introduction of incentives for them to divorce and the removal of disincentives, we are inexplicably expected to prove the much more plausible case beyond a reasonable doubt. Those who make passionate excuses for frivolous divorcées tell us we need to listen to the excuses, and of course there is always an excuse.

What we need is a confession. Not just any confession either. We learned from the good Christian women that a woman calling out the frivolous divorcée anthem “I’m not haaaaapry!” isn’t really frivolous:

…it can feel quite soul-destroying to stay, stay, stay. I believe in commitment and
working for the marriage in the face of all kinds of adversity, BUT I think there needs to be more love and grace offered to those IN or even LEAVING unhappy marriages. “I’m unhappy” may sounds trivial on the surface, but that feeling is generally just the result of something more seriously wrong.

This level of confession isn’t enough. No case of wife initiated divorce (with the attendant collection of cash and prizes) is morally suspect unless the divorcée herself flat out tells us it was frivolous. I’m not sure, but I suspect the confession also needs to be witnessed and notarized, or at least made by the divorcée herself in a national publication.

We may be in luck here. Commenter TM shared a link to the Huffington Post article Is It Easier To Deal With Divorce When You Made The Choice To Leave? Click the link for the full article, where newly minted divorcée Jennifer Nagy tells us:

Although I was the one who decided to leave, I still found myself completely devastated and filled with regret — my entire world turned upside-down.

...I had the perfect life and the perfect relationship. I lived in a condo on the beach, had a great career and a kind and patient husband. I had friends, money to spend and security. The only thing that I didn’t have was happiness.

She also makes what is a surprisingly common comment by frivolous divorcées, that she wishes she could have shifted the blame for her own frivolity onto her husband:

I often wished that I could have been the one who was left by my husband. Of course, I acknowledge that being left isn’t any more fun, but I longed to be able to avoid taking responsibility for the choice that made me feel so unhinged. By being left, I could have retained the belief that I had done everything possible to save our marriage. When times were particularly tough, I could have gotten angry and blamed him. Instead, I had to deal with the loneliness, sadness and emptiness of divorce, while also experiencing crippling self-doubt and regret.

Let’s review the evidence for the charge of frivolity:

- I’m not haaaapy! Check.
- Admission that she instigated the divorce for no valid reason. Check.
- Written by her own hand in a national publication. Check.

This might be it. We might have just found the one frivolous divorcée we can actually call frivolous. While the hordes of frivolous divorce enthusiasts and apologists will still of course claim that frivolous divorce in general is overstated, at least in this one case we can convince the deniers!

There is nothing left to do but cross our fingers and take it to the judges. First up is fellow divorcée mamacat:

...I know that in my case it took over two years before I stopped cringing about what I had done – institute a divorce.
However, I have never before heard someone claim that they divorced themselves out of the perfect marriage. That is a contradiction in terms, to my way of thinking. I do not see enough clues in the article to come to any kind of idea as to what, exactly, motivated the author to get out of her marriage, but whatever it was, it was something, not nothing, and therefore what she had was not a perfect marriage. If the only way for the author to save herself was to leave, then it was far from a perfect marriage.

Clearly mamacat didn’t feel like Ms. Nagy made a strong enough case for her own guilt. Sure she claims she divorced frivolously, but you simply can’t take her word on it. But this might just be a fluke. Surely others are willing to take Ms. Nagy’s heartfelt confession at face value. Let’s see what Huffpo commenter StuntHunt had to say:

- It wasn’t the perfect relationship. It just looked that way on paper. There’s a yin and yang to every “successful” relationship. You can’t fake that.

Next up is mamacat again with some follow up thoughts. While she is certain the marriage wasn’t salvageable, she hopes that in the future this marriage might be salvageable:

- Perhaps, with a really good therapist, it would someday be possible for them to reunite. I assume that at some point they felt mutual respect, admiration, and love.

Next up are the thoughts of Imhappy. No word on whether she is buying Ms. Nagy’s suspect confession or not, but she helpfully reminds us never to judge those who divorce even if they tell us they didn’t have a good reason:

- Everyone has been so harsh on Jennifer. It’s impossible to judge her heart unless one has walked in her shoes. Marriage is such a convoluted matter that it is really such an injustice to cast a stone at Jennifer for having decided the way she did.

However LeeRose reminds us that non-judgmentalism only goes so far. She passes judgment on those who frown upon frivolous divorce and stands proudly in solidarity with Ms. Nagy and her decision to end her perfectly good marriage:

- Reading the bitter comments the group of immature men who hang around this section just to bash women, I consider you to be lucky

Sorry for the false alarm. If I ever run into a case of frivolous divorce which is compelling enough to convince the deniers, I’ll let you know. Just in case, are any of you a notary?

**See also:**

- [Her husband was her best friend.](#)
- [A Detailed Description of Divorce Fantasy](#)
At least I’m banned in China.
by Dalrock | March 10, 2012 | Link

I’m really ticked at the Southern Poverty Law Center. They left me off a list of evil mean manosphere sites. Congrats to Ferdinand, Roosh, A Voice For Men, The False Rape Society, and The Spearhead among others though.

Perhaps the most absurd part of their new report Misogyny: The Sites is that they hold out Manboobz as a voice of reason:

What follows are brief descriptions of a dozen of these sites. Another resource is the Man Boobz website (manboobz.com), a humorous pro-feminist blog (its tagline is “Misogyny: I Mock It”) that keeps a close eye on these and many other woman-hating sites.

With Manboobz as the official counterpoint of the manosphere, it really isn’t even sporting. I almost feel bad for the SPLC. Is he really the best opposing view they could come up with when exposing the dark danger and thought crimes of the manosphere? If you haven’t read his site, take a few minutes to see what you have been missing.

While I’m disappointed that I didn’t make the cut, I at least can take solace in Greenlander’s report that this blog is banned in China. Yeah, I know, it turns out that all wordpress.com blogs are banned in China, but you have to take solace where you can find it. Maybe I can appeal to the SPLC and point out that all the other commies think I’m really dangerous and have them reconsider adding me to the list.

Edit: I see that Paul Elam has written a thoughtful letter in response to the SPLC. I would love to see them attempt to respond to it.
How to paint the bias against fathers as unfair to mothers.
by Dalrock | March 10, 2012 | Link

that quality enshrined in a man who, having killed his mother and father, throws himself on the mercy of the court because he is an orphan.

— Leo Rosten on the definition of Chutzpah

I found a link from Manboobz’ site to another SPLC page: Leader’s Suicide Brings Attention to Men’s Rights Movement. It is a pretty typical litany of these men are scary, these men are angry, these men are sexual losers, etc. However, this one part made me chuckle (emphasis mine):

But Molly Dragiewicz, a criminologist at the University of Ontario Institute of Technology and the author of Equality With a Vengeance: Men’s Rights Groups, Battered Women, and Antifeminist Backlash, argues that cases in which fathers are badly treated by courts and other officials are not remotely the norm. The small percentage of divorces that end up in litigation are disproportionately those where abuse and other issues make joint custody a dubious proposition. Even when a woman can satisfactorily document her ex-husband’s abuse, Dragiewicz says, she is no more likely to receive full custody of her children than if she couldn’t.

I have to hand it to them, they took the fact that women nearly universally get custody whether or not the father is an abuser, and turned this into something for women to complain about. The feminist capacity for martyrdom and self pity is truly one of the most powerful forces known to man.

As I’ve shared before:
**Edit:** After reading Opus’ learned comment I realized that I had missed the good feminist using another bit of misdirection, which is to suggest that since the courts only decide a very small percentage of the cases the outcomes of the rest of them are somehow unrelated to the bias of the courts.

Double points to Ms. Dragiewicz and the SPLC for a rationalization twofer!
The good Captain has put out a call for help. I’m admittedly late in responding to this, but he assures me that it isn’t too late for our voices to be heard. As the Captain explains:

Forbes writes an article about a Wisconsin legislator aiming to bring some semblance of shame and responsibility to single parents deeming it a form of abuse or neglect. I wouldn’t go so far as deem it “abuse” or “neglect” in today’s legal terms, but it is at least damaging and is one of the biggest problems facing the US. Even the wording used said it’s a “contributing factor” which I believe is quite accurate (and I believe statistically provable if we correlate divorce and single-parenting with crime, abuse, neglect, etc. etc. – but let’s not let facts get in the way).

Of course the author and his readers mocks the Wisconsin legislator, presumably because they’ve never been brought up in a single family household and write off the damaging effects of single parent households as “bogus” or “hilarious.” You know, all you latch-key kids, all you fatherless or motherless children who had to grow up in the 70’s and 80’s. You’re morons if you think divorce or single parents were bad. You should be thankful you were brought into this world by two people incapable of bringing you up under a stable household. How selfish you must be. You want BOTH a mother AND A FATHER? Selfish little brat.

As the Captain noted on a follow on post, even Heartiste has weighed in on the topic.

If you have a minute and want to help, please leave your comment on the original Forbes article.
Why so many wives wish their husbands would cheat.
by Dalrock | March 11, 2012 | Link

A number of readers have pointed out the article on Huffington Post: I Just Wish He Would Have An Affair! Click the link for the full post, but in a nutshell it describes the surprisingly common phenomenon of wives expressing the wish that their husbands would cheat on them, and asks why this is so common. The article opens with:

“My husband is so nice. He’s a good guy. I just wish he would have an affair!”

I have heard these comments, or comments very similar to this, numerous times lately. What’s going on? I’m not sure I have an answer. In fact, I know I don’t have an answer...

Further down she elaborates:

These women are done. They say they aren’t happy. They say they aren’t in love with their husbands (or any other man — they aren’t having affairs). They say they simply wish they were no longer married to him. They aren’t fulfilled. They wonder if this is how they are doomed to live the rest of their lives (and God-willing, most of them have another 40+ years ahead of them).

The common factor amongst all of these women is that they say that their husbands are really solid, good, nice men. They are not victims of physical or emotional abuse. They are not married to felons. They are not married to alcoholics or drug addicts. Their husbands are not having affairs. In fact, they tell me, there really isn’t anything “wrong” with their husbands ... they just don’t want to be married to them anymore because they have fallen out of love.

While the author is baffled by the fact that so many of these women wish their husbands would have an affair, the reason is quite obvious if you consider the situation from the would be frivolous divorcées perspective. Divorce is an act of immense destruction. This is true even in cases where it is fully justified. Families aren’t designed to be broken apart. It takes an act of terrible destructive power to make this happen. You can’t just unfasten a few bolts and neatly remove one part from another. The only method available is something akin to remodeling with dynamite.

Put yourself in these women’s shoes for a moment. Imagine you have a mortgage you don’t want to have to pay any more. Never-mind the fact that you were the one hell bent on buying instead of renting, and never-mind that you very likely signed these mortgage papers in front of everyone you know; you aren’t haaaapyy paying the mortgage any more. However, as your friends and the media tell you 24×7, you are in luck. Due to an inexplicable bout of legal insanity, there is a way out of your heavy obligation, a loophole. All you have to do is light the house on fire:
Don’t worry, your kids are statistically extremely likely to make it out alive without (visible) lifelong burns and pain. Yes, you will unfortunately put them and the rest of the family through unconscionable suffering, but the law is designed to move as much of the consequences as is possible to your soon to be ex husband and your children. But there is either way a terrible cost to doing what you want to do. It is a grave act of destruction. No one can deny this, even the pathological deniers:

…I know that in my case it took over two years before I stopped cringing about what I had done – institute a divorce.

So while you won’t be held legally responsible for the destruction you are about to unleash, you need to find a way not to be held morally responsible. You have to answer the question:

How could you profit from inflicting this kind of pain and destruction on the innocent, on your own family? How could you profit from breaking your own solemn word? What kind of a monster would do that?

This is where the near absolute corruption of modern Christianity comes into play. Even if you aren’t particularly religious, Christianity is the most prominent moral voice in the west. If you can get moral cover from Christianity this is your best shelter for what you want to do. Fortunately as I’ve shown repeatedly the corruption of modern Christianity is nearly perfect. A faithful Christian on the topic of marriage and divorce stands out as much as an honest cop in Ciudad Juarez.

But even here you have to work with them. It isn’t that Christians aren’t willing to gin up a biblical excuse for what you are about to do, but you need to provide them with a kernel to build their biblical rationalization on. They don’t need your husband to actually commit adultery, just tell them that he viewed pornography. They don’t need him to actually abuse you, just make an earnest enough pronouncement that he did. It can be as simple as declaring I will say, I was extremely emotionally abused. But as I said, you have to give them something however small that they can manufacture into a serious biblical charge. And don’t worry, it isn’t just Protestants who will do this for you, as Elusive Wapiti describes in his post
Second Chances on the Divorce Superhighway:

My former wife had already absconded with my children across the country when she served me with divorce papers, thus her act of filing for divorce was both the beginning and the end of the divorce process. It was all over but for the court date to make it official...

Incidentally, her Catholic priest recommended to her that she seek a divorce (and later the Archdiocese of Washington would breezily approve the annulment, after having the sac to ask me for a $500 “donation” to finance their declaring that my marriage to her never happened and my children were henceforth bastards).

But what if part of you knows that your husband is truly a good man, who doesn’t deserve to be slandered while also (along with your children) bearing the bulk of the cost of the destruction you want to unleash? This can create a sense of guilt, as the Huffington Post article explains:

And we are talking about women here, so here comes the “guilt.” Women have guilt covered — and these women are no different. They feel guilty as all get out and wonder about what everyone else will think should they decide to leave this “nice” guy. They wonder about the impact it will have on their kids, their extended families, their circle of friends. Deep inside they feel selfish and ask, “What gives me the right to leave my husband when he has done nothing wrong?”

Yes, you read that right. Women are victims for feeling guilty about wreaking massive devastation on the innocent, for profiting from their own family’s pain and her own unwillingness to keep her promise. What they need is a patsy, a rube. They need someone else to volunteer to take the fall for the terrible crime they plan on committing. There is only one choice; their husband must be the one to play the patsy.

I lit it on fire because my husband looked at boobies on the web.

And remember, Christians are going to want her to claim some form of abuse or adultery. This leaves her with two options, somehow convince him to cheat (or at least view porn), or to abuse her. As with the wife in Fireproof, many women find that by denying their husband sex they can at least drive him to viewing porn. But as wretched as frivolous divorcées are, for some of them at least this charade is too much to stomach. They can’t imagine explaining for the rest of their lives that they turned their home into a smoking hole in the ground.
because their husband looked at porn. The same goes for trying to claim some nebulous form of abuse. So unless they can bait their husband into hitting them or filing for divorce himself, they need to get him to cheat.

This is why the *Huffington Post* author keeps hearing from women who wish their husbands would cheat, and why we have heard this same thing from so many other sources. You may recall the frivolous divorcée from the *Marie Claire* article I quoted in this post:

> Clark had dated a handsome businessman for four years before they got engaged, and although he didn’t make her heart race, she still loved him. “We were best friends, and I thought he’d make a great husband and father, even though I wasn’t ‘in love,’” she says. “I walked down the aisle thinking, What the hell? During my vows, I wasn’t making eye contact with my fiancé.”

> Five years and two kids later, their sex life nonexistent, Clark wanted out. “I’d often wish he would cheat,” she says.

Devlin discusses this same basic thing in his post *Rotating Polyandry—& its Enforcers, Part 1*:

> The women sometimes responded with a kind of countermanipulation: “they thought if they were cold and treated their husbands terribly, the men would leave, or ask them to leave.” Sometimes this happens—which, incidentally, explains why divorce initiation statistics can be misleading. A significant portion of the roughly thirty percent of divorces which are formally male-initiated result from the wife deliberately maneuvering her husband into taking the step.

> But it is not always easy for women to obtain a divorce in this manner: “Some of the women couldn’t believe the things their husbands were willing to put up with.” (So much for men not being committed.) The author recounts cases where women deliberately tried to provoke their husbands into striking them because they calculated it would be to their advantage in the looming child-custody dispute.

We see the same thing described by Dreamer1982, one of the Christian women who have now gone on for 44 pages justifying divorce if they aren’t haaapy and feeling the love:

> When I told a friend of mine that her h was cheating on her, while she was devastated, she was also thankful and relieved. In her words, “What you told me saved me from having to stay in a loveless marriage.”

Most recently we saw this same perspective expressed by the author of the article I discussed in my post *Pathological denial*:

> I often wished that I could have been the one who was left by my husband. Of course, I acknowledge that being left isn’t any more fun, but I longed to be able to avoid taking responsibility for the choice that made me feel so unhinged.

There are two key things we should all take away from this. The first is that a divorcée with a seeming good excuse very well may not be as innocent as she sounds. The profoundly biased
family courts and the thorough corruption of modern Christianity create a huge incentive for wives to willfully maneuver their husbands into playing the patsy. He may have hit her, he may have even cheated on her, but that doesn’t mean she was an innocent victim or is a good bet for (re)marriage. Some number of women are certainly blameless, but unfortunately we typically can’t tell. This is made all the worse by the bizarre willingness, often eagerness, of the blameless to stand in solidarity with the frivolous.

The other thing men especially must take away from this is to be aware of the risk. As Devlin describes, “I’m not haaaapy!” isn’t just an innocent expression of marital dissatisfaction. It is typically an indication that you are already well down the path of marital destruction. Men need to be aware of this to protect themselves from false charges, and they need to be smart, restrained, and moral enough not to actually play the patsy. No matter how much she communicates through her attitude and her actions that she wants you to hit her or cheat on her, don’t take the bait.

House fire and smoking hole images by SpeedyEJL and Christian Patterson, respectively.
The women at Christianforums are outraged!

by Dalrock | March 14, 2012 | Link

You may recall the Christian forum I linked to in my post From cornerstone to stepping stone; the mainstream Christian view of marriage. They are outraged that their private conversation on the internet has been quoted on this site! How dare I use their own words to show how soft on marriage they are! Christian forums is supposed to be a place where Christian women (and perhaps Christian men?) can be soft on marriage without ever being called on it. If Christians can’t be soft on marriage there, what place is safe?

The discussion thread is available here for your reading pleasure.

It is worth noting that the thread was started by the commenter who goes by the handle dreamer1982. You may recall her from her thoughtful Christian insight into the threat staying in an unhappily marriage poses to one’s soul (emphasis mine):

I think it’s shortsighted to judge people who divorce because they have been very unhappy for a long time. The unhappiness is the symptom of what is seriously wrong with the relationship…and if that can’t be fixed (because one spouse is unwilling) then it can feel quite soul-destroying to stay, stay, stay. I believe in commitment and working for the marriage in the face of all kinds of adversity, BUT i think there needs to be more love and grace offered to those IN or even LEAVING unhappy marriages. “I’m unhappy” may sounds trivial on the surface, but that feeling is generally just the result of something more seriously wrong.

For extra irony points, I learned about the thread after the site itself sent me a pingback to the discussion. For that I want to personally thank dreamer1982 for linking to my blog when she created the thread. I hope she appreciates that I went ahead and approved the pingback, and even offered the extra bloggers courtesy of making a separate post linking back to her topic.
Commenting note.
by Dalrock | March 14, 2012 | Link

In a few hours I’m going to be setting all comments to moderation and I can’t say how frequently I’ll be by to let them out. As I mentioned a while back, I have a lot on my plate right now. I’ve been able to keep an eye on the comments so far and even cranked out several posts, but I need to turn on comment moderation probably for the next few weeks.

I mention this so you can 1) get your comments in now if you have something you want to get in, and 2) so any other bloggers who want to host a discussion have an opportunity to announce this in the comments section of this post before I turn on moderation.

Edit: Just to clarify, this isn’t about me taking a heavy hand with the comments. I might decide to turn the dial a bit more that way in the future, but this is something different. I won’t be able to keep up with the discussion for extended periods of time so I’ll be turning on default moderation. Since I won’t be regularly checking the comment filters I won’t be freeing them up regularly either. This tends to ruin the flow of the discussion, which is why I thought some other bloggers might want to host specific conversations there. While there of course, you will need to follow their rules. Either way, the manosphere must go on, with or without me actively participating for the next few weeks.

Update: Comments are now set to always go to moderation. It may be a while before I can check in and release them.
I’m back.

by Dalrock | March 27, 2012 | Link

Well, sort of. I was away for a family vacation for the past few weeks. I thought I would have more regular internet access during the trip but that didn’t work out as expected. I’m seriously looking into a mifi unit for my netbook. Either way, the break was good for me. I’ll be writing new posts as time permits. I’m still in the middle of a large work project, so I will probably continue to be sporadic in my posting and participation in the discussions. However, I’ve returned the comment policy to normal. Only those who are listed in one of the filters, flagged by askimet as spam, and new commenters will have their comments held for moderation.
Commenter Drew was kind enough to propose that his church measure divorce, and reported back when he found himself at an impasse (emphasis mine):

I suggested tracking the divorce rate for our church to one of the elders. He encouraged me to gather the data and share it...

The problem I am running into is that each local church is autonomous. The result is that finances and attendance rates are all local, with no central database. **Marriages are not recorded at all, because the church doesn’t technically marry anyone (not considered the job or authority of the church).** For my current local church, I am not aware of any divorce (maybe the sample size is too small?).

Any suggestions on how to deal with this roadblock?

I’m afraid the response he received is what I expected, and fits closely with what I predicted in my original post on the topic. The nature of corruption is that those who are corrupt are extremely unlikely to tell you they are corrupt. In fact, they typically say all of the right things. Find a third world police force rampant with corruption, and with almost no effort you will find all sorts of public and internal statements regarding their adherence to the “highest ethical standards”. It is very likely they also require all officers to attend annual training on the importance of not tolerating corruption. The police chief most likely can give lengthy, passionate, and eloquent speeches on the importance of police integrity and his department’s strict ethical standards.

Yet they are still corrupt.

The churches Drew was working with no doubt have compelling statements both in the form of periodic sermons and perhaps even a plaque or statement on the church website regarding their unwavering support for Christian (lifelong) marriage, perhaps even using the word “covenant”. However, their actions show that marriage is something they see as defined by the state, not the bible. They still pretend that the church is involved in marriage, and even pretend to perform marriage ceremonies. These ceremonies quite literally aren’t worth noting however, because the important part of the arrangement occurs at the local courthouse. **Edit:** Drew has clarified that the churches in question do not perform marriage ceremonies.

Yet sometimes the corrupt become so casual about it that they forget to hide their corruption altogether. Many Christians no longer even pretend to believe that marriage is the core of Christian sexual morality, and not a legally sanctioned version of boyfriend and girlfriend, a more formal stepping stone on the path of serial monogamy. I thought of this when I noticed the definition of marriage used by Christianforums.com in their married couples section (emphasis mine):
Married Couples Married Area – Available for those who are married, which is defined as a legal union between one man and one woman.

There it is. Marriage is simply a legally sanctioned form of boyfriend and girlfriend. It is serial monogamy plus cash and prizes.

Some members evidently didn’t get the hint, prompting the latest sticky in the married couples section titled Additional change to the SoP by moderator redheadedstepchild, a self described Child of God (final emphasis mine):

**We have added the following to the SoP:**

Divorce is not to be promoted in this forum except in cases where individuals are in physical danger. Those who are contemplating divorce due to extenuating circumstances may be able to find support in the recovery forums.

This forum needs to be supportive of maintaining marriage. That said we recognize that there are circumstances which may lead one to consider divorce. The recovery forums are better suited for dealing with these issues.

Please remember that when someone shares a personal experience it is not up for judgement. Divorce is always a last resort, but we will not allow judgement of those who do make that choice.

Related posts:

- The women at Christianforums are outraged!
- From cornerstone to stepping stone; the mainstream Christian view of marriage.
- Why so many wives wish their husbands would cheat.
- Pathological Denial
- Shattering the forcefield of denial
- Marriage lite: mistaking “No sex before monogamy” for a moral statement
I have been remiss since my return in not thanking Chris (Dark Brightness) and Laura G. Robins (Full of Grace, Seasoned with Salt) for creating threads on their own blogs allowing the discussion regarding the outraged women at Christianforums.com to continue while I was away. Chris’ post is titled Feminism and Christian Man... and Laura Robins’ post is titled Open Thread: Dalrock’s “The Women at Christianforums are Outraged”. If you have a moment both are worth taking a look at. I haven’t made my way through them yet but I noticed that Laura’s post has 70 comments.

**Note:** If I’ve missed any other blogs which hosted open threads please let me know so I can list them here as well.
I’ve mentioned Glenn T. Stanton, Director of Family Formation Studies for Focus On The Family before in this blog. As you might recall he has bragged that the most faithful Christians only divorce 38% of the time. You have also heard him call unwed mothers heroic. In the latter link I mentioned a bizarre passage from his book Secure Daughters, Confident Sons: How Parents Guide Their Children into Authentic Masculinity and Femininity. In the passage he explains that he and his wife try to watch the movie As Good As It Gets once a year. He uses this movie as an example of the goodness of womanhood. In the section titled Girls Need To Know They Can Call Out The Best In Others, he tells us how the unwed mother in the story demonstrates this:

She is a confident and attractive young single mother, Carol Connelly, (Helen Hunt). Even as they grow closer, he is helpless to keep from insulting her regularly.

In one scene, they find themselves out for a nice evening at a fancy restaurant. When Melvin criticizes Carol’s dress, she tells him he has no idea how much his words hurt her and that he’d better come up with a compliment pretty quick. She even reminds him that a compliment is something nice that one person says to another.

As I have mentioned before I haven’t watched the movie in question. However, from the plot summary on Wikipedia I understand that the movie is about how the love of an unwed mother and the wisdom of a homosexual redeem a manchild. As Pastor Driscoll might say:

Melvin will drive straighter once he is carrying the load of an unwed mother and another man’s child.

Poorly thought out pickup truck metaphors aside, the moral lesson Mr. Stanton draws for girls from this exchange is startlingly bad. Here we have a woman who already failed her child by failing to provide a father. Now she finds herself attracted to another man who by all accounts isn’t interested in either marriage or fatherhood. Mr. Stanton doesn’t see this as a warning for young women that following their animal side will lead to disaster for themselves and their children. He doesn’t see it as a moral reminder for women to focus first on finding a worthy man to marry before having sex and children, a man they can remain married to, a man they are willing to submit to and whose leadership they can follow. No, the Director of Family Formation Studies at Focus On The Family sees this scenario as an opportunity to teach wayward young women that they can tame the bad boy they are attracted to if they only tell him his negs hurt their feelings.

I haven’t read all of Mr. Stanton’s wisdom in the book, but from skimming the pages available on the Amazon.com preview feature I did notice some more gems.

Chapters 5 and 6 focus on the process of boys and girls becoming adults. In chapter 6 Metamorphosis to Womanhood: Making Healthy Women out of Healthy Girls he explains that
women are essentially innately good, and any deviations from this are due to society pushing them away from their natural state of goodness (emphasis mine):

We should appreciate what a profound life transition takes place when a girl becomes a woman...

A good woman is the more intricate of the species, for while both men and women are complex and profound, women universally have more interesting layers to their femininity than men have to their masculinity....

As parents guide their girls into the complex and wonderful world of healthy womanhood, what do they need to be aware of?

What are the essential qualities that transform our daughters into mature, secure women?

As you read through the qualities described below, please keep in mind that much of this is innate, but because our culture seems to fight so hard to suppress certain natural tendencies, it’s our privilege and responsibility as parents to watch out for opportunities to nurture and guide in these areas.

In Chapter 5 he takes a very different tack when explaining the process of growing up for boys. While girls naturally metamorphosize into women so long as society doesn’t trip them up, boys have to complete a journey to manhood. Here is a segment from The Journey to Manhood: Making Healthy Men out of Healthy Boys (emphasis mine):

In the amazing project of creating men from boys, we do well to recognize a curious fact about every single boy who has ever come forth into the world, including your own: not one of them has ever been a man before! As a rule, people who have never done something before need some help and direction in learning how to do it. Few pick it up all by themselves.

Who will help your little boy become a man? How will this be achieved?

These are profound parenting questions that demand great and long reflection. Note that I wasn’t entirely correct earlier. Each conveyor belt leads not necessarily to manhood but to male aging, because that’s what the mere passage of time produces. But good men don’t just happen. Good men are most often created in good families, and great intention needs to be put into the process. Fathers and other men play a key role!

A bit later he explains that the current epidemic of women having children out of wedlock and/or kicking the father out of the home after marriage is due to a lack of good men (emphasis mine):

...Marriage and family are declining so badly in nearly all American
communities because, as a society, we have forgotten how to manufacture good men. Good men do what’s right, and they respect and care for the women in their lives. They work hard, they don’t make excuses, they know what their duties are, and they do them without complaining. They fight for what is right and hold accountable those who do wrong, including themselves.

If women can’t find good men to marry, they will instead compromise themselves by merely living with a make-do man or getting babies from him without marriage. Unfortunately, this describes exactly the new shape of family growth in Western nations by exploding margins...

Women want to marry and have daddies for their babies. But if they can’t find good men to commit themselves to, well... Our most pressing social problem today is a man deficit.

There is a special kind of irony in him lecturing about how good men hold those who do wrong accountable just before he goes on to not hold women accountable for having children out of wedlock, frivolously divorcing, and for choosing cads over dads. In Mr. Stanton’s defense, his view that men are to blame for women choosing to make babies with cads fits closely with Pastor Driscoll’s assessment of the situation as I have shown here, and as Laura Grace Robins has shown here. Neither of these men appear to be aware that young women are being taught to delay marriage as long as possible and that this message is enthusiastically received. They are apparently blissfully unaware that even Christian women passionately defend frivolous divorce. Likewise, neither man seems aware that young women are openly embracing the hookup culture, a culture which they often find addictive.

But just because Messrs. Driscoll and Stanton are Christian leaders, don’t assume that their foolishness is either kind or Biblically based. While modern Christians often struggle with the concept that women like men do in fact sin, the Bible is filled with lessons in this regard. Teaching men to look to women for moral guidance is if anything an inversion of Biblical teaching. These men received their foolishness not from the Bible but from the culture at large (which they then proceeded to reinforce in the name of Christianity).
Rules of the road for fornication.
by Dalrock | March 31, 2012 | Link

Fly Fresh and Young (FFY) has a post where he ponders the morality of being a player, titled Are women “collateral damage”? (H/T In Bona Fida):

Look, I love women. I love the chase, I love the seduction. I love that look in their eyes when you know it’s on, I love getting to know the cool ones better. I love having sex with them, I love having one night stands with them. I love having wild yet short flings with them, I love being f***buddies with them. I love being in a relationship with a worthy woman (rare as they are), and I love being in love.

However, I have the power to get all of the above from many women, and often a few concurrently. So I do.

He is touching on a topic I’ve discussed previously, but the problematic mindset is so prevalent that this is very much worth revisiting. Most Traditional Conservatives are obsessed with creating and enforcing rules of the road for fornication. There is an unspoken assumption that young women engaging in uncommitted sex have a right to swing from man to man on an ultimate path to marriage. Once the woman tires of the carousel, Christian and secular Traditional Conservatives ride in on a white horse and start demanding that whichever man the woman is having uncommitted sex with now must do the honorable thing and marry her. However, Trad Cons go a step further and also create elaborate rules of the road for fornication in their desperate attempt to make the carousel as pleasurable and rewarding an experience for women as possible. These two issues are interrelated, because the underlying assumption is that promiscuous women need to be treated as marriage material, they just haven’t gotten around to getting serious about marriage yet. Another assumption is closer to the College Boyfriend view, that women need many years of “relationships” until they find the man they want to marry, and in the meantime they may as well have a career. This issue came up a few months ago on the blog Darwin Catholic, where one commenter lamented the changes in the culture:

There are only so many years of fertility that a woman has, and it seems the secularists have won a great victory with this education/career nonsense encouraging an awful lot of women to waste that time in dubious endeavors.

This outraged Mrs. Darwin, who scoldingly explained that what looks from the outside like women putting career before marriage is really just women looking for a husband for a really really long time while working (and sampling a quantity of men):

I’ve said this before, and I’ll continue saying it until my voice gives out: One does not choose marriage in a void; one can only discern marriage in the light of another person, real and present, whom one wants to marry. All this talk of how women ought to get married young posits a world in which women browse through the orchard of love and pluck likely men off trees. Real relationships don’t work that way. Until a woman meets the right man, what is she to do? Having a career sounds
One might assume Mrs. Darwin was limiting her passionate defense to career women who delay marriage while remaining virgins, except it turns out that men not wanting to marry non virgins is another hot button issue for the Darwins. Commenter GKC/Mr Anonymous politely argued the practical and biblical merits of men being averse to marrying non virgins on another Darwin Catholic post, and this resulted in him being banned from the Darwin Catholic blog and the thread being locked from further discussion. Mr. Darwin sent him on his way with:

Now, I’m done with you. In your initial comments, you seemed like you were open to reasonable and polite discussion. Your last few comments have become increasingly insulting and, frankly, suggest some rather perverted obsessions. Take them elsewhere. You’ve shit tested one too many times here and it bores me. If you comment again on this blog, I will delete it.

And I’m closing comments on this thread. I’m not impressed with the level of thought coming over from manosphere blogs, and I’d rather spend my limited writing time talking about something interesting.

I think it is safe to add one more to the man up and marry those sluts column.

Before we go any further, I’ll reiterate a point I’ve made many times before. If you are a Christian the moral issue isn’t to find the most moral way to fornicate. FFY isn’t being moral, and neither are the women he is with. But the moral answer isn’t for him to switch from being a player to a nice guy serial monogamist (with or without cash and prizes). The moral choice would be for him to ditch the hos and either remain celibate or find a worthy wife, although since he is an alpha I wouldn’t advise a woman to marry him.

Yet Trad Con moral angst is directed almost exclusively at the men in the fornication market who they feel aren’t playing by the rules. It isn’t that these men are fornicating, it is that they aren’t doing it the way Trad Cons want them to do it. As I wrote above, this comes from a generally unspoken assumption that fornication is the logical path for women to follow to marriage. Therefore their partners in fornication need to live up to a set of high fornication standards. With seemingly no discussion this idea has somehow become sacred, something which must not be challenged.

This is when you consider it a truly bizarre idea. Why do the Darwin Catholics and Pastor Driscolls of the world look at women engaging in the hookup culture and see marriage material? At the same time, why do men like FFY see these same women as good for a good time and nothing more? I think the answer to both questions can be found in the shift from a dating/courtship/marriage Sexual Marketplace (SMP) to our current hookup/serial monogamy SMP, and this is closely related to the changing age of marriage:
The chart above uses data from this US Census spreadsheet, and shows the long term trend in the US regarding age of marriage. To better explain how this long term trend has impacted the SMP, I’ll break it down further below by decade. I’ll also focus on median age of marriage for women, since young women are in the power position in the SMP.

Note: The red lines in the charts which follow indicate the average for the decade.

Put yourself in the shoes of an 18 year old young woman in the 1950s. As you can see, half of her peers are married by the time they are a few months past their 20th birthdays. Since
marriage isn’t something which typically occurs overnight, these women have likely been in the courtship and engagement process for several years. A woman who marries at age 20 was very likely strongly considering marriage at age 18 if not younger. Many of the women around her have in fact married at younger ages than 20. Young women in this kind of situation will approach the dating market very differently than young women do today. They may not plan on marrying their first boyfriend, but they are generally looking for a boyfriend who they feel is husband material. This focus on dads over cads is reinforced by the fact that other women are looking for the same dad traits. This creates what is called in game parlance preselection, and can be very powerful.

Now place yourself in the shoes of a young man in the 1950s. As it has always been, young women are the prize of the SMP. If you want them to give you the time of day, you had better be offering what they are looking for. As I’ve just shown, generally this meant demonstrating dad potential. This isn’t to say that players/alphas didn’t exist or didn’t have success, but the playing field wasn’t stacked in their favor as it is today.

Fast forward a decade to the 1960s. As you can see, the trend has continued but the fundamental SMP hasn’t changed; the median age of marriage has increased by only a few months. If you are an 18 year old young woman, you still find that your peers just a few years older than you are very likely to already be married. The pressure is on to find a husband. Screwing cads for sport might be enticing, but there is no time to waste, and developing a reputation would harm your near term goal of finding the best husband you can attract.

Since the women are still looking for dads and not cads, as a young man the signal is still strong; work hard and prepare to act as a provider. Young women will spot the young men with the best potential and want to be with them.
Ten years later and we are in the full swing of the sexual revolution. On top of that, the trend towards later marriage for women has continued. However, a young woman’s peers are only marrying a year later than her mother’s peers did in the 1950s. This isn’t a lot of time to embrace the carousel, and marriage is still a near term goal for an average 18 year old woman. Certainly more women are screwing cads like FFY for sport than in previous generations, but the smart ones stay off the carousel or at least seriously limit their exposure to it. Many no doubt decide to split the difference with a series of college boyfriends until she finds the one she likes the best, and then pressure him into proposing.

By all accounts this must have been the golden age for greater betas. They have enough alpha/cad to be attractive to women on the carousel, and they also have the dad/beta qualities that women were still considering with marriage just around the corner. This golden age of greater betas seems to be what so many Trad Cons have etched in stone in their minds. This along with the apex fallacy leads to the premise that most men have all of the options. They can either use and discard women looking to marry, or they can marry them. Better yet, why not decide to have the best of both worlds and use and discard marriage worthy women until they decide to marry?

Note that the split-the-difference strategy in this scenario looks strikingly similar for men and women. One would be hard pressed to determine who was conning whom.
Now we are in the 1980s. While it took 20 years for the median age of marriage to go up one year between the 50s and 70s, it has gone up another two in the last decade. However, AIDS and the fear of STDs in general have put a bit of a damper on the promiscuity of the last decade, and when it comes down to it large numbers of young women are still in the marriage market from the beginning. 18 year olds look to 20 and 22 year olds for an understanding of what they should be doing, and those women are actively hunting down husbands. This isn’t a good time to develop a reputation, but a college boyfriend or three probably won’t do any harm. A few cads might find their way accidentally into the mix as well.

For greater betas the split the difference strategy still probably works pretty well. Cads are doing better because a larger number of women are delaying marriage into their late 20s and some even past then.

Enter the 1990s and the median age of marriage for women is now 24 and a half. While an 18 year old
woman in the 1950s saw herself likely marrying in 2 years, an 18 year old woman in the 1990s doesn’t see this happening for over 6 more years. 6 years is a lifetime to an 18 year old of either sex, so her initial foray into the SMP likely isn’t looking for a husband. However, there is an inertia to inhibitions and the “good girls” are still following the college boyfriend script, even though fewer women now feel compelled to follow it. Those who chase cads assume rightly or wrongly that they can clean up their act and marry an unsuspecting beta once they are ready.

For the greater beta things are starting to get much tougher. Fewer women are seeking out dad qualities, and those who are could well have been chasing cads just a year or two prior.

Skip ahead to the generation that survived Y2k. Women are marrying roughly an additional year later than they did a decade ago, and 7.5 years later than they did in the 1950s. An 18 year old woman’s peers aren’t looking for a husband, and neither are the women 2 and 4 years older than her. The women who are looking for husbands are in a very different life stage than she is, so this removes her sense of urgency. The only thing holding her back from fully embracing the now raging hookup culture would be a strong moral belief that sex shouldn’t occur before marriage. For the rest, why not go after the hottest men they can find? There will be time to paper it over with stories about college boyfriends later. Besides, everyone is doing it.

For young betas this SMP is an unmitigated disaster. Your choices amount to finding one of the rapidly vanishing young women who are looking to marry, learn to emulate the cads, or remain celibate (voluntary or otherwise). On top of that, courting young women has become outright foolish unless one has a high degree of certainty that she is motivated to marry soon. Young women will gladly accept your quaint offer of gifts, free food, and entertainment, but most won’t be on the market for anything serious for many years. Courting older women has the same basic problem, with the additional negatives of them being less attractive and more likely to carry baggage of STDs, be hung up on a past alpha, or raising another man’s child.
For players like FFY, this is the time to be alive. Sexually unscrupulous young women are literally throwing themselves at you, and the only thing you have to worry about are the finger wagging Trad Cons who want to make sure the hos enjoy the ride. These same conservatives have generally turned their backs on marriage in the past decades, allowing it to become a mechanism to crush honest men. But even if the Trad Cons hadn’t squandered their moral authority it wouldn’t deter men like FFY, because he is one of the bad boys women are flocking to. His bad boy nature is both what makes him attractive to hordes of young women seeking out cads, and also what makes him not care what society in general and Trad Cons in specific think of him.

As you can see, the trend of women having “relationships” with men for an extended period of time has continued in the most recent years data is available for. Unfortunately, Trad Cons are so obsessed with the rules for the road of fornication they can’t focus on bringing us back to a truly moral situation.

See also:

- The weakened signal
- We are trapped on Slut Island and Social Conservatives are our Gilligan.
- Misery and Vice
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Mr Darwin Responds.
by Dalrock | April 2, 2012 | Link

Mr Darwin has written a post in response to my **Rules of the road for fornication**. His response is titled **How to Marry a Nice Girl**. I haven’t read his entire post, but I noticed one issue after skimming part of it and attempted to post a comment on his site. Unfortunately I’m unable to prove to his spam filter that I’m not a robot, and after failing to pass the captcha test several times I decided to post my comment here instead:

Hi Mr. Darwin. Thanks for your reply.

I haven’t had time to go through your entire response, but I wanted to point out that we appear both to be using the same dataset. Double check my post and you will see that I referenced the complete xls spreadsheet from the US Census, and that I’m using median and not mean age of marriage in all of my charts.

This is a minor issue, but I think it is worth noting.

Check out Mr. Darwin’s response if you are interested, and if your captcha skills are better than mine participate in the discussion in a courteous way.

**Edit:** Chris from Dark Brightness has his own response to Darwin Catholic up, titled **Nicking wisdom from the papists**
What, Me Worry?
by Dalrock | April 3, 2012 | Link

As I mentioned yesterday Darwin Catholic (DC or Mr. Darwin for brevity moving forward) has a post up titled How To Marry a Nice Girl in response to my post Rules of the road for fornication. At the time I hadn’t read his full post, but having done so now I want to share my thoughts. Mr Darwin opens with:

Manosphere blogger “Dalrock” has linked to me under the apparent misapprehension that because I wrote that it is okay for someone (even, some were shocked to hear, a woman) to intentionally remain single so long as he or she remains celibate, Mrs Darwin and I are promoting fornication. This seems to be about on par with Dalrock’s previously shown abilities to read and understand the arguments of others...

Mr. Darwin has misunderstood my argument. My disagreement was in two parts. The first was with his wife’s assertion that the trend we are seeing in women (in general) delaying marriage is driven not by feminist encouragement to women to prioritize education and career before marriage, but instead is being driven by women using careers to pass the time while eagerly looking for husbands. This is patently absurd. Reading her reply again, I realize that this might not have been what she meant. Women often take statements about the culture in general as personal attacks on themselves and the choices they made. Mrs. Darwin’s passionate rebuttal to the commenter on her site lamenting the general trend of women delaying marriage may well have been a defense of her own choices, and not actually intended as a response to the issue he was raising. The inability of so many to separate the general from the personal in these cases is the cause of a great deal of confusion and I strongly suspect this was one of those cases.

The other part of my point was Mr. Darwin’s over the top reaction to a polite discussion on why it isn’t bad advice to suggest that men should prefer to marry virgins. Putting together Mrs. Darwin’s great passion in defending the ever rising age of marriage for women with Mr. Darwin’s over the top outrage that men would insist on only marrying virgins, the Darwins appear quite passionate in their defense of the career woman slut who suddenly decides she needs to marry. Without addressing his own previous arguments against men who wish to marry virgins, he explains his overall reaction to GKC with an editorial note:

Last time I unleashed a broadside at the manosphere in general and Dalrock in particular, I was spoiling for a fight after watching Dalrock’s readers flood into the comboxes of Patheos in response to a post by Elizabeth Duffy and behave pretty badly while doing so. (This ranged from garden variety rudeness to calling the author a c***.) So when I stepped in with a response post, I was in the mood for a fight. When one of Dalrock’s readers started propounding the idea that regardless of repentance any woman who had sex before marriage was “a slut” and could never get married, I grew tired of dealing with the situation, banned him, and closed the thread.
If I'm reading this correctly, he is suggesting that he responded the way he did to GKC not because he disagreed with GKC's politely structured biblical and practical argument, but because he suspected that GKC had at some point read and/or commented on my site, and that others whom DC suspected may have read and/or commented at my site had made objectionable comments on a third party's site. It is worth pointing out that GKC had already expressed his own concern about the comments which were directed at Ms. Duffy. Still, the rule of *Six Degrees of Dalrock* took precedence and GKC was prevented from politely making his case. Aside from the strange friend of a friend whose cousin once read Dalrock's blog explanation, DC's assertion that he was “spoiling for a fight” strikes me as suspect. If he was spoiling for a fight, why did he end the discussion as soon as the opportunity for a vigorous intellectual exchange appeared? Why “unleash a broadside” if you plan on fleeing to port once the ostensible enemy appears?

At any rate, GKC will be pleased to learn that DC has now decided to unban him. At the same time, DC clarifies that words like “slut” and “ho” are banned at Darwin Catholic, as are comments “generally derogatory towards women (or men)”. I can only assume that there are no such thing as sluts in the Darwin Catholic world, since the word itself is offensive. Or perhaps they recognize the existence of sluts, but would prefer that commenters use an approved euphemism. Might I suggest the term *grass widow*, or a phrase I believe was coined by Badger, a woman who has had too many hot dogs in the babymaker. Feel free to suggest your own euphemisms in the comments section (here) so DC can consider them for his commenting policy.

My next point is in relation to the data I used in my rules of the road post. Mr. Darwin misunderstood the data I was using. Overlapping slightly with where I left off before:

This seems to be about on par with Dalrock’s previously shown abilities to read and understand the arguments of others, and once again I can’t help responding, especially because he attempts to make an argument from data while clearly using an incomplete historical trend and generally not knowing what he’s talking about.

Farther down in the analysis he elaborates:

…by starting in the 50s, Dalrock misses a fact I imagine he’s not aware of: the 50s marked a low point in the average marriage age in the US. This table shows median age at first marriage (rather than average), so the numbers are very slightly different from what Dalrock’s quoting, but the trend is very clear: the median age at first marriage fell steadily from 22 for women in 1890 to 20.3 for women in 1950. It didn’t rise to the 1890 rate again until 1980.

The table he links to is an abbreviated version of the full US Census data set I linked to in my original post. If he had looked at the full version of the data I shared, he would have noticed that the median age of marriage rose to the 1890 rate in 1979. This is inconsequential to the discussion, except for the fact that DC can’t have understood my analysis very well if he didn’t realize he had only found a summary version of the full data set I shared. He even misunderstood me as presenting mean and not median ages of marriage, even though every chart I shared had this prominently in the title. As for his ostensible smoking gun that I left out the great late marriage scandal of 1890, I did see that in the data but I didn’t (and still
don’t) see that as relevant. The full data set only has annual data starting in 1947. When I
created a chart from it I started with 1950 as a round year which also took us further away
from any extraordinary impacts potentially caused by WWII. I didn’t see the need to go back
120 years when 60 years was sufficient to describe our path to the hookup culture. More
important, as I explained in my analysis when women are commonly marrying at 22 the
priorities of an 18 year old young woman are going to generally be on marriage. From my
own analysis of the post sexual revolution 1980s, when women were marrying at 23:

18 year olds look to 20 and 22 year olds for an understanding of what they should be
doing, and those women are actively hunting down husbands.

The point of my analysis was that there is a tipping point as the age of marriage continues to
extend in the post sexual revolution world, where women entering the SMP stop initially
looking for dad material men and feel free to go after cads for a period instead. Nevertheless,
DC locks in on this issue and offers statistics on the age of marriage going back to 1600. I
don’t have any specific knowledge of the marriage trends in the 1600s, but I’m guessing the
culture was generally able to keep those women who planned to marry in check until they did
so.

DC’s final criticism of my post is due to younger marriage leading to higher divorce rates:

Dalrock’s amateur sociology by decade leaves out an obvious problem: People who
divorce in one decade probably got married anywhere from 5-20 years before...

In other words, marrying a 20-year-old woman is no guarantee you won’t get
divorced. Lots of those women who married young in the 50s and 60s proceeded to
get divorced in the 70s and 80s.

Does this mean you shouldn’t marry young? Obviously, we don’t think so, since we
married at 22 (well under the average marriage age in 2001.) But it is true that all
data these days suggest that those who marry young are more likely to divorce than
those who married older.

I don’t deny that young marriage is associated with higher rates of divorce. However, it isn’t
clear if this is due to women “marrying the wrong man”, or due to the much greater ease of
remarriage for women who divorce while young. Given the fact that divorce rates decline
dramatically as the wife ages, I suspect that the perceived opportunity to remarry is a very
large driver here.

Throughout his analysis DC can’t help but confuse criticisms of a general social trend with an
assault on his own choices and those of his peers. He does this frequently with phrases like:

Of all the couples our age (mid 30s) we’ve known living our kind of life in the
Catholic sub culture, only one that I knew personally has gotten divorced.

and

That didn’t worry me, because I wasn’t marrying “woman aged 22” and I wasn’t
marrying 100 women and hoping to get the maximum percentages of those marriages to last;

and

And I know good Catholic guys (and also good Catholic women) who are in their late 20s or early 30s, still looking hard for the right spouse, and still saving themselves for marriage.

In DC’s world, it is all about him. There aren’t any social problems afoot so long as his marriage, his family, and his small social circle are untouched. When asked by one of my readers if in his support of marriage he advocates divorce law reform, DC replied:

– I’m not particularly working on family law issues because 1) I’m neither a legislator nor a lawyer and 2) it doesn’t affect me much since I don’t believe in divorce in the first place.

What DC doesn’t understand is a large percentage of the millions of fathers kicked out of their kid’s lives didn’t believe in divorce either. That is the whole point. No fault divorce is unilateral, as fellow blogger Elusive Wapiti recently described:

My former wife had already absconded with my children across the country when she served me with divorce papers, thus her act of filing for divorce was both the beginning and the end of the divorce process. It was all over but for the court date to make it official. This single act set us both on what the report calls the “divorce superhighway”...

Incidentally, her Catholic priest recommended to her that she seek a divorce (and later the Archdiocese of Washington would breezily approve the annulment, after having the sac to ask me for a $500 “donation” to finance their declaring that my marriage to her never happened and my children were henceforth bastards).

But why should DC care about men like Elusive Wapiti or their children? Who cares if millions of other men are being treated with gross injustice; DC doesn’t believe in divorce. Actually, on second thought DC’s answer might make sense, depending on how we interpret the phrase “believe in”. If he means this in the sense that he doesn’t believe in Santa Clause, then his apathy is easier to understand. Perhaps DC’s level of denial is even greater than I had previously considered.

Elsewhere he advised one of my readers who was concerned with the damage wrought by feminism in the larger culture to not worry about the culture, and simply join a group of people who aren’t part of the culture:

Go find a group of people who actually share your beliefs about marriage (not just give lip service to them, but really share them) and start looking for a mate there.

In DC’s defense, he practiced what he preaches. Brendan described for my readers the subculture that DC is a part of:
I have had some dealings with people from FUS, and I think what others need to understand is that, in effect, the people who come from FUS (and the handful of similar very conservative Catholic institutions scattered around the US) are basically akin to the Amish. A huge percentage of the people there get married either while they are still in college at FUS or immediately thereafter. They’re not geographically concentrated like the Amish are, or technologically limited, but they are similar in that they are a very small separatist-type group that doesn’t generally participate in the culture at large — even in the *Catholic* culture at large that you may see in your local Catholic parish.

But this raises the question of why DC and his wife are so passionate in their defense of the status quo in the larger culture. Why are they so invested in opposing those who oppose feminism? If feminism doesn’t need to be opposed, why has he separated himself so dramatically from the feminist culture he so passionately defends?

Perhaps part of the answer lies in his particular sub-flavor of the Traditional Conservative counterculture. While DC is all for Traditional Conservatism, he derides Traditional Conservative women who decide to become wives and mothers without first going to college and playing career woman (emphasis mine):

And that I tend to strongly disagree with the flavor of “trads” who think that women shouldn’t be educated or pursue careers while single. This is for the simple reason that I find educated and accomplished women far more interesting than those whose only accomplishments are long hair, lack of makeup and prairie skirts.

Ridiculing traditional wives and mothers is one thing, just don’t say anything ill about sluts.

In another comment on my site, DC channeled his inner Marie Antoinette when he explained why he opposes those of us who speak out against the great harms feminism has wrought in our society:

Sure, there are a lot of badly behaved women in the world. The solution, from my point of view, is simply to not marry women like that and move on. Why spend all one’s time winding oneself up about women in general? After all, we each only need one.

What is interesting is his core advice here is what I give as well in my *Interviewing a prospective wife* parts one and two. The primary difference is that DC is fundamentally in denial about the feasibility of this strategy for the majority of men, and he also instinctively sides with feminists in issues of the culture war. Only a small subset of women meet the requirements that either DC or I would advise a man to look for in a wife. While smart men who want to marry should be on the lookout for suitable women other men have overlooked, on the larger level only a small number of men will be able to successfully marry following this advice (and it is still even then imperfect advice). All men can do is improve their own (and their children’s) odds of having a chair when the music stops. The net end result for society will still be the same, especially with Traditional Conservatives insisting on acting as the advance guard of feminism.
I hope that one day DC and other Trad Cons will reconsider their apathy for the state of marriage and their knee jerk defensiveness of feminism and the hookup culture. Our disagreements aside, he is clearly a very sharp and articulate man, and I don’t question that his intentions are good. He is at the end of the day a man who is devoted to leading and taking care of his wife and children, and is whether he acknowledges it or not at risk to the very culture and laws we are speaking out against in the manosphere. For his devotion to his family he has my respect, and I truly wish him and his the best.
Congratulations Athol Kay and MMSL

by Dalrock | April 9, 2012 | Link

H/T Badger. For those who don’t already know, Athol Kay has spent the last several years helping married couples with his blog Married Man Sex Life. As I’ve said before, he is the king of his topic, and his book is the best introduction I’m aware of to the concept of game for traditional men. While his passion is clearly to help others, along the way he helped his own family as well. In a recent post You Don’t Need Cancer For Permission he announced that he is now able to quit his job:

Anyway… a year ago Jennifer and I were all but filing for bankruptcy and that was even after strip mining my 401k, checking the couch for change and deferring the taxes. If the Primer didn’t sell, we were going to be totally hosed. I seriously love my readers. Seriously, seriously, seriously love my readers. Which means my next news is kind of amazing...

...I’m quitting my day job.

Commenter pdwalker shared what I’m confident is a very common sentiment amongst MMSL readers:

I hope you and the missus makes a mint for what you’ve done for me and my family.
I’ve had a fantastic week and it’s all your fault. I hope yours is even better.
Check out Christian Men’s Defense Network
by Dalrock | April 11, 2012 | Link

A frequent commenter here (bskillet81) has created his own blog and it already has excellent content and discussion. Check out Christian Men’s Defense Network
Trad Con Tourette’s
by Dalrock | April 12, 2012 | Link

Definition
Trad Con Tourette’s Syndrome (TCTS) is a mental disorder suffered by many Traditional Conservatives, characterized by involuntarily blurting out feminist slogans and/or pedestalizing women.

Causes and symptoms
The cause of TCTS is unknown. Those suffering from TCTS can be readily identified by their compulsive need to write or speak feminist slogans and pedestalize women while simultaneously claiming to be a Traditional Conservative. Note the claim of being Traditional Conservative is crucial for the accurate diagnosis of TCTS, as this is what separates it from Deranged Feminist Syndrome (DFS) and Proud Mangina Syndrome (PMS, See also Manboobz). Consider the following compulsive feminist slogans (H/T Ferdinand):

[Men in the manosphere] talk about how women aren’t worthy of their greatness but are (insert crude term here) who need to be forced back into their place as serving wench, with our obviously inferior minds and anatomy.

and

[good men are] kindly respectful of women, regardless of whether or not the woman is acting like a lady. They would never think of using the crude terms flung around the manosphere.

While the use of hyperbole in mocking traditional sex roles and demands that sluts and ladies receive equal respect would be signs of DFS when stated in the context of a Women’s Studies class or a slutwalk, in this case they are symptoms of advanced TCTS. These statements differ from symptoms of Deranged Feminist Syndrome because they were written by a woman who by all outward appearances is traditional and submissive. TCTS can be positively diagnosed in this case by the contradiction between her words and how she presents herself to the world.

As much as those unable to restrain their spontaneous feminist slogans suffer, TCTS is even more devastating to those Traditional Conservatives who compulsively pedestalize women. This can manifest in claims that women are innately good, uncontrollable man up rants, or in an irresistible need to worship women:

I was taught that real men fall to their knees in adoration and humility before God, mothers and children.

Treatment
The only known cures for TCTS are the use of corrective lenses and a TCTS inhibiting prescription commonly called the red pill. If either one of these treatments are followed the condition is 100% curable. However, those suffering from TCTS are notoriously unwilling to
admit they have a problem and often resist treatment.
The other day I mentioned Christian Men’s Defense Network. Given the familiar names in the discussion there and the nearly 700 clicks to his site in the stats since then I know that many of you have already gone over there to see what he is building. If you are interested in a thoroughly Christian take on the issues we discuss here, this new blog is a must read. He has only been blogging for a week now but in that short time he has already easily demonstrated his talent. I’ve added him to the blogroll.

He has a powerful three part series (part 1, part 2, part 3) aimed at helping Christian men who were cheated on by their wives. In part one he explains why he created it:

Now, let me explain things to you like they are. When it happened to me, there was almost nothing out there to give me Christian guidance on what to do about it. Almost nothing. And what was there, was, I discovered in retrospect, based on a false understanding of psychology and, even worse, a false understanding of Biblical marriage and sexuality.

Almost all the stuff I found was about a guy cheating, not the woman cheating. This is despite the fact that female marital infidelity is a growing trend within the Christian community, one that the church refuses to deal with and likes to paper over. In our society, women are almost as likely to cheat on their spouses as men, but there’s next to nothing out there to help a Christian man deal with that.

Which is why I wrote this. It’s a little something to guide you through the process. It may not be perfect, but it’s a heck of a lot more than you’ll get from Focus on the Family or other “Christian” institutions, many of whom have given themselves over to latent Christian feminism or faulty unbiblical views of marriage. So calm down and pay attention. Again, God has your back. Trust me. He had mine, even though it took me a long time to realize that.

Then he frames the issue:

The Devil is trying to get at you, to weaken your resolve to abide in quiet faith to your Lord and King. But he isn’t trying to get at your marriage. He already got at your marriage when he got at your wife. There’s nothing you can do about that now. You are his next target. It might be possible for your marriage to continue, but realize the Devil already got it, and you’re now starting over.

Towards the end of the first part he prescribes a daily dose of the three P’s: Psalms, Proverbs, and Paul, and he explains why he recommends each one. Here is why he advises reading Proverbs:

Proverbs because there Solomon talks of the importance of wisdom. You will need wisdom in your life more now than you ever have before. Solomon also talks a great
deal about how to avoid the wiles of a sexually immoral woman. Your wife, as hard as it is to admit, is such a woman, and her wiles can be powerful, tearing you and your family down to please her sinful passions. “For a prostitute’s fee is only a loaf of bread, but an adulteress goes after a precious life” (Prov. 6:26). You need wisdom.

In part two, *Shame Control*, he addresses anger and the very common tendency of cheating wives and Christians in general to blame the husband when a wife cheats:

It’s okay to be angry. Christians today will tell you anger is never justified. And yet they claim to serve a Lord who actually chased people out of the Temple with a whip like a mad man. Ignore all that. Be angry, but do not sin.

Next, you need to be clear that this is not your fault. Shame will be a constant threat to you. And you must not let the Devil shame you. Cling to God and resist the Devil.

Your wife especially will try to shame you. She will try to tell you she did this because she was “unhappy,” because you don’t listen to her, because you don’t communicate well, because you don’t keep the house clean (my ex-wife tried all of these). That’s baloney.

Christians should consult the Bible, not the movie *Fireproof* for their understanding of how to view unfaithful wives:

No, the Bible gives us only one reason that she cheated on you: Lust. Rank, disgusting, vile, perverted lust. Women lust too, even though, again, a lot of Christian pastors don’t ever mention that. They only like to talk about guys who look at porn, never about women who commit lust that leads to infidelity.

In part 3 *Pitfalls* he reinforces the importance of staying strong and not giving into the frame of blame shifting:

The first pitfall to avoid is to not fall for any blame-shifting tricks your wife might throw at you. If your experience is true to a common pattern (one I also experienced), she’s been telling you for weeks or months that she is “unhappy” in the marriage, and that you need to change. She might even have threatened divorce if you didn’t change.

This is very common. In fact, you might even be in marriage therapy right now to deal with your alleged shortcomings. This is a major pitfall you need to identify and avoid: She isn’t telling you all this stuff because you are really a bad husband. She isn’t going to therapy with you because you need to change for the sake of the marriage. She isn’t threatening divorce because she’s unhappy.

Rather, she’s doing all of these things because she needs you to take the blame for her sin. If you google “christian wife cheated” or something similar, you will find multiple stories where the guy is going to therapy with his wife and then finds out she was cheating. Or you’ll find stories about how she was complaining about the marriage, and then he found out she was unfaithful.
He explains why this is crucial first from a Christian point of view, pointing out something which is almost always overlooked:

| Don’t do it. She has to admit that the current crisis in the marriage was caused by her own lack of self-control, not by you being a bad husband. She must admit this, both for her own spiritual health, and because your marriage cannot survive unless she does. Repentance results in healing. Unrepentance results in self-destruction. |

Then he explains it from a game point of view:

| Furthermore, if you admit to being the chief problem, she will lose all respect for you. I know, this sounds really bizarre, but it’s how female psychology works. She needs a man who is strong and tough, who can stand up to threats and remain stable. She needs a man who can stand up even to her, because if her man cannot stand up to a woman who is clearly in the wrong, how could she trust him to stand up to bigger threats? |

He follows this up with some very insightful advice:

| Second, if you are currently seeing a marriage therapist, stop. This is the opposite advice of what most Christians will give you. But if your wife brought you to the counselor under false pretenses, then continuing the counseling relationship is buying in to your wife’s scheme. |

He advises that the husband reset the frame, and if the husband feels that counseling is still in order he gives advice on how the husband can improve the odds of finding one who will deal with the issue fairly.

He also deftly covers the topics of divorce, forgiveness, and reconciliation:

| So do not seek any form of revenge. Divorce isn’t revenge, and if you decide to pursue divorce for the purpose of revenge, you’re making a big mistake. Now, not all Christians agree on when—if ever—divorce is permissible. As a Protestant, I hold to the usual Protestant interpretation that it is only permissible in case of adultery (with the possible exception of physical abuse creating a “divorce for personal safety, but no remarriage” situation). Adultery is the very case you’re in right now. |

| But my point is, regardless of your personal beliefs about divorce, when you forgive your wife, it doesn’t mean you’ve reconciled the marriage. Forgiveness is a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition for reconciliation. |

I’ve quoted this fairly heavily, because it is easier to show you how good this series is than try to explain it. Still, this is just a teaser. Read the full series on his site (part 1, part 2, part 3), and bookmark it so you can share it with a Christian man in need.

**July 5 2016:** Updated with corrected links.
When discussing the topic of changes in divorce law we typically talk about divorce theft and how this causes men to be understandably hesitant to marry, as well as the impact it has on men and their children who are directly victimized by the new regime. However, divorce “reform” is as much about manipulating the power balance within marriage as it is about ensuring that women can frivolously divorce while collecting cash and prizes. Economists Stevenson and Wolfers describe this in their paper *Bargaining in the Shadow of the Law: Divorce Laws and Family Distress* (emphasis mine).

In the literature on the economics of the family there has been growing consensus on the need to take bargaining and distribution within marriage seriously. *Such models of the family rely on a threat point* to determine distribution within the household. The switch to a unilateral divorce regime redistributes power in a marriage, giving power to the person who wants out, and reducing the
power previously held by the partner interested in preserving the marriage.

They aren’t under any illusions; divorce reform is all about redistributing power from the spouse who wants to honor the marriage vows to the spouse who doesn’t. This is one of the best kept open secrets I’ve ever encountered.

Also, don’t be confused by the gender neutral terms; women are overwhelmingly the ones who don’t want to honor the marriage vows. This is confirmed by the academic study “These Boots Are Made for Walking”: Why Most Divorce Filers Are Women and the data on the age of wife at the time of divorce. Putting this together, divorce reform is all about redistributing power from the husband who wants to honor the marriage vows to the wife who doesn’t.

Stevenson and Wolfers are very open about this. They of course present it through the feminist narrative that husbands are evil brutes which must be tamed, lest they abuse, murder, or drive their wife to suicide:

Examining state panel data on suicide, domestic violence, and murder, we find a striking decline in female suicide and domestic violence rates arising from the advent of unilateral divorce. Total female suicide declined by around 20% in the long run in states that adopted unilateral divorce. We believe that this decline is a robust and well-identified result, and timing evidence speaks clearly to this interpretation. There is no discernable effect on male suicide.

They clarify that this isn’t about women previously being “trapped” in abusive or dangerous marriages, but about how putting all husbands in fear of divorce might tame potentially abusive husbands (emphasis mine):

To see how divorce laws affect the external threat point, note that prior to unilateral divorce, a partner wishing to dissolve the marriage could leave without their spouse’s consent. However, in such a situation, a legal divorce is not granted and, as such, the right to remarry is forfeited. Under unilateral divorce the value of the exit threat increases for the unsatisfied spouse, as the right to remarry is retained regardless of the position of one’s spouse. Thus, the exit threat model predicts that changes in divorce regimes will have real effects. If the divorce threat is sufficiently credible, it may directly affect intrafamily bargaining outcomes without the option ever being exercised.

Indeed they found that this was in fact the case. They close their conclusion with:

The mechanism examined in this paper is a change in divorce regime and we interpret the evidence collected here as an empirical endorsement of the idea that family law provides a potent tool for affecting outcomes within families.

Again, they weren’t looking for evidence that divorce reform allowed wives to escape abusive husbands. They were looking for and found that changes in family law served as a sort of marital sword of Damocles over husbands, causing them bend to their wife’s will out of fear of unilateral divorce.
In this context we can understand how cases like John’s and walking in hell while not the standard outcome of “divorce reform” also aren’t unintended consequences. They serve as a warning to keep all husbands in line.

It is also worth noting that while academic studies couch this in the feminist narrative of checking what would otherwise be an army of sadistic husbands, this is really about husbands living in fear of their wife becoming unhappily and dynamiting the family. Only a fool hasn’t noticed that one of the most prominent themes in women’s entertainment is the concept of the empowerment women experience from frivolously divorcing.

Christians are actively reinforcing these legal and social changes by abandoning the biblical view of marriage in favor of the feminist view. While the old paradigm was that a woman who couldn’t keep a man was a failure, feminists and Christians have turned this around and now view a husband who can’t keep his wife happy as a failure. At the same time, the wife who kicks the father of her children out of the house is now seen as heroic. This idea that husbands must grovel to their wives to stave off her ever threatened unhappiness is so ingrained in modern Christian thought that there was no meaningful backlash amongst Christians when this was made the central plot of the movie Fireproof. Tens, perhaps hundreds of millions of Christians watched the movie and delighted in its presumed Christian message on marriage. We saw proof of the same thing with the women of christianforums.com going on for over 40 pages passionately arguing the morality of frivolous divorce. Shortly after I pointed this out, the moderators of the forum enacted a new rule forbidding members from writing anything in judgment of frivolous divorce (emphasis mine):

| Please remember that when someone shares a personal experience it is not up for judgement. Divorce is always a last resort, but we will not allow judgement of those who do make that choice. |

This abandonment of the biblical concept of marriage in exchange for the feminist view of marriage doesn’t just impact the marriages of Christians. Christianity is the driving moral force in the west, and as such their turning their backs on biblical marriage has given all women in the west moral cover to use the new legal threatpoint against their husbands to maximum effect. Husbands are hemmed in by all sides cheerleading his wife to frivolously divorce if he fails to make her happy.

Yet despite the millions of innocent men and their children who have been ground up by the machinery needed to keep husbands in their place, wives now report less marital happiness (Source: National Marriage Project, P 67 Fig 4):
We are feeding millions of innocent men and children to the machinery of divorce to keep this threatpoint in place, and not even making women happier with their marriages.

Sword of Damocles image information.
Men make ultimate sacrifice; women and children hardest hit.

by Dalrock | April 16, 2012 | Link

Sarah Boesveld of the Canadian National Post wrote an article commemorating the 100th anniversary of men standing aside and drowning so that women on the Titanic could enjoy additional leg room on the life boats. The Post titles her thoughtful piece:

Titanic Anniversary: Is a man brave or condescending if he lets women and children go first?

No word on a rumored follow up piece commemorating the Spartan 300 at Thermopylae tentatively titled:

How hard would it have been for them to put the toilet seats down before they went into battle?

I don’t have time to write a detailed take-down of this latest piece of gruesome hand wringing that more men didn’t perish in the Costa Concordia. However, I didn’t see anything new so a link to my previous posts on the subject should hopefully suffice.
Dating Stanton’s Heroes

by Dalrock | April 17, 2012 | Link

Call them what you will, grass widows, marriage challenged mamas, or Stanton’s heroes, the men at University of Man have dating them covered. Keep in mind that I use the term dating, um, loosely. If you aren’t interested in this topic or are easily offended, you might want to pass on the rest of this post.

A friend of the faculty who is a single mother herself kicks off the series with her guest lecture You Have to Realize That My Kids Come First!!!

Obviously, there is a huge difference between dating a single mom seriously versus just going for the “pump and dump” or any variation of a short-term lay. If you are only looking for something short-term, there is no shortage of lonely single mothers looking for a “sponsorship” and/or male validation and companionship. Many women (myself included) go through a period where their self-esteem is at an all-time low and they need male companionship (read: sex) to feel desirable again.

Professor Hale from rival school Rebellion University jumps in and steals the class’ attention with his post My Kids Come First

If you as a single mom are putting your kids first... what are you doing dating? Unless you are specifically looking for a breadwinner/mealticket to provide for your kids financial security, you have no business being out there dating. Doing so and claiming that your kids come first is just demonstrating that you know you are not doing what is right for your kids, but you want other people to think you are a good mom. You aren’t. You are just looking for someone to help fill your empty place... between your legs. Why is that bad? Specifically that is bad because of the number of child molesters and grifters who prey on women just like you. You are putting your kids at greater risk than if you just stay home and watch a movie... with them. If you are looking for a meal ticket, honor demands that you tell your new boyfriend that that is your goal. That is not an evil thing. Many satisfying long term relationships have started on a much smaller foundation.

Now that the prerequisites are out of the way, you are ready for Professor Mentu’s advanced baby mama dating course titled Single Moms are like Motorcycles

My response is basically “No I don’t.” I don’t have to realize anything, do anything, remember anything, respect anything, or acknowledge anything that I don’t want to. Congrats on popping out some other man’s womb turd, but that’s none of my concern unless I choose to make it so.

A bit further down Professor Mentu explains the proper way to ride:

Hot single moms are like motorcycles: exciting, sleek, high-performance and fun to
ride, but they can’t stand up on their own. As even the most expensive Harley-Davidson needs a rider or a kickstand to remain upright, so does the single mom need either a rider or a dickstand to keep her from falling over. Without a rider, she may be using your dick, baby daddy’s dick, Uncle Sam’s dick, or a combination of the three – but rest assured she’s not standing on her own. There’s a dickstand somewhere.

**Dickstand:** A man who props up a single mom while she’s waiting for an Alpha to ride her hard.

Keep in mind that the professor isn’t offering moral advice, he is offering practical advice. However, offering to play the role of dickstand (the most recent stepping stone on her path of serial monogamy) isn’t any more moral than what the professor advises. There is no good reason to be a dickstand.

Mentu offers another bit of insight to consider. While the classic path to unwed motherhood (marry, kids, then divorce) is arguably less moral than the more modern approach, the first category is a safer bet for the alpha rider:

Most divorced single moms do not want to get pregnant again outside of marriage. I will not spend time with a single mom unless she was married when she became pregnant. The ones ok with popping out a bastard child are too risky to be worthy of my time or attention.
We live in strange times. Recently several religious conservative bloggers have suggested that the word “slut” is a slur against all women, and that it is a type of profanity. My best guess is they feel that sluts know that what they are doing is wrong, so even using the word in general is cruel to their already convicted hearts.

Yet at the same time we have sluts literally marching down the street in major cities worldwide. The sluts have responded to the hesitancy of traditional conservatives to use a word they feel is cruel as an invitation to normalize sluthood.

Following the line of thought that the concept of slut involves a deeply unfair double standard, others have tried to make the term gender neutral. Susan Walsh offered a gender neutral definition of the term in her post What a Slut Is (see link for her full definition):

- A slut is a person of either sex who regards sex strictly as a physically pleasurable activity. Sex in and of itself does not include an emotional, spiritual or practical component. Love, emotional intimacy and reproduction are sometimes associated with sex, but are in no way necessary or even desirable as a precondition for sexual activity.

As I mentioned in my post Defining sluthood I’m sympathetic to why Susan wants to do this, but I think it misses the very essence of the concept. Slut is sex specific. Calling promiscuous men sluts just doesn’t carry the same punch. Similarly, when Susan uses the term manwhore in her post Manwhores: For Casual Sex Only, she is trying in vain in my opinion to recast the concept of whore.

As others have pointed out, the reality is that there isn’t a double standard; there are simply different standards applied to men and women. If this makes you so angry you want to braid your leg hair and go on a slutwalk, I’m afraid I can’t help you. However, I can at least offer an explanation for why this is the case.

While there is no perfect opposite concept of slut for men, perhaps the closest is the concept of coward. In both cases the terms denote a loss of honor and a lack of trustworthiness. In addition, both are directly related to one’s fitness for marriage. No woman wants to be married to a coward, and no man wants to be married to a slut. Both words pack a similarly damning punch; yet for some reason there is no hue and cry that the word coward be erased from the English language.

Consider the case of the Titanic. Molly Brown entered a lifeboat and once underway suggested that they return to try to rescue additional survivors. While her compassion for others and her desire to rescue them was undoubtedly noble, no one questions why she was willing to accept the offer of the lifeboat seat in the first place. She was given preference while over a thousand men and no small number of children were one way or another denied a seat. Unlike the men on board, she knew no one would even for a second consider her a
coward for accepting a seat on a lifeboat.

This brings us to the other great objection to the word slut; the definition of the term tends to be somewhat malleable. Those who object to the word demand that an immutable standard be offered, otherwise the term must have no meaning. Exactly what percentage of the varsity basketball team can a girl blow before she is considered a slut? What if she loves them all? How many hot dogs in the baby-maker is too many? They often choose cases in the gray area and demand either blanket acceptance of female promiscuity or condemnation of a woman who isn’t perfect. If you won’t condemn the woman who lost her virginity to her College Boyfriend and then went on to marry (and remain married) after perhaps a few slow motion steps on the path of serial monogamy, you can’t think of any woman as a slut. Pretty soon, this demand to not recognize the concept of slut morphs into a moral imperative; man up and marry those sluts! Any man who fears marrying a slut is deemed a coward.

While sluts are busy marching down the street demanding approval for actions many Trad Cons are unwilling to even label, feminists and many Trad Cons are busy calling men cowards for failing to offer their lives for women (including sluts) they don’t have any obligation to in a shipwreck where over 99% of the souls survived. Never mind the fact that at least two men on board Costa Concordia gave their lives to save others, and never mind the fact that many of the men chose to protect their own families instead of offering the romantic gesture so many feminists and Trad Cons crave. They wanted the Full Titanic Experience, and those cowards deprived them of it!

As I’ve pointed out before, the expectation that lifeboat seats were off limits to men isn’t universal. It isn’t generally recognized outside of the Anglosphere, and even there it is a relatively recent concept which has already been obsoleted by feminism. Similarly, the Spartans had a code of honor which by today’s standards is quite striking. Consider the well known (if historically questionable) admonition of Spartan mothers to their sons:

“With it or on it.” We’ve all heard that Spartan mothers said it while giving their sons shields before their first battle. With it = victorious hero; on it = fallen hero; without it = coward.

There is also the famous tale of the Spartan boy who concealed a wolf cub under his cloak to avoid being caught stealing. He is said to have maintained a steady expression while the wolf cub gnawed on him, and his crime was only discovered when he finally fell down dead from his wounds.

No mother today would tell her son it is better to be killed in battle than to return without victory, and likewise we don’t hold up the Spartan youth in the story as an example of virtuous manhood to be emulated. Still, we do have a basic expectation of men when it comes to courage. The concept of coward isn’t made meaningless by the fact that the boundaries can change over time. The fundamental concept endures because there is a real reason for it. Men who won’t defend what is important aren’t a good fit for marriage or fatherhood. Likewise, while the concept of slut may be somewhat malleable, the fact remains that promiscuous women aren’t a good fit for marriage.

One could also point out that to some degree we do judge both men and women based on
both concepts. For example, at some point a man with a history of promiscuity is undoubtedly not a good fit for marriage. Ironically most men would probably be more strict in where they draw the line here than most women (by their actions) do. Likewise while no man would consider a woman unfit for marriage because she failed to give her life for strangers, it is possible for a woman to display so little ability for self sacrifice that she isn’t fit for marriage. But none of this changes the underlying fact. Men and women are judged by different standards, and these standards are grounded in the reality of what marriage is about. A husband who won’t defend his family when the need arises is as unfit for marriage as a wife who won’t protect her own chastity when tempted.

There is another side to this, and this is the cruelty to young women resulting from pretending the concept of slut either doesn’t exist (by refusing to use the term) or is somehow unfair to women. Young women are being lead astray by those who deny or minimize the concept and making decisions which will very often harm them and their families later. There is nothing cruel about being honest about the reality of the term and the importance of her own chastity. The cruelty in fact comes from those who would aid the seducer by providing false comfort that she won’t be judged by her actions. In this case the very malleability of the term increases the cruelty. If we want to be kind to young women we should make it clear that men and women still will judge them based on their chastity, and that what feels like the wild west morally could very well change in short order. We have pushed the boundaries of excusing female promiscuity past all practical reason, and this makes a rebound of the pendulum all the more likely. Speaking the truth now will protect women who might otherwise be caught spending their youth expecting one standard and being judged when they decide to marry by a very different standard.

See also: Lay down your arms.
This blog and the Manosphere mentioned in the Sydney Morning Herald.
by Dalrock | April 23, 2012 | Link

It is good to see we are impacting the larger conversation. Here is the article:

Why women lose the dating game

The quote:

But there is another conversation going on – a fascinating exchange about what is happening from the male point of view. Much of it thrives on the internet, in the so-called “manosphere”. Here you will find men cheerfully, even triumphantly, blogging about their experience. They have cause for celebration, you see. They've discovered a profound change has taken place in the mating game and, to their surprise, they are the winners.

Dalrock (dalrock.wordpress.com) is typical: “Today's unmarried twentysomething women have given men an ultimatum: I'll marry when I'm ready, take it or leave it. This is, of course, their right. But ultimatums are a risky thing, because there is always a possibility the other side will decide to leave it. In the next decade we will witness the end result of this game of marriage chicken.”

The endgame Dalrock warns about is already in play for hordes of unmarried professional women - the well-coiffed lawyers, bankers and other success stories. Many thought they could put off marriage and families until their 30s, having devoted their 20s to education, establishing careers and playing the field. But was their decade of dating a strategic mistake?

The post she is quoting is Supply and demand in the marriage market. H/T Lavazza, and thanks to Ferdinand for getting the word out.

Edit: Susan Walsh of Hooking Up Smart and Whiskey were also quoted in the piece.

Edit 2: Thanks to Captain Capitalism for the kind words and the linkage.
Crass site/post warning, but if that doesn’t deter you check out 5 Easy Steps to Get Him to Propose:

1. **Do your market research.** Determine what the men you find attractive want in a wife, then give it to them. If you’re not willing to do this, then on behalf of men everywhere, I invite you to shut up and stop bitching about not being married. Shaming your customers into buying your product only works on women and beta males (women). And no, banging a different man every three months on your way to the serial monogamy hall of fame is not market research.

2. **Advertise something he does not already have and is likely to value.** You’re strong, independent, successful, challenging, aggressive and assertive? Well la-dee-da; he is too. In fact, if you’re considering him as a marriage prospect, he probably has all of that in spades. Try offering him something he doesn’t have and is likely to value. I bet he’s not feminine, soft, sweet, caring, kind, gentle or maternal, and I’ll bet he values those traits and doesn’t see them as a weakness like you do for some reason. A man interested in marriage is not looking for an executive, author, clinician, comedian, artist, pilot, politician, researcher, HR representative, best friend, buddy or pal – he’s looking for a wife. You may be a super-duper awesome business lady, but are you qualified to the fill the wifely position for which you’re applying? Don’t answer that, because you don’t get to make that decision – the hiring manager does.

I’ll differ with him on the best friend part and a few other areas where he might be slightly over the top in making his hilarious overall point. This is just a teaser, check out the whole post if it is up your alley.

**Note:** I plan on writing my own (serious) post on the topic of women finding a husband as soon as time permits.
How young should a woman marry? (Part 1)
by Dalrock | April 25, 2012 | Link

One of the common topics of the manosphere/androsphere is women setting about finding husbands in all of the wrong ways. The most common mistake women are making today is wasting their youth and chastity pursuing everything but marriage, and then going on a desperate husband hunt in their late 20s to mid 30s. Certainly many women who have followed this approach report being happy with the results, but there is reason to believe that this approach will only become more difficult as more and more women attempt it. The problem women who try this method and fail experience is once they find out it isn’t the right path for them they are already locked in.

However, the counter argument to women marrying young is that women who do so risk marrying before they are developed enough in their sense of self to know what they want. The premise is that a woman might develop different priorities and goals than her husband during the course of the early years of the marriage and find herself incompatible with him after a few years (often coincidentally shortly after their last child is out of diapers). This is a serious concern, and those making this case have some compelling statistics to point to in the form of much higher divorce rates for women who marry young. In this post I’ll propose a model I think young women should follow for finding a husband to address this concern, and in part two I’ll address the statistics.

I propose that young women should take their husband hunt seriously from the beginning. This means not looking for boyfriends, dates, friends with benefits, etc. They should be looking for a husband from day 1, focusing exclusively on men who meet all three of the following criteria:

1. Men who are (or are likely to be) interested in marrying her.
2. Men she finds attractive enough that she is able to fall head over heels in love with him.
3. Men she is ready to submit to as a wife and follow his leadership for the duration of her life.

Bullet number one should be obvious, but it is certainly worth stating. One difference I’ve noted between men and women is women often don’t stick to the set of available options when making their selection. A woman considering her options in marriage shouldn’t consider the recent interest (accepted or otherwise) from the exciting guy in the local band for some no strings attached sex, or even for a long term relationship. If he isn’t interested in marriage, she shouldn’t consider him when considering her options. The same goes for men who might be interested in marriage but don’t demonstrate an interest in marrying her. Of course, none of the above is always a valid option so long as the woman is honest with herself that this means she is willing to risk foregoing marriage altogether with the hope that her available options will ultimately improve.

Bullet number two is an interesting one. Many young women set out on a path to what Mentu describes as pursuing the serial monogamy hall of fame, falling in love with a series of (they hope) ever better men. Early in their search they would no doubt have this as their number
one must have criteria. However, after some period of time even chaste women who find they haven’t located a husband are tempted to lower their standards in this area in order to not have to compromise in the areas of wealth and success. I’ve argued strongly that women should not do this, and continue to feel this way.

Bullet number three is where it gets interesting. While wives submitting to their husbands is a clear command in the New Testament, very few devout Christians even take this seriously in practice. It flies against the norms of our culture, and even those who are very traditional are likely to be alarmed by the statement.

In fact, bullet number three should frighten you. If it doesn’t, you likely aren’t understanding the gravity of the situation. I’m assuming it immediately raised questions in your mind like:

- What if he is abusive?
- What if he won’t take her needs and wants into sufficient consideration when making decisions?
- What if he is prone to make risky or irresponsible decisions?
- What if he isn’t faithful?
- What if he isn’t motivated to work to provide for his family?
- What are his religious and moral values?
- Is he a kind person?
- Is he mentally and emotionally stable?
- Is he capable of leading her in a way which she is comfortable following? (leadership style/game)

The proof that this is the right process is that these are all of the right questions. These are the questions women looking to marry should be asking but very often aren’t.

This also resolves the problem of the wife potentially moving in a different direction than her husband over time. If she is following his leadership, while change is nearly guaranteed they will be changing together. In picking him she is both making a guess at the kind of life she hopes to live and picking someone she trusts to work with her while navigating the process. In the true spirit of one and done marriage, she is hooking her wagon to him for the duration. For richer or poorer, in sickness and health, they will succeed or fail together. If she does this not only will she be much more likely to remain in love with and attracted to her husband, but she will also remain happier because she won’t be second guessing her choice.

Women who don’t follow the third criteria have an additional problem beyond the lack of attraction for their husband and the unhappiness which comes from second guessing past decisions; they very likely will end up wherever he leads them anyway, or at the very least they will experience the negative results of his leadership either way. Feminism can be described largely as a process whereby we remove women’s fear of bad outcomes. However, the reality is the consequences of a poor choice of mate are so great that they can’t truly be shielded from them. At the best they will largely shift the harm onto the man and their own children while making the man the patsy.

But this still leaves the question of how young a woman should marry. The answer is no younger than she is responsible enough to actually make this kind of decision, and only then
once she has found the man who meets all three criteria. The reality is while the list of
criteria is short, this is a very difficult puzzle to solve. Such a man isn’t going to be common,
so she had better start looking immediately if she hopes to find him. The process could very
well take years, perhaps quite a few. If she isn’t mature enough, she needs to focus on
maturing as soon as possible so she can get in the race. However long the process will take,
it can’t start until she is ready. If she finds Mr. Right while she is still childish it won’t do her
any good. Starting early has the added benefits of preventing her from developing a sexual
history along with a taste for alphas along the way. It also allows her to take maximum
advantage of her youth, beauty, and fertility when competing with other women for the best
potential husbands while avoiding the dwindling options which accompany being the last to
choose.
Are young marriages doomed to divorce?
by Dalrock | April 28, 2012 | Link

In part one of this series I proposed a model for women to skip the carousel and marry young, provided they can find a husband they are head over heels in love with and trust to lead them in life. In this post I’ll address the statistics around the common argument that young marriage leads to higher divorce rates because young women “don’t yet know who they are”.

[Image: Chart showing divorce rates by age and race]

As you can see from the NCHS/CDC chart above, there is reason for concern here. Young marriages, especially very young marriages in that data set certainly do show a higher risk of divorce. However, this doesn’t necessarily mean that the higher divorce rate observed is due to women “not knowing themselves” yet. There are a number of plausible explanations, with that hypothesis being only one of them:

1. Young marriage increases divorce risk because young women “don’t know who they are” yet.
2. Women with higher IQs tend to go to college, and women who go to college tend to marry later. Given that IQ tends to negatively correlate with divorce, this could be what is actually being observed. See chapter 8 in Herrnstein and Murray’s The Bell Curve for a discussion of IQ, education, and divorce.
   Edit: I quote from that chapter in this post.
3. Some percentage of young marriage (especially very young marriage) may be associated with impulsiveness, which itself would increase divorce rates.
4. Divorce rates are highest when women are youngest and have the best chance of remarriage. Couples who marry when the wife is young are exposed to higher risk of divorce due to the wife being more attractive to other men.

My own sense is that all of these explanations are in play here to some degree. I’ll focus on
the last hypothesis in this post and share the data I was able to find which may help shed some light on it. Before I share more data however, I think we need to consider some counter theories. These suggest that delayed marriage may in fact increase the risk of divorce:

1. Women who delay marriage will generally end up with higher partner counts, which leads to lower marital satisfaction and greater risk of divorce. See The Social Pathologist's Sexual History Divorce Risk II as well as his well known previous post on the topic.
2. Marriage is a big change from single life. Women who marry younger have had less time to get used to being single and are more adaptable to the new lifestyle.
3. Women who have become established and independent find it harder to accept their husband as the leader of the family. If they don’t see him as leading them, they are very likely to experience lessened sexual attraction and romantic love for him and become unhappy with their marriage.

Interestingly these counter theories aren’t actually disproved by the chart above. While the chart is dated 1995, this is the year the data source was compiled. To determine the 10 year divorce rate they must be looking at marriages which occurred in 1985 or earlier. In fact, this appears to be the same 1995 data set which I found looked at divorces going back to 1965 when looking at remarriage rates. This is important when considering what the 25 or over category looks like. The median age of marriage has been increasing over time, and if we are looking at marriages in the 60s, 70s, and early 80s we are looking at a time when the median age of marriage for women ranged from 20.5 to 23. So the 25 or over category in that study looks very different than first marriages in that category occurring today; it is skewed much more to marriages occurring in the woman’s late 20s.

Now let’s return to the question of what causes marriages before age 25 to have higher divorce rates than marriages where the woman was just over 25. As I said, the standard explanation of women who marry young changing their priorities after marriage strikes me as having some merit. Under the current feminized model this would seem to pose a real risk, but my proposal in the previous post addresses that risk. I also think reasons two and three are fairly straightforward, and must be at least part of the explanation for what we are seeing. This leaves the final alternate explanation:

**Young marriages are exposed to higher risk of divorce in the first 10 years because the wife’s chances of remarriage are highest when she is young.**
All else being equal, being married to a woman in her 20s is more risky than being married to her in her 30s, which is more risky than being married to her in her 40s, etc. The longer you move out the date of first marriage, the lower risk you will be exposed to (again, all else being equal).

However, this raises the question if all else really is equal. What if divorce risk in general is highest just after the wedding, and tapers off from there? This kind of trend might even explain the declining divorce risk as women age. Perhaps women aren’t motivated to divorce by their opportunity to remarry after all, despite common academic acceptance of the idea. Perhaps the chart above is just an artifact of divorce risk declining steadily the older the marriage gets. This question had me looking for more data to try to better understand what is going on. While I haven’t found any smoking gun one way or another, I have some charts which will shed some more light on the question.
The chart above uses data from the 2012 Statistical Abstract of the United States, specifically from Table 131. They separate it out by men and women; the above chart is for men, and here is the same chart for women:
While the two charts are similar there is some difference. My best guess on the reason for this is deaths must be a portion of the reason marriages aren’t reaching the stated anniversary. Since husbands are more likely to pass away before their wives, more men who were interviewed had experienced long marriages than women. For this same reason, the results for men are likely a better fit when considering divorce risk since death of their spouse is less of a factor.

While these charts are the standard way I’ve seen this data displayed, they suffer from an important problem when trying to understand how divorce risk changes as the marriage progresses. The percentages are expressed in terms of the original group of marriages in the cohort, and therefore don’t account for the fact that fewer marriages exist in the later periods than in the former ones. Because of this, even if the divorce rate per 1,000 marriages was remaining steady throughout the duration of the marriage we would expect to see the slope of the curves decrease over time. To account for this I’ve reworked the same data to measure the number of marriages which disappeared during each period divided by the number of marriages the period started out with. I then took this number and divided it by 5 (the number of years in each period) and multiplied it by 1,000 to come up with a rough annual rate of marriage endings (death + divorce) per 1,000 couples. Here is what this looks like for men:
The pattern across marriage cohorts is strikingly similar. The risk of divorce jumps dramatically in years 5-9, and begins declining from there. There is a similar pattern for women, although you can see what appears to be the higher incidence of spousal death influencing the results:
Overall the shape of these curves doesn’t fit with the hypothesis that the declining divorce rate as wives age is largely an artifact of risk changes due to longer marriages, at least in the US. However, it does seem to explain the peculiar shape of the UK curve:

Either way there is still the general question of which is the underlying cause of these trends. Does
divorce risk decrease over time because only the strongest marriages survive? Or does divorce risk decrease over time because the wife’s temptation to divorce is lessened by her reduced opportunity to remarry? Given the way these are correlated I don’t think we will ever be able to prove exactly what is driving what. It makes sense to me that both of these are in play to some degree, but I do think that declining remarriage opportunities as wives age are a much larger driver of this trend than most people consider. Either way, what the data does prove is that the common bromides that divorce rates are up because lifetime marriage just lasts too long with our longer life expectancies and that divorce is driven by husbands trading their aging wives in for a younger model are pure nonsense.

While no smoking gun is likely to be found, I was still interested in better understanding how these things have changed over time. What has happened to divorce risk by wife’s age as women have continued to delay marriage? Has this increased the divorce risk for women in their late 20s and 30s? While I’m not aware of this kind of historical data for the US, the UK’s ONS does publish annual data going back to the late 1950s. I took the data from table 3b here and created averages for the last five decades:

While the general shapes of these curves have remained fairly consistent over the decades, there are some noteworthy changes between the 1990s and 2000s. Divorce rates in the UK for wives in their 20s dropped during this period. At the same time, divorce rates for wives in their early 30s remained the same while divorce rates for older wives increased. This can be interpreted as evidence that women delaying marriage while riding the carousel is starting to show up in divorce rates.

I don’t claim to have all of the answers here; hopefully someone will do a formal study on all of these questions. If you are aware of better data on this, I would appreciate you sharing what you have. Either way, the idea that young marriages inherently have uncompensated
risk for divorce seems to be very much in question. If you understand the risk factors of impulsiveness and the benefits of higher IQ, and the woman is following the model I propose in part 1 I think you have an opportunity to significantly better your odds. Additionally, waiting to marry a woman who is older, more set in her ways, and has a higher partner count comes with its own set of risks, and this seems consistent with the last chart I shared for the UK. Much of the additional risk of marrying a young woman appears to come specifically from the fact that she is more beautiful and fertile and therefore has greater opportunity to remarry. With this in mind, waiting until your prospective wife isn’t as desirable isn’t a choice I think most men are likely to want to make. In that case, the risk itself comes with important compensation.

**Note:** I’ve put all of the related spreadsheet tabs I used to create these charts into one spreadsheet which you can now [download](#). Please let me know if you find any errors in my work.
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Several times a year men are treated to a men step up sermon, with the veneer of balance offered by the preacher telling the ladies to be patient and support the men, not realizing how imbalanced that is, setting up the female morality superiority complex that defines western faith...

Men seem to love self effacing, to nod and weep yet again, to rerererererererecommit to be better men.....again.....literally crying while the self satisfied wife empathizes and rubs circles on his back in support. Its a SICK dynamic, and its rotting men from the inside.

— conservativation/empathologicalism

Empath’s vivid description of the modern Church keeps popping into my mind lately. The driving force behind this obsession with only correcting men is a mixture of a very unbiblical view of women and pure cowardice. As reader Jonathan Cooper explains, pastors are terrified of correcting women:

Yes, preaching on women’s responsibilities is a great idea. I have seen it done. The women revolt and the pastor is quickly fired. I have heard supposedly Christian women flatly say they will never, ever, ever submit to their husbands or obey what the Bible has to say about their role. The problem is not a lack of knowledge; it is a lack of obedience. As long as civil and criminal law is on their side they will continue to behave as they do. After all, they have every incentive to rebel. Who is going to stop them? The church? The government? The media?

What makes the practice of only correcting men all the more craven is how this goes against all principles of leadership. Whether you are in business or the military, only the very worst leaders reprimand a subordinate leader in front of his own subordinates unless they are going to immediately take them out of their leadership role. Even then, doing so has the risk of undermining the position itself. If generals make a habit of criticizing lieutenants (even just those who are performing poorly) in front of enlisted men, even good lieutenants will find it very difficult to lead. This is an awful practice in cases where there is generally good discipline, and the very worst thing a leader can do in cases where the authority of leadership is already in question.

In the case of the Church pastors are repeatedly criticizing husbands and fathers in front of their wives and children, and they are doing this with full knowledge that the wives are already in open revolt. This is after all why they won’t ever speak on topics the wives disapprove of.

Then they walk away and expect the father to act in the role of head of the household.
Craven

by Dalrock | May 3, 2012 | Link

Quite a few readers have asked that I share my thoughts on the movie Courageous. This is the latest movie by the Kendrick brothers and Sherwood Baptist Church. It is the movie that does for fathers what Fireproof did for husbands. Below are my thoughts after watching the movie twice (I scanned through and took notes on key scenes the second time).

**Plot Spoiler Alert:** Don’t read any further if you haven’t seen the movie and don’t want the plot spoiled.

At its core the movie is about a failing father, a police officer named Adam Mitchell played (well) by co creator Alex Kendrick. We know Adam is a failing father because the movie grinds this in. Without the help of the authors we would be tempted to see him as an excellent father who at times fails in minor ways and is struggling with a somewhat rebellious teenage son and a harridan wife. Adam is a faithful husband, works hard as a provider and dotes on his children. When he is interacting with his daughter it is clear that she knows she is loved and she dotes on him as well.

But the authors of the film know better. Adam is a failing father, and they set out to convince the viewer of this. Early in the movie Adam returns home after a long day of work in a scene eerily similar to the opening fight scene of Fireproof (right down to the shot of the pickup truck pulling into the driveway). As soon as he walks through the door his belligerent wife lays into him:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wife: Where have you been? (irritated tone)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam: Working on reports. Trying not to miss another deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife: You missed Emily’s piano recital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam: (exhales ashamedly) Totally forgot about that.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After this she starts about their teenage son who wants Adam to run with him in a father/son cross country race. The son appears and pleads his case. Adam has other priorities, and when the son leaves the room he suggests instead that they spend time together building the new shed. His wife shoots the idea down because that would be the father leading the son, and not the other way around (emphasis mine):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wife: Can I suggest that you spend a little more time with him?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam: Victoria all he wants to do is play video games and go run five miles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife: (look of exasperation) Well then go run with him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam: I’m 40 years old. There’s gotta be a better way to spend time with him than</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
torturing myself.

Wife: Well you have got to do something.

Adam: He can help me build the shed in the backyard.

Wife: Yeah he's gonna see that as your project. besides, he's at school most of the time anyway.

This failing husband/failing father theme is common in TV and movies, so it all has a sickening ring of familiarity to it. The Kendrick brothers have followed the popular directive to tear down the father/husband quite well; Spielberg would be proud to feature this scene in one of his movies. Since this scene sets up the central conflict in the plot, part of it is featured in the trailer. Click here to get a sense of the way this is handled.

Sandwiched in the middle of this scene we have a brief respite from the bad father routine. The daughter comes in and the wife suddenly changes her attitude. Instead of running the show and scowling, all of a sudden she is smiling, pleasant, and deferential. She says the daughter wants to go to a birthday party and that she told the daughter it was up to her father. This sudden switching of gears isn’t an effort by the Kendricks to model the proper behavior of a wife and mother however. This is a setup; later in the movie the little girl is killed while riding either to or from the birthday party her father said she could go to. It is specifically pointed out that had he not allowed her to go she would not have been killed.

The next key scene is roll call at Adam’s job as a sheriff’s deputy. They use a pretty clunky plot device to point to the very real crisis of absent fathers. The sheriff reads an email he received with a list of compelling statistics on the negative outcomes associated with children raised without a father. But the Kendrick brothers have a problem; these stats show the value of fatherhood, and they are trying to tear fathers down. Specifically, they have to tear Adam down as a father for the movie to be a story of redemption. He has to be seen as a failing father in order to repent. I’ll cover how they handle this challenge a bit later.

The elephant in the middle of the room of course is why fathers are absent. In the US 40% of children are now being born out of wedlock. This can only occur when the mother decides to have children without first securing a proper father for them in marriage. A very large number of the children fortunate enough to be born in wedlock later have the father ejected from the home as a result of divorce. Academics have found that the ability to kick the father out of the home is the reason women initiate divorce much more often than men. In short, the problem of fatherless children isn’t due to a lack of men willing to be fathers. It is a result of the sexual revolution and the direct incentives we have created for women to expel the father from the home.

The Kendrick brothers seem aware of the issue of women not securing fathers for their children via marriage or kicking the husband/father out later, but instead of addressing it choose multiple times to gloss over it. Adam’s partner tells him that a third of his paycheck goes to alimony and complains about being kicked out of his son’s life:

I only get him every other weekend, and even then it’s only after Mia’s filled his
head with her toxic opinions of me.

Adam shuts him down without any compassion, presumably because he doesn’t want his daughter to hear the conversation. Nothing further is mentioned on the topic, but later we learn that his partner is the villain. The message is clear; only men who deserve it have this happen to them.

One of the other officers has a 15 year old daughter with a penchant for gang bangers. We learn early in the movie that he moved his family from Atlanta to avoid the bad influences there. Almost immediately his daughter Jade locates the up and coming gangster in the area. Her mother tells her father: Another saggy pants boy interested in Jade. This was a perfect opportunity to address the issue; young women acting like Jade are a huge part of the problem. It would be cruel not to call her on what she is doing. Instead of reprimanding her, he tells her:

I know how young men think. They want to win your heart, but they don’t know how to treasure it.

The same father (Nathan Hayes) tells us in another scene that his own father had six children by three different women, and that he was the fifth child. Here is another opportunity to point out the role that women are playing in creating fatherless children; his mother had a child by a man who already had four illegitimate children. She had to know what he was like, but she did it anyway. But again, this is presented as solely the failing of the irresponsible man his mother chose to father him.

Another character/officer explains part way through the movie that he has an illegitimate child as the result of a hookup with a cheerleader in college (he was an athlete). Just as with the rest of the movie, there is only judgment for the man, none for the woman.

Now getting back to the Kendrick brothers’ problem. They’ve framed the problem as absent fathers, but they really need to hang this on the average father for their story to work. Specifically they need to show Adam, a truly excellent father, as a failure. They do so with a convoluted path of logic, which while they don’t spell it out looks roughly like this:
About mid way through the movie the officers are at a barbecue at Adam’s house. One of the men comments that the steaks reminded him of his father barbecuing. This brief comment quickly turns to all of the men bitching about their fathers:

Nathan Hayes: I wonder where all the good fathers went.

Shane Fuller (the villain): Aint that the truth.

Adam is surprised, because he had heard Shane’s father was a good man:
Adam: What? I remember you talking about your dad. Wasn’t he like an usher or something at your church?

Shane: Yeah, but that doesn’t mean anything. Soon as the church service started he’d step out back for a smoke. You know one time he says to me “I better not catch you drinking. Had a beer in his hand when he said it. My mom used to nag him. That is until they got divorced. Look it’s not like I don’t love the guy, but it’s hard to respect a hypocrite.

The other two officers present eagerly chime in with negative stories of their own fathers.

Shortly after this Adam’s daughter is killed. Adam is crushed with grief, but his wife offers little consolation:

Adam: I should have been a better father.

Wife: No. You’re still a father.

I had to rewind that scene several times to believe what I was hearing. She very specifically doesn’t say he was a good father (which he clearly was). All she says is he is **still a father**, with the point being that he still has the chance to change and **become** a good father to their son. This is the completion of the morphing sins of fatherhood. Shortly after this scene Adam pronounces:

I’ve been doing about half of what I should’ve been doing as a dad.

With the crushing of the average good father (represented by Adam) complete, the path is now cleared for the resolution to be a better father. At first Adam proposes to handle it man-style, by asking the other men to witness his resolution and hold him accountable. The men like the idea and consider making the resolution as well. Then Nathan’s wife decides they are doing it all wrong; they need to dress up and make the pledge formally. It thereby goes from man-style to wife-style, and they make the pledge in front of a pastor. It makes for a very strange ceremony, something which seems like a wedding ceremony except without any vows from the wife. It opens with:

I do solemnly resolve before God to take full responsibility for myself, my wife, and my children.

This sudden belief in the headship of the father goes against most of the rest of the movie. It certainly isn’t consistent with their cutting good fathers off at the knees. Not surprisingly, the women and children make no corresponding vow to follow his leadership. There is no talk of wives submitting to their husbands or children honoring their father and mother. While the Kendricks didn’t write a resolution for women, they had a woman write one and have released it in association with the movie (it isn’t mentioned in the film itself though). You can read the resolution for men [here](#), and the one for women [here](#). You can also buy your own certificate suitable for framing [here](#).

The movie closes with Adam giving a speech in a packed auditorium. The speech is laden...
with language about fathers abandoning their children:

I’ve seen first hand the deep hurt and devastation that fatherlessness brings in a child’s life. Our prisons are full of men and women who have lived recklessly after being abandoned by their fathers, wounded by the men who should have loved them the most.

You may be thinking, what about the mothers who didn’t marry first, or married only to expel the father from the home? He addresses them as well:

While so many mothers have sacrificed to help their children survive, they were never intended to carry the weight alone. We thank God for them.

Not all of the speech is bad, which you can read here. However, even when it is supposed to be inspirational it is littered with accusations against fathers, such as:

But there are some men, who regardless of the mistakes we’ve made in the past, regardless of what our fathers did not do for us, will give the strength of our arms and the rest of our days to loving God with all that we are, and to teach our children to do the same.

It ends with a rousing series of questions on who will lead his family, with the response each time being “I will.”

There are action and comedy scenes in the movie which I haven’t described, along with subplots for each of the fathers. At times the men act heroic, although following one such scene Adam and his partner question if it is worth it to risk your life for your child. But what I’ve shared in this post shows the main plot and point of the movie.

I’ve titled my review craven because the approach to entirely ignore the actions of grossly irresponsible women and instead pile on to good fathers along with the rest of the culture takes absolutely no courage. They witnessed millions of hurting children and cowardly decided to take the easy way out. If the Kendrick brothers wanted to show courage they would have dealt with the difficult issues of women choosing to have children out of wedlock, as well as those not honoring their marriage vows. Perhaps in their next movie they will find the courage to do so.
I originally posted this as a comment in the excellent discussion at CMD-N’s latest post Courting and the Evangelical American Princess. Van Rooineck warned women of the unintended consequences of nuclear rejection:

| Memo to the “ladies” — If you are rude to a man you’re not interested in, word may get around and the guy you ARE interested in, may never try. It’s even worse if you put down your unwanted suitor PUBLICLY, in front of a crowd… NONE of those men will ever try. (Yes, i’ve even seen that.)

I think there is an even larger message here. Women in general have abused the courtship process beyond all sanity. Nuclear rejections are a part of it. So is the extension of the period of time women expect courtship. It used to be just a few years, and women felt a sense of urgency to make a choice as well as a great deal of pressure to stick with that choice once made. Now women think nothing of deciding they won’t consider marriage until after 25, quite often later. Yet even Christian women who do this still expect the benefits of courtship all the way through. They want to be taken on dates, wooed, etc. One thing a man knows about a woman as she gets older is many other men have likely wasted their romantic investment in her. She from that point of view becomes a bad bet for courtship. She may still be marriageable, but she isn’t worth a large one sided effort to find this out.

What we need to explain to young women is not only that their own behavior will determine how willing men are to foot the searching costs, but that the behavior of women in general has already changed the rules. The whole point of courtship is finding out if there is a match there. Footing this investment has become a losing proposition for men in many ways. She can’t expect the man to know that “she is different”, because this is what the process is about. In the past women enjoyed a free ride here, but it came at the cost of pressure to not dither and make marriage a priority. The pressure is gone now, and so is much of the free ride. So all a young woman can expect now is the new baseline limited courtship which men have adjusted to. The older she gets the less of this she should expect. If she handles this badly she will gain a reputation for such and will receive even less than the age adjusted baseline. But either way she can’t expect what women received in the past, and even that is less than what Disney has likely sold to her.
Texas U.S. Senate candidate is proud to have been raised by one of Stanton’s heroes!

by Dalrock | May 8, 2012 | Link

I was in the car this afternoon and heard an ad for US Senate Candidate Tom Leppert. What struck me was this part:

Raised by a single mom and self-made in the Texas tradition, Tom Leppert is a man I've come to know and respect.

I certainly don’t fault the man for being raised without a father in the home, but in this case he seems to be bragging about it. Skip to 36 seconds to hear it in the ad:

While this isn’t the biggest deal in the world, it strikes me as very strange that this is what he asked local sports star Troy Aikman to tell Texas voters, especially since this is still the Republican primary race. It doesn’t say if his parents divorced, his mother got pregnant out of wedlock, or if his mother was a widow [Edit: See note at bottom of post. His mother was in fact a widow]. I suspect if the latter is the case and he used the specific term widow he would have lost points with the sadly quite large unwed mother voting block.

Perhaps that is the point. The ad above isn’t the only time his mother’s singleness is offered as a point of pride. With just a bit of searching I found a similar reference in the biography posted by Pastors for Tom Leppert (emphasis mine):

Raised by a single mother, Tom worked his way through college, earning a degree from Claremont McKenna College and an MBA from Harvard Business School. He later served under Ronald Reagan as a White House fellow in both the Treasury Department and in the White House.

Tom’s faith plays a vital role in his life, and that faith has formed the framework for all of his decisions in both public and private life. Tom and his family are members of First Baptist Church and Park Cities Baptist Church.

At one point in time I’m fairly certain politicians in bible belt Texas were proud if they were raised by married parents. But that was some time ago, certainly pre Stanton/Driscoll/Courageous.

Now amongst religious conservatives the assumption is that men are causing women to have children out of wedlock by not being good enough to marry. Mark Driscoll has gone on record twice (here and here) making this case, and Glenn Stanton has made this case in two of his books. I’ve already written about Stanton making this case in his book on raising children. More recently I stumbled onto Stanton making the same case is in his book on marriage, The Ring Makes All The Difference:

Having interviewed many young adult women over the past decade, I have talked with more than a few who had babies out of wedlock. These are not just young teens
or early twentysomething women who got pregnant by accident. Many are women in their later twenties, thirties, and even early forties who got pregnant intentionally because they found their biological clocks ticking faster than their wedding bells were ringing.

As one successful professional woman living in Seattle, Washington-working as a professor of literature at a noted university-explained to me, she always wanted to get married and have children in the traditional way, but a husband never materialized.

A successful professional woman in Seattle who couldn’t find a husband? That sounds familiar. Isn’t that where Pastor Driscoll’s church is located? Could it be they both are talking about the same woman? I have no way of knowing, but seriously what are the odds? Did Pastor Driscoll forget to mention that the aging career gal in his church was a baby mama when he scolded men for not manning up and marrying her?

Back to Stanton’s book. He shares some stats on the profound increase in unwed births, and then closes the section with:

This dramatic growth of unmarried childbearing among adult women is largely due to women choosing to have babies with men who are good enough as live-in partners-good enough, they sense, to be baby-daddies, but not good enough to be marriage material. You probably have friends who are there—or have been there.

Now skip to 1:13 below to hear the same Glenn Stanton, Director for Family Formation Studies at Focus on the Family, call single mothers heroic:

**Edit:** Per the statesman.com Leppert’s father passed away when he was young.

His father died when Leppert was young, and his mother raised him on a secretary’s salary.
The contrast between how modern Christians treat good faithful fathers and unrepentant unwed mothers is truly astounding. For the latest installment of this, I offer you the CBN.com (Christian Broadcasting Network, 700 Club) article Janine Turner: Single Mothers Can Change History.

The article is an unabashed plug of Turner’s book Holding Her Head High: 12 Single Mothers Who Championed Their Children and Changed History. According to the article, the book tells us inspirational tales of abandoned mothers and widows. But while the story is about women who had no choice in becoming single mothers, the target audience is clearly today’s mass of baby mamas. There is therefore of course the standard sleight of hand regarding Janine’s own story:

“I was not a single mother by choice,” she says. “I think circumstances happen to people that are sometimes beyond their control in the relationships they’re in. I also learned that the definition of single mother is very broad; it means, widowed, divorced and abandoned.

The murky language of circumstances in relationships could of course indicate that Janine is a rare exception to excuse #6, or it could mean that she simply got knocked up out of wedlock by a man not interested in fatherhood or marriage. No doubt Focus On The Family’s Glenn Stanton would consider her a hero either way, but to some of us this still matters. According the stats on Famous Hookups.com her history of serial monogamy includes three “celebrity relationships” which averaged roughly 9.8 years each, and she has never married. I can’t confirm the information from the gossip site, but I can find no reference of her ever marrying in my own web search. By my calculation based on Wikipedia’s stated 1962 birthdate for her
she was approximately 35 when she gave birth in 1997.

But Janine isn’t just your garden variety baby mama. She is a Christian baby mama. The article stresses that this book urging baby mamas to hold their heads high is entirely wholesome and Christian:

One of the prerequisites Janine pushed for was that the women she researched and included in her book had to be women of faith.

“There are a lot of women out there who did great things in their life, but they didn’t have faith, and to me, that’s pivotal,” she says. “I really believe children need a foundation of faith, morals, and guidance.”

We learn that her act of sexual immorality and profound disobedience has strengthened her walk with God:

“One of the things God would always say to me is, ‘I’ve given you a flame inside and don’t let anybody put that out. Not circumstances and not people.’” When Juliette was born in 1997, Janine’s walk with God deepened. “My faith immediately deepened to another level with God,” she says. “I’ve taken my daughter to church every Sunday since she was three months old.”

With her holy hamster commanding her to be true to herself, how could this not be the case?

I haven’t read her book, but I was curious about the Christian baby mama inspirationfest I was missing out on. I am only a married faithful father, so I can’t ever become one of Stanton’s heroes. However, perhaps I can bask in the glory of godly unwed mothers vicariously. Looking at the amazon.com preview page for her book I found the endorsements section. Pastor Gary Richmond loves this book because it dispels the myth that fathers are essential (emphasis mine):

I love this book because it dispels a horrible myth: As a single-parent mother, the best I have to hope for is survival for my mediocre emotionally damaged children. Janine’s excellent research proves what we now know to be true. **Women who are willing to work hard and dare to dream can provide everything their children need** not only to succeed, but to change their world for the better. She truly provides hope in hard times for the women who need it most.

Gary Richmond
Pastor to Single Parents, First Evangelical Free Church

Pastor Richmond has written his own book, *Successful Single Parenting*. I haven’t read Pastor Richmond’s book either, but I did skim through parts of it with Amazon.com’s preview. Lacking Pastor Richmond’s many years of in depth biblical study, I was unaware of the rich Christian tradition of unwed mothers. In chapter 3 he tells the story of the Bible’s first single mother, Hagar. He opens the chapter with:
How well do you know bible history? Can you name the first single mother?

As he is telling that story, he explains:

God has promised that He will be a Husband to the husbandless and a Father to the fatherless.

You can preview the chapter via google books here for the whole empowering story.

Janine Turner photo licensed as creative commons by Alan Light.
Modern Christians have radically reframed marriage from the way the Bible does. Where the Bible shows the husband in headship and the wife as submissive, modern Christians have turned this upside down. The re-framing is so pervasive that most Christians have no idea that it has even occurred. I’ve charted out the details below, but there are three fundamental changes which are at the core of the radical reframing of Christian marriage:

1. The command to husbands to love their wives has been transformed into a command that he make his wife feel loved. This subtle transformation turns a straightforward biblical command into a Sisyphean task. After all, the wife herself is the only one who can pronounce whether she feels sufficiently loved. Additionally only she can define the very meaning of the word love in this context. As a result, Christian husbands are now held hostage to the emotions of their wives. They must forever jump through whatever hoops their wives hold up in an impossible effort to gain her approval. For example, if he watches a football game instead of doing what she wants him to do he isn’t making her feel sufficiently loved and is in violation of the biblical command. There is no escape from this rule once you accept the subtle change, as logically only she can tell us how she feels.

2. The command that neither should deny sex to the other is now seen as only applying to husbands denying sex to their wives. Wives aren’t to be expected to follow this command unless they feel sufficiently loved and are “in the mood”. Even if this were to apply, there is the added exception that the wife shouldn’t follow this command if it makes her uncomfortable. This gives the wife a powerful trump card to hold over her husband. If he doesn’t follow her leadership she can and will deny him sex for as long as it takes to bring him to submission.

3. A wife holding her husband hostage to her emotions and employing denial of sex will eventually wear down the will of even the most determined Christian husband. An additional threatpoint is needed to further enhance the wife’s undisputed authority and if needed provide an exit strategy. This is the threat of unilateral divorce, with the accompanying expulsion of the husband from the home of his children and the appropriation of the majority of his wealth and income. However, for this to be effective Christianity had to be morphed from a force standing in the way of divorce to one which provides moral justification for divorce.

These three changes put wives in the position of absolute headship in modern Christian marriage, in an inversion of the biblical concept of headship. Moreover, while claiming to fear the ever threatened tyranny of husbandly headship, the new model puts the husband in a far more subservient position to his wife than a mere inversion would accomplish. After all, no sane reading of the Bible would make the husband’s emotional state the final arbiter of wifely submission and obedience. She isn’t commanded to ensure that he never feels any sort of dissatisfaction. A husband who berated his wife simply because he wasn’t happy would be seen by all as abusing his position. The same goes for a husband who denied his wife sex and/or threatened her with divorce for the same reason. Yet armies of Christian “relationship
experts” now make their living writing books and articles and holding workshops advising Christian wives on the proper way to do exactly this. In fact, these books, articles, and workshops are packaged as “supporting Christian marriage”.

The modern Christian reframing of marriage:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The Bible</strong></th>
<th><strong>Modern Christians</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The husband leads the wife. | This is theoretically true, but in practice is nullified by an overwhelming list of exceptions which the Bible forgot to mention. Practically speaking this boils down to:  

*Only if he is Christian enough and making her feel sufficiently loved.* |
| 1 Peter 3:6, 1 Peter 3:2; Eph 5:24, 1 Tim 2:12, 3:4, Tit 2:5, Gen 3:16 | |
| The wife must submit to her husband. | If he is leading her correctly she will want to submit. Therefore every act of rebellion on her part is actually proof of fault on his part and her own innocence.  
Alternate explanation: This means only “mutual submission”, where the husband submits entirely to his wife’s leadership. See Fireproof.  
Note: The husband always has responsibility, even though in practical terms he never has authority. See Courageous. |
| 1 Peter 3:1, 25, Eph 5:228/24, Col 3:18, 1 Tim 2:11 | |
| The husband must protect his wife, with his own life if needed. | In this rare exception the Bible actually means what the words say.  
Caveat: He isn’t doing it right if she doesn’t feel sufficiently loved when he offers his life to protect hers. |
| Eph 5:25 | |
| The husband must love his wife. | The husband actually loving his wife is irrelevant, which is explained in the Book of Oprah. What the scripture means is the husband must make his wife feel sufficiently loved. Only the wife and her girlfriends can define the term love in this context and be the judge of whether she is feeling it sufficiently. |
| Eph 5:25,28,33, Col 3:19 | |
| The wife must love her husband. | This Space Intentionally Left Blank |
| Tit 2:4 | |
| Neither is to deny sex to the other (or you will create temptation for sexual sin). | This is true when applied to the husband, but it is different for the wife. She has to feel sufficiently loved, and even then “in the mood”, so don’t be pushy. It will happen when and if she decides it will happen. You can expedite this process by following her leadership.  
Note: Anyone who says differently is a perverted wife raping bastard.  
Alternate explanation: This only applies in cases where the husband isn’t tempted by sexual sin. |
| 1 Cor 7:5 | |
| No divorce except for a short list of grievous violations. | Unless the wife is unhaaaapy, which is irrefutable evidence that the husband failed to make her feel sufficiently loved. In that case Christian love commands that we gin up a biblical justification for divorce.  
Note: If Catholic, there are no biblical justifications for divorce but the exception of the wife being unhappy remains. Therefore the correct path is to find a way to declare that the marriage of 10 years and multiple kids never existed.  
Either way, don’t rebuke those who willfully and unrepentantly violate this command. That would be failing to show Christ’s love. |
| 1 Cor 7:10-16 | |

http://dalrock.wordpress.com/
Note: I have included at least one citation for each row in the table above, but this is not intended to be an exhaustive list. If I’ve left off your favorite reference for any of these please share it in the comments.
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- The Book of Oprah
I’ll do several posts this week following up on my Reframing Christian marriage post, offering examples. Today I’ll share two different examples where Christian men and women are taught that husbands are responsible for making their wives want to follow the biblical command to submit. Both of the examples are high profile pages and came up prominently when I was searching for information on the Christian definition of marriage.

Example #1. What Every Husband Needs to Know from bible.org* (emphasis mine):

Headship involves the husband’s solemn obligation to establish an atmosphere of love in which the basic needs of his wife are fulfilled—an environment in which she is free to grow and develop into all that God wants her to be. Her submission will then be the voluntary response to his loving leadership.

He goes on to explain that women are natural responders:

If she receives irritability, criticism, disapproval, unkindness, indifference, lack of appreciation, or lack of affection, she will respond with a defense mechanism, such as bitterness, coolness, defiance, or nagging. Some women turn to drinking or submerge themselves in social activities.

However, he explains that if she receives love from her husband, she will respond in kind and “will blossom into the most beautiful creature under God’s heaven.” He offers no biblical backing for this bit of nonsense, nor for this even worse bit (emphasis mine):

When a man claims that his wife doesn’t love him anymore he is unwittingly admitting that he hasn’t loved her as he should have.

He closes the paragraph with:

Thus the responsibility for a successful marriage rests initially with the husband. He makes the first move—that of loving his wife with the totally unselfish love of Jesus Christ.

A bit further down he starts on a new branch of insanity, accusing Christian husbands of seeing themselves as pampered kings:

Sometimes a husband develops the strange notion that his home is a castle and he is the king. His wife’s task is to provide for his comfort and to protect him from all unpleasant circumstances.

He then proceeds to cut husbands off at the knees, instructing husbands to be their wives’ helpmeets:
Most wives work hard, maybe even harder than their husbands, and no husband ought to be above helping with the housework and the children. If the wife is really the weaker vessel, then wiping the dishes, sweeping the floor, supervising the children, cleaning the windows, or dozens of other little helpful acts are just other ways of saying, “I love you.”

I don’t have any objection to doing anything which needs to be done around the house. No work is beneath me, as I wrote in my very first (somewhat rambling) post on the blog. But what he is doing here is preemptively denying husbands the opportunity to decide how their household will divide labor, and he is doing so in perfect harmony with feminist instead of biblical sensibilities. There is no room left for husbands to lead on the question after this. If he doesn’t do what the wife thinks he should do (follow her leadership), he accuses the husband of not loving his wife sufficiently. At the same time, he is also playing into the tired feminist trope that wives work harder than husbands.

He continues on with this theme, accusing husbands of being unwilling to help around the house, fix things which are broken, or have a date night with their wives. He tells us this is like spraying herbicide on a flower:

But when the wife begins to wilt and reflect the same attitude toward her husband, he is usually quick to complain about it. Problems like this will be solved when the husband begins to show the love of Christ.

All of this is laden with encouragement to wives to see their own emotional state as the sole arbiter of whether her husband is loving her as he should. It formally invites all of the pop relationship psychobabble into biblical marriage.

Interestingly the corresponding piece for wives by the same author (Richard Strauss) What Every Wife Needs to Know stresses that they must submit even if their husband isn’t showing Christ’s love, indeed even if he isn’t a Christian. But by having the issue both ways in a time of outright rebellion by the vast majority of Christian wives he has planted the seeds for marital discord.

Example #2. About.com, What Does the Bible Say About Marriage?

After some statistics from our good friend Mr. Stanton on cherry picked Christian divorce rates, on page two she quotes Eph. 5:23-32. This is a promising turn, but she quickly rationalizes the scripture away:

Husbands are urged to lay down their lives in sacrificial love and protection. And in this safe and cherished embrace of a loving husband, what wife would not be willing to submit to his leadership?

As Mr. Strauss explains in his piece on the role of wives (but contrary to what he wrote to husbands), this simply isn’t the case. Wives are commanded to submit to and obey their husbands, and this isn’t predicated on the husband showing Christ’s love. In fact, 1 Peter 3:1 states that wives must submit to their husbands even if the husband isn’t a believer. What she writes has no more validity than if one were to say:
Wives are commanded to submit to their husbands. And given this submission, what husband wouldn’t be willing to love and sacrifice his life for his wife?

*The original link is now broken, but I found the same article at a different location. Update: I found the archived Bible.org version here.*

**See Also:**

- [Reframing Christian marriage](#)
- [Reframing Christian marriage part 3: husbands as helpmeets.](#)
- [Reframing Christian marriage part 4: judging the performance.](#)
- [Reframing Christian marriage part 5: sex as a weapon.](#)
Reframing Christian marriage part 3: husbands as helpmeets.

by Dalrock | May 17, 2012 | Link

Many of my readers are already familiar with Sheila Gregoire and her blog, To Love, Honor and Vacuum. After looking at how big name sites like Bible.org and Ask.com reframed Biblical marriage, I was curious how faithful Sheila was in her teaching to the biblical command that wives submit to their husbands (especially given her graduate level education in women's studies). I used Amazon's search feature for her book, To Love, Honor, and Vacuum: When You Feel More Like a Maid Than a Wife and Mother. I was pleasantly surprised to see her quoting the scriptural command for wives to submit to their husbands (P. 116 of the paperback):

> Whether we like to be reminded of it or not, the Bible calls for wives to submit to their husbands (Eph 5:22).

While she is of course understating the command by only referencing one of the many places this is commanded in the New Testament, the reference itself is there. However, what really struck me when I read a bit more before and after this line is the context she is referencing this in. The chapter is titled “The Family That Cleans Together”, and the section the quote is included in is titled “Let Him Know He’s Needed”. The same section includes this bit of scriptural rationalization*:

> Many biblical commentators think that the meaning of “the husband is the head of the wife” in Ephesians 5:23 implies something similar to “source,” like the head of the river. The wife draws energy and support from her husband, and the husband finds part of his identity in supplying his wife with what she needs.

She then explains that wives who are too self sufficient are depriving their husbands of the opportunity to “fulfill their God-given role”, and also rob themselves “of the gift of being cared for”. She warns us that such husbands “will feel distant, perhaps like a failure”, even if they can’t pinpoint what the actual problem is. But what is she talking about? What exactly should wives do to avoid depriving their husbands of what they desperately need while giving themselves the gift of being cared for? After reminding women to not forget to appreciate that their husband usually works outside of the home, she advises wives to not deprive their husbands of the opportunity to do his share of the housework:

> Then take the opportunity to show him he’s needed at home, too. Often men feel superfluous at home, like they don’t even belong, because you manage everything. Make honest requests of him that allow him to help support you and feel involved in building your home.

Note the complete inversion of the concepts of headship and help meet. In her framing, husbands were created to serve their wives and it would be cruel for wives to deprive them of the opportunity to serve her both outside of and inside the home. Further down she gives
instructions on how wives should manage their husbands, including a segment titled “Delegate Appropriately for Him”:

If you want your husband to take responsibility for certain chores on his own, without being asked, you need to find a delegation method that conveys to him what needs to be done without threatening him.

Leaders delegate, and she clearly sees the wife as the leader of the husband despite her lip service to the concepts of headship and submission. She follows with a table that explains how to translate straightforward requests into language husbands can understand. After the table she suggests that wives give their husbands lists of chores:

My husband is motivated by lists. If I just tell him I would like him to help clean up after dinner, he doesn’t know what to do. But if there is a list of daily and weekly chores on the fridge, and he can see what is left to be done, he’s like a Tasmanian devil whirling around the house, cleaning.

*This rationalization is thoroughly debunked in this paper.*
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Reframing Christian marriage part 4: judging the performance.
by Dalrock | May 18, 2012 | Link

Christian wives have been taught to see their role in biblical marriage primarily as a judge of their husband’s obligation to love them as Christ loved the church. This is as I showed in the beginning of the series essential to their inverting the biblical frame of marriage and placing themselves as the leader over their submissive husbands.

This important biblical command has become the focus of an unhealthy obsession amongst Christians when considering marriage, effectively crowding the rest of the commands regarding marriage out. Prior to the release of the movie Fireproof, co creator Stephen Kendrick was asked how he and his brother Alex (the lead in the movie Courageous) decided on the topic for the movie. The opening part of Stephen’s answer is very telling (emphasis mine):

We had been praying specifically for a storyline that would help strengthen our culture and had considered several options. To be honest, Alex didn’t initially want to do a movie on marriage though he was taken by the idea of daring a man to love his wife. After months of prayer, the Lord clearly led us to go after this issue through a compelling story that we hope captures the hearts of both women and men...

These are two men who are presumably well versed in the bible, and yet only one command stood out when considering making a movie on Christian marriage. And even here, they managed to twist the original meaning to something straight out of pop relationship psychology. It isn’t about the firm love of leadership, but the touchy-feely love of romance novels and chick flicks. It is Christ’s love for the Church interpreted through the lens of Jesus is your boyfriend. They took it a step further and ultimately made it not about the husband demonstrating his faithfulness to this command, but him winning the heart of his whorish wife away from the man she is pursuing. It didn’t matter until she felt it sufficiently, and only total submission to his wife would do.

This mindset is also on display in a post Sheila Gregoire did back in December, Am I Too Hard on Women? Sheila quotes a commenter on her blog:

I for one am tired of well-meaning Christians not holding men’s feet to the fire. The Bible is pretty clear that men need to love their wives as Christ loved His Bride, the Church. I don’t see Jesus standing at the foot of the cross saying to Himself: “Well, you guys are weren’t dying for today because there’s a ballgame on and you don’t look very pretty to me.”

Did Jesus and does He still ACTIVELY pursue His Bride? Should men continuously make their wives a priority and pursue them?
But it isn’t just men watching non wife approved ballgames the commenter is angry about. She is furious that men are listening to what women tell them they want in order to feel loved:

Another thing: I hate these lists that men are given to tell them how to show love to their wives. Buy her flowers. Write her little love notes. Do this for her. Do that for her. I think the best thing a man can do is quit relying on those generic lists, even such advice from “Christian” counselors, and start studying your wife. Make your own lists, men, that show you wanted to be sincere and genuine in your relationship with your wife. . . That you actually treasure your wife and realize she is a unique creation by God given to you to CARE FOR, PROTECT, SERVE, and HELP.

She closes her rant with:

Please, Christian church ladies, quit making excuses for Christian husbands. Somebody, PLEASE SOMEBODY, hold their feet to the fire. As long as you keep telling women to do what men ought to be doing, it’s not going to improve.

Sheila tells us that she agrees with the commenter, but that her blog is targeted to women and not men. She uses the comment to demonstrate what she experiences when she and her husband do Christian marriage conferences. Each time Sheila speaks to the wives at the conference about what they need to do, the women resent being told they have anything to improve:

One of the interesting things about giving the wife talk is that, as I start to talk about what a woman can do to make marriage great, I see many in the audience looking distinctly uncomfortable and shifting in their seats.

At this point Sheila stops her talk and reassures the wives that their husbands are getting it even worse:

…right now my husband has all of your husbands in another room, and he is blasting them and telling them what they need to do, too, in no uncertain terms.

Only after this are the women willing to listen and consider their own obligations. She explains that she often experiences the same sentiment from the readers of her blog, which she characterizes as:

I won’t listen to your advice for how women can make their marriages better unless I’m assured that someone is lecturing my husband first, because he’s the one who really needs to change.

Sheila reassures her readers that she understands their concerns, but that she writes a blog for women, not men. Her point is that neither sex is given a pass to not follow biblical commands because their spouse isn’t living up to them. She also mixes in a vague accusation that men aren’t as interested in fulfilling their biblical roles in marriage because it is women and not men who read “relationship blogs”. She then feels compelled to give an offering to the standard feminist bogeyman of wives becoming doormats and being abused:
This does not mean that we are to be doormats, and indeed, acting like a doormat and enabling him to treat you disrespectfully can make your marriage worse. I have spoken about this at length. It also does not mean that we put up with abuse.

Sheila’s obsession with wives not becoming doormats is so great that one of the linked posts she references was actually one she wrote after reading my post Rotating Polyandry and Its Enforcers. She read about the need for husbands to show firm leadership, and felt compelled to write a post of her own warning wives not to become doormats. In an age where wives are openly rebelling against the biblical command to submit to their husbands, in classic feminist form Sheila is consumed by fear that wives might submit too much to their husbands. She continues to harp on this even after admitting in a previous post that Christian women are obsessed with “being true to themselves” and that the church gives women a pass:

In general, the church is very hard on men and very easy on women, and yet it is women who instigate most divorces. We need to get back to the message that we have a responsibility and an obligation to make our marriages work, even if those marriages do not make us happy. But that goes against conventional wisdom, and seems mean. We really are fighting upstream!

But that was an entire three months before Sheila wrote the post asking if she is too hard on women, so this has already been forgotten.

Fortunately Sheila can at times be temporarily reminded of the fact that churches are giving wives a pass for open rebellion, focusing instead only on husbands. Elspeth jogged her memory with an excellent comment. After Elspeth’s comment several other women expressed similar sentiments, including Mrs. P:

Unfortunately feminism has become such an accepted part of our culture that even the church gets caught up in it. You’re right about the vast difference between Mother’s Day and Father’s Day church services. Mother’s Day is all about honoring and glorifying motherhood/womanhood while Father’s Day is all about telling men that they’re all terrible husbands/fathers and they need to get their lazy bums off the couch. Isn’t Father’s Day supposed to be about HONORING fathers? Yeesh.

This lead to a startling turn around by Sheila in the comments:

I agree that the church really is harder on men. I’ve known two women to leave their husbands in the last few years in our church after affairs, and everyone still assumed it was the husbands’ fault. It was really tough!

Don’t worry Christian wives; Sheila had forgotten all about this a month later, so her blog is once again a safe place to judge the performance of husbands who refuse to submit to your authority. Carry on.
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Denying sex is the modern Christian wife’s go-to method of maintaining her control of the marriage. Judging whether he loves her sufficiently is effective as emotional manipulation, but it lacks the raw power that witholding sex has. In this sense, judging him as not sufficiently loving her is as much a rationalization for her use of sex as manipulation as it is manipulation in and of itself.

In 1 Corinthians 7 Paul neatly frames the morality of sex and how it relates to marriage. As he explains, marriage is the one and only safe harbor for sexual desire. It is the Biblical answer to those who burn with desire. Because of this, he makes it clear that neither spouse is to withhold sex, and that each spouse has authority over the bodies of the other in this regard. This is very different than the modern view that sex is moral if it involves “love” and/or (serial monogamous) “commitment”. As Paul describes it there is nothing wrong with burning with sexual desire so long as it is directed towards your spouse, and so long as you don’t defraud your spouse of the marital sex which is their due. He states that to deny sex to your spouse is to invite Satan to tempt your spouse with sexual sin.

But as you can imagine this presents an obvious problem. How can a Christian wife exercise control of her husband by withholding sex? How is she supposed to make him submit to her if she lacks this powerful tool in her arsenal? In fact, as Paul explains it she actually is commanded to submit to her husband sexually! Clearly there must be a mistake. If there is one thing she knows, it is that she isn’t really supposed to submit to her husband, despite the clear language and the frequency of the command.

So she goes to work looking for a rationalization. Certainly there must be a loophole. What if she isn't in the mood? While no other commands from God require that we be in the mood to fulfill them, certainly this one is different. Otherwise she would have to submit to her husband in a very profound way, in a way which the Book of Oprah explains should only be reserved for the heroes of romance novels. Her husband is her help meet, her holy kitchen bitch, not a gallant knight on a white steed!

But all of this sounds so arbitrary. If one isn’t careful it could sound like manipulation. And she is of course a submissive Christian wife, just not in that way (or any other meaningful way). There must be another test, something which only she can be the judge of. Luckily she already has one, in the form of testing the purity of his love. With a slight adaptation, she can combine the concept of judging the purity of his love with the non Biblical idea that sex gains moral purpose if it is expressed only out of love, not out of that dirty lust that men have and women don’t.

Behold the modern Christian wife’s frame regarding sex in marriage. Sex in marriage is good, so long as it is on her terms (she isn’t submitting) and so long as it is strictly romantic in nature. If her husband wants sex when she isn’t in the mood, well it probably is because she is too tired. Surely he would have better chances if he did more of the housework so she would be fresh and rested when he made his advances. Also, his need for sex must not
actually be a need for sex. If he burns with the passion the Bible tells us marriage is a safe harbor for, his thoughts are impure and she will turn him away.

I’ve referenced Sheila Gregoire previously in this series, but this really is her area of specialty. Sheila has written multiple books on sex aimed at Christian wives, and has devoted large segments of her blog to the topic. Sheila’s frame is very much the non Biblical frame I describe above. When prodded she will at times acknowledge that denial of sex is an act of defrauding, but her overall tone is to validate the idea that sex will happen on the wife’s terms. Her fundamental approach to wives denying sex to their husbands is to find ways for the wives to decide they want it. This of course leaves the Christian wife safely in the driver’s seat.

The idea that husbands have to prove the purity of their sexual intent is a common theme from the women who read her blog, and I’ve never seen her bat this down. In her post How A Marriage Changes she quotes a commenter named TimbrelDancer from a previous post confessing about why she denied sex to her husband (emphasis in original):

| What made the biggest difference for us, in the long run, was that I began to realize that my husband wasn’t the big, selfish “jerk” I thought he was, just because he wanted to have sex on a regular basis. I give 100% credit to God for the change that saved our marriage. On a practical level, though, it came down to the fact that I didn’t really believe my husband loved me like he said he did. Despite all of his selfless service to me, I always felt he was doing it either because (a) he wanted to anyway or (b) he was trying to manipulate me into doing something he wanted (like have sex, for example). Because of that, I either didn’t recognize the basis of his caring acts, or I assumed they had a completely selfish basis and I resented him. Resentment turned to bitterness turned to hatred turned to almost divorcing him. |

Note the threatpoint of frivolous divorce weaved in there as a caution; don’t push your rebellious wife men if you know what is good for you. Elsewhere in the quote she reinforces this in reference to a husband commenting on another thread:

| I think George is doing an awesome job of being caring and thoughtful, and having him become uncaring and unthoughtful (or demanding) is not likely to have the kind of effect he would hope for. It may, however, wake his wife up, but possibly at the expense of his marriage. My husband chose the route of becoming uncaring and unthoughtful, and it did eventually wake me up, but it also greatly endangered our marriage and also caused some serious problems with our children. If I hadn’t been extremely committed to staying married and if I hadn’t had numerous friends who were willing to pray for us, I’m fairly certain we would be divorced now. |

There is only one way to deal with a wife denying sex, and that is compliance. Husbands must prove to their rebellious wives that their intentions are pure, that they aren’t like all of those other men. Sheila reinforces this in her commentary:

| I strongly agree with the idea that this commenter put forward, about having an honest talk where you ask what you can do to help your spouse feel more loved. I
know this sounds backwards; you, after all, are the one who doesn’t feel loved. But the truth is that neither of you is connecting, and by showing her (or him) that you realize this, then your spouse will probably start to feel more positively towards the relationship, too.

A reader named Toni commented with the same message:

> It’s taken some time, but my husband and I have learned the very fine art of having a wonderful sex life. We both had to let go of expectations and misunderstandings along the way. One of the things I had to learn and accept about my husband is his absolute desire to please and satisfy me. I now understand that he doesn’t just want sex, he wants sex specifically with me! And the same goes for me! This helped me understand the difference between just having sex and the beauty of love making.

The larger comment received Sheila’s enthusiastic stamp of approval:

> Exactly, Toni! Great point. Thanks so much for sharing.

Another commenter weighs in with the same frame:

> I was like Toni for a long time, in that I didn’t understand that my husband wanted to make love to me – I thought he just wanted sex because he’s a guy, because that’s the message we get everywhere. That made me resentful. I still desired him – I have always desired only him – but I eventually started to feel disconnected when we had sex. I didn’t know why until I started reading your blog, Sheila.

Commenter Phyliss weighs in with a success story about how her withholding sex ultimately lead to the husband she had always wanted. Her happy ending involved the “Love Dare”, from the movie Fireproof.

I suggest reading the entire post and comment section, but I will warn you that it is a flat out rationalization hamster stampede with a great deal of random darting back and forth. One of the commenters actually recognized that her not submitting to her husband was causing her to not feel attracted to him, but she framed this as strictly his failure. He needs to learn game to please her; he doesn’t need to be restored to his rightful position as head of the household.

While the last wife I mentioned had part of it wrong, she definitely was on to something. Sheila herself brushes against this truth in her book Honey, I Don’t Have a Headache Tonight: Help for Women Who Want to Feel More In the Mood. Chapter 7 is tantalizingly titled “Who Wears the Pants in This Family?”. In that chapter, Sheila explains that the origins of Feminism were good and pure, but that it was corrupted by non Christian women in the 1960s. She does criticize the war on men/boys, and at one point suggests that women “wave the white flag” in the war of the sexes. But all of this strikes me as just touching on the surface of the issue. In the same chapter she tells us that while women should embrace their femininity, there are limits:
There’s also no need to become what he thinks is pretty. Some men, like my husband, have a preference for women in long hair. Keith, however, is oblivious to all of the mousse and blow drying that would be involved in making my long hair do anything other than hang there limply. I think it’s difficult for most women over thirty to pull off long hair with panache. Cut my hair and highlight it and I look much more sophisticated, and I feel far less frumpy!

One thing she does describe is how when she lets her husband lead her she feels attracted to him. On those occasions where he is twirling her around instead of twirling around doing chores for her, she feels a sudden increase in libido. For that brief moment, he leads and she follows. Instead of quoting the book I’ll let her husband describe it to you in one of their promotional videos:

Christian wives employing denial of sex have another problem, however. The Bible is very clear that this creates an opening for Satan. Yet if the husband isn’t kept sexually unsatisfied she will lose much of her power over him. This means not just denying him the sex which is his due as her husband, but ensuring that he doesn’t have any other outlets of release. And what of her own culpability for creating sexual temptation in her husband contrary to specific Scriptural injunction? The answer here is to invert the meaning of the command to not deny sex at risk of creating temptation for sexual sin. In this new twisted version of the Scripture, wives are commanded not to deny their husbands sex unless their husband is tempted by sexual sin. As Sheila explains in Chapter 4:

If your husband uses pornography, Marnie Ferre advocates refusing to have sex with him. Think of it like an alcoholic; you wouldn’t offer an alcoholic a drink, so you shouldn’t offer a pornography addict something that will feed his addiction, either. That may sound drastic, but he is committing adultery because he’s lusting after somebody else (see Matt. 5:28). And the more he has sex with pornography in his mind, the harder it becomes for him to change.

Aside from conflating viewing porn with porn addiction and adultery her analogy is simply not Biblical. Denying a husband who is tempted by porn the healthy sex which is his due as your husband is better compared to denying someone clean water because they are so thirsty they are tempted to drink out of the sewer. The rebellion of wives in this area is very clear, and Sheila knows it. Yet when Paul’s warning comes to pass, she takes that as reinforcing the wife’s justification for rebellion.

See Also:

- Reframing Christian marriage
- Reframing Christian marriage part 2: rebelling wives aren’t to blame for their own rebellion.
- Reframing Christian marriage part 3: husbands as helpmeets.
- Reframing Christian marriage part 4: judging the performance.
- A Tale of Two Beaches
Update from Ann.
by Dalrock | May 24, 2012 | Link

Just over a year ago I wrote a post in response to a reader who I call “Ann”, titled How to encourage a husband to show more leadership. Check out the original post to see Ann’s specific request.

Ann contacted me again a few weeks ago in the comments section of the page. I’ve pulled out the end of the note at her request, but here is the part she said was ok to share in a post:

Hello Dalrock,

This is “Ann” writing back to tell you how nicely things have been going after we had the exchange above, exactly one year from today (such a coincidence that I thought of writing to you today)

I took most of your advice and applied it to our daily life. As I went through it, new forms of encouraging him to lead also came up, naturally.

I can tell you there have been lots of changes in our relationship, all in a good way. They aren’t huge, dramatic changes but it’s more like stones setting in their place. I can observe my husband feels more free to do what he wants, to say what he wants even though people don’t really agree all the time. I see him give advice to his friends about these things and it makes me very happy, not to mention proud. I also noticed changes in myself, I noticed some mistakes I’ve been making and stopped making them.

Another great note, all this hasn’t decreased his respect for me one bit. Just because he sits at the head of the table or he decides where we’ll go, what we’ll do in most cases, he didn’t start ignoring me or treating me like I don’t matter. It is a great case to see that both things can exist together. He still respects and loves me the way I respect and love him, he still asks for my opinion on things that involve me and wants me to be happy.

So I wanted to thank you for taking my question seriously and responding me in a kind and helpful way.

As you can imagine this made my day.

Note: As I did for the original post I ask that all comments be respectful and kind in tone. I will remove any comments which aren’t respectful of Ann or her husband.
Scientists observe the rationalization hamster.
by Dalrock | May 25, 2012 | Link

Pick the badboy! He’ll make a great dad!

H/T to Mrs. Dalrock for finding the original article. From Live Science, Why Women Choose Bad Boys. The researcher has coined a new term, “ovulation goggles”:

When looking at the sexy cad through ovulation goggles, Mr. Wrong looked exactly like Mr. Right.

Check out the entire article, but note that they found scientific proof of the rationalization hamster in action:

“When asked about what kind of father the sexy bad boy would make if he were to have children with another woman, women were quick to point out the bad boy’s shortcomings,” said Durante. “But when it came to their own child, ovulating women believed that the charismatic and adventurous cad would be a great father to their kids.”

Hamster pic from Love hamster.
I’m not sure if I really need to include a spoiler alert for a movie from Y2K, but if you haven’t seen the movie *Unbreakable* and don’t want the plot spoiled read no further.

The other day my wife mentioned the scene below and I was thinking about the immense power of it. It strikes me as an example of vulnerability game*. For context, here is part of the plot summary from wikipedia:

The worst offender is a sadistic janitor holding a family hostage and torturing them inside their home. On a rainy night David follows the janitor back to the victims’ house. After freeing the children he is ambushed by the lurking janitor who throws him off a balcony into a pool below, where he nearly drowns but is rescued by the children. He then strangles the janitor. That night he is reconciled with Audrey and the following morning, secretly shows the newspaper article of his anonymous heroic act to his son.

*It is more an example of vulnerability game to the audience than to the wife, since she hasn’t just witnessed his feats of alpha strength the way the audience did. As Roissy explains the power is in the contrast and you don’t want to overdo it.
Professor Mentu was kind enough to link my entire Reframing Christian Marriage series in his post:

In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the oh my god I can’t believe she’s wearing those heels with that skirt!

I should warn you in advance that his language can be a touch rough at times. More importantly, for those who are uncomfortable with actual biblical marriage, suffer from an addiction to grooms, and/or lack the courage to hold your own church leadership accountable, you will feel an irresistible urge to attack the messenger. Don’t worry, this is only natural. After all, if only men like Professor Mentu were to change their ways the fact that your pastor would pass out if anyone showed him what the Bible actually says about marriage and divorce would become irrelevant. If after reading such churchian heresy you feel the need to repent, say 10 Man up and marry those sluts! and watch the movie Courageous while weeping in front of your family and you will be forgiven.

For those who crave additional penance, be sure to buy and read the books from Joel and Kathy Davisson as Bskillet has expertly taken out in his God Save My Hamster series:

- God Save My Hamster
- God Save My Hamster, Part 2: God Loves Frivolous Divorce
- God Save My Hamster, Part 3: Hamster Is Lord

Don’t miss Empathologicalism’s take on Joel and Kathy:

Your wife had an affair, its your fault
Check out Rollo/The Rational Male
by Dalrock | May 30, 2012 | Link

Many of you have noticed the new addition to my blogroll as well as Rollo's insightful comments here. If you are interested in the game side of the sphere I think you will really enjoy Rollo's blog.
The ubiquitous frame of hypergamy.

by Dalrock | June 3, 2012 | Link

In his latest post The Abdication Imperative Rollo explains how the subconscious programming of women defines our post feminist culture. In direct contrast to conventional wisdom (but in perfect alignment with our lying eyes), Rollo describes the cultural mechanisms put in place by women in an attempt to deal with their profound fear of commitment:

In an era when women’s sexual selection has been given exclusive control to the feminine, in an age when hypergamy has been loosed upon the world en force, social conventions had to be established to better silence the doubt that hypergamy makes women even more acutely aware of. And nowhere is this doubt more pronounced than in the confines of a monogamous commitment intended to last a lifetime.

The degree of denial here is so great that outside of the manosphere few would be able to accept that it is in fact women who naturally are terrified of (true) commitment. Part of this is projection by women onto men, and part of it is the deceptive nature of women’s sexuality. The feral woman’s preferred sexual experience is to be seduced by a series of men who prove their alphaness to her. Essential in this process is that her risk in being seduced is rewarded by the man’s commitment/investment in her. Women are driven to secure commitment from the men they mate with in order to secure the protection, resources, and parenting assistance she will require for the resulting children. This push to secure maximum commitment from men has been widely misinterpreted as women naturally wanting to commit in marriage. Our friend Glenn T. Stanton expressed the conventional wisdom in his Christian parenting book Secure Daughters, Confident Sons: How Parents Guide Their Children into Authentic Masculinity and Femininity.

Women want to marry and have daddies for their babies.

Actually he is technically correct. Women do want to marry. What they don’t (innately) want is to stay married. More accurately, they want the exclusive option to unilaterally end the marriage should they feel that they have better options. Women’s natural desire for marriage needs to be understood in the frame of the feral woman’s script. The flawed assumption is that a woman marrying naturally represents a woman who has found her rock and intends to stay there.
This may well be the case. Women are in fact capable of taking their marriage vows seriously. The problem is the assumption that this is the natural tendency for women, when the true natural tendency is quite different.
The way women experience this isn’t via a conscious desire to hop from man to man. A former commenter Paige shared her own insight into how a young woman experiences this:

Relating Pump-n-Dumping to Serial Monogamy assumes more self-awareness in the woman than she actually has. At the beginning the woman is convinced she will be in-love forever...if the romantic feelings decline she believes the relationship is no longer worthwhile for either partner. But she doesn’t just assume at the beginning that this will happen.

In fact, the woman’s preference would be to have the man she has sex with and obtains commitment from continue to prove to be the best man available to her. In this way she validates her past choice and provides stability for her existing children while experiencing the pleasure of being seduced/courted over and over again.

But this doesn’t mean that her natural inclination is to find one man and remain faithful to him. Marriage has moral force because it requires a moral choice from both men and women. For a man to remain faithful to his vows he has to suppress his natural urge for sexual variety. For a woman to remain faithful to her vows she must suppress her natural urge to constantly search for a better man to mate with and extract commitment from. She must also suppress her natural urge to attempt to dominate her husband, and to use denial of sex as a tool to do so.

What is so dangerous is the way the subconscious female imperative has corrupted our ability to perceive sexual morality. Glenn Stanton made the statement I quoted above in the context of excusing women for the fact that 40% of children in the US are now born to unwed mothers. Millions of children are doomed to grow up without a father because men like Stanton lack the moral clarity and courage to speak out on their behalf. To Mr.
Stanton, feral women are proof that men are failing to sufficiently man up. Since he assumes (contrary to both the Bible and science) that women are programmed to find a rock and stay there, women's failure to do so must indicate a lack of suitable rocks.

This misconception persists despite a mountain of both scientific and statistical evidence. Women are consistently the initiators of divorce, and at the same time they deny the very possibility of frivolous divorce. Yet we deny all indication of reality, in a misguided effort to shelter immoral women from moral judgment. It would be far kinder to all (including women), to tell the painful truth.

This tendency to rework morality to suit the female imperative has saturated our entire view of sexual morality, both inside and outside of marriage. In a recent post on Hooking Up Smart (HUS), Susan Walsh demonstrates the subconscious assumption that promiscuous sex is immoral if it isn’t conducted according to women’s preferred script. In her post Studies Reveal Players Like Their Women Dumb, Drunk and Easy, she describes men who fail to cater to the feminine imperative as predatory and exploitive:

An exploitative mating strategy is defined as an adaptive strategy to get sex when a cooperative strategy is deemed unreliable. Cooperative mating strategies are exemplified by mutual interest and consent. There are two primary reasons why males might employ exploitation tactics:

1. The female does not want to have sex, while the man does.
2. The female wants a relationship, while the man wants casual sex.

Keep in mind she is talking about men interacting with young women engaged in the hookup culture. These aren’t women who are taking great pains to find a husband; they are interested in casual sex. Such women are in fact the target audience of Susan’s site, which explains the very title of the blog. If her target audience was women looking to save their chastity for marriage, her site might instead be titled Marrying Right and Smart (MRS). But it is not MRS, it is HUS, and the preferred female form of promiscuity rules the day for the HUSies. They are looking to be seduced by a mysterious stranger, and then convert a no strings attached sexual experience into ongoing investment and commitment from the man. Should this mysterious stranger continue to win the HUSy’s favor, she will then demand he offer a greater level of (unilateral) commitment in the form of a marriage vow.

But as Susan points out there are men who refuse to play by this script. They maddeningly take the “no strings” part of the hookup bargain as seriously as the HUSies do, and don’t fool themselves into thinking random hookup partners are owed any more commitment/investment than they choose to freely offer. Such men must be shamed. Susan finds them guilty of being exploitive, and defines four different exploitive tactics employed by men in the hookup market with the help of a UT Austin academic paper. The first is seduction, which the UT Austin researcher defines as:

Sexual seduction is the act of charming or convincing someone into having sex. Seduction differs from courtship, which may include long-term commitment and investment as goals.
Implicit in the definition is the belief that women have the right to have men standing by at the ready to offer commitment following no strings attached sex. The pure insanity of this idea is only eclipsed by the fact that such thinking has made its way into academic research.

The second category of sexual exploitation is what Susan calls “verbal or nonverbal pressure”, which the UT Austin paper defines as:

> Pressure involves relentless persistence, threats, or coercion to induce an individual into having sex.

Notice how salesmanship is subtly compared with rape. Men pursuing their own desires in the SMP is deemed unacceptable. Only women can morally do so. Men who are moral are expected to understand this and only hookup based on the motivations of the HUSies.

The next category is deception, which the UT Austin paper defines as:

> Deception is dishonesty about intentions, likelihood of further commitment, or personal characteristics such as those sought by members of the opposite sex—a phenomenon well documented in human mating (Haselton, Buss, Oubaid, & Angleitner, 2005).

The profound absurdity of this is due to the deliberate vagueness of the hookup process. As Susan herself explains in the section What is Hooking UP? in her about page:

- Hooking up is a term to describe a sexual encounter between two people. It is a deliberately vague expression, and can mean making out, having intercourse, or anything in between.
- Hooking up has replaced traditional dating on college campuses, and has also become prevalent in the general population and culture. The hallmark of hooking up is the clear understanding between both parties that the encounter will be free from any expectations for further contact. It is designed to avoid the possibility of commitment. However, hooking up is still the primary pathway to a potential romantic relationship.
- The hookup script reverses the sexual norm; the pair becomes sexual first, before emotional intimacy or a relationship is established.

The only rule of hooking up is there is no expectation of commitment or relationship. Susan knows this, but she frames men who don’t offer HUSies commitment as deceptive, and therefore exploitive.

The last category of exploitation of HUSies is outright sexual assault. The need to add this to the list while subtly framing seduction as rape is very telling. Men who don’t play by the woman’s rules are guilty, and should be looked at as possible rapists. Straighten out young man, and offer those HUSies the commitment their gift of no strings sex entitles them to. But remember, you don’t own her, so don’t try to constrain her sexuality by assuming she should offer you commitment after she blows you in the back room.
Woman on a rock pic by kimba. Woman on stepping stones pic licensed as creative commons by Steve-h.
We need worthy adversaries.

by Dalrock | June 4, 2012 | Link

We need a stronger opponent to argue with.

Poking holes in Susan Walsh’s fallacies is like beating up your little red-headed cousin.

–Greenlander

Greenlander has an excellent point. The one thing the manosphere is sorely lacking is an intelligent adversary. As it stands, we perpetually appear to be knocking down straw men because the arguments we refute are all child’s play. Normally one would be tempted to assume that we are simply ignoring the thoughtful critics and pouncing on the inept ones. But if this is the case, whom are we ignoring?

The quality of our opponents is so low, when the SPLC declared the manosphere a group of thought criminals they were forced to list manboobz as the intellectual counterpart to us. I can only imagine the SPLC conversation:

SPLCer1:Seriously? That is who we are going to list as the counterpoint to the manosphere? I don’t use the word mangina, but come on, this guy is a mangina! Are you sure the manosphere didn’t make him up just to make us look like fools?

SPLCer2: I know. But who else are we going to point to? He’s all we’ve got!

However the actual conversation went, the SPLC ended up holding their nose and listing manboobz in their official denunciation of the manosphere:

The so-called “manosphere” is peopled with hundreds of websites, blogs and forums dedicated to savaging feminists in particular and women, very typically American women, in general. Although some of the sites make an attempt at civility and try to back their arguments with facts, they are almost all thick with misogynistic attacks that can be astounding for the guttural hatred they express. What follows are brief descriptions of a dozen of these sites. Another resource is the Man Boobz website (manboobz.com), a humorous pro-feminist blog (its tagline is “Misogyny: I Mock It”) that keeps a close eye on these and many other woman-hating sites.

True to form, manboobz rose to the occasion with a new post titled: Men’s Rights Activists, or Kitten Haters? You decide. Don’t take my word for it, click on the link and see for yourself.

But things may be looking up. A feminist calling herself jaimerapp on youtube has created a video to announce that she knows how to use the internet. This isn’t much, but it is at least promising. Sooner or later a feminist who knows how to use the internet is bound to make a point, even if only by accident. Until then, we can only hope. Godspeed jaimerapp.
H/T U Man
After nearly three years Ferdinand is hanging it up. He has been an organizing force in the manosphere and the larger sphere which he describes as the “alternative blogosphere”. As with most bloggers in the sphere, I am grateful to Ferdinand for the crucial help he provided driving awareness of my blog in the early stages. Just as I was starting to hit my stride Ferdinand graciously began prominently linking to my best posts each week. Sundays were something I looked forward to, wondering which posts Ferdinand would link and how much traffic would follow. As my blog grew he continued to modify his rotation, doing the same for other promising bloggers who needed the awareness more than I did.

I have no idea how he managed to read all of the blogs on such diverse topics as he did. If you have ever reviewed his weekly link roundups, you know what I mean. Given the inherent contradictions, Ferdinand didn’t focus on blogs he agreed with, but on blogs which he thought were making interesting and valuable points.

Ferdinand was also willing to help upstarts such as myself when we asked for help. He has been in my eyes the unofficial godfather of the manosphere. Both times I asked for his help he provided the visibility that only he could deliver. The first time I asked was for help exposing Match.com’s sale of divorce to middle aged women. The second time I asked was for help exposing the Christian tendency to excuse wife initiated divorce.

Thank you Ferdinand, and good luck on your future ventures.
Choice addiction poster child

by Dalrock | June 5, 2012 | Link

Back in April commenter PB was kind enough to bring the following Daily Mail article to my attention: I dated 50 men in six months (and STILL didn’t find love). In it choice addiction poster child Pippa Wright describes how she is consuming mass quantities of low level investment from men in a futile effort to compensate for the lack of true investment which only accompanies true commitment:

Please don’t judge me: I’m not a woman with loose morals. Like so many modern single women, I’m a multi-dater. I’m one of a new breed adopting a scattergun approach — packing as many men as possible into our diaries in an effort to find love.

In the past six months I have seen 50 men...

In many ways her story isn’t new. I previously shared the story of the post marital spinster blogger who went on over 100 first dates in just one year. That blogger hasn’t updated her site since August of last year, but since her site is still up I’m guessing she still hasn’t found the replacement for the husband she discarded in her early 20s. In another post I described yet another divorcée who went on 87 first dates in two years.

Miss Wright’s story is also very similar to Kate Bolick’s tale. Like Miss Bolick, Miss Wright never married and claims to be pushing forty. I say claims because her stated age of 38 doesn’t jive with the pictures in the article. Miss Wright can date as many men as she likes, but she still unfortunately looks like 20 miles of bad road. The carousel has been extremely unkind to her. Additionally her stated age of 38 also doesn’t fit with her description of her dating history. The only “boyfriend” she mentions having is an American man she hooked up with while drunk and dumped after 6 months twenty years ago. While it isn’t impossible that she would still be pining for the man she dumped at 18, it seems more likely that it was the man she dumped at 28.

At any rate, let Miss Wright serve as a cautionary tale for would be carousel riders. The time passes far faster than you know, and you can’t fill the void left by not having real commitment from a quality man by substituting volume of fleeting attention from men who will never be invested in you.

Her tale and the tales of other women should also be a caution to young men. Beware the looky-loos who will use your willingness to foot the cost of courtship against you. While women like this may not be the average, the sheer number of dates they go on means they will be very much over represented in the average dating man’s experience.
What HUSies want.
by Dalrock | June 6, 2012 | Link

In my previous post The ubiquitous frame of hypergamy the discussion has turned towards what feral women actually want. Yohami offered this insight:

What I kept telling to Susan (and wouldn’t listen). Yes, girls go f*** and they want relationships. However “relationship” doesn’t mean lifelong commitment and monogamy. Relationship doesn’t even mean love. Relationship only means there’s enough time and space to vert a lot of emotions into it, from the shiny ones to the darker ones, whatever applies. Pure sex is insipid. Emotional (drama) sex is yummy. Put dramatic sex on hands of a vigorous confident man who can take her to dramatic places and she’s on fire. No drama, no vigorous sex? she’s outta here towards brighter or darker places.

My one disagreement with Yohami’s analysis is that I think the women do want love. They want the man to fall in love with them as a sign of his investment in them, as a way to achieve the benefits of commitment without committing themselves. They can also use this to claim they are more moral than those sluts who are doing it the wrong way. They also want to fall in love with the man, because this provides the very emotional drama they crave.

Yohami’s description reminds me of a comment I left on Rollo’s site, which Rollo was kind enough to quote in his post 50 Shades of Twilight. Here is my take on what feral women want:

I think there is another side to the same coin. These women don’t just want to build a better beta, they want to tame the alpha. In fact, I think the former is just another way they are trying to approach the latter. They want to take an inherently unsafe activity and make it safe. They want to submit to a man without having to submit; they want a man who can tame their feral self. They want him to trip their danger signals. Even better if he is a stranger from a strange land.

They want this all to happen without giving up their freedom; they want to play this out in the context of serial monogamy, so they can feel loved while also claiming their promiscuity is moral. They want to lose control to a string of strangers who have all of the hallmarks of very dangerous men, and they want a promise that this will always end well.

They want to know that this will be safe, without it losing the excitement of it feeling unsafe. They are telling men to build a sort of serial monogamy amusement park where they can ride the roller coaster and experience the fear of falling or crashing, while knowing that just behind the scenes grown ups are actually in charge and are responsible for them safely feeling unsafe.

One more thing. As I mentioned above they don’t want to be hemmed in. So instead
of building an actual amusement park, they want roller coasters to spring up randomly in the same exact circumstances where the real danger they mimic would appear. They want to be driving their car on the freeway one instant, and the next experience the fear of careening out of control. They want to impulsively jump off the edge of the Grand Canyon and have a parachute appear and deploy at the last minute. And all they ask is your guarantee that all of this will be safe.
When people consider the sexual revolution over the last 100 to 150 years, the invention of the concept of “boyfriend” tends to be discounted. Other milestones tend to be given greater consideration, and while all of them are relevant, the profoundly disruptive nature of the new concept of boyfriend shouldn’t be overlooked.

**Note:** I don’t claim to be an authoritative expert on the history of courtship. What I’m sharing here is what I’ve been able to piece together based on conventional wisdom and some moderate searching on the web. If you can provide sources to information which I’ve omitted I will be in your debt.

As best as I can tell, until roughly 100-150 years ago courtship in the west looked something like the diagram to the right. A woman looking to marry would spend supervised time with a number of gentleman callers who had been vetted by her family. After some time she would select from the available men, with the formal proposal coming from the man himself.

One example of courtship rituals used in the past is the courting candle. These allowed the father of the young woman to determine a set amount of supervised time which a caller could spend with his daughter:
When the daughter’s suitor came calling, the father lit the candle in a sitting room where the couple conversed. When the candles burnt to the metal at the top of the candle holder, it was time for the suitor to promptly leave.

Note that not only did the suitor not take the young woman out on exciting dates, but there was also no expectation that the young woman should fall in love with a series of men before deciding whom to marry. Yet somehow this latter concept has become sacrosanct, even amongst the most traditional minded.

From the point of view of the feminine imperative, something had to give. How was a Victorian woman supposed to feed the hypergamous beast which lay beneath her prim and proper exterior? An entirely new creation was needed, something which previously had lacked even a name. Between 1895 and 1900, that name was created. Over time this new term bridged the gap between the concepts of illicit lover and husband. It solved a number of problems for the feminine imperative, providing three essential benefits which previously were only available in (once and done) marriage. Inventing the concept of boyfriend created a socially approved mechanism for women to obtain/experience the following three things without having to choose/commit to one single man:

- Sex (recently).
- Romance/love.
- Status (having a man publicly invested in her).

Of the three, the last tends to be overlooked by the game side of the manosphere. Women’s primal desire for the status accrued by a formal relationship with a worthy man, especially marriage, is a counterforce against the hypergamous fear of commitment. This counterforce appears less significant than it really is because women assume they can have marriage for the taking, at least until it is too late. The concept of boyfriend finally allowed unmarried women an option for a sort of marriage lite, where the status and morality of marriage were on offer in diluted form.

When looking at the modern SMP, the introduction of the hookup culture is what is most striking to most observers. However, the innovative concept of boyfriend still plays a central role in providing the essential stamp of propriety the feminine imperative requires. In fact, the boyfriend is the glue which holds the entire process together:
The criticality of the boyfriend step is evident in the amount of energy directed towards ensuring that hookups result in as Susan Walsh would say “relationships”. Random groping/sex isn’t something one would logically think should result in men offering to be boyfriends, but it must occur for women to be able to both engage in unrestrained hypergamy and expect the eventual status which comes only with marriage. Anyone even remotely threatening this crucial step from hookup to boyfriend can therefore expect to draw the outsized wrath of white knights and slut apologists everywhere.

Even modern divorce culture can be seen as an attempt by women to expand the class of boyfriend. This in fact is the natural state feral women seem to want to push to from either direction. In the case of hookups and dates, women will attempt push men they retain interest in up into the boyfriend position. In the case of a husband, feral women are pushing them down back towards the (ex) boyfriend position:
Note that even here, the position of husband is still maintained as actual husbands are demoted to boyfriends. This is because there is still greater status associated with the concept of lifetime monogamy. Once she finds “the one”, she still wants to reserve the full status of wife for herself.

See Also: How young should a woman marry?
Note to feminists: Only protest culture of violence if there isn’t actually a culture of violence.

by Dalrock | June 8, 2012 | Link

Given the Associated Press’ previous bizarre stories out of Cairo this may or may not turn out to be the truth, but USA Today is trumpeting: Mob attacks women at anti-sexual assault rally in Egypt. From the AP article:

CAIRO (AP) – A mob of hundreds of men assaulted women holding a march demanding an end to sexual harassment Friday, with the attackers overwhelming the male guardians and groping and molesting several of the female marchers in Cairo’s Tahrir Square.

For anyone who has ever wondered what would happen if feminists ever protested rape culture where such a culture actually existed, this would seem to be the answer.
Badger’s outstanding post “29/31": A Time-Travel Video About The Wall had me wanting to see if the 2011 Census data was out. I was in luck, but it doesn’t look good for the ladies hoping to leap from the carousel into marriage.

In the past I’ve shown ten year snapshots side by side. This time I decided to see what the yearly trend looks like for the key age brackets. All data presented is for White Non-Hispanic women in the US. Other races and/or countries will look different. I have been focusing on White women because this avoids the possibility of racial demographic shifts adding confusion, and the vast bulk of the “will I be able to marry?” hand-wringing in the media is coming from White women. If anyone wants to compile this for another race or country please let me know and I’ll link to it.

When I considered the possibility of a marriage strike two years ago I angered a number of readers for not being convinced*. Some readers even accused me and/or the US Census of fudging the data. At the time the trend of reduced marriage rates was very clear for women under 35, but it wasn’t there for women 35 and over. 2009 was the most recent year data was available then, and as you can see from the chart above the percent of never married 35-39 year olds went up by only 0.8% between 1999 and 2009. In the last two years it has gone up dramatically from 11.8% to 14%. At the same time, the trends for the younger age brackets have all continued as well**. While we still can’t know for certain how all of this will
be resolved, the more data that comes in the worse it looks for women planning on pulling the marriage ripcord at the last minute.

It is hard to say how much of the recent trend is driven by the economic downturn since 2008. However, the problem for the women who delayed marriage until the last minute is they don’t have the flexibility of time. Their fertility, youth, and beauty don’t care about the business cycle.

The compounding problem which seems likely is that as they and their peers become more urgent in their search for a husband, the power in the marriage market could shift from women to men. Consider the real estate bubble in places like Southern California a decade ago. Buyers who found the home they wanted would offer asking price or at times above asking price out of fear that someone else would snatch their dream home out from under them. However, once the bubble burst the psychology reversed, and now sellers are the ones urgent about closing the deal.

The makings of a possible spinster panic would seem to come from the way the flow of would be brides is backing up in the pipeline. Late 30s is the absolute last minute for women to expect to marry and have children. From what we have seen the husband panic tends to set in during the late 20s to very early 30s. This makes the recent rise in never married 35-39 year olds striking. The picture below takes a closer look at the recent trend for women in their 30s:

Note the relationship between the data points in the green and blue ovals. The women in their late 30s today are the same women we have data for in their early 30s five years prior. What the respective trends in the circled areas show is that in the last few years the rate of marriage for mid 30s women has been declining. This must be the case because when we look at these same cohorts five years prior they all started with roughly the same levels of marriage.

What should make this albeit short trend alarming for marriage delayers is that there is also a dramatic increase of younger never married women making their way through the pipe. Imagine never married women in their thirties as water in a bucket. At the bottom of the
bucket there is a hole (marriage), and at the top is a pipe pouring additional unmarried women in each year. The hole in the bottom of the bucket has become constricted, and we know that the flow filling the bucket will be increasing based on the increasing numbers of unmarried women in their late 20s.

*I’m still not convinced what we are seeing is driven primarily by men deliberately avoiding marriage. I can’t prove this either way, but my own sense is that it is being driven initially by young women deliberately postponing marriage. This movement to delay marriage by women has had unintended consequences. Part of the group of men they would traditionally have married have registered the lack of interest by young women in marriage and have not seen the incentive to do the hard work to put themselves in a position to be a provider. Additionally, as men get older their SMV increases, especially in their late 20s and early 30s. At some point for many men marrying an ageing carouser/career woman seems to become less attractive than sticking it out in the dating market with their own rising SMV.

** I left off the 20-24 age bracket from the chart above because it changes the scale, making it more difficult to see the trend for the older ages. You can see the same chart with the younger group included here.

See Also: Committed to the trail
Never marrieds piling up part 2; what should I do?  
by Dalrock | June 11, 2012 | Link

In my last post I shared the latest stats on marriage for white women in the US. The key takeaway is that it seems very likely that a large number of women intending to only delay marriage will end up losing out on the opportunity to marry. The very fact which makes young women delaying marriage feel safe (so many of their peers are doing the same thing) is ironically the source of the risk.

But what if you are a woman who wants to marry? How can you make use of this information? The first thing you need to do is memorize all of the following bits of folk wisdom:

- You have all of the time in the world.
- God has the perfect man already picked for you, and He will reveal this man in His time.
- The last one down the aisle wins.
- “Having a fabulous single life leads to an even better marriage later” (see link above for source)
- Now is the time to travel, date lots of men, and find yourself!
- Never settle!

Get a set of notecards and write all of these sayings down on them and keep the cards with you at all times. This is critical, because when one of your peers starts talking about getting off the carousel and taking her husband hunt seriously, you will need these sayings to talk her out of it. Right now you have information which the market hasn’t fully processed; you need to keep it that way while you snatch up the best available man.

**Don’t settle; get the best husband you can.**

The last piece of folk wisdom in the bullet list above is actually correct, but you can use it to confuse your competition. It doesn’t have to work forever, it just has to stun her for a bit while you take care of business. Instead of settling, what you want to do is figure out what your priorities are, and then compare those against your legitimate marriage prospects.

As a thought exercise, imagine the best husband you can reasonably expect to attract. Think of the actual marriage proposals you have received in the last few years. If you have none for reference, you will need to be painfully honest about which of the men who expressed interest in you were likely to want to marry you. The more honest you are here the better a head start you will have over your peers. Now imagine this best case husband. If you look closely, you will notice other women around him. That’s right:

**Those bitches are trying to steal your man!**

Given the urgency involved, it is critical that you stop dating for fun or for a boyfriend, and start instead looking seriously for a husband.
Now that you understand what is going on you need to also consider the risks. Like the salmon in the picture your path to find a mate is known by others. This is especially true if you’ve waited until the last minute. Not all men in the dating market are interested in marriage. You need to make sure you don’t waste your time with these men while the bitches are busy stealing your man. This is why being honest about the kind of man you can attract for marriage is so crucial. Men like Marcos are looking for greedy marks who themselves are looking to con an unsuspecting man into marriage with the early offer of sex. Don’t focus on the too good to be true men, because they probably are.

The last piece of advice I’ll offer is to expand your net. If you have been assuming that you will be meeting better marriage prospects in the future, scrutinize that assumption. If there is reason to still believe this, what can you do to make this happen today? You don’t want to rush into a marriage you or your husband won’t be willing to stick with, but you do want to find a way to expedite the arrival of the mystery man you have so far been patiently waiting for. This might mean moving to another city or even state, but it could just be getting more involved in activities where you think your future husband is likely to meet you.

See Also:

- How young should a woman marry?
- Advice to a woman in her 30s looking to marry.
- Calibrating attraction by controlling the venue.

Bear photo by Azov.
When it comes to the recent invention of the concept of boyfriend, the most absurd incarnation of the concept is the form nearly all modern conservative Christians eagerly embrace; the celibate boyfriend. The near universal and enthusiastic acceptance of this idea by Christians is fascinating because it is entirely unbiblical. Christians seem to have convinced themselves that it is biblical however, since it doesn’t involve sex. With their adoption of the celibate boyfriend template, the new devout Christian path to marriage typically looks like:

The chaste boyfriend offers virginal (or “re”virginal) Christian women two of the three benefits boyfriends provide to their nonvirginal peers. While they aren’t getting sex, they receive the romance/love as well as the status which comes with having a boyfriend. Interestingly this new creation is the perfect opposite of another recent invention, the friend with benefits. While friends with benefits receive sex without love, romance, or the status which comes with investment, celibate boyfriends get to offer love and investment without receiving sex.

Not surprisingly most men aren’t anxious to sign up for such an arrangement. This is the subject of periodic shaming and hand wringing, as we’ve seen recently with the media coverage of Olympic runner Lolo Jones. The headline by People tells us: Olympian Lolo Jones: Being a Virgin Hinders Finding a Boyfriend. Likewise CBS has a story titled Lolo Jones Admits Trouble Keeping Boyfriends Because of her Virginity. Note the shaming offered at the very
Interestingly Lolo never actually uses the term *boyfriend* in the interview, so it isn’t clear if this is actually what she is looking for. From the short soundbite it sounds like she may instead be looking for a husband.

Either way this leaves the question; why would men want to sign up for the role of celibate boyfriend? This is a role which requires the man to be exclusive to the woman without receiving sex or a promise of marriage, and it isn’t even *biblical*. 
New and improved Christianity, inner goddess with extra moxie edition!

by Dalrock | June 15, 2012 | Link

Let the woman *learn in silence* lead with all subjection *moxie*. But I suffer not *command* a woman to teach, nor *and* to usurp *have* authority over the man, but *and* to be in silence. *sassy!*

-1 Timothy 2:11-12, New Inner Goddess Translation

Laura Grace Robins started it all with: Commanded to Operate Like a Princess. Bskillet81 followed up with: EAPs on Parade: Christian Slut Walk or Demonic Goddess Worship? ballistic74 then brought us: Proof of Arrogance and Pride.

After the above excellent work, I thought there was nothing left to say on the topic. Then I found the *I Am Woman* page and video from the same church. From the *I Am Woman* about page:

You are managing all life throws at you and making it to tomorrow. You are like a ninja – able to see many things happen and react to them all!

...

In a world that makes it seem arrogant to believe in yourself and breeds a lack of self confidence — we need to rise up and celebrate who we are!

...

I am as tall as an amazon — and I still wear heels.
I am afraid that you will think this is bragging, but I love my sisters enough to lead the way and do it anyway.
I am a committed lover of Jesus.
I am good in a crisis.
I am loyal.
I am an empowerer of my sisters.
...
I am a princess because I am a daughter of the King.
I am a little crazy, and I like it that way.
...

What are you? You are woman. Beautiful. Unique. Special.

Tell us who you are and join the I am Woman Sisterhood...

And then there is the *I Am Woman* youtube video:
Also don’t miss Professor Mentu’s Gimme That Old Time Girligion!
I started this blog on Father’s Day in 2010, with no idea of what was ahead. My hope then was the same as my hope now, to influence the conversation. I don’t expect to directly change anyone’s mind, but if I can influence the conversation I can be a part of something larger (along with you), and I do believe it will ultimately change the way people consider the issues we discuss.

Along the way the blog has been both recognized and snubbed, and traffic has grown beyond anything I ever would have imagined. This time last year I was stunned when the cumulative hit count passed half a million. A few months ago it passed the two million hit mark.

Recently I was honoured with a degree in Red Pill Pharmacy. (Thank you University of Man)

Yeah, I know it doesn’t really mean anything, but be honest; you want one too!

My sincere thanks to everyone who has and continues to contribute to the conversation we are having here. While the system won’t be changing any time soon, we (in the larger sphere) pose a real threat to the status quo as we challenge corruption and individuals choose to act in their own best interest.
As this is an anniversary of sorts, I present the gift of linkage:

- Haley: New Boundless blogger to men: “Yep, still your fault.”
  Men, you should stop abusing your wives. Women, let me think of something you shouldn’t do.
- University of Man: Chick Tease: Using a Woman’s Own Tactics Against Her
- W.F. Price: The Truth About the American Nun Issue
- Patriactionary: Father Knows Best: Homage to Quiplinks Edition
- Full of Grace Seasoned with Salt: Women are Mightier than Lions.....Hear them ROAAR!
- Captain Capitalism: $700 Billion in Dating Wealth Transfers Applying the “Well Rounded” Argument to Fathers Amazing
- Badger: Body Language: The Beer Shield The Subsidizer’s Dilemma, or Squeezing the Sexual Marketplace From Both Ends
- CMD-N: Activism Shmactivism

Happy Father’s Day
I haven’t done a Brothers Grimm post in over a year; starting with this post I intend to rectify that.

One of the common themes in the Grimm tales is the importance of hard work. While laziness in general is called out for derision, special attention is given to housework. You can see this with Cinderella and King Roughbeard. Our tale today also stresses the importance of housework, but even more so it is focused on combating the whispers (with the twist that one could argue that it is aimed at men). Since this is a short tale and to the best of my knowledge in the public domain, I will include the entire story below. To make it easier to read I won’t place it in blockquotes. The version below is the translation from Margaret Taylor in 1884. Enjoy.

Note: If you are used to the Disney tales the original Grimm tales are nothing like them. They frequently bring home their harsh message with great force, and the tale below is no exception.

The Mouse, the Bird, and the Sausage

Once on a time a mouse, a bird, and a sausage became companions, kept house together, lived well and happily with each other, and wonderfully increased their possessions. The bird’s work was to fly every day into the forest and bring back wood. The mouse had to carry water, light the fire, and lay the table, but the sausage had to cook.

He who is too well off is always longing for something new. One day, therefore, the bird met with another bird, on the way, to whom it related its excellent circumstances and boasted of them. The other bird, however, called it a poor simpleton for his hard work, but said that the two at home had good times. For when the mouse had made her fire and carried her water, she went into her little room to rest until they called her to lay the table. The sausage stayed by the pot, saw that the food was cooking well, and, when it was nearly time for dinner, it rolled itself once or twice through the broth or vegetables and then they were buttered, salted, and ready. When the bird came home and laid his burden down, they sat down to dinner, and after they had had their meal, they slept their fill till next morning, and that was a splendid life.

Next day the bird, prompted by the other bird, would go no more into the wood, saying that he had been servant long enough, and had been made a fool of by them, and that they must change about for once, and try to arrange it in another way. And, though the mouse and the sausage also begged most earnestly, the bird would have his way, and said it must be tried. They cast lots about it, and the lot fell on the sausage who was to carry wood, the mouse became cook, and the bird was to fetch water.
What happened? The little sausage went out towards the wood, the little bird lighted the fire, the mouse stayed by the pot and waited alone until little sausage came home and brought wood for next day. But the little sausage stayed so long on the road that they both feared something was amiss, and the bird flew out a little way in the air to meet it. Not far off, however, it met a dog on the road who had fallen on the poor sausage as lawful booty, and had seized and swallowed it. The bird charged the dog with an act of barefaced robbery, but it was in vain to speak, for the dog said he had found forged letters on the sausage, on which account its life was forfeited to him.

The bird sadly took up the wood, flew home, and related what he had seen and heard. They were much troubled, but agreed to do their best and remain together. The bird therefore laid the cloth, and the mouse made ready the food, and wanted to dress it, and to get into the pot as the sausage used to do, and roll and creep amongst the vegetables to mix them; but before she got into the midst of them she was stopped, and lost her skin and hair and life in the attempt.

When the bird came to carry up the dinner, no cook was there. In its distress the bird threw the wood here and there, called and searched, but no cook was to be found! Owing to his carelessness the wood caught fire, so that a conflagration ensued, the bird hastened to fetch water, and then the bucket dropped from his claws into the well, and he fell down with it, and could not recover himself, but had to drown there.

Update: The version my wife grew up with was translated by MRS. H. B. PAULL in 1885. That version ends with:

And all this happened because one little bird listened to another who was jealous of the happy little family at home, and from being discontented and changing their arrangements they all met with their death.
The restaurant analogy takes on a life of its own.

by Dalrock | June 21, 2012 | Link

Last week I offered a rough analogy explaining why I don’t try to convince men who aren’t interested in marriage that they really should want it. Anonymous Reader added on to this analogy with his own excellent comment. This week fellow bloggers Private Man and Hawaiian Libertarian liked the combined analogy enough to create posts regarding it. Private Man kicked it off with his post: The Marriage Analogy – A Must Read. Hawaiian Libertarian added further to the discussion with is post Perspective Makes a Difference, with his own analysis and a collection of follow on comments. Check out both posts if you are interested.
Updated U.S. Custody and Child Support Data (2009)
by Dalrock | June 22, 2012 | Link

**Edit:** For the latest data, see [this post](http://www.TheRedArchive.com).

This is an update of the data I posted in August last year. See the previous page for details on where the data through 2007 came from. I added 2009 data from the report [here](http://www.TheRedArchive.com) and updated the charts. The basic narrative is unchanged:

It starts with who is granted custody:

![Custody Breakdown by Sex](http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/childsupport/reports.html)

For those few fathers granted custody, they are less likely than mothers who are granted custody to be awarded support:
For those few fathers who are awarded support, they are awarded less on average than mothers who are awarded support:

In the past the system was also biased against fathers in the percent owed which was collected. This looks to be a wash now:
However due to bias in amount awarded, the average amount received by fathers is still lower:

As a result of all of these biases against fathers, the percentage of all child support dollars paid is extremely biased:
The 2009 data seems to confirm that the 2007 data was an anomaly, and didn’t represent a trend towards slightly less bias against fathers regarding total dollars received. My best guess is the 2007 anomaly was due to sampling error, because the change in the population of parents receiving support shouldn’t be great over such short time periods.

Here is the excel version of the spreadsheet I used to create the charts. The original spreadsheet is from Libre Office so there may be some artifacts from the conversion. As always, please let me know if you find any errors in my calculations.

See Also: The child support catastrophe
Why?

by Dalrock | June 22, 2012 | Link

No man ever said on his deathbed I wish I had spent more time in the office.

–Unknown

Why did you have children if you find them to be a burden?

Why do you think the high powered roles of the private and public sector (or any job) exist to ensure that you have a self satisfying biography while “having it all”?

You wanted to run with the bulls, so why don’t you shut up and run with the bulls?

Anne-Marie Slaughter in *the Atlantic*:

**Why Women Still Can’t Have It All**

(H/T gdgm+ and Hollenhund)

**See Also**: Feminist Scavenger Hunt
Reviewing the data on child support and the discussion which followed has me thinking we need an image to break through the frame that child support is only fair and for the children. Child support at its core is about placing a cash bounty on the removal of fathers from the home of their children. With this in mind, I’d love to have an old west style wanted poster, something to the effect of:

WANTED

LOYAL FATHERS

CASH BOUNTY PAID FOR THE EVICTION OF EACH FATHER FROM HIS CHILDREN’S LIVES.

It would be crucial that the entire work be new and free of copyright by someone else. This rules out the easy to generate ones on the web. If anyone is interested in helping with this, let me know and I’ll email you at the address you include when you submit your post (don’t include your email address in the plain text of your post).
Susan Walsh did a post the other week titled Your Chances of Divorce May Be Much Lower Than You Think. In it she shared some stats on divorce rates from the 2010 State of Our Unions report by The National Marriage Project at the University of Virginia. Overall I think Susan is doing a service by sharing more information on the question of divorce, but I also think that this is a complex question and it would be easy for her readers to walk away with a misunderstanding of the true nature of the risk of divorce. For example, Susan writes (emphasis mine):

So far, Millennials voice more favorable attitudes about marriage, despite a constant drumbeat of gloomy news about marriage from the media. The common myth that the overall national divorce rate is 50% is just one example. (It’s 40%, and has been declining steadily since 1980. That’s bad enough - why exaggerate?) Additionally, the politically correct bias so prevalent in the media renders much of the coverage deceptive at best.

Susan doesn’t cite her source in busting this “myth”, but this question is something which is anything but settled. The very report she cites later in the post puts it this way on P 72:

Overall, the chances remain very high—between 40 and 50 percent—that a first marriage started in recent years will end in either divorce or separation before one partner dies.

On page 73 (the same page Susan pulled her other stats from) they go even farther:

By now almost everyone has heard that the national divorce rate is nearly 50 percent of all marriages. This is true for the married population as a whole.

The initial quoted range of between forty and fifty percent lifetime divorce rates roughly fits what the NY Times reported in an article on divorce rates in April of 2005 (H/T Half Sigma). One of the researchers they interviewed stated that the fifty percent estimate was “very sensible”:

Dr. Larry Bumpass, an emeritus professor of sociology at the University of Wisconsin’s Center for Demography and Ecology, has long held that divorce rates will eventually reach or exceed 50 percent. In an interview, he said that it was “probably right” that the official divorce statistics might fall below 50 percent, but that the rate would still be close.

“About half is still a very sensible statement,” he said.

However, Susan’s larger point (and Half Sigma’s as well) is that divorce rates vary widely by demographics. The very high overall divorce rates can be misleading because of this. This is a valid point, although even here the good news is bitter sweet.

Whistling through the graveyard?
by Dalrock | June 25, 2012 | Link

www.TheRedArchive.com
First the good news:

College educated women have historically exhibited a far lower divorce rate than the population at large. The following data is from Figure 1 on page 19 of the State of Our Unions report:

In the NY Times article they estimate that roughly 60% of all marriages which end in divorce do so within the first ten years of marriage. Assuming this is correct, this would give us a rough lifetime divorce risk estimate for college educated women of under 20% (11% / .6 = 18.3%). Compared with the consensus average of 40-50% average lifetime divorce risk, this is truly impressive.

The Marriage Project authors attribute this much lower divorce rate among college educated women to what they call the “success sequence”:

...highly educated Americans (and their children) adhere devoutly to a “success sequence” norm that puts education, work, marriage, and childbearing in sequence, one after another, in ways that maximize their odds of making good on the American Dream and obtaining a successful family life.

This overlooks the strong relationship between the age of the wife and the rate of divorce. College educated women tend to marry later, and this reduces the incentive they perceive to divorce in the form of remarriage prospects. This also overlooks the impact of IQ. Sorting by education is very close to sorting by IQ, yet the terms “IQ” and “intelligence” aren’t used anywhere in the report. This is especially problematic because they (and Susan) also report lowered divorce risks for a number of other characteristics, many of which tend to be strongly correlated with IQ, such as income, out of wedlock births, and coming from an intact family. Someone who didn’t understand the nature of the data might not notice that if you add up all of the reductions in risk the report lists in the table on page 72 (and Susan lists in her post)
the total risk reduction would be 131%, which would mean a negative risk of divorce. The authors of the report make this worse by following the table with the statement:

So if you are a reasonably well-educated person with a good income, your parents stayed together, you are religious at all, and you marry after age 25 without having a baby first, your chances of divorce are very low indeed.

Very low indeed? Why not simply report what the actual reduction in risk would be?

IQ has been found to have strong and at times contradictory impacts on divorce rates, which in itself should cause at least some pause. In *The Bell Curve*, Herrnstein and Murray shared their results from analyzing a longitudinal sample of Americans. They found that higher parental Socio Economic Status (SES) tended to increase 5 year divorce rates, while higher IQs tended to lower 5 year divorce rates. Given the strong correlation between parental SES and the IQ of the child this shows two conflicting forces at work in Americas Upper Middle Class. They also looked at the question of education and divorce rates (emphasis mine):

It is clear to all researchers who examine the data that higher education is associated with lower levels of divorce. This was certainly true of the NLSY, where the college sample (persons with a bachelor’s degree, no more and no less) had a divorce rate in the first five years of marriage that was less than half that of the high school sample: 7 percent compared to 19 percent. But this raw outcome is deceptive. **Holding some critical other things equal—IQ, socioeconomic status, age, and date of marriage—the divorce rate for the high school graduates in the first five years of marriage was lower than for college graduates.**

They also found that IQ played a huge role in divorce rates within the college educated group. Those who were college educated with an IQ of 100 had a 5 year divorce rate of 28%. Those who were college educated with an IQ of 130 had a five year divorce risk of only 9%.

As you can see, the authors of *The Bell Curve* found that IQ swamped education as a predictor of divorce rates. Yet IQ is an academically taboo topic and therefore is seldom mentioned. This is something to keep in mind whenever looking at risk factors for divorce which might be correlated to IQ.

As I mentioned above the impact of IQ on divorce risks can be contradictory. Researcher J Dronkers investigated the impact of IQ on divorce in his paper *Is there a relation between divorce risk and intelligence? Evidence from the Netherlands* He found that when divorce was first introduced in the Netherlands (and was therefore “novel”), higher IQ was associated with higher rates of divorce. However, once divorce became common the opposite effect was observed. Since Herrnstein and Murray were looking at the impact of IQ on divorce in the US after divorce had already become common, their results fit with what was observed in the Netherlands.

**Now the bad news:**

What Susan doesn’t mention when referencing the *Marriage Project* report is the full title of
the report. When she refers to the report as “The State of Our Unions, 2010;” what she leaves off after the colon is the rest of the title: *When Marriage Disappears*. The same chart which shows that ten year divorce rates are down to 11% for college educated women also shows that for women with a high school diploma ten year divorce rates have remained essentially steady at 37%. If we apply the 60% estimate here, this would mean that roughly 62% of these marriages would ultimately end in divorce. The same basic rates apply for high school dropouts as well. This means that marriage is a foolish proposition for men considering marriage with 70% of American women. Try to push more diners into the restaurant if you wish, but it will only make the problem worse.

Marriage in the US has become something only the elite can afford to dabble in, a fact which is masked by the overall declining divorce rate:

![Graph showing US divorces per 1,000 married women](http://www.virginia.edu/marriageproject/pdfs/Union_11_12_10.pdf Fig 5 P 69)

The sad fact behind the decline (and levelling off) of divorce rates in recent years is that it is driven not by overall reductions in divorce risk, but by those who who present the greatest risk of divorce not marrying as often in the first place. The decline in the rate of marriage has masked the larger problem with marriage itself.

Additionally, just because men are avoiding marrying the women with the highest divorce risk it doesn’t mean these women aren’t having children. The trend of the past thirty years has been a normalization of the idea of out of wedlock births for women without a college degree:
So far this remains uncommon amongst college educated women. However, given how quickly high school educated women accepted out of wedlock childbirth this might change in the future. This risk is exacerbated by men like Glenn Stanton lionizing unwed mothers.

The impact of hookup culture on future divorce rates:

One thing the most recent data doesn’t tell us is what impact if any the widespread acceptance of hookup culture will have on divorce rates moving forward. Just because marrying a college educated woman in the late 90s turned out to be a relatively safe bet, it doesn’t mean marrying one today will have the same low risk. Back in the late 90s the hookup culture was still in the early stages. Since then we have seen the growth of hookup culture and a mass of women postponing marriage until the very last minute. All of this adds up to an explosion of former carousel riders suddenly looking to marry. Based on what The Social Pathologist has shared here, here, and here, we know that the more sexual partners a woman has the less satisfied she is in marriage and the higher risk she presents for divorce. On the flip side, we know that older wives are less likely to divorce. This leaves us with a best case scenario of unhappy marriages with low rates of divorce, and a worst case scenario of unhappy marriages with high rates of divorce.

Conclusion:

Based on the most recent available data, the risk associated with marrying a college educated woman may be much lower than the overall risk of divorce. However, if she has participated in the hookup culture or sees serial monogamy as relationships with training wheels, your risk of divorce may well be much higher after all.

Either way, the logical result of legal incentives to women to divorce, the intentional destabilization of marriages and Christians turning their backs on biblical marriage is coming to pass. If this doesn’t turn around, we may one day tell our grandchildren (if we know who
they are) that we witnessed the death of marriage as an institution.
There is no baby boomer (or silent) generation divorce spike at retirement.
by Dalrock | June 29, 2012 | Link

There is a common theme in the media suggesting that baby boomers are divorcing in greater numbers now that they are in or approaching retirement. The most recent example I’ve seen is from Casey Dowd at Fox Business (H/T Empathologicalism): Why So Many Baby Boomers are Getting Divorced. The breathless headline is accompanied by the obligatory image of an older woman fed up with her husband. The actual words need not be written:

| So long boring loyal dude! |

This is all standard fare for those selling divorce. Rule number one is you only sell divorce to women. Women eat this up, which is why every form of women’s entertainment has divorce fantasy as a staple. Selling divorce to men would be in bad taste, as this would leave fatherless children and more importantly men wouldn’t stand to be pandered to so shamefully. There are a number of other rules, including giving the impression that everyone is doing it, especially older women. If you can convince the public that grey divorce is rampant you can have maximum impact destabilizing and demoralizing all marriages. Why stick through difficult times if late life divorce is inevitable? You may as well quit now.

The problem is the line between news and entertainment is frequently blurred. Because of this we have a rash of headlines suggesting there is an explosion in divorce around retirement. This is quite simply not the case. Here is what Mr. Dowd writes in the Fox Business article:

| The divorce rate among boomers has jumped recently and that number is only expected to climb. |

He cites statistics from the National Center for Family & Marriage Research (NCFMR) at Bowling Green State University in making this claim. With a bit of searching I found these excellent charts* from the NCFMR. After looking at the data referenced as well as the working paper from the same group on the topic it is clear that the statement referenced above is incorrect in both of its assertions. The divorce rate among boomers has fallen, not increased, and it is expected to fall further, not climb. In addition, this and other articles leave the false impression that late life divorce is relatively common.

As I’ve shown previously and the charts linked above confirm, divorce is much less common as couples age. The changes under discussion are large percentage changes in very small numbers. For example, look at the divorce rates per 1,000 married couples age 55-64 in figure one in the chart linked above. In the US in 1990, there were roughly** 5 divorces per 1,000 married couples in this age bracket. Looking at the same age bracket today, it has doubled to 10 per 1,000 married couples. This value of 10 is very small compared to the roughly 30 divorces per 1,000 couples for those now in their twenties and early thirties. While there will be a few more grannies batting their bifocaled eyelashes on the dating scene, this
is more of a trickle than a flood. You can get a sense of perspective from a chart I put together using similar but slightly different data than what the NCFMR shows in the charts linked above. Here is how divorce risk changed by age when looking at women in the US in 2009:

![Divorces per 1,000 married women by age](chart1.png)

More to the point, if you are a boomer your divorce risk has dropped dramatically over the last 20 years. You might be wondering how this could be given the doubling stats I referenced above, but the answer is simple. Twenty years ago boomers were twenty years younger and experiencing much higher divorce rates than they are now. Here is what happened to divorce rates for boomers and silents using the NCFMR Figure 1 data**:

![US Divorce rates per 1,000 married couples by cohort: Boomers and Silents](chart2.png)
Here is the data compiled in chart form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Divorce Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-1945</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-1955</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-1965</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While there is something interesting happening, there is no jump in divorce rates for any of the cohorts of boomers and silents measured in the data referenced. All cohorts experienced dramatic reductions in divorce rates during this time, and are expected to experience more of the same. What has happened is a bending of the curve of divorce distribution across time. I noted the same basic phenomenon in the UK when considering the divorce implications for young marriage here (see final chart). The simplest answer for the US data seems to be that boomers and silents simply divorce at much higher rates than the generations before or after them. As they move through the age brackets, this would account for making the curve steeper in 1990 and less steep in 2010. Part of this could be that these cohorts of boomers and silents divorced and remarried more than previous cohorts did when they were younger, and second and third marriages have much higher divorce rates. At any rate, this is something very different than the claimed jump in divorce rates as boomers and silents retire.

But a bending curve won’t sell copy, and it won’t create the kind of “everyone is doing it” sensation which sells divorce. So instead Mr. Dowd interviews an “expert” from a firm which sells divorce services, whispering:

Do you think these trends are going to continue? Is the 30-year itch the new seven-year itch?

*This data was compiled similarly to the data I compiled myself here. My data is for 2009 and theirs is for 2010 but the two still are extremely close.

**Their charts don’t have data value labels so I may be slightly off in reading their values. However, even if I’m off by one or two either way it doesn’t change the analysis.

See Also: Divorcée Retirement
Will betas shrug?

by Dalrock | July 2, 2012 | Link

The only way most men were kept in line, marching off to their dreary jobs, was with a Noble Lie, that it would make them honoured as heads of houses. You can make a man literally die for honour; but he won’t work himself to death for an ungrateful woman who regards him simply as somewhere between a joke and an oppressor.

–David Collard

When reading the 2010 State of Our Unions report for my post Whistling through the graveyard? I noticed the following quote:

Probably because of marital social norms that encourage healthy, productive behavior, men tend to become more economically productive after marriage. They earn between 10 and 20 percent more than do single men with similar education and job histories.

They cite several papers which have investigated this, and in doing just a bit of my own research I found that this is a fairly common topic of academic inquiry. What is fascinating is the theoretical models the papers are considering. It never occurs to them that when men marry they take on the burden of providing for a family. Men with families earn more because they have to. It isn’t a benefit of having a family, it is a cost.

I’m not complaining about the cost, but simply pointing out that it is what it is. However, outside of the manosphere the world appears to be oblivious to this. Here are the common theories studies tested when considering the fact that married men earn more than their unmarried counterparts:

1. Married men can focus more on paid work since they are freed up from doing housework.
2. Women can spot the men with secret potential to earn the most. Men don’t earn more because they marry, they marry because they can earn more.
3. Patriarchal employers are paying married men more out of the goodness of their hearts.

Obviously the courts understand the reality here which is why they threaten divorced men with imprisonment if they don’t earn enough money. They know that the incentive to work hard to support a family is removed when the man’s family is taken away from him. Take away the man’s family and you have taken away his reason for working harder.

But the actions by the courts are only a short term solution. Sooner or later men in general will become aware of the new reality. Getting married no longer is a reliable path to having a family, but the burdens will be yours for the duration either way. In theory we would have a group in our society invested in conserving the traditional family. If I had to make up a name for such a theoretical group, I’d call them Traditional Conservatives.
Now that I mention it, we already have a group by that name and with those stated goals. However, they aren’t interested in ensuring that the traditional patriarchal model of the family is protected*. Instead, almost all of them have made it a habit to cut men off at the knees. Their unwritten agreement with feminists has been and continues to be to hold men down while feminists rob them.

In one sense I can see where the Trad Cons are coming from. They are only trying to conserve today’s culture, and have already swallowed yesterday’s feminism whole*. From their point of view they need to make sure men keep signing up to do the additional work required make them attractive as a potential husband, and later after marriage take on even more work to support their new family. But they don’t want unhappy sluts, so they can’t fight against divorce theft and the intentional shift of power to wives within marriage. The only option this leaves them is to try to shove more men into the machinery and pretend all is well.

What the Trad Cons trying to shove more men into the hopper haven’t considered is that (surprisingly) it doesn’t seem to be men catching on that has lead to our growing batch of unmarried women. They were so busy holding men down so the feminists could rob them that they didn’t notice that the feminists were convincing women to delay marriage past all reason. Now we have a generation of men who didn’t get the signal to prepare marriage. While there is a great deal of hand-wringing that these men are shirking their economic duty to prepare to marry a washed up 30 something carouseler, hard stats are typically in short supply.

However, fellow blogger (and proof of NATCALT*) Oz Conservative had a post the other week which may back the theory up. In his post Pay gap is now running the other way? he shares stats from the US Census which show that single women between 22 and 30 earn 8% more than single men of the same age. I’ve seen statistics like this before, but Oz Conservative helped me connect the dots here:

But what happens when men don’t just “go with the flow” but get more motivated? What happens when men start to take on family responsibilities and settle into a stronger work ethic? At that point in time, men start to earn more than women, many of whom are downscaling their work commitments.

But when men in their 30s and 40s start to earn more, do we get the media cheering them on for their strong work ethic? No, it gets presented as a great social injustice that has to be rectified by state intervention.

Oz Conservative is spot on here, but this still leaves the question of how many of today’s unattached 30 something men will be lured by the possibility of marrying an ageing career woman/former carouseler to knock themselves out career wise. The other question is what percentage of those men who are already successful will want to roll the dice on marriage in our current legal and social climate. This is a question which will greatly impact everything from future tax revenues to property values. If beta men don’t perceive the incentive to take on the role of family provider it is because we as a society have spent great efforts to degrade that role. No amount of chanting man up and marry those sluts! will change this.
*Not all Traditional Conservatives are like that*
Conventional wisdom on the trend in US divorce rates may be about to change.

by Dalrock | July 4, 2012 | Link

When it comes to divorce rates in the US conventional wisdom is that it peaked around 1980 and has been declining ever since. However, there is new data which suggests that the rate of divorce in the US has remained nearly the same since 1990.

The biggest problem with measuring divorce rates in the US over the last two decades is obtaining a complete data set. Official data isn’t available for all years for all states. Here is a portion of Table 133 from the 2012 Statistical Abstract of the United States. You can get the original in PDF or spreadsheet form here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Marriages 1</th>
<th>Rate per 1,000 population 1</th>
<th>Divorces 1</th>
<th>Rate per 1,000 population 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Rate per 1,000 population</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Rate per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>1990 2000 2000</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>1990 2000 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2,443</td>
<td>3.8 5.3 6.8</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>4.7 4.1 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>237.1</td>
<td>7.9 7.8 5.8</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>4.3 6.4 5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>10.2 7.9 9.8</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>3.2 4.1 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>10.6 7.5 7.4</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>4.6 4.4 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>13.3 14.1 14.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>4.9 5.4 5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you can see, the number of divorces hasn’t been available from the state of California for over twenty years*. California isn’t the only state with missing data; recent data is also missing for Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Louisiana, and Minnesota. Click here to see the full table with the missing data highlighted.

There is another problem with the table from the Statistical Abstract; it is only showing the raw number of divorces as well as the number per 1,000 population. The problem with the first number is obvious; the US population is increasing, so you can’t make a meaningful comparison over time using the raw number of divorces. The problem with the other way they report divorce rates is more subtle. While showing it as a value per 1,000 population adjusts for population growth, it doesn’t take into account another important trend. Only people who are married are at risk for divorce, but the percentage of the population which is married at any given time has declined steadily:
To adjust for this groups like the National Marriage Project divide the raw number of divorces by the number of people who are married in the same period and convert this into divorces per 1,000 married couples (or married women):
This metric makes the most sense when looking at the long term trend, but the data source is problematic. The chart above suffers from the same missing data as the table from the 2012 Statistical Abstract. **Out of six 5 year periods of decline since 1980, only the first two include data from California**, the largest state in the country by population. Starting with 1995 data from California isn’t included, and as I pointed out above five other states are missing for one or more recent periods as well. Louisiana and Indiana don’t report data going back to at least 1990, perhaps further. This is a very significant gap, and until recently the choices were to use the partial data or not measure national divorce rates at all.

But now there is another option. The American Community Survey (ACS) performed by the US Census has recently added questions about divorce. The ACS uses a nationally representative sample, which solves the problem of the states which aren’t reporting divorces. As I pointed here, the National Center for Family & Marriage Research (NCFMR) at Bowling Green State University used ACS data to calculate divorce rates by age in the US for 2010. In their report they make a surprising statement:

| The overall U.S. divorce rate has remained essentially unchanged over the past 20 years. In 1990, 19 people divorced for every 1,000 marrieds versus 18 per 1,000 in 2010. |

I’m not sure why the NCFMR is calculating the 1990 rate as 19 while the National Marriage Project calculates this as 20.9. While the two are calculating slightly different metrics, I’m not sure this would account for a nearly two point difference. NCFMR is reporting the number of divorces per 1,000 married couples, while the Marriage Project figure is per 1,000 married women.

At any rate, NCFMR is reporting a drop of only 1 divorce annually per 1,000 married couples between 1990 and 2010. This is very different than conventional wisdom, and it will be interesting to see how the researchers in this field sort this out. The NCFMR document which makes this statement is dated 2012 and since it references a working paper from March of 2012 it appears to be very recent. Interestingly, a slightly older document from the same group makes a very different statement about recent divorce rates. Here is what they wrote in First Divorce Rate, 2010, published in 2011 (emphasis mine):

| Over the last four decades, there has been more than a three-fold percentage increase in the proportion of Americans who are currently divorced, rising from 2.9% in 1970 to 10.7% in 2008 (FP-10-01). Despite this growing proportion, research suggests that among married couples, the divorce rate—which peaked in the late 70s at about 23 divorced per 1,000—has declined over the past 25 years (Stevenson & Wolfers, 2007). |

The full title of the Stevenson and Wolfers paper they cite is Marriage and divorce: Changes and their driving forces, and you can view the paper here (see Figure 1 on P3). As with the data from the Marriage Project, Stevenson and Wolfers show a steady decline in divorces per 1,000 married, although they show what looks like some yearly variation. They don’t give specific numbers in the chart, but their value for 2005 (the final year they show) appears to be the same as the Marriage Project is reporting for the same year (16.4).
I was curious about the different data sets being used by the National Marriage Project and the recent NCFMR report, so I emailed the National Marriage Project. Brad Wilcox, the Director of the National Marriage Project was kind enough to reply quickly to my question. Here is his reply:

Thanks for your note. Because the ACS data provides a more geographically comprehensive portrait of current divorce trends than does the data from the National Center for Health Statistics, the National Marriage Project is considering switching to ACS data in the 2012 edition of the State of Our Unions.

Given how recent the ACS data is I think this is a very fair response. I’m looking forward to seeing what they do in their upcoming report. Their last two reports have been released in December, so I assume that is when the 2012 version will come out as well.

*Table 133 from the 2012 Statistical Abstract doesn’t show divorce numbers between 1990 and 2000, but the final table from the 1995 Statistical Abstract shows California data missing for 1993.

**Update:** The National Marriage Project is using the ACS data in their latest report.
The papers have been awash in feminist triumph over a study which is said to prove that men who do housework are happier:

- MSN: *Forget sex, chores make men feel happy, too* Complete with ridiculous picture of a man delighted to be doing laundry.
- ABC: *Doing Chores Makes Many Men Happiest* (with another picture of a man doing laundry)
- The *Telegraph*: *Secret of a man’s happiness: do the dishes for a quiet life* (with a picture of a man helping his wife do the dishes)
- The *Independent*: Katy Guest: *It’s official – housework makes men happier*

There is only one problem. The kind of study they did can’t prove what they are saying it proved. Multiple regression analysis is only as strong as the theoretical underpinning of the study. You can get all of the sampling and statistics just right and still get it all wrong if your theory isn’t right. I haven’t seen any links to the actual study, but from the description in the *Telegraph* they compared men’s answers regarding how much housework they did with the same men’s answers on questions regarding their own happiness. If you’ve even walked past a Statistics 101 course while the door was open you know that in this kind of study you can’t point the causal arrow. It could just as likely be that when men are treated better by their wives they are happier and therefore more willing to do housework. It could also be that both happiness and housework correlated with something else which wasn’t measured, like IQ/altruism.

These problems exist with the best of studies, when real scientists and grownups are overseeing them. In this case we have results being released by a researcher who doesn’t even pretend to be unbiased. Check out the incredible press release on the Cambridge site, titled *Charting gender’s “incomplete revolution”*:

A major investigation into gender equality across Europe expresses “deep concern" about the prospects for further closing the gender-pay gap, and finds evidence for the survival of “male breadwinner” ideals. At the same time, it also reveals that men are happier when doing their fair share of housework.

...
Researchers expected to find, for example, that both men and women will be more satisfied with their household income if they have earned the money themselves. In fact, a series of interviews with couples on low or moderate incomes revealed that both tend to prize the man’s income more.

The authors suggest that this is really a modern version of the old idea that a man should eat well even when food for other family members is scarce, so that he has the strength to go out and earn a living. The authors reflect that: “The saying, ‘the more things change, the more things stay the same’, springs to mind.”
Feminist dream vs feminist nightmare.
by Dalrock | July 7, 2012 | Link
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feminist Dream</th>
<th>Feminist Nightmare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rides the carousel before marrying in her late 20s or early 30s. Has kids and then discovers she isn't haaaaapy. Collects cash and prizes.</td>
<td>Overshoots the chance to marry and remains childless. Becomes the warpig she always laughed at. Or Marries too late to have children. Has to divorce too quickly for much in the way of cash and prizes if she hopes to remarry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences divorce empowerment by living it up spending her ill gotten gains safe in the knowledge that another man will step in and marry and support her.</td>
<td>No worthy man is willing to marry her after divorce, even after she dramatically adjusts her expectations downward several times. She works until retirement and retires on Social Security and whatever else she has personally saved after accepting reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gets a degree and has a career just long enough to prove that she isn't like those wives and mothers she looks down on. Once this gets boring she is “drafted” by her husband and children out of the empowering role of career woman and forced to be a stay at home mom. She makes it obvious that she suffers this fate solely for the sake of her children.</td>
<td>Is forced to work to support herself all of her life and pay off her own student loans. Is never burdened with a husband or children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses affirmative action to push more qualified men out of the way so she can have the degree and career the evil patriarchy tried to keep her from having. Marries and has children with a man who is even more successful than she is.</td>
<td>Finds out that the office alpha has a dozen women just like her (or younger and prettier) throwing themselves at him. Wonders why all of those men she pushed out of the way aren't there to sweep her off her feet in marriage. Remains unmarried and childless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the pioneering woman who breaks in to an all male field!</td>
<td>Works in an office full of women who broke into the same field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is so strong and independent that her husband follows her leadership. She escapes being trapped in a traditional marriage, submissive and treated like a possession!</td>
<td>She is so strong and independent that her husband follows her leadership. Now she is trapped married to a submissive loser who can't lead her and whom she finds sexually repulsive. They both suffer at the whim of her out of control emotions. She never has to worry about a man possessing her.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://dalrock.wordpress.com/
Feminist territory marking.

by Dalrock | July 10, 2012 | Link

The latest round of debate about women in combat has helped me understand something which had previously left me perplexed. Feminists have two primal desires which work cross purpose. They want to:

1. Be (like) one of the guys (experience manly pride)
2. Mark all spaces as feminine (extinguish manly pride)

The first desire is the face which shows up first when demanding concessions. Here is this incredibly capable woman who can do what the men are doing. Why won’t you let her in? The reality of her actual ability will vary. Some of these women really can perform at the level required. Many others insist that they only need “a little help” because the standards to enter the field are difficult biased against women. Either way, I’m convinced that the desire to experience manly pride is sincere. Aside from the inevitable lowering of standards, the other feminist primal desire is then unleashed.

Once a woman has “broken in” to the all male field, the focus inevitably turns to marking the territory. This can come from the initial woman/women who broke in, or from the group which followed their path. Either way, once women are allowed in as a matter of rule (vs one or a handful of truly exceptional women), any sense of manly pride for the women admitted rapidly evaporates. At this point the focus shifts from experiencing manly pride to stopping men from feeling it. If they can’t have it, no one can.

Marking the space as feminine often begins with practical necessity. Women need separate bathroom and changing facilities, gear needs to be re-sized to fit women, etc. However, the requests never end with true practical necessity because the compulsion to mark the space as feminine is overwhelming. Any symbol which could be associated with manly pride must be clearly marked as feminine. It starts with women demanding to be allowed to wear the US Air Force uniform, but the urge to mark the uniform as feminine is irresistible. They can’t help themselves (LSFW).

Apparently some people are pissed off about a photograph of two Air Force servicewomen, Terran Echegoyen-McCabe and Christina Luna, breastfeeding their children in uniform, calling it a “disgrace.” What, soldiers aren’t supposed to have boobs (or babies)? Soldiers aren’t supposed to appear nurturing?

The problem for feminists is they still deeply crave to experience what only men can truly experience: manly pride. This is why feminists have so little interest in building up their own organizations. Being top woman doesn’t cut it. They want to break into an all male field; this is the only way for women to experience that feeling of manly pride. But the reward is fleeting. No matter what they do, they aren’t men. So they set about tearing it all down, stamping out any symbol of manly pride.

Just as interesting is how resilient to this men are. Once feminists break into an all male
sphere and start marking their territory, men simply regroup. Manly pride is real, and no amount of feminist foot stamping will make it truly go away. Manly pride is something men impart on their institutions and creations, not something they merely receive from them. Wherever there are men there will be manly pride, and there will also be a group of envious feminists desperately trying to figure out how they can get in on the action.

While it is massively expensive, at least it is entertaining.

See also:

- Feminist scavenger hunt
- Dying to be treated like one of the guys.
The Spearhead has a new post up by Aych titled The Suddenly Radioactive ‘Have it All’ Promise. Aych makes the observation that feminists are in the process of walking back from the promise that women can have it all. He references a recent column at Salon by Rebecca Traister Can modern women “have it all”? Ms. Traister makes the specious claim that feminism is being held to account for promises it didn’t make:

It is a trap, a setup for inevitable feminist short-fall. Irresponsibly conflating liberation with satisfaction, the “have it all” formulation sets an impossible bar for female success and then ensures that when women fail to clear it, it’s feminism - as opposed to persistent gender inequity - that’s to blame.

The problem with her argument is twofold. First, modern feminism is founded on women’s tendency to feel a vague (yet powerful) sense of dissatisfaction. It is the solution to the problem with no name. Betty Friedan was the founder of NOW and wrote the book The Feminine Mystique, which is generally credited with launching second wave feminism. From Wikipedia:

The “Problem That Has No Name” was described by Friedan in the beginning of the book:

“The problem lay buried, unspoken, for many years in the minds of American women. It was a strange stirring, a sense of dissatisfaction, a yearning [that is, a longing] that women suffered in the middle of the 20th century in the United States. Each suburban wife struggled with it alone. As she made the beds, shopped for groceries ... she was afraid to ask even of herself the silent question — ‘Is this all?’

Sorry feminists, you absolutely own that. Vague female dissatisfaction is your founding philosophy, and solving it is your reason for being. Just because you figured out that it is a feature, not a bug, you can’t beg off having to fix it. In an amazing blunder, feminists have stepped in to the scapegoat role for women’s unhappiness and are now the new henpecked husband. All I can do is offer some advice: Just try being nice to her feminists, maybe ask her about her feelings more and she will snap right out of her malaise. If she isn’t happy, it must be something you are doing wrong.

The other problem is that feminists have been telling women they can have it all for decades (H/T Oz Conservative). Now we have a generation of young women who are seriously testing that theory and in a few years time the results will be in. Some will live the feminist dream, others will find it to be a nightmare.
New addition to the blogroll; Society of Phineas
by Dalrock | July 13, 2012 | Link

Ballista74 has been busy. Check out his blog The Society of Phineas

Also check out Bskillet’s latest post over at CMD-N: Why Hamsterbation Causes Blindness
Don’t worry men, there are plenty of slightly used career women getting ready to marry.

Reader imnobody linked to an article on a site called The Gloss titled 7 Things I Should Have Told My Grandparents When They Asked Why I’m 28 and Not Married. It offers some insight into the thought process of the unprecedented crop of marriage delaying women. The whole slideshow is what she wishes she would have said instead of running away and bursting into tears when asked. Just remember, she really isn’t worried about it. There is absolutely nothing wrong. So stop making her cry!

Even better than the article and slideshow are the comments, especially this one:

- My married best friend’s mother does this to me. Finally I just told her: “Because everyone I know who got married before they were 30, ended up being chronic adulteresses.” Don’t know if she knew about her daughter’s plethora of affairs before, but she does now, and she hasn’t bothered me since.

Evidently not enough time on the carousel means the woman is too slutty to marry. Make a note of that men.
From the same site, also for your reading pleasure I offer I’m Single, But I Want A Wedding:

...(because I would, one day, like to get married) but that I am not saying “I want to get married.” I want a wedding. I want to plan a wedding. There’s a pretty massive difference.

You may also enjoy I’m Engaged! What I Learned From Twenty Years of Dating:

Oh look, I got engaged!

I’m happy and all, but if you talk about that too much, half the women you know are all like, “Bitch.”

... Then comes the era of Men Whom You Live With...

Her fiancé must be so proud to read this. Just think of all of the great things she learned from those other men she was with.

In praise of a decade-plus on your own

I care about getting credit — and professional respect, where it’s due — for my work. I care a lot. I don’t see any point in the false humility of pretending otherwise. Professional respect is an important part of a gentlewomanly life.

That feminist merit badge is critical to get before getting married. Otherwise you risk being one of those mothers whose only accomplishments are having long hair and wearing prairie skirts.

On a more serious but related note, earlier this week I stumbled onto a series of recent articles triumphantly declaring that college educated women don’t have to worry about delaying marriage. From the NY Times opinion section, The M.R.S. and the Ph.D.:

Is this really the fate facing educated heterosexual women: either no marriage at all or a marriage with more housework and less sex? Nonsense. That may have been the case in the past, but no longer. For a woman seeking a satisfying relationship as well as a secure economic future, there has never been a better time to be or become highly educated.

From the Chicago Tribune, Women say ‘I do’ to education, then marriage. The subheading trumpets Study highlights historic reversal: Women with degrees more likely to wed than less-educated counterparts. There is just one small problem; the study is of women who were born from 1958 to 1964. It turns out that almost all women currently in their late 40s and early 50s got married. I could have told them that. Unfortunately the generation of women this is aimed at aren’t acting remotely like the generation of women in the study, as the chart at the top of the post demonstrates. Some choice quotes from the article:
Now, marriage is an achievement women make after they are educated and start their careers.

And, making the same point I made here:

...college is no longer a “marriage partner market. College girls look at the men they are dating as Mr. Right Now, not Mr. Right.

Referencing the same study, is Slate XX with College-Educated Women No Longer Risk Being “Old Maids”.
An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas

-Matt 12:39

Should you ever cross paths with Mr. Glenn Stanton, Director for Family Formation Studies at Focus on the Family, be sure to brighten his day by telling him:

38% of the most devout Christians have divorced at least once!

You may be wondering how this could possibly brighten his day. For most people the fact that Christians (especially the most devout Christians) are flouting Christian sexual morality in such incredibly high numbers would be considered extremely shameful. This is what an adulterous generation looks like. However, don’t worry; by saying this to Mr. Stanton I’m confident that you will make his day. Mr. Stanton seems quite proud of this fact, because less devout Christians and non believers divorce at even higher rates!

That’s right, the most devout Christians are slightly better at obeying God’s command for sex and the family than non believers! Here is how Mr. Stanton phrases this:

The divorce rates of Christian believers are not identical to the general population — not even close. Being a committed, faithful believer makes a measurable difference in marriage.

Keep in mind that it is only a subset of Christians who divorced at the excitingly low rate of 38%. Another subset of Christians divorced at 60%, while non believers in the same study divorced at 50% (source). But Glenn Stanton is a glass is half full kind of man. A subset of Christians divorcing at only 38% is good news he wants to share! Christians everywhere rejoiced when he wrote about this triumph back in February 2011 in his article The Christian divorce rate myth (what you’ve heard is wrong). Lest the celebration end after only one year, he wrote about it again in April 2012, The Christian Divorce Rate Myth – it is LOWER than the general population (H/T Empathologicalism).

So go ahead fellow Christians, take a moment to celebrate that the most devout amongst us violate God’s command for marriage slightly less than those who don’t believe in such a command at all, while other Christians violate the command even more often than non believers!
The Widow’s Two Daughters.

A widow, who lived in a cottage at some little distance from the village, had two daughters, one of whom was beautiful and industrious, the other idle and ugly. But this ugly one the mother loved best, because she was her own child; and she cared so little for the other, that she made her do all the work, and be quite a Cinderella in the house.

Poor maiden, she was obliged to go every day and seat herself by the side of a well which stood in the broad high road, and here she had to sit and spin till her fingers bled. One day when the spindle was so covered with blood that she could not use it, she rose and dipped it in the water of the well to wash it. While she was doing so, it slipped from her hand and fell to the bottom. In terror and tears, she ran and told her stepmother what had happened.

The woman scolded her in a most violent manner, and was so merciless that she said, “As you have let the spindle fall into the water, you may go in and fetch it out, for I will not buy another.”

Then the maiden went back to the well, and hardly knowing what she was about in her distress of mind, threw herself into the water to fetch the spindle.

At first she lost all consciousness, but presently, as her senses returned, she found herself in a beautiful meadow, on which the sun was brightly shining and thousands of flowers grew.

She walked a long way across this meadow, till she came to a baker’s oven, which was full of new bread, and the loaves cried, “Ah, pull us out! pull us out, or we shall burn, we have been so long baking!”

Then she stepped near to the oven, and with the bread shovel took the loaves all out.

She walked on after this, and presently came to a tree full of apples, and the tree cried, “Shake me, shake me, my apples are all quite ripe.”

Then she shook the tree till the fruit fell around her like rain, and at last there was not one more left upon it. After this she gathered the apples into one large heap, and went on farther.

At last she came to a small house, and looking earnestly at it, she saw an old woman peeping out, who had such large teeth that the girl was quite frightened, and turned to run away.

But the old woman cried after her, “What dost thou fear, dear child? Come and live here with me, and do all the work in the house, and I will make you so happy. You must, however, take care to make my bed well, and to shake it with energy, for then the feathers fly about, and in
the world they will say it snows, for I am Mother Holle.”

As the old woman talked in this kind manner, she won the maiden’s heart, so that she readily agreed to enter her service.

She was very anxious to keep friendly with her, and took care to shake up the bed well, so that the feathers might fly down like snow flakes. Therefore she had a very happy life with Mother Holle. She had plenty to eat and drink, and never heard an angry word.

But after she had stayed a long time with the kind old woman, she began to feel sad, and could not explain to herself why, till at last she discovered that she was home sick. And it seemed to her a thousand times better to go home than to stay with Mother Holle, although she made her so happy.

And the longing to go home grew so strong that at last she was obliged to speak.

“Dear Mother Holle,” she said, “you have been very kind to me, but I have such sorrow in my heart that I cannot stay here any longer; I must return to my own people.”

“Then,” said Mother Holle, “I am pleased to hear that you are longing to go home, and as you have served me so well and truly, I will show you the way myself.”

So she took her by the hand, and led her to a broad gateway. The gate was open, and as the young girl passed through, there fell upon her a shower of gold, which clung to her dress, and remained hanging to it, so that she was bedecked with gold from head to foot.

“That is your reward for having been so industrious” and as the old woman spoke she placed in her hand the spindle which had fallen into the well.

Then the great gate was closed, and the maiden found herself once more in the world, and not far from her step-mother’s house. As she entered the farm-yard, a cock perched on the wall crowed loudly, and cried,

“Kikeriki! our golden lady is come home, ’ see.”

Then she went in to her mother; and because she was so bedecked with gold, both the mother and sister welcomed her kindly. The maiden related all that had happened to her; and when the mother heard how much wealth had been gained by her step-daughter, she was anxious that her own ugly and; die daughter should try her fortune in the same way.

So she made her go and sit on the well and spin; and the girl who wanted all the riches without working for them did not spin fast enough to make her fingers bleed.

So she pricked her finger, and pushed her hand in the thorn bushes, till at last a few spots of blood dropped on the spindle.

Directly she saw these spots, she let it drop into the water, and sprung in after it herself. Just as her sister had done, she found herself in a beautiful meadow, and walked for some distance along the same path, till she came to the baker’s oven.
She heard the loaves cry, “Pull us out, pull us out, or we shall burn, we have been here so long baking.”

But the idle girl answered, “No, indeed, I have no wish to soil my hands with your dirty oven” and so she walked on till she came to the apple-tree.

“Shake me, shake me,” it cried, “for my apples are all quite ripe.”

“I don’t agree to that at all,” she replied, “for some of the apples might fall on my head,” and as she spoke she walked lazily on farther.

When she at last stood before the door of Mother Holle’s house, she had no fear of her great teeth, for she had heard all about them from her sister, so she walked right up to her and offered to be her servant. Mother Holle accepted the offer of her services, and for a whole day the young girl was very industrious and did everything that was told her, for she thought of the gold that was to be poured upon her.

But on the second day she gave way to her laziness, and on the third it was worse. Several days passed and she would not get up in the mornings at a proper hour. The bed was never made or shaken so that feathers could fly about, till at last Mother Holle was quite tired of her and said she must go away, that her services were not wanted any more.

The lazy girl was quite overjoyed at going, and thought the golden rain was sure to come when Mother Holle led her to the gate. But as she passed under it a large kettle full of pitch was upset over her.

“That is the reward of your service,” said the old woman as she shut the gate. So the idle girl walked home with the pitch sticking all over her, and as she entered the court the cock on the wall cried out—

“Kikeriki! our smutty young lady is come home, I see.”

The pitch stuck closely, and hung all about her hair and her clothes, and do what she would as long as she lived it never would come off.
There is a new study making the headline rounds about 6-9 year old girls wanting to be sexy. As so often happens the actual name of the study is not mentioned in the news stories and even if it were, the study itself is likely only available via journal subscription. Still, there are a number of articles about it including the LiveScience article Why 6-Year-Old Girls Want to Be Sexy. According to the article, the researchers at Knox College showed young girls paper dolls and asked them to:

...choose the doll that: looked like herself, looked how she wanted to look, was the popular girl in school, she wanted to play with.

The “sexy” doll won out as both the doll they wanted to look like (68%) and the one which is in the girl’s opinion more popular (72%). The LiveScience article includes a picture of two dolls differently dressed, but I’m not sure these are actually examples from the study. If so, I would say they should use the word “slutty” instead of sexy, since the sexy doll is dressed like a hooker.

Unfortunately the researchers seem to be laboring under a great deal of confusion about our current culture and female sexual nature. The presumption in the article is that young girls are being driven by the culture to self sexualize. Given what we know from game and the social revolution driven by feminism, the opposite is much more likely. Girls are no longer being constrained by the culture, and are reverting to an animal like state. Feminists have openly worked to remove all cultural constraints from girls and women, and this is what has happened. Feminists rebelled against the view that women’s chastity is important and that young women should see themselves as preparing for marriage. Even Traditional Conservatives now passionately defend the trend of delayed marriage.

What else should we expect when words like slut are deemed hateful to all women by feminists and Trad Cons alike, and young women plan on spending a decade or more in the sexual marketplace before beginning to look for a husband? If the qualities of a wife aren’t important, raw sexuality is how women will compete for the attention of the most desirable men and thereby their status with other women. Grade school girls are watching and learning from middle school girls, who are learning from high school girls, who are learning from college girls.

How is any of this a mystery? If we started a movement to remove all social constraints from boys and men and after 50 or 60 years of profound success we found that boys were becoming violent womanizers, would anyone really be surprised? Why then all of the handwringing that removing all social constraints from girls and women has lead to uncivilized girls and women?

Perhaps most troubling is that the researchers didn’t study the potential impact of fathers:

Starr studied the influence of mothers because there’s more evidence that
daughters model themselves after their mothers, but she believes that fathers may also play an important role in how young girls see themselves. She would also like to look at how fathers and the media influence boys’ understanding of sexualized messages and views toward women.

The presence of fathers doesn’t just impact the girls themselves, it impacts the mothers. A wife who submits herself to her husband is sending her daughter a very different message than a sexually empowered single mother (or soon to be single mother if she doesn’t get her way).
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Several readers objected to my post *Feral females in the news* because they read it as me asserting that girls aged 6-9 naturally tend to compete sexually for boys. This wasn’t what I had in mind. My argument was that 6-9 year old girls were following the lead of older girls and that the older girls are not being driven by the culture but are in fact driving it.

The dominant frame in our culture is that post pubescent girls and women are naturally modest and chaste. The assumption is that if women are indulging in their sexual power, especially young women, there must be some outside force making them do something which goes against their nature. If 6-9 year old girls are following suit, then this is seen as further proof that women across the board are being pressured into acting in ways they don’t want to.

When young women start dressing immodestly the assumption is that they don’t really want to do this, but are being *forced* to do it. The poor girls must be being sexualized by those dirty nasty boys and perverted men. Boys and men must be driving the culture to cause young women to want to indulge in the power of their sexuality. The young women who dress and/or act like tramps are poor victims, too innocent to understand what is happening to them. They must suffer from a lack of self esteem and are in desperate need of more moxie so they can avoid becoming exploited in this way. If they only were able to be true to themselves they would immediately switch to modest clothing and start seeking out the husband they will stay with for life, because *that is the true nature of women’s sexuality*.

This is pure nonsense. Both men and women have sexual impulses which need to be directed, constrained, and channelled if we want to have a moral and functional family structure and society. But feminists are very open that they despise any restrictions on girls and women, especially when it comes to them exercising *power*. The power young women have in spades is sexual power, but it turns out to be *more difficult to effectively exercise than feminists imagine*. Nevertheless, feminists have managed to remove the restrictions on female sexual behavior and have been more successful than anyone could have predicted. Even Traditional Conservatives now see the word *slut* as an insult to all women.

This foolishness is so pervasive that few can even identify it. It is one of those ideas which entered the popular understanding without much real discussion. Otherwise sane parents assume their daughters don’t have a sexual nature which needs to be curbed, only self esteem which needs to be reaffirmed and evil boys which need to be kept at bay. If a young woman sets out on her preferred path of promiscuity, nearly everyone mistakes it for her somehow being frustrated in her search for lifelong marriage.

Fortunately this cultural insanity only applies to female sexuality and not male sexuality. Otherwise we would have fathers finding their son’s illicit cache of *Playboy* magazines and lecturing him with:
Son, I know your friends are all pressuring you to look at pictures of beautiful naked women and that you are just trying to fit in. I was forced to do so at your age too, and it was terrible. The thing is, the playmate doesn’t know how to cherish your heart. We need to work on your self esteem and make you less self disciplined, more true to yourself, and your desire to look at this will go away.
Why being a female is a great gift to the universe.
by Dalrock | July 23, 2012 | Link

The most fascinating part of feminism is when you boil it down how incredibly vacuous it is. It is an unthinking grab for power, a mindless reaction against a nameless discontent. A recent article in The Huffington Post demonstrated this perfectly. Cute Kid Note Of The Day: Why Being A Girl Is Wonderful An eight year old girl was given a writing assignment:

Being a female is a great gift to the universe. Here are a few wonderful things about being a girl...

The girl’s father was so proud of her response that he scanned it and uploaded it on Reddit*. I can only imagine that he wept tears of girlpower joy while he did so. I haven’t interviewed him, but if I did I’m guessing his response would be something to the effect of**:

You try to teach your kids right, but you always wonder... Does she know she has a vagina? And boobs? That she is smart and can get a job? That these things give her power and make her a gift to the universe? When something like this comes along it is so incredible because now you know, yes, she really does!

Proof of the vapidity of feminism is the Huffington Post description of the girl as “One very wise 8-year-old”. What wisdom? I don’t fault the girl; she did a great job parroting back what has been fed to her, and boiled feminism down to essentially a set of bullet points. It isn’t her fault that when one does this it looks suspiciously like a manosphere parody of feminism. To be fair, what else was she supposed to say? What else is feminism preparing young women for but to be just like men (even though they can’t be), only with vaginas, boobs, and the ability to become pregnant?

*Reddit often has some very funny comments. I thought the first two responses in this thread were particularly good.

**For the satire impaired that was not an actual quote from the 8 year old girl’s father.
Men no longer footing the bill to court older women.
by Dalrock | July 24, 2012 | Link

There are many ways the feminist dream can turn into a nightmare. Most of them involve flawed assumptions that men won’t ever adjust to women changing the rules. The Telegraph has a new article out describing one way this is happening: Love in the time of austerity.

As the cost of living escalates, so it seems, has the cost of loving, at least for the more mature woman. While older men remain willing to prise open their chequebooks for a 25-year-old whose alabaster complexion would grace the yacht of any concupiscent billionaire, an increasing number are ignoring the traditional etiquette of courting when it comes to women over the age of 35.

While it would seem inevitable that men would eventually figure out that women are extending the age of courtship beyond all reason, the tone of the article is shock that it could ever come to this. Suddenly these very untraditional women are all about tradition:

Gallantry is in retreat, buckling under the forces of recession, spurious excuses of equality - and the assumption that such women are in no position to protest...

The article is full of quotes from both men and women anecdotally confirming the trend. The only statistic offered in the article is that the number of women between 35 and 50 who are currently single has increased 7% in two years. While it is light on hard data, at the very least it points to the risk of becoming committed to the trail. Actually the trail is likely the only thing these women have any commitment to, which is why they are bemoaning their fate. Otherwise, why do they find themselves looking for romance and the next stepping stone on the path of serial monogamy as they enter middle age? Statistically we know very few of them are in this position through no fault of their own. There may be the odd widow or exception to the rule regarding excuse #6, but these are going to be few and far between. The vast majority of these women have hopped from stone to stone on the path of serial monogamy until the path disappeared in front of them.

We learn about 39 year old Jennifer Ames, who lost her accounting job last year and as a result was forced to give up the expensive gym membership, beauty treatments, and shopping sprees she used to stave off the effects of age. Her boyfriend noticed the difference and broke up with her. He now has a new 25 year old girlfriend, and why shouldn’t he? He had made no commitment to Ms. Ames, and she hadn’t made a commitment to him. If you are playing the boyfriend/girlfriend game there is no commitment there, only one or both people keeping their options open.

The author also quotes a male friend of hers on the topic:

I’d be prepared to invest a lot of money on a woman under 30. There’s more mileage there and you feel good having her on your arm. Why would I spend money to have a 40-year-old middle-ranking executive on my arm instead? And if she is on my arm, she’d better pull her weight financially.
Again, why not? Both the under 30 and the 40 year old women in question are out to get the best deal they can without becoming tied down. If he is going to forgo the moral path of marriage just as the women are doing, why shouldn’t he act in his best interest?

Another man in the article makes a similar point:

> While I would happily spend money on a real babe, over whom other men are competing, I don’t feel the need to do the same with an older woman who is probably desperate...

The entire article is worth a read, but it closes with a particularly entertaining bit of rationalization. It turns out that middle aged women are going to punish men their age for preferring young sexy women, and will take their no longer sexy selves off the market! You go aging girls! Hit them where it hurts! The author explains:

> Once, wining and dining grown-up members of my sex were willing to overlook men’s imperfections in search of a committed relationship. This gave men a certain sexual power, even if it came tinged with gratitude. No longer.

Looking for **commitment**? I respectfully suggest that she doesn’t understand the meaning of the word. There is a very small likelihood that a woman finds herself in her late 30s or 40s unmarried after seriously looking for commitment. But it isn’t just her who is punishing men for no longer being willing to foot the bill for her serial monogamous lifestyle. She tells us about another middle aged woman who is closing up man-hopping shop! 42 year old Eliza Budsworth is staging her own form of man strike at the injustice of being asked to split the cost of a romantic getaway. How dare he! What kind of a woman does he think she is?

> I had the chance of a romantic weekend in Venice last month but the man who asked me wanted half the hotel bill up front, and so that was that. In any case, that sort of attitude doesn’t really sweep you off your feet. I know I’m not this year’s top model, but if men who aren’t exactly George Clooney are only willing to be generous with 23-year-old sexpots, they’re also the long-term losers.

**See Also:**

- SMP searching costs and the unmourned death of courtship.
- Rejoice in the wife of your youth.
Some are more equal than others, and being superior means you need a helping hand.
by Dalrock | July 25, 2012 | Link

Some are more equal than others, and being superior means you need a helping hand.

men, their rights and nothing more; women, their rights and nothing less.

-Susan B Anthony

Newly minted Yahoo CEO Marissa Mayer has upset feminists by backing away from the label. Feministing takes her to task for this in the recent post Marissa Mayer doesn’t particularly care for feminism. What struck me was the quote the feminist was upset about, the one where Ms. Mayer boldly declares that she isn’t a female supremacist (emphasis mine):

I don’t think that I would consider myself a feminist. I think that I certainly believe in equal rights, I believe that women are just as capable, if not more so in a lot of different dimensions, but I don’t, I think have, sort of, the militant drive and the sort of, the chip on the shoulder that sometimes comes with that.

Women are just as capable as men, except for those things they are more capable at. No chip indeed.

Even better are the final words in the Feministing post (emphasis mine):

And Marissa, it is too bad that feminism has become a negative word. You know what’s also too bad? Your failure to acknowledge that without feminism, you could never have become the CEO of Yahoo.

Keep in mind that there are two ways to end up as CEO of an internet search giant. You can create it, as did Google CEO Larry Page and former Yahoo CEO Jerry Yang, or you can wait for someone else to build the internet search giant and become appointed CEO as Ms. Mayer did. Feministing seems to be arguing that the former isn’t possible for women, without even considering it. They also seem to be suggesting that Ms. Mayer wouldn’t have been accepted to Stanford and later hired at Google* based on merit alone, and therefore wouldn’t have had the experience required to be in consideration for the Yahoo CEO job.

I can see how Ms. Mayer might not care for feminism after all.

*She was Google employee #20 and their first female engineer
Now that almost all Christians have abandoned the Biblical frame of sexual morality nearly everyone has unknowingly filled the void with what Rollo calls the feminine imperative. The new rules of sexual morality are simple. If sex is on the woman’s terms, it is moral. If sex is on the man’s terms, it is immoral. You can see this with the moral elevation of serial monogamy and the moral stress placed on sex in the context of romantic love. This isn’t something you will see discussed outside of the manosphere however because all of this is accepted without conscious thought.

The other day I came across a youtube video of a 2008 episode of the Dr. Phil show about a pickup artist named Paul Janka. The framing of the show is fascinating, with conflicting messages suggesting that Paul and his method are both a failure as well as too successful. Even more interesting is the moral framing of the question. Dr. Phil seems certain that Paul is doing something immoral, but he doesn’t ever come out and say what that might be. The closest he comes is when he questions if Paul likes women (3:55 in the first youtube below):

Dr. Phil: How many women [have you had sex with]?

Paul: 132

Dr. Phil: Do you like women?

Paul assures him that he does. Dr. Phil then challenges Paul to explain a quote of his (leaving the “banged” part out):

She may look fit, sexy and sophisticated, but after you’ve banged her and she’s naked, with mascara running down her face and she’s trying to stuff her thighs into a pair of too small jeans at 2 a.m., you’ll realize she’s just another person trying to get by.

The tone in Dr. Phil’s voice and the look of disgust on the audience members’ faces say it all:

How dare you think of those classy ladies that way! Those are the future wives and mothers of America!

Later in the segment (8:20 in the first youtube below) they introduce one of the women Paul has gamed. Dr. Phil calls her Heather, and mentions that she blogs for Gawker. According to this Gawker post her full name is Heather Fink (confirmed on her blog). Heather explains that at first Paul was charming, but then he told her that he keeps a spreadsheet of all of his conquests.

Heather: After he said that I said “Ok, I’m definitely not touching his [censored]”.
She made out with him later that night, and some time later called him up for a drunken hookup at 2:00 AM. But according to her Paul was masturbating when he opened the door (Paul denies this), and this ruined the mood.

Heather: I was completely turned off, and thought he was crazy. And I was thinking in my head “get through the night, sober up, go home”.

Paul: I think maybe she just got undressed and came into bed. What I do remember vividly is touching her.

Heather: I slept in back to back, like my back turned to him the whole time completely shut off and like stiff and like “don’t touch me”.

Later she says:

You didn’t need a system Paul. I didn’t sleep with you because you screwed it up for yourself.

What is so noteworthy about all of this is the moral tone. The title of the segment is Male Egos Out of Control. Heather has no shame when she describes calling Paul up for a booty call. She is presented as a hero, fending off the evil pickup artist and showing him his place. There is no shock that this woman is describing her plans for casual sex, only strong disapproval that Paul was pursuing the same thing on his own terms. Heather even goes so far as to chastise Paul for squandering his chastity:

If you are that good looking, and you went to Harvard, and you waste it by volunteering yourself as a public [censored], that’s sad!

Check out the videos to see what I mean (LSFW):

Start first at 3:55 in the video above, then skip to 8:20. Start the video below from the beginning.

For those men looking for a wife, you will be pleased to learn that Heather is now in her 30s and looking for a husband.

...They were there with their adorable husbands, and there was an empty seat where my adorable husband could sit if I had one. But I don’t...

And then I saw someone in the friends and thought – damn even he got married too? That makes me a bit insecure.

...

I would like it if life works that out for me some time soon. I think it will work eventually for sure, I just have faith in that.
I’m very curious when, where and who in the meantime.

If after watching the videos above you feel you need a pep talk before considering a woman who has gotten her wild years out of the way, Professor Mentu has you covered with his (crass) series *Top 5 Reasons Her Sexual Past Shouldn’t Matter* #5 She chose you to be her partner, #4 There’s Meaning in Meaningless Sex, #3 She Doesn’t Have an STD, and #2 She was Selective, and #1 You’re not going to marry her.

Don’t worry ladies, I have a pep talk for you too if you are interested in an alpha like Paul.

See Also:

- The ubiquitous frame of hypergamy.
- We are trapped on Slut Island and Traditional Conservatives are our Gilligan
Video blogger Man Woman & Myth has put together an outstanding series of short documentaries explaining the problems with feminism. Many of you may have seen some of his videos before, but I would like to drive more attention to them. All of us know men and women who might be somewhat open to breaking away from the fem centric frame of our mainstream culture on one topic or another. His videos are a great way to advance the conversation with someone who isn’t ready to accept how profoundly feminism has corrupted our culture. Think of them as topic specific glasses you can share with others without overwhelming them.

Here is some information about the author from the About page on his blog:

The author of this site is from the UK, is married and is eminently well-adjusted. He has decided to create this site and the documentary video series out of a desire to point out the numerous and glaring failures of Feminism and bring the spotlight onto its single crowning achievement: the extensive and horrific institutional hatred against men in Western societies - misandry.

Thankfully, the author has not fallen foul of the various pitfalls Western men must navigate due to Feminist women and the Feminised state and cannot, therefore, be easily classed as the “bitter-and-twisted activist”. There are no unhappy marriages or nasty divorces, no paternity fraud or unwanted children, no false rape accusations or any particularly negative event whatsoever which prompted this website and documentary. He is simply a man who has a clear view on the toxic nature of Feminism, its corrupting effect on women and it’s larger negative effects on all of us.

Feminism only truly serves the state and certain other groups, but women just don’t see it. Feminist women don’t understand that they are not the opposite sex, they are the complimentary sex. The “battle of the sexes” defeats us all.

In future weeks I’ll spotlight different videos. I think the weekends are ideal for this because you probably won’t want to watch videos at the workplace due to the political nature of them. Feminism is truly our state religion and videos like this are therefore heresy. Assuming you are in a place where you can freely watch the video, enjoy his youtube short: Misandry – Men Don’t Exist
Many falsely assume that feminism is somehow about self-loathing women, illogical emotion-driven women, women with hairy armpits, women who look like men, unattractive women, lesbians, and supplicating men who think being a feminist will get them laid. Fortunately a group of feminists at Duke University have banded together and launched the website Who Needs Feminism. They are combating the misconceptions about feminism, while directing public attention to the real and pressing issues which only feminism can solve. Here is their About statement from the bottom of their site (emphasis mine):

Identify yourself as a feminist today and many people will immediately assume you are man-hating, bra-burning, whiny liberal. Perhaps a certain charming radio talk show host will label you as a “Feminazi” or “slut.” Even among more moderate crowds, feminism is still seen as too radical, too uncomfortable, or simply unnecessary. Feminism is both misunderstood and denigrated regularly right here on Duke’s campus. We, the 16 women of Professor Rachel Seidman’s course on Women in the Public Sphere, have decided to fight back against these popular misconceptions surrounding the feminist movement. Our class was disturbed by what we perceive to be an overwhelmingly widespread belief among students that today’s society no longer needs feminism. In order to change this perception on campus, we have launched a PR campaign for feminism. We aim to challenge existing stereotypes surrounding feminists and assert the importance of feminism today.

They have created a submission form where feminists can submit their own photos and statements. Based on the text on the form it appears that they are exercising editorial discretion regarding which submissions are published. This is a very good idea, otherwise some non-feminists might submit caricatures of feminism to try to discredit the campaign and make feminists look foolish:

We prefer and prioritize photo statements that use our original poster format, but we do read all submissions!

Once you’ve taken a moment to rid yourself of any male privilege and preconceived notions of what feminism is about, I’ll point out some of the insight the learned ladies at Professor Seidman’s Women in the Public Sphere are sharing with the world as part of their PR campaign. Note that each entry has both a photo and text. Be sure to click on the links to see the photo.

I’m serious though; put away the male privilege and open your mind. Feminism isn’t about a bunch of hairy pitted misfits trying desperately to change the world so they personally will fit in better and be seen as more attractive. It is a serious intellectual pursuit. If you don’t knock this kind of thinking off I’ll have to ask you to quit reading.

That’s better.
First up is Leah, and she is here to destroy the stereotype. **Leah needs feminism because:**

- I need feminism because I shouldn’t need a reason for not shaving my pits (I’m not making a statement; it’s just more comfortable).

Way to go Leah! Just because one feminist happens to have hairy armpits, it doesn’t mean this is an important issue to feminists! This is simply a personal matter and one of comfort. It isn’t like they are broadcasting their hairy pits on the network news or making political statements with them. And men think they are so logical! Next on our tour of enlightenment is **batmanisreal**. She needs feminism because she looks like a man. Her poster reads:

- I need feminism because I am a woman, even though I may not look like society’s version of a woman.

The text below the poster states:

- I’m tired of getting beaten up because women don’t understand and men are intimidated.

Some of the patriarchal smartasses among my readers are likely thinking (no doubt with their male privilege): **Women like batmanisreal already get special protection under the law and in the workplace. Isn’t that the mark of a society with great compassion and tolerance?** However, what you need to understand is we need feminism so that people won’t just tolerate her lifestyle but will applaud it. She can’t be fully free to look and act as she wishes so long as others are free to form their own opinions. So check that male privilege and start thinking logically or I’ll seriously ask you to stop reading.

Next on our list is an entry by what appears to be the creator of the site herself, **whoneedsfeminism**:

- I need feminism b/c my roomie’s philosophy textbook valued men’s experience as more “valid” and “logical” while the “feminist alternative of care” received a 1/2 pg. explanation of why emotions are “too subjective” to produce LOGIC…no wonder western thought is so patriarchal. Symbolic logic does not equal moral/women’s issues

Oh. This is embarrassing. In my own moments of male privilege above I accidentally implied that logical thinking is better than emotional thinking. I’ll leave the errors there though instead of burying my shame. Perhaps others can learn from my mistakes.

At any rate, now that I’m quite angry with myself for invoking my male privilege of logic over emotions I can at least better understand this next entry, also by whoneedsfeminism:

- I need feminism because I hate myself.

Now that I’ve shed my own preconceived notions, I’m starting to better understand how women are being oppressed by not being encouraged to display their armpit hair with pride. Jade is being oppressed by the patriarchy and desperately needs our support:
The fact that a woman has armpit hair and does not hide it whilst on a television program for Ireland, should not make several news programs in Australia. This is RIDICULOUS and furthermore the men on said programs do not have a right to look disgusted or make horribly degrading comments.

She doesn’t link to the specific case, but with some searching I found this story which may be what she is referring to. Next on our list is girlwiththemouseyhair.

I need feminism because 70% of people living in abject poverty are women and as a lesbian, poverty is 24% more likely for my girlfriend and I. This makes me worry about our life together.

Next is the powerful story of askdreambaker. She needs feminism so people won’t focus on her breasts:

I do not fit into the “ideal body image” at all and have been told as such. I have had remarks made about my breasts and about how if you ignore everything else I am bang-able. It has gotten to the point where I paranoid that, they are the only things that people see in me.

I’ll bet the only parts of her you looked at in the photo were her breasts, and you probably wondered if she is “bang-able”. What is wrong with you? Why did you objectify her by focusing on her breasts? Why didn’t you notice her hair, or her eyes? Why did her bang-ability even come to mind when you were reading about this serious feminist topic? See what she has to face every day?

Lastly I present the entry by stevenewlins. Note the decorative flair he drew around the word feminism to show how serious he is about the topic. If I’m reading him correctly, he wants to make sure women know he is down with them having casual sex and aborting any unwanted pregnancies which might occur as a result:

“I need feminism because I’m tired of living in a country where women are treated as if they’re undeserving of making decisions regarding their own bodies, they’re made to think they don’t need to be compensated equally for the same work, and they’re raised to think that slurs like ‘bitch’ and ‘slut’ are okay”

I’ve only pointed out a few of the entries, all from the first page*. However, there is much more insight where this came from. In fact there are 174 pages (and counting) of it. I only focused on the first page so you patriarchal pigs wouldn’t accuse me of cherry picking the best arguments the feminists had to make. I have no doubt however that I could have found equally enlightening entries on any of the 174 pages.

*At the time that I wrote the post on Saturday morning 7/28.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Everyone knows</th>
<th>Everyone also knows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men have commitment issues, while women naturally want commitment.</td>
<td>Women need no fault divorce to avoid the horrible fate of being <em>trapped in marriage</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The average married woman can dump her boring loyal husband and trade up to a better man!</td>
<td>Where have all the good men gone? And Divorce is driven by husbands trading in loyal aging wives for a younger, prettier model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fault divorce laws are designed to punish disobedient husbands and fathers.  &quot;He did what? Dump that loser and make him pay girlfriend! Take his kids <em>and</em> his money!&quot;</td>
<td>There is no such thing as divorce theft, only husbands walking out on their blameless wives. And Child support, custody, and the family court are unbiased and solely about the best interest of the child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime marriage is no longer realistic since people live too long now. You can't expect women to keep their vows past age 35.</td>
<td>It would be archaic for a woman to marry before the age of 30. And Divorce is driven by husbands trading in loyal aging wives for a younger, prettier model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers are selfless and deeply concerned with the best interest of their children.</td>
<td>It is in the best interest of the child that their mother not be unhaaappyy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And

Children suffer immensely when their father is kicked out of the house.

http://dalrock.wordpress.com/
Professor Hale’s War Stories

by Dalrock | August 3, 2012 | Link

Professor Hale at Rebellion University has been sharing stories from his past. While they aren’t technically war stories because none involve actual combat, they are both funny and entertaining. As far as I can tell the first story in the series is My First Time from back in mid July. However you could just as well read them in reverse order, starting with the most recent: Ranger School Ch5: Pain.

One of the most common injuries at Ranger school is getting a sharp stick in your eye. If you have ever heard the expression, “It hurts less than a sharp stick in your eye”, you get the idea. This expression was invented at Ranger school.

Here is an excerpt from his story Carried Away: Another story of my wild youth:

It seems the clear spot I found was only clear because tens of millions of ants had worked very hard to keep it that way. This was their superhighway from the hill to the fields. And right at that moment they were trying to figure out why there was something in their path and how they were going to remove it. I don’t speak “ant” very well, but I think the winning strategy had something to do with cutting me up into small, “ant sized” pieces.

I was not getting stung or cut up only because ants live in a highly organized society with a very strong union. The ants that found me were the scouts and scouts are not allowed to do any cutting. Then the porter ants arrive and I was too big to port, so thirty thousand of them are just sitting around waiting for the cutting ants to arrive. And I could tell by the looks on their little faces that “no, you are not counting this as my coffee break”.

Professor Hale has a gift for story telling and if he ever does write that book he is threatening to write, I’ll buy it and read it.
If you are a Christian in the manosphere you likely have asked the question:

Shouldn’t Christians be able to learn what they need to know about men and women and marriage from the Bible, and not from the studies by pickup artists and Evolutionary Psychologists?

The short answer is yes. The Bible should be all you need.

The problem is Christians have decided not to follow the Bible on the question of marriage in specific, and men and women in general. I’m not just talking about Christian enthusiasm for providing moral cover for frivolous divorce. I’m also talking about the numerous sections of the Bible which modern Christians are embarrassed about because the sections offend their newer and more dominant religion, feminism.

Before we go any further, I want to acknowledge that Not All Christians Are Like That (NACALT). To avoid lumping all Christians together, I’ll outline the boundaries so those who don’t practice feminism first and Christianity second can take comfort in the fact that I’m not referring to them. What follows is not intended to be a complete list of areas where the Bible clashes with feminism, but it hopefully is representative enough of the conflict for you to determine which side of the fence you and those you know have landed on.

I’ll start with an admittedly contentious question, whether Christian women should cover their heads in church. Paul’s instructions to the church at Corinth in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 seem to leave at least some room for interpretation. However, what is most telling isn’t just where one lands on this question but the reasoning used to arrive there. Consider for example the exegesis on the topic by Dr. Daniel B. Wallace at Bible.org: What is the Head Covering in 1 Cor 11:2-16 and Does it Apply to Us Today? Dr. Wallace lays out the case for several different readings. He tells us that he originally held the view that the passage means real head covering and is applicable today (emphasis mine):

The argument that a real head covering is in view and that such is applicable today is, in some respects, the easiest view to defend exegetically and the hardest to swallow practically. Since it is never safe to abandon one’s conscience regarding the truth of Scripture, I held to this view up until recently. Quite frankly, I did not like it (it is very unpopular today). But I could not, in good conscience, disregard it.

Later in the article he explains his new view that only a meaningful symbol of submissiveness is required today, although he isn’t able to suggest what might function as that symbol (emphasis mine):

Today, however, the situation is quite different, at least in the West. For a woman to wear a head covering would seem to be a distinctively humiliating
experience. Many women—even biblically submissive wives—resist the notion precisely because they feel awkward and self-conscious. But the head covering in Paul's day was intended only to display the woman's subordination, not her humiliation. Today, ironically, to require a head covering for women in the worship service would be tantamount to asking them to shave their heads! The effect, therefore, would be just the opposite of what Paul intended. Thus, in attempting to fulfill the spirit of the apostle's instruction, not just his words, some suitable substitute symbol needs to be found.

His argument is that head covering was intended as a gesture of submissiveness, and isn't needed so long as the woman is in fact submissive. Yet at the same time he declares that actually being submissive would be humiliating to modern Christian women in our feminist world. There needs to be a meaningful symbol of submission, so long as it doesn't actually symbolize submission. This is rationalization at its finest, and it also shows that when feminism and the Bible collide Christians very strongly tend to choose feminism while conjuring up a suitable excuse for disregarding the parts of the Bible they are ashamed of.

You will find Christians performing a similar dance where the Bible tells wives to submit to their husbands (I Peter 3:1&5, Eph 5:22&24, Col 3:18, 1 Tim 2:11, & Tit 2:5). The same occurs when the Bible says that women are to remain silent in church and not teach (1 Tim 2:11-12): how many Christians are comfortable with Paul's instruction in 1 Corinthians 14:34-35?

34 Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience as also saith the law.

35 And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church.

I'll stop here for a moment and ask my fellow Christians who are reading: Have you located your inner feminist yet? If any of the passages I reference above make you uncomfortable because they feel sexist, then you just did.

This is the reason Christians need to learn game. The Bible is sufficient, but it isn't what 99% of Christians are following when it comes to men and women. Where the Bible clashes with feminism, feminism almost always rules the day. The problem is insidious because very often Christians have swallowed feminism without even realizing it. How many Christians that you know see the movie Fireproof as teaching about biblical marriage? How many see nothing wrong with the movie Courageous and the non stop modern Christian practice of cutting leaders off at the knees? Why do none of the amazon.com reviewers of Sheila Gregoire’s book To Love, Honor, and Vacuum: When You Feel More Like a Maid Than a Wife and Mother note that she has inverted the concept of submission? Why do none of the reviewers of Glenn Stanton’s book Secure Daughters, Confident Sons notice that he has an incredibly foolish and unbiblical view of women?

The answer to the question of why Christians need game is because Christians have adopted feminism over the Bible. Not all Christians have done this. For example, the Amish still follow
strict gender roles including headship and submission. From what I can find they have a divorce rate less than 1%, and they are growing rapidly due to their high fertility rate. So if you are Amish, you probably don’t need to learn game. Of course if you are Amish you aren’t likely to be reading this either. For the rest of us, Christians need game because:

1. Abandoning the biblical frame of marriage kills the attraction wives feel for their husbands. Game will help get some of it back. If you insist on indulging in feminism even a little, you absolutely need to learn and practice game.
2. Game will help you stop rejecting and being ashamed of the Bible when it comes to men and women. Game will help you understand that your wife wants and needs to look up to you. She needs you to lead her and at times overrule her emotions with your strength of will and frame. It will also help you understand that women aren’t the morally superior sex that our foolish culture claims they are.

On the topic of wives being attracted to their husbands, the first thing most Christians need to learn from game is that it really is natural for wives to be attracted to their husbands. This of course flies in the face of modern Christian thought. Modern Christians view the urge for sex as a somewhat distasteful need that applies almost exclusively to men. This is evident in the Christianese expression “hubba hubba”. For an example of this view, see the article Motivating Men to be Caring Communicators by Jay & Laura Laffoon:

| Men lust after women. Women lust after being lusted after. Your wife wants you to want her. She desires to make herself desirable. Now we don’t mean lust as the world means lust- hubba hubba - we mean your woman needs to know that she is beautiful to you. |

Note to my readers: Only follow the advice in the article quoted above if you want your wife to feel unloved.

Sheila Gregiore used the same expression in a recent blog post:

| When a woman takes her shirt off at the end of the day, her husband immediately starts thinking sexy thoughts. When a man takes his shirt off, a woman tends to think, “Is he going to put that in the laundry hamper?” We don’t tend to think, to the same extent, “Oh, come get me, hubba hubba.” It’s not that we NEVER want to be taken; it’s just that our sex drive is far more caught up in feeling safe, and feeling cherished, and feeling loved, than it is in pure visual stimuli. |

Sheila has a similar passage in the introduction to her book Honey, I Don't Have a Headache Tonight: Help for Women Who Want to Feel More In the Mood:

| While sex may be wonderful, for many women it’s not always worth the effort. And unlike our dear spouses, for us it is an effort. We don’t automatically get “in the mood.” When we glimpse our darlings getting undressed, “hubba hubba” doesn’t usually come to mind. Instead, we watch him shedding his clothes and think, “I hope he’s not going to leave that laundry for me.” We need to have our to-do lists ready, make sure everyone has something to wear tomorrow, and get the house somewhat livable before we even entertain the possibility of making love. |
If you learn nothing else about game, learn that the quote above is absolute nonsense. Women do experience a strong desire to have sex, and it has nothing to do with whether she has finished her to-do list. The modern Christian misconception that women generally don’t experience strong sexual desire is a result of Christian wives not keeping their chastity prior to marriage and Christian husbands becoming less dominant and thereby less attractive to their wives (and the wives themselves rebelling). While there are of course medical exceptions, in general if your wife isn’t feeling “hubba hubba” towards you on a regular basis, something is very off. This isn’t just a harmless myth; large numbers of Christian husbands have learned the hard way that their wives do in fact experience strong sexual desires, they just feel them for other men.

Keep in mind that the condescending “hubba hubba” expression being used to shame husbands who feel sexual desire for their wives represents a sentiment that is anything but biblical. This kind of desire is exactly what Paul explains is the very reason to marry in 1 Corinthians 7:2-5. Far from minimizing this desire, Paul instructs husbands and wives to fulfil their spouse’s needs in this regard. Likewise, a husband thinking “hubba hubba” when his wife takes her shirt off is doing exactly as husbands are instructed in Proverbs 5:18-19:

18 Let thy fountain be blessed: and rejoice with the wife of thy youth.

19 Let her be as the loving hind and pleasant roe; let her breasts satisfy thee at all times; and be thou ravished always with her love.
Vox weighs in.
by Dalrock | August 8, 2012 | Link

Vox Day has shared his own thoughts on Christians and game on his blog Alpha Game: Game and the Decline of the Church
Losing control of the narrative.

by Dalrock | August 11, 2012 | Link

One of the biggest misconceptions in the manosphere is that women aren't interested in marrying anymore. It is an understandable misconception, because the actions of today's young women send a very confusing message. Only 20% of white women 20-24 years old in the U.S. have married. This is a very recent development; just ten years ago 30% of U.S. white women that age had already married. You only have to go back to 1996 in the US to see a time when half of all first marriages (of all races) involved brides who were under 25 (source).

The other piece of data which creates confusion is whether women stay married once they get married. As with the age of marriage data, this doesn't suggest that women want marriage. Women initiate the vast majority of divorces, and the divorce rate has been roughly constant for the last 20 years. Additionally, women consume divorce fantasies without shame. If you are targeting entertainment to women it is a given that a core part of your offering needs to be divorce fantasy or women won’t be interested. This is no less true if you are selling entertainment to Christian women.

But the fact remains that while they want to put off getting married and generally don’t want to feel an obligation to stay married, young women still want to get married, and they even still want to be married. If your reaction to this statement is That doesn’t make sense! It can’t possibly be! then you need to remember that logic and honor aren’t what is driving large numbers of modern women. They have been told they can have it all, and getting married is a minimum requirement for a woman to have it all.

Having it all means the woman gets her feminist merit badge and freely spends her sexual capital during her most attractive and marriageable years. After this having it all means she finds a beta provider to underwrite her new preferred lifestyle, that of a stay at home or works-for-fun wife and perhaps mother. This of course sets her up for the next round of adventure, where she divorces the boring loyal dude and makes him continue to underwrite her lifestyle while she seeks out the secret multimillionaire hunky handyman whom she was meant to be with all along.

For those having trouble keeping track of all of this, having it all means:
1. Getting her feminist merit badge while:
2. Having sex with the most attractive men who are willing to have sex with her. After a decade or so of this, she:
3. Marries a nice reliable man who provides the financial support and social status of wife and perhaps mother. Once she has gotten out of this what she wants, she:
4. Discovers that she is unhappier, and was somehow "trapped in marriage!" Many women prefer to savor this step for some period of time, perhaps even for many years. There is power and drama here and the next step contains risk.
5. Is forced to divorce the bad man who made her unhappier by doing everything she demanded he do.
6. Basks in the drama of a newly divorced woman, wronged by her ex husband and the society which forced her to marry the wrong man.
7. Has sex with the most attractive men who are (still) willing to have sex with her. Since this misguided attempt at reliving the glory of her twenties is generally an immense disappointment, she then wants to quickly move on to:
8. Finds her secret multimillionaire hunky handyman who insists that she marry him, thus returning her to the higher social status of wife.

Believe it or not, the having it all list ends here. A woman divorcing once and then marrying up says drama, rebirth, and empowerment. A woman divorcing twice says loser who couldn’t keep a man. Divorcing without remarrying says post marital spinster, also known as crazy cat lady her still married friends, colleagues, and relatives make fun of. Key to this process is to stick the landing so she winds up in the group making fun of the crazy cat ladies instead of becoming one of them.

But if you are a young woman looking to have it all sticking the landing isn’t something you need to worry about right now. You need to focus on your feminist merit badge while getting rogered by men who are very different than the kind of man you will eventually pressure to marry, the man to whom you will insist you “aren’t that kind of woman” so he needs to put a ring on it. And of course you need to make sure the pool of suckers potential husbands don’t notice what the larger script is.

This is where it is all starting to unravel. Game and the internet are conspiring to make it much more difficult to keep this open secret under wraps. Part of the problem is previous generations of women got married at such high rates the plan seems foolproof. Likewise, the fact that so many other women are doing the same thing provides a sense of safety in numbers. All of these factors are combining to create an environment where the men they are counting on manning up are instead at risk of catching on.

You remember the beta providers they are counting on, right? These are the men whose job it is to work extremely hard in their 20s to be prepared to support a wife and children in their 30s when their carousel queen is finally ready to “settle down”. In past generations the plan worked fairly well because most twenty something beta providers found themselves either on a track to marriage or at least with a periodic girlfriend. Now many of these men find themselves without any sexual interest from women through the bulk of their 20s. Most of these men will probably carry on as expected and “man up” once the tarts have been sufficiently popped. Now that she’s “found herself” (under a parade of men), I’m guessing
large numbers of beta provider types will *man up* and *do the right thing*. However, some would be beta providers will drop out of the pool of eligible providers by either deciding to become the player the young women want, or by only working hard enough to *get by*. For those who don’t become a player or drop out however, there is the additional risk that they will get wise to the game; with the internet other women are all too freely spilling the beans. Professor Mentu recently shared this youtube video where a group of 30 something women are surprisingly candid about their own sexual choices (LSFW):

You sleep with the bad boy you do not marry him.

But it isn’t just these two women who are letting the cat out of the bag. Women around the internet are spoiling the narrative. CR at *Gucci Little Piggy* shared a brutally honest quote from an article on *Wall Street Oasis*:

“I like my current boyfriend but I am not attracted to him. I have been seeing a few other men on the side whom I find pretty attractive and excited to be with.” I knew a couple of banker chicks in NYC, who are doing exactly this. They feel that their current boyfriends are beta-males (good providers) while they look for fun with alpha-males.

In another (crass) post Mentu quotes a group of women discussing how it works on facebook:

Most guys could care less about our sex history (like they know anyway) as long as we don’t rub it in.
...How many women sleep with guys who know one another? The guys I date never knew one another!!! Sheeessshhh... They can never gauge my sex history unless I volunteer to tell them.

In the same post Mentu shares another woman’s candor about her sexual past on Yahoo Answers:

This is serious business. Not only does the internet make it more likely that a young man will randomly run into this kind of truth, but sites in the manosphere explain what is really going on. Making things worse, the women hoping to *have it all* are expecting their beta providers to remain unaware for well over a decade.

I’m sure this will work for many of them, but I can’t see it working for all of them.

*We can do it* poster from *Wikipedia Commons*
Cypher’s Problem
by Cane Caldo | August 15, 2012 | Link

In his post Why Christians Need Game, Dalrock states the case thus:

Christians need game because:

1. Abandoning the biblical frame of marriage kills the attraction wives feel for their husbands. Game will help get some of it back. If you insist on indulging in feminism even a little, you absolutely need to learn and practice game.
2. Game will help you stop rejecting and being ashamed of the Bible when it comes to men and women. Game will help you understand that your wife wants and needs to look up to you. She needs you to lead her and at times overrule her emotions with your strength of will and frame. It will also help you understand that women aren’t the morally superior sex that our foolish culture claims they are.

I was asked if I would like to submit a guest post, and this is it. Many thanks to Dalrock for his graciousness, and to the readers for their long-suffering.

My goal is to show:

1. Game isn’t what you think it is.
2. Game means more than you think it does.
3. Christians don’t need Game.

Some parameters need to be set, so that the discussion can be fruitful. For my definitions I’ve chosen Dalrock’s blog, and Roissy/Chateau/Heartiste’s (henceforth called simply “Roissy”). Dalrock’s blog is a natural choice. This is where the debate is. Most importantly, Dalrock is probably the foremost independent Christian Game blogger.

Likewise, Roissy is the foremost Game blogger, period. His posts have set the tone for the entire field. He has the most development on both the philosophy and practice of Game. While he makes no claim to be the end-all-be-all of Game itself (and wasn’t its beginning) he is the most erudite and referenced prophet of Game. The fact is, we cannot talk about Game without talking about Roissy.

Lastly, I also reference the film “The Matrix” quite a bit. It’s important to understand the movie that introduced the Red Pill concept, to understand the Red Pill movement.

Game Isn’t What You Think It Is

What is Game? Here’s the definition, as I understand it:
Game is the applied science of attraction, most commonly expressed as the art of seduction. It’s based on the supposed evolutionary psychology of human; with a special emphasis on exploiting the condition of hypergamy.

Hypergamy is a philosophy of the condition of women that says, whenever possible, any given woman will choose to mate with the male in her vicinity that is exhibiting the most, and most dominant, sexual traits. Those sexual traits, themselves, are Game.

We don’t find this definition all in one place. It’s been broken-down into bite-sized pieces. Here are the most frequent, most emphasized pieces:

- Game is the applied science.
- Game is the art of seduction.
- Game is exploiting hypergamy.
- Game is exhibiting manly sexual traits.
- Game is exhibiting the most dominant sexual traits.

We call accepting this truth “Taking the Red Pill”. In fact, we call each of these bits Red Pills. We exhort each other to keep taking the Red Pills. But that’s not how the Red Pill works, is it? You take it once, and you’re out of the Matrix. More on this later.

Like most of you, I’ve eaten all these morsels, and they seemed good to me. But in the gastronomic tract of the mind they’ve been churned back together. Here’s what comes out:

- Game is founded on Game, most commonly expressed as Game. It’s based on the supposed evolutionary psychology of humans; with a special emphasis on the concept of Hypergamy.

Hypergamy is a philosophy of the condition of women that says, whenever possible, any given women will choose to mate with the male in her vicinity that is exhibiting the most, and most dominant, Game. Those Game are, themselves, Game.

Now, if that sounds silly to you, here are several definitions from Roissy:

- “Game is its own status.”
- “Game IS.”
- “Biomechanics is God.”

When we remove the tautologies and self-references from the my definition (which I think is very fair, and in keeping with the spirit of Roissy’s more compact ones), all we are left with is the concept of hypergamy. Even that is severely crippled with the lack of evidence that is founded upon the now-very-unstable Game. What we really see is that women want what they want, and that they want more and better, and there seems to be no end to their appetite.
Game Means More Than You Think It Does

You found Game either because you searched for “How to pick-up/meet women”, or because you looked around you, and you saw the wasteland that Feminism has wrought upon Western Civilization. You could sense something wasn’t right, but you couldn’t put a finger on it because you were enveloped in it. Everywhere, more and more news about women breaking down more barriers; more women CEOs, government officials, university students and presidents, reporters, soldiers, and sexy singles. And equally present the news that business is bad, government is atrocious, college is a waste, the news sucks, we can’t win wars anymore, and everyone is divorced.

Why is everything so off? Does anyone else get this bad vibe? We tend to focus on the fact that in the movie, the good guys found Neo first, but they show you that it didn’t have to turn out like that. The agents were immediately on the heels of Neo. What if you asked the Internet: “What is the Matrix?”, and the agents replied?

Cypher

Cypher is one of the most interesting characters of the movie. He’s outside the Matrix, and he’s knows what is inside it is phony, but he can’t stop fantasizing about the pleasures of the Matrix. Good food and good women are rare in the real world. Life outside the Matrix very much seems dull. Cypher knows one good-looking woman, and she’s hung up on another guy. He spends his free time watching the programs scroll by, building his lust; not focused on the real world and mission, but on what he’s missing out. Cypher sums up his discomfort and displeasure when he says to Neo, “I know what you’re thinking: Why, oh why, didn’t I take the Blue Pill?”

Eventually, his lusts get the better of him, and he starts working for the agents; visiting with them in restaurants among beautiful, fake, people. Ultimately, his lusts lead him to betray his mission, his friends, and even the woman he loves. It’s the most likely fate of the Christian man that follows Game. It’s not the only possible fate, and not the worst. You could get taken over by an agent. (This is what I suspect of Roissy.) Roissy knows the Matrix isn’t real–just as Neo, Morpheus, and Cypher do–but he is intent upon using the Matrix to get pleasure. You can find it here, here, and here. Above all, you can find it in the Sixteen Commandments of Poon. Game writers all work from the point of view that the sensory experience of steak and vagina is so good, that whatever you have to do to get it, you should. And whatever betrayal you have to commit to yourself or others is just effective Game.

This is being in the real world, but taking the Blue Pill.

Christians Don’t Need Game

At its fullest, and most coherent, the Blue Pill of Game says that the source of happiness is found between many women’s legs, and that to get there you must serve their unspoken–and even misunderstood– desires. It says (contradictory on its face!) that you must serve yourself, and to serve yourself you must serve them…right up until they are no more use to
you. It’s often said that Game doesn’t pretend to answer what to do with women who the Game-user has no use for; whether by age or behavior unsuitable to the Game-user. This is a lie. It says: Get rid of them. Christians must not do this. The problem the Christian has with Feminists is the problem that Morpheus states to Neo during the-very apt-woman in the red dress test.

“Look around you. What do you see? [...]The very minds of the people we’re trying to save. But until we do they’re a part of that system, and that makes them our enemy.”

We are not free to abuse them, even if they’re sluts. Game, though, demands this. Over and again we read on Roissy, Roosh, and others that we can only develop Game by using it on many women. In addition to the logistical problems for the Christian (much more the husband!), this teaching demonstrates the difficulty in forming a cohesive philosophy of Game. You can’t Game until you’ve Gamed a lot.

Part of the perception problem is that Feminism is so pervasive that any assertive behavior the Game writer puts into his text is considered Game; simple because it’s not outright Feminist. This is what’s so deceptive about Roissy’s Sixteen Commandments: The things that a Christian husband can’t do, are Game; those he can, aren’t! Additionally, all of them focus on either the supremacy of the man applying them, or women’s hypergamy. “You do these things because it will subvert her hypergamy.” “You don’t do these because her hypergamy will be encouraged.” That frame is all wrong for the Christian.

If scripture were relatively silent on male-female relations then maybe a case could be made for it; like engineering. But it’s so far from being silent (It’s concerned with it from cover to cover) that we must view Game as a competitor to scripture. To bring this back to Dalrock’s case, just after his two reasons, he says:

“On the topic of wives being attracted to their husbands, the first thing most Christians need to learn from game is that it really is natural for wives to be attracted to their husbands.”

This isn’t what Game says! It says that it’s natural for wives to be driven by their hypergamous biomechanics to be attracted to the available alpha in their proximity. If Game is true, then a man should NEVER marry. Game writers whole-heartedly agree with that sentiment. If you’re already married, you’re simply meat waiting to be processed by the Feminist machines.

No man can serve two masters. Serving women—that is, Feminism; that is, the Matrix—is what Game is all about. Understand her desires. Fulfill her desires. Reap pleasure from her desires. This is Feminism twisted back on itself. Game attempts to use the Matrix to get in Feminist pants. Christianity means to send Feminism to Hell.

Here’s how scripture describes it in one place: 2 Timothy 3:1-7

But understand this, that in the last days there will come times of difficulty. 2 For people will be lovers of self, lovers of money, proud, arrogant, abusive, disobedient
to their parents, ungrateful, unholy, 3 heartless, unappeasable, slanderous, without self-control, brutal, not loving good, 4 treacherous, reckless, swollen with conceit, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God, 5 having the appearance of godliness, but denying its power. Avoid such people. 6 For among them are those who creep into households and capture weak women, burdened with sins and led astray by various passions, 7 always learning and never able to arrive at a knowledge of the truth.

Here we have a description of PUAs and Game writers, a command to avoid them, and a very apt description of all the passions a woman is given to; including Feminism, and hypergamy. Scripture says: Avoid such people. For among them are PUAs. You’re not Neo. You’re a potential Cypher, or a potential agent.

What the Christian man must have is a scriptural frame. I want to be clear: The real world is a very dead place. There is death, divorce, and fatherless children all around. Concern for them is what the real Red Pill—the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ crucified—reveals to us. Answering what to do about that is another post.

Finally, I want to ask the readers a question. Let’s assume that I have Game wrong, and that it can be separated from the PUA culture, and its tricks. Let’s assume it’s simply about breaking through the Feminist frame, understanding hypergamy, and adopting a masculine frame. Considering that the Christian man is called to marriage alone for sexual release, and that the world is full of sluts (there aren’t nearly enough virgins to go around), how is Game anything but a round-about method of telling Christian men to Man-Up and Marry These Sluts?
Brendan’s definition of a slut.
by Dalrock | August 17, 2012 | Link

Brendan wrote an intriguing definition of the term slut in the discussion of the previous post:

On the “what is a slut” issue, the question really isn’t about a numerical cutoff, which is why that’s generally an unfruitful way of looking at the question. A slut is someone who has an instrumental view of sexuality — that is, one who views sex in a hedonistic way for the most part. A person with this mentality towards sex will not link sex with marriage exclusively, because the view of sex is distorted and based on hedonic elements which we all know can well occur outside of marriage as well. That is, sex is about two (or more) human beings collaborating physically to bring each other sexual pleasure, and this is a “good” in and of itself as long as ‘enthusiastic consent’ is present. That is an instrumental/hedonist view of sexuality, and is the sine qua non of being a slut. That is the case whether one actually has a high n or not — lots of other factors go into one’s n, and not all of them are subject to individual control (although quite a few are). There are women with low n’s who nevertheless have a very instrumental/hedonist view of sex. Eventually, that will come out and express itself, even if it is decades later, because marital sexuality will eventually fail to hedonistically satisfy. The same holds true of men as well — men who have a hedonistic/instrumental view of sexuality are also sluts, whether they have a high n or not. The point isn’t that all of these people will “stray” sexually, if they marry — rather the point is that their relationship to sex is more hedonistic and less sacramental, and is therefore fundamentally distorted, and therefore will eventually lead to some challenges down the road. There are plenty of people who have fairly low n’s who nonetheless have a slutty view of sex, who then end up questioning their commitments later in life when they may feel they have “missed out” sexually — that is a decidedly slutty thing to say, because someone who does not have a slutty view of sex would not feel that they have “missed out” by skipping the opportunity to have instrumental/hedonistic sexual encounters and experiences when younger (or feel the interest in having them later in life) — they simply were not interested in having sex under those conditions because of their understanding of what sex actually is, and what it means (note that I am not suggesting it is always black and white in any person, and there are people who have non-slutty attitude towards sex but who may struggle with slutty thoughts about sex — that probably reflects a lot of people as well, which isn’t very surprising due to the generally sinful condition most of us find ourselves in).

So the issue isn’t really the “n” as much as it is the attitude. Note, however, that this really only works one way. That is, a higher “n” person is virtually always someone who has (or had) an instrumental/hedonistic view of sex — a slut or a (claimed to be) ex-slut. Someone who has a sacramental view of sex will generally have an “n” of zero outside marriage (but not always — some non-sluts do make a mistake due to sin, but still the number would be very low, like 1). So it generally isn’t the case that people who have higher n’s are not sluts (or were not sluts) — they were at the time.
The question then becomes “are they still one”, and that has to do with their attitude towards sex and what it means to them. Conversely, a person can have a very low “n”, like DH, and still be a slut interiorly when it comes to sexuality, seeing it as instrumental and hedonistic — this just means that the person is selective in his/her hedonism. And, as I said above, and as we see in DH’s case interestingly enough, if this fundamental attitude towards sexuality remains intact, generally this will be expressed in some way at some point in life, either before one makes a “commitment” or, in some cases, after. It’s not that such persons can’t live a monogamous life — they can, if they take commitments seriously. It’s that their attitude towards sex can lead them to question the sexual aspect of their commitment more easily, and lead to regrets about it (or even earlier sexual reticence, as I note above) later as life marches on.

The logic he uses is elegant, and I would argue that he is drawing the line in accordance with biblical sexual morality (which almost no one in our current culture Christian or not ascribes to). For this reason alone it is worth serious consideration.

I disagree that this is the definition of the term slut though, because the term is fundamentally sex specific and his definition is universal. The sex specific nature of slut has not to do with the sinfulness of fornication (which is the same for men and women), but with the degree of practical risk involved with marrying such a person. The greatest asset of a marriage are the children it produces. With this in mind, no one wants to marry a partner who appears defective regarding their ability to protect this asset. The wife has the role of protecting that the children are unadulterated. The husband has the role of physically protecting both the wife and their children. As I have argued previously, the closest counterpart for men to the term slut is coward.

However, this doesn’t negate the truth in Brendan’s definition, and men who view sex according to Brendan’s definition of slut are certainly not a good risk for marriage. This is even worse if the man ranks too highly in alpha traits.
Women’s sacred path to marriage is in danger.
by Dalrock | August 20, 2012 | Link

Women crave the commitment of lifelong marriage and will naturally seek it out and hold their marriages together so long as they aren’t tricked into marrying the wrong man. Young women’s hearts and feelings are like the nose of a bloodhound in this regard. Their emotions will lead them to their perfect match, the man God intends them to marry. Once they find this man they will not only marry but stay married.

But while women are gifted in knowing about relationships, men can only screw this up. Unlike the pure hearts of women which seek out love, the hearts of men are corrupt and seek out lust. Furthermore, young women need a certain amount of experience to learn how to hone their skills of soulmate tracking. They need to learn how to follow their heart, and we need to give them this opportunity for the good of all society. Otherwise women will suffer the fate of being trapped in marriage, after being somehow fooled into marrying the wrong man. The unwitting woman is then forced against her will to kick the father of her children out of the house and collect cash and prizes. The wellbeing of our future generations is at stake and we therefore must reorder our entire society to ensure that women’s perfect husband tracking instincts are allowed to function as God designed.

Crucial to this process is to avoid the biggest danger of all, that she marries the first man she has sex with. The other danger is the risk of men interfering with the woman’s noble quest for love with their own ignoble quest for lust. These men will not only trick women into being trapped in marriage, but also trick them into having sex without love and commitment.

To stave off these disasters we have created the optimal path for women to marriage. Few dare to discuss something this sacred, but everyone knows this is what must be done for the good of society. Women need to sample a series of men in mini marriages otherwise called Long Term Relationships. In these mini marriages she practices the skill of falling in and out of love and experiencing sex and a romantic relationship with a series of men. Once she has sampled enough men, her heart will tell her when she is with the man she needs to marry. There is much mystery in how her heart accomplishes this, and only she and God can know. Her heart is always right, so if she marries a man whom she later finds she can’t remain married to this is proof that she was somehow tricked by the man. Her heart is the expert, and we need to ensure that she can follow it. Our best defense against her heart being overruled is to fortify the young woman with the powerful forces of girlpower and moxie. Scientists tell us that this is best accomplished by having her complete her college education and have her own career before trusting her heart to make the choice. Once our noble marriage seeker has found the man she was destined to marry, she then hands him a special card which all women have (it comes from their magic hearts).
It is then the man’s duty to do as the card instructs and man up and marry her. So long as everyone involved follows this perfect script, all of our problems with unhappy marriages, broken homes and fatherless children will be solved!

But some men are tricksters and are threatening the entire sacred process. These players lay in wait for innocent young women on their noble quest to have sex with a string of men until their heart tells them they have found the man they should marry. The players are in it for sex, unlike the women who are in it for love and commitment. Even worse, they have no intention of following instructions should they be handed a man up card. They care nothing that the woman may have already invested a decade or more of her youth nobly sampling men for marriage potential. This is downright trickery, and the players are putting the entire process of women finding Holy Matrimony in jeopardy!
Beauty taming the savage beast.
by Dalrock | August 27, 2012 | Link

The whole modern world has divided itself into Conservatives and Progressives. The business of Progressives is to go on making mistakes. The business of Conservatives is to prevent mistakes from being corrected.

-G. K. Chesterton

Nearly all Traditional Conservatives are deeply invested in the narrative of men as uncivilized and immoral brutes who need to be tamed by morally superior women. We see this with Glenn Stanton’s delight in the movie As Good As It Gets, and his assertion to parents that their daughters will naturally grow up to be good so long as society doesn’t trip them up. We also see this in Pastor Driscoll’s famous line:

Men are like trucks: they drive straighter with a weighted load.

This narrative is in fact part of the rationale for women’s sacred path to marriage. Once the woman has had sex with a suitable variety of men, the man she hands the man up card to has the duty to marry her not only as a reward to her for having done the work of having sex with many men, but as a duty to himself to submit to her moral superiority so she can make him a better man.

Traditional Conservatives are making two key mistakes to come to this frame of mind. The first is a misunderstanding of why men in a culture which supports traditional marriage behave so differently than men in a culture which discourages it. Civilization was built by men, specifically by beta men who were motivated by the possibility of having and leading a family. Men are willing to work harder and make sacrifices when they either have a family or perceive the possibility of having one. Trad Cons have misunderstood this effect, and instead misattributed productive and civilized behavior among men to an effect of women being present.

The second mistake is Trad Cons having forgotten what they were conserving in the first place. As I’ve mentioned before, Trad Cons act much like a drift sock; they aren’t anchored to a fixed position so they simply act as a drag against whatever the current direction of change is.

If Trad Cons were anchored to a fixed position it would be the Bible. The Old Testament is filled with cautionary stories about men who let their wives lead them instead of the other way around, and the New Testament is also clear on this issue. Outside of the Bible, folk tales and Shakespeare teach the opposite of the modern Trad Con narrative, with tales of husbands taming their shrewish wives. However the Bible should either way be the primary anchor when conserving western thought on this issue, and this should be the case whether one is Christian or simply conserving the Judeo-Christian tradition.

But most Trad Con Christians aren’t anchored in the Bible. In fact, the Bible is an obstacle.
they need to overcome on a regular basis. Fortunately for them they have become quite good at this. Consider Dr. R. Albert Mohler Jr., the president of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. He explains the problem of pornography in marriage in his article The Seduction of Pornography and the Integrity of Christian Marriage, Part 2 (H/T Kaehu, and don’t miss Ballista74’s excellent post).

According to Dr. Mohler, the problem with pornography in Christian marriage is that it threatens the natural order of things by weakening the wife’s control over her husband (emphasis mine):

The emotional aspect of sex cannot be divorced from the physical dimension of the sex act. Though men are often tempted to forget this, women possess more and less gentle means of making that need clear.

Consider the fact that a woman has every right to expect that her husband will earn access to the marriage bed.

He explains that God wants wives to withhold sex in order to control their husbands, and in this way the wife can lead and purify her husband. While a husband’s desire for sex with his wife is physical and therefore shameful, she purifies the act of sex by ensuring that it is more abstract and emotional. He makes this argument by citing from 1 Corinthians 7, which states that neither spouse is to deny sex to the other because it creates temptation for sexual sin (like pornography). He reads this through the lens of Ephesians 5 which states that the husband is to lead his wife and to wash her with the water of the Word, and she is to submit to him. Where Scripture says “up”, Dr. Mohler explains that it secretly means “down”.

While Paul states in 1 Corinthians 7 that unmarried men are focused on pleasing the Lord and married men tend to fall into the trap of focusing on things of the world (pleasing their wives), Dr. Mohler knows that the opposite is true:

I am confident that God’s glory is seen in the fact that a married man, faithful to his wife, who loves her genuinely, will wake up in the morning driven by ambition and passion in order to make his wife proud, confident, and assured in her devotion to her husband.

Dr. Mohler explains that this occurs through the moral wisdom of a woman’s tingle:

Put most bluntly, I believe that God means for a man to be civilized, directed, and stimulated toward marital faithfulness by the fact that his wife will freely give herself to him sexually only when he presents himself as worthy of her attention and desire.

This he explains is the fundamental problem with pornography; it weakens the power the wife holds over her husband in the form of withheld sex, interfering with her ability to civilize him. He illustrates this by offering a contrast. First he describes a married man:

The first picture is of a man who has set himself toward a commitment to sexual purity, and is living in sexual integrity with his wife. In order to fulfill his wife’s rightful expectations and to maximize their mutual pleasure in the marriage bed, he
is careful to live, to talk, to lead, and to love in such a way that his wife finds her fulfillment in giving herself to him in love.

He contrasts this to the untamed brutes men will naturally become if not lead by a wife:

This man need not be concerned with his physical appearance, his personal hygiene, or his moral character in the eyes of a wife. Without this structure and accountability, he is free to take his sexual pleasure without regard for his unshaved face, his slothfulness, his halitosis, his body odor, and his physical appearance.
Commenter Feminist Hater posted a link to a recent *Daily Mail* article:

**Half of women delay starting a family because they don’t want to give up their freedom.**

What struck me the most were the comments, especially this one by belblac:

I was scared I would not meet Mr Right and have children so I foolishly married someone I did not love and was ultimately unhappy with...the trade off? my two beautiful son’s who I love totally. Would I do the same again? Yes, because I would not have missed my two son’s for the world. I guess sperm donation would or could have been an option but it was not widely available back then...and I do think, despite how I felt about my ex husband, that my son’s benefited from having two parents during their growing up years. I just wish I could have had both my son’s and an ‘happy ever after’ marriage with their Father...that would have been so nice.

Commenter JJ has her own explanation for the problem. It is the alphas who are focusing on younger, more attractive, and fertile women who prevent aging career gals from becoming mothers:

This is not helped by men like my attractive, thirty-something male work colleague who won’t go out with women over thirty because they want babies. Hé doesn’t want to be ‘tied down’. I get a bit fed up with women being blamed for not having babies at the medically approved time. Men are involved too.

I think what she was trying to say is *man up and marry those sluts*.

Commenter Big Mama Mia explained that the problem is women are afraid of being gamed by the system like belblac was:

Maybe its the fear of being left holding the baby. So many woman are the sole parent. That alone is enough to remain childless. Not so bad if you have good people in your life and lots of cash.

To this commenter Completely Average replied:

In the UK, women initiate divorce 70% of the time. So 70% of women who are the sole parent made the choice to be the sole parent. ————————– If you’re afraid of being alone there is a simple solution, stop leaving your man.

Commenter Tifa Lockheart took issue with this, explaining that **there is no such thing as frivolous divorce.**

You could ask yourself why that 70% filed for divorce. Surely that would be a more telling statistic on the break up of marriages? Or are you suggesting that either a man or a woman should stay with a drunken, abusive or adulterous partner? The
numbers that file tell us nothing other than they had a reason to file, they don’t say why & therefore they are of no importance. Unless you’re saying that this 70% of women filed for divorce because it was fun in some way?

The system is designed to be gamed the way belblac describes. I challenge anyone who disagrees to point out what laws are in place to prevent any woman who wants from marrying a man she doesn’t love, using him for status, conception, and early child rearing, and then kicking him out of the home while retaining a large portion of his assets and income?

There is nothing preventing this. It is the system functioning as designed. Yet, there is near perfect denial of this, and like belblac above the women who run the scam themselves quite often see themselves as the victim.
Society has seen fit to hand wives the option to destroy their families on a whim in an effort to give them power over their husbands. In order to maximize the credibility and effectiveness of this threat, the church has stepped in to offer moral cover, and the culture regularly eggs her on. If she acts on this option she will cause herself and her own children great and lasting pain. She will almost always end up with the real life bad outcomes the absurd divorce fantasies are based on. Instead of a secret multimillionaire hunky handyman magically appearing with a proposal of marriage after she detonates her family, she is far more likely to find herself alone or pretending she did better than she did.

But none of this changes the fact that she has the option to blow up her family and society’s full moral and legal blessing to use it. While she can’t rationally expect to avoid creating her own personal catastrophe in the process, the threat she can hold over her husband is all too real. Men who marry (or find themselves married) in this climate tend to adopt one of three postures:

1. **The Supplicating Beta.** He is convinced that a combination of denial and supplication will keep her happy. The supplicating beta husband’s thought process is: “If I’m good enough, she will be happy. So long as she is happy she won’t push the plunger. If she
pushes the plunger, it is my fault.” Besides, women never divorce on a whim; they always have a good reason. Those men who are divorced by their wives must deserve it.

2. **The Master Manipulator.** He is in complete control, and has the obligation to keep her from pushing the plunger. The master manipulator has expert skills of psychological and social finesse. He doesn’t fear her using the detonator because his Game is so good he is firmly in control of what she does and thinks. To him marrying is ultimately proof that he is so alpha he can deliberately place himself at an extreme disadvantage and still come out on top. Any man who can’t do the same is an inferior being who deserves his fate in the divorce meat grinder. While not worded this way, his thought process is strikingly similar to that of the supplicating beta (although he lacks the supplicating beta’s repulsiveness): “If I’m good enough [at my Game], she will be happy. So long as she is happy she won’t push the plunger. If she pushes the plunger, it is my fault.”

While the supplicating beta acts recklessly by (inadvertently) making himself sexually repulsive to his wife, the master manipulator may instead see himself as able to get away with what for other husbands would be acts of recklessness because he is so sexually attractive. He’s so firmly in control that she wouldn’t destruct the family even if he treats her cruelly and/or keeps one or more women on the side.

3. **The Resigned Loving Patriarch.** He is unshakable in his knowledge of the fact that he is the rightful leader of the household. He isn’t going to be reckless by either making himself repulsive or treating his wife cruelly, but he doesn’t absolve his wife of her own profound moral obligations. Against his better judgment the state and church have seen fit to hand her the detonator and to encourage her to use it. After recovering from the initial disbelief of the absurdity of what the church and state have done, his response is: “Are you going to use that, or are you going to make us dinner?” He isn’t above using tools of leadership and psychology to effectively lead, and as a loving patriarch he wants her to be happy; Game is an effective tool which he employs for both purposes. But he understands that her capacity for rebellion and/or to find reasons to be unhappy is great, and that she has to make her own choice. If she gets unhappier and pushes the plunger, it is ultimately her own responsibility.

Original housewife image by Tetra Pak (creative commons). Dynamite detonator from this picture by Lilu under WTF Public License (NSFW)
It’s a feature, not a bug.

by Dalrock | September 10, 2012 | Link

Redditer _simplecosine_ was kind enough to link to my post _Threatpoint_ where I stated:

> ..divorce reform is all about redistributing power from the husband who wants to honor the marriage vows to the wife who doesn’t.

Redditer _justaconservative_ read the post and **pointed out my error**:

> This article is perfectly ludicrous. Prior to unilateral divorce, the legal situation favoured whichever party was able to make the marriage most unconscionable for the other party, without crossing the line into blatant illegality. The aggrieved party either had to suffer an unlivable situation, had to leave without a divorce and forfeit their right to re-marriage, or had to negotiate for a divorce on the terms of the aggressor.

> While both genders are fully capable of being the aggressor, the realities of most families meant that men were overwhelmingly favoured by this arrangement; as their typically greater sizes and strengths meant a greater ability to make marriage unconscionable (through physical violence/control), and they generally controlled most of the income. A woman, or otherwise financially vulnerable party, who couldn’t remarry could be condemned to destitution by this system if they simply left, so they would be forced to negotiate a settlement far below what they needed or deserved. The economically independent party could also always threaten to leave, and have it be a real threat, preventing the other party from making the living arrangement truly unconscionable for them.

See his full comment for all of the conservative goodness, but note what his argument is in the two paragraphs I quoted. His argument is that marriage as practiced from biblical times until 40 years ago was inherently unfair to women, and that he for one is glad that feminists fixed this. He doesn’t deny the social engineering I’m describing, he merely is _thankful_ for it. I know Not All Trad Cons Are Like That, but honestly how many do you know who aren’t?
Mentu’s moving vasectomy post.

by Dalrock | September 12, 2012 | Link

Mentu put up an outstanding post earlier this week on why he chose to get a vasectomy. Predictably it drew the standard smug. While the standard traditional response to the great violence being done to marriage (including innocent men and children) is at best a shrug, when an individual man elects not to sign up for the chance to be kicked out of his kids’ lives there is hell to pay. Why won’t he man up and marry those sluts! The predictable cry goes out. If only the smug brigade had the same outrage when Christian leaders express hostility for biblical marriage. In the smug brigade’s defense, their feminist overlords tend to make their lives very uncomfortable when they get out of line.

As a literary work, I especially appreciated the duality of the married with kids hoax. Mentu played the hoax on the clinic, and the church and state played the hoax on the real father. Brilliant.

Check it out if you have a spare moment. If you are inclined to smug, order in an extra delivery so you don’t run out.

Edit: Ulysses has his own take on Mentu’s post and the discussion below here.
One of the questions that comes up when we look at lower marriage rates as well as delayed age of marriage is which sex is driving the change. Compounding the problem is the relationship between the two, and the fact that the answers could be different. For example, it seems plausible that women are delaying marriage in their early twenties, and that men who wanted to marry when young are less inclined to marry an older woman later in life.

Given the message aimed at women, the celebration of the feminist merit badge and hookup culture as empowerment for young women, and who holds the SMP/MMP power position when young, I think it is safe to say that it is preferences of women which is driving the delay we have seen in the past decades in age of marriage.

However, I was curious if there was a way to test this in the available data. I’ve shared the long term trend of median age of marriage in a previous post (source):

I took the same source data and plotted out the difference between the values for men and women by year. Here is what it looks like going back to 1890. Note that prior to 1947 the data has gaps, which is why the chart immediately above started at 1950:
Here is what it looks like just from 1990:

My initial thought is that if men were interested in delaying marriage and women weren’t, we would expect to see a significant increase in this delta over time, especially as the median age of marriage increases. Instead it looks like 2 years is a very steady gap.

I’m not entirely through thinking this over, but thought you my readers might want to
consider the issue and offer your own thoughts.
An adaptive strategy for furthering the family line.

by Dalrock | September 16, 2012 | Link

Some have noted that fathers have begun treating their daughters as if they were sons, as this US Army commercial demonstrates:

However, a more rational approach would be to decide early on to encourage daughters to marry young and start having children, while encouraging sons to forgo having their own children and instead invest emotionally and financially in their nieces and nephews. Even with decades of feminism daughters make poor sons, but the deck is now profoundly stacked in their favor regarding parenthood and custody. The sons and parents could financially support the daughters having children without creating a legal incentive for them to blow up the family and sue for child support. The family would at the same time strongly encourage the daughter to remain married to the father of her children, as this is very much to the children’s benefit. While financial support from a father creates an incentive to divorce and expel the father from the household, financial support from grandparents and uncles could be used as an incentive to keep the family together. In this way a family might have the same number of grandchildren overall but avoid the disadvantages of a system which strongly discourages fatherhood.

I’m not advocating this approach, but I can see where given the system we have built many might decide it is to their advantage to follow it. This is defacto what is already occurring in many families as a response to the unequal legal treatment of fathers and mothers, and we can see this for example in Mentu’s story.
Vox Day responds to Susan Walsh’s skepticism of female solipsism in his current post at Alpha Game. Susan poses the question:

What evidence can you offer that “female solipsism” is not just another manosphere circle jerk?

A bit later she elaborates:

I have made a habit of digging into the source of certain claims in the ‘sphere, and what I usually find is a complete absence of intellectual rigor. Instead, there is a sort of high-fiving among male bloggers on principles that are completely unsubstantiated.

Unless someone can offer me some rational explanation for saying that women are especially solipsistic, I don’t accept it.

I can empathize with Susan wanting to see hard data on this, and I would be very interested in seeing a rigorous study on this question. Unfortunately I’m not aware of any, and a quick web search didn’t help. If you know of one, please share it. Susan, Vox, and I will all be in your debt.

I see two areas where female solipsism is most obvious. The first is the tendency of women to think anything being discussed is about them personally. This can be truly ridiculous, as occurred in an exchange between my wife and another woman a few years ago at a gathering of Christian mothers. My wife mentioned reading about a school assigning inappropriate books to middle schoolers, and the other mother was very concerned about this until my wife mentioned one of the titles. It was The Electric Koolaid Acid Test, and when my wife mentioned the title the woman became very upset and said:

But I read that in college!

The woman responded emotionally as if my wife was judging her for having read the book years ago (how could my wife even have known?), and physically recoiled away from my wife. She simply couldn’t process that it wasn’t about what she personally had read 20 years ago in college and was about what schools were assigning to Jr High students today. This was in a group of women who filtered everything through whether it was “Christian” enough. Once a field trip to the local opera was discussed and deemed inappropriate because the opera didn’t have an explicitly Christian message.

The other example I see very often is the amazing lack of empathy women have for men. I’ll use an example many here are familiar with. No fault divorce and the accompanying family court process is designed to punish men who egregiously break their marriage vows. Academics admit that it is designed as a punishment for men meant to be used as a
threatpoint to give wives power. Women acknowledge this at one level, because whenever a husband misbehaves the instant chorus is *Take his kids and his money. That will teach him!* Yet when men point out how unfair this is given that the system treats all men as if they abused/abandoned/cheated, women want proof that this isn’t fair. **They can’t understand that a system which always punishes a man as if he committed something egregious is inherently unfair.** Because of this, they demand proof that the amount of child support is excessive, and that the men complaining about the process don’t really deserve to be punished.

This is especially noteworthy given the differing opportunities for men and women to commit divorce theft and how our society has responded. Everyone knows the male version: Use up her youth and then divorce her and marry a younger woman. Alternately he could take on a mistress when his wife is older, making his wife the one to file for divorce. Either way the wife is most vulnerable when she is older and her husband’s SMV/MMV is relatively higher. The preferred model for women is to use a man for status (get the wedding), legitimacy (get knocked up within wedlock), and early parenting help (get the kids weaned and out of diapers), and then kick him out to collect cash and prizes while she is still young and attractive.

Given the differing strategies for men and women to commit divorce theft the timing of divorce tells us much about who is really sticking it to whom. If men are sticking it to women, we would expect divorce rates to rise as wives entered and passed middle age. If women are sticking it to men, we would expect divorce rates to be highest when the wife has the best remarriage opportunities and to drop with her chances to remarry. We might even see a spike in divorce 5-10 years after the wedding, leaving just enough time to get junior born and out of diapers. If both men and women are sticking it to each other, we would expect to see indications of both patterns, with divorce rates dropping through a woman’s thirties before climbing again starting around age 40 or so.

The actual stats in the US and UK show that divorce is highest when the wife is young and declines the older the wife gets. Women are clearly taking advantage of their opportunity to commit divorce theft in large numbers, but *almost no men are*. Looking at the UK historical data, while divorce rates have exploded across the board this age based pattern was as true in the 1960s as it is today:
A somewhat different data pull demonstrates the same basic pattern for the US. While the US data in the chart below includes marriages ending due to death of the wife as well as divorce and doesn’t show the age of wife, obviously the wives are getting older as the marriage progresses (see this post for a full explanation of the chart):
Note that in the US marriage endings are most common in the second five year period. This leaves just enough time to have the kids, get them weaned and out of diapers, and discover she isn’t haaapy while she still has as much of her youth as possible. We see a similar bump in the UK divorce rate data by age above, although US divorce rates by age drop continuously both now and in 1990.

Putting this in perspective, women complained about men committing divorce theft (trading an older wife in for a younger model). Even though statistically it was extremely rare, men empathized and reworked the entire divorce process to counter just that risk. Now that men are being brutalized by that process with great regularity men are complaining to women. But women in general don’t care; if you raise the issue, all they can think of is how a man might one day do something to them. They respond emotionally, demanding proof that the men being punished don’t deserve it:

Provide stats for this or shut up. Men cheat more than women do. How do you account for that in divorces initiated by women? He breaks the contract, she files. Sounds fair to me. Yes, there are frivolous divorces, but I’d like to know what percentage of female-initiated divorces they are. I think this theme is exaggerated and overblown in the manosphere echo chamber.
More on female solipsism
by Dalrock | September 20, 2012 | Link

Vox has his promised follow on post up: Why solipsism matters. In it he offers both a definition and a practical test for it. Check it out.

Commenter Cail Corishev made a point on Vox’s post which I think is very relevant:

There’s a common occurrence in Internet discussions. Someone presents a theory that some people aren’t comfortable with. The uncomfortable ones claim that terms need to be defined or proof needs to be offered — reasonable-sounding requests — and they divert the thread to a quest for perfect definition and proof, throwing up complex requirements and bulleted lists of points that must be satisfied before the theory itself can be discussed. By the time that’s done (if ever), everyone’s gotten sick of the discussion and moved on.

And a bit further down:

Empirical data has its place — I’m certainly not anti-science — but so do intuition and gut feeling. A guy comes into the group and says, “Hey, there’s this term that really fits something women do that guys need to understand,” and the other guys slap themselves on the forehead and say, “Holy crap, that’s it! I kinda understood that, but I didn’t have a way to think about it better than, ‘She be crazy.’ This really helps me understand how to deal with women/my woman.” A discussion begins as they explore the new concept.

I agree with this. The truly interesting things we discuss in this sphere are the ones which are contrary to conventional wisdom. The insistence on a conventionally accepted term for an unconventional idea can only serve to stop the discussion. This doesn’t mean there isn’t value in searching for data, the best possible term, and most coherent definition, but the search shouldn’t be allowed to automatically preclude the discussion. It should instead be part of the discussion. In addition, those who add the most value to the discussion tend to be the ones in the best position to influence terms and definitions. If you want to wield the power of an opinion leader, you need to start by becoming the opinion leader. Don’t complain about the lack of data; find data and share it. Don’t complain about the term, coin another one and if people like it better and the old term hasn’t solidified they will use it instead. Don’t complain about the lack of definition; offer a definition which is so good others will be inclined to reference it, or even better accept it. For bonus points, perhaps offer a practical test.

Lastly, while the rationalization hamster is a different concept than female solipsism, the two are clearly related. This is perhaps best demonstrated by Badger’s excellent post from March of last year: Scientific Evidence for the Rationalization Hamster. In that post Badger quotes a UC Santa Barbara brain scientist describing how one part of the brain can invent information to avoid mental inconsistency:

Patients with “reduplicative paramnesia,” because of damage to the brain, believe
that there are copies of people or places. In short, they will remember another time and mix it with the present. As a result, they will create seemingly ridiculous, but masterful, stories to uphold what they know to be true due to the erroneous messages their damaged brain is sending their intact interpreter. One such patient believed the New York hospital where she was being treated was actually her home in Maine. When her doctor asked how this could be her home if there were elevators in the hallway, she said, “Doctor, do you know how much it cost me to have those put in?” The interpreter will go to great lengths to make sure the inputs it receives are woven together to make sense—even when it must make great leaps to do so.

**Edit:** See also Ian Ironwood’s *The Tangled Chains On The Swing Set of Solipsism*
Conservatives enabling feminism

by Dalrock | September 22, 2012 | Link

From the definition of enabling at Wikipedia:

A common example of enabling can be observed in the relationship between the alcoholic/addict and a codependent spouse. The spouse believes incorrectly that he or she is helping the alcoholic by calling into work for them, making excuses that prevent others from holding them accountable, and generally cleaning up the mess that occurs in the wake of their impaired judgment. In reality what the spouse is doing is hurting, not helping.

I think the mind frame of an enabler helps explain why many* conservatives act the way they do. They see themselves as the responsible ones who have to hold it all together. Whatever scheme feminists cook up, enabling conservatives find themselves trying to make it somehow work, or at least to minimize the pain experienced by those who follow the scheme. Ultimately of course the end result is enabling the feminists by making sure their bad ideas don’t result in immediately noticeable consequences. This also explains the angry conservative response to criticism of their efforts to enact a working form of feminism; they see themselves as the sane ones who are holding it all together.

*NACALT

See Also: Greasing the marriage rope.
Rollo from Rational Male found the youtube series by Pastor Craig Groeschel of LifeChurch.tv and was kind enough to bring it to my attention. I haven’t looked at the whole series, but I found the one below especially interesting. While his style is distracting, when he is sticking to the script (the Bible) his description of sex in marriage is very good. As he points out, biblical sex in marriage is described using powerful animal imagery. He doesn’t suffer from Mohler’s disease of believing that marital sex is made moral by the wife assuming control and making it “romantic”. His translation of the original Hebrew of Proverbs 5:18-19 at 2 min 9 seconds makes this clear. But then he goes off (biblical) script, and gives truly painful but standard bad advice for husbands on how to seduce their wives straight from the Book of Oprah:

Let me give you some advice about this, because I believe that one of the best things you can do for your marriage is have some physical and intimate fun. So let me give some advice to the men and to the women.

Men, first of all, work on your approach. Vary your approach. Get creative in your approach. Be tender in your approach. Quit just doing the same approach every day:

Hey! You want some of this don’t you! I know you do! Check this out!

Don’t get out of the shower walking around like [strutting]. Wooork on your/approaaach! Romance, conversation, bring a gift home, listen, rub her feet...

He then chastises husbands for sexualizing ordinary situations:

Wife: Can you make me a bowl of cereal?

Husband: Sure thing I’ll make you a bowl of cereal! Give me a spoon and I’ll stir you up!

Wife: We’ve got to get the oil changed.

Husband: I’ll change your oil!

The poor husbands don’t stand a chance, and the pastor has no idea what he is doing to them.
Defiant Collaboration

There is a widely held belief among Christians, even in the manosphere, that Christians in general are standing up against feminism and the debasement of marriage but the culture isn’t responding. The myth of Christians and the church “fighting the good fight” is one that won’t die no matter how many times I or others debunk it.

The United States is frequently pointed out as being as the most religiously conservative nation in the western world when it comes to sexual morality, and indeed there are stats to back this up. If you ask the average American who are the most zealous Christians fighting against feminism and for the family as defined in the Bible?, they will almost undoubtedly respond with some combination of Focus on the Family, the Southern Baptists, and Pat Robertson’s CBN & The 700 Club. These are the groups Americans, the religious fundamentalists of the western world, see as the most extreme defenders of the traditional family. Yet as I’ve shown the Director for Family Formation Studies at Focus on the Family calls unwed mothers heroic, explains that women deliberately having children out of wedlock is proof that men aren’t worthy, and tells parents that their daughters have an innate goodness which their sons lack. More recently we’ve witnessed Dr. R. Albert Mohler Jr., the president of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary teaching that God intends for husbands to be purified by submitting to their wives. Elsewhere I’ve shown Pat Robertson’s 700 Club presenting an unwed mother as a Godly woman, plugging her book extolling the virtues of single motherhood:

CBN.com – Actress, single mother and author, Janine Turner was inspired to write Holding Her Head High: Inspirations from 12 Single Mothers Who Championed Their Children and Changed History. Her book describes the social implications for women and children from the Roman Empire through the Middle Ages to Pioneer days...

If you asked the average Christian to recommend a movie which presents biblical marriage or fatherhood, they are almost certain to suggest a Christian divorce fantasy or a movie which disparages Christian fathers and cuts Christian husbands off at the knees.
I could of course go on for some time on this. I could talk about the fellow manosphere bloggers who had their marriages shot out from under them by the Catholic Church. I could show conservative Christians rationalizing that the Bible calls for a meaningful symbol of women’s submission, so long as it doesn’t actually symbolize submission. I could show how Christians have entirely reframed biblical marriage, and how even the most traditional Christians see the word slut as a slur against all women, defend the ever increasing age of marriage, and look down on women who marry and have children without first attaining a degree and having a career. I could (and have) shown all of this and more, but it wouldn’t matter. For most Christians nothing can pierce their credulity of the ultimate pretty lie, their unshakable belief that modern Christians are not actively and passively collaborating with feminism.

To believe otherwise would shatter one of their most cherished narratives, that their pastor and fellow congregants are part of the earthly team fighting the good fight. This is why Christians everywhere cheer when Glenn Stanton boasts that the most devout Christians have a 38% divorce rate, and it is why they are far more interested in discussing what a handful of non Christian men like Roissy are doing wrong than the fact that hundreds of millions of Christians are defiling marriage in Christ’s name. Focusing on Roissy’s sin makes them feel morally superior as a Christian, and this is the crutch which has allowed Christians to continue on this path for many decades. The alternative would be to acknowledge the unfathomable betrayal of the Bible by this generation of Christians when it comes to sexual morality, men and women, and the family, which would (and should) be deeply humbling.

I recently challenged commenter GK Chesterton on this very point:

Never forget that Christians are driving this mess. There is a myth that Christians in general are fighting the good fight but the culture is winning out. It is a lie. The most conservative Christian voices are leading the charge to stab biblical marriage in the back, and they are effectively doing so in Christ’s name. See Glen Stanton of FOTF and Dr. Mohler of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary for just two examples.

He replied that Christians haven’t failed in their duty to uphold biblical marriage, and that what appears to be collaboration with feminism is merely Christians trying to be nice (emphasis mine):

I would submit that absent Christianity and the Christians that believe in it you wouldn’t even know a marriage problem existed. Therefore no, I disagree that this is specifically a Christian problem. I believe many alpha cads are making it such, but they are lying as they oft do. I think Stanton et al are making a classical Christian mistake in that they are elevating “nice” into a virtue. It is not. Nor is this problem new. The sexual abuse problem resulted from the same way of thinking.

This kind of denial is part of a larger Christian institutional resistance to change. While the enthusiasm with which the modern church has collaborated with feminism is deeply shameful, the psychology involved isn’t surprising. This is the same psychology business leaders and project managers face when attempting to change secular structures where individuals have become personally invested in the status quo. Note that this doesn’t mean
that at a logical level the individuals resisting change actually agree with feminism. Many are simply reacting emotionally and psychologically out of fear of change. Either way, the reflexive resistance to any effort to move back toward the biblical model of marriage is profound and relentless. This takes on many forms, but the underlying theme is often that there either isn’t really a problem or that the problem can’t possibly be addressed.

One form of denial and resistance is the claim that biblical marriage really isn’t something Christians should concern themselves with. A commenter named Jimmy on Vox’s Alpha Game blog was troubled that I spend so much energy pointing out that the Church is turning its back on biblical marriage:

After reading Dalrock for awhile, he is sort of not getting it either. There’s a whole population of available women who are no to low N count women so why are they insisting only slutty women exist? Also, the whole bit about the state of the Christian Church neglects their central mission of ministry. Dating is a side show.

Note his absurd claim that my focus is on dating in an effort to change the topic to something unimportant to the church. Further down he complained:

The discussions about manning up is about men marrying slutty women. His various posts about the Church is about men marrying slutty women. That’s the whole basis of discussion. He doesn’t himself offer the alternative. He looks for evidence that the Church is not doing its job in shaming women. Is that the Church’s job?

A bit further down he reiterates to another commenter that what I have shown is trivial, and only distracts from important work of the church:

You might not like how churches function, but what you’re complaining about won’t get you where you need to go. Ministry is the primary function of Churches. It is should be the focus, not the side show of recommending who to date.

In what is very common form, when I pointed out that my focus is on marriage and challenged Jimmy to point out where I had ever chastised the church for not focusing on dating, he explained that he of course agrees with me.

I do get the complaint about not adhering to Biblical marriage. The church focuses on men sacrificing to their wives instead the wives making a sacrifice is well noted. I completely agree with you on this issue.

Another method of obstructing any attempt at change is to set the bar for evaluating change absurdly high. Commenter Unger demonstrated this with a recent comment:

What evidence do you have that Game will make better women from the only perspective that matters in the end, which is concerned with saving their souls?

Unger is saying that the millions of children who suffer the devastation of having their father kicked out of their homes isn’t sufficient reason for Christians to attempt to move towards a
biblical model of marriage. All that matters is whether the child’s unhappy mother’s soul is saved. Don’t worry that Christians are providing the moral cover under which marriage is being destroyed. You must first prove that any action you take will save the rebellious wife’s soul.

The hallmark of the inhibitor of change is that they only offer criticism of the suggestions by others. Very often they aren’t even aware of what they are doing. They are standing up for biblical marriage in their heads, even if in practice all they can offer is resistance to change. Note that this is different than mere disagreement on how to address the problem; honest Christians can and will disagree about the best way to restore biblical marriage. This can be discerned by how seriously the objector to any given idea is actually working to offer their own fixes or improve the ideas of others.

The seriousness of the alternative is extremely important, because it is common for solutions to be offered which claim to address the problem but which present no real challenge to the feminised church. For example, several years ago I proposed that churches might discourage frivolous divorce simply by measuring it. Not surprisingly quite a bit of the response by Christians was that this wouldn’t be fair because it would hurt and embarrass women. Others rejected the idea while claiming to agree with the goal, offering an unthreatening solution instead. Christian blogger Bike Bubba explained that the problem with measuring divorce is it measures an outcome, and missed the real issue:

I’ve got two big reservations about using statistical methods in the church. The general problem is that those who use them a lot in a corporate setting know very well that they tend to be applied in an impersonal, “hands off” way. Management loves these in great part because it allows them to “do something” without really interacting with the people involved. Disaster often ensues because the statisticians and managers don’t realize that what they’ve found only correlates to the real problem—but is not the real issue.

Ah, but what is the real issue, if it isn’t frivolous divorce given moral cover by the church and relentlessly sold by the culture as empowering to women? I know that the millions of fatherless children are eager to know. Fortunately Bike Bubba explains:
Regarding the proposal specifically, it falls into the problem of measuring outputs instead of inputs; a divorce is not a cause, but is rather the result of years of poor decisions by one or both spouses. The husband decides he doesn’t need to be discipled, or to disciple his family. The wife looks elsewhere for spiritual leadership. Without discipleship, that wonderful part of marriage gets neglected. One or the other looks elsewhere, and then things go rapidly downhill from there. Church members who have said “hi” to them for years, or decades, are shocked.

The problem is not that Christian women are taking the feminist bait and rebelling, the problem is strictly a failing of Christian men. Fortunately there is a glib answer to all of this, now that we know that 40+ years of feminism have nothing to do with the problem. The solution is made even better by the fact that it won’t make feminists in the church uncomfortable:

Put simply, if you want a statistic that you can use to improve your church (and reduce the divorce rate), count the number of members who are actively discipling their families and each other, and have the pastor and deacons guide that effort.

Sometimes, it really is as simple as.....the Gospel.

Ironic Vichy battle ax coin image created and licensed as Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 Unported by Prométhée33.
Connecting the pathological fear of husbands having power with the peter pan manboy syndrome.

by Dalrock | October 4, 2012 | Link

In a recent series of posts The Social Pathologist relays his professional observations regarding the differences in the men and women he treats in his medical practice. In *Hypergamic Affirmative Action*, he explains:

> In my experience, women today seem to have more “balls” than men do. They seem more driven, more ambitious and can make stuff happen. They seem to cope better with adversity than many of my male patients. With most women, life goes on. The kids need to be fed, the uniforms washed and the bills paid. Many men flounder. My readers may not like this but they are my objective observations.

This seems to be a common concern today, especially in the media. *What is happening to men? Why won’t they man up?* I’m not entirely sold on the scope of the claim, but there does appear to be at least a kernel of truth here. In line with The Social Pathologist’s observations, there is evidence that on the margins at least young men feel less motivation to put in the effort needed to be prepared to lead a family.

What strikes me however is that we really should have seen this coming. Over the long term, mismatches of authority and responsibility tend to meet an adjusting force. We live in a culture which is terrified of men having power and authority in the family, and the culture is acting accordingly. At the same time, our society is increasing the legal responsibility men take on when they have a family. Where authority and responsibility used to be in alignment there is now an astounding mismatch.

Each year the law responds to ever greater levels of paranoia that husbands might have any power over their wives. This is after all what divorce reform is all about. During the marriage it is intended to provide a threatpoint in order to move power from the husband to the wife. Should that not be sufficient, the divorce regime kicks in expelling the father from the household (removing all power) while legally enforcing his responsibility. We also see this in the ever more absurd domestic violence legislation and enforcement. Not only are domestic violence laws and enforcement based in a corrupt intellectual paradigm, but each year they become more sensitive to any perceived transgression by husbands. It is now against the law for husbands to be rude, insulting or angry. But even this isn’t enough, so officials in the UK have taken the extraordinary step of calling it what it is. From the Daily Mail (H/T Feminist Hater):

> At the moment, domestic abuse is generally taken to refer to acts of physical violence. But police and prosecutors will be expected to use the new definition when identifying and monitoring cases, meaning men who abuse partners in a ‘controlling’ fashion could face charges too.

The article explains that the definition of “abuse” now includes husbands who pressure wives
not to associate with bad influences and who control the finances.

Not to be outdone by law enforcement, Christian leaders have jumped on the bandwagon. It is common practice to cut men off at the knees from the pulpit and in the box office. Christian author and blogger Sheila Gregoire explains in one of her books that biblical headship means the wife giving her husband a list of chores, while Dr. Mohler fears that pornography will jeopardize the Christian wife’s ability to control her husband via denial of sex. Everywhere you look in our society you will find outright terror at the thought of men having power, especially husbands.

While we might argue about the speed and magnitude of men’s reaction to such a shift, as well as the specific mechanism we might observe (marriage strike vs weakened signal, etc), I don’t see how one could argue that an overall decline in men’s eagerness to work hard in preparation to lead families is surprising.

We wanted non threatening men, and now we have them.
If you’ve ever looked at pictures of ancient coins you may have noticed that they are typically not very round. One method of debasing ancient coins was to shave off bits around the edges, a practice called clipping. The debaser could then collect up the gold or silver shaved off of multiple coins while passing the clipped coins off at face value. The practice was of course highly illegal, but the problem was as a merchant it was difficult to draw the line on when you would and wouldn’t accept a coin at face value. If only 1% or 2% of the metal was gone you knew you didn’t have much to worry about. But as the money circulated longer each incremental bit of clipping started to add up. Once the original line was crossed it was difficult to know where to refuse a coin. So long as you could pass it off on someone else you were fine, but you didn’t want to be the final sucker in the chain who foolishly accepted the debased coin at face value.

One of the steps taken to prevent this kind of debasement was to mill the edges of coins. This way it was more obvious when even a little bit had been clipped off. This is why US quarters have milled edges; quarters used to be 90% silver, so there was some incentive to clip. When the government switched to copper-nickel clad quarters they kept the milling as part of the design:
Men looking to marry face the same kind of dilemma ancient merchants used to face. Feminists and their enablers have slowly shaved off the value of marriage for men. Marriage for men no longer means:

- Being the legally and socially recognized head of the household.
- An expectation of regular sex.
- Legal rights to children.
- Lifetime commitment.

As each new bit has been shaved away, men have had the choice of either accepting debased marriage at face value or walking away:

As men came to accept each clip, additional clips were continuously made. Women chose to marry later in order to first have a degree. This older bride then came with a little extra attitude, maybe some student loan debts, and perhaps more expensive tastes. Again, the choice by men was to accept what was commonly on offer or avoid the transaction altogether. After all, this is what everyone else was accepting:

Ok, it isn’t quite as good as the last round, but what are you going to do? In the end if you don’t look too carefully it kind of looks like the same
thing. But of course the clipping hasn’t stopped there. That wife who waited to marry until she graduated college really needs to get a career before marriage so she can complete her feminist merit badge. This even older and less attractive career gal wife of course comes with even more feminist attitude, and somehow still comes with student loan debt. She also now has a legal incentive to divorce in the form of cash and prizes and nearly guaranteed child custody. Oh, and we also have some new laws which assume you are an abuser if your wife decides she needs some drama or extra leverage against you. But what are you going to do? Aren’t you man enough to accept her?

There’s just one more small thing. It took her so long to find you that you can’t reasonably expect her chastity to be perfectly in tact. I mean, it’s mostly there, but it suffered a ding or two. Her virginity was gone to her first boyfriend, but don’t worry it was very romantic and she still has fond memories of that special time. Not too long after that those jerks at the frat house did a number on her pride, but you can’t hold that against her. She’s a bright gal, and after that she learned how to hook up smart. There were, I think, a few other clips along the way. Nothing too serious, but after all remember it did take her forever to find you. Your little bird may not be quite as young and innocent as she would have been had she found you sooner, but there is always hope.
You may now kiss the bride.

Lydia Kings image licensed as Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 Unported by Classical Numismatic Group, Inc. Heads view of quarter and Virgin Islands quarter images are from the United States Mint.
Glenn Stanton Swooned
by Dalrock | October 11, 2012 | Link

Check out Roissy/Heartiste’s analysis of the scene Glenn Stanton can’t get enough of* (youtube clip included).

Mr. Stanton tells us in his book Secure Daughters, Confident Sons: How Parents Guide Their Children into Authentic Masculinity and Femininity that he and his wife make it a point to watch this movie once a year. Stanton references the same scene Heartiste explains from a game perspective. To Stanton it is a teachable moment explaining how an unwed mother can make a man better:

She is a confident and attractive young single mother, Carol Connelly, (Helen Hunt). Even as they grow closer, he is helpless to keep from insulting her regularly.

In one scene, they find themselves out for a nice evening at a fancy restaurant. When Melvin criticizes Carol’s dress, she tells him he has no idea how much his words hurt her and that he’d better come up with a compliment pretty quick. She even reminds him that a compliment is something nice that one person says to another.

Heartiste of course has a different perspective on what is going on in the scene.

*Note that the post itself is pretty tame but you are on your own if you click on any other links or read the comments.
Feminist territory marking, NFL style.
by Dalrock | October 13, 2012 | Link

I’m not a huge football fan, but for the past few years I’ve clicked on a game in October only to be repulsed by the sea of supplication. I don’t know what is more troubling, that NFL management thinks men who watch football will put up with this emasculation of the sport, or that they might be right. Either way, this is clearly a case of feminists realizing that they couldn’t experience manly pride and therefore deciding to extinguish it.

For those not in the US you can get a small sense for the degree of madness here and here. If you are in the US and haven’t seen this, flip on one of the games this Sunday and you will see what I’m talking about.

Fortunately aside from that of which we do not speak in the Dalrock household, the UFC seems to be holding strong against stage 1 of the standard feminist assault.
How the destruction of marriage is strangling the feminist welfare state.

by Dalrock | October 15, 2012 | Link

The standard narrative is that feminism removed the artificial restrictions that were holding women back, and what we observe today is a level playing field. The Social Pathologist described this in his recent post Hypergamic Affirmative Action:

The social, sexual and economic liberation of women in the latter half of the 20th Century has meant that for the first time women were able to compete with men in society without restriction. The result has been spectacular if not particularly beneficial to the happiness of women. Whilst not all degrees are created equal (men still overwhelming dominate the “hard” fields of knowledge) the fact that there are now more degree credentialed women than men is simply astonishing. As income is broadly correlated with economic well being, its safe to assume that women have been able to achieve a economic parity with men. The manosphere may not like this result but the fact is that women have been able to effectively compete with men when the shackles of social convention have been removed.

What he is describing is the feminist fantasy coming true, and out of respect for the feminists reading I suggest taking a moment to savor the euphoria before we continue.

The problem with his statement is he is ignoring the incredible amount of social engineering required to achieve and maintain the current state. Feminism has become a central organizing force for western culture. Nearly every decision public and private must consider feminism first, and everything else second. This is true for everything from our last ditch nuclear deterrent to men’s entertainment. Even the Word of God must kneel before the word of feminists. The reason this doesn’t come to mind for most people is it is everywhere. It seems normal, if not natural.

What is too easy to forget is that this is artificial, and therefore requires constant effort to maintain. Feminism didn’t demolish a barrier between two seas and let the water levels adjust; it is a massive pumping operation. Turn off the pumps even for a little bit and reality will come flooding back.

The longer we keep the pumps running, the more the true cost of the operation becomes evident. Most of what feminism gained it did on credit of one sort or another, and these bills are coming due. The reality is human biology makes it impossible for a large percentage of women to focus on casual sex and professional advancement to the degree that feminism insists is only natural. The reason for this is children require more investment than women themselves can provide. Women who want to be mothers need to extract resources from men in order to be truly successful parents. Many have looked at the success of a small number of widows in raising their children without the help of a husband and assumed husbands and fathers aren’t really necessary. However, what is possible as an exception isn’t something we can build a society on. Aside from those who started with great wealth, widows
have always struggled to provide for and raise their children. In a healthy society made primarily of husband lead households they also benefit from an in tact social and familial structure.

But a husband-lead permanent family structure is something feminists must destroy. They have no choice if they are to achieve their goals. They need to find a way to compel men to provide resources for children while removing men’s authority and women’s responsibility. In a society with traditional marriage men voluntarily agree to produce more than they personally need in order to lead a family. The problem for feminists with this voluntary model is something which is core to all voluntary cooperation agreements; women must give something up in exchange for men doing the same.

There are of course multiple ways to attack this problem of mutuality. While the methods appear different on the surface, the ultimate end is the same; men must be compelled to offer financial (and sometimes parenting) resources to women who want to have children, and women must be freed from reciprocal obligation and responsibility. The methods to achieve this tend to fall into one of three models:

1. **Socialist State Model:** The economy of the state must be reorganized to redistribute production. While the stated aim of socialism is to redistribute wealth from rich to poor, in practice this is a very effective tool to redistribute wealth from men to women. In the socialist state model marriage becomes largely irrelevant because the resource transfer is being achieved at a state or corporate level. These resource transfers can take the form of make work jobs, cash benefits, and free or subsidized child care and education (which tend to become one and the same). Marriage tends to be looked down upon in this type of model because women living with men are forever at risk of being “oppressed” by male leadership. Marriage also works counter to the socialist aim of equality of outcome; if some children grow up with fathers (even weak ones) while others lack fathers altogether the children with fathers have a large advantage. This inequality of maternal outcome poses a danger to feminism as well because women who want to give their children an advantage are at risk of suffering from exposure to male authority.

2. **Sham Marriage Model:** This is the model preferred by feminists with a sense of nostalgia. In this model great effort is expended to maintain the illusion of marriage as a fundamental and legitimate social institution. While the edifice is left in place however, the institution itself is entirely debased. Husbands are still expected to support and protect their families, but their authority and rights are all removed. Marriage becomes a vehicle for theft, and something women delay as long as possible and discard as soon as it is no longer needed.

3. **The Stanton/Povich Model:** Under this model women enjoy their sexual freedom and are free to pursue their goals of education and career without the responsibilities and limitations which come with being a wife. Should such a woman find herself giving birth, she heroically whittles down the list of paternal suspects until she determines the biological father of the child. She then enlists the state to compel the biological father to bankroll her and her children.
What we see in practice tends to be a blending of the three models above. The exact blend of course will vary over time and from country to country, but any country which fits The Social Pathologist’s description has by necessity fully implemented some combination of the three.

The fatal flaws of all three of these models, including their use in blended form, are the same:

- There is insufficient incentive to keep the mass of men producing at the levels needed to transfer enough wealth to women.
- Women who spend their early adulthood focusing on education and career before becoming mothers lead to an enormously expensive mis-allocation of investment in human capital. This exists across all industries but is most easily identified in the case of medical doctors, as The Social Pathologist has witnessed.
- Children don’t just need financial resources, they need a real father. Fathers who aren’t head of the household are a very poor substitute for those who are.
- By prioritizing women’s careers over becoming mothers, the birthrate greatly declines.

While the first two bullets reduce production by existing men below their potential, the last two reduce the number of productive men in future generations. Taken together we end up with reduced numbers of productive men, and less production by those few who exist. These problems aren’t visible at first with feminism however because there is a delay in experiencing the loss of production by men. This gives the initial appearance of a free lunch, where the only result is the increased production associated with women prioritizing paid work. However, this apparent free lunch is simply the inertia of the system; the flaws become progressively more evident from generation to generation.

It is worth reiterating that both the destruction of marriage and the resulting lowered production are ultimately inescapable for any society which makes feminism a priority. There is no way to square this circle, no matter how many people claim it is only natural.

The truth of what I’m describing can be found by opening any economic or business publication. The nations of the west are all facing a time bomb of entitlements caused by demographics moving the wrong way. In the US, Social Security and Medicare present looming demographic threats which get closer every year. Eventually there will be too many people taking out of the system and too few willing or able to produce at the excess levels required to fund them. Discussion of this problem is constant in the financial press, with articles like the one by Forbes titled: America’s Baby Bust: How The Great Recession Has Jeopardized Our Demographic Health

Without these future workers our already tottering pension system will become even more untenable, as is occurring in Europe and Japan.

Of course since feminism is the dominant philosophy of our time the author struggles to understand why birthrates are falling. For some inexplicable reason in the past economic growth has lead to falling birthrates, while economic decline is now also leading to falling birthrates:

Without growth, the long-term decline of most high-income countries, including the United States, is all but assured.
This turns on its head the commonplace assumption that societies reduced their birthrates as they got wealthier.

The problem in the US is worse than it looks on its face. While we remain at near replacement level fertility, the internals of the macro number are cause for concern. Slate explains this in an article subtitled Why America’s widening fertility class divide is a problem. The feminist system comes with perverse incentives regarding family formation. The most capable women are encouraged to delay childbirth as long as possible. At the same time, successful men fear becoming fathers because fatherhood is the bait for the trap feminists and their enablers have set for honest men. Ironically the New York Times can see the disincentive for productive men to become fathers, but only when looking outside of the United States; the headline declares In Europe, Divorce and Separation Become a Burden for Struggling Fathers, and the stories are straight out of the manosphere:

The Forbes article cites the NY Times piece, and in an added twist of irony manages to conflate fatherhood and parenthood just in time to miss the point:

Stories about divorced Spanish or Italian young fathers sleeping on the streets or in their cars is not exactly a strong advertising for parenthood.

Making the problem worse is the list of solutions currently on the table. We can go the way suggested by the Slate article, and increase transfers to women with children. Never mind that this brings us back to the core problem. The other solution is to raise taxes, but this exacerbates the productivity problem. In order to tax our way to solvency, we would have to declare a fiscal jihad on the productive. But men are already showing signs of being less willing to create the very excess wealth these taxes are after, for the reasons explained above. If men don’t see the incentive to lead a family, higher taxes will convince ever larger numbers of capable men to decide to get by on just enough to keep themselves comfortable.
With the exception of widows, single mothers have traditionally faced strong social stigma. Feminists have made removing this stigma a priority as it is essential in order to free women from the reciprocal obligations which traditionally have come with motherhood. Feminism is far more about removing women’s responsibilities than it is about increasing women’s rights, so this is a critical area of focus for feminism.

On the surface feminists have been very successful removing the stigma associated with unwed motherhood. Religious conservatives like Glenn Stanton, Director of Family Formation Studies for Focus On The Family now refer to unwed mothers as heroic, and attribute the explosion in out of wedlock births to the failings of men. Director Stanton explains this in his book on parenting (emphasis mine):

- If women can’t find good men to marry, they will instead compromise themselves by merely living with a make-do man or getting babies from him without marriage.
- Unfortunately, this describes exactly the new shape of family growth in Western nations by exploding margins...
- Women want to marry and have daddies for their babies. But if they can’t find good men to commit themselves to, well... Our most pressing social problem today is a man deficit.

Director Stanton’s profoundly modern view of unwed mothers is very common amongst the most socially conservative Christians. Pat Robertson’s 700 Club celebrates a book by and about unwed mothers, while Pastor Mark Driscoll describes the problem very much like Director Stanton does above.

Despite the astounding success feminists have had convincing our cultural leaders that unwed motherhood should be seen as only normal (or even heroic), below the surface the stigma still remains. One unwed mother recently complained about the unfairness of it all at babycenter.com

- I am so sick of single mom stereotypes, and this articles just tries to justify them all.
- I’m sick of people thinking I’m any less an awesome mom because I don’t have a husband. I’m sick of people thinking I’m trashy because my kids have different fathers.

Another over at Cafe Mom described feeling overwhelmed by the judgment she perceives:

- Lately it seems like everywhere I turn, I mean EVERYWHERE, I’m faced with some stereotyping about single moms.
- I feel so discouraged.
- So many people seem to think that I must have been irresponsible, or slutty or
stupid or selfish, or a horrible wife.

I’ve even heard someone say single mothers shouldn’t expect some man to pick up the pieces of her bad choices. It makes me feel ashamed that I even want to remarry.

Why do they automatically assume we all made some terrible choices?

And even if some of us did, are we not allowed to make mistakes?

The discussion at Cafe Mom went on for 147 comments, and there was wide agreement by the resident unwed mothers that they were indeed perceived as the OP described. Despite the best efforts of conservative Christian leaders, single mothers are still perceived negatively.

Part of the problem is that real life examples of single mothers and the impact of fatherlessness on children are far too common to ignore, so the perceptions end up being driven by reality instead of opinion leaders. While the average man or woman likely would regurgitate the PC take on single mothers, at a gut level they know something different. This probably explains why single mothers still feel the stigma even though expressing this stigma has itself become taboo.

This will only become worse moving forward, since 40% of all births in the US are now out of wedlock, and those children born in (theoretical) wedlock are still at extremely high risk of having their father expelled from the home. Single mothers are now a massive demographic, and marketers are catering to them.

The children’s network Nickelodeon caused controversy by launching a block of sexually laced programming aimed at mothers on their channel Nick Jr. as the article from KVUE explains:

**Sexual comedy show airs on toddler network**

One can only assume that Nickelodeon has done the market research and has determined that shows like Mom Friends Forever (MFF) are what the mothers of their youngest viewers are interested in. Here is the description of the series from Nick Mom (emphasis mine):

Follow the real lives of Judi and Kate, mom best friends who are **juggling work, kids and relationships**—and laughing through it all.

For a sense of the show, see the preview titled **Dating Again**. From the website it appears that one of the two mom friends is married but it isn’t clear if her husband is the father of her children. Either way, the ostensible new face of motherhood has a trashiness which is impossible to ignore, and the focus on “dating” is a big part of it.

To some degree this represents an overall loss of class by mothers in general, but it is also clear that single mothers and soon to be single mothers are leading the cultural charge here. As this progresses further it will put more and more strain on “team woman” as higher class
married mothers become less and less comfortable being associated with low class single mothers. While divorce fantasies like *Eat Pray Love* are clearly appealing to the majority of married women and many will be tempted by the “liberation” offered by mixing raunchiness in with their identities as mothers, the tackiness of this becomes more difficult to conceal every year.

**See Also:** How to child proof the revolving door to mommy’s bedroom.
Parents at a Northern California high school are outraged that the time honored tradition of hooking up with varsity athletes has been turned into something dirty. According to the Piedmont Patch:

What has apparently been an open secret at Piedmont High School for several years — the existence of a “Fantasy Slut League” where male varsity athletes amass “points” for sexual activity with female students — became public Friday when the school district issued a notice to parents of PHS students.

Casual sex is serious business, and this kind of thinking is exactly what is putting women’s sacred path to marriage in jeopardy. Still, I have an idea for the beleaguered alpha chasers at Piedmont High. Turn the tables on them! As Vox Day points out in his current post, women are eager to expand the definition of slut to include promiscuous men. Now is the time to take advantage of this new wave in male slut shaming. The alphas at Piedmont High won’t know what hit them!

All the alpha chasers have to do is form a fantasy slut league of their own. Then they can lure unsuspecting alphas into having sex with them, and document the sordid details while celebrating their conquests!

When the moxie and equality filled ladies of Piedmont High implement this strategy, they can take a page out of the playbook of another group of high school men who had a similar club two years ago:

Those boys broke up into teams — one was dubbed “the Southside Slampigs” — and organized an “opening day” party where the mission was to hook up with as many unsuspecting draftees as possible, the Times reported.

See also: Slut
Free book download on Amazon today and tomorrow.
by Dalrock | October 25, 2012 | Link

Samuel Solomon’s book The Altar is available for free download today and tomorrow on Amazon. I haven’t read it so I can’t offer an endorsement, but it does sound intriguing. If you read it please share your thoughts in the comment section below.

Just wanted to let you know that my book, The Altar, is FREE today and tomorrow on Amazon. This is the smackdown I promised for Fireproof, and it’s loaded with manosphere points, scripture, and its a really good story.

The official description:

Daniel Kirk and his wife Chelsea, on their way to a marriage retreat cruise, are hijacked and find themselves adrift in the ocean, landing on an unknown and mysterious island. Their marriage on the rocks, and their lives at stake, they must fight for survival, and fight for each other. With the world stripped away, and their hearts broken, they must face each other, face God, and a mortal enemy that would destroy them.

Here is his website.
One of the more toxic ideas in our culture is the idea of “the one”. This concept is the foundation for women’s sacred path to marriage; once a woman finds “the one”, everything will be right and honoring her marriage vows will be easy. This is closely linked with the nonsense idea that sex is moral so long as there is (non committed) commitment, and/or love. If her promiscuity involves love or (non committed) commitment, then she isn’t being a common tramp, she is searching for “the one”.

We know given the explosion in single mothers that this idea is toxic to children and fathers. What isn’t often discussed is how toxic this idea is to the woman herself. Part of the problem when we evaluate the concept of the one is it sounds like something different, not unlike “no sex before monogamy” or “no sex before commitment”. If you weren’t paying close attention, you could easily mistake these for a belief in marriage. In fact, I would wager that nearly everyone makes this mistake.

It isn’t just others whom women are fooling when they think this way; they are also fooling themselves. Looking for the one to marry and remain faithful to is actually feral female behavior dressed up as self discipline and morality. They have perverted the lifetime marriage concept of “my one and only” by substituting in the Lifetime idea of the perfect man. Due to their solipsism what they can’t see is this perfect man is essentially the same perfect man all of the other women seeking “the one” are looking for. In fact, the fact that other women are also looking for him is one of their requirements. If they understood this the folly of their never ending search would become immediately evident.

Core to this foolishness is the assumption that attraction is unique for every man and woman. While the woman is lying to herself about her own nearly universal set of preferences in the perfect man, she is also lying to herself about those of men. While she wants a man with a specific combination of social dominance, worldly success and prowess, intelligence, physical strength, attractiveness, loyalty, and kindness, so does every other woman out there. While the more minor details as to the perfect mix might vary slightly from woman to woman, the basic set of ideal men is incredibly small. This is true for men as well. The basic attraction factors of youth, beauty, femininity, and loyalty/chastity are the same for all men, and only a small percentage of women fit in the “most attractive” category. Thus, it isn’t the case that there are two people out there who would be most attracted to only each other, while others might not find them very attractive.

Making this worse for women is the more they hop from man to man (even if they avoid sex), the less attractive they tend to become while their threshold for feeling attracted to a man goes up. They end up with more and more expensive tastes and less to bargain with. This is especially true for sluts, as well as for women who have children (initially in or out of wedlock).

Looking for the one is a prescription for misery. No matter how many Lifetime movies she watches, the never married/divorced single mother isn’t going to attract a better class of
man now that she is older, has the baggage of another man’s children, and has a proven track record of not being able to pick a man she could stay with. The concept of the divorcée or never married single mother trading up to a better man is as laughable as the expectation of turning in your 10 year old Buick for a brand new top of the line Cadillac.

This is why the “true life” divorce fantasies sold to women all end up being so absurd when you examine them just a little bit closer. Match.com’s claimed “true life” story of the middle-age-with-kids divorcée receiving a sudden declaration of lifetime commitment from Ethan the secret multimillionaire hunky handyman might be proof that this kind of story really does happen. But when you look just a bit closer you find out it was written by a woman who specializes in writing just this kind of tale as fiction. Likewise Elizabeth Gilbert’s Eat Pray Love memoir of how she divorced her way to a better man is breathtaking to feral women across the globe. However, when you look a bit closer it turns out that her new man is nearly 20 years older than her, mostly bald, and appears to be shorter than her as well. Even with this step down she explains in the follow on book that he married her to get a visa and come live in her house in the US. Yet another celebrated tale of divorcing up is How Stella Got Her Groove Back. In the movie Stella’s new man was handsome and manly. In real life, he was visibly gay, and (what are the odds?) married her for a US visa.

Contrast this with a prescription for a woman to find happiness. She looks for the best man she can marry while she is young and hasn't lessened her ability to bond and fall head over heels in love, and decides that he is her one and only, for better or for worse, in sickness and in health, for life.
Is his wife abusive?
by Dalrock | October 30, 2012 | Link

A man recently turned to yahoo answers for help with his question “My wife of 5 years grabbed me.?”

A few night ago my wife and I got into an argument. We both had had a few drinks at home with some friends for her birthday. She was mad at me and we went to our bedroom to talk about it. I shut the door behind us and was standing in front of it. She was very mad and hit a cup of water across the bedroom. And said she was leaving. I told her there’s no reason to leave and that we should just talk and move on with our night. She walked over to me and grabbed my wrists and threw me into the bed. And then left the room. I have bruises on my arms and side. She has never touched me in the 6 years we have been together. But a week ago she got in my face for the first time. So it seems to me that it’s getting worse. Should I take these as red flags? If so what should I do. Also we have three kids together. I don’t want this to effect them.

Is she abusive for pushing him aside when he tried to hold her captive? Given her (mostly) non abusive track record, should he give her another chance to learn the proper way to be held captive so she doesn’t abuse him again? Or should he divorce her, take the kids, and make her pay child support? What if the situation was actually the other way around?

In another recent question on answers, a wife picked up a searing hot pan during a heated argument and hit her husband with it. The husband struck back in self defense, and she ran away crying. The husband was distraught, and wanted to know how to explain to his wife that he was only acting in self defense. One of the answerers advised the husband accordingly (emphasis mine):

I suggest you call the UK Women’s Aid domestic abuse hot line at 0800 2000 247. The counselor there can help explain to you why you did what you did, what your wife is feeling right now, and how to prevent it from happening again. They are non judgmental and will be glad that as an abuser, you chose to call and get information on how to stop abusing your wife. Then tell your wife that you called, and give her the number so that she can call too. Then you both set up an appointment with a marriage counselor to see together, and you get a personal counselor just for you who specializes in anger management.

Please don’t hit your wife again.

See also: Blowing the Whistle on the Domestic Violence Research Paradigm

Moderation note: This is an emotional topic, so please use restraint. Any comments which advocate violence against men or women will be removed and the commenter banned.
Baby mama drama
by Dalrock | November 3, 2012 | Link

I’m going to be taking a blogging break for about a week and will be disabling comments later this evening. In the meantime, I thought I would leave you with some baby mama drama:

*The Daily Mail*: *Single mom, sorry!: The ‘tip’ one woman left after enjoying a lavish $138 meal*

But before you judge, a blogger from *Mommyish* is convinced this is a frame job. Don’t miss her thoughtful post: *La La La, I Can’t Hear You: I Refuse To Believe A Single Mom Left This Crappy Tip*

Rounding out the baby mama drama is the outrage over the *I hate teen moms* facebook page: *‘I Hate Teen Moms’ Facebook Page Under Fire*

This last one is a bit unfair, because women who marry young (and stay married) and have children before they turn 20 shouldn’t be included with the mass of teenage unwed mothers who are the driving the backlash.

**Edit:** Bonus baby mama drama (H/T Mrs. Dalrock). **Anonymous Mom:** *I’m Tired Of Feeling Grateful To My Husband For Marrying A Single Mom*

**Note:** Comments are now set to all go to moderation. I’ll let them through in a week or so.
Drudge has been headlining the unfolding scandal surrounding General Petraeus, and there are so many manosphere related angles it is fascinating. Rollo has accurately described Petraeus as beta, but for women it should also raise the question of how much alpha they really want. See also W.F. Price’s post Petraeus Homewrecker, Career-Killer Strong, Independent Woman.

For those who haven’t been following the news, here is my rough understanding of the story based on the articles I’ve read. As is always the case, it is likely that the press has gotten parts of this wrong and/or there is more yet to break.

Gen. Petraeus, CIA Director and mastermind of the surge in Iraq has allegedly been having an affair with his biographer, married mother of two Paula Broadwell. The alleged affair was discovered after Mrs. Broadwell apparently suspected Mrs. Jill Kelley (another married mother close to the General) of being the kind of hussy who would steal another woman’s man. According to the Daily Beast, Mrs. Broadwell sent Mrs. Kelley catty anonymous emails with statements like:

| You parade around the base ... You need to take it down a notch

Mrs. Kelley according to the Daily Mail then contacted one of her beta orbiters who works for the FBI, and he agreed to white knight on her behalf and have this minor catfight elevated into a federal matter. Once the FBI started investigating the catty emails they found exchanges between Petraeus and Broadwell which ultimately lead to Petraeus resigning his post as head of the CIA. Along the way, the hussygate investigation has lead to an investigation into whether General John Allen, the current commander of NATO troops in Afghanistan was having an affair with Mrs. Kelley.

Surprisingly, it doesn’t end there. According to the New York Post, both Generals Allen and Petraeus white knighted on behalf of Mrs. Kelley’s twin sister Natalie Khawam in a custody battle:

| The generals’ letters to the court — written in the past two months — supported a motion to overturn a ruling made nearly a year earlier by a judge who resoundingly denied custody to Khawam, because of serious reservations about her honesty and mental stability, court records show. 
The Private Man’s update on the Manosphere
by Dalrock | November 16, 2012 | Link

The Private Man has a good post up on recent changes in the sphere. I would add CMDN to his list of recently closed down blogs.

We should probably also create a separate category for Rebellion University, which I propose we call What’s this button for? Fortunately Professor Hale is back sporting a shiny new wordpress blog.

Check out The Private Man’s update including a list of new blogs to watch: The Manosphere Is Evolving
Badger writes about a woman at a dinner party who recently tried to enlist him in her friend’s quest to keep her dating hopper filled with new men:

“Do you have any normal friends for my friend to date?”

Vaguely confused by the hasty presumption that I was a dating sourcer, but detecting an opportunity for a silent manosphere laugh, I replied “you’d have to tell me more.”

“Well, she’s been dating guys from OKCupid and says she just can’t find any normal guys there.”

Now I was irked. It would have been one thing if she said her friend worked long hours with all women and just wasn’t meeting men, or had had trouble getting back on the carousel after a breakup. But she’s swimming in men and is striking out wildly. And I happen to know that a significant portion of the young men in my city are on OKCupid, so I know there’s a few good fish in that pond.

As Badger points out, the woman is presuming quite a lot in expecting a stranger to fix her friend’s dysfunctional dating strategy:
The fact that she saw me as a possible conduit for her issue of the day smacked of a combination of megalomania and an appeal to the male instinct for problem-solving – “maybe you can help me fix this!” Expecting me to leap into the coat closet and re-emerge in my Captain Save-A-Ho suit, ready to line up cannon fodder for her chica amiga who couldn't generate her own romantic sales leads.

What strikes me even more is the widespread denial of the larger issue. Once a woman sets out with a strategy other than one and done marriage, she all too often becomes a ravenous beast with a need to constantly fill her hopper with more men. Most of these men will be either outright rejected or (worse) added to her stable of beta orbiters.
Strip mining machines are typically stuck for life in the very pits they create. While younger prospectors are starting up in rich ground, as a strip miner for men ages she ends up forever reprocessing less and less promising tailings.
Eventually nearly all of the most promising ore has been lost forever in an unintended environmental impact or has been snapped up by more astute miners. Even if she does come across a promising nugget, the years and hard mining operations have taken their toll; her battered sluice box can no longer even slow down most nuggets, let alone retain them.

This is why if you come across a site focused on single women (or single mothers), there is a never ending obsession with feeding the hopper. More men. More men. Must find more men. Anyone and everyone is enlisted in the obsessive task of devouring through mountains of men in an attempt to relive the glory days of their early mining experience.

To be fair, the constant need for new romantic prospects isn’t limited just to choice addicted women in today’s Sexual Marketplace (SMP). Those men who find themselves repeatedly in the first 2-3 stages of the strip mining operation have little choice but to look for new hoppers to throw themselves into. Some men have figured out the business of dealing with strip miners, and deliberately set out to play the role of hookup, fling, and (as part of a soft harem strategy) boyfriend. A much larger group of men unwittingly end up playing the role of forever scraped aside top soil, beta orbiter, and the sucker who chivalrously pays for dates with the miner while she has sex with rockbanddrummer for free.

But either way there is a critical qualitative difference. Those men who are setting out for a life of sexual variety are very honest about the moral and practical reality of their choice and the continuing need for new ore in the hopper. They aren’t pretending to be seeking the one, and therefore don’t need to lie to themselves and others about the nature of their operations. As a result, they are able to come up with effective strategies to keep operational costs down and efficiently retain as much of what they are seeking for as long as possible.
It is worth noting that the entire process is often mistaken for something more quaint due to the denial at the core of the operation. Strip miners work hard to associate themselves with the romantic image of their grandmothers and even sisters who spent a few years in their late teens and early twenties carefully panning for a husband. Finding a proper husband is no small task, and many women still quietly take this seriously. They understand that devouring mountains is counterproductive, and instead work to locate rich areas to prospect and carefully sift to avoid discarding the prize or falling for the flash of fools gold. They don’t attract the attention of the much more visible strip miners because they aren’t devouring mountains, and when they think they have found a good prospect they aren’t about to tip their hand to other miners.

Wise prospectors also understand the vital importance of holding on to their gold once they find it.

Bagger 288 panoramic image licensed as Creative Commons by Martin Röll
Gold in pan image licensed as Creative Commons by Dennis Garrett
Rockbanddrummer term coined by Deti.
Not all women are cut out to be professional divorcées. While she may lack talent and want to be a writer, a woman may find she never pretended to make a lifelong commitment. Such women are often relegated to the role of *professional spinster*, and have to elbow it out with the likes of Kate Bolick and Lori Gottlieb. This is the nature of the world; not everyone can be a fashion editor, and credentials matter.

Even if a woman finds she meets all three essential requirements, there is still the question of what type of professional divorcée she should be. Everyone’s favorite of course is the *empowerment divorcée*, but this adds the prerequisite of having a foreign man marry you for a visa. Elizabeth Gilbert made it look easy when she found an old guy to marry her for a visa so she could write her blockbuster divorce empowerment book/movie *Eat Pray Love*. Before that, Terry McMillan set the gold standard by having a gay man marry her for a visa and writing about it in *How Stella Got Her Groove Back*.

But what if you didn’t manage to have an old dude or a gay man marry you for a visa after divorcing? While you can’t join the ranks of professional *empowerment* divorcées, you still
meet the basic requirements; there is no need to forego the opportunity to make your lack of marital commitment your springboard to fame and fortune. After all, who had ever heard of Sandra Tsing Loh before she joined the ranks of professional divorcées? She had been writing for years as a professional unhappy working woman, professional harried mom, and professional unhappy wife, but becoming a professional divorcée was her ticket to the big show.

The problem is there is no shortage of women who lack talent, want to be a writer, and pretended to make a lifelong commitment. While modern women have created a massive market with their shameless collective obsession with divorce, there is still only room for so many professional divorcées. Modern women may be fickle when it comes to sacred vows, but they won’t settle for anything but the best when it comes to reading about divorce. As a result the go-to female writing technique of baring their souls isn’t enough here. To stand out, a divorcée must be willing to sell her soul. Simply divorcing and then telling all won’t cut it anymore. Want to make an impression? Your divorce has to harm children, preferably your own. Better yet, announce that your divorce not only harmed your children, it was frivolous. This way millions of women can feast vicariously on your obscene sense of self pity, the trail of wreckage you leave in your wake, and your intense solipsism.

Sandrah Tsing Loh is no slouch, but if you want to observe the master at work you really need to witness Susan Gregory Thomas. Ms. Gregory Thomas exploded onto the professional divorcée scene in mid 2011 with her seminal book In Spite of Everything: A Memoir and its accompanying piece in The Wall Street Journal The Divorce Generation.

Ms. Gregory Thomas masterfully spends the first two thirds of her lengthy WSJ piece recounting how devastated she and her peers were by the divorces of their parents, and explaining how as a result she vowed never to do the same to her own children.

For much of my generation—Generation X, born between 1965 and 1980—there is only one question: “When did your parents get divorced?” Our lives have been framed by the answer. Ask us. We remember everything.

... 

Our suburb was littered with sad-eyed, bruised nomads, who wandered back and forth between used-record shops to the sheds behind the train station where they got high and then trudged off, back and forth from their mothers’ houses during the week to their fathers’ apartments every other weekend.

... 

I can’t help feeling that every divorce, in its way, is a re-enactment of “Medea”: the wailing, murderously bereft mother; the cold father protecting his pristine, new family; the children: dead.

She tells us that the impact of her parent’s divorce on her was so profound, she is like a war orphan:
After hearing about my background for some time, my distinguished therapist made an announcement: “You,” she said, “are a war orphan.”

She explains that she and her husband were determined not to inflict the same harm on their own children:

...those of us who survived the wreckage of split families were determined never to inflict such wounds on our children. We knew better. We were doing everything differently, and the fundamental premise was simple: “Kids come first” meant that we would not divorce.

At this point my audience may be somewhat confused. You promised us a professional divorcée, a woman who is willing to feed her kids to the meat grinder for attention and profit. Why are you telling us about this woman who loves her kids enough to honor her marriage vows and resist the siren call to evict their father from the house? But this is where the true genius of Susan Gregory Thomas becomes evident. She may lack the talent needed to make it as an honest writer, but she is a master at playing the gruesome game of selling out her own children for status and drama. Once she has made an airtight case that only a monster would frivolously divorce knowing how it would devastate her children, she coolly tells us that is exactly what she did four years ago.

She spends the rest of the piece explaining how her divorce (as she just told us about her marriage) will be different and won’t harm her kids. While she and her peers had to deal with the trauma of parents remarrying and shuttling from household to household, her children will benefit from a joint custody arrangement and the fact that their parents are still primarily focused on being parents.

In the fall of 2011 she followed up with a piece in the New York Times titled The Good Divorce. She starts by explaining again how against divorce she is, how damaged she personally was as a child by divorce, and how she has discovered the key to divorcing without harming her children. But this kind of story won’t sell copy. The audience demands something gruesome to feast on, and Ms. Gregory Thomas delivers. She explains that as a result of her frivolous divorce her children experienced financial hardship*, the depression of a parent (her), and the shuttling between two households. In case we miss the significance of this, she points to studies showing that these are the very things which most damage children following divorce. She then proceeds to share anecdotes of how her children were harmed:

As if on cue, our older child had had a very difficult third-grade year, two years ago, in which she was at the vortex of a mean-girl. She’d always had an entrenched sense of justice, but when she perceived that a classmate had deeply violated her code, the propulsion of her hate-mongering was breathtaking. Her father and I were dumbfounded: “Heathers” — really?

Then, our younger one had reading and math problems. We couldn’t understand: She was so bright, so eager to learn, had such an allusive imagination. What was the problem?
One bright side to this is her own children won’t have to tell their stories to therapists as she herself did; the therapists and everyone they know will have already read all about them.

In July of this year Ms. Gregory Thomas wrote a piece on wives who outearn their husbands: When the Wife Has a Fatter Paycheck. You may be thinking “Finally, an honest piece of writing, not another round of it’s all about me.” Maybe someday, but not with this piece. This one turns out to be about how she personally suffers now that she is at the 8th and final step of having it all. The problem? In her bid to remarry after putting her kids through the meat grinder, she had to make a few concessions. For reasons she doesn’t explain, it seems that her secret multimillionaire hunky handyman failed to appear:

Like millions of my sisters, this puts me smack in the middle of a distinctively modern dilemma: how to handle the tensions of a marriage between an alpha woman and a beta man.

My husband, an antiques restorer whose field has all but evaporated as a result of the recession, does his best to help with chores and child care, while earning enough to pay utilities and car-insurance bills. I’m the one who works an octopus-armed 12-to 14-hour day, often seven days a week.

All great divorce tales are stories of rebirth, and Ms. Gregory Thomas has metamorphasised from largely unknown writer to Alpha Woman in her role as professional divorcée. Writing articles and a book about how you failed your children is a full time job, and the clear mark of a strong independent woman.

*In her web page Ms. Thomas claims authorship of the blog Broke-Ass Grouch, and a recent blog post confirms this. While I don’t doubt that she and her children have experienced financial hardship as a result of her frivolce, I’m not convinced that she lives in the ghetto, raises chickens for eggs, and makes her own cheese as she claims. I suspect this is just part of her octopus armed attempt to make it as a writer. One of the reviewers of her “memoir” on Amazon writes that she tells us she spent $100k on a kitchen remodel during marriage #1. This appears to be what she is spinning in the WSJ piece as “her generation” being so invested in their children that they spend more money “improving the nest”. From her gravatar picture, she appears to have a newborn child as well as a classy tattoo.
More grim news for carousellers hoping to jump at the last minute.

by Dalrock | November 24, 2012 | Link

Ever since my post in June Never marrieds piling up I’ve been curious what the data would look like for 2012. The US Census has the data posted, and I’ve updated the charts. I’ve also added two new charts at the end which show the breakdown by race. As I shared previously, the first two charts are time series for white women going back to the last year I have easy access to data for, 1999. Here is the chart for ages 25 to 49:
I left the 20-24 age bracket off the chart above because the never married rate for that group has been fairly flat the last few years and it changes the scale of the chart. However, I have created a version of the chart including that age group for your data analysis pleasure.

Here is a zoom looking just at the 30-49 age groups:
My basic analysis of the data hasn’t changed since my previous post, but the additional data reinforces that something very important is happening.

More and more women continue to postpone marriage past their late 20s, and those who do so are finding it harder to marry in their 30s. The changes in the later age groups likely dramatically understate the eventual impact of the existing choices because there is a delay before the changes in each age bracket fully cascade into the next older bracket. Note that the same situation exists between the early and late thirties brackets which we saw with last year’s data, only more pronounced. The late thirties group has been increasing even though the corresponding values for the same group five years earlier were constant. This indicates that marriage rates for women in their mid thirties have been declining over the last five years.
At the same time, we see that women in their early thirties now are starting off with significantly lower marriage rates than just a few years ago. Putting this together, more women are ending up in their early thirties having not married, and fewer women are able to marry in their thirties.

Note that the women currently in the 35-39 bracket have a 15.4% never married rate. When these same women were in the 30-34 age bracket 5 years ago they had a never married rate of 18.5%. However, the women currently in the 30-34 age bracket have a much higher never married rate of 25.1%! It seems unlikely that today’s early thirties women starting from this much higher number will be able to drop down to 15% in five years, especially since we know the rate of marriage for that group has dropped considerably. They will probably be lucky to drop down to 20%. However, the cascade doesn’t stop there. Today’s early thirties women left their late 20s five years ago with higher marriage rates (39.3% never married) than today’s late 20s women (47.5% never married).

Where this will eventually come to rest depends on too many variables to try to predict, but at the very least we know that a significant amount of reduced marriage rates are already loaded into the system. It would take a very strong increase in later marriage rates to merely cause the values for women in their 30s and 40s to level off.

As these changes become evident, it is very likely that we will see a power shift in the “marriage market” as the husband shortage for marriage delayers becomes obvious. The psychology of markets tends to revolve around fear and greed. For the last 40 years, the marriage market has been characterized by greed on the part of would be brides and fear on
the part of would be grooms. This is why women have felt so comfortable making marriage a last priority, behind education, career, and casual sex. The recent history of the marriage market can accurately be summed up as 40 years of ultimatums by women, with men backing down in the face of each new ultimatum. The nonchalance by women towards marriage has been misinterpreted by many as a lack of interest in marriage, but I believe that it is reflective of an assumption that marriage will be theirs for the taking, so what is the rush? The statistics above tend to bear out the logic of this position. Young women look at their late 30s and early 40s aunts and see that all but a handful managed to marry. But the same stats which explain their current level of comfort show why that comfort will soon be coming to an end. At some point as more and more thirty-something women find themselves unable to marry the mood of the marriage delayers will turn from greed to fear. Instead of looking for reasons to reject men, they will focus more on holding on to the men they can get. This will be a change on the margins, but it will be enough to be noticeable. This will have the follow on impact of changing the prevailing mood of late 20s and thirty-something men from fear to greed, as they notice a sudden embarrassment in SMP options.

I was also interested in the breakdown of these figures by race. I've focused on marriage rates for white women when looking at time series to simplify the analysis. I don't have the time to chart out the different races year by year, but I have pulled together some snapshots showing the same basic data by race. Here is what it looked like in the year 2000 (source):


Here is what it looks like now (source):
Edit: I’ve exported the spreadsheets I used to create these charts to excel format (originals in Libre Office). Here is the file with the time series for White women. Here is the file showing all races. As always, please let me know if you spot any errors in my calculations.
A year ago Suzanne Venker famously asked: *Marriage: What’s in It for Men?*

...we must retract the message Boomers sent young women about female empowerment. Indeed, it isn’t a coincidence that marriage rates have plummeted alongside America’s fascination with the feminist movement. Empowerment for women, as defined by feminists, neither liberates women nor brings couples together. It separates them. It focuses on women as perpetual victims of the Big Bad Male. Why would any man want to get married when he’s been branded a sexist pig at “hello”? In the span of just a few decades, women have managed to demote men from respected providers and protectors to being unnecessary, irrelevant, and downright expendable.

She was close to the core of the issue then, but was missing the key point of leadership. Telling the man he is responsible for financing and protecting the family but not leading it places him in a subordinate role. As others have pointed out, the difference between a driver and a chauffeur is who is calling the shots. Far too many self labeled “traditionalist” women want to put men in the driver’s seat as figureheads with the wives calling the shots; they are feminists who don’t want to get their hands dirty. The issue of headship is the litmus test which separates out truly traditional women and feminists in traditionalist clothing.

Just this week Ms. Venker launched what has become a celebrated broadside against the results of feminism with her *Fox News* opinion piece *The war on men*. The signature line of the piece is by now familiar to most readers:

> Believe it or not, modern women want to get married. Trouble is, men don’t.

The piece certainly has its merits, as Vox Day, Empathologicalism, and LGR have already explained. However, she still avoids the question of headship in the article.

In the meantime Ms. Venker spoke with the *Daily Beast* to correct the record: ‘*The War on Men’ Author Suzanne Venker: I’m Misunderstood!* Venker explains (emphasis mine):

> **Women should understand that they absolutely can be strong and independent and be married**, but that being feminine and vulnerable and taking on that more traditional role as being dependent on a man and letting him have some say in the matter is not wasting that empowerment. They are confusing what empowerment means. They think it’s about money and prestige, but there is a tremendous amount of empowerment in surrendering in the home and letting the man in your life be what he wants to be, which is to protect you and care for you and provide for you.

One might read that as suggesting that men are made to be servants to women, and women need to let men act as servants (and perhaps even consider their husband’s input when
making decisions). This of course sounds familiar. She reinforces this concept later in the interview:

I work outside the home. My husband does his thing. No one would consider me a docile or obedient housewife... I am married to a guy who works so that I can have a cushy writing life. That is the beauty of marriage.
Several fellow bloggers expressed concern in the comments section of my last post that I might be creating an enemy out of an ally. After all, in her opinion pieces Venker seems to get it at least somewhat right. At least she wants to allow men to be men in some ways (provide and protect), even if she is all about the strong independent woman. The problem is expecting men to continue with traditional gender roles while having no reciprocal expectation of women is a disaster. This is just another brand of feminism, where women have rights and men have responsibilities. We can see this in her interview with the Daily Beast:

...women, once they have children would prefer to work part-time or not at all when their children are young. Their career trajectory will be different than that of men. Feminists don’t like that. They want everybody to want the same thing, career trajectories to be the same. Women may say I really want to exercise or hang out with my friends and have coffee or go shopping and have a cushier life, and your guy will be happy to do that, and go to the office all year long for 40 years to allow you to do that. Men don’t have that option. And there is nothing wrong with having different road maps.

The need to enforce this brings us the worst parts of marriage 2.0, which are all about ensuring that the wife can divorce without consequence if her husband doesn’t follow her leadership. This is what the threatpoint is all about. After all, what if her “guy” isn’t happy going to the office all year for 40 years to allow his wife to lead a cushy life after she attains her feminist merit badge? While Venker claims to oppose easy divorce, she can’t really come down hard on it because women need this threatpoint to have it all.

Venker knows this better than most, because she has been there and done that. In her interview with New York Magazine she describes finding that she had to personally adapt as a wife and temper her “strong-willed and opinionated” personality. This lead to the topic of her first marriage, and she explained that her being a strong independent woman wasn’t the cause of her divorce:

I wouldn’t say what we’re talking about here applies to my first marriage, although there is some connection. After college, I lived in and worked in New York, and I was married for four years, then I moved back to St. Louis, remarried, and had two children. Our issues were geographical. I didn’t want that crazy lifestyle. I wanted a simpler life, a one-income family. I didn’t want to live in New York. But that’s not the whole enchilada.

See also the video of the Venker interview on Fox and Friends here (H/T Free Northerner). In that interview she continues to distance herself from her War on Men article and seems to
want to reclaim her feminist bona fides. She reiterates that wives should sometimes allow husbands to make decisions. She also makes it very clear that she isn’t talking about husbands as head of household.

One of the hosts suggests as an example of women making accommodations to men that wives not take out the garbage, even if they already have it in hand (leaving that honor for their husband). Ms. Venker is delighted and responds that this is a perfect example of what she has in mind. Another example he offers to her enthusiastic agreement is that wives should leave it to their husbands to investigate a possible intruder in the home.

She does end the interview with a plea for appreciation on behalf of men, explaining that men are much better now than in her father’s generation. She offers the example of men shopping while wearing Snuglis™ (like this man) as proof of men’s improvement. She made the same basic comment in the NY Mag interview:

> I grew up with the hands-off father from a different generation. He was old school and didn’t show his love. I don’t see how people cannot see the huge change between him and fathers today, who are wearing Snuglis, and you’ll see them at Target on a Wednesday afternoon. I think male involvement at home is a wonderful thing, but understand that if you try to make them into women completely, you’re never going to be able to have that male provider.

See Free Northerner’s take on the Fox & Friends interview in his post: Venker Backtracks
One of the common questions on the *Marriage and Divorce* section of *Yahoo Answers* comes from husbands who don’t understand why their wife is reacting negatively to their romantic gestures. One husband recently asked *Why does my wife not appreciate me?*

Yesterday was my wife’s birthday and I sent her flowers to her office. She threw a fit because they were not the flowers she was expecting. Really? First of all, I just sent her a big flower arrangement 2 weeks ago for our wedding anniversary. I didn’t want to spend a lot of money on these flowers because I am throwing her a surprise party this weekend. Plus I booked her a 3.5 hour massage and bought her a diamond necklace. She doesn’t know that because it’s a surprise.

The point I am trying to make is, isn’t it the thought that counts? Just knowing I love her be good enough? I think. But apparently it is not.

The answer to his question comes from understanding what women want. Men are taught repeatedly that what women want are gestures of investment, commitment, and love. Give her flowers, buy her an expensive dinner, write her a love letter, etc.

In fact these are things women want, but they don’t want them from just any man. They want them from a man they are attracted to. If you think about women’s fantasies as represented in romance novels, etc. you will see that women don’t fantasize about having a bevy of ordinary men falling over themselves to give her the most thoughtful gift. Women fantasize about winning the heart of the dashing hero, and ultimately having him acknowledge this with tokens of his investment, commitment, and love. These tokens give her comfort that she isn’t hopelessly pursuing an unavailable man. She wants him to feel too good to be true, but she also wants some reassurance that she isn’t just being conned.

What men are being taught is to skip the hero part and go straight to the expression of love. They are taught to offer comfort as a way to build attraction, instead of building attraction first and then offering comfort. It is no wonder that this not only doesn’t work, but often fails spectacularly.

If you try offering comfort without first generating attraction with a woman you aren’t already romantically involved with, the typical responses will be:

| Aww, that’s really sweet. You are going to make some lucky girl (but not me) a great boyfriend/husband some day! |

Or (same meaning):

| Let’s just be friends. |

Or, worst case scenario:
What a creep!

If you do this with your wife, the common responses are an inexplicable and irrational anger and frustration, and perhaps even contempt. Do this long enough, and you will eventually hear:

I love you but I’m not in love with you.

This last line is the worst of all coming from a wife, because it is a strong signal that a divorce is around the corner.

Fortunately there are things you can do to hopefully recover the situation. As with anything else, much of this will depend on how big a hole you are already in. This article assumes you aren’t in a really deep hole here, but that like nearly all husbands you and your wife are both frustrated that your attempts to make her feel loved are at times at least having a very different result.

As you may have guessed, what you need to do is generate more attraction. It could be that she only needs to feel a bit more attraction than she already does, but for most men it would be difficult to err on the side of too much attraction. Either way, as her husband you should be able to sense her changed response to you as you regain balance between comfort and attraction. While generating attraction is as much an art as it is a science, it isn’t as difficult or mysterious as it probably seems right now. This article isn’t intended to make you a black belt in seduction, but instead to explain the basic problem and get you started on the path to a much happier marriage.

Earlier I mentioned romance novels, and you may be thinking:

I can’t become a romance novel hero. Those men are caricatures of real men. Besides, I’m not secretly a wealthy prince, I’m not six foot seven with six pack abs, and I almost never ride a dashing steed while wielding a broadsword.

The good news is you don’t have to become a romance novel hero, you just have to become her hero. This is very similar to wives becoming discouraged when noticing that their husbands are attracted to super-models or Playboy Playmates. A woman doesn’t have to be perfect to arouse her husband, she just has to be his Playmate.

Hopefully you can look back on a time in your relationship with your wife when you could tell she was attracted to you. This might have been during your courtship, or perhaps more recently. During this time a romantic gesture like flowers from you would have given her that unmistakable gleam in her eye, and sincere delight. You don’t have to be the flawless hero of a romance novel, you just have to help her see you as her hero the way she did in the past.

Change the dynamic of your relationship.

Women are attracted to men who are leaders, especially men who are leading them. You probably know of cases which fit the cliché of wives falling in love with their bosses, and this is the mechanism which causes that pattern. You may or may not be a leader of men, but
you absolutely need to become the leader of your household. This doesn’t mean becoming domineering, but more of a Captain and First Officer model. Women wanting a man to lead them is counterintuitive given that we live in a fully feminist age. But there is a difference between what women say and think they want in a man, and what their subconscious wants. Ignore the fundamentals of human psychology at your peril.

For your own comfort while you learn more you probably want to start off slowly here. Start making more decisions without seeking your wife’s approval. Learn not to be timid or afraid of her moods and reactions. Always remember that she wants you to be her rock, and you can’t be her rock if you are matching the whims of her emotions. Instead of timidly hugging her, playfully grab her around the waist and pull her into you so she can enjoy your strength. Stand tall. In your mind remember that you are a strong and worthy man, and keep that frame as you do these things.

More difficult but also essential is to respond when she challenges you. Be prepared for her to subconsciously test you to see if you really are cut out to lead the family. Is he the real deal, or a faker? Going back to the example of the romance novel, very often the fantasy involves the man taming the woman. This is also a common theme in literature, with Shakespeare’s Taming of the Shrew being just one example. While the taming is often dramatic and overt in literature, what you will want to do is much more subtle. You aren’t looking to break her spirit, but to show your own strength of spirit and conviction and in doing so show her that you are the man she can depend on, the rock she wants to cling to.

Recall the reaction of the wife to her husband sending her flowers at work in the beginning of the post. Many of the answerers on Yahoo pointed out that she was being a bitch. While I’ve explained the psychology behind her response, this is still the case; she responded like a spoiled child. Her husband needs to see this for what it is, a test of his will and leadership. Will he succumb to a childish rant and abandon principle out of fear of her emotions? He needs to see this as an opportunity to demonstrate that he really is her rock. He needs to calmly call her out on this, and by all means avoid the advice to apologize to her or follow up with even more gifts. When he does this she very likely will throw an even bigger fit, but if he holds firm with the right frame once she calms down she will begin to see him in a new light.* He finally stood up to her.

**Further Reading**

As I wrote above, this isn’t intended to make you an expert at generating attraction from your wife. Part of the challenge you have is that what you have been taught doesn’t work, but everyone knows that is just how it is. Because of this, there will be a learning curve and some time required to adjust to the new (accurate) mental model. I’ve included a variety of resources below with the understanding that not all will appeal to all readers, but that hopefully one or several of them will fit your needs.

If you are a Christian I suggest you start with the biblical framing of marriage. While it is nearly universally ignored or feebly explained away, the Bible makes it clear that the husband is to be the head of the household and the wife is to submit to him. If you and your wife are faithful enough to follow it, you won’t need any further instruction than the Bible. However, if you want some more detail as to how you might apply this I’ve written a
separate primer on this [here](https://www.chateaufood.com).

For those who aren’t Christian, or who are but aren’t prepared to follow the Bible regarding marriage, there are other resources available. One excellent primer is the Dave from Hawaii post at Château Heartiste. You may also find some value in reading about my wife’s experience when I began changing the dynamic of our marriage. I also suggest Hawaiian Libertarian’s post on using these skills outside of a romantic context as well as his excellent post Defining Hypergamy.

Once you’ve read the primers I would suggest checking out Vox Day’s Alpha Game blog and Athol Kay’s book and blog Married Man Sex Life, starting with his posts on Alpha and Beta Male Traits and The MAP.

*Since we are talking about human beings it is impossible to fully predict how she will respond, especially without more information. If she already views him with full contempt or if she is mentally unstable this could lead to her becoming more irrational and perhaps even to divorce. However if she would divorce him for failing to apologize for giving her flowers, remaining married to such a woman would be a nightmare, and giving in to her when she is being irrational will generally only make her more enraged. The risks are the husband’s to bear so only he can decide the right course of action in the end.

**Note to “regular” readers:** Please consider the intended audience of this post when commenting on it. However, please do feel free to share any words of encouragement and advice to husbands who are new to the concept of game and are just learning about it for the first time. Comments which aren’t appropriate to the specific audience of this post will be removed.
A secret the KGB couldn’t have kept.
by Dalrock | December 2, 2012 | Link

On my last post the discussion turned to how likely the average man was to have learned about the mechanics of sexual attraction. TFH argued that the time is approaching where this information will be so widely available that if one hasn’t started picking it up it is an indication of unwillingness to learn, not lack of exposure:

As bad as feminists and ordinary women are, by the end of 2015, we will reach the point where some men will have to be told that ‘you cannot entirely blame the burglar if leave the front door open with a neon arrow pointing to it, while you go out of town’.

I won’t try to predict the saturation of information by 2016, but right now very few men over the age of 25-30 have ever heard of either the manosphere or the concept of game. Even so, exposure is the least of our challenges. Feminism is the dominant ideology of our age, and learning that women are attracted to men who lead them is tantamount to crimethink. It doesn’t matter that it is true; entertaining thoughts which counter feminism is a terrifying prospect. This is perhaps more the case for those who don’t see themselves as feminist, and especially those who consider themselves anti-feminist because they oppose abortion, think men have a duty to man up and marry a woman once she has had sex with enough other men, and believe that men have a duty to act as a traditional protector and provider (but not head of household) so their wife can decide if she wants to have a career or stay at home.

The proof of our challenge with older men is not how many have ever heard of Roissy, but the hundreds of millions of Christians who have spent a lifetime avoiding and denying the parts of the Bible which offend feminism.

The best we can hope for is to help those men who are willing to challenge the dominant ideology and overcome their lifetime investment in a mental model of romance which fails miserably but “everyone knows” is right. I don’t think posts like my last one will spark a movement, and that isn’t my intent. I’m simply hoping to help the handful of married men who are ready to learn, and in doing so help a few more kids grow up with their father in the home.

But there is another side to this. Younger men, the ones now in high school, college, and perhaps a few years older, live in a very different world than the one older men came of age in. When I was in college in the late 80s and early 90s, half of all women still married before the age of 24. As I explained here, this influenced the actions of women going back to their late teens. Very large numbers of women were still interested in having a steady boyfriend while in college, and soon thereafter marriage. If you were a man in college without a girlfriend, at least you saw your friends having girlfriends, and you saw the men just a few years older than you getting married.

Now the majority of women are spending a decade after coming of age sexually pursuing a small percentage of the most attractive men. When given the choice, young women have
overwhelmingly chosen hookups over commitment. If you are a young man witnessing this, the lie my peers and I were brought up with that women naturally commit for life is forever exploded. The flower of women's youth is now dedicated to the men who can generate the most “tingles”. In this environment the answer to the question of why young women are focused on the attention of a small number of men (and how to possibly join those men) is a secret the KGB couldn’t have kept. Even if you aren’t able or interested in joining the small group of men, the truth of game will be in front of you every day.

All that was missing was a clear explanation of why women obviously behave in fundamentally different ways than conventional wisdom predicts. Men like Mystery and Roissy and now countless others have done just that. Knowledge of “game” is rapidly becoming mainstream for high school and college age men. They don’t have to learn it from the internet, they hear it from the very men their female peers are falling all over. As a result it is starting to show up both in character archetypes and even in the dialog of movies aimed at young people. One example which comes to mind is the remake of a 1980s vampire movie, *Fright Night 2011*. Early in the movie we see a fairly ordinary high school kid with a surprisingly hot girlfriend. His very manner shows an understanding of game, and this struck me when watching the movie even before this exchange where one of his peers asks what his secret is:

[referring to Amy as they watch her walk away]
**Mark:** Did you find a freakin’ Genie Lamp, man? Make a sacrifice to the hot ass God? Cause how do you get that?
**Charley Brewster:** It’s just game, man. Rock solid game.
[Charley walks away]
**Mark:** He doesn’t even have a car!
**Ben:** Seriously!

This generational shift is the real threat to feminism, and there would be no way to stop this if you wanted to. Shut down every blog in the manosphere and the only question is how long before all of the institutions of our society, from the church and academia to the police and the Supreme Court are populated by men who understand what game teaches. This won’t mean the end of feminism, because the power is already deeply entrenched and we will still have what Rollo has coined the feminine imperative. However, it will mean that feminism won’t have a choke-hold on the discourse, and won’t be able to make men fear the crimethink of examining the true nature of men and women.
Children are as likely to end up living with neither parent as they are with just their father.

by Dalrock | December 8, 2012 | Link

The Census has the 2012 Families and Living Arrangements data out so I pulled a copy of Table C3. Here is the latest data on the living arrangements of children in the US under 18 (all races):

The table has the same category breakdown for fathers that are in the chart for mothers, but the slices were too small to be meaningful and made for too much of an eye chart. To clean it up a bit further I consolidated the married and unmarried categories for “Both Parents”, and did the same for the different categories of children living only with their mother:
Note that children are as likely to be living with neither parent as they are to be living with only their father. I’ve shared stats and an exposé on the bias in the custody system previously, but this is pretty much says it all.

When you combine the profound bias against fathers regarding custody with our no fault divorce process the truth is that fathers are legally “deputy” parents. Just as deputy sheriffs “serve at the pleasure of the sheriff”, in the US fathers serve at the pleasure of the mother. The fathers in the “both parents” category are not on equal legal footing to the mothers. They are merely fathers the mothers haven’t decided to eject or replace yet. As a result, we could more accurately label the category “Both Parents” as “Mother’s Choice”: 

http://dalrock.wordpress.com/
In fact, some of the “fathers” represented in the data are already replacement fathers, as the Census data doesn’t distinguish between actual fathers and the man mommy replaced him with (stepfathers). They don’t note this in Table C3, but it is explained in definitions section of the Census paper Living Arrangements of Children: 2009:

Children are defined in this report as all individuals under 18 years old. The survey asks respondents to identify the child’s mother and/or father if they are present in the household. A separate question asks respondents to identify the type of relationship between each child and parent, whether biological, step, or adoptive. All living arrangements are as of the time of the interview.

Worse, the “stepfather” may or may not be married to the child’s mother, even though this is the very definition of the term. Instead, they leave it up to the child’s mother to define:

Stepchildren are identified by the survey respondent, and their stepparent may not be currently married to the child’s other coresidential parent.

They of course use the gender neutral term “parent” which is technically accurate but highly misleading. Because of the bias in the custody process, mothers receive custody over 80% of the time.
This means that 80% of the time when a “parent” is defining if the non biological parent they live with is a “coresidential parent”, *mommy* is defining whether the latest man she is shacked up with is the child’s step-father, and whoever she defines as the step-father *at that moment* is then treated as the *actual father* in the data.

**See Also:**

- U.S. Historical Living Arrangements of Children: 1880 to 2009
- Updated U.S. Custody and Child Support Data (2009)
- Is Europe proof that intact families don’t really matter?
I was curious about the demographics of family structure so I put together some more charts from the same data set as the last post. I've created two charts for each category, with the first showing the percentage of children living with both parents, and the second showing the rest. The more detailed charts have larger versions available if you click on them (check for mouseover).

Overall the data reinforces how much of a race and class marker marriage has become for raising children. While we can’t take the “both parents” data at face value since it includes nebulously defined step parents (mostly stepfathers), this does show that for specific segments of society marriage is still extremely important when it comes to having and raising children. We already know that college educated women are far less likely to divorce, and it would appear from the charts below that when they do divorce remarriage is still an essential part of the script if children are involved. This focus on marriage for raising children is currently running up against declining marriage rates, which means that something will have to give.

Here is the percentage of children living with both parents, by family income.

**Edit:** Kman pointed out that following separation family income will drop, so the income comparison is problematic. This is confirmed by the relevant definitions in the CPS definitions page. The comparison based on education below is a better measure of the impact of socioeconomic status on living arrangements.
Here is the same basic view but showing the remaining categories:

There is a similar pattern by education, although note the interesting results for those with less than a 9th grade education. I didn’t chart it out but children of foreign born parents lived
with both married parents 76% of the time and lived with both parents (married or not) roughly 80% of the time. Because of this, I suspect that the first column on the education chart may be more reflective of first generation immigration patterns than native education:
The following two charts show the breakdown by the age of the child. Note that the category of children with unmarried cohabiting parents shrinks dramatically as we look at older age brackets. However, it isn’t possible to say how much of this represents the instability of cohabitation compared to marriage. Some of this could be due to the rising out of wedlock birth rate over the last 20 years; the children who are oldest today started off with a higher percentage of married parents. Also, to the extent that initially unmarried cohabiting parents are tying the knot over time this would also shrink the category.

![Chart: Percent of US Children Living with Both Parents by Age, 2012](http://dalrock.wordpress.com/)

Source: Table C3, [http://www.census.gov/hhes/families/data/cps2012.html](http://www.census.gov/hhes/families/data/cps2012.html)
Here is the same breakdown by race:

Percent of US Children Not Living with Both Parents by Race, 2012


http://dalrock.wordpress.com/

- Only Mother
- Only Father
- Neither

- Asian alone: 10.6%
- White alone, Non-Hispanic: 16.4%
- Hispanic: 28.0%
- Black alone: 60.0%
Commenter Arual recently pointed out this bit of airy feminine wisdom: *Some People Can Stay In Your Heart But Not In Your Life*

As she spoke, the sadness was audible in her voice. From the outside looking in, someone may wonder why she is asking for a separation. He didn’t cheat on her. He’s not abusive to her. He’s a decent guy. He’s been an okay partner to her – they have good memories and good times together.

However, she knows that they were brought together for a time... and that time has come to an end. It’s hard for her to explain why it needs to be over. She just knows it does.

Behold the great mystery of feminine relationship wisdom. How does a woman know when the time is right to detonate her family and collect the resulting cash and prizes?

*She just knows.*

**See Also:**

- Women’s sacred path to marriage is in danger.
- Is frivolous divorce overstated in the manosphere?
I was curious if the mythical Peter Pan Manboy we hear so much carping about lately was visible in the data, and since those making the claim are generally elusive on the stats I've pulled my own. The data set I chose is the same data set I used to evaluate ever married rates, the US Census Current Population Survey including the Annual Social and Economic (ASEC) Supplement. This data set excludes the homeless, those who are institutionalized, and those who are overseas. Note that the figures reported are earnings, not income. For more technical details, see this.

Since the Peter Pan Manboy is by definition unmarried and young, let's look at unmarried men and women in their early 20s. Focusing on unmarrieds allows us to exclude housewives from the data when comparing men and women.

If we were only looking at men it might look like we had just found what we are looking for. 30% of unmarried men in this demographic earned no income in the previous year, and 67% of them earned less than $15k. However, the myth says that these are men who are slacking off while their female peers have their acts together. The women in this category look even worse: 31% of them had no earnings the previous year, and 74% of them earned under 15k!

Don't be discouraged though, we may still find our mythical manboys. Women tend to marry earlier than men, and as a result there are fewer unmarried women in this age group than men (9,211 vs 10,014). Perhaps the issue isn't regarding the percentages but overall...
While there are slightly more men than women in the zero earnings group, this can’t be what all of the fuss is about, especially if you look at the other two categories under $15k.

Don’t give up yet. Maybe we are looking too young. Women are more likely than men to go to college, so maybe looking at early 20s is too young. Certainly girlpower and moxie must be in full swing by the time we look at unmarried men and women in their late 20s:
It isn't there either. Perhaps again this is an issue of raw numbers vs percentages:

Again, the raw numbers aren’t impressive for the late twenties either. But perhaps we need to go yet a bit older:
This is even worse for women, as are the raw numbers:

One thing which is worth noting is that looking at unmarrieds tends to bias this search against men, because low and non earning men are the least desirable marriage prospects.
Additionally, men tend to earn more money after marrying than unmarried men with the same level of education and experience do. If we looked at married men and women or simply all men and women, this would make men look better relative to women so it wouldn’t help in our search.

But perhaps this is an issue about race. The writers complaining about the *Peter Pan Manboys* tend to be white; could this phenomenon be something specific to white men? Nope. It isn’t there either:
Earnings Distribution for Unmarried White Non Hispanic Men and Women Age 20-24
US. 2012

Numbers in thousands

WITHOUT EARNINGS | UNDER $5,000 OR LOSS | $5,000 TO $14,999 | $15,000 TO $24,999 | $25,000 TO $34,999 | $35,000 TO $44,999 | $45,000 TO $54,999 | $55,000 TO $64,999 | $65,000 TO $74,999 | $75,000 TO $84,999 | $85,000 AND OVER

Unmarried White Men | 1354 | 950 | 1341 | 1480 | 1036 | 719 | 719 | 12 | 23 | 18 | 30 | 2
Unmarried White Women | 884 | 450 | 728 | 719 | 40 | 295 | 12 | 23 | 18 | 30 | 2


Earnings Distribution for Unmarried White Non Hispanic Men and Women Age 25-29
US. 2012

Percent

WITHOUT EARNINGS | UNDER $5,000 OR LOSS | $5,000 TO $4,999 | $5,000 TO $14,999 | $15,000 TO $24,999 | $25,000 TO $34,999 | $35,000 TO $44,999 | $45,000 TO $54,999 | $55,000 TO $64,999 | $65,000 TO $74,999 | $75,000 TO $84,999 | $85,000 AND OVER

Unmarried White Men | 18% | 5% | 10% | 13% | 15% | 15% | 23% | 23% | 24% | 20% | 4% | 2%
Unmarried White Women | 19% | 6% | 10% | 13% | 15% | 15% | 23% | 23% | 24% | 20% | 4% | 3%

In looking at this I ended up making a much larger number of charts than I have included in this post. I’ve created separate pages including these charts for White, Black, Asian, Hispanic, and All Races. Feel free to check them out and make sure I didn’t leave something important out.

While I didn’t find confirmation of the myth, I am astounded at the number of unmarried men and women who earn either nothing or extremely small amounts. Certainly part of this is due to the poor economy. However, I have to wonder if we aren’t seeing men no longer perceiving heading a family as an incentive to work harder, and therefore the real complaint is that single men have started working more like single women.

Either way, there is a serious issue with too many takers and too few makers. Perhaps most striking is the number of unmarried White men and women in their 40s who earn nothing:
See Also: How the destruction of marriage is strangling the feminist welfare state.
Not Glad Tidings for Post Marital Spinsters.
by Dalrock | December 22, 2012 | Link

The National Center for Family & Marriage Research (NCFMR) at Bowling Green State University has crunched the numbers on the latest remarriage stats:

Men are more likely to remarry than women, and this difference grows dramatically with age. Note that only 2 out of every one thousand divorcées 65 and over remarried in 2010.

I wish they would have broken the under 45 category out a bit since there is a big difference between the prospects of a divorcée in her 20s and one in her late 30s or early 40s. However, I’m guessing the sample sizes didn’t permit this since women under 45 represent just 28% of all current divorcées:
Combining the information from the two charts above, 52% of existing divorcées have a 19 in 1,000 chance of remarrying in any given year, while another 20% have a shockingly low 2 per 1,000 annual chance of remarriage. Only 28% of existing divorcées have the much rosier annual chance of 73 per 1,000, even though the rosy metric is the one most frequently touted. Interestingly even the youngest category of existing divorcées is highly skewed to the oldest ages, with 64% of them over 35:

The crop of existing divorcées is skewed older in part because younger divorcées are much more likely to remarry and (temporarily at least) leave the data set. Here is the age breakdown of women who divorced during 2009, the latest year I could find data for:
While this is younger than the current divorcée population it still skews strongly to older women; only a third are under 35. Any way you slice it this is bad news for aspiring divorcées, as remarriage is an essential part of having it all and the longer women delay their first marriage the older they will be when they later divorce and look to remarry. With the median age of first marriage for women at 26.5 and the median length of first marriages ending in divorce at 11 years this means the bulk of tomorrow’s divorcées will be divorcing even closer to (if not in) middle age. Even the early birds will end up competing with the expanding group of never marrieds, a group which is already finding it extremely difficult to marry in their 30s.

Not only is remarriage essential for class reasons, but women who divorce very often end up incredibly alone later in life if they don’t remarry. The 2004 AARP study of men and women who divorced primarily in their 40s (72%) and early 50s (15%) found that for women remarriage was not only much harder, but the consequences of not remarrying were much worse for women (emphasis mine):

- **Almost 9 in 10 men (87%) dated after their divorce, compared to 8 in 10 women (79%)... Among those who dated after the divorce, more than half of men (54%) but fewer women remarried (39%).** (Page 39)

- **Many women, especially those who have not remarried (69%), do not touch or hug at all sexually.** An even larger majority of women who have not remarried do not engage in sexual intercourse (77% saying not at all), in comparison with about half of men (49%) who have not remarried. (Page 6)

It is even worse than the 2004 AARP study found however, because it was looking at the outcomes of divorces in the past and remarriage rates have been dropping for the last 50 years.
Edit Oct 6 2014: Updated the remarriage over time chart to one showing the correct time scale.
How the feminine imperative “just happens”.

by Dalrock | December 26, 2012 | Link

Sunshine Mary has been digging into the feminine imperative, trying to understand the mechanics of it. In challenging the concept she is doing the sphere a favor by forcing a more rigorous examination of it.

In How doth the little feminine imperative grow? she describes the interaction of a group of mostly home schooled young men and women. The young women (American Heritage Girls) recently joined up with an existing group of Boy Scouts for a joint Christmas celebration. When it came time to enjoy the cookies, the girls all went first:

> I noticed my daughters cutting into the front of the line at the buffet table, along with all the other AHGirls, and I heard one of the older Boy Scouts loudly instructing the cubs to stay back and let the girls go through the buffet line first. The girls all looked a bit startled by this but, faced with a long table full of treats, happily skipped right up to the front with nary a backward glance...

> The thing is, no girl asked or appeared to expect to go through the food line first, though they also didn’t object to doing so (they also didn’t thank the boys). It was the boys who were enforcing this on one another, and they were doing it very proudly.

As Sunshine Mary points out, it was one of the boys who directed this.

> It just appeared to happen spontaneously and willingly.

This causes her to question whether the feminine imperative is really a valid concept, or if this isn't something strictly due to the nature of men:

> While the feminine imperative may be a valid concept, I do not at present agree with Dalrock that it is women defining social rules to meet strictly female needs.

Numerous commenters on her post noted that it is very natural for men to look after women, and this has always been the case. Indeed, this natural protectiveness men have for women is part of the mechanism which leads to the feminine imperative. However, it is only part of the mechanism. The other side is vehement objection to reciprocity, and this very much does come from women. To the casual observer the scene Sunshine Mary describes where men defer to women and the women don’t bother thanking them (or truly even appreciating the gesture) seems to “just happen”.

The reality is that women’s passivity is far more superficial than it appears. Vox Day recently explained why women tend to be passive aggressive:

> ...passive-aggressive behavior is an intentional attack on another individual made with at least some degree of plausible deniability concerning the attack, the intent,
or the target. The reason for the plausible deniability because the passive-aggressive individual wants to be able to attack someone else without giving his target a justification for striking back.

Should he be questioned, the passive-aggressive attacker will usually affect to deny he was making an attack, or that he intended any such thing, or that the person he was obviously attacking was, in fact, the target....

This is a perfectly reasonable conflict strategy for women, who are on average smaller, weaker, slower, and less intelligent than men.

The seeming passivity of women in the process of rewriting social norms to the exclusive benefit of women is what is throwing Sunshine Mary off. She can easily test this by coaching one of the boys to suggest that the girls show some reciprocal form of deference to the boys during a future celebration. Perhaps the girls should serve the boys refreshments during their next celebration, as Anonymous Reader suggested:

One way to damp down the entitlement princess training just received by the boys / young men deferring to the girls / young women would be to cause the girls and young women to defer in a different way to the boys and young men. For example, at some future time you might consider having the AH girls serve the Boy Scout boys, perhaps by seating the boys at table and having the girls bring trays to the tables.

If this is suggested the lie of the girls’ passivity will come out in force. It won’t come out in the form of a logical reaction, even if on the surface it appears to start that way. For example, they are likely to bristle at the idea of having their moxie damaged by deferring to the boys, and make a feminist argument for equality. However, if this is simply about equality one could then propose that instead of serving the boys the girls have the boys go first through the treat line, and agree to take turns at this from here on.

At this point the reality of the feminine imperative will become evident, because while the girls were seemingly passive when everything was going their way, any deviance from this will be met with emotional outbursts. Whoever proposes either true equality or simple reciprocity will become the object of great irrational anger, and at this point the passivity turns to aggression. While the girls (and their mothers) won’t know why they are so angry, they will know that whoever proposed such a thing is a terrible person. Sunshine Mary described just this sort of thing regarding Joseph of Jackson in a separate post.

Another excellent example of the passive aggressive enforcement of the feminine imperative occurred in August when Zippy Catholic linked to my post Losing Control of the Narrative in his post Rubbernecking Past the Death of Masculinity. Commenter Lydia was outraged that men were being allowed to notice very large numbers of women delaying marriage to focus on casual sex and career, as well as divorcing frivolously. That I could notice such things was in her mind proof that I am a defective man and husband:

If the blogger linked is supposed to be an example of someone who appears to care deeply about marriage and the family, you can keep him. I don’t care if he’s a
Christian. I don’t care that he knows feminism is false or that lots of Christians are, unfortunately, feminists. (Whoop-de-doo.) Someone that callous and cynical, who freely thinks and talks in the terms of “Game,” who pretty obviously thinks that all women are prima facie sluts, has had his chivalry and his capacity for wonder permanently damaged if not destroyed. I wouldn’t want him or his followers in the so-called “Christian manosphere” (shudder) coming within a hundred miles of marrying one of my daughters.

...what does one expect from people who want to wander around the blogosphere wallowing in talk of the sluttishness of women and the needs of poor men to protect themselves from these predatory females?

...How would a man who thinks and speaks that way view his wife as a gift? Where would be that capacity for joy and wonder and blessing?

Lydia’s complaint is that I am being allowed to think differently than than she would permit, and that Zippy is compounding the problem by exposing his male readers to such subversive ideas. Her argument isn't that the facts I’m presenting are untrue, but that I’m committing a thought-crime against the feminine imperative by acknowledging such a painfully obvious pattern. She is there to make sure no such thought-crimes occur in the minds of Zippy or his readers, lest they too become defective men:

...my conclusion is that the occupational hazard of being immersed (maybe perforce, because of one’s job, for example) in the situations in which women have ruined men’s lives is a particular level and type of jadedness and a damaging of that ability to see a woman as a gift. I think that _especially_ the fathers of sons should want their sons not to suffer that kind of damage, especially not when they still have the opportunity, hopefully, to go through life without suffering it.

She reinforces this further down in the discussion:

No one should even be able to *think* of nonsense like #1-#4...

She takes special offense at my pointing out that frivolous divorce exists and that it is in fact regularly encouraged by the church and the culture:

This portrays women as somehow determined by the outside world to behave wickedly and destroy everyone’s life (including, what the manosphere doesn’t seem to realize, her own life in a very real sense) on a whim. Wow, that’s darned insulting. *Not one* of my close female friends is “resisting divorce porn.” The idea is risible. They’re just happy and busy and living their lives, love their husbands, etc.

Having established that divorce porn isn’t a problem and having chastised men for thinking women are tempted to utilize a system designed for them to abuse men, she later explains what the real problem is. It turns out that homosexual husbands and “rape porn” have much to do with it:

Frankly, I think that some (indeed, numerically quite a few, though I won’t pronounce
dogmatically on the total percentage) cases where a woman initiates a divorce are cases where _she_ has lost _her_ “bet” in marriage and has suffered the consequences of the risk she took—where, for example, her husband ended up addicted to rape porn and refused to stop, where he was keeping a mistress or sleeping around, where he was an active homosexual, where he was genuinely, seriously abusive, or plenty of other situations.

During the long exchange (130+ comments) Zippy and I both encouraged Lydia to point out where my post was either factually or logically incorrect. I don’t believe she directly responded to Zippy’s request, but to me she explained that she would not do so because I am not her friend. My specific request was:

I’m just trying to break through the internet tribalism and have an actual discussion. At some point can we break past claims that the other guys are “internet tough guys” who probably don’t love their wives, and have a real discussion? This is all I’m asking.

To which she replied:

No, not really. I have an extremely full Internet life, probably too full. In fact, certainly too full. Plus a real, in-person life. What you call “tribalism” I call friendship.

Yet, while she was too busy to point out where my facts or logic were incorrect, she wasn’t too busy to wage a one woman filibuster in the comboxes of Zippy’s blog post. She was sadly ultimately successful in this, to such a degree that Zippy followed up with a post asking if it is reasonable to consider such things.

Lydia’s marathon emotion driven objection to my post is evidently out of character for her, and according to Zippy she is widely known for her use of facts, logic, and reason:

You haven’t truly tasted irony until you’ve seen someone lecture Lydia McGrew about using facts, logic, and reason.

I’ll have to take Zippy’s word for that, because her lengthy filibuster of what she deemed crime-think displayed none of these qualities. However, assuming he is correct, this makes the example all the more pertinent. Threaten the feminine imperative and you will unleash an unthinking emotional tirade focused on you personally and not on the ideas being discussed. The woman enforcing the imperative likely herself can’t see how irrational she is being; she only knows how angry she feels at the men who are violating the imperative. Other men notice what happened to the previous thought criminal and are often cowed into silence.

This is how the feminine imperative “just happens”.

**Update:** Several other bloggers have written their own thoughts on the issue (Vox Day, Frost, Zippy Catholic, Sunshine Mary, and Ballista74). See also Rollo’s recent post on the feminine imperative and employment law.
Feral love
by Dalrock | December 28, 2012 | Link

Sex is for love!

— Vince Vaughn’s character lecturing his slutty daughter in The Watch

The modern elevation of unconstrained romantic love to something pure, transcendental, wise, and moral is something future cultures will look back upon with great curiosity. Wiser cultures understood that romantic love is an incredibly powerful force which unless carefully constrained tends to wreak great havoc, as Wikipedia explains:

In the classical world, erotic love was generally referred to as a kind of madness or theia mania (“madness from the gods”). This love passion was described through an elaborate metaphoric and mythological schema involving “love’s arrows” or “love darts”, the source of which was often the personified figure of Eros (or his Latin counterpart, Cupid), or another deity (such as Rumor). At times the source of the arrows was said to be the image of the beautiful love object itself. If these arrows were to arrive at the lover’s eyes, they would then travel to and ‘pierce’ or ‘wound’ his or her heart and overwhelm him/her with desire and longing (love sickness). The image of the “arrow’s wound” was sometimes used to create oxymorons and rhetorical antithesis concerning its pleasure and pain.

...passionate love often had disastrous results according to the classical authors.

Similarly, Shakespeare’s Romeo and Juliet serves as a warning against the dangerously childish nature of feral romantic love, although today audiences are very unlikely to be able to comprehend this message.

Our modern view of romantic love is so profoundly foolish because it fails to grasp the fact that the unconstrained search for romantic love leads to a never ending stream of new love, ultimately followed by disappointment/disinterest for one and heartbreak for the other. This constant quest for a new high or fix followed by the inevitable crash is at the core of choice addiction. For women pursuing choice addiction the reality of the larger pattern is nearly universally ignored, and the momentary feeling of “I will love him forever” is frozen in time with the trail of wreckage conveniently forgotten. Former manosphere commenter Paige described this frame of mind perfectly:

Relating Pump-n-Dumping to Serial Monogamy assumes more self-awareness in the woman than she actually has. At the beginning the woman is convinced she will be in-love forever...if the romantic feelings decline she believes the relationship is no longer worthwhile for either partner. But she doesn’t just assume at the beginning that this will happen.

When men act this way we call them players or cads, but when women act this way we tend to say:
She was following her heart!

Indeed, the quest for “true love” is at the core of women’s sacred path to marriage. In the event that she finds herself not wanting to keep her commitment this is nearly universally offered as proof that it must not have been “true love” after all, and there is great suspicion that the man must have somehow deceived her. Even Christians have fallen for this toxically foolish concept, and as a result when Christians approach the epidemic of wife initiated divorce the focus is not on the scriptural framing of marriage but on demanding that husbands make their wives love them instead of the new man she has fallen in love with. This is after all the core message of the movie Fireproof (along with the concept of wifely headship and husbandly submission). That hundreds of millions of Christians watched this movie and delighted in its presumed Christian message on marriage is immensely troubling.

While women tend to either ignore the cyclical pattern of feral love altogether or frame each new emotional train wreck as an essential stone on the ultimate path to the one, men are at least generally more aware of the absurd nature of uncommitted romantic love. The music video below portrays this with an interesting blend of old and new:

Our foolish elevation of romantic love to a moral force and the ultimate good is even more disastrous because large numbers of women now also feel that they have the right to marry a man they aren’t able to fall in love with. Our current madness stands in stark contrast to the elegant wisdom of the Bible on the topic, which explains that lifelong marriage is the only moral safe harbor for sex, but that it is only wise to marry if you burn with passion for your future spouse (1 Cor 7).

**See Also:**

- From cornerstone to stepping stone; the mainstream Christian view of marriage.
- Rejoice in the wife of your youth.
Update: Zippy and I have agreed to disagree. Here is my most recent comment to Zippy at his site:

Dalrock:

I presume it is mutual that we are past the point where we might have a beer (or a scotch) and put all of this past us.

Not from my POV. I’d buy you a beer tomorrow.

I’ve given this a bit of thought and while we clearly don’t (and won’t) see eye to eye on this issue I’ve given it awful hard to you personally and you are responding here with a great deal of grace. You even offered again after I continued. That can’t have been easy and in my book is a very manly gesture.

If you are still so inclined, I propose we agree to disagree on this issue, raise a virtual glass, and look forward to what we might learn from one another in the new year.

My prayers are for the best for you and yours in 2013, and that God will bless you.

Here is Zippy’s Reply:

Dalrock:

May Providence smile upon you, your family, and all of your projects in the new year.

If someone has one handy, please give Cane Caldo a hanky.

---------- Original Post, Comments Now Closed ----------

Zippy Catholic accuses me and the manosphere of being caught in the grip of a cult in his most recent post Cynicism: the starry-eyed idealism of the nihilist:

Some of the commenters on this thread (either here or in trackback) might consider the extent to which their reactions confirm Lydia’s view. By forming what amounts to a cult around a somewhat useful social analysis akin to the Meyers-Briggs test they convince themselves that they know strangers on the Internet well enough to do personal over-the-wire psychoanalysis.

Note that he passive aggressively makes these claims about me without having the stones to either quote exactly what I’ve written which is wrong or even name me anywhere in the
original post. The links in context however are to a recent post of mine and an exchange I had on his blog with a commenter named Lydia (more later), and all of the commenters on the post are clear that he is coyly referring to me. To the extent that they have unanimously misconstrued me as the target of his vague accusations he has not corrected them.

Zippy’s passive aggressiveness makes it difficult to lay out his charges in any logical form, but I’ll do my best. His core argument appears to be that I’m guilty of psychoanalyzing Lydia instead of engaging her in rational debate. My infraction is made especially serious because I am doing this using (and quoting) her own written words on the internet:

I generally consider over-the-wire psychoanalysis of total strangers to be a reductio ad absurdum of the point of view expressed.

Again, he doesn’t actually accuse me of being the person he is talking about, so perhaps instead of an accusation this is an excuse he is making on his and Lydia’s behalf. It could be that he isn’t accusing me of over-the-wire psychoanalysis, but explaining why he is making an exception to his general objection to the practice. At any rate, according to Zippy’s post something I (although not by quote or name) have done has proven Lydia right when she claimed that I was psychologically damaged (emphasis mine):

I think there are some valuable facts and insights in the manosphere. But by demonstrating the kinds of behaviors one expects from people in the grip of an ideology, manosphere commenters unwittingly show that the manosphere fosters precisely what Lydia contends it fosters in at least some men, e.g.:

A habitually cynical outlook. A continual view of sexual life as a matter of full-fledged conflict between the sexes.

and

But there are always occupational hazards in continually being immersed in certain kinds of evils. In this case, my conclusion is that the occupational hazard of being immersed (maybe perforce, because of one’s job, for example) in the situations in which women have ruined men’s lives is a particular level and type of jadedness and a damaging of that ability to see a woman as a gift.

I can only presume that whatever I did to cause Zippy to diagnose me as psychologically damaged and part of a dangerous cult relates to my written words over the internet, since I don’t know Zippy in person.

Later in the discussion he continues avoiding making an actual claim against me, and for the third time instead mysteriously refers to “some commentators”:
What some folks seem to be missing is that, while I may have disagreed with her about the prudential wisdom of exploring manosphere subjects, Lydia made a perfectly valid point (and indeed some commentators have unwittingly confirmed it): that the manosphere tends to produce an unreal cynicism in many of its participants.

Whoever it is and whatever they actually wrote, they have really stepped in it according to Zippy:

Part of the symptomology here is that folks just don’t seem to have a clue how utterly ludicrous it all is.

I’m starting to get the impression that this “feminine imperative” business is basically a big ad hominem. She’s a woman, she disagrees with Zippy prudentially on the value of engaging with the manosphere, so she’s not only wrong she’s also some kind of biological evo-psych robot spouting untruths (err, even though she has a point) ... but of course she just can’t help herself because she is Team Woman.

Good grief.

I’ll stand by while Zippy works up the courage to name this nameless manosphere commenter(s), quote the offending text(s), and lay out a clear rational case against them. In the meantime, I’ll offer some context of the original exchange he is referring to.

Back in August a commenter named Lydia on Zippy’s site objected to my post Losing control of the narrative. However, instead of using facts and logic to refute my points (any of them), she chose to psychoanalyze me and convince Zippy’s readers not to listen to me lest they too become mentally damaged. This kind of psychoanalysis-in-lieu-of-debate is predictable to the point of being tedious, which is the point behind the The Catalogue of Anti-Male Shaming Tactics. I didn’t initially point this out because facts and logic are on my side; my strong initial preference is to engage in an exchange of ideas and not to personally defeat an ideological opponent. Making it personal gives up my main advantage, and also would prevent me from possibly learning something knew. Unfortunately the initial focus of the discussion fell Lydia’s way. Fellow blogger Chris of Dark Brightness called Lydia out for her childish emotionalism and use of petty psychoanalysis to avoid discussion as a preface to making his logical case:

Lydia.

You are offended by Dalrock. Particularly some of the things people say there. Or perhaps CL and SevenMan. Or the fact that I’m a Prot.

Get over it and grow up. Those of us who have sat and listened to people who have lost their family... and heard it so many times that you know what comes next in the script... are not getting good and clear messages from the pulpit.

At the first hint that Lydia would be called on her irrational and emotional tactics, Zippy the white knight galloped in*:
FYI, Lydia is Protestant, and will be treated like the lady she is.

With the imminent threat to Lydia’s delicate sensibilities averted, Zippy then went back to allowing Lydia to derail the discussion until another commenter called Lydia out on what she was doing:

Reading these comments reminds me once again why it is absolutely futile and a complete waste of time to debate serious issues with 99.9% of all women.

We have several men commenting, using logic, references, concrete facts. And then we have Lydia who just rationalizes away emotionally. She doesn’t like the message, in fact she takes umbrage at it. She doesn’t like the criticism of the sisterhood and because of this she villifies the entire manosphere. It’s a classic case of hamsterlympics.

Zippy suited up once again and galloped to Lydia’s rescue:

You haven’t truly tasted irony until you’ve seen someone lecture Lydia McGrew about using facts, logic, and reason.

This was the tone Zippy the moderator set early on, allowing Lydia to derail the discussion and rebuking anyone who would point out her refusal to argue facts, logic, and reason. Since Zippy seemed to be caught between his fear of offending the boss and his obvious interest in having the discussion, I pleaded with the person in charge that we might be permitted to have a rational discussion:

Lydia,

I gather that you don’t like me. While that isn’t my preference I’m ok with that. What I’m more interested in is which of my arguments you disagree with. Do you think men shouldn’t be weary of marrying a woman who has made marriage last on her priority list? You mention young women you know who aren’t like that. Why then would you not want young men to prefer women who make marriage a priority? Why defend the ones acting badly in the name of the ones acting well?

As for my view of marriage, I am a passionate proponent of lifetime marriage. It is because of this I take great issue with those who turn it into a farce.

Lydia responded dismissively and continued her tack of marginalizing me as obsessive and dangerous to women:

I’m not in the slightest defending women who are acting badly.

I’m trying to restore culture. I don’t think that can be well done by undermining chivalry, encouraging base cynicism about women generally, obsessing over wicked women, and permitting and even encouraging coarse and lewd talk about women.

Zippy responded that pointing out the obvious and backing it up with facts and logic is
something different than cynicism:

> I guess I am having a hard time seeing **cynicism** in a script of how things actually, a great deal more commonly than hen’s teeth, go. And I expect a young man who knows that that is how things commonly go (and why) to be in a position to make better decisions than a young man who doesn’t know it.

He reiterated this a bit further down:

> **Lydia:**
> I am certainly not saying that I see no cynicism, etc in the manosphere! What I am saying is that the “narrative” in the post I linked, while bluntly stated, is a true account of how things actually go a significant amount of the time; and I am further saying that most young people considering marriage, possibly excepting those living in true enclaves like the Amish, are better off knowing these things than not knowing them.

I tried several more times to very gently encourage Lydia to switch from emotionally psychoanalyzing me to discussing the ideas at hand. As I mentioned in a previous post, she **flat out refused**. While Zippy feared displeasing Lydia, he continued the plea for her to allow an actual discussion:

> **Dalrock wrote:**
> At some point can we ... have a real discussion?

I think it is important. Possibly that is because I have a son. Four or five years ago he and his friends were all effectively in one of those protected enclaves I’ve been talking about. After the financial crisis hit, gradually over time a bunch of his friends drifted out of the enclave: a second parent had to go to work and thus the kids had to go to public school is the most common thread. The dads have absolutely no idea what their kids face, and the kids are often more willing to talk to me than their own dads. I’ve already seen some of the dynamic at work with some older kids who’ve since graduated high school, and it isn’t pretty.

In making his case for talking about the issue and not how evil Dalrock is, Zippy pointed out that he has learned “actual facts” by reading my blog:

> Believe it or not, I’ve learned some actual facts by reading Dalrock. If you haven’t, by all means don’t read it.

Despite my persistently responding to her insults with courteous requests to discuss the **issue and not me** she continued with more of the same:

> I’m sure you have. That doesn’t counteract the big picture I’m arguing for. One could probably also learn some actual facts about black crime by reading Chimpout. I
believe there’s actually a blog called that. And I would be willing to bet there are rampaging misandrogist feminist sites out there from which one could learn some facts one hadn’t known before about wife abuse. I recommend not doing so, though.

The discussion continued with Lydia calling the shots and Zippy and Chris trying to convince her to have an actual discussion. For some time Lydia accused Zippy of maligning a future daughter in law by noting the prevalence of divorce porn and frivolous divorce:

For example, as I said, you should be able to think about this stuff without maligning a future daughter-in-law. This portrays women as somehow determined by the outside world to behave wickedly and destroy everyone’s life (including, what the manosphere doesn’t seem to realize, her own life in a very real sense) on a whim. Wow, that’s darned insulting. *Not one* of my close female friends is “resisting divorce porn.” The idea is risible.

All of this eventually wore down Zippy’s patience:

Lydia:
Something about this thread has destroyed your ability to read, and therefore your ability to properly attribute ideas.

In the first place, “as I understand it, the claim is …” means that I am describing a series of claims. It doesn’t mean that I am asserting them all as true, and most certainly not in an unqualified way.

In the second place, nobody has ever suggested that any of these claims “implies that all women” anything. Statistical claims like “90% of the women I went to college with were not suitable for marriage” inherently and obviously don’t mean “all”. That’s partly why your personal experience (and mine) is not ultimately relevant here.

I think Dalrock had a point earlier in the thread when he said that you were accusing in vague terms while suggesting that you are immune from the requirement to prove the accusation. Now you are starting to do it to me. Just stop it.

And after she continued Zippy wrote:

Once again I can’t figure out what I’ve actually written that you are disagreeing with. You seem to be taking all sorts of things for granted though, in addition to attributing things to me that I haven’t said.

After even more failed attempts to engage in a discussion with Lydia Zippy wrote:

When it comes to this subject, Lydia, I can only conclude that you don’t want to understand. I’ve seen what it looks like when you do want to understand, and this isn’t what it looks like.

Exasperated, Zippy followed up with:
So that’s it, eh? We aren’t going to actually, you know, engage the subject matter? To even think about the plight of the average twenty something Joe Shmoe who wants marriage and a family, and is uniquely hampered in that pursuit in a way never before seen, and subjected to phenomenal systematic risk, is to make ourselves ritually impure? Really?

Zippy never did get Lydia’s permission to have an actual discussion on the issue (vs how dangerous and damaged I am). He ultimately gave up on the thread and wrote a new post about the experience titled Between Dalrock and a Hard Case:

In the comments of the last post we learned that Dalrock’s influence is so powerful (Update: see here for today’s mind-ray promoting Game) that I’ve lost the capacity to think for myself. But before the lights of reason wink out completely and I sink into the testosterone Hive Mind, I’d like to explore a question raised in the thread.

... Without going into excruciating detail on all of these points, suffice to say that I am puzzled by the claim that it is simply ludicrous and absolutely beyond the pale to even consider the possibility that, in the general case, in our present state of culture and law, a young man who makes marriage a priority and makes good choices will have a materially harder time getting married, starting a family, and staying married than a young woman who makes marriage a priority and also makes good choices.

And that was that. The only thing which seems to have prompted Zippy to conclude that Lydia was right about me all along is this recent post of mine.

*After I pointed out how absurd Zippy’s pouncing on Chris was later on in the thread Zippy apologized to Chris.

**Edit:** I see that while I was writing this post Zippy was writing another post, Cultural Marxism in the manosphere. In this he continues his practice of neither quoting the actual arguments he is ostensibly refuting nor naming whom he is referring to. It ends with:

I’ve got some advice for you, manosphere fellas: if you want to be taken seriously by people who care about the truth try putting some more distance between yourselves and your putative enemies.
My comment to Zippy Catholic
by Dalrock | December 30, 2012 | Link

Update:  Zippy and I have agreed to disagree. Here is my most recent comment to Zippy at his site:

Dalrock:

I presume it is mutual that we are past the point where we might have a beer (or a scotch) and put all of this past us.

Not from my POV. I’d buy you a beer tomorrow.

I’ve given this a bit of thought and while we clearly don’t (and won’t) see eye to eye on this issue I’ve given it awful hard to you personally and you are responding here with a great deal of grace. You even offered again after I continued. That can’t have been easy and in my book is a very manly gesture.

If you are still so inclined, I propose we agree to disagree on this issue, raise a virtual glass, and look forward to what we might learn from one another in the new year.

My prayers are for the best for you and yours in 2013, and that God will bless you.

Here is Zippy’s Reply:

Dalrock:

May Providence smile upon you, your family, and all of your projects in the new year.

If someone has one handy, please give Cane Caldo a hanky.

Note: Several of my commenters have questioned the need for my previous post, and I think this is a valid question. zhai2nan2 offered a humorous link to a quickmeme on internet fights, and I agree that this is generally an accurate depiction of the phenomenon. Empathologicalism framed it similarly:

But…..I guess pick your favorite guy and escalate the drama!

Again, this is very often a fair observation. As I explain below this is to some extent for me personal, but there is an extremely important larger issue around the honest exchange of ideas and the most basic forms of blogging courtesy required for this to occur.
I want to stress that I’m not looking to silence Zippy, but that I continue to ask him to have a fair and honest discussion, something I’ve been asking for since August of this year.

I’ve slightly modified the comment below to include links, but you can see the original comment in context here. I’ll update below with a link to any response from Zippy [done], so please let me know if one is up and I haven’t yet done so.

________________________________________

From the comments of some of your readers I gather that my short 2.5 years of blogging experience pales in comparison to your own length of experience. However, even in my much shorter blogging time I quickly noticed that any time I mention another blogger in a post who is at least controversial to my audience that this often has the unintended side effect of hanging them up as a sort of piñata for my commenters to tear apart personally. Ironically this effect is worst when I quote the other blogger not to criticize them but to find some area of limited common agreement. This is to a large degree an unavoidable cost to having the kinds of discussions which I find most valuable, the kinds of conversations with the potential to profit from vigorous intellectual disagreement and synthesize something larger than either side began with. However, as a moderator I can at least be aware of the footing I’ve put the other blogger in by analyzing their ideas in front of a hostile crowd. The absolute worst thing I can do is moderately praise a fellow blogger to whom my audience is hostile to and then prevent the “foreign” blogger from defending himself. Censoring those who vigorously disagree with the blogger would make no sense either, because this prevents the very exchange I hope to profit from. If I do this I’m only hanging the poor outside-of-the-group blogger up as a piñata to be attacked purely for entertainment, since the only potential benefit is now off the table.

Consider your treatment of me in your original rubbernecking post. You hung me up in front of a hostile crowd while expressing limited agreement for my ideas. So far, no foul, and I’m eager for the potential to profit from exactly this type of exchange so I’m happy to pay the price of admission. When I do it to other bloggers I’m aware of the position I’m putting them in, and I think this is tacitly understood amongst all but the least experienced bloggers because they generally handle the situation with a great deal of grace.

But you then tilted the field away from an intellectual exchange by tying the hands of myself and anyone else who wanted to have the exchange. Lydia opened the comments with a long series of slanders against me personally, without even pretending to offer anything of intellectual value. When Chris called her on this early in the thread you made it as clear as possible that you wouldn’t permit anyone to challenge Lydia when she behaved in this way. You rebuked him despite the fact that Chris explained that he works in mental health and regularly counsels men who have failed in their attempts at suicide after being crushed by the system. If you look at the thread you will see that his comment closes with this explanation and the very next words in the thread are your very strong rebuke to Chris for daring to challenge Lydia. She was as you explained a “lady”, who would receive special protection on your blog. Then when another commenter pointed out her refusal to argue with logic, facts, and reason you found your moderator legs yet again and smacked him down publicly for doing this. Yet not once in the 130+ comment exchange did you rebuke Lydia for...
her repeated slander of me. I have come to expect to have to argue my ideas in front of a
hostile crowd on an absurdly tilted playing field, and elected to simply “play through”. But to
say that you were an ungracious host would be the epitome of understatement. Adding insult
to injury, you have repeatedly lectured me since then on my own failure to keep my
commenters in line, frequently alluding to the superior class of commenters on your own
blog. This after setting the stage for your commenters to abuse me personally in the most
intellectually dishonest ways and actively preventing any and all defense. And all of this
merely for sport, since as you yourself explained in your Dalrock and a Hard Case post the
only possible profit to be gained, a serious exchange of ideas, you allowed Lydia to take off
the table.

Yet with all of this I’ve held my tongue and elected to let it slide, because I still hoped to
profit from an exchange of ideas. Yet in your Cynicism post you now declare that Lydia was
right in her marathon slander of me on your blog, and both of your last two posts amount to
what you yourself define as the sin of calumny:

I prefer linear comments because they make it easier to follow a thread over time. I
also prefer them because they encourage us to directly quote the part of someone
else’s post to which we are responding. This has lots of benefits, not least of which is
that it makes it a bit harder (though of course not impossible) to pretend someone
said something he didn’t say. Bad paraphrase (“Bob said he wants to pitchfork
children!”) is one of my pet peeves, though I know I’m not completely immune
myself. I consider it a vicious form of calumny when it is done on purpose; so
lets never do it on purpose and try hard not to do it on accident.

I can’t say if you are doing this on purpose of course, since that would require me to
psychoanalyze you over the wire. All I can do is ask you whether it was on purpose or not,
continue to ask you to cease, and remind you of your other words on the topic:

Calumny is when someone tells falsehoods about a person in a way damaging to
that person’s reputation or standing in the community. In the case of the Todd Akin
affair, many people have told lies about what he actually said...

I’ve personally only seen one single person retract and apologize, and good for him.
That’s the kind of guy I want in the moral foxhole with me.

Is Zippy Catholic the kind of man you would like to be in the moral foxhole with?

I’ll also politely ask that you stop referring to me as “brain damaged” as you did here, even
while accusing me of ad hominem using a form of argument you yourself define as a vicious
form of calumny. If I’ve committed ad hominem, please do me the courtesy of quoting the
text and explaining my error. If you can’t do this, please acknowledge that this is the case
and cease making the claim.

_____________________

**Update:** Zippy’s responses are here. I’m not impressed to say the least, but I’ve said my
piece. I’ll get some new posts out time permitting.
Back in May Empathologism wrote about Joel and Kathy Davisson in his post *Your wife had an affair, it's your fault*. One of their catch phrases is “lowering the boom”. They use this term to describe wives using the divorce meatgrinder to punish husbands who have “abused” them. However, it is worth noting that anything which makes a Christian wife unhappily could be argued as fitting their incredibly expansive definition of “abuse”. Does he not make her happy? That’s abuse! Does he not go to counseling as she commands? That’s abuse! Does he not read the relationship books she assigns to him? That’s abuse! From *Don't Develop BITTERNESS* (Note: The original site has been taken down, but the Wayback machine has an archive [here](https://web.archive.org/web/20190508083908/http://www.redarch.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=261:don-t-develop-bitterness&catid=24:empathologism&Itemid=127)).

| Has she spoke directly to him about her heart felt needs... and he has rejected her heart-cry repeatedly? |
| Has she begged him to go to counseling, and he has refused? |
| Has she pleaded with him to read good books on marriage - yet he has declined to do so? |

However, they do have requirements on the wife. Her job is to lead her husband and forgive him for being a failure:

| One of these requirements is that she speak up to her husband, very clearly, and COMMUNICATE to him exactly what he is doing or not doing that is straining the relationship. Has she learned to speak up and REQUIRE that he be a man of God in his marriage by being the husband that he promised to be when he convinced her to marry him? |
Another requirement for a wife, is to forgive her husband, IF he hears her heart and begins to change in to the husband that he promised to be when they were dating. She needs to recognize his efforts at change.

Has she forgiven him for failures and recognized efforts at change?

If a wife has NOT been plain spoken, If a wife has NOT called upon her church leadership to speak to her husband and call him to accountability, if she has NOT asked him to read books or go to counseling, then she has to do this first. First things first.

I’m sure there are many unhappy Christian wives reading my post who want to know: I’ve nagged him and complained about him to others. I’ve told him what to read and which Oprah episodes to watch. And I’m always having to forgive him for being such a failure. What next should a godly wife do?

Many of my other Christian readers are no doubt thinking of the scriptural instruction that wives win their husband over without a word, and they would be technically right. No words are required, just a good divorce lawyer. If he is making her unhappy, Joel and Kathy explain that she has a sacred obligation to use the family courts to crush him (emphasis mine):

If she has done all of this, and he is still a manipulative, controlling, and abusive husband. Or if he is simply a retreating, non-responsive husband to her needs who continually ignores her pleas, informing her that she is losing her sanity, then she must act before she becomes embittered.

She must act before she indeed does lose her mind.

She must decisively give him what he wants: out of the marriage. What does he want? He wants OUT!

In this case, it is time for him to get exactly what he wants, and that is to be put out of the home.

**She must engage the law to the fullest extent to extract child support and alimony.** If her state can extract this from him with a separation, then separation is the way to go. If her state cannot extract this in a separation only, then she must file a divorce to put his back to the wall.

But don’t worry, this is all part of God’s plan. They explain that crushing him with the family courts is to ideally be used as a threatpoint. This is needed to restore the wife’s position of headship over her rebellious husband, and taking command of him using this tool is her biblical duty (emphasis mine):

Do we WANT divorce.. or separation in these cases, until “death do us part?”
Absolutely NOT!

We WANT restoration!

We WANT healing in the marriages.

**If this wife does NOTHING**, the end result is clear: She will become a bitter woman who is so deeply wounded that in many cases, **her relationship with the Lord will be hurt or even ended.**

**Her husband will continue in his rebellion.**

Even worse, there is a chance that if she doesn’t act quickly to crush her rebellious husband the no fault divorce process might misfire terribly and be used to punish **her:**

In most of these cases, when a wife does not finally leave him out of bitterness and anger, he will file for divorce.

He will feel fully justified that his crazy wife was the full problem in the marriage.

He may even turn the children against her because she is so crazy.

She may not see her children return to her until they are young adults and begin to understand, in retrospect, the abuse that their wonderful father put her through.

These end results are NOT good, but the Body of Christ is replete with examples of this exact end result: bitter and deeply wounded wives and self-justifying, pride-filled, completely deceived husbands and ex-husbands.

It is VERY, VERY hard to convince a Christian wife of this course of action.

Thats right, she might suffer the injustice of having her children taken from her with no due process. She could suffer this fate simply by his word alone, and the normally justified process could be instead used to trample the innocent! This is why it is so critical that an unhappy wife act decisively and crush **him** with the family court, and do it with extreme prejudice:

Woe to that wife who believes her husbands first proclamation of change and welcomes him back into her heart and home immediately. The first two wives that we had personal experience with, who kicked their husbands out or left the husband respectively, BOTH let the husbands come back TOO SOON. Within a week of coming home, each of these husbands reverted to their old behavior.

In one case, it took a year for the wife to get circumstances organized again to where she could leave. In the other case, the husband turned things around, provoked his wife to hit him, got a restraining order against HER, and she ended up being out of the home. He ended up with the child. It took SIX MONTHS for her to get
back into her home, regain control of the child and get him out.

This is why it is also critical not only to crush him decisively, but to make him grovel:

The Spirit of God would compel you to give your husband (or ex-husband if that be the case) a chance.

Test him.

Put him through the ringer.

Make him grovel.

You suffered for twenty years.

If he cannot stand to suffer, outside the home, for a period of time, while he is doing everything that he needs to do to bring healing to your heart, then he is not a changed man. (How long of a time? That is pretty individual. If a wife has only been in a marriage for a short time, then the time would be short. If he has been a lousy husband for twenty years, then longer, obviously.

Note that even if you have only been married a short time, you suffered for twenty years. I would add that wives should be careful not to let him twist this around and make you sound crazy when you say this either. Keep in mind the husband who provoked his poor wife into beating him. He made it look like she was the abuser! Don’t use your fists to punish him, use the tools God gave you, the family court.

But lets say you are a wife who has been obedient to the Scripture (as interpreted by Joel and Kathy) and used the holy family court to crush your husband and piously made him grovel. How will a Christian woman know when her husband is finally acting the way God intends? As Dr. Mohler (separately) explains here, it is through the mysterious wisdom of her vagina, the one needle which always points to the true north of godliness:

| A Christian woman CANNOT resist her husband, when he becomes Christlike.

Thats it. You will know it is time to once again honor your marriage vows when he has won back your love.

While Joel and Kathy are so incredibly over the top in how they present all of this, note that what they are describing is the plot to the movie Fireproof.

I’m not aware of any Christian leaders who are willing to directly associate themselves with Joel and Kathy and their far too overt calls to use the divorce process to bring wayward husbands in line, and I would be shocked to learn of any. However, note that no active permission from a pastor or any church body is required. All that is required is for the family courts to exist as a no reason required tool to crush husbands, and for the church to look the other way.
Actually I left out one extremely important step. Husbands who have been brought to heel need to demonstrate this by reading Joel and Kathy’s books and attending their weekend retreat:

- What does this wife do when her husband first turns his heart back toward her?

She must demand that he get into counseling and begin a journey of discovery, BEFORE the marriage is restored.

- Our books are perfect for this man. Paul Hegstrom’s books are perfect for this man. Ken Nair’s books are perfect for this man.

- Our Intensive Marriage Weekend is a required necessity for this couple, BEFORE the marriage is restored.

I might offer that Sheila Gregoire’s book *To Love Honor and Vacuum* should be added to the list to teach the newly tamed husband all about biblical headship.

**Edit:** Click here for a list of exciting products and services you can purchase from Joel and Kathy to assist on your journey of marital creative destruction.

**See also:**

- [Lowering the boom, a testimonial.](#)
- [How Fireproof lowers the boom.](#)

Wrecking ball image licensed as Creative Commons by Stefan Kühn.
Several commenters to my post Lowering the boom asked if I could elaborate on my statement that what Joel and Kathy were describing was actually the plot of the movie Fireproof. Since the plot is discussed in detail below you won’t want to read further if you haven’t yet seen the movie and don’t want the plot spoiled.

One thing which is crucial to understand about Fireproof is that while it is widely considered the preeminent Christian movie on marriage, it is not a movie about Christian marriage. This subtlety is something the movie’s defenders will fairly quickly point out if you ask how the movie managed to ignore (or get backwards) nearly all of the key New Testament instruction on marriage. This they will explain is why Caleb was taught in the movie that his viewing pornography is a form of sexual sin, but Catherine isn’t taught that her denial of sex is in fact creating temptation for Caleb to commit sexual sin (1 Cor 7:2-5). They will further explain that when the movie shows Caleb submitting to his wife, it isn’t offering this as a Christian husband’s role in marriage but as a way for a man inspired by Christ’s sacrifice to win the love of his wife. Likewise, Catherine isn’t rebuked and never repents for lining up the doctor for either an affair or as husband #2 (adultery either way you read it) or for her decision to frivolously divorce, because she isn’t a Christian when she does all of this and her conversion occurs off-screen. If this were a movie on Christian marriage they will tell you, it would of course have to cover the core New Testament instructions on marriage. But it isn’t, so it doesn’t. If you think I’m making too fine a point of this, note how careful they are whenever describing the movie. For example, from the outreach page for churches (emphasis mine):

| Use this movie to help strengthen marriages and couples in your church and community. FIREPROOF is an unprecedented opportunity to communicate God’s design for relationships. |

They don’t say it communicates God’s design for marriage, because again this would have required addressing God’s design for marriage.

Fireproof is a movie about Christian conversion where the catalyst for God to change Caleb’s heart is Catherine initiating divorce.

Divorce is the beginning of something wonderful...

Catherine is of course ultimately rewarded for helping God make Caleb into a better man; she
receives a better husband, a new wedding ceremony, a happy marriage, and is inspired to accept Christ herself. But none of these wonderful things could occur before she helped God by putting Caleb in a state of crisis when she decided to divorce him.

This is the core message of *lowering the boom*; wives divorcing their husbands are doing God’s work by creating enough pain for him so that God can then work to make him a better man. As Joel and Kathy explain, crushing a husband with the machinery of no fault divorce won’t always work because of free will, but it creates the essential opening God requires for transformation to be possible:

Will every man turn his heart back toward his family? Of course not. If God could control every man, he would. But He can’t. This wife’s actions have simply given God an open door to deal with her husband.

This uncanny similarity between Joel and Kathy’s *lowering the boom* philosophy and the plot of the most celebrated Christian movie on marriage doesn’t necessarily suggest that the Kendrick brothers are fans of Joel and Kathy however. The theme of wife initiated divorce leading to winning the cosmic jackpot is a very common one. In this sense *Fireproof* can best be seen as the Christian entry in Hollywood’s divorce fantasy genre.

Consider the blockbuster movie and bestselling book *Eat, Pray, Love*. As with *Fireproof* it starts with an unhappy wife who triggers an incredible process of empowerment and spiritual rebirth by divorcing her husband. Where Elizabeth gains spiritual wisdom from a Hindu Ashram as an ultimate result of her frivolous divorce, Cathrine comes to accept Christ as the ultimate result of hers. Likewise, while divorce is Elizabeth’s exit out of an unhappy marriage and her path to finding the love of her life, the exact same thing is true for Catherine with the twist that her “new” perfect husband is the result of God fixing the one she already had (and all He needed was a little help from her). In between of course both divorcées are delighted by being courted all over again.
Dalrock's guide to “lowering the boom” in *Fireproof*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wife has a disobedient husband who doesn't follow her headship.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife complains, but her husband still doesn't submit to her.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife threatens divorce.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat of divorce is the necessary trigger to enable God to transform the husband.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife follows through on threat of divorce (delivers signed papers).</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife makes her husband grovel, and her husband completely surrenders to her.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife knows God has transformed her husband only once she falls back in love with him.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*Dominos image* licensed as creative commons by aussiegall. Checked boxes from checkbox example image licensed as creative commons by Marekich. You are free to use the lowering the boom table image above with the same license as the original checkbox example image.
Don’t be tricked into responding to a reframe with an intellectual argument.
by Dalrock | January 4, 2013 | Link

In the discussion on the last post Empathologism mentioned that the biblical instruction to husbands and wives not to withhold sex is often framed as something shameful. He described one white knight husband having a violent emotional reaction to hearing this part of the Gospel from the pulpit:

Later that couple was with us and the guy was so angry he would have punched the preacher because in his words, “how dare he suggest she must open her legs at my demand”

Infowarrior1 pointed out that this can place one in a difficult situation:

Here the difficult part. I recall on a christian radio show a woman weeping that her husband supposedly was supposed to help her and love her (she was a broken woman by the way had bad history) felt entitled to her body and raped her. To then say that it is the woman’s obligation to do so would be in the minds of many the acceptance of rape.

This is the same point I made in Reframing Christian Marriage (cropped version of full table):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Bible</th>
<th>Modern Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neither is to deny sex to the other (or you will create temptation for sexual sin). 1 Cor 7:5</td>
<td>This is true when applied to the husband, but it is different for the wife. She has to feel sufficiently loved, and even then “in the mood”, so don't be pushy. It will happen when and if she decides it will happen. You can expedite this process by following her leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Anyone who says differently is a perverted wife raping bastard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate explanation: This only applies in cases where the husband isn't tempted by sexual sin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://dalrock.wordpress.com/

This is so predictable because the Scripture itself is painfully clear. There simply are no serious objections to it. This is why those who do try to argue with it make such fools of themselves.
The problem is those of us who are inclined to argue logically and rationally will often fall into the trap of misunderstanding what others are doing. It is critical to understand what is happening here. This started with instruction about marriage from the Bible. Those who disagree with the Bible then change the frame to a subtle or not so subtle accusation that anyone who accepts the Bible must be a perverted wife raping bastard. Again, what else are they going to do?

The key is not to get suckered into arguing logically in response to their reframe. This is (was) a discussion about the Bible’s teaching on marriage. Don’t get drawn into debating an absurd and often passive aggressively implied accusation that you are a pervert. Simply by agreeing to this reframe you have ceded the argument to them in the minds of nearly everyone observing. This trap works because you want to argue logically. This is a good thing, but you first need to move the frame back to the topic at hand. To do this, call out their argument for what it really is while reframing the discussion back to the topic at hand:

| Yes, I know, parts of the Bible can be very shocking coming from our feminist culture. It can take some work to get to a point where you aren’t ashamed of what it says simply because it offends feminists. Sometimes it takes courage to stand by God’s Word. |

Note that there is nothing cheap about this (unlike the original reframe). **They are rebelling against the Word of God, and are suggesting that it is shameful that you aren’t.** Pointing out their rebellion and shame of the Gospel is not only appropriate but an act of Christian kindness. How else can they repent from something so serious? Biblical marriage is something of immense beauty; don’t let others go unchallenged when they suggest it is shameful.

The basic rule is if someone is arguing a point logically, then you should also argue logically. But if someone is using a reframe, especially a *cheap reframe*, you absolutely need to deal with that first and not carry on as if that was a valid intellectual maneuver. Once you have done this you should of course be prepared to carry on logically discussing the original question.
Modern day chivalry.
by Dalrock | January 5, 2013 | Link

Sears Optical has a series of commercials where someone misunderstands what is going on because they need new glasses. The latest one I’ve seen is *That’s a Mannequin*, and has a half blind husband guarding his *chunky immodest wife’s* dignity from the *leering eyes of a mannequin*.

This modern day twist on *Don Quixote* sums up the farce that is modern chivalry:

A clueless white knight guarding non existent dignity from eyes which didn’t want to see what the “lady” was inflicting on them in the first place.
Untethered
by Dalrock | January 6, 2013 | Link

If I could invite any woman who questions the power of submission to live in my shoes for one week, she would never question it again. She too would stand in awe of God’s amazing protection wrapped tightly around a couple who have truly become one. She would smile and laugh more than she ever has and have her heart bursting with a love she’s never felt before. She would honestly hate her own self for wasting so much time in rebellion – I did.

— Sarah’s Daughter

I’ve been reading through blog posts by Sheila Wray Gregoire for an upcoming topic, and the thing which strikes me the most about her writing is how painfully inconsistent she is. I’ve written about this before, but it goes far beyond stating that she encounters a phenomenon all the time one day and then a few months later declaring that she has never experienced such a thing, or positioning herself as traditional Christian woman while having a masters degree in Women’s studies and considering herself a feminist in all but name:

I have stopped calling myself a feminist, although I do believe in equality, because the term has become so tainted politically.

Sheila’s writing is flat out erratic. I’ve written before about rationalization hamster exhaustion, but she takes this to a whole new level. This is astounding because Sheila isn’t just another blogger; she and her husband hold Christian marriage seminars and she has written five books aimed at women on the topic of Christian marriage. In fact, she not only considers her work a ministry, but she teaches other women to start their own ministries as well. She has been doing all of this for many years, yet there is no consistency in her writings on the core topics she claims to be an expert on. Some of her advice sounds fairly good one day, but then not long after she comes along and directly contradicts herself.

The only thing which is consistent is her penchant for rebellion against the Scripture and finding ridiculous ways to ignore what is plain on the face of it. But this is the point. Sheila’s rebellion against Scripture is directly tied to her being so incredibly untethered. Due to her feminist rebellion she lacks a biblical husband who is a rock she can cling to when her emotions storm over her. Ironically in her too clever by half rationalization of Scripture she has cheated herself out of one of the greatest benefits biblical marriage offers to women.

This all starts with her rebellion against the biblical instruction to wives to submit to their husbands (1 Pet 3:1&5, Eph 5:22&24, Col 3:18, 1 Tim 2:11, Tit 2:5). Sheila is at war with this Scripture, and is very open that it offends her as a woman. I’ve referenced previously how she addresses this in her book, To Love, Honor, and Vacuum: When You Feel More Like a Maid Than a Wife and Mother (P. 116 of the paperback):

Whether we like to be reminded of it or not, the Bible calls for wives to submit to their husbands (Eph 5:22).
You may be thinking she is going to follow through with a grudging but otherwise somewhat sane discussion of the topic. However, **she then explains that in practice this means wives are to give their husbands lists of chores (delegating housework) so he feels needed and she feels cared for.** I don’t blame you if you find this extremely difficult to believe, so please do read more here and then either pick up a copy of the book or use the Amazon search feature to verify that this is what she does.

More recently Sheila took another crack at this core topic to her area of professional and ministerial expertise in *Wifey Wednesday: What Does Submission in Marriage Mean?* As usual, she starts by explaining how the Scripture *makes her feel*, and how much it offends her feminist sensibilities (emphasis hers):

> Today I want to talk about a word that drives many of us around the bend: **SUBMISSION.** I have to admit that I still shudder sometimes when pastors preach on this, or when the word comes up, because it has so often become the source of angst in so many marriages. What does it mean? Does it mean that women are lesser? That we have to let him make all the decisions? That my needs don’t matter? In many sermons, it has almost sounded like that.

> **In other words, to many of us “submission” has a negative connotation.** Husbands are told to love their wives as Christ loved the church (Ephesians 5:25), and that doesn’t seem to sound negative. But submission, to many women, is a net negative. Part of that is bad teaching we’ve received on it. Part of it is us chafing at it.

She applies some patented extra strength Sheila rationalization in an effort to give the appearance of actually believing in the Bible, and the women reading seem to think they just got a solid message on biblical submission. Yet nowhere in the post does she mention repenting for her rebellion.

Not surprisingly Sheila is also at war with the Bible regarding denial of sex. This is a **core tool** in the arsenal of a rebellious Christian wife to force her husband to submit, second only to **threatening divorce.** Sheila simply can’t accept this Scripture because then she won’t be able to dominate her husband. But coming out and stating this plainly would sound, well, **unbiblical.** As she did with the topic of submission, Sheila instead claims she agrees with the Scripture while twisting it beyond all recognition. In *What Does 1 Corinthians 7:5–Do Not Deprive Each Other—Really Mean?* she explains that when it says the husband and wife have authority over each other’s bodies so neither has the right to deny the other sex, this actually means each has the right to deny the other sex:

> Let’s assume that it’s the wife with the lower libido for a minute (though it certainly isn’t always) and look at it this way:

> If her husband’s body belongs to her, then she has the ability to also say, “I do not want you using your body sexually right now with me.”

Ouch. If your head doesn’t hurt, you aren’t paying attention. Early on in the exegis Sheila explains (emphasis hers):
First, let’s note what this verse does not say. Paul did not write:

| Do not **refuse** one another, except by mutual consent and for a time... |

He wrote **do not deprive**.

*Deprive* is not the same as **refuse**. I believe many people interpret this verse to mean refuse.

She then explains that this means a wife should dole out sex to her husband the same way she would manage what her children eat (emphasis mine):

...let’s look more closely at deprive.

If I were to say to you, “do not deprive your child of good food,” what am I implying? I’m saying that your child should get the food that is commonly recognized for good health: three healthy meals a day, with some snacks. **I am not saying that every time your child pulls at your leg and says, “Mommy, can I have a bag of Cheetos?”** that you have to say yes. You are not depriving your child of good food by refusing a request for Cheetos.

When I mentioned Sheila’s mental image of a husband as a child tugging on his mommy-wife’s leg wanting sex, and the mommy-wife deciding whether her husband’s desire for her was “healthy”, my wife pointed out how incredibly unsexy that is. The Bible gave Sheila a husband who was her leader, and that is sexy. But Sheila has a masters degree in Women’s Studies, so she knows better than God. In her superior wisdom Sheila has mentally transformed her husband into at best a kitchen bitch, and at worst a child tugging on her leg wanting to know what kind of sex she will approve.

What Sheila doesn’t understand is the choice isn’t between happy rebellion and miserable submission. It is in fact exactly the opposite. Sheila is robbing herself of the joy of being a wife. My wife takes great pleasure in making herself physically attractive to me by keeping herself thin and her hair long, and especially enjoys modeling new clothes she buys for “husband approval” (our daughter also delights in watching this interaction). Pleasing her husband is one of the great simple joys of being a wife, and this is something women brag about. But Sheila won’t let herself experience this because of her feminism, and in chapter 7 of her book *Honey, I Don’t Have a Headache Tonight: Help for Women Who Want to Feel More In the Mood* she writes (emphasis mine):

There’s also no need to become what he thinks is pretty. Some men, like my husband, have a preference for women in long hair. Keith, however, is oblivious to all of the mousse and blow drying that would be involved in making my long hair do anything other than hang there limply. I think it’s difficult for most women over thirty to pull off long hair with panache. Cut my hair and highlight it and I look much more sophisticated, and I feel far less frumpy!
As Stingray recently explained:

Because that would mean that women would have to simply let go of any control. To have control while being malcontent seems better than relinquishing control to increase happiness. A happiness that they really have no conception of and literally cannot imagine.

One of the great tragedies of feminism is how it has left women aching for the very thing they rebelled against. Their yearning for a husband to lead them is palpable in the *Marriage and Divorce* section of *Yahoo Answers*. They want it so much, they are very often grateful when I explain to them how to overcome their feminism and let their husband be the leader they are starving for, like this woman, and this woman. Even Sheila’s readers have moments of incredible clarity on this, and a commenter named Kat is an excellent example (emphasis mine):

My sex hang ups come when I start feeling like he is tippy toeing around me and constantly looking to me to make a decision on things...

But all the little “beta” actions wear me out and leave me feeling like I never get to lean on him, that he isn’t there for me if I have a bad day or fall apart. By “beta” I mean things like going back and forth 15 times as we text about whether he wants to do a certain activity with the kids the next day, bc he doesn’t want to just come out and say, “I don’t want to do that.” Or hearing me vent about a relative or one of the kids’ behavior and not stopping me when I let my mouth run too far, because he doesn’t want to upset me more. Argh!

I know a cranky wife can be intimidating, guys, but most girls really appreciate the strength and confidence you show when you are not fazed by her emotions.

She knows she rides a roller coaster, and even if she can’t express it, having a husband who will insist on having a talk when one is needed and who will keep that convo on topic with an aggressive concern for the marriage will encourage and bless her and very likely turn things around after a time!

I think I finally communicated this to my honey yesterday. I explained that feeling in charge when he was around, feeling like EVERYONE in this house looked to me to call the shots, watching him hesitate and come off as soooo sweet and passive, was a HUGE turn off for me.

…I’m talking about wanting my husband to say, “I am going to rip your clothes off when I get home. Put the kids in front of a long movie.” and then doing it, despite my groaning, and convincing me I really did want him to. 😁 )) I’m talking about him asking what my schedule was for the day, and then telling me that I was going to take child X with me on those errands while he took W, Y, and Z with him, and he would bring home dinner so don’t cook. Aaaaaahhhhhhhhhhh! To be able to lean on him, to see him take an aggressive interest in how the house works and what is going on, to feel like he desires me so much he will not take no for an answer and
kisses me out of my stress...

...it’s the stuff our fantasies are made of, guys! Maybe not every woman, but every married girl I know gets starry eyed as they tell stories of their husband leading in such an in-tune and family-focused way, esp if it involves romance and sex.

...guys, lead whether she bats her eyes at you at first or not!... Too much beta-helpfulness can backfire, bc you are presenting as a wimp weaker than she is, and who wants a leading man like that? She wants to feel like your leading lady, not your mother.

Sheila responded:

Amazing comment! Thank you. I’m tempted to use this one as a separate post next week! I just may do that...
A criticism too kind
by Dalrock | January 9, 2013 | Link

Commenter Istrice at Zippy’s site levels the following accusation against the manosphere:

…the problem is that the roissysphere stands on the shoulders of giants and claims to feel the soil beneath it’s feet. These nonsense, sloppy terms like solipsism, feminine imperative, team woman, “game” are ideas with no rigor, as imprecise as the dull minds that conjure them up.

Yet all across the roissysphere no single red pill person ever recommends learning the precise terms of the great works of the ages, instead offering a bag of bullsh&t and telling you to read the rantings of a keyboard warrior from DC.

What a hollow existence it is to work oneself into a fey mood inventing tools (which they call game) to climb a mountain only to find the mountain was already home to greater men then they, and could have used tools of higher quality if they had bothered to look.

He doesn’t note which great men or works he feels the manosphere is neglecting. Shakespeare might not be old enough or great enough for him, and perhaps the same is true for Brothers Grim and the Bible. However, I disagree which is why I write about them.

While we might disagree on whether the above works are worthy of discussion, his image of the men of the manosphere climbing a forgotten mountain and rediscovering ancient knowledge to take us out of our feminist Dark Age is quite poetic. I think he may be overdoing it by suggesting that the manosphere is a modern day Renaissance, but either way the compliment in the form of criticism is very much appreciated.
Linkage #1: I imagine Tacomaster has already received more than his fill of advice by now, but after I gave my own response I asked Cane Caldo if he would be willing to offer his thoughts as well. Cane has an eloquence when describing sex in Christian marriage which I find very moving, such as this quote:

For the loving husband and wife that flow of love can only (and blessedly!) spill over the brim of our cups into each other’s. It’s not trouble, it’s not fantasy, and it’s certainly not just you. I have learned to loathe even the specter of “naughtiness” to be brought into discussions of the Christian sex. It is holy, and holy means dark and secret to those outside.

You can find more like this from Cane in his excellent post titled: Tacomaster Desires Steadfast Love

Linkage #2: Grerp is back, and I’ve reactivated the link on the blogroll. I was going to leave a comment but Ecclesiastes already said it and I failed in my attempt to prove that I’m not a robot.


Linkage #4: Captain Capitalism has a new book out, Enjoy the Decline.
It’s classic. A girl tells a guy that he’s her only accomplice, and meanwhile she’s pulling jobs with half the guys in town.

She’s armed, she’s dangerous, and she’s desperate to get married.

In the full episode there is a hilarious scene where they interrogate one of her dim witted accomplices named Marvin. Marvin won’t tell them anything about her, because she is the hottest woman who has ever taken an interest in him and they were about to get married. He says she is my lucky day and I’ve been nothing my whole life. Nobody. Only girls that would even look at me had neck hair or one eye that didn’t work right. In an effort to get him to give her up they show him footage of her committing a crime with another man just a few hours after they picked him up. Marvin is devastated to see her committing the same crime with someone else which she had originally planned on doing with him (from memory):

*Police officer:* You do know what she is, don’t you?

*Marvin:* Yeah. *(ashamed pause as he admits it to himself)* She’s a crime slut.
Let them eat cake.

by Dalrock | January 12, 2013 | Link

There is at the very least much controversy regarding who (if anyone) actually said the famous line attributed to Marie Antoinette. However, regardless of the veracity of the quote it has gone down in history as the epitome of callousness. After all, Marie Antoinette was famous for frivolously spending France’s money on her hobby of playing peasant at a time when actual peasants could barely afford to buy food. Her penchant for spending earned her the famous nickname Madame Déficit. The attribution of the quote along with her actual conduct combine to create a picture of a woman who simply couldn’t register the immense suffering of countless real life people, because in her mind they were merely props for her own amusement.

Although the original quote is suspect, today we have a very real example of the kind of incapacity for empathy which the famous line represents. While many modern women have responded to feminism by taking on male roles with the seriousness of men, many others prefer to dabble in playing men. As a result, we have women playing warrior, playing career woman, and playing pioneer. All of this comes at immense cost to our economy, at a time when many are struggling to get by.
Unlike the large numbers of men and women who are outraged by the injustice of the family courts, the modern day Marie Antoinette looks at the great pain and injustice fathers are experiencing at the hands of the family courts and channels the famous line in one of two forms:

Let them ask for custody.

Let them pay child support.

In reality these two separate statements represent the same underlying sentiment. Those being crushed by an unjust system must have somehow had it coming. While they can’t dispute that the system is designed to be used to punish men without a need to show any actual wrongdoing, all they can think of are the great princesses who rely on the system to play strong independent woman. The unjust system gives them power, and that is more important than the suffering of innocent men and children.

Let them ask for custody.

As I have explained before, this is a specious claim because it assumes that fathers would be granted custody if they only asked for it. The reality is that men’s lawyers counsel them on their real expectations of the process and advise them to take the best deal they can hope to get. This is a classic case of what economists call bargaining in the shadow of the law. As the working paper No-Fault Divorce and Rent-Seeking explains:

...spouses engage in ‘bargaining in the shadow of the law’ (Mnookin and Kornhauser, 1979), where the existing law becomes a threat point for one of the spouses.

As an analogy, imagine a criminal court system where there was virtually no chance of being acquitted if you were part of a specific unfavored class, no matter how strong your case is. If you offer unfavored defendants in this scenario the chance to plead guilty to receive a lower sentence, they will nearly always take it because they have nothing to gain by trying to make their case for innocence. Yet you couldn’t take a 90% (unfavored class) guilty plea end result as proof that a system is fair which finds the unfavored class guilty 99% of the time cases go to trial. They are simply two sides of the same injustice.

There is another problem with the Let them ask for custody quip; it overlooks the very reason men marry and have children. Men don’t start a family to become half of a broken home, whether this is the half which pays child support or the half which gets the children. Men want to lead an intact family and work together with their wife to give their children the best. While taking a man’s children and then forcing him to pay for the honor is adding insult to injury, winning sole custody and having to pay others to do much of the parenting isn’t a great option either. Even though no doubt most men would greatly prefer the latter over the former, we shouldn’t overlook the great injustice committed by a wife who blows up her family without serious cause regardless of who wins custody. We understand this when it comes to men who walk out on their families to start a new one with a younger woman, and we should be clear about this when women indulge in the rampant female fantasy of divorce empowerment represented by movies like Eat Pray Love and Fireproof.
Let them pay child support.

There are two core claims which make up this sentiment. The first is that child support is only fair because it merely forces the man to own up to his responsibility as a father. He had sex, so he deserves to pay. But the woman had sex too, and in the vast majority of the cases she is the one who initiated the divorce. In fact, when Brinig and Allen studied the issue they found that the ability to take away the children was the biggest motivator for wives to divorce (emphasis mine):

> Our results are consistent with our hypothesis that filing behavior is driven by self-interest at the time of divorce. Individuals file for divorce when there are marital assets that may be appropriated through divorce, as in the case of leaving when they have received the benefit of educational investments such as advanced degrees...

> We have found that who gets the children is by far the most important component in deciding who files for divorce, particularly when there is little quarrel about property, as when the separation is long.

For those who don’t speak economist, they are saying that the reason women initiate divorce twice as often as men is because they know it gives them the opportunity to steal the children. In this context, child support isn’t forcing a man to pay for responsibilities he wasn’t willing to shoulder, it is the payment of cash and prizes to mothers who blow up their families.

But today’s grand princesses have an answer to this as well. Even though academic studies have found that the motivation was the opportunity to commit divorce theft, the man still must have had it coming. Note that they implicitly accept that losing custody and paying child support is a form of severe punishment for men. What they are arguing is the punishment is just because the men deserved it. Commenter T made this basic argument over multiple comments during a recent discussion:

> Women divorce to get rid of unwanted husbands...

> I assume that unwanted husbands are unwanted for good reason.

But why make such an assumption? Brinig and Allen didn’t find any reason to come to this conclusion, and the system is specifically designed not to consider fault. Women have the ability to profit from an unjust system, and all of the data suggests that they are in fact doing this, yet women like T demand that women who blow up their families be given the benefit of the doubt. As the famous line goes, provide stats for this or shut up! Men must be considered guilty until proven innocent, they argue, as this is only fair. In fact, even if you were to assume that only half or even one quarter of the men being punished by this system are innocent, this is a grave injustice. The innocent are being punished to reward the guilty! Yet whenever this debate unfolds, there is a strong tendency of those arguing for justice to try to prove that the men being punished are innocent. They unknowingly take on the female solipsists frame and have a debate about whether those convicted without any form of due process were really guilty or not. This is made even worse because no amount of
hard data will convince modern day Marie Antoinettes that men don’t deserve to be crushed. As T explained in the same thread, a certain percentage of fathers who have their children taken away from them deserve it because they are guilty of doing something concrete like abuse, abandonment, addiction, or infidelity. This of course ignores the fact that in the cases where the wife was the one who precipitated the divorce due to these same offenses the system will still punish the husband as if he were the one who committed the offense.

Commit a mugging? Go to prison.
Got mugged? Go to prison.

Later T explained that the rest of the fathers are guilty because there is no concrete wrongdoing to point to:

From what I’ve seen, if a person cannot think of something that they are doing wrong in their marriage and their marriage is going badly the problem is probably them.

This is where the debate nearly always ends up. Once cornered with facts and logic, the defenders of injustice resort to pure denial. No wife initiated divorce is ever frivolous, even when the wife claims she divorced frivolously. You simply can’t take a divorcée’s word for it when she tells you she divorced frivolously. You know how divorcées lie.

We can do it poster from and Marie Antoinette painting listed as public domain on Wikipedia Commons.
Previously I’ve written that most churches *speak like Christ and act like Oprah* when it comes to divorce. The reality is even worse than that, because when it comes to marriage across the board nearly all Christians now speak like Oprah too. The assumption is that while the Bible focuses on headship and submission and on shutting the door on the idea of divorce, there is something missing. *While it is all well and good to have marriages which are faithful to the biblical instruction on the topic, they tell us, the Bible forgot to include instructions on how to have a happy marriage.* As a result, we have the wholesale Christian adoption of the modern secular “relationship expert” school of thought, a school of thought not from the Bible but from a new book they have discovered, the Book of Oprah.

A little over a year ago Sheila Wray Gregoire commented on my blog to register her strong objection to me referring to the wife in *Fireproof* as acting “whorish”. Later in the comment she also objected to my neglecting the issue of marital happiness (emphasis mine):

> I find that you talk a lot on this blog about how people should never divorce (which I more or less agree with), and that women shouldn’t expect so much from their husbands (which I also agree with), and that women are asking their husbands to be both betas and alphas at the same time (which I also agree with), and that women leave their husbands too much (again, in agreement). But what I don’t find is you dealing honestly with genuine problems that couples have with communication, with distance, with betrayal of trust, with porn, etc. I agree with everything you’re saying, but *I don’t think marriages can be fixed with a simple “suck it up and put on your big girl panties”*. That might make someone STAY in the marriage, but it won’t make the marriage thrive, and what I’d like to see is couples who are genuinely attached and intimate. I’m not saying that if you aren’t intimate that’s grounds for divorce; not at all. But I’d like to see couples thrive. And that means that sometimes you actually have to work at problems, not just say “you’re expecting too much, get over it”. You have to learn how to communicate, and how to give, and how to understand the different ways that men and women approach sex, parenthood, life, etc.

Ironically while this is generally presented by Christians as becoming modern and learning from science, scientists know that the biblical view of marriage *actually works* (emphasis mine):

> The study’s findings are consistent with other research demonstrating the powerful effects of marital commitment on marital happiness. A *strong commitment to marriage as an institution, and a powerful reluctance to divorce, do not merely keep unhappily married people locked in misery together*. They also help couples form happier bonds. To avoid divorce, many assume, marriages must become happier. But it is at least equally true that in order to get happier, unhappy
couples or spouses must first avoid divorce. “In most cases, a strong commitment to staying married not only helps couples avoid divorce, it helps more couples achieve a happier marriage,” notes research team member Scott Stanley.

In the full study they point out that marriage counseling is seldom the solution (emphasis theirs):

Spouses who turned their marriages around seldom reported that counseling played a key role. When husbands behaved badly, value-neutral counseling was not reported by any spouse to be helpful. Instead wives in these marriages appeared to seek outside help from others to pressure the husband to change his behavior. Men displayed a strong preference for religious counselors over secular counselors, in part because they believed these counselors would not encourage divorce.

A separate study also confirms that adopting a mental posture of unwillingness to divorce leads to greater marital happiness.

I reference the movie Fireproof so much because it isn’t just an example of how its creators think on the topic of Christian marriage; that the movie is so universally and enthusiastically accepted by modern Christians offers a unique insight into how pervasive the new thinking on marriage truly is. There simply is nothing else so universally accepted by modern Christians on the topic of marriage. It isn’t just Protestants who adore the movie; Catholics love it too. It isn’t just the message embedded in the plot which is telling, but the way the movie is marketed. As I mentioned recently, they have to be careful not to call it a movie on Christian marriage (since it isn’t). However, given the many ways to finesse this their choice of wording when they are reaching out to churches is still very telling (emphasis mine):

Use this movie to help strengthen marriages and couples in your church and community. FIREPROOF is an unprecedented opportunity to communicate God’s design for relationships.

Note that the implication is that a couple which is neither married nor engaged is a “relationship” that a church should strengthen. Marriage is just one kind of “relationship” churches should tend to in this frame of mind. This is what the marketers of the movie believe churches want to hear, and I see no reason to believe they are incorrect.

A fundamental change in Christian thinking is the acceptance of the ever present threat of divorce should the wife become unhappy. This isn’t a grudging acknowledgement of unfortunate legal reality, but a full fledged internalization of the secular world-view on divorce. It is now unquestioningly accepted that a Christian husband’s first priority must be to prevent his wife from becoming unhappy and divorcing him. This is after all the meaning of the Fireproof tag-line Never leave your partner behind. In the movie it is the Christian husband’s responsibility to ensure that his wife loves him so she doesn’t leave him for another man. We know Caleb finally “gets” what the movie is selling as Christian marriage in the triumphant fist-clenching scene where he confronts the man his wife is in the process of leaving him for:
I know what you’re doing. I have no intention of stepping aside as you try to steal my wife’s heart. I’ve made some mistakes, but I still love her. So just know I am going after her too.

And since I’m married to her, I’d say I’ve got a head start.

In practice the modern Christian approach to marital difficulties ends up being the same approach followed in the secular world; the wife shares her feelings at great length and the husband must listen and do something about it. This inverts the biblical relationship of the husband and his wife’s emotions. In biblical marriage the husband is his wife’s emotional rock, and he lovingly anchors and shelters her when her emotions storm over her. If he didn’t, she would become untethered. In this new bastardized version of Christian marriage the wife’s emotions rule them both.

I’m not saying there isn’t any room for Christian marital counseling, or even retreats, books and movies which teach husbands and wives to communicate better and understand each other’s needs. However these must come from an unwavering belief in biblical marriage, including the topics of divorce, headship & submission, and denial of sex. It should also start with a clear understanding of the times we live in. Part of it should be taking great care not to elevate the wife’s emotions to the point where they are now the driving force in the marriage, and to avoid cutting husbands off at the knees. To the extent that this exists in the Christian “relationship counseling” industry, I’ve never come across it. Such a perspective would certainly stand out like a sore thumb in all but a handful of modern day congregations.
In the discussion on Ballista74’s excellent post The Pressure Of Corrupted Ministry the topic turned to the question of submission. Commenter Sis made what is a very common argument:

Submission is a gift, not something that can be demanded. Just like giving our lives to Christ, he gives us a choice, we have free will in the matter. I.e. the church (wife) and Christ (husband), it must not be forced. Just like a man’s protection and wealth is a gift to his wife and should not be demanded.

How would Christ go about getting the church to submit? He would love her and assure her she can put her trust in Him, never demanding.

This is an extremely important point. As I explained in a previous post, the idea of submitting to a husband should frighten a woman. What we need is a way for women to decide for themselves not only whether they are willing to submit to a man, but which man they are willing to submit to. Once a woman freely makes this choice, we should celebrate her choice with some sort of ritual. As Sis points out, men have a frightening choice to make as well. I propose that we combine both choices into a common ritual, where both can publicly declare their decision to honor biblical marriage. Since we are talking about biblical marriage, I would further propose that we hold this type of ritual in a church (or Cathedral).

Once the man and woman have declared their decision to protect/provide and to submit (respectively), we should celebrate! Everyone has their own way to celebrate, but many people like dancing, and I’ve always been a fan of cake. In respect to the preferences of others, I propose that we celebrate with both.
Wedding cake image licensed as creative commons by Michael Prudhomme.
Lowering the boom, a testimonial.

by Dalrock | January 17, 2013 | Link

Previously I shared Joel and Kathy Davisson’s message that a wife who is unhappy has an obligation to God to lower the boom and crush her husband with the family court. Today I thought I would share a testimonial they published from one of the women who followed their advice:

Things are GREAT and things are really hard at the same time. The great things are that the boys are both doing so much better emotionally than they were five months ago. HalleluYAH!

My son seems much more relaxed and happy now. He hasn’t been in tears (except occasionally over his dad and the divorce) and saying how much he hates life and wants to die for months!!!! No more poetry about cutting himself either! No more dark and morbid pictures and his bitterness and cynicism has declined a lot as well. My other son’s behavior has started to even out as well, with fewer and fewer meltdowns. He isn’t punching himself in the face anymore and saying what a bad boy he is either. However, he is still very clingy towards me and refuses to sleep in his own bed. I have tried to move him after he is asleep out of my bed and into his own but after a few nights he wakes up immediately and starts to cry. I have also discovered that he is sleep walking at night too. I wake up immediately, since he sleeps with me, and coax him back to bed where he cuddles up and goes back to sleep. So far this has not been a major problem.

Note: Unfortunately this isn’t satire, and children were harmed in the lowering of this boom.

See Also:

- Why do you care?
- Flyer sent home with our kindergartner.
- Harming your kids for attention and profit.
- Dragging your kids through the meat grinder; practice makes perfect!
The Feminine Imperative Revisited
by Dalrock | January 18, 2013 | Link

The Social Pathologist starts off on good footing in *Marx and the Feminine Imperative* when he writes:

Now, I do think that the Feminine imperative holds true, especially for the avowed feminists, but for the average woman, I don’t think she wakes up in the morning desiring to consciously or unconsciously screw men over.

But..... Rollo and Dalrock’s highlighting of the subject did get me thinking and I think something else is happening. *I do think that the effects of the feminine imperative are real* but what is enabling this is not some underlying power conflict but something more complex and therefore harder to understand and tackle.

But later he stumbles by suggesting it is simply about women getting the benefit of the doubt for immoral actions:

I really don’t think there is such a thing as the feminine imperative, what I do think though, is that Western Women are privileged to enjoy *moral indulgence*–it’s their get out of jail free card, and currently, Western Women are exploiting this phenomenon *en mass* to avoid moral responsibility. When a woman does something consciously dumb, rude or evil, there are many resources in Western Culture she can draw on. Sure, men can access some of these resources, and criminals frequently do, but women have far deeper pool of cultural “treasure” to get out of jail.

The problem is the feminine imperative is much more insidious than simple moral indulgence. *The feminine imperative has warped our very ability to think morally.* For example, a recent commenter at Dr Helen’s blog offered the following helpful dating advice for men looking for good women:

...I have found that when men “go there too soon,” a woman feels regretful or in some cases objectified... Whether or not they were they said “no.”

So, if you are looking for “the one,” patience is the best. “Getting women in bed quick!” is the fastest way to get a woman out of your life, if you ask me. A good woman wants to wait, and you want a good woman for the long haul, I would think...

I guess I can only offer the “good-girl, looking for life-long partner” perspective. They are out there, maybe fewere and fewer?
How many even inside of the manosphere can spot this for what it really is? Most will mistake it for Christian sexual morality or at least something along those lines, instead of what it really is, the cuckoo chick which pushed Christian sexual morality out of the nest when no one was looking. Modern Christians can’t spot this for what it is so they nourish it as if it were their own. It takes a vigilant eye to spot this parasitic imposter as the feminine imperative masquerading as sexual morality. The beauty of it is even the woman writing this likely has no idea of what she is actually doing.

Where I think many are getting hung up is in the explanation of the mechanics of how all of this happens. This is certainly a valid and interesting discussion, but whether or not you agree with Rollo on the mechanism doesn’t invalidate the phenomenon. Something very real is happening, and it follows what is generally a distinct and recognizable pattern once you understand what a feral woman’s mating script actually looks like. In essence, what Rollo has done for us is both point out the pattern and offer an explanation at the same time. He may or may not be right about the explanation, but the pattern is as undeniable as iron shavings surrounding a magnet. We don’t have to know the mechanics of electromagnetic fields to see that there is a pattern there, and those who are objecting to the concept of the feminine imperative should take the same approach. While the mechanics may be in question, the result is undeniable.

Warbler tricked into feeding Cuckoo chick image licensed as creative commons by Per Harald Olsen.
Time magazine has a piece on Sesame Street selling divorce to children: D Is for Divorce: Sesame Street Tackles Another Touchy Topic. The article describes Sesame Street’s first attempt back in 1992 to convince children that divorce is something positive. In that attempt Snuffleupagus tearfully explained that his father was being expelled from the family home and that he didn’t know where his father would ultimately live. The whole thing blew up in testing when the preschoolers recognized it for the traumatic event it really is:

Viewers learn that sometimes divorce can be “for the best.” We are assured that Snuffy and his sister Alice will always be loved. And yet when Sesame Street tested the segment on preschoolers, just weeks before it was scheduled to air, it was nothing short of a disaster. The children didn’t know where Snuffy was going to live. They didn’t think his parents loved him. Some worried their own parents might get a divorce. They cried.

Since their intent was to paint a happy face on the demolition of families Sesame Street pulled the segment and scrapped the idea for twenty years. Recently they took another shot at it, and instead of portraying a character dealing with the news that their parents are divorcing they portrayed it from the perspective of a happy little girl drawing pictures of the two houses she lives in. They did get one part right; daddy’s house is tiny while mommy lives in a giant home. They also got something else right; this time the segment isn’t slated for the main show but is only available online where parents can decide if they want to play the segment for their children.
Fantasy vs reality.
by Dalrock | January 25, 2013 | Link

**Fantasy:** She’ll kick your butt

…experts on fitness and on women in the military say the past two decades have shown that being female is not the biggest barrier to serving on the front lines. Being fat is.

**Reality:** Weight of Combat Gear Is Taking Toll

Carrying heavy combat loads is taking a quiet but serious toll on troops deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan, contributing to injuries that are sidelining them in growing numbers, according to senior military and defense officials.

**More Reality:** Get Over It! We Are Not All Created Equal

I was a motivated, resilient second lieutenant when I deployed to Iraq for 10 months, traveling across the Marine area of operations (AO) and participating in numerous combat operations. Yet, due to the excessive amount of time I spent in full combat load, I was diagnosed with a severe case of restless leg syndrome. My spine had compressed on nerves in my lower back causing neuropathy...
While the official claim is that integrating women into combat roles is to provide the largest possible pool of capable forces to draw from, nearly no one takes this seriously. Most who support the move will fairly quickly change their argument and claim instead that this profoundly costly change is about the desire to provide opportunity for a handful of extraordinary women. This new argument is framed as:

| If a woman is just as good as the men, why shouldn’t she be allowed to join the unit? |

This is an effective argument because it plays on men’s empathy for women and our respect for true achievement. However, this still isn’t the real reason feminists are obsessed with putting women in combat roles. This is about something which is core to feminism, and it boils down to a high stakes version of the childish feminist boast:

| Anything boys can do girls can do better. |

Understand that this is nothing more than a boast, which is why feminists have so little interest in actually having women achieve the kinds of things we celebrate men for. When Charles Lindbergh was being celebrated for his incredible feat of creativity, skill, and risk taking, feminists were beside themselves. Here was a man who was being celebrated for masculine virtues; they needed a woman to pretend to do something similar so they could tamp down this troubling national celebration of masculinity. So feminists found a woman with a pilot’s license who wrote newspaper columns about flying and had her ride as a passenger on a transatlantic flight; then they threw her a heroes welcome as Lady Lindy, complete with a ticker tape parade and an invitation to the White House. Just as we see with putting women in the military, Earhart was all about style over substance:

| She chose a leather jacket, but aware that other aviators would be judging her, she |
slept in it for three nights to give the jacket a “worn” look. To complete her image transformation, she also cropped her hair short in the style of other female flyers.

At the core the feminist obsession with the military is not an interest from a practical perspective, but for what the military symbolizes. A nation’s military is traditionally the ultimate symbol of the virtue of the nation’s manhood. Stories of fighting men exhibiting incredible bravery and self sacrifice are used to inspire all men to strive for excellence no matter what their path in life is. Feminists chafe at this idea because they can’t stand any celebration of men. The whole point of putting women in combat is to make sure we can never again say: Thanks to the men who sacrificed so much for us without feminists chiming in “and women too!” This is why no unit can be left untouched, even elite ones.

While the WWII Italian fighting man is often maligned in the US, the reality is many Italian men showed incredible bravery and dedication on the battlefield.

The heroic behavior of the Folgore Division during the Second battle of El Alamein in resisting the attacks of six British divisions (two armored and four infantry) inspired the respect and admiration of its enemy. Lacking effective anti-tank weapons, the Italian paratroopers managed to stop British tanks only with a few obsolete 47/32 guns and petrol bombs. On 11 November 1942, when the battle was over, the BBC transmitted the famous official bulletin: “The remnants of the Folgore division put up resistance beyond every limit of human possibility.”

The Folgore, having run out of water, withdrew from the El Alamein front at 2:00 a.m. on 3 November 1942, carrying their anti-tank weapons. At 2:35 p.m. on 6 November what was left of the division was captured by the British. They had exhausted their ammunition and destroyed their weapons, but refused to raise their hands in surrender or show the white flag.

These are the stories we tell young men to inspire them to greatness, and this is what feminists must blot out from our collective thinking. In order to do this they don’t need to have women who actually perform to the level of men, they only need to suit up women like the picture at the beginning of the article and show them as the new face of the Folgore Brigade.

In this sense the demoralization of the average fighting man isn’t an unintended consequence of introducing women. This is at its heart about demoralizing men, both the fighting men and the other men who are inspired by them. Likewise the lowered standards for women aren’t something which feminists see as a real problem, because this further demoralizes the men while allowing feminists to focus on style over substance. They aren’t looking to win actual battles, only a battle for the way the nation views manhood.

Since the goal is to erase the concept of masculine virtues, the new bargain the introduction of women into combat represents isn’t to have women join equally or even seriously in the fighting and dying. The new bargain is that men will continue to be the ones who fight and die, but they must not feel a sense of masculine pride in either doing this or having this obligation. In this sense they are doing to the military what they have done to other institutions. Husbands and fathers are still responsible to protect and provide for their
families, they have just been taught not to see themselves as head of the household.

One thing to keep in mind is that previous generations of women valued and even guarded masculine virtues. We wouldn’t have to go back very far to find large numbers of women who would have been offended at the idea of trying to strip the nation’s men of masculine pride. They knew and admired the sacrifice their husbands and fathers had made on the battlefield and off, and they understood how vulgar it is for women to desire to take away the sense of pride in manhood. In fact, they took pride in the fact that these were their men, just as they took pride in their own roles as wives and mothers. Modern “traditional” women almost never object to the naked moves to stamp out masculine pride, they just want to make sure they get their due chivalry from men. However, there are still women even today who understand how unseemly this is. They aren’t the women demanding yet more chivalry from unknown men. They are the ones who know that no woman can really take away the masculine pride of their fathers, husbands, brothers, and sons, and they thank God for this.

At the individual level the sense of masculine pride can’t be taken away. Men will continue to take risks and create new things. But since the attack on the national sense of manhood has been thoroughly successful more and more this will be separated from the culture at large. Manly pride doesn’t only exist on the battlefield; it exists wherever men are striving for excellence, where they are risking, building, and creating. But at a national and local cultural level masculine pride is being systematically snuffed out, and our larger culture will continue to show the effects of this loss. Those who want the results of masculine virtues will almost exclusively respond to this loss in the culture by shaming men. This might work some on the margins, but you won’t inspire men to be great with shame alone.

Italian paratrooper photo licensed as creative commons by the Italian Army.
A Tale of Two Beaches
by Dalrock | January 31, 2013 | Link

Beach #1

Mrs. Yes makes it a point to be warm and inviting whenever her husband storms her beach. He is always welcomed with a kiss and a lei.

Beach #2

Field Marshal Gregoire has erected a few obstacles for her husband to overcome when he tries to storm her beach.
As a result, it is slightly less inviting.

One night after a series of failed landings where her husband was thrown back into the frigid waters, he successfully navigated the obstacles.
The next day an unexpected gift arrived.

Is this a trick?

Field Marshal Gregoire was suspicious. Was this unexpected gift an attempt to trick her into not manning the guns?
After a thorough investigation she fortunately determined that in this case, a thoughtful gift was in fact a thoughtful gift. It would be absurd for a husband to attempt to manipulate such a wife, after all.

Image Sources:

Private beach image licensed as creative commons by Jarrod Trainque.
Atlantic Wall images (Machine Gun, Standing Guard, Low Tide, and High Tide) licensed as creative commons by the German Federal Archive (Bundesarchiv, Bild 146-1987-017-29A / CC-BY-SA)
Flowers image licensed as creative commons by Ian Muttoo.
What if a wife doesn’t regulate the couple’s sex life?
by Dalrock | February 1, 2013 | Link

In the discussion of the last post Spacetraveller asks:

Is there never a ‘saturation point’ where ...um...marital relations are concerned?
Whilst I totally ‘get’ that a man has earned the ‘right’ to ‘easy’ access to his own
wife, is there such a thing as ‘too easy’?

Perhaps this question is evidence of my own ‘projection’. But I wonder if there is
some truth to my theory??
(I guess my question would be already answered if ‘Mrs. Yes’ had already posted her
husband’s reaction to her year-long ‘trial’. But as yet, she hasn’t, and I am curious as
to the effect on a man if his wife never said no. Even if this were a realistic scenario
(that she never says no), my question is, does this bring with it a whole new level of
problems, i.e. a certain lack of respect for wife?)

Right off the bat, there is no worry about the wife seeming too “easy”. They are married, so
this simply doesn’t apply.

But to the larger question of what it is like, what happens is the couple gets incredibly close.
You don’t need to wait for Mr. Yes’ response, because he may not be eager to write about
something so personal on a blog. Mrs. Yes already described it:

Yes. We have always been affectionate – although not in the normal ways. We have
never been the type to end a call with “I love you” or leave for work with a kiss. Our
affection is usually shown by holding hands, sitting together and having some
physical contact. A hug or squeeze as we cook dinner or go about our lives. I do
depend that we are more affectionate and I think where I see this the most is actually
in bed - but not during sex. We snuggle up more as we settle in for the night, after
sex and just while we sleep. While we have always held hands out and about – he
now reaches for my hand pretty immediately as we get out of the car these days.

How it manifests will vary based on the nature of the couple itself, but it will be an incredible
closeness. Husbands who don’t get rejected don’t shy away from physical affection because
they feel really close and don’t fear rejection if they get aroused. Imagine a scenario where
you build a fire and have an unlimited supply of firewood. Whenever one of you wants, you
are free to throw another log on the fire. Paradoxically you end up with both periods of more
intense heat and passion as well as moments where the fire has burned down nicely and it is
pleasantly warm. You don’t get those wonderful glowing coals by being stingy with the wood.

For my wife and I not only are we very physically affectionate, we also talk a great deal. Our
daughter has commented numerous times that when we go out to a restaurant the other
parents don’t talk to each other. When they do talk it is pretty much just to the kids. We talk
to the kids too of course, but according to our daughter at least we are always talking to each
other. My wife describes the periods of “pleasant warmth” as being like a never ending
slumber party, and we very often do end up staying up laughing and talking late into the night.
We’ve been covering some incredible ground recently in what has been coined the “Christian Manosphere”. While some have mocked us for rediscovering what countless generations already knew, I see our agreement with pre-modern Christianity on the topic of biblical marriage as a very reassuring sign that we are on the right track.

While there is productive disagreement within the sphere which allows us to learn and correct errors, there is also a passive aggressive backlash. Vox Day’s recent posts on the blogging style of what he terms gammas, the men one step above omegas in the “socio-sexual hierarchy” is uncanny in its description of this dynamic. From Vox’s most recent post on the topic:

Gammas find direct conflict particularly difficult because they don’t customarily engage in it. They habitually engage in female-style indirect conflict, where rhetoric is are the battlefield and the sly passive-aggressive shot taken with plausible deniability is the weapon of choice.

From his post immediately prior:

Notice that whereas the ALPHA points (links and identifies) and laughs (is genuinely amused), the gamma avoids (refuses to link, refuses to even name), and alternates between feigned laughter, feigned indifference, and genuine anger. Confrontation and contempt are alpha. Evasion and sniping from safety are gamma.

Manosphere blogger Samson’s Jawbone left a series of bizarre comments on this site back on Dec 30th. In this one and this one he complained that he wished he could unknow what he now knows about women and attraction, as he has become cynical:

I do actually agree that over-immersion in the manosphere makes one cynical and removes some of the romance from life, forever. Whether this outweighs the benefits of learning the truth is unclear, but I think it’s more important than I used to. I often wish I had my innocence back.

This really surprised me at the time, because understanding women better has only increased my empathy for them. This is true despite my continued willingness to call out bad behavior by women. In reality unless you are consumed by bitterness the object of calling out bad behavior should be at least in part for the benefit of those you are correcting. My improved understanding of and empathy for women has helped me when offering advice to women on the blog and at Yahoo Answers, and my wife regularly comments that while she loved the “old” me, she feels far more loved now and really appreciates the changes I’ve made. But Samson really did have a negative reaction to learning more about women. Back in March of last year he wrote a post on it:

I don’t know what’s more gut-wrenching: watching women deny that they play cruel
games… or seeing them acknowledge that, yes, we really are this cold-hearted and calculating. The latter is certainly more shocking.

…Sociosexual philosophy has disillusioned me beyond all reckoning. Peering deep into the psyche of woman has rendered me grievously scornful in feeling and mercilessly unscrupulous in behaviour towards these unholy, ungodly beings. I venture to say that… I hate them. Yes, I hate them! And how could I not?

…they are beasts, deserving nothing but callous treatment and damnation; and I can wish nothing upon them but furious hatred, ignominy and a miserable passing.

On January 11th Samson wrote what appears to be a breakup letter with the Manosphere:

After years of at least semi-regular reading (less regular in recent months), I am finally inclined to distance myself from the part of the web called the “manosphere”...

A related, second reluctant conclusion I’ve come to is that many, if not most, of the men on these sites are not really worthy of much respect, not worth emulating or feeling much sympathy for...

For instance, most of the manosphere denizens are perverts. Even at the supposedly “Christian” sites, most of the men are perverts. I mean this not as a pejorative, but in a literal, clinical sense: these men’s ideas about proper sexuality have been perverted; corrupted. On these sites, there is a good deal of posturing about wifely “submission”, but an awful lot of the time this is followed by complaints that a wife won’t “submit” – to her husband’s pleas for sodomy. This very blog entry was inspired by a sordid discussion that I saw at Dalrock’s (a site that I frankly have never been impressed with, viewing the author’s style as whiny and frequently bordering on misrepresentation), in which one commenter was upset and soliciting advice because he expected marriage to be an opportunity to engage in sickening sexual acts, and was disappointed when this didn’t materialize.

In his closing paragraphs he includes his own version of where have all the good men gone!, having somehow forgotten entirely that he is a Christian man who coincidentally has a blog. Won’t some big strong good man come to Samson’s rescue?

I would still like to see a Christian – a TRULY Christian – resurgence of teaching on the biblical definitions of manhood, womanhood, and submission, but after what I’ve been seeing in the manosphere, I wonder whether that’s possible. Theoretically, it should be – but in practice, it doesn’t seem to work out. For whatever reason, the men who are most interested in this topic seem to have their own pathologies.

When I found the post I left a couple of comments challenging Samson to stop being so evasive. If he feels the need to imply that I’m a pervert for believing in biblical marriage, he should be able to point out the offending text. In true chick mode he followed up with another post, including a refusal to do anything beyond making cowardly and passive aggressive
...in response to complaints that I have not identified whom or what I am talking about with exact precision: I decline to do this because I think such things ought not to be talked about and find discussion of them to be creepy. That is the end of it.

While Samson is clearly the worst in this regard, he isn’t the only blogger who is following the passive aggressive pattern in objecting to the Christian Manosphere. On January 22nd Simon Grey wrote:

There is a certain segment of the Manosphere that is both nominally Christian and participates in the Men’s Rights Movement (MRM). I generally make a point of avoiding these people since, as far as I can tell based on what I’ve read, they generally make a point of blaming women for everything that’s wrong with the world...

Anyhow, getting back to the point at hand, there are still plenty of men today who are, in a sense, trying to blame Eve for every major problem they have. The complaints are legion. Some men complain about getting fucked over in a divorce. Some men complain about not getting fucked over enough in the marriage bed. Some men complain that their wives are unattractive; some men complain that their wives are not attracted to them. Some men complain that their wives are lazy and refuse to help around the house. In general, a good number of these men avoid being introspective and asking themselves whether they have at all contributed to their own problems.

It isn’t clear who or what he is referring to here, but that is the point. All I can tell is he is referring to Christian married (or divorced) men in the manosphere. In a baffling denial of the modern feminist movement, Simon places the bulk of the blame for the rebellion of women on the common man:

A husband’s job, though, is to obey God and do what he says. In regards to marriage, the husband is expected to lead. He is expected to treat his wife with kindness. He is to love his wife and not be bitter towards her. He is to protect his wife. He is to provide for his wife. He is to sacrifice himself for his wife, if necessary. He is to make sure that his wife is sexually fulfilled. He is to do this because God requires this of him. He is not to do this because he expects his wife to return the favor...

This is not to say that women are completely without fault. However, it is clear that the greater fault lies with the men and their near-complete failure to comply with God’s commands. Therefore, men in unhappy marriages need to examine their lives for sin and failure, and do what they can to correct their course and live as the leaders that God would have them to be. Once they’ve done that, then we can talk about the women.

This idea that men have to be perfect before we can expect anything from women is more of the standard fare we get from feminised Christian leaders, and it has no basis in Scripture.
The NT emphasis is on telling wives to submit to their husbands, not telling husbands to force or manipulate their wives into submission. This of course is recognized by those against submission and twisted to suggest that marriage vows are only promises to God, and aren’t something each spouse also promises to each other (as well as their future children and the larger community). This thread of specious logic of course instantly disappears if we are talking about a wayward husband, as no one would suggest that an unfaithful husband hasn’t betrayed his wife.

As Cane Caldo points out in his excellent post Advocates Under Authority, the OT similarly only offers enhanced moral protection for women who are under submission to a man. The idea that the mass of modern women in feminist rebellion are in submission to either a father or husband is truly laughable. Nevertheless, Simon has doubled down on this idea that God holds men primarily accountable for the rebellion of women in his second post in the series, I Will Not Punish Your Daughters When They Commit Harlotry.

Simon also discovered a scriptural defense of Man up and marry those sluts!

I note, not without some degree of amusement, that the example of Hosea would indicate, contra to the assertion of some MRMs and MGTOWs, that God does occasionally expect men man to man up and marry whores.

Given this logic I can only assume that we should look forward to a future post by Simon Grey explaining to pro lifers that “God does occasionally instruct parents to kill their children“.

If men like Simon Grey and Samson’s Jawbone have insight to share with other married Christian men, I call on them to share it and stop the passive aggressive sniping. There is a mass of human suffering out there and pompous claims of “I’m better than those other Christian husbands” won’t do anyone any good, men, women, or children.
Back in July of 2012 I pointed out that the conventional wisdom on the trend in US divorce rates appeared to be changing. The reason is the official data set gathered by the National Center for Health Statistics has been missing data for California, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Louisiana, and Minnesota. Here is the divorce data the National Marriage Project published in their 2011 State of Our Unions report:

![Graph of US divorces per 1,000 married women](http://www.virginia.edu/marriageproject/pdfs/Union_11_12_10.pdf Fig 5 P 69)

However, the National Center for Family & Marriage Research (NCFMR) at Bowling Green State University used a new data set (American Community Survey) to calculate divorce rates by age in the US for 2010. When they compared this result with their statistic from 1990 they determined that divorce rates had remained flat for 20 years:

The overall U.S. divorce rate has remained essentially unchanged over the past 20 years. In 1990, 19 people divorced for every 1,000 marrieds versus 18 per 1,000 in 2010.

Back in July of 2012 when I emailed the Director of the National Marriage Project about this he indicated that his team was considering using the new ACS data as well. Since then their State of Our Unions report for 2012 has come out. Here is the new divorce trend using ACS data for 2011:
Note that Indiana and Louisiana divorce data is missing from 1990 and 2000 in the chart above, and California data is also missing for 2000. Since the 2011 data point uses the ACS no states are missing. I’m not sure why the two groups show different estimates for the 1990 divorce rate (19 vs 20.9), or why the NCFMR calculated the rate for 2010 at 18 per 1,000 and the National Marriage Project calculated 2011 almost four points higher at 21.7. The ACS data appears to jump around a bit from year to year because when I calculated the overall US divorce rate for 2009 using ACS data I came up with 19 per 1,000 married couples.
Once you understand the nature of the fire ant colony you can provoke them in relative safety. The fierce response to any disturbance of the mound is entirely predictable. The ants simply have no choice in the matter. Poke the mound and they come storming out, furiously stinging and attempting to restore the mound to its previous shape.

You can witness the same thing whenever discussing issues which offend the feminine imperative. Much of what we do in the manosphere is knock down the false frame of feminism. In fact, we generally need to focus more on the frame than the facts because the facts are indisputably on our side. However, even when the focus is on the facts, the response from the feminine imperative is the same; out boil the ants to rebuild the frame.

In the discussion of my post A Tale of Two Beaches, commenter T provided an excellent example of this. She immediately set out to rebuild the frame of Sheila’s Now Hear This post (the picture alone says it all). I’ve excerpted several comments below so you will need to see the original discussion for full context, but the excerpts show T’s constant reframing of the discussion to the idea that compliance is sexy, and the corollary; husbands who don’t comply are repulsive losers who ultimately risk frivorce. Note that each segment separated by ‘…’ is from a separate comment. This isn’t a series of excerpts from just one or a few comments. To her credit, T held on to the compliance is sexy frame through to her final comment in the discussion:

| So are the things that Shelia Gregorie mentions in her post unreasonable? |
| ... |
I saw most of that list as things that husbands should be doing anyway. So the problem is that she doesn’t say that even if he doesn’t bother with any of that, then she should still have sex.

... Having to do this causes vaginal dryness. Just FYI.

... But a wife whose husband doesn’t do most of those things actually isn’t going to be happy. Although I agree that she shouldn’t withhold sex no matter how she feels, a husband who doesn’t do some of those things is a turnoff.

... Having to explain what you want to someone who is sexually incompetent (and a man who can’t find a clit and doesn’t know what it is for is incompetent) is not sexy.

... However I do think that a husband who doesn’t do the stuff that she listed is likely to actually turn his wife off.

... Not turning her off and being a good husband?

... I think that whether they are valid prerequisites to ungrudging sex is irrelevant for practical purposes. Most women won’t be able to have enthusiastic sex with a husband who is lacking in many of these areas. You can tell her that her prerequisites are invalid and she will tell you that you’ve turned her off. She may grab some lube and fake it for you if she believes that she owes that to you, but it isn’t going to get you a mutually satisfying sex life.

... Sex is not just physical for some women, it’s emotional as well. Before I developed some emotional control if my feelings were hurt, or I wasn’t feeling loved at the moment I didn’t want sex and couldn’t enjoy it if I had it anyway.

... I have told friends that there is no reason to deny sex and that their marriages will probably improve if they are sexually generous with their husbands. That doesn’t change the fact that sex can be difficult for women to enjoy when they aren’t feeling good about their relationship.

... This is exactly the reason that many women “frivorce”. They look at their husbands, see someone who creates more housework than he does, doesn’t meet her emotional needs and wants sex while not being sexy. If she’s already going to work and dropping her kids off at daycare then he is also redundant.

The problem for men is that we tend to respond to fairly obvious reframes as if they were an attempt at a logical argument. It isn’t that responding to these reframes is never a good idea, but that you should always be aware of what is going on. Either way, in this case T’s problem was the framing of the OP was overwhelming. No amount of petty shaming would change the fact that no woman reading would want to associate her sexuality with Field Marshal Gregoire (left) instead of Mrs. Yes (right).
One thing which is worth noting is that when the ants are rebuilding the mound they generally aren’t aware of what they are doing. Women absolutely can argue logically, but certain topics have a tendency to bring out a little known module of the rationalization hamster, the emotion to logic converter. When this module is engaged what comes out is structured in the form of a logical argument, but it is really just emotion in translation.

Private beach image licensed as creative commons by Jarrod Trainque. Standing Guard image licensed as creative commons by the German Federal Archive.
Aren’t you sure?

by Dalrock | February 12, 2013 | Link

Cane Caldo discusses the issue of mandatory paternity testing in his post Paternity and Bats in Oz. Given the controversy around mandatory paternity testing I propose what should be an uncontroversial change to the birth certificate application.

Today the birth certificate form asks the husband to certify that he is the child’s father. If a husband balks when confronted with this form, his wife indignantly asks:

| What! Aren’t you sure?

To address the issue, I propose changing the birth certificate application form to allow the mother to check one of three options:

1. I do not know who the father is.
2. I believe ________________ is the father.
3. I swear under penalty of law that ________________ is the father, and there is absolutely no possibility that another man fathered this child.

Make it a felony to fill out and sign the form with option 3 inaccurately. A paternity test proving that the man she named isn’t the biological father would be legally defined as proof of her falsely filling out the form, and is therefore evidence of a felony.

To those ladies who would object to this proposal I ask:

| What! Aren’t you sure?
Very often the whispers come from within your own family. Sometimes they come from mothers to daughters, and other times they come from daughters to mothers. “She” at Yahoo Answers Marriage and Divorce shows us how it is done with My parents don’t seem happy together?

Ok, this isn’t a “they fight a lot” situation. This is just in general. Ok so, my dad usually gets my mom these cute cards for special occasions and flowers. He does that every time. The thing is, he’s never done anything really special that will surprise her.

Most husbands get their wife rings, or diamonds. It’s not unappreciative, because we already know he does too much trying to make money and keep us happy, and we do appreciate that, but a relationship, especially in marriage should be exciting and satisfying. Not predictable and boring.

I don’t mean to be nosy with their marriage, but I just want my mom to be happy. she doesn’t say anything to my dad b/c she doesn’t wanna seem mean and greedy, becuase she’s not. but I couldn’t help but point it out (I have a big mouth) to my dad..and he screamed at me not to talk like that.

I’m not trying to play some innocent act, but I was only trying to help. was i wrong about all this? Because I talked to my mom, and she agreed that my dad never spices up anything..but she said “it’s ok, I’m used to it now“ and started laughing, but later I hear her sniffling and she’s all sad. I feel like she’s unhappy that he doesn’t really make a by effort to keep the marriage going and more happy..
What we need is more chivalry!

by Dalrock | February 18, 2013 | Link

Brendan/Novaseeker made an insightful comment a while back describing what he sees as the core disagreement between the manosphere and non manosphere “traditionalists”:

Actually I think the basis of it is that social conservatives and, to an even greater degree, traditionalists are interested in systemic solutions rather than personal/pragmatic ones. Take chivalry, for example. Social conservatives and traditionalists are generally extremely pro-chivalry, because they see it as a part of a social order they would like to restore/resurrect. The more pragmatic guys in the manosphere, whether “Gamers” or not, view chivalry as mostly self-defeating on the personal level, and so are skeptical of it. Socons and trads may realize that their preferred social order is not returning soon, but they don’t want any *more* steps taken away from it, such as men abandoning chivalry wholesale. This leaves men in a very bad spot in the meantime — acting according to the rules of a social order which no longer exists, and in the context of one which actively punishes men who engage in this behavior in many cases — the socons and trads answer is generally “suck it up, man up, men must lead us out of this, etc.”, where the manosphere typically sees this as futile and instead adapts practical approaches that deal with the current system that is in place, whether they think it is a good one or not.

To me, that is where the hate comes from — socons and trads hate it when more steps are taken away from their preferred order, even if these are pragmatic in light of the current existing order, and manospherians hate it when socons and trads insist on men opening themselves up for extreme risks simply for the ideological hope for a cultural restoration that seems a long way off rather than, you know, actually helping guys live with the system we’ve got currently.

Samson’s Jawbone liked this explanation so much he endorsed it from the other side of the intellectual divide:
This is a brilliant comment, and captures perfectly my frustration with the manosphites who are frustrated with traditionalist conservatives. I say this in case anyone doubted the truth of what Brendan offers here.

Novaseeker mentions chivalry, and this is arguably ground zero for the disagreement here. To many traditionalists, chivalry is something women deserve from men even when they aren’t acting like ladies. This is why Lydia’s response to my pointing out that large numbers of modern women are acting like harlots was to decry my loss of chivalry. We saw the same frame of mind from the traditional blogger I referenced in Trad Con Tourette’s:

[good men are] kindly respectful of women, regardless of whether or not the woman is acting like a lady. They would never think of using the crude terms flung around the manosphere.

Core to this mindset is a profound denial of the shredding of the social contract by decades of unchecked feminism. In a move which can only be described as enabling feminism, they most fear and object to anything which would allow feminist women to experience the costs and responsibilities which should naturally come from what they are demanding. In an era where sluts are literally marching down the street they tell us sluts must be treated like ladies, and modern career women must be treated with the deference reserved for traditional ladies in the Victorian era.

Igrobins has been describing this frame of mind by a group calling themselves Traditional Women’s Rights Activists (TWRAs) in two excellent posts here and here. TWRA Jesse Powell explains that chivalry must be extended by men to all women equally in On Chivalry (emphasis mine):

...chivalry is not something that is “deserved” in the sense of it being earned or based on superior merit or it being an expression of preferential treatment due to the woman’s good conduct. Chivalry is a universal duty of the man towards all women indiscriminately; it is a principle of ethical conduct rather than it being in response to any particular behaviors or characteristics of the woman. Chivalry is also universally desirable and a male duty regardless of the social system currently prevalent in a society and regardless of whether or not chivalry is culturally or legally sanctioned.

Jesse explains further in his coming out letter Why I am a TWRA:

I am a TWRA, a Traditional Women’s Rights Activist, because I strongly believe that women should be granted the rights and privileges of the Traditional Woman; the rights and privileges that women were commonly granted traditionally, before feminism came on the scene. I will further add that the rights of Traditional Women should be granted to women generally simply on the basis of their being women whether a particular woman identifies as being a “Traditional Woman” or not.
By Jesse’s view of the world, all men owe protection to all women, regardless of the woman’s own actions. In Jesse’s world, a woman can pretend she is a kick ass member of an elite military unit, she can even provoke other men, and your job as a man is to underwrite her safety even if this means risking your own safety, wealth, and personal freedom. This is not only demanding that men enable feminism at great cost to themselves, this is men enabling feminism at great cost to their own families. Intervening with violence on behalf of a stranger is generally a phenomenally bad idea, and men who make a practice of this are at great risk of ending up dead/injured, in prison, and/or destitute. If you take on this asinine responsibility, you are exposing your own family to great risk.

The only rational response by a man is to be discriminating regarding whom he will and will not offer protection to. Commenter Tspoon said it best:

...yes I’m prepared to underwrite their safety with mine, but like any entity which undertakes to underwrite the risks of another, I have expectations for the behaviour of those I must protect. Which is where it breaks down somewhat. Outside of my two daughters, it’s been over 20 years since I met or knew a female of whom I knew, without reservation – That I would in fact guarantee her safety as far as I could. Outside of a minor miracle, I have no anticipation of meeting another...
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A proper dressing down for unchivalrous men.
by Dalrock | February 21, 2013 | Link

Somewhere in the world a woman is upset! What are you as lazy men doing to fix this?

Sorry for being so harsh, but you men need to hear this. I know I do. For example, just the other day I was reading about a woman in London who was victimized by modern men’s useless laziness. The article was titled Is there a man left under 40 who isn’t a rude, ignorant pig? I don’t know about you but the title alone really hit home. Now that I think about it, I really am a rude ignorant pig! Why didn’t I even notice? The author of the article is an incredible woman. She is as sassy, strong, and independent as they come; yet even she finds that men are letting her down.

Some time back she was doing her own strong and independent thing (I’m guessing on her way to a power meeting or preparing to write another article decrying traditional gender roles in marriage), when out of the blue her car thingy stopped working; I think she said it was the doohickey or something. Anyway, here she is, a strong independent woman, but this car thingy has made her upset!

They could see my distress when I began peering under the bonnet.

Some of you men (I hate to use the term so loosely) need a remedial lesson in chivalry, so for those who need it spelled out a woman becoming upset is the universal signal that you need to swing into action right away. Don’t feel too bad if you didn’t know this, because there were men right there on the scene who either didn’t know or shirked their obligation:

Next to me was a building site full of men in fluoro jackets standing doing nothing.

I shouldn’t have to reiterate that she was upset while these men in fluoro jackets were doing nothing. This baffling inaction by London’s men left our heroine to take extreme measures, as she was reduced to calling for professional assistance:

I got back in the car, and on my mobile phone to call the BMW breakdown service to get the vehicle recovered. I was in tears. Still no one bothered to help.

That’s right, she was in tears, yet those shameful men left her to the fate of calling BMW for service! At one point in her incredible ordeal it looked like modern manhood was about to at least partially redeem itself, because one man approached the passenger side window to check on her. Again, most men reading already know this, but the first rule of assisting strong and independent women is you must take great risks rather than cause her the slightest inconvenience. While approaching on the passenger side is the safest way to handle this, what he thoughtlessly didn’t consider was all of the trouble this would cause her in rolling down the passenger side window:

In the midst of all this, a parking warden knocked on my passenger window. I wound it down. ‘I can’t hear you,’ I said. ‘Why didn’t you knock on the driver’s window?’
Do you know what he said? ‘To do that I would have to stand in the road and I might get run over.’

I can’t put it any better than the strong independent woman herself:

Young working British men: you should be ashamed.

This being the manosphere I already know what my readers are thinking:

That was the UK. Most of us in the manosphere are in the US, and we would never suffer to allow a woman in our presence to become upset!

The fact is it is all too easy to blame it on the other guy, so my next story of lazy thoughtless modern men is from Rachel commenting on Sheila Gregoire’s blog. After explaining that lifeboats should be reserved for women because their lives are more valuable than men’s lives, Rachel recounted a gut wrenching story of a man who didn’t know his place:

I was sharing an elevator with a man about my age. When the elevator stopped, I automatically started to get off and he almost ran into me! I am so used to men letting me get off the elevator first, it hadn’t occurred to me that he wouldn’t. Once I righted myself, I got thinking about it and why would he let me off first? I am his equal.

This got her thinking about us men and how she can best make use of the fact that while she is our equal, our lives are worth less than her life:

I started to think if there was a scientific reason, and I could not come up with one. In fact, I thought maybe the man should go first to let him see if it’s safe…

I have to admit that for a bit this really made it hard for me to know when I can get off an elevator. But now I make it a point to rush out and check each floor first for danger whenever a high powered career woman pushes the button to get off. When I do this I can tell I’ve shamed the other men in the elevator, because they almost always look down and try to suppress a nervous laugh of embarrassment at their own worthlessness. Sure, this can make for an awkward moment when I get back on the elevator, but I’d rather do the right thing than spare these worthless men’s feelings.

Rachel has also helped me understand under what circumstances a less valuable person like myself (and the men reading) should be allowed to enter a lifeboat on a sinking ship:

The thought process led to thinking about the “women and children first” policy and I do still think that applies, unless the child who is getting on the life boat is only accompanied by his/her father. I think then the dad should be able to get on the life boat with his child(ren).

I don’t want to do too much dressing down in one day, so I’ll close with just one more example where able bodied men allowed a woman to become upset. This woman carried her computer in to a shop at the local mall to have it fixed, and then changed her mind and carried it back to her car. Along the way she became visibly upset, yet no men intervened.
and insisted on carrying her computer for her:

I don’t know how much it weighs, but by the time I got all the way back to my car I was nearly in tears because it was SO heavy and I was SO frustrated. And here’s my point: I cannot even tell you how many able-bodied young men I passed while I was carrying something that was OBVIOUSLY too heavy for me.

Remember men, we exist to prevent the women of the world from becoming upset. Fortunately this woman is a mother and will raise her sons right:

When I finally got to my car I called my husband and told him that my boys will NEVER pass someone who needs help and not offer to help them. I was so disgusted that not one single man offered to help me! So so so sad. I can’t influence any of the men who passed me by, but I can certainly influence the 3 young men God has entrusted to my care and if I have ANYTHING to do with it, they WILL put women and children first!!!

Sure, there are three good men on the way, but don’t sit around waiting for them to arrive. In the meantime, there are women who are upset. All of us have a responsibility here. Don’t wait for them to be in tears; spot the potential events which could make women you don’t know upset, and take preventative action. If we all pitch in we can make this right together. The women of the world have waited long enough. Don’t keep them waiting any longer.
Liz Jones is the well known columnist whom I referenced in the opening segment of my last post. I thought I’d follow up with some links.

Captain Capitalism wrote a post not too far back naming Liz as one of what he calls The Dowd Crowd where he advises young women of the dangers of following the advice of women like her.

I stumbled on an article yesterday written by her ex husband titled How feminism destroyed real men. This is the man she complained about sitting in the warm car while she filled it up in cold weather. It was written during the brief time they were married, and what struck me was that when he isn’t praising her strong independentness he sounds remarkably like Roissy. He also points out that feminist women like Liz need over the top alphas like him:

I’m always telling my wife, the writer Liz Jones, to shut up. She gets into a prissy huff about it, but I know she respects me for not indulging her neuroticism. Long ago, I realised it is unhealthy for a man to embroil himself in arguments with women.

While men want an argument to make sense and have a rational conclusion, women solely want the argument itself: it’s a pressure valve for their emotions, and once they get started there is no stopping them.

... 

I deal with these elements of the female personality with impassive indifference. People might call me a sexist pig, but I am the opposite. I love women, and I love my wife because she is brilliant and incredibly strong.

... 

She is a warrior and she needs to be with someone who is a match for her. Knowing the limits of what I will deal with in a relationship, I maintain my self-respect and, accordingly, gain hers.

He also explains how he used his mastery of her in the bedroom to smooth things over after his last affair.

My last post wasn’t my first satirical one involving Liz Jones. You may also enjoy A post-marital spinster’s rationalization hamster in the final stages of exhaustion.

See also Vox Day’s take on my “dressing down” post here.
Why wouldn’t he take her call when she was drunk?

by Dalrock | February 26, 2013 | Link

A woman on Yahoo Answers asked yesterday why a guy she is interested in is acting so strangely. She was out drinking the other night and called him when she was very near to being blackout drunk. He told her not to call him when she was drunk, and wouldn’t answer her repeated drunken callback attempts. The next day he tried to contact her multiple times, but now she is ignoring his calls. She wants to know why a man would act this way.

Here is my answer:

———–

This is a classic case of not realizing what you want until you can’t have it. I can’t tell you the number of men who have contacted me in a panic after figuring out too late that their dream in life was to marry an alcoholic party girl. One man only realized his error after introducing a nice well mannered woman with self restraint to his mother; she took one look at her and pointed out that he wouldn’t want such a boring woman to raise his children! The problem for him of course is that by the time he accepted his mother’s words of wisdom all of the truly alcoholic girls were already married.

All you can do is accept that this is entirely his problem. Most men take a few years before they can truly appreciate a woman who is able to get blackout drunk. Just keep doing what you are doing, and good things are bound to happen.

Source(s):

I’m a happily married father who writes a popular blog on marriage.

———–

I intended this to hopefully jar her into reconsidering the path she is following. When I submitted it I thought the most likely response would be for her to withdraw the question (as ultimately happened to this one). I was surprised to see that she very quickly selected my response as the best answer, giving it a five star rating with the comment:

Hehe I loved your words, and agree with you on what you said. Many thanks

My best guess is that I was too subtle, but my wife is convinced that the woman knew I was calling her out and being called out by a man was exactly what the woman was craving.
Grannies gone wild!
by Dalrock | February 27, 2013 | Link

Key to the process of selling divorce is convincing women that their romantic prospects don’t really decline with age. We could easily cut the divorce rate in half if the reality opposing this ubiquitous myth was understood. However, outside the manosphere few are aware of the truth of women’s rapidly declining romantic prospects with age, and the media is eagerly selling a destructive fantasy to women.

The New York Post has a piece out titled Randy grands take over online realm – number of seniors playing the field more than doubles which feeds the popular misconception. While the AARP found that older men’s romantic prospects were far better than than those of older women, the NY Post gushes about elderly women as the jewel of the dating scene. They quote 68 year old Liz Defore, whom they describe as bragging about her “online dating frenzy”:

I have hundreds of men trying to hang out with me

Then they pile it on even thicker, giving a sense that Defore is experiencing an abundance of attractive offers and that she (and not older men) is in a position to be choosy:

The Southern California native joined a slew of dating sites last year after breaking up with her 48-year-old boy toy. Now she basks in male attention as more than 600 men have come running after her self-described girlish looks and youthful mind. Meanwhile, she happily scours profiles, finding herself hot metrosexuals who slather on moisturizer, manicure their fingernails and ball out at rock concerts.

“My man can’t act like a fart! I’d rather stick pins in my eyes,” says Defore.

After a brief note that STD rates among seniors have doubled, the Post returns to gushing about the wealth of dating prospects on offer to older women. We meet another 68 year old woman living up the single life:

“I went out on a date at least once a week. You know there are things that are fun in life, and that was fun for me!” gushes 68-year-old Judy Tatman of her escapades following her husband’s death.

If you read closely the spin of these two women’s dating experience becomes obvious. In one paragraph they are talking up Ms. Tatman’s abundant suitors:

Her online studs varied in shape, size, color and age. Some men as young as their thirties happily went after her. “They were younger than my son! But I’m a pretty chick,” she said.

Yet in the same piece they describe the men sending her pictures as “Shirtless, weathered men”. That her prospects as an older woman are terrible is spun as proof that older men are
pathetic and desperate:

| And I’m thinking, is this supposed to make me hot or something? |

Despite all the abundance of choices Ms. Tatman is supposed to have experienced, we learn at the end of the article that during the course of a year she only found three men attractive enough to have sex with. Ms. Defore, who was introduced as having hundreds of men after her and framed as in a position to be choosy, hasn’t been contacted by any men she didn’t find repulsive:

| Ew, yuck! They look too old. Or they don’t have teeth. They’re yahoos with baseball caps! |

**See Also:** Dalrock’s Law
In the discussion of Grannies gone wild! newly arrived worker ant Just Asking noticed that something was amiss with the anthill and immediately set about rebuilding it:

Why do you people spend so much of your life discussing things that really have no bearing on your life. If sexy grandma wants to hookup with sexy grandpa for a little action, so what. Let them have their fun. Or are you really that desperate to find something/anything to complain about and yet another thing to blame it all on women. Gee whiz people have you nothing to worry about but what other people are doing.

Fellow colony member T eventually recognized a kindred spirit and started rebuilding as well:

I agree with you. But the manosphere enjoys insulting women, and granny’s wrinkled up lady bits are an easy target.

The OP of course had nothing to do with insulting women or granny’s aging lady bits, but if you are a worker ant you have to do the best you can.

The point of the post was how the media sells the fantasy to women that their romantic prospects somehow don’t decline dramatically with age. In this case the media pulled out all of the stops in an effort to claim that this was true even for 68 year old grandmothers, but the most important impact is actually on 30 something and middle aged women. The media of course also targets this fantasy directly at these younger (but not young) women, as I’ve demonstrated with Eat Pray Love, How Stella Got Her Groove Back, Lorraine Berry, and Single in the Suburbs. But selling this fantasy for the oldest women gives comfort to aspiring divorcées of all ages. If granny still has it all going on, surely their own nagging fears about reentering the dating market are entirely unfounded.

All of this constant reassurance from the media is very effective, even though the message is preposterous. It is absurdly easy to see through these fantasies but the target audience wants to believe. They don’t want to know the truth behind these stories, as CL recently described:

my brother sent some woman (a university student) he’s talking to Dalrock’s post on Eat Pray Cats and How Stella Got Her Groove Back, and this woman said she felt “deflated” after reading it. LOL

It is important to remember that this deflation isn’t an act of cruelty; it is in fact an act of kindness. It is an act of kindness to the children who would otherwise have their father ejected so their mother can collect 30 pieces of silver. It is also an act of kindness to the woman herself. It can only help her to understand that if she decides to blow up her family for profit she can’t actually expect to be magically rewarded with a better man. She needs to know that in real life the best men aren’t pining for a treacherous, aging woman with another
man’s children and a track record of not keeping her most sacred of commitments. The best men have the best options, and none of these markers is a positive thing in the eyes of men with options.

Being honest with her upfront will spare her decades of regular Where have all of the good men gone? conversations. One problem with treachery is it makes for very little sympathy. The same women who egged her on to divorce in the first place will never let her forget how foolish she was for divorcing such a good man, and the children she put through the meat grinder aren’t going to have much patience for her complaining about the results of her obvious foolishness either.

While the point of the original post was the catastrophic fantasy being sold to women, there is also a valid point to make regarding the unseemliness of our elderly talking and acting in such an undignified manner. Commenter gdgm+ linked to an excellent article by Kay Hymowitz titled Desperate Grandmas, which covers both the true outcomes for those who sold the culture “feminist wisdom” and the gross indignity of their continued attempts to deny reality.

See also: Why do you care?
The morality of marriage 2.0

by Dalrock | March 5, 2013 | Link

I commit to you! Now I commit to you! Now I commit to you!

"Clue" on Yahoo Answers asks: Is it considered cheating if I divorce my husband to date another man?

I met a man 5 months ago and we are good friends, nothing sexual, I do not allow this to happen b/c I am married but I have been falling in love with him and since I don’t want to have extramarital sex I am thinking about divorcing my husband. Would this be cheating? And would it be cheating if I finally have sex with this other man 1 day before my divorce is final for example? Isn’t this just a convention?

This is an excellent question, and something which many are likely wrestling with. In the past marriage was for life and this left serial monogamists in a moral bind. However, now the rules have changed. Under the new definition of marriage so long as she waits until it is “official” she is fully within the letter and spirit of marriage to jump to another man. Those who are moral sticklers would of course insist that she marry this new man before having sex with him, and when she is ready for the next man after that divorce husband number two and then marry husband number three, etc.

The above however only represents the modern secular/legal perspective. We should also consider the modern Christian perspective. Here the rules are fundamentally the same, but you need to work up a biblical cause if you are a Protestant or declare that the marriage never occurred if you are a Catholic.
Sheila Gregoire explained the Protestant view in a comment responding to my post *Promiscuity is good, so long as it is on the woman’s terms.*

And so in the movie Fireproof, she was in a relationship where divorce was permitted, and she was planning on divorcing, and planning on remarrying. Thus, I wouldn’t say that’s whorish. He’s the one who cheated.

I’m just uncomfortable with you saying that Christians are allowing people to “whore” around because we’re permitting divorce, when I don’t think that’s the case. I believe there are very narrow grounds for divorce: abuse, affairs, and in some cases, addictions.

Protestant aficionados of serial monogamy may initially be disheartened by Sheila’s apparent strictness in what constitutes biblical grounds for divorce. However, there is no need to be concerned. Nearly everything is now considered abuse, and in the case in question Sheila was explaining that the husband viewing pornography was adultery. The key thing for Protestant serial monogamists who want to avoid the sins of fornication and adultery is to legally marry first and then gin up suitable pretext for divorce when you are ready for the next “commitment”. Otherwise the same strict moral rules which apply to marriage 2.0 are in effect.

Catholic serial monogamists would seem to be in a tighter bind here, since the RCC position on divorce is that it is never allowed. Civil divorce is allowed in some situations, but this doesn’t release Catholic serial monogamists to jump to the next stone in the path via remarriage. However, Catholic lawyers have discovered that perhaps as often as 90% of the time people who *thought* they got married really didn’t. This is especially common for Catholics thinking they were married in the US, because roughly 80% of RCC annulments are *granted in the US*, which accounts for only roughly 5% of Catholics worldwide. In these cases remarriage is permitted, and this is so common that one Catholic priest advises couples who fear they divorced in sin to go through the annulment process as a form of healing.

So many people misunderstand the Church’s teaching of divorce, annulments and remarriage. I encouraged those in the congregation to speak to me or another priest about getting an annulment to help move on with their lives. I’ve heard of so many people staying away from the Eucharist because they are divorced and as a result cannot receive communion. NO! Divorce in and of itself is not a sin, is not a reason to stay away from the Eucharist. Being remarried outside of the Church would be a reason one should not receive Holy Communion. The Church recognizes the difficulty that so many people have when it comes to this area of life. She stands ready to assist those who are in pain.

This just leaves the question of all of the sex which occurred after your wedding and before your divorce when you weren’t actually married. You may be concerned that this sex outside of marriage was fornication. However, you are covered here as well. Since you mistakenly thought you were married it turns out all of that unmarried sex wasn’t fornication.

I’m not the final authority on finding the appropriate moral rationalizations for serial monogamy, but hopefully this post has helped my readers start thinking about the *right* way
to engage in serial monogamy. As always, consult your local divorce attorney/pastor/priest for guidance on the proper way to engage in serial monogamy to make sure you aren’t accidentally doing something immoral.

Woman on stepping stones pic [licensed as creative commons by Steve-h].
One of the Dallas/Fort Worth megachurches has a web page called The Man Site. They offer what they call mansources:

**Be a Better Man**

Looking for some resources to help you “step up” and build a better home? We’ve got you covered!

They make a classic feint to biblical headship while quickly reminding readers that “all are equal”:

Lake Pointe Men’s ministry will encourage men to be servant leaders in their homes - recognizing that, in Christ, all are equal, and all should be loved. We have events like Man Church that will teach men how to love God with all their heart, soul, mind and strength. View some of our “ManSources” to supply you with resources about real issues. Have questions or real manly needs? Contact us...we can help.

One of their featured mansource speakers is Sam Ingrassia. I haven’t heard the content, but from the description Mr. Ingrassia talks about his book *Just Say the Word*, a book to help husbands lead their wives in prayer. I was curious how Mr. Ingrassia handled the topic so I took a quick look at the introduction to the book in Amazon.com. There isn't much available there, but the introduction bemoans the fact that modern Christian men “are failing to provide spiritual leadership to their wives”. While this is undoubtedly true, there is no mention of the fact that modern Christian women are as feminist as any other group of women. Modern Christian men don’t lead their wives because Christian leaders are terrified of mentioning the parts of the Bible which offend feminists, which is pretty much all of the NT regarding women and marriage. Men are failing, but their primary failure is to confront the mass feminist rebellion, a failure which at least from what I can see Mr. Ingrassia himself is guilty of. To be fair to Mr. Ingrassia, I can’t imagine him being invited to come speak to *Man Church* if he stressed the biblical framing of marriage in violation of the Book of Oprah.

This failure is front and center in the very first endorsement in the book:

Sam Ingrassia is on to something. For years I struggled when it came to praying with my wife. Why? Because she is light years ahead of me when it comes to getting in touch with God. And I’m a pastor! It seems that we men need help, and we need a plan...

*See Also:* Cutting leaders off at the knees.
This won’t end well.
by Dalrock | March 12, 2013 | Link

The Atlantic has a piece out by Leslie C. Bell titled Women in Their 20s Shouldn’t Feel Bad About Wanting a Boyfriend (H/T Free Northerner). Ms. Bell takes issue with Hanna Rosin’s assertion in Boys on the Side that young women are entirely satisfied with the hookup culture. Interestingly both Bell and Rosin agree that hookup culture is being driven by the choices of women, they just disagree on how comfortable young women are with the results. As is typical for this kind of article, neither offers any actual statistics to back up their assertions.

Given the lack of data it isn’t possible to state for certain what is going on here, but my personal guess is that both are right to a degree. Given the Sexual Market Place (SMP) power position young women hold they are the ones in the position to demand hookups, “relationships”, or marriage. Since hookups are the order of the day it is clear that this is what young women are demanding. As to the point of contention, my own sense is that early 20s women are by and large quite happy with the hookup culture while late 20s women are increasingly uncomfortable with it. Either way, those young women who are uncomfortable enough with the hookup culture always have the option of electing for something different. It isn’t until their mid to late 30s that they will find that men are now the ones in a position to set the frame of the SMP.

What neither author noticed is that young women are comfortable with hookups because they assume that LTRs and ultimately marriage will be theirs for the taking once they tire of hookups. Flings/hookups are fun, and even (feel) empowering when a woman is young and in the SMP power position; each new encounter is further proof that she holds the veto power over men. However, when the men are the ones doing the vetoing empowerment turns into a never ending round of rejection. Instead of having men pursue her she finds herself being passed around, if not passed over.

Ms. Bell quotes a woman named Katie who at 25 is right on the dividing line between early and late 20s. Katie is torn between her desire to demonstrate girlpower and her fear of ending up alone; she worries that her focus on higher education and career will ultimately limit her romantic prospects:

- She felt deeply ashamed by such thoughts, worried that they signaled weakness and dependence, qualities she did not admire. To put such a high premium on relationships was frightening to Katie. She worried that it meant she wasn’t liberated and was still defined by traditional expectations of women.

Part of the problem is the message parents are sending to their daughters:

- Many feel ashamed about being too relationship-oriented in their 20s. Parents warn, “Do you really want to settle down so early?

What neither the young women nor their parents are taking into consideration is that young
women who decided to ride the carousel in their 20s are already starting to have great difficulty finding a husband when the time comes. What young women are doing by voting with their sexual power for hookups and flings over LTRs and marriage is changing the way men are approaching sex and relationships. When they finally are ready for LTRs and marriage they are finding that the prospective husbands they expected to be in a holding pattern for over a decade are hard to come by.

Men in their early 20s are observing that marriage and girlfriends aren’t in the cards, and this reduces their incentive to work hard to demonstrate provider status. Their female peers are too busy hooking up with cads while misguidedly trying to signal their own provider status. In short, the grooming process for grooms is vanishing.

Eventually the reality that an entire generation of women can’t devote their most attractive years to casual sex and then marry in their very late 20s or 30s will sink in. Not all women will find this impossible, but it is highly unlikely they will be able to marry at the rates they are expecting. This sense of certainty is what kicked off the entire process, so once reality fully sinks in we will start to see women in their 20s react to this latest round in the sexual revolution.
A wife’s best defense against a troublesome mother-in-law.

by Dalrock | March 13, 2013 | Link

Not all mother-in-laws are troublesome, but when they are troublesome they are a great source of frustration for wives. Most wives who face this problem try to solve it by putting pressure on their husband to intervene. Wives can bring a great deal of pressure to bear on their husbands in the form of denial of sex and threatened divorce, but in this case their go-to solution is shockingly ineffective.

Ironically the reason wives find themselves powerless against their mother-in-laws is their having taken on the power position in the marriage. Once they did this they created a de facto matriarchy. As the more senior member of the clan the mother-in-law outranks the wife. Putting pressure on the husband doesn’t work in this situation because the husband isn’t acting as the leader and protector of his household; he is trying to placate two women who are effectively in positions of authority over him. The mother-in-law will sense this even if she couldn’t articulate it. When her son requests that she change her behavior the mother-in-law sees him for what he is; he is a messenger from the wife, whom the mother-in-law outranks.

The solution is simple; the wife needs to relinquish the position of head of household and cede that position to her husband. This means she needs to abandon her tools of manipulation over her husband, not ratchet them up. This will take some time and effort, and there are simple steps a wife can take to encourage her husband to start taking on the role of leader and protector.

The solution isn’t foolproof, but it is extremely effective. Nearly all men are highly protective of those they lead, and if they see themselves as head of the household they will start to naturally see themselves as their wife’s protector. The mother-in-law will also sense the change, and since the husband is now acting under his own natural authority she will take him seriously in a way she never did with the wife or when she saw him as the wife’s ambassador.

My wife has given this advice to married women in her circle, and while most were aghast at the idea of allowing their husband to lead the ones who followed the advice were amazed at the results. In many cases the mother-in-law not only ultimately settled down, but became downright pleasant to the daughter-in-law. In one case the formerly at odds mother-in-law and daughter-in-law now actually enjoy each other’s company so much they regularly go shopping and to lunch together.

Patriarchy or matriarchy: take your pick.
I pointed out in *Light years closer to God* that Christian men are failing women, and the primary failure is their unwillingness to confront the mass feminist rebellion. As a man calling out other men is easy. It *feels* brave, like you are owning up to your own failures and holding yourself accountable. Calling out women on the other hand is extremely difficult. It (on the surface) goes against our instinct to protect women, and it makes you *feel* like a bully. Plus, when you call out men they tend to own up to what you are calling them out on. When you call out *women* you are off for a day at the races.

The vast majority of modern Christian men are guilty of acting like cowards in order to *feel* like heroes. Because of their cowardice and slavish devotion to their own feelings they are causing great harm to women and children.

This profound failure by Christian men is most evident when approaching the topic of now rampant single motherhood and how it has come to pass. If you listen to Christian leaders you will be told that single mothers themselves aren’t at fault. In a *radio interview* Glenn Stanton was moved by the heroism of single mothers and explained:

> ...look around within your community, your church body, and you see young boys being raised and dad gone because of his death or because of his desertion or because of a divorce or maybe he just never was on the scene...

Notice that in Stanton’s mind single motherhood is either the fault of men or *it just happens*. This is due to Mr. Stanton’s astonishingly unbiblical view of women:

> ...women left to themselves will develop into good women, more responsible women, just naturally...

The page featuring the Stanton quote immediately above appears to have been recently *scrubbed* from the *Boundless* website, but you can see an archived version of the page on
Even more difficult to scrub will be all of the hard copies of Mr. Stanton’s book on parenting where he made the same basic assertion. In that same book Mr. Stanton explains the recent explosion in out of wedlock births:

Women want to marry and have daddies for their babies. But if they can’t find good men to commit themselves to, well... Our most pressing social problem today is a man deficit.

Keep in mind that this isn’t Stanton talking out of turn on a subject he hasn’t studied. Stanton is the Director on the subject for Focus on the Family.

Mr. Stanton isn’t alone. This narrative that men are solely responsible for out of wedlock births is pervasive amongst modern Christian leaders. The Kendrick brothers expressed this view in their much celebrated movie Courageous, including in the final rousing “I Will!” speech. Pastor Driscoll makes the same argument in Relevant Magazine (emphasis mine):

...if you’re a single gal hoping to get married someday. You’re like: “Seriously, that’s the candidate pool? You’ve got to be kidding me.” That’s why 41 percent of births right now are to unmarried women. A lot of women have decided: “I’m never going to find a guy who is actually dependable and responsible to have a life with. So I’ll just get a career and have a baby and just intentionally be a single mother because there are no guys worth spending life with.”

I’ve shared all of this before, but the insanity of the modern Christian position on out of wedlock births is so great that it is tempting to forget just how incredibly foolish it is. It is difficult to process the fact that our leaders are so eager to excuse the rampant sinful and catastrophic choices women are making, choices which have lead us to a state where over forty percent of children are now born out of wedlock.

Except for the minuscule fraction of out of wedlock births due to rape, every single out of wedlock birth represents a case where a woman chose to bear a child by a man who wasn’t interested in marrying her or a man she wasn’t interested in marrying. We also know that the choice of unfit fathers isn’t random. This is exactly the kind of man women who are thinking with their genitals will choose. Yet Christian men, especially Christian leaders, can’t bring themselves to call out this pervasive sin which is harming countless millions of children. In fact, when an actress and single mother wrote a book touting the benefits of fatherless children The 700 Club not only failed to call her out for her own sin and encouragement to other women to sin, they plugged the book.
But the out of wedlock birth machine isn’t the only factory cranking out fatherless children, as the chart above makes clear. Out of wedlock births are the largest single category of fatherless children, but divorce accounts for 30% of them. What is often a prelude to divorce, separation, accounts for another 15%. We know in the case of divorce that women overwhelmingly are the initiators, and they are motivated by the opportunity to steal the most valuable asset of the marriage, the children.

Yet Christian men and Christian leaders can’t bring themselves to criticize women for the rampant and very open flaunting of biblical teaching on marriage and sexual morality by women. This cowardly silence is not only sinful but immensely harmful to men, women, and children. Men who remain silent on this are choosing the suffering of millions of children over their own discomfort. They are also gravely harming women by assisting them in avoiding repentance in their cowardly feelings-driven silence.

As a result of the silence by Christian men, Christian single mothers routinely engage in a game of make believe where their own sin and that of millions of women like them never really happened. Commenter Kaehu recently pointed out one such woman named Jennifer Maggio. Ms. Maggio runs a “ministry” on the topic of single motherhood:

Jennifer Maggio is considered a leading authority on single parents and womens issues. She is an award-winning author and speaker who draws from her own experiences through abuse, homelessness, and teen pregnancy to inspire audiences everywhere. She is founder of The Life of a Single Mom Ministries and writes for dozens of publications. She has been featured with hundreds of media outlets, including The 700 Club, Daystar Television, Moody Radio, Focus on the Family, and many more. For more information, visit thelifeofasinglemom.com.

Ms. Maggio herself had multiple children out of wedlock, as her about page describes:
At 19, Maggio found herself pregnant for the fourth time, living in government housing on food stamps and welfare.

Note that she doesn’t discuss her own sin from a frame of repentance, but a frame of denial. It just happened; she found herself pregnant. She is even more duplicitous in how she frames this in her article Single Moms and the Church:

As her body crumbles to the floor, she can hardly believe what she is hearing. Her husband wants a divorce. No, not me. Not us. I’ve done everything right. I’ve tried. I really have. A million thoughts rush through her mind as the reality that her world will no longer be the same comes crashing against her. She lies there, crying and helpless, wondering how she will survive financially, what her friends will thing, and how her children will survive without their father in their daily lives.

This is reality for more than 15 million women who find themselves parenting alone today in the United States...

Christian men and Christian leaders: It is time to man up, put your fear and feelings aside, and confront the feminist rebellion which is devastating men, women and children. I know you are afraid, but you can’t let your fear continue to rule you!
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Haunted by a number
by Dalrock | March 20, 2013 | Link

*The Frisky* has a piece up where the author complains about slutshaming *herself* titled: *I Lied To My Gynecologist About My Number Of Sexual Partners.*

I didn’t think I was ashamed of the number of sexual partners I’ve had in the 20 years I’ve been getting it on until I found myself filling in a number half the true total at a recent gynecologist appointment.

Since she is proud of her sexual liberation, the discomfort she felt at the actual number is baffling to her:

Even if I never had to say it out loud and its size was simply one more piece of data for her to use in evaluating me, something about it made me erase what I’d typed in the online form and halve it...

The incident shook me up; I consider myself an advocate for sexual freedom and would never want to judge anyone for their number of partners, yet I did it to myself.

Her hamster runs throughout the piece trying to rationalize why she isn’t ashamed of her sexual past when she remembers it but the *number itself* is something she is uncomfortable with.

When I actually recall the collected sexual experiences and lovers I’ve had, I’m not actually ashamed...

Still, there’s something about my number that feels off to me, like a dress that once fit perfectly that now I can’t squeeze into no matter how much contorting I do.

She ends the piece declaring that she now is fully comfortable with her number, and just to show how comfortable she is with it she takes the bold step of not disclosing it:

I deliberately haven’t listed my number here, not because I’m ashamed, but because it’s not the point. My number could be two and I could feel bad about it, or 2,000 and I could be proud of it; it’s all a matter of perspective.

Yet her number is *exactly* the point, or else there wouldn’t be an article. The reason for this is the mental game she is playing with the word *slut*. This is the same mental game the women of the slutwalks are playing. They have “owned” the aspect of the word which connotes “sexually available”, and with a bit of expert hamsterizing “sexy”. But this isn’t the full meaning of the term. Slut doesn’t just connote a sexually available woman, it connotes a *broken* woman, a woman who can’t bond. This is why she can fondly recall her sexual past but the number itself is so jarring.

When she was young she faced what seemed like an ocean of romantic prospects. Now her
number represents a mountain of romantic failures. Because of this she makes it a point to assure us and herself that she is capable of remaining with one man, even while she is careful not to suggest that hopping from man to man is a bad thing (this is still the *Frisky*, after all):

The number represents who I used to be, but is at odds with my current staid life. For the past year, the only person I’ve slept with is my boyfriend, and even before that, I was much more considered and careful than I’d been in my twenties and early thirties. I’d come to a place where I wanted sex to be about more than just sexual pleasure. Please note that I’m not saying sex for pleasure’s sake is wrong in any way—it’s wonderful! What I mean is that I didn’t want to have even the most mindblowing, earth-shattering sex with someone who’d lock me out of their life the next day. That tradeoff was no longer worth it.

As I mentioned in *This won’t end well* jumping from man to man feels empowering for a young woman, but when she is older it takes on a very different feeling. Instead of proof of sexual power, it becomes proof of sexual *powerlessness*. As irrational as it is, the fantasy for promiscuous women is that all of their tramping around will ultimately lead to hitting the relationship jackpot. This is why *Sex and the City* had to end with Carrie marrying Mr. Big, why *Single in the Suburbs* had to end with a proposal from a secret multimillionaire hunky handyman, and why the sequel to *Eat Pray Love* had to be *Committed*.

The problem for sluts on a path to marital bliss is empowerment turns to brokenness far more quickly than they could ever imagine. Having her pick of men very quickly turns into “she can’t keep a man”, even by the most open minded. Back in December the *Stir* came to Taylor Swift’s defense after someone tweeted:

Dear @taylorswift13, please stop whoring around with every guy you see. We all know you’re only doing it so you can make another album.

The article indignantly reminded women that they need to show slutty solidarity, but the readers couldn’t get past the obvious. The very first comment by “kelticmom” laid it out:

As much as I like her.....if the shoe fits......how many men has she been with???? I can name 8 off the top of my head. The girl just can’t be single.

Even though this is a slut friendly site, several other readers quickly weighed in with agreement:

Also agree with keltic. I’m definitely starting to think that SHE is the problem in her relationships, not the guys.

And:

I don’t know if its all publicity or what, but she does have a lot of boyfriends...all the time. Girl needs to slow down a little bit. Can’t really fault people for saying that she dates too much.
Red pill bitterness
by Dalrock | March 23, 2013 | Link

Several readers have asked me to elaborate on a point I made in Backlash against the Christian Manosphere regarding “the red pill” and empathy for women. See the previous post for full context, but my point was regarding this post by Samson’s Jawbone where he wrote:

Roissy is fond of saying that he’s not a “misogynist”; no, learning the unvarnished truth about female psychology has given him a *higher* appreciation for women. Not so for me. Sociosexual philosophy has disillusioned me beyond all reckoning. Peering deep into the psyche of woman has rendered me grievously scornful in feeling and mercifully unscrupulous in behaviour towards these unholy, ungodly beings. I venture to say that... I hate them. Yes, I hate them! And how could I not?

Samson wrote that two years ago, and at the end of December 2012 he left this comment on my site:

I do actually agree that over-immersion in the manosphere makes one cynical and removes some of the romance from life, forever. Whether this outweighs the benefits of learning the truth is unclear, but I think it’s more important than I used to. I often wish I had my innocence back.

As I mentioned in Backlash, understanding women better has only increased my empathy for them. This is true even though I’m willing to call out bad behavior by women. In fact, failing to confront bad behavior by women is the primary way Christian men are failing women today.

My increased empathy for and understanding of women has helped me when composing advice for women both here on the blog and on Yahoo Answers. I haven’t done a formal count, but I believe I’ve offered more advice on both the blog and Answers to women than to men. My willingness to offer honest and (hopefully) helpful advice to women has at times frustrated my readers. In June of last year I offered advice to unmarried women on how to avoid the marriage crunch so many of their sisters are already experiencing. Commenter Nas asked:

You know this one thing really bugs me about many in the manosphere, the desire and need to give females advice. What team are you playing for anyway?!

I asked Nas what about my post made him angry; that I was giving women good advice, or that they won’t take it? He responded:

– Both but especially the latter.

But Samson’s issue was far deeper. Understanding women left him with at worst an intense hatred for women, and at best a greatly reduced ability to feel love for women. The first is an overreaction to starting from a position of overlooking all sins committed by women. If you
nurtured a fantasy that women are innately good then seeing their sins for the first time is bound to be jarring. This is especially true given that the widespread pass given to women has encouraged an immense amount of bad behavior. If you are struggling with this be careful not to paint all women with the same brush, and to understand the pass which modern men have offered women for what it really is, cruelty dressed as kindness.

This doesn't mean there is no place for anger at injustice, but to keep the larger picture in perspective. This means not seeing “woman” as a faceless collective, but making a serious effort to see individual women for who they are. The “red pill” helps us understand their different temptations from ours, but understanding this should help us empathize and relate to our own imperfection. Key to this process is keeping in mind the importance of repentance. One of the most powerful biblical examples of sin and repentance (for me) is the scene in Matthew where the rooster crows and Peter suddenly realizes he has betrayed Christ exactly as Christ had predicted. Overwhelmed with this sudden recognition, Peter wept bitterly*

My advice in this area is to first consider your own failures, those you have truly repented from. With this in mind try taking the knowledge you have learned in the manosphere and apply it trying to help one individual woman at a time. Part of what you should have learned is how women are likely to react to your message, so you can tune it for maximum likely effectiveness. This requires putting yourself in her shoes as much as possible, and this is at the core of empathy. There is of course no guarantee that she will accept your good advice, no matter how expertly framed and communicated. However, if you are doing this well you should see that a good percentage of women are surprisingly willing to hear advice which goes entirely against the grain of our culture. As you do this you will start to see just how profoundly unhappy very large numbers of women are with the status quo.

The second problem with Samson’s reaction to learning the truth about women is his stated difficulty loving women. He says knowing the truth has left him cynical and removed some of the romance from life, forever. But what he longs to recover is something he never really had. He was in love with a fantasy, something which wasn’t real. If you can’t love a woman after understanding the truth, you never really loved her. Ironically the common complaint by men bitter about the red pill is that they can’t accept the fact that women aren’t attracted to “their real self”. There is a bit of fantasy-demolishing truth here, but it also overlooks something critical; it is in men’s natures to be leaders, to strive for dominance. Being a whimpering emoting wife-following beta shouldn’t be your natural state, your “real self”. If it is, then this is your real problem, not learning the truth about the problem. Note that I’m not saying beta is bad, but there are both negative and positive aspects to beta. Learning that the more craven side of beta turns women off shouldn’t disabuse you from retaining the more noble side. But to do this you need to take a hard honest look at who you are. If you are feeling bitter, this is almost certainly coming from the ignoble side of beta.

Also keep in mind that if you truly love your wife you will want to understand how to make her feel loved. If you are selfishly hung up on retaining a childish fantasy about women, you can’t understand her well enough to understand what she craves from you. That she is much more likely to be craving decisive leadership from you than fawning footrubs shouldn’t be a problem unless you are in a very unhealthy mental place as a man.
*See also this scene in John where Christ confronts Peter.
Did the last decade prove that gay marriage isn’t really a problem?
by Dalrock | March 27, 2013 | Link

Ross Douthat with the New York Times notes that David Frum has changed his position on gay marriage after concluding:

If people like me had been right, we should have seen the American family become radically more unstable over the subsequent decade and a half.

...

By the numbers, in fact, the 2000s were the least bad decade for American family stability since the fabled 1950s.

Douthat isn’t convinced, and today wrote a post asking What Was the Family’s “Least Bad Decade”? In his post he points out several problems with Frum’s assertions, including a link to my post back in July of last year where I pointed out that the previously accepted decline in divorce rates was brought into question by newer more complete data from the American Community Survey (ACS). Since then The Marriage Project has also adopted the ACS data.

See Douthat’s full post on the NY Times website using the link above. I left a comment there but at the moment it is in moderation:

——— Comment ————

Thank you for the link. I don’t know if you noticed but The Marriage Project did end up using the ACS divorce rate data in their latest report (fig 5, P70). Since they use collated state data (with missing states) for previous years it makes it appear that divorce rates went up between 2000 and 2011. However, I’m not sure we can really infer that since as the note below the chart points out the two data sources aren’t compatible.

Either way, out of wedlock birth rates steadily climbed during the last decade (see Fig 1 NCHS Data Brief No. 18 May 2009). Similarly, “ever married” rates dropped dramatically for women in their 20s and 30s. It is hard to tell if this is an overall decline in marriage rates, or simply a postponement of marriage (cutting child bearing years very close). My own interpretation of the data is that women are intending to postpone marriage to their 30s but are finding it very difficult to marry once they get there. I went through this data in my post: https://dalrock.wordpress.com/2012/11/24/more-grim-news-for-carousellers-hoping-to-jump-at-the-last-minute/
Why aren’t men responding to economic signals?
by Dalrock | March 29, 2013 | Link

I think the greatest, most astonishing fact that I am aware of in social science right now is that women have been able to hear the labor market screaming out ‘You need more education’ and have been able to respond to that, and men have not, and it’s very, very scary for economists because people should be responding to price signals. And men are not. It’s a fact in need of an explanation.

— Michael Greenstone, M.I.T. economics professor

Social scientists are obsessed with the “gender wage gap”; for decades they were distraught that the gap existed at all. Now large numbers are alarmed that the gap is shrinking. The quote above fits with the more recent concern, and is central to the New York Times business section article Study of Men’s Falling Income Cites Single Parents, as well as an opinion piece by David Frum at CNN titled Straight marriage is the real issue (H/T Rollo).

While I’m not a professor of economics from MIT, I do have a real degree in economics and an honorary PhD in red pill pharmacy. Putting those two together allows me to explain what so frightens the good professor and the journalists quoting him. To start with, they very much should be frightened by the shrinking wage gap, but not because men are ignoring market signals or are somehow unfit for the modern economy. In fact, the problem is that men are slowly but surely starting to respond to market signals stemming from our radical overhaul of the family structure in recent decades.

Not too many decades ago the US and the rest of the western world had marriage as the central organizing philosophy for family structure. This was a structure which created an incentive for men to produce more than they required for their own consumption and encouraged them to take on the responsibility of a family. This system not only benefited children, but men and women as well. Women benefited from the protection and resources husbands provided to them and the children they bore. Men were provided the only socially and morally sanctioned access to sex as well as the prestige and satisfaction which came from leading a family. Society as a whole benefited because children had the advantages of growing up in an intact home and men were willing to work extremely hard to produce the required surplus.

Through a combination of legal and social “reforms”, the US now has what appears on the surface to be a dual family structure but is in legal reality a single family structure organized around the concept of child support. Where in the past a woman needed to secure a formal promise from a man in the form of marriage before she could expect him to support her and the children she bore, in this new structure the law declares that any man she has children by are bound to support her and her children whether she marries or not, and whether or not she honors her own marriage vows.

While men were motivated under the old family structure, they absolutely detest the new child support system of family formation. Under the old system a man who married before
fathering children could reasonably expect access to his children and the opportunity to
direct their upbringing (in concert with his wife). Under the new system the children are de
facto considered the property of the mother, whom the state compels him to pay so she can
direct their upbringing generally as she sees fit. Since the new system has removed the
incentive for men to work hard to provide for their families, it has to rely instead on threats of
imprisonment to coerce men into earning “enough” income. Where men used to take pride in
the birth of their children and celebrate with cigars, large numbers of men now fear
fatherhood more than anything.

Under the new rules even if a man chooses the structure of marriage he is always subject to
being forced into the child support model for any or no reason by his wife. No fault divorce
laws are unilateral and openly celebrated by both social scientists and modern Christianity as
a tool for wives to threaten their husbands. Fathers have gone from being the respected head
of household to deputy parent serving at the pleasure of their wives.

Fortunately for society awareness of the reality of the new system has been slow to spread.
Most men are either uninformed about the true nature of the family court or assume that the
woman they marry would never detonate their family for 30 pieces of silver. Because of
inertia men continue to earn more than women, and those who have studied the question
(Hymowitz, Farrell) have found that this is due to men choosing to work harder, longer,
and/or more difficult and dangerous jobs than women. While the MIT economist is correct
that men earn fewer degrees than women, those men who do earn degrees are far more
likely than women to choose majors with real economic value. However, the gender earnings
gap is still shrinking, and this has the author of the NY Times business article both puzzled
and worried:

The fall of men in the workplace is widely regarded by economists as one of the
nation’s most important and puzzling trends. While men, on average, still earn more
than women, the gap between them has narrowed considerably, particularly among
more recent entrants to the labor force.

He should be worried, but he shouldn’t be puzzled. The hard earned lesson of the twentieth
century was that incentives work far better than coercion when it comes to generating
economic value. Yet despite winning the cold war the US and the western world has quietly
elected to move from an incentives based family/economic structure (marriage) to one based
on coercion (child support).

Nearly all observers however are misunderstanding the cause/effect relationships here. In his
otherwise excellent recent NY Times piece Late Marriage and Its Consequences, Ross Douthat
makes the classic error of confusing the added responsibility men take on when they marry
for a benefit, instead of a cost they bear in exchange for leading a family:

Men, meanwhile, reap a wage premium from marrying earlier, so late marriage
tends to hurt their economic prospects

Similarly, the NY Times business piece and Frum’s piece at CNN both note that men’s
shrinking relative economic output is occurring at the same time the majority of young
mothers are skipping the time honored wedding/birth/divorce process and deliberately
choosing to have their children out of wedlock. As we’ve seen with Christian leaders like Stanton and Driscoll, the standard narrative is that women are being forced to choose the child support model by men who are unworthy of marriage. The NY Times business piece explains:

Men who are less successful are less attractive as partners, so some women are choosing to raise children by themselves, in turn often producing sons who are less successful and attractive as partners.

Frum echoes this sentiment with:

As men (on average) finish less education, as male wages (on average) decline, men become less attractive as marital partners.

Dr. W. Bradford Wilcox of The Marriage Project doesn’t make this mistake in a similar article he wrote recently for Slate, but he agrees that the explosion in out of wedlock births is due to deliberate choices by women:

Melissa, a 31-year-old single mother, had this to say about why she has never married any of her boyfriends: “I just never felt that anyone’s as loyal to me as I am to them,” she said. “Even when I feel like I’m in a good relationship, there’ll be little things that they’ll do that will make me start wondering, ‘Do they really have my back?’ ”, according to the Love and Marriage in Middle America project, a study of Middle American relationships in a small town in Ohio. What’s striking about Melissa’s comment—which is all too representative—is that it’s not just the bad guys who give her pause about marriage; it’s also the good guys. She just seems to harbor a general suspicion about the possibility of lifelong love and the whole institution of marriage.

The long term danger here is obvious. The more women delay, avoid, and abuse marriage the less men will be willing to generate the surplus economic output our economy depends on. Instead of being the economic powerhouse of the west, men disenfranchised from fatherhood will more and more decide to enjoy the decline. This reduction in economic output will coincide with the massive increases in social costs caused by fatherless children and comes at a time when governments are already running out of options. If we want to stem this vicious cycle we will ultimately have no choice but to return to a marriage based family structure. Right now this is politically unthinkable, as both the left and the right are deeply invested in the child support model of family organization. However, the more we experience the true costs of this model the more the folly of this path will become undeniable. True hardship has a way of making the right choice suddenly clear, so it is still possible that we will ultimately return to a marriage based family structure. In the meantime social scientists will remain baffled and hundreds of millions of children will continue to suffer.

See Also: Debtors prisons are an essential tool of our new public policy.
How we came to embrace illegitimacy.

by Dalrock | April 4, 2013 | Link

Some time in the 60s and 70s something let the illegitimacy genie out of the bottle in the US. In the early 1960s we went from out of wedlock birth rates consistently under 5% to a dramatic upslope leading to our present rate in excess of 40%. You can see this in Figure 1 from NCHS Data Brief No. 18 May 2009, Changing Patterns of Nonmarital Childbearing in the United States:

![Figure 1: Number of births, birth rate, and percentage of births to unmarried women: United States, 1940-2007](source: CDC/NCHS, National Vital Statistics System)

It is difficult to separate legal verses social changes because each tends to greatly impact the other. However, Betsey Stevenson and Justin Wolfers offer some insight into the legal part of this dynamic in their paper Marriage and Divorce: Changes and their Driving Forces:

Supreme Court rulings in the 1960s and 1970s also changed the nature of family relationships by eliminating many of the legal distinctions stemming from the marital status of a child’s parents. In 1968, the Supreme Court ruling in Levy v. Louisiana (391 U.S. 68) granted equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment to “illegitimate” children. Five years later, the 1973 ruling in Gomez v. Perez (409 U.S. 535) overturned state laws exempting men from financial responsibility for “illegitimate” children. These rulings reduced both the social and economic cost to women of bearing a child out-of-wedlock, and thus may also help to explain the decline in shotgun marriages. This remains an under-researched topic in need of further scrutiny.

As they say, this is “under-researched”. More accurately this bit of history is outright denied. Try finding any reference to a legal distinction between legitimate and illegitimate children here, for just one example.
Similarly, neither *Levy v. Louisiana* nor *Gomez v. Perez* are referenced in the fairly lengthy history of child support included in the paper by Daniel L. Hatcher in *Wake Forest Law Review*, *Child Support Harming Children: Subordinating the Best Interests of Children to the Fiscal Interests of the State* (2007). This omission leaves the impression that the legal basis for compelling child support for illegitimate children was a settled issue in the US going back to at least the 1800s:

Along with the poor laws and criminal nonsupport laws, states enacted bastardy statutes aimed at forcing putative fathers to support their illegitimate children. The statutes were both criminal and civil in their focus and, like the nonsupport laws, their purposes were mixed. For example, a Maryland court explained that “[w]hile the prime object of the Maryland Bastardy Act is to protect the public from the burden of maintaining illegitimate children, it is so distinctly in the interest of the mother that she becomes the beneficiary of it.”

Yet clearly prior to the 1960s there were competing legal views on the degree to which mothers of illegitimate children had a “right” to compel the father to pay support.

Another massive change is the social acceptance of mothers who bear children out of wedlock. Even the name of the bastardy statutes indicates a profoundly different social view of illegitimacy than our current embrace. This vastly different social order comes through in one of the court cases Hatcher quotes in the same paper, the 1832 decision of the Court of Appeals of Kentucky in *Burgen v. Straughan* (emphasis mine):

[N]or can we perceive how it can be unlawful or immoral, or inconsistent with the policy of the law, for the mother of a bastard to agree with the father that, if he will co-operate in the maintainance [sic] of their child, she will not proceed under the bastardy act . . . . It should not be deemed injurious to the community or county. It is not the public duty of the mother of an illegitimate child to assert her statutory right. Her voluntary forbearance is no breach of any moral or civil obligation. Her child may become a burthen to her county; but this might happen, and would, perhaps, be more likely to occur, if such contracts as that we are now considering should be declared illegal and void. Many, in her condition, might prefer all the wretchedness of destitution and poverty, to a voluntary promulgation, in a county court, of all the circumstances necessary to coerce contributions under the bastardy act.

**See also:** *From Hawthorne to Povich*
Anonymous Reader suggested in the discussion of the last post that welfare law changes in the 1960s might have also played a role in encouraging illegitimacy:

Dalrock, it seems to me the most likely direct influence on illegitimate children would be the Great Society. I have been told by people who were around as adults in the mid 1960’s that before the LBJ political landslide, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) was available only to women who had been married. Widowed or abandoned or divorced, made no difference, but the claim made is that it was not available to women who had bastard children until after LBJ I cannot confirm this, so far am unable to determine the requirements for such aide prior to 1964-65.

...

So the question that ought to be investigated is this: did the rules for AFDC, public housing, and other mother-and-child protective aid change in the mid 1960’s?

With just a bit of google searching I found The Legal History of Aid to Dependent Children Program which corroborates what he had been told.

A provision in the law that authorized ADC assistance only to “suitable homes” functioned, in the program’s first three decades, to reduce the number of eligible children (in 1960 when 79 of every 1000 children were in need, only 30 received assistance) and, particularly, to inhibit coverage of “illegitimate” children and children of color. Local ADC policy frequently discontinued coverage during seasons when low-wage labor was short in fields or homes, thus forcing poor mothers into such labor.

For its first three decades, AFDC operated much like a private charity, with its case workers given discretion in investigating clients, cutting off benefits to those determined to be unsuitable, and reducing benefits to those found in violation of any of AFDC’s myriad regulations.

Radical agitators fought to establish welfare as a right:

The overarching objective entailed establishing a federal constitutional right to a minimum adequate income.

According to the paper, they were largely successful in this through a series of court rulings.

See also: The blurry line between the welfare state and child support
Another crack in the narrative

by Dalrock | April 11, 2013 | Link

NY Magazine’s The Cut has a new article out on a topic which is rapidly making the rounds: Meet the SWUGs of Yale: Women ‘Washed Up’ at 21

The striking feature image shows a coed with the tell-tale dead in the eyes look. According to the article, SWUG (Senior Washed Up Girl) is a new term which originated in Cornell and appeared at Yale in 2010. Yale student Greg Kelley defines the term as:

...a girl who has been through the meat grinder. A seasoned veteran who knows the ropes.

Ouch.

However, even with a dead in the eyes look, at 21 a reasonably fit young woman is still going to pull a great deal of sexual attention. Only on a rare and closed social scene is a 21 year old woman too old and jaded to attract the attention of men, as the article points out:

Of course, the SWUGs aren’t actually washed up. Three months from now, they will be the bright-eyed newcomers in New York or Los Angeles, the 22-year-olds dancing on banquettes in nightclubs, who still drink too much and still flirt with boys. They’ll go from envying freshmen girls to being the envy of older women.

The real challenge for these women is the way their male peers are starting to see them, and thinking of them dancing on banquettes in nightclubs doesn’t help. This is just another crack in a slowly crumbling narrative. This is especially risky for UMC women because their marriage prospects are limited. While I would bet that the vast majority of Yale and Cornell men graduating today will ultimately go on to marry, if an additional 5-10% of UMC men decide not to marry this would be a catastrophe for UMC women.

UMC women are a bit of a paradox because they are the ones who lead the delay in marriage, yet they need marriage more than women of other classes. Having children out of wedlock is still highly frowned upon in UMC culture, and marriage is still an important status marker in itself. By delaying marriage and riding the carousel they are giving the men of the UMC an ultimatum; accept a debased form of marriage or none at all. We can only wait to see how this bet turns out for the current graduating class, but already there are signs this might not end as they are expecting.
In This won’t end well I explained the seeming contradiction between Hanna Rosin’s assertion that women chose the hookup culture because they found it empowering, and Leslie Bell’s observation that women wanted something more.

What neither author noticed is that young women are comfortable with hookups because they assume that LTRs and ultimately marriage will be theirs for the taking once they tire of hookups. Flings/hookups are fun, and even (feel) empowering when a woman is young and in the SMP power position; each new encounter is further proof that she holds the veto power over men. However, when the men are the ones doing the vetoing empowerment turns into a never ending round of rejection. Instead of having men pursue her she finds herself being passed around, if not passed over.

With the media feeding frenzy on the Yale Daily News article about SWUGs, it is interesting to note that one of the women Rosin interviewed for Boys on the side was a Yale coed:

One sorority girl, a junior with a beautiful tan, long dark hair, and a great figure, whom I’ll call Tali, told me that freshman year she, like many of her peers, was high on her first taste of the hookup culture and didn’t want a boyfriend. “It was empowering, to have that kind of control,” she recalls. “Guys were texting and calling me all the time, and I was turning them down. I really enjoyed it! I had these options to hook up if I wanted them, and no one would judge me for it.”

Rosin starts to point out that some time along the way “Tali” had started wanting something more. Tali now wished a man would ask her out on a $3 frozen yogurt date. However, Rosin then quickly closes the door on any yearning for something other than hookup culture, explaining that women really are empowered by it.

This question, each time, prompted a look of horror. Reform the culture, maybe, teach women to “advocate for themselves”—a phrase I heard many times—but end it? Never.

But there is more to the story. It turns out that “Tali” is Raisa Bruner, the author of the SWUGNATION article which the media is going nuts over:

That’s me — Tali.

The previous year, Rosin, a friend and I plopped down on a patch of grass in the Law School’s courtyard to make sense of what was going on at Yale with women, relationships and sex. That conversation become fodder for Rosin’s trend piece.

Clearly Rosin was overly eager to close the door on the dissatisfaction which sets in with hookups once a woman stops being the hottest, youngest thing on the menu. Yale’s
microcosm is highly unusual given how quickly the transformation from *hot young and empowered* to *washed up and passed over* occurs, but the *basic pattern* is what occurs over a longer time period in the larger sexual marketplace.

Bruner does her best throughout her article to convince herself and her readers that she is empowered by the hookup culture just as Rosin argued. She desperately wants to redefine the term SWUG to mean women who are freed from caring about attention from men.

And a SWUG — a female Yalie defined by a “don’t-give-a-fuck” or “DGAF” attitude — should be the modern young feminist ideal.

But for SWUGs like Chloe and I, that’s not quite how it pans out. Whatever empowerment we’re supposed to be deriving from this version of the feminist moment is looking pretty thin on the ground.

She vacillates on this throughout the piece, finally ending with an unconvincing but obligatory nod to feminist empowerment:

We are not any old SWUGs, I decide as I carry empty wine glasses to the sink. And we do want it all — equality and individuality, power and humor. If we label ourselves, it’s only because the language has yet to catch up. As the generations of women before us did, we’ll make sure it does.

She notes that the term SWUG started at Yale as the kind of empowering term she wishes to “reclaim” it to. But the problem with attempts to manipulate language is reality has a way of overpowering the whitewash:

Maybe it was that way once. But right now, SWUG’s social meaning at Yale remains about the hooking up that we women are — and aren’t — doing, and how little we’re supposed to let that bother us.
The American Conservative has an article by Rod Dreher discussing gay marriage titled Sex After Christianity (H/T Masson). Dreher asks:

is sex the linchpin of Christian cultural order? Is it really the case that to cast off Christian teaching on sex and sexuality is to remove the factor that gives—or gave—Christianity its power as a social force?

He makes a strong case for answering this in the affirmative, and ties the abandonment of biblical marriage by modern Christians to the surge in public opinion in favor of gay marriage:

Conservative Christians have lost the fight over gay marriage and, as we have seen, did so decades before anyone even thought same-sex marriage was a possibility.

Dreher’s argument here is certainly not unique, but it is well made and the entire article is very much worth reading. However, there is one area where I have at least partial disagreement with him:

By the 1960s, the conviction that sexual expression was healthy and good—the more of it, the better—and that sexual desire was intrinsic to one’s personal identity culminated in the sexual revolution, the animating spirit of which held that freedom and authenticity were to be found not in sexual withholding (the Christian view) but in sexual expression and assertion.

...

Our post-Christian culture, then, is an “anti-culture.” We are compelled by the logic of modernity and the myth of individual freedom to continue tearing away the last vestiges of the old order, convinced that true happiness and harmony will be ours once all limits have been nullified.

While there is much truth to this, it isn’t entirely correct. There is a new sexual morality which modern Christians and non Christians alike have embraced in the place of biblical marriage, and it isn’t centered around overt hedonism. The new sexual morality is centered around romantic love.

This transformational shift has been so complete and so insidious that unless you have actively considered the idea you almost certainly have at least partially adopted the new mindframe yourself. Consider for example Roissy’s claim that he loves many of the women he has sex with. Does this offend you? Do you interpret this as Roissy pretending that his sexual exploits have a purity, a morality which you are certain they lack?

If so, why do you feel this way? Roissy certainly doesn’t suffer under a delusion that love makes sex moral. Roissy understands a simple truth; sex is more enjoyable when he
experiences it both physically and emotionally. He has sex with romantic love for the same reason one might have sprinkles on their ice cream; he likes it better that way.

So where does this outrage come from? It isn’t biblical. From a biblical perspective Roissy is misusing both sex and romantic love. But how many modern Christians can even understand that?

What nearly all modern Christians have done is place romantic love above marriage. Instead of seeing marriage as the moral context to pursue romantic love and sex, romantic love is now seen as the moral place to experience sex and marriage. This inversion is subtle enough that no one seems to have noticed, but if you look for it you will see it everywhere.

Lifetime marriage, with separate defined roles for husband and wife and true commitment is what makes sex and romantic love moral in the biblical view. In our new view, romantic love makes sex moral, and the purpose of marriage is to publicly declare that you are experiencing the highest form of romantic love. Thus people now commonly refer to a wedding as “making our love official”.

The gradations we now apply to romantic love are symptomatic of the problem. We take great care to distinguish between “pure love” or “true love” and mere “infatuation” or “puppy love”. But there is no biblical basis for this kind of thinking, and scientifically there is no reason to believe the hormones/chemistry is any different. The reality is (physical) sex naturally tends to create feelings of romantic love. When channeled correctly this is both moral and incredibly enjoyable.

Only in a world of sex outside of marriage is there a need to distinguish between gradients of romantic love, where some forms are more pure and authentic than others. Take away the mind frame of serial monogamy, and these ideas become absurd. When the Apostle Paul advises us on marriage, he tells us to only marry if we “burn with passion”. There is no worry about “true love” vs “puppy love”, etc, because such thoughts are meaningless in this context. If the couple has a strong sexual/romantic attraction and are prepared to commit for life and fulfill the roles of husband and wife, then they should marry.

But Paul’s advice runs counter to what we now consider a woman’s sacred path to marriage. The modern view is that women especially need to experience falling in and out of love a sufficient number of times to identify “the real thing”. If she finds “true love” the new paradigm asserts, she will remain bonded to him for life. But of course if she later finds herself “trapped” and not wanting to keep her commitment, this is prima facie proof that what they had wasn’t true love after all. Marriage in this context is just a public assertion of true love, and there is no concept of commitment outside of romantic love.

Because it is love and not marriage which now confers morality upon sex, sex outside of marriage is now considered moral so long as you are in love. Thus we have the modern harlot’s defense/anthem “but we were in love!”. It is also entirely logical for gays to demand the equal right to “declare their love” via marriage under this new twisted paradigm.

See Also:
• “The one” vs “my one and only”
• Beauty taming the savage beast.
• From cornerstone to stepping stone; the mainstream Christian view of marriage.
As I mentioned in *Lovestruck*, once you recognize the modern inversion of the moral relationship between romantic love, sex, and marriage you will begin to see this *everywhere*. A while back Rollo pointed out a couple of posts by a Christian blogger named Joy who tied herself in knots trying to write about Christian sexual morality without offending modern culture. The first post is *News Flash: You Probably Won’t Marry a Virgin*. Even more interesting than the post itself however are the comments. Commenter Gunnar Tveiten was offended that Joy even tepidly suggested that chastity was a good thing. He referred to reserving sex for biblical marriage as “a sad and perverted thing”, and explained that romantic love is what matters when considering the morality of sex:

> You go on: “God is a God of second chances, and no mistake” in other words, if you’re among the 96% who ignore the nonsense, then you blew your “first chance”, you did something wrong, but God forgives your mistake and gives you a second chance. Here’s the thing though: what if it *wasn’t* a mistake? What if it was, as it often is, *deliberate* and *repeated* and with a person you love – perhaps even the person you end up marrying? Do you imagine the 96% generally had sex once, or a handful of times? That would again, be a rejection of reality.

> Then you come out and say it explicitly: “Now, I’m not saying go out and have lots of sex. It’s best to save sex for marriage for many reasons, spiritual and otherwise.”

> In other words, we all do it wrong. 96% of us. You, like most churches, live in an alternative universe where this is true. The overwhelming majority of us REJECTS that universe and substitute our own. In *our* universe, intimacy between people who love one another is a thing of beauty – the deepest expression of trust, love and compassion. Created by God himself. Glorious and wonderful.

> By insisting that celibacy has spiritual and other advantages, you become part of the problem: you contribute to the shame, instead of talking about love.

He elaborates in response to another commenter who chose not to have sex outside of biblical marriage:

> My bible is a book about love. Love is the highest and most important commandment I find when I read it with an open mind. Intimacy and sex is one (of many!) ways we express our love. I do not think that love among adult consenting human beings, can ever be a sin. This is my understanding.

Commenter Gwen explains that while she has repented for some of her past fornication, some of it she won’t ever repent for because it occurred in the context of romantic love and her sacred path to marriage:

> When I met the man I was certain I was going to marry, I thought long and hard
about what I wanted and what he wanted (he was not a virgin), and finally landed on the decision to responsibly and lovingly have pre-marital sex. Months later, we ended our relationship, and I was devastated. I told myself that I was being punished for my sins, and that no good man would ever love me.

Many years and many relationships later, I have a much healthier perspective. He and I absolutely were not meant to be husband and wife, and our marriage, had it occurred, would have ended miserably. However, our relationship, in the beginning, was loving and wonderful, and our sex life, including our first time, was also loving and wonderful. Even now, I do not doubt that he loved me at the time, nor do I doubt that I truly loved him. My first time was gentle and full of respect and caring and mutual understanding, and for that, now that I’ve worked through the guilt and shame dumped on me by the culture, I am grateful.

I have made choices that I regret, and decisions I’ve asked forgiveness for, but my first time is not, nor will it ever be, one of them.

Commenter Joel wants to bring this back to the Bible, and starts off at least somewhat well. However, even he ends up suggesting that romantic love is something which confers morality to sex in biblical marriage:

If you consider yourself a believer, you must acknowledge that there is a gigantic list of scripture that indicates that we are avoid sexual temptation, which let’s be honest, except for the argument of consensual sex between two nearly (or on the road to being) married people deeply in love, much of our sexual craving is rooted in lust.

Note that not claiming romantic love gives moral cover to sex doesn’t mean that romantic love doesn’t have a place in biblical marriage. As I pointed out in the last post, the problem is the moral inversion. Romantic love is now seen as the moral place to experience sex and marriage, instead of marriage being seen as the moral context to pursue romantic love and sex.

Joy then wrote a follow up post On Virginity: What I Did and Did Not Mean where she apologizes to anyone who felt shamed by her previous post’s fleeting brush with biblical sexual morality:

While I tried my best to respond in the comments, and even modified my post to try to make things more clear, some people still felt shamed by the post. I regret that deeply and want to try to clarify a few things.

And clarify she does. She explains that sex outside of marriage is not shameful, but that it must be within the context of romantic love:

Choosing not to abstain from sexual intercourse before marriage is fine not shameful.
As I wrote above, we are sexual beings. We desire the pleasure and connection of sexual relationships. When we love someone, we want to demonstrate it in real and tangible ways, and physical acts of kissing, touching, and intercourse is very much a part of that. I encourage you to be wise in who you choose to interact with in this way. Many people use sex to manipulate and abuse their partner - watch out for this.

But again the comments were even more telling than the post itself. This time manosphere veteran Jack explained why he won’t marry a woman he views as having a history of promiscuity:

Women are the gatekeepers of sex, and men are the gatekeepers of commitment.

I refuse to give commitment to a woman who did not guard her virtue. She gave it away to other men, and I find it unattractive. No judgment implied. Just not attracted to women with a past.

This brought the following response (emphasis mine):

So a woman’s value is only as good as her virtue? And if she loved another and expressed that love physically with that person before you, she’s too unattractive and not worthy of your attention, attraction, commitment?
Vox explains Dalrock’s Law
by Dalrock | April 22, 2013 | Link

Vox Day explains a key reason behind Dalrock’s Law in his post Alpha Male: the magic preference (emphasis mine):

Read between the lines. All women should try it at least once... because that will make this long-haired woman more attractive by comparison. And more importantly, note that women will readily say anything, no matter how ridiculous, in their attempts to get you to submit to their frame. The most effective way to deal with this is ask for explanations about their reasoning, which will of course rapidly reveal that it is sheer rhetorical nonsense.

In this case Vox is responding to a recent commenter on an old post of his explaining that short hair on women is less attractive than long hair. This is one of those posts which continues to bring women out of the woodwork in desperate attempts to rebuild the mound. This same thing continues to occur on my old post Are Women Done With Men After Age 55. I wrote that post two years ago and yet it it is still one of the most visited posts on the blog. As I write this it is the (current) 5th most popular post even though I haven’t linked to it in over a year. Like Vox’s post stating the obvious on long hair, it continues to draw angry worker ants frantically trying to rebuild the frame. My personal favorite comment on that post is where a woman wrote about a 79 year old “complete knockout” she knows who is about to marry a doctor (emphasis mine):

Sorry, but looks do matter to women. I also disagree that men age better than women. At least not the women I know. Meanwhile, these are not “frat boys” these women acquaintances and friends of mine are dating. These are guys close to them in age (in some case a few years younger), and these guys are successful, without exception. So they’re not looking for “sugar mamas.” Case in point, my mom has a widowed friend who is 79, is a complete knockout (she goes to a gym six days a week) and is about to marry a doctor. They have known each other since they were teenagers and he always had a crush on her, which did not diminish with her age. It certainly seems to bother you that some women actually have not been put out to pasture, and refuse to see themselves as “washed up” and undesirable. As I said earlier, how you see yourself determines how the world sees you, regardless of your age, looks or gender. So sorry if I don’t buy into your ageist, misogynistic BS. P.S. – There are worse fates than winding up with a cat. It beats winding up with some loser guy.
Duck pickin’ women
by Dalrock | April 24, 2013 | Link

I happened to watch a few episodes of A&E’s *Duck Dynasty*, and the patriarch of the family (Phil Robertson) is a real character. From his conversion story he started off a Roissy style alpha, into “sex drugs and rock and roll” until he was 28. In college he played quarterback for *Louisiana Tech* with Terry Bradshaw on the bench as his backup.

Aside from his faith and obvious take charge personality, Robertson’s thoughts on men and women stand out for how counter-cultural they are. I couldn’t find the examples I was looking for but in the search found a few which should at least give you a taste for his unique style and world-view. In this first clip he talks about his wife’s need to “chatter”. This clip makes him seem harsher towards his wife than the rest of the show does, because it is clear that he loves her very much. Still, it shows his alpha aloofness:

Here he is advising his grandson on how to choose a wife:

- Don’t marry some yuppie girl. Find you a meek, gentle, kind spirited country girl. If she knows how to cook, and she carries her Bible and lives by it, and she loves to eat bullfrogs, now there’s a woman!

(note the video shows him cleaning bullfrogs so if you have an aversion to seeing game processed you probably want to skip this one)

I don’t have a way to start an embedded video at a specific time, but you can skip to 1 min 13 seconds to see his related advice in the following clip:

- William Penn would roll over in his grave if he could see what these Pennsylvania girls have turned into. See these Quaker girls way back 200 years ago they picked these boys’ ducks. I guarantee you William Penn had a duck pickin’ woman with him. But these days I said “Do you girls pick ducks up here?” and they said “No we pick pockets up here!”. Hard to find a duck pickin’ woman in Pensylvania anymore. You boys let it get away from you!

  Their main problem is they are waiting until they get to be 20 years old before they marry them. In Louisiana we marry them about 15-16. Check with mom and dad before you pull a move like that.

- 16 year olds they’ll pick your ducks. 20 they’ll pick your pocket.
Disney has a new television program about a young princess in training titled *Sofia The First*. Nancy Kanter (Senior Vice President, Original Programming and General Manager, Disney Junior Worldwide) explained when announcing the series at the *Huffington Post* that as a feminist mother she originally had mixed feelings regarding her own daughter dressing up as a princess:

I would walk her to preschool, me in my power suit, she in fake tulle and little girl high heels that flapped from her feet as she teetered down West 72nd Street. I questioned just what I thought I was doing by allowing, maybe even encouraging her to aspire to this outdated, irrelevant role model. Born in a generation that invented “super-mom”, was I just crazy for not putting a stop to this and buying her a chemistry set and some hockey skates?

She eventually made peace with the idea, and is now in a position to use Disney programming like *Sofia The First* to rework the culture one 2-5 year old mind at a time.

Kids grow up so quickly, and it is important to ensure that whilst they are still developing they receive the right information and the right instructions about how to be a positive influence in society.

But not everyone agrees with Ms. Kanter regarding the *right instructions* for young minds. Movieguide made news recently for pointing out that Disney’s new princess program promotes single motherhood:

*SOFIA THE FIRST*, Disney’s new pre-school princess on home video, doesn’t need a prince. She’s the daughter of a poor single mother who marries King Roland.

... Clearly, the creators see a role for the media in shaping the social and moral values of 2- to 5-year-olds. It’s fine to promote honesty, grace and civility, but any message that undermines the traditional family is harmful. Children raised by their natural parents are far less likely to live in poverty, quit school, use drugs, commit crimes and spend time in prison. If Disney actually cares about the long-term well being of children, it would promote the traditional family rather than the “modern family.”

Movieguide’s stance against promoting single motherhood is impressive given that it runs counter to our new philosophy of the family as well as the mainstream Christian perspective. As I’ve mentioned before, Focus On the Family’s Director of Family Formation Studies refers to single mothers as heroic. Not to be outdone, Pastor Mark Driscoll endorse single mothers as good prospects for marriage (H/T holyhandgrenadeofantioch):

Single guys: don’t overlook the single moms. Jesus’ mom was a single mom & it
went pretty well for Joseph.

But the promotion of single motherhood isn’t the only social engineering going on with the modern princess tale. Brothers Grimm tales about princesses like King Roughbeard and Cinderella taught girls humility and the importance of hard work (especially housework), while tales like The youth who could not shiver and shake taught boys the importance of bravery and perseverance. But in our new culture self restraint and humility are traits girls are taught to reject, and there is no room for separate role models for boys. Disney’s new view of the princess is in many ways the old classical view of the prince, as exemplified by the movie Brave:

Toyota followed the same pattern of princess-as-warrior-prince in its 2013 Superbowl commercial for the Rav4:

All of this has gone so far that some feminists are starting to wonder if it has gone too far. In her own Huffington Post article Raising a Son Within the Princess Culture feminist and single mother Dresden Shumaker worries that boys like her son are being squeezed out of the culture:

...a funny thing happened when I met my son — I started to realize how destructive girl power can be to boys.

...

But here is what I sadly realized: Within modern girl power, there seems to be a message that girls are better than boys. Boys are BAD. Boys are MEAN. Boys are silly, weak, stupid, clueless, rough.

Schumaker wholeheartedly embraces the gender neutral ideal of feminism, going so far as to dress her young son “W” in a frilly pink skirt (picture). But her son hasn’t missed the message in his favorite shows:

W’s favorite tv show is “Sofia the First” on Disney Jr.

He watches each episode multiple (MULTIPLE) times to the point that he can recite most of the dialogue. A week ago, he snuggled into me and proclaimed, “boys are not nice.” I asked him which boy and he told me ALL boys. All boys are not nice. They are mean.

He was right. In almost every “girl triumphs” story there is a slew of “mean boys.” Or there are boys that have to be told to be kind.

None of this is new, and it stems from the feminist denial of sex differences and their overpowering envy of manhood. Still, it has become so obvious that even radical feminists can start to see the damage their extensive rework of our culture is doing to their sons. Ironically all of this has also left something missing in the sex lives of feminist women, as the...
Huffington Post article Single Moms (And Other Strong Women) Need Alpha Males explains (H/T GBFM).

Izozzlzlzoz
Vox points out the feminine imperative in action in his post *Regulating sex*:

> Women desperate to become mothers are increasingly signing up for sperm donation websites where men are offering ‘natural insemination’ only.

See Vox’s full post for the larger quote from the *Daily Mail*, but this single sentence captures the essence of the twisted frame. These noble women are trying to create life, but the evil men want to force them into having [dirty] sex!

If this were instead an example of a masculine imperative the sentence would read:

> Women are setting out to have illegitimate children in as cold and clinical a fashion as possible, yet men are insisting on a human connection as a minimum requirement for their first act of fatherhood.

Of course neither frame represents true sexual morality.
She was used!

by Dalrock | May 3, 2013 | Link

Right in line with my [last post](#), tabloid magazine *In Touch* and the *Christian Post* decry Kanye West’s failure to marry two time divorcée and soon to be baby mama Kim Kardashian. The *In Touch* cover indignantly declares:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humiliated Kim Discovers She’s Been Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>She thought Kanye would be her ticket to ultimate fame &amp; fortune. Now divorced \ and desperate to wed, Kim realizes she’s been played as he refuses to propose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is standard tabloid fare, but it isn’t just *In Touch* which is outraged that Kanye West is refusing to honor this two time divorcée’s [sacred man up card](#). The *Christian Post* headline worries: *Kanye West ‘Has No Intention’ of Marrying Pregnant Kim Kardashian?* (emphasis mine):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><a href="#">Kardashian</a>, who is seven months along in her pregnancy, admitted that she would</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>walk down the aisle again <strong>despite previously enduring two divorces.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...”She served a purpose for him ... Kim used to be so desirable that every guy wanted to date her. But now he’s over it,” the insider claimed.

All I have to say to Kanye is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18 years, 18 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>She got one of your kids got you for 18 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know somebody paying child support for one of his kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His baby mamma’s car and crib is bigger than his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will see him on TV any given Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win the Superbowl and drive off in a Hyundai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She was suppose to buy you shorty TYCO with your money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She went to the doctor got lypo with your money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She walking around looking like Michael with your money</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mark Richardson of Oz Conservative explains the mindset of career women who missed their opportunity to have children in his post “We’ve assumed we can put it off indefinitely”:

It’s not that these women have entirely rejected the idea of motherhood, but it is not actively pursued - it is something that is assumed will just happen of itself at some indefinite point of time in the future.

The women in question are 40 something UK career women quoted in a recent Daily Mail piece. They always assumed they could have it all; marriage, motherhood, and career, but the motherhood part of the equation at least turned out to be beyond their grasp. This is the exact opposite of what 55 year old feminist Elsa Walsh described in her recent Washington Post article Why women should embrace a ‘good enough’ life (H/T Greenlander). Walsh expected to have to make serious trade offs in order to indulge her feminism:

…when I enrolled at the University of California at Berkeley in 1975, I held three truths to be self-evident: I would never marry. I would never have a child. And I would have an interesting job, as a writer or a lawyer.

I wanted to be independent and self-supporting. I wanted love, but I wanted to be free.

Even after graduating college she was quite serious in her feminist ideology:

I embraced my feminism proudly. I always wore pants to work, and I swore off (stupidly, I recognize now) reading any fiction by male authors.

And yet despite her hard boiled ideology and her swearing off marriage and motherhood, the cultural inertia left over from a previous era seems to have guided her without her knowing it:

…I announced — to my parents, my friends and yes, to my boyfriend — that I was never getting married. Marriage was a patriarchal system, and I wanted none of it. We would stay together because we wanted to be together, I said.

Seven years later, I married him. And I was happy. Instead of feeling trapped, I felt liberated and secure and protected — not by patriarchy but by love. He had a young daughter whom I adored, and of course, seven years after our wedding, I had a child. I’d been wrong about that, too.

Second wave feminists like Walsh were able to have the best of both worlds. They were able to boldly declare their uncompromising feminist politics in their youth and yet somehow end up directed into both marriage and motherhood. They didn’t expect to “have it all”, but it just somehow happened. Fast forward a decade and the 40 something women in the Mail article describe the exact opposite. They always expected to have it all, and because they didn’t
take deliberate action and make compromises they lost the opportunity to become mothers.

Ironically the difference in both expectations and outcomes is directly attributable to the “progress” made by the previous generation of feminists. In addition, there is strong reason to expect that the discrepancy between expectations and outcomes will only increase for younger cohorts of women, especially those who feel it is important to have their children within wedlock. Each new cohort of women continues to delay marriage further, and there are limits on how far out childbirth can be delayed.
I’ve just been looking through your yahoo answers profile (and your incredible 76% best answers from 58 answers) and I can only salute your sterling work. That’s an incredible amount of direct 1-to-1 good work you are doing. While I am an atheist I do believe biblical marriage is the best model for civilised society and personal happiness so I commend you on promoting it.

— KrauserPUA

I generally shy away from focusing on definitions due to their tendency to take us into intractable ratholes, but the fact remains that definitions are important. In the case of the term *manosphere* this is especially important because there is a tendency outside the sphere to mistake the manosphere for a collection of readers and writers who are in general intellectual agreement. There is a kernel of truth to that belief, but it misses the truly profound differences in worldviews held by the main schools of thought in the manosphere. With the breadth of opinions within the sphere in mind, I can only offer my own definition and allow an opportunity in the comments for those who have a different take to offer their own.

One way to look at the manosphere is historically, and since the sphere itself is quite new this only means a few years back. This isn’t to say that those in the sphere have only been active for a few years, but the concept of the manosphere only goes back a few years (to my knowledge). Just a year or two back I would have offered a very simple definition of the sphere. If you were somewhat regularly included in Ferdinand Bardamu’s weekly link roundup, I would argue that this made you a de facto member of the manosphere. This is a very broad definition because Ferdinand drew from an incredible breadth of perspectives in his link roundup. I don’t think it is an exaggeration to state that his link roundups played a central role in knitting together extremely different groups into a common conversation.

And a conversation is what I would argue the manosphere really is. Perhaps more accurately the manosphere is the place where the conversation occurs, not unlike the broader term *blogosphere*. By this definition being a member of the manosphere doesn’t suggest much about your point of view, but it identifies you as engaging in the discussion.

However, while there is no such thing as a common manosphere orthodoxy, there are a set of core ideas held by nearly everyone in the manosphere. Interestingly these aren’t the ideas the sphere is commonly accused of being an “echo chamber” for. In fact, the ideas claimed to be manosphere orthodoxy are where the biggest active faults exist within the sphere. Game is the most prominent example of this. There is significant disagreement on whether Game works, and if it works whether it is moral. I offer the 599 comment discussion in response to Cane Caldo’s guest post on the topic and the heated semi formal debates on the topic hosted by A Voice For Men. Likewise the Social Pathologist has challenged the concept of the feminine imperative, as have Cane Caldo and many of my readers.

Unlike Game and the concept of the Feminine Imperative, what nearly everyone in the
manosphere agrees on is the extensive tearing of the social contract by decades of feminist tinkering. For me this is mostly about marriage and our adoption of a radically new model of the family. Interestingly you can frame all of the main “factions” of the manosphere based on how they respond to the debasement of marriage. While I point out the debasement of marriage in order to try to restore something precious, Roissy makes it his life’s goal to enjoy all of the young sluts our society is sending his way while they postpone their search for a husband. In my post Dating Stanton’s Heroes I showed how Professor Mentu similarly chooses to respond to the glut of mothers who eject their children’s father(s) from the home. Even here though, Roissy and Mentu understand how foolish the larger society is for allowing and encouraging all of this to happen. This paradox is exemplified by the very kind comment from KrauserPUA quoted in the beginning of the post. A third group looks at the destruction of traditional marriage and basically says “good riddance” (MRA & MGTOW).

As with any simplification these descriptions of the categories aren’t perfect, and not everyone in the manosphere fits neatly into any one category. Also, even within each category there can be a significant breadth of perspectives. Still, I think this description of the main “camps” of the sphere is roughly accurate and helps conceptualize the main differences between them.

So we have three main groups which all acknowledge feminism’s radical change in the social contract while strongly disagreeing on how to respond to this reality. My own camp might be called the traditionalist segment of the manosphere, and we mourn the loss of marriage and are working to find solutions to shore up the culture, laws, and the church as well as specific steps individual men can take to reduce their exposure to the risk of frivolous divorce (going all the way back to the choice of whom to marry). At any given time and depending on the topic at hand two of the three groups (traditional marriage, Roissy’s group, and MRA/MGTOW) tend to be in agreement in disagreeing with the third group. However this is very fluid, and the alliances are intellectual and topic specific. There is generally a baseline respect for the fact that these fault lines exist, which can initially make it shocking to read say an Orthodox Christian and a pickup artist reinforcing each other’s intellectual arguments. They absolutely aren’t in agreement with each other on the question of sexual morality, but there will be times they are in agreement on the facts, etc. of any given issue. Since these core fault lines are so intractable between the three groups, there is generally some effort not to make them the focus of discussion and agree to disagree. These dormant fault lines are always there, but some care is taken to avoid perpetually getting locked in the same discussions over core values*. This doesn’t mean the question is off the table, it just means that after so many rounds everyone has already made their case.

The closest there is to a manosphere orthodoxy involves acknowledging the reality of the new order and responding with something other than “Man up and marry those sluts!” Cross either of those two lines and all three groups are in sudden agreement. You won’t be run out of town on a rail, but I would offer that the manosphere is well prepared to engage in those discussions and I’ve never seen anyone make a solid case either for “Nothing to see here folks, move along...” or “Man up and marry those sluts”.

There is a reason such divergent groups are participating together in a common conversation which goes beyond the previous uniting effect of Ferdinand’s link roundup. Feminism has
been so completely successful in changing the culture and taking over all of our social institutions that opposing feminism has become one of the great taboos of our society. Making this worse, very few are even aware of this because the lion’s share of feminist thinking is no longer thought of as feminist thinking; it is simply thought of as normal thinking, or more accurately right thinking. Opposing feminism has become the heresy of our age, a thought crime few dare to even contemplate. The sickness of feminism is everywhere, but it is most striking in our churches. The cultural transformation has been so swift and so profound that most of what the Bible teaches on the topics of marriage and men and women is now quite literally unthinkable and unspeakable in nearly all of polite Christian company. The biblical frame of marriage is simply too radical for all but a handful of pastors to preach. As a result, the conversations Christians have in the manosphere today can’t occur anywhere else.

The basic misunderstanding of what the manosphere is becomes most visible when bloggers or commenters from outside the sphere are engaging someone from the manosphere either on a manosphere blog or especially an off sphere blog. Part of the misunderstanding comes from how foreign and radical even politely offered moderately anti-feminist thinking is to those outside the sphere. Because opposing the new feminist order even moderately is now so radical and there are multiple “camps” participating in the conversation, those from outside the manosphere very often initially badly misread whom they are interacting with. For example, it isn’t uncommon for very solid traditional members of the manosphere to be misidentified as either PUA or MGTOW even when their arguments are clearly traditional. For those who are new to the manosphere I would suggest being aware of how different the participants tend to be in any given discussion, and not to mistake agreement by two individuals on a point of fact to necessarily indicate broader agreement than is really there.

Note: This post is an adaptation of a comment I originally made on Zippy Catholic’s post How should the orthosphere engage the manosphere?

*Since this post is about the fault lines it is more likely than most to draw out heated disagreement in the comments section over the fundamental differences those fault lines represent.
Alan Roebuck at the Orthosphere wrote a post several weeks ago on the proper response of traditional men to the question of marriage. I approached Alan and offered to write a response as a guest post, and he very graciously accepted. My response is titled Must a Traditional Man Accept Modern Marriage? and you can click to Alan's original post from there.

For those who wish to comment on the guest post please take a moment to read their comments policy before doing so.
Linkage
by Dalrock | May 21, 2013 | Link

It may be a while before I can write up a new post, but fortunately there is always plenty of excellent content around the sphere. Feel free to suggest posts you think I or my readers would find of interest in the comments.

Sunshine Mary has a new post up discussing cutting husbands and fathers off at the knees with another amazing Mark Driscoll quote: Can a wife respect a husband who is an idiot?

The Social Pathologist has a series of interesting posts considering the differences between National Socialism and Communism from a sexual hierarchy perspective. Start with A Man’s Socialism and then see his follow up posts:

1. Alpha Socialism.
2. The Right Left
3. Alpha Socialism II: Swole Hitler
Continuing the discussion.
by Dalrock | May 24, 2013 | Link

Vox continues the discussion from What is the manosphere? and Must a Traditional Man Accept Modern Marriage? with his new post: Nihilists vs Civilizationists

...whereas Roissy and I obviously respect each other despite our different purposes, those who incline more towards his “fiddle while Rome burns” perspective are considerably less able to view those differences in the abstract than Roissy, while those who are more focused on saving civilization from itself, (or at least preserving the seeds of civilization as the fire sweeps through the forest), are considerably less able to view the fiddlers with the same sort of equanimity that I am.

What both camps have in common is a diagnosis. Where they differ is the prescription. This is why they are not functional allies in the long term. Their immediate objectives and priorities have nothing in common and their perspectives are fundamentally different. However, it should be kept in mind that neither side created the problem to which both are reacting, and it should be recognized that both have important roles to play before the course plays itself out.
“Women’s desire — its inherent range and innate power — is an underestimated and constrained force, even in our times, when all can seem so sexually inundated, so far beyond restriction,” he writes. “Despite the notions our culture continues to imbue, this force is not, for the most part, sparked or sustained by emotional intimacy and safety.” In fact, he argues, “one of our most comforting assumptions, soothing perhaps above all to men but clung to by both sexes, that female eros is much better made for monogamy than the male libido, is scarcely more than a fairy tale.”

The implications are huge. As Bergner puts it: “What nascent truths will come into view, floating forward if these faiths continue to be cut apart?”
To the heroes of Father’s Day.

by Dalrock | June 16, 2013 | Link

Today being Father’s Day I thought I’d break my blogging hiatus to honor the real heroes of the holiday.

I’m sure you already know who I’m thinking about. That’s right, single mothers. I’m not talking about widows or the rare exception to excuse #6. I’m talking about the ever growing number of heroic women who have children out of wedlock as well as their slightly more traditional sisters, women who marry before having children and then bravely expel their husband from the home of his children. In honor of Stanton’s heroes, I bring you Kerri Zane at the Huffington Post’s 5 Ways for Single Moms to Celebrate Father’s Day.

Proudly embrace your mom and dadness. Single moms by decision, or because Dad’s ditched the scene, don their breeches and stilettos every day. Today is no different, except you get to honor the amazing both part parents that you are! Round up your village to join in the celebration, put on your daddy cap, and fully own that you get two special Hallmark holidays.

Besides, in addition to being both mom and dad, large numbers of single mothers also provide a steady stream of father figures to help their children grow up happy and well adjusted. Why settle for just one dad when an enterprising single mother can provide dads by the truckload. The lucky children of single mothers are frequently treated to a veritable parade of father figures! Fortunately these enterprising single mothers don’t go unrewarded for their keeping the hopper full of almost like dads. As Ms. Zane explained just a few months ago jumping from one sex partner to the next is one of the 5 Reasons It’s Better To Be A Single Parent:

Married couples may have more sex, but it isn’t nearly as much fun. While they constantly have to “spice it up” in the bedroom, the nature of being single and switching partners does all the cooking for us. We tease, experiment and explore the bawdy awareness of every new lover. Researchers at the University of Pisa found that testosterone levels, in both men and women, make the sex hotter during the first two years of a relationship.

Edit: You may also enjoy this site my wife found full of fantastic gifts for single mothers on father’s day: http://www.happyfathersdaymom.com/

Edit2: Donal Graeme has a post inviting you to share your church’s father’s day sermon here.

See also:

- How to child proof the revolving door to mommy’s bedroom.
- The normalization of the trashy single mother.
A Fathers Day call to repentance.
by Dalrock | June 17, 2013 | Link

In churches across the western world Father’s Day has become a day to reflect on the crumbling of the family. Given the mass suffering caused by broken homes, this is a topic worthy of serious reflection. It is in fact worthy of more than mere reflection. I propose that Father’s Day should become a day of repentance for Christians, and you can do your part by sharing this post with your pastor and encouraging him to join what will hopefully become a growing movement.

Before we get to the topic of repentance though, we need to look back on the last few decades and the destruction wrought on the family. While feminism started long before the 60s, modern feminism is often argued to have been sparked in that decade with Betty Friedan’s *Feminine Mystique*. In the decades that followed we have radically reshaped our society in an effort to free women from the patriarchal roles defined for women in the Bible. We have freed women from being *trapped* in marriage by passing no fault divorce law and moving from a marriage based family structure to one based on child support. Christian leaders have done their part by carefully avoiding the parts of the Bible which offend their now feminist congregations, which is nearly *everything* relating to women and marriage. Pastors across the land demonstrate their extensive feminist sensibilities by avoiding or playing down the repeated instructions to Christian wives to submit to their husbands, to the point where this has now become second nature.

What has followed our radical overhaul of the culture and the churches is euphemistically called *progress*. No longer constrained by the need to marry and submit to a husband, the modern empowered woman is now almost as likely to decide to have her children out of wedlock as within wedlock.

![Figure 1. Number of births, birth rate, and percentage of births to unmarried women: United States, 1940-2007](image)

**SOURCE:** CDC/NCHS, National Vital Statistics System.
Add to this the pandemic of wives expelling their children’s father out of the home and we have a sea of human misery.

But sacrificing millions of children on the altar of feminist progress isn’t enough, and pastors across the land have shown that when it comes to feminism their faith knows no bounds. As feminists repeatedly warn us, women who defy God’s plan are forever at risk of feeling guilty. This jeopardizes the entire feminist enterprise, placing decades of progress at risk. Fortunately feminism has no better ally in this regard than conservative Christians. As women in the west en masse have come to fantasize and obsess over the “empowerment” of divorce, Christians blessed this unholy obsession with their own entry into the divorce fantasy genre. Now Christian women don’t have to expose themselves to secular ideas in order to fantasize about the empowerment of divorce, they can do so with their pastor’s blessing. But as we all know feminism is forever at risk of being rolled back, and outdated (biblical) ideas about the family are an ever present threat. Christian movie makers have stepped in once again to offer comfort to single mothers everywhere by pretending that decades of feminist rebellion never happened, and instead blaming men for the choices of women.

High profile Christian leaders now regularly explain that the explosion in women choosing unwed motherhood is not due to a mass feminist rebellion, but due to some inherent defect in the men the modern feminist woman finds herself surrounded by. The Director of Family Formation Studies at Focus On The Family explained in his book on parenting that:

> Women want to marry and have daddies for their babies. But if they can’t find good men to commit themselves to, well... Our most pressing social problem today is a man deficit.

But it isn’t just high profile Christian leaders who have done their part in denying the recent and unprecedented (post fall) feminist rebellion while shifting the blame to men. The unsung hero of the feminist movement has been the lowly pastor. Pastors across the western world have quietly done the thankless work of promoting feminism week in and week out, without so much as a pat on the back from feminists. Yet without the continued support of these unsung pastors feminism would be in extreme jeopardy. Modern pastors have given today’s feminist woman the moral blessing of Christianity. Each year pastors take great pains to not only deny the feminist rebellion taking place in their very own congregation, but to heap effusive praise on the women of the congregation on Mother’s Day. Father’s Day on the other hand is mostly considered a special invitation to cut husbands off at the knees.

Not all pastors have supported feminism out of outright hostility to the Bible. Many, perhaps most, have chosen to remain silent on the feminist rebellion while blaming men because it was safe. As I mentioned above, the current rebellion by women is unprecedented historically. Pastors everywhere know that to seriously preach a biblical view of marriage would put their career in immediate jeopardy. There is after all a full fledged rebellion going on. Fighting such a rebellion is dangerous, so concessions must be made in order to be permitted to teach the rest of the Bible. But this just reinforces how craven the modern pastor has become. They deny the outrageous rebellion front and center out of fear of becoming a casualty of that rebellion.

Whatever the reason a pastor has chosen feminism over the Bible, repentance is what is
required. While repentance is humbling and painful, it is the necessary first step to healing and redemption. This is true whether the pastor chose feminism over the Bible out of hostility or shame regarding God’s design for the family, or out of simple fear of losing wealth and prestige. Since the problem is nearly universal, what we need is a day of repentance. Given the widespread history of using Father’s Day to denigrate what the Bible tells us is the rightful head of the family, Father’s Day is the logical choice. With this in mind, I offer a list of bullet points which I would encourage pastors across the land to work into their annual Father’s Day sermons until the plague of feminist rebellion and broken families is overcome. This is just a start, and I hope my readers will be willing to help me complete this list.

- I repent for denying the feminist rebellion which was rampant in my congregation, and choosing instead to blame men for the ravages of feminism.
- I repent for cutting husbands and fathers down in an effort to secure my own power as a pastor. For decades I tore down the men I had an obligation to support as God’s designated head of the family, and I humbly beg their and God’s forgiveness for this.
- I repent for the countless times I shied away from teaching the Bible’s clear and repeated instruction to wives to submit to their husbands, and instead focused on the shortfalls of husbands as well as modern “relationship” theory based not in any book of our Bible, but from the Book of Oprah. I repent for my cowardice, and for the hubris of thinking I had found a way to improve on God’s design of marriage and the family.
- I repent for not protecting the children of my congregation by turning a blind eye to the widespread celebration of divorce by women in our culture. When given the choice between defending innocent children and defending my position and prestige, I deeply regret that I chose the latter. I sincerely apologize to each and every child I failed in this way.
- I repent for not speaking out against the accepted view that young women should delay marriage to avoid the risk of being a submissive (and therefore biblical) wife.
- I repent for my personal role in the tragic destruction of biblical marriage as an institution.
- I repent for the deep harm I have caused the women of my congregation and of our culture by encouraging them to the sin and misery of rebellion through both my words and my silence. I now understand that the choice is not between happy rebellion and miserable submission, but quite the opposite.
“Offensive” historic nose art safe in the Air Force National Museum for the time being.
by Dalrock | June 19, 2013 | Link

Drudge linked to a story today titled Navy Will Inspect Its Bathrooms for ‘Degrading’ Images of Women. There isn’t really anything new about military policy in the basic article; women wanted in and the final mopping up operations of marking the territory are pretty much on schedule:

“If there is doubt as to whether material is degrading or offensive,” the memo says, “the individual conducting the inspection shall remove the material from the workplace to ensure a professional work environment.”

What did interest me however was towards the end of the article where it explained that the Air Force has made an exception for historic WWII nose art on planes in the National Museum:

According to a December 2012 Dayton Daily News report, paintings of voluptuous women will not be removed from the nose cones of old planes at the National Museum of the U.S. Air Force at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

Following to the Dayton Daily News story I found a quote from Col. Cassie Barlow, commander of the 88th Air Base Wing:

“I think the tradition and history at the Air Force museum is just that... That’s our history. We’re not going to go back and change those things because that’s part of our history and that’s an important part of our organization. I think the museum will keep the displays that they have just as they are.

One plane from when the Air Force was an organization of men was so troubling to the Dayton Daily News reporter (or perhaps editor) that it couldn’t even be named:

The museum’s collection has several aircraft with nose art of pin-up models. For example, a World War II-era B-24D Liberator bomber on display shows a pin-up model reclining in a blue dress and a profanity used in the name of the plane.

I have no expertise when it comes to the topic of nose art, but I did some searching and I believe this is the B-24D which must not be named:
Unfortunately this terribly un PC B-24 isn't entirely out of the woods yet. The article references “complaints” which have been made about some of the planes and quotes a statement provided by the Air Force National Museum:

| At such time when an inspection is complete, the museum staff will make a reasonable assessment before any actions are taken... |
| Some aircraft and artifacts contain historical art, which the museum is professionally obligated to accurately represent as part of Air Force history. |

Strawberry Bitch photo licensed as Creative Commons by Christopher Paulin.
Dr. Helen is disturbing the mound.

by Dalrock | June 23, 2013 | Link

Fox News recently did a segment on Dr. Helen’s Men On Strike, and clearly Dr. Helen has hit a nerve. Dr. Helen wrote:

[The] new world order is a place where men are discriminated against, forced into a hostile environment in school and later in college, and held in contempt by society. Maybe there is no incentive to grow up anymore. It used to be that being a grown-up, responsible man was rewarded with respect, power and deference. Now, not so much.

Tucker Carlson responded to the quote with the Traditional Conservative* party line:

Every word of that is true, and let me say who cares? If you’re a man, stop whining and reclaim your birthright which is masculinity, and masculinity and male power derive from responsibility. You don’t embrace responsibility, you have no power

This line of thinking is essentially saying:

We’ll teach those feminists! Once they are done screwing other men and playing career woman, we’ll marry them and support them! And if they decide to divorce us, why we’ll give them cash and prizes!

Take that feminists!

Or perhaps:

Prove how powerful and traditional you are; man up and marry those sluts!

Follow the link above to check out the video. The combination of feminist contempt by the eye rolling female host and faux traditionalism by Tucker Carlson is something which has to be seen to be fully appreciated.

Interestingly the day before Carlson’s comments, Matt K. Lewis at Tucker Carlson’s Daily Caller wrote a favorable piece on Dr Helen’s book titled Going Galt: Why men are boycotting marriage, fatherhood and the American Dream.

...most observers of this phenomenon have concluded that we just need to “man up.” That is, until now. Dr. Helen Smith’s new book is decidedly different, inasmuch as she argues that if men are checking out of society, it’s only because we are making rational decisions about changing incentives.

All of this also follows the the recent dust up over a Fox News segment regarding the increase in women as the primary breadwinner, where Juan Williams states:
I just think that this should be in large letters on the front page of every newspaper in America because what we are seeing with four out of ten families now the woman is the primary breadwinner you are seeing the disintegration of marriage...

You are seeing I think, systemically, larger than the political stories that we follow every day something going terribly wrong in American society, and it is hurting our children.

Fox News host Megyn Kelly was incensed that a group of men were disturbing the mound, and brought Lou Dobbs and Erick Erickson on to her show to scold them for daring to challenge feminist progress:

*Not All Traditional Conservatives Are Like That.

See Also:

- Why aren't men responding to economic signals?
- Must a Traditional Man Accept Modern Marriage?
The conservative reaction to Dr. Helen’s *Men On Strike* is interesting because it is the opposite of their general stance on government creating the wrong incentives. When high income taxes discourage investment and production, conservatives point to the Laffer curve and advise lowering tax rates to rectify the problem. The liberal response to conservatives pointing out that high taxes are strangling the economy is to accuse those responding to the current incentives of being selfish or unpatriotic. We see the same pattern across a slew of issues, including stifling environmental regulations, capital gains taxes, minimum wage laws, and rent control. Liberals tend to want to shame actors into going against their own best interest in order to prop up bad public policy, where conservatives tend to point out the folly of using shame and moral coercion to overcome bad policy. The solution to bad policy, conservatives regularly point out, is to fix the policy, not to try to strong arm companies and individuals to go against their own best interest.

But all of this suddenly changes when the bad policy is regarding *marriage*. Then the same conservatives* who stand ready to offer a detailed lecture on the need to match risk with reward, authority with responsibility, and to have consistent and fair enforcement of contracts suddenly switch to the tactics of a liberal defending a 90% marginal tax rate**.

Sure it goes against a man’s best financial and legal interests to marry under the current system, but making foolish choices regarding risk and reward is what being a man is all about! Where is your sense of adventure, your patriotism?

So what makes marriage different to conservatives? Why instead of pushing to remove the built in incentives for women to legally abuse marriage and the uncompensated risks men take in marrying, do so many conservatives reflexively dismiss the need for reform and passionately respond with bizarre and incomprehensible arguments and calls to duty and patriotism? (H/T SlargTarg)

There are three main reasons for this:

1. They are responding emotionally and reflexively to the term *marriage strike*.
2. They have been suckered into the role of enabling feminists.
3. They are invested in the current corrupt model of marriage.

Reason one stems from the conservative tendency to dislike unions. The term “marriage strike” conjures up images of corrupt union bosses, a sense of entitlement, and stifling inefficiency. As a fleeting initial reaction by conservatives this is understandable. The term *marriage strike* is problematic, especially since it doesn't accurately describe what is going on. The decline in marriage is no more a “marriage strike” by men than the economic malaise during the Carter years was a “business strike”. Businesses under President Carter didn’t shrink in an effort to hurt President Carter, they were simply responding to the
incentives at the time. The risks of investment were high, and due to high taxes the potential reward was greatly reduced. Likewise we aren’t seeing men refuse to marry despite wanting to marry under the current system. Men aren’t engaging in collective bargaining to hold out for a better deal; individual men are simply making their own cost/benefit decisions, and as women have collectively upped the ante fewer men (on the margin) are now motivated to marry.

While the term marriage strike is problematic, Dr. Helen is using the term in the context of “going Galt”, referring to Ayn Rand’s famous book Atlas Shrugged. In Atlas Shrugged, the productive class find themselves torn between their natural instinct to work hard, produce, and to solve problems, and the fact that continuing to do so ultimately enables a perverse regime. There is no collective decision in the book by capitalists to refuse to continue to solve the problems the regime creates; this is something each character must agonize over individually. This same problem is something conservatives are struggling with today, and unfortunately large numbers are still stuck in the mental mode of trying to find a way to make feminism work.

But there is a final reason why so many conservatives forget their passionate belief in fair and predictable courts and in balancing risk and reward whenever the topic turns to men and marriage. Just like a liberal arguing that capital holders have an obligation to risk their capital no matter how unpredictable the courts are and how confiscatory the taxes on investments are, many conservatives are defending a system of perverse marriage incentives for men because they like the system. Of the three reasons conservatives turn into liberals when discussing men and marriage, this is by far the strongest.

While being invested in the current system is the primary reason so many conservatives suddenly become irrational on the topic of marriage, it is also greatly misunderstood and surrounded by a thick fog of denial. On the surface it seems impossible. Conservatives are after all, conservative. Surely they support traditional marriage! However, the modern conservative has bought into the lie of feminism. They see marriage as a zero sum game, and fear the oppression of women more than they yearn for traditional marriage. Reforming the corrupt family courts and corrupt churches would in their mind lead to widespread oppression of women. In short, they don’t believe that traditional marriage and traditional sexual morality are good for women. The idea of women marrying young with little or no sexual experience frightens and even repulses them, as does women being encouraged to focus on being wives and mothers over education and career, as does the idea of wives submitting to their husbands.

This is where our opportunity to engage conservatives lies. Part of the issue is that conservatives aren’t used to being challenged on their misplaced fear of traditional sexual morality regarding women and marriage. They see themselves as arguing for traditional sexual morality because they are measuredly critical of slutwalkers and oppose abortion and gay marriage, all the while supporting serial monogamy as a woman’s sacred path to marriage. The other part of the issue is that conservatives are misunderstanding the true nature of sexual morality as well as the nature of men and women. We need to help conservatives understand that romantic love doesn’t confer morality on sex and the choice for wives isn’t between happy rebellion and miserable submission.
This won’t be easy, and we won’t be able to convince large numbers of conservatives that traditional roles and traditional morality aren’t oppressive to women all at once. But when forced to truly face the issue I’m convinced that more and more conservatives will ultimately adopt a conservative position on marriage and sexual morality.

*Not all conservatives are like that.

**Not all liberals are like that.
Asking the wrong question.
by Dalrock | July 10, 2013 | Link

Dr. Helen links to a blog post by Neo-Neocon titled: Should men* be allowed to opt out of child support?

As one of the commenters on Dr. Helen’s site points out, Neo-Neocon’s post drifts somewhat aimlessly on the topic. As I see it though the problem isn’t in Neo-Neocon’s answer, but with the question itself. A more accurate framing of the question she is trying to answer is:

How should we replace marriage as our organizing philosophy of the family?

Simply put, the purpose of child support is to replace marriage. Discussing how it should be implemented is discussing how to replace marriage. Some might argue that this is a good thing, either as a rare exception (say for a husband who abandons his family) or as a rule (as practiced in the western world). But this doesn’t change the fact that child support is working exactly as designed, and exactly as should be expected. Child support crowds out marriage, and even in cases where weddings still technically occur the option for the wife to unilaterally convert the family from a marriage based family to a child support based family always exists. This is part of the threatpoint designed to empower wives and dis-empower husbands. Men simply don’t have the option to choose the marriage based model over the child support model.

This is why Neo-Neocon’s discussion of the best way to implement child support was destined to be convoluted from the beginning. Without acknowledging what child support really is and what it does, there is no logical way to discuss it. This is especially true for Neo-Neocon since she states that she supports marriage:

Wouldn’t it be unconscionable if married men could voluntarily relinquish rights (and duties) to their own children and remain married? And even if they wanted to divorce the mother and live apart and relinquish rights and responsibilities to their children, it would seem as a public policy matter that they should not legally be allowed to walk away from supporting their own children by that mechanism, even if the divorce is not their fault. Children would suffer even more than they do now, and it’s bad enough the way it is.

See Also:

- How we came to embrace illegitimacy.
- How changes to welfare encouraged the illegitimacy explosion.
Angelica at Yahoo Answers asks: Why are young men oogling me?

I am a woman in her mid-30s and decent looking. Decent, not drop-dead gorgeous by any means. Anyways, I have noticed younger men (like early 20s and even younger) checkin me out lookin at me like the wanna take a bite or something! In HS I was not the one these young, hot guys would typically chase after, so why am I getting this attention now?!

Of course I’m happy, but I’m also a little confused. Please help me...

Pleased with the opportunity to help out, I explained:

They see you as in their league so they are more bold in checking you out than they would be with a woman who wasn’t in their league. You are at the intersection of the male and female curves for sexual attractiveness. Young women are the rockstars of the dating world, while young men are fairly low in the pecking order. As women age their attractiveness declines, while as men age their attractiveness tends to increase until around their mid 30s (where it starts to decline as well). As your attractiveness has declined, you now find yourself roughly at par with late teens/early twenties young men. See the article from OK Cupid linked in the sources for data on how age impacts attractiveness for men and women.

Not my best work, but good enough for her to select it as best answer with a five star rating and the following comment:

Makes sense. I better go out an get as many of these guys as i can before I hit 40 lmao
Dr. Helen’s book *Men On Strike* continues to drive the conversation, especially among conservatives. Unlike Tucker Carlson’s *who cares?* Rush Limbaugh’s response was far more receptive. Rush plugged Dr. Helen’s book on his radio program, and interviewed Dr. Helen in his July newsletter.
With the recent discussion of Dr. Helen’s *Men on Strike* I decided to take another look at the US Census *Current Population Survey* data on marital status and earnings. Note that the dollar figures presented are not adjusted for inflation, and represent *earnings, not income*. Also note that the years selected represent five year increments except for the first one (1999), which is as far back as I could easily find data. As I have done before I have limited the data set to White Non Hispanics to simplify the analysis and avoid picking up trends which might be caused by changing racial demographics. If you are interested in data for other races, I have 2012 charts for *White*, *Black*, *Asian*, *Hispanic*, and *All Races*.

As I mentioned in a previous post looking at the data set, what immediately stands out is the surprisingly high percentage of adults with zero earnings, especially since the data set excludes the homeless or those in prison or other institutions. We would expect a fairly high percentage of married women to have no earnings, but surprisingly high percentages of unmarried men and women now have no earnings as well. This trend predates the recent Great Recession, but not surprisingly there was a further increase during the recession. Here is a look at the percentages of early thirties married and unmarried men and women with zero earnings over time:

![Percent of US White Non Hispanics with zero earnings.](image)

Data Source: [http://www.census.gov/hhes/families/data/cps.html](http://www.census.gov/hhes/families/data/cps.html)

If we add in the percentages of each group which earned more than zero but less than $15k it looks like this:
Unmarried early thirties men are the potential husbands marriage delaying women are counting on to whisk them into a glamorous married life, yet nearly a third of these men earn nothing or close to nothing. While some of these low and non earning men are no doubt in this position for truly temporary reasons due to the extremely poor economy, for many others this represents a lack of professional attainment which will be extremely difficult to overcome. A young man with low or no earnings has much more potential to improve than an early 30s or older man in the same position. These men can no more go back and focus their 20s on education and career than unmarried older women can go back to their early 20s and focus on finding a husband.

There is another striking feature of the data, and that is the obvious motivation of married men. This shows up most prominently in the extremes, when looking at the zero earnings bracket as well as the top earnings bracket. The difference is visible across time and becomes more pronounced with higher age brackets. The animation below walks through the different age brackets showing the percentage of each group which earned nothing over time:
Note that as the age categories become older in the chart above unmarried men more and more closely resemble women (married or unmarried). The trend is very similar when looking at the same progression for those earning over $75k:

There is a great deal going on with earnings trends, and this is not intended to be a comprehensive analysis of the topic. However, it is quite clear that what we are witnessing is anything but the “end of men”. What we are seeing at the extremes is married men doing whatever it takes to succeed in a terrible economy, while the results for unmarried men are
similar to that of women.

The different behaviors of married vs unmarried men is important because what we are seeing is the benefit to society of a marriage based family structure. Marriage motivates men to work harder than unmarried men as well as women (married or unmarried).

Feminists coined the term *patriarchal dividend* to describe the supposed free lunch men gain in a patriarchal society. However, what decades of feminism has proven is the real dividend was not to the men themselves but to society as a whole, as married men were motivated to produce in excess of their own personal needs. As we continue our societal drift away from marriage we will experience less and less of this benefit, as more and more men respond to the new economic signals and elect to enjoy the decline.

**See also:** [How the destruction of marriage is strangling the feminist welfare state](http://www.TheRedArchive.com).
Rethinking the marriage wage premium.

by Dalrock | July 21, 2013 | Link

A number of commenters on my last post wanted more evidence that marriage as an institution motivates men to earn more. Commenter Drew asked:

I think the jumps from correlations to narrative/ causation is a little sloppy. For example, do the married men make more because they are higher motivated to do so? Or are they a fully developed and self motivated character that naturally results in more financial success and able to attract women in general to marriage?

This is a very common question for the academics who study the marriage wage premium, and numerous studies have found that the differences in wages between married and unmarried men can’t be explained solely by the selection bias regarding which men are able to marry. A 2004 article by Professor Hal R. Varian in the New York Times titled Analyzing the Marriage Gap describes one such study. Professor Caplan reviews the competing theories in his article What Is the Male Marriage Premium?

However, while selection bias can’t explain the entire difference, there are a number of plausible reasons to believe that selection bias explains part of it. The NY Times article linked above focuses on several selection related hypotheses, including the possibility that better looking men are both more likely to earn more money and to get married. But Drew’s conjecture is for a more direct selection bias, that women are selecting husbands based on their estimated future income potential. This certainly makes sense, but notice that nested in this question is the assumption that men are competing to be picked for marriage by signaling provider potential. Put another way, men are competing for sexual access to the most attractive women. Under a marriage based system men compete for sexual access by competing to marry, and men compete to marry in part by signaling their ability to provide. This of course fits my original assertion, that marriage motivates men to work harder and earn more. There is no conflict between my original assertion and Drew’s question; we are saying the same thing in different ways.

The problem we have is as large numbers of women continue to postpone marriage past their most attractive years (and marriage is more and more debased) signaling provider status becomes less and less an efficient strategy for men competing for sexual access to the most attractive women. This is of course what Roissy and Roosh have explained in great detail.

Commenter GK Chesterton raised another common theory regarding why married men earn more money:

I’d like to see more on this especially pushing further back. I know people have done studies on the economic benefits that families afford in specialization. That is, mom can take care of the kids exclusively and dad can earn. It might be interesting to see household output in economic activity based on married or not married. That way you can tally single men and women against married couples.
While traditional wives certainly add great economic value to the family as a whole, the specialization argument falls flat in my opinion when considering the question of married men’s higher earnings. The problem with the argument is it assumes married men are free to focus more of their time and mental energy on paid work than unmarried men. If this were correct, married men should then be free to work longer hours and travel more for business than unmarried men. The basic assumption is that bachelors are too tied down focusing on housekeeping, cooking meals from scratch, and doing their laundry to really focus on paid work. This is to put it mildly, counter-intuitive. I did a quick google search on the question and the top two results (here and here) refute the specialization theory. The fundamental problem with the specialization theory is that it overlooks what marriage provides to men (aside from sexual access). Marriage is the way men set out to have a family, and the economic value of a traditional wife is greatest within that context. Having a family increases the demands on the man’s time, but the specialization benefit of a traditional wife helps to offset the extra demands the married man has taken on. Either way, the economic benefit of specialization would show up in greater household wealth, not in greater earnings for the man. Just to be clear, I’m not questioning the substantial economic contribution of traditional wives; I’m merely pointing out that it doesn’t plausibly explain why married men earn more than unmarried men.

But there is a more simple way to test whether marriage motivates men to earn more. Starting roughly 40 years ago western society decided to dismantle marriage. Core to this process has been to address the issue of motivation for men. Family courts know that if a man is ejected from his family he will have less incentive to financially provide for his (now ex) wife and children. The same goes for men supporting illegitimate children and their mother. This is the whole point of child support and alimony, to replace the motivation marriage would otherwise create. When the family is intact the man has an incentive to provide not just for himself, but for his wife and children. While most men would still provide for their children even if they aren’t part of his household, it is widely accepted that his lack of status as husband and head of household will mean a reduction in his willingness to provide for his children. The same is even more true regarding support for the wife. But the courts know that just mandating child support and alimony aren’t sufficient to make up for the former motivation provided by the institution they replace (marriage). Coercing men to make these payments lacks the ability to motivate the man to earn as much as he would have earned were he head of household, so there is less income for the courts to transfer to the woman and child(ren). As a result, family courts now take the extraordinary measure of calculating the amount of income they believe the man is capable of making, and then imputing that income to him when calculating how much child support he must pay, as Dr. Stephen Baskerville explains:

> Though ostensibly limited by guidelines, a judge is free to order virtually any amount in child support. A judge who decides that a father could be earning more than he does can “impute” potential income to the father and assess child support and extract attorneys’ fees based on that imputed income.

If marriage didn’t create a substantial incentive for men to earn more, there would be no need to artificially reproduce this incentive when creating a system to replace marriage. While economic studies are helpful, this is a matter of basic sense.
Commenter *They Call Me Tom* offered another common sense explanation for the differences we see in the earnings of married vs unmarried men:

> Wow... to put it shortly. I mean some things seem to make sense... I always said during the layoffs in architecture over the last few years, that I’m certain it was easy enough for me to absorb four or five months out of work, but that I could only imagine how rough it was for the men with wives and children. It’s easy to tighten your own belt, but to tighten the belt of your wife and children? It has to create a sense of desperation (and as put in the article above... more ambition).

That married men are under significantly more pressure to produce earnings than unmarried men is something nearly universally understood, yet when the topic of the marriage earnings “premium” comes up this basic fact is somehow overlooked. This comes from the all too common interaction between the feminist and conservative viewpoints. Feminists view marriage as enslaving women, and are generally reluctant to acknowledge the efforts of husbands. The posture of conservatives however is less intuitive, but they also tend to greatly downplay the sacrifice of husbands. This flows out of the chivalrous view of conservatives, where men taking credit for their sacrifices is seen as in poor form. However, we know that conservatives do know men are taking on a significant burden when they marry, as they are very open about this whenever they scold unmarried men as slackers. As Pastor Driscoll puts it:

> Men are like trucks: they drive straighter with a weighted load. Young men are supposed to load themselves up first by being responsible for themselves and not expecting their mom to fill up their sippy cup with beer and push them in a stroller to the unemployment line. Young men who take responsibility for themselves are then ready to marry and take responsibility for the life and joy of their wife.

The problem is the denial from both feminists and conservatives has lead to a widespread failure to recognize how important to society marriage really is. Child support and imputed income can’t replace marriage, and the sooner we are honest about this the better for all involved.
What is the domestic violence industry really about?
by Dalrock | July 24, 2013 | Link

The Daily Beast has an article by Philip W. Cook titled In Cases of Domestic Violence, Men Are Also Victims (H/T Dr. Helen). Cook explains that despite the perception crafted by domestic violence advocacy groups, women commit domestic violence as often if not more often than men:

Straus and his colleagues found that in minor violence, the incident rates were equal for men and women. In cases of severe violence, more men were victimized than women, with 1.8 million women victims of severe violence and 2 million male victims of severe violence a year. Women suffer a greater amount of total injuries ranging from mild to serious, but when it comes to serious injuries where weapons and object use come into play, the injury rate may be about the same.

Hundreds of scientific studies support what every experienced law-enforcement officer knows: half the time, it is a case of mutual combat; a quarter of the time only the woman is violent; a quarter of the time only the man is.

While I applaud Mr. Cook for his efforts to make the true facts of the situation known, the problem is domestic violence advocacy is seldom about simply protecting actual victims of abuse, and almost always involves a naked attempt by feminists to cow men (especially husbands) into submission, just as feminists have done with divorce.

Feminists are getting away with this because almost no one notices the bait and switch. As with the sign pictured above, domestic violence groups claim their focus is to “save a life”, using what at first glance are gender neutral terms. But as with the billboard, once you look just a bit closer it is clear the only people they are focusing on protecting are women.

Moreover, while the headline advertises stopping violence and saving lives, if you go to the site listed on the sign another agenda becomes clear.

Are you being abused? Take the Dating Violence Quiz at the Women In Need website. As the page explains, if you answer yes to even one of these questions, “you may be in an abusive dating relationship”. As is standard for this kind of quiz, actual abuse is presented alongside scenarios where men aren’t doing what women want. “Shove you, slap you, or hit you?” is presented along with:
Threaten to break up with you?

In a bit of truly amazing rationalization, one question manages to create a scenario where it is abusive if one partner takes the other’s money, makes the other ask before handing over money, or refuses to give the other money:

Take your money, make you ask for money, or refuse to give you money?

But if *one partner* taking the *other partner’s* money is abuse, then how can failing to turn your money over, or even failing to do so without being asked also be abuse? The answer of course is it depends on *which* partner we are talking about. A man who takes his girlfriend/wife’s earnings is implied to be an abuser, as is a man who doesn’t allow his wife/girlfriend to take his money (or only does so after being asked). More importantly, how did we move from hit/slap/shove to *he doesn’t give me money*?

On the site’s advocacy page they explain that one sign of abuse is a man who believes in traditional sex roles, what they call “Rigid Sex Roles”. I can only assume they make an allowance for traditional roles when it comes to which sex spends money earned by the other sex. Either way, the conflation of traditional sex roles with abuse is getting to the heart of the matter.

This issue is as I mentioned above far too often about the power dynamics of marriage (and other relationships) instead of being about real abuse. Feminists object to men in the role of head of household, and domestic violence laws and advocacy are an incredibly effective club feminists are using to beat down traditional husbands. The highly influential Duluth *Power and Control Wheel* is as upfront about this as one can imagine. From the Duluth Model website:

Everyone can take steps to end violence.
Here are some key ways to stop violence in your community:

Don’t ignore violence or tactics of power and control you see in relationships of friends, family or neighbors.

Download a copy of our *Power and Control Wheel* to help identify common tactics used and spot abuse as it happens. Help victims and offenders get the help they need before it is too late.

One of the spokes in the *Power and Control Wheel* is:

**Using Male Privilege**

Treating her like a servant
making all the big decisions
acting like the “master of the castle”
being the one to define men’s and women’s roles

They offer their *Equality Wheel* as the antidote to domestic violence. The *Equality Wheel*
includes gems like:

- Listening to her non-judgmentally
- being emotionally affirming and understanding
- valuing her opinions

On the same page they explain the need to indoctrinate law enforcement with their material:

**Help your community start a “coordinated community response” to domestic violence.**

When everyone from 911 operators to judges have a plan of agreement of how to appropriately respond, battered women and their children are safer and batterers are held accountable and given opportunities to change. Contact our National Training Project at 866-417-6111, option 1, or visit our training and resource materials pages to learn more about starting a coordinated community response in your community.

In their FAQ they explain why they don’t take a gender neutral approach (emphasis mine):

The battering of women by men continues to be a significant social problem–men commit over 85% of all criminal assaults and women are killed 3.5 times more often than men in domestic homicides. Not naming this gender disparity, and the continued underlying social, cultural and institutional structures that support it, keeps us from naming the social problem for what it is. **While we do recognize there are cases of domestic violence other than male perpetrated violence against women, even in those cases the perpetrator’s sense of entitlement to control or dominate another remains the predominant cause of violence.**

In the answer to another question they explain that women abusing men is different than men abusing women (emphasis mine):

When women use violence in an intimate relationship, the circumstances of that violence tends to differ from when men use violence. Men’s use of violence against women is learned and reinforced through many social, cultural and institutional experiences. Women’s use of violence does not have the same kind of societal support. Many women who do use violence against their male partners are being battered. Their violence is used primarily to respond to and resist the violence used against them. On the societal level, **women's violence against men has a trivial effect on men compared to the devastating effect of men’s violence against women.**

See Also: [Blowing the Whistle on the Domestic Violence Research Paradigm](#)
Fenton’s hypothesis.
by Dalrock | July 29, 2013 | Link

Commenter Fenton raised an interesting point in response to my post Forfeiting The Patriarchal Dividend:

A hypothesis: men who lose their jobs (and sink to little or no income) are then often divorced, to free up the woman to find someone with more resources. The two statuses are linked not by motivation to work harder, but by female filtering: men with earnings are acceptable to marry, men without earnings are then divorced. I have no data with which to test this, unfortunately.

This question may not be of interest to many of my readers, but I wanted to dig into the data and see how much of this possible effect I could rule in or out. There are two ways this could be causing the group of married men to have a smaller percentage of zero earnings than the group of unmarried men:

1. **Instantaneous:** In any given year a (mostly) random group of married men find themselves without earnings, and during that same basic time period their wife divorces them, moving them from the married to the unmarried category. Assuming a higher percentage of the men going through a divorce in any given year have zero earnings than the population of married men, that year’s divorces will cause the married category to look better and the unmarried category to look worse than they otherwise would.

2. **Cumulative:** Over time wives are divorcing the least motivated men, and since these men are unmotivated they are remaining unmarried. This would cause the concentration of non earners to build up in the divorced category (especially in older age brackets), and the high concentration of non earning divorced men would increase the percentage of unmarried men with zero earnings.

**How big is the instantaneous (same year) impact of divorce on the percentage of married vs unmarried men with zero earnings?**

The instantaneous impact will be largest in the age bracket with the highest divorce rates, so divorce rates by age is the first piece of data we need. While I don’t have divorce rate data on White men in 2012, the Census put out a report for 2009 with a breakdown of the number of men (all races) who went through a divorce that year by age bracket. I combined this data with the number of married men in the same year to create the following table:
These figures are for all races in 2009, but they at least give an estimate I can plug back into my calculations for Whites in 2012. As you can see, only a small percentage of married men are experiencing divorce in any given year, but there is significant variance by age. Since very few 15-24 year old men are married, I’ll focus on the 25-34 year age bracket as it has the next highest divorce rate.

The next piece of data we need is the percentage of men going through a divorce in 2009 who had zero earnings. The same US Census paper includes this information as well, although unfortunately it doesn’t break it down by age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of men experiencing divorce*</th>
<th>Number of married men**</th>
<th>Percent of married men experiencing divorce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>41,760</td>
<td>1,236,000</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>260,453</td>
<td>9,123,000</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>323,094</td>
<td>13,436,000</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>285,729</td>
<td>14,666,000</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>131,875</td>
<td>12,205,000</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-and over</td>
<td>57,146</td>
<td>11,943,000</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/hh-fam/cps2009/tabA1-all.xls
http://dailrock.wordpress.com/
Adding the percentage of men divorcing in 2009 who were on unemployment (9.5%) to the percent not in the labor force (17.2%) gives us a total of 26.7% with no earnings. This number almost certainly overstates the percent of White men age 25-34 divorcing with no earnings because:

- It includes men who are at or nearing retirement age, both of which have higher percentages of zero earnings than 25-34 year old men do.
- Zero earnings rates are lower for White men than men of all races.

From here we can estimate:

A) The number of 25-34 year old White men who went through a divorce in 2012. We get this by multiplying the number of married men in that demographic by the percent of 25-34 year old married men (all races) who went through a divorce in 2009 (2.9%).

B) How many of those divorces involved men with zero earnings (26.7% of the answer from “A”).

Once we have these two estimates, we can add the estimated number of men who went through a divorce in 2012 back into the White married category and subtract them from the unmarried group. This allows us to quantify the (estimated) impact of that years divorces on the results. Here is what the revised calculations look like for married men:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012 White married men Age 25-34</th>
<th>Number with zero earnings</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent with zero earnings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual 25-34 married men*</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>5,486,000</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated 25-34 men who experienced divorce in 2012**</td>
<td>41,818</td>
<td>156,620</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated 25-34 married men if no divorce in 2012</td>
<td>406,818</td>
<td>5,642,620</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated instantaneous decrease in zero earnings due to divorce in 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://dairock.wordpress.com/

We do the same thing with the 2012 White unmarried category, but in this case we need to subtract the estimated divorces:
This tells us what the figures would have been had no divorces occurred in 2012 (again assuming the estimates are accurate). The married category would have had 7.2% of men with zero earnings (an extra .56%). The unmarried category would have had 15% of men with zero earnings (a difference of .28%).

Since the original total difference between married and unmarried White men was 8% for the 25-29 bracket and 8.5% for the 30-34 bracket the estimated combined instantaneous effect of (at most) .84% (.56% + .28%) would only account for a small part of the difference we are seeing. Since the later age brackets have lower divorce rates, the instantaneous impact would be even smaller for older men.

**What about a possible cumulative impact of divorce?**

The best way to measure this is by breaking down the unmarried category to its different sub groups (divorced, widowed, never married, etc) and calculate zero earnings percentages for each sub group. Fortunately this data is available by age bracket for White men in 2012. Since the biggest difference between married and unmarried men was in the 45-54 year old age bracket (and the cumulative effect would be greatest for the older age categories) I calculated the percent of each sub group of unmarried White men age 45-54 in 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012 White unmarried men</th>
<th>Age 25-34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number with zero earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual 25-34 unmarried men*</td>
<td>995,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated 25-34 men who experienced divorce in 2012**</td>
<td>41,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated 25-34 unmarried men if no divorce in 2012</td>
<td>953,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated instantaneous increase in zero earnings due to divorce in 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://dalrock.wordpress.com/
As I did with the charts in the original post, I’ve included “Separated” in the unmarried category because for Whites separation fairly quickly leads to divorce. See fig 32 of this study for more details. Interestingly the percent of divorced men with zero earnings was identical to the same figure for separated men.

Note also that divorced and separated men have the lowest percentage of men with zero earnings for the entire unmarried category. Divorced men are actually pulling the average down. This rules out a cumulative impact of divorce as increasing the percentage unmarried men with zero earnings. The other possible cumulative impact would be on married men. However, this is less clear cut because while it is clear that there is some selection going on regarding the men experiencing divorce in any given year, the new marital status also means less incentive to earn.

What is especially surprising is the high percentage of widowed men with zero earnings. At first glance it would seem that there shouldn’t be a correlation between a man’s earnings and his wife’s probability of passing away. However, since this is a 10 year age bracket what we might be seeing is older men being more likely to both have 0 earnings (either due to retirement or disability) and to have lost their wife. However, when I broke it out for just 45-49 year old white men the result for widowed men was nearly identical. It might also be that there is a correlation with lifestyle choices of the married couple that we are seeing, such as drug or alcohol abuse leading to higher than average levels of both early death and unemployment/disability. But it is also possible (I would argue likely) that this difference represents the formerly married man’s reduced incentive to work now that he no longer has a wife. My guess is both are in play here, but I won’t speculate on the relative weight of the two factors.

**Conclusion**

Some of the differences we see between married and unmarried men does seem to be explained by wives divorcing non earning men as Fenton hypothesized, but this impact is small compared to the overall difference observed and has the biggest impact on the younger age brackets where divorce rates are highest. The biggest difference we find in zero earnings rates between married and unmarried men is in the older age brackets, and for
these brackets the cumulative impact of divorce is actually reducing the observed difference. All of this confirms that marriage does appear to motivate men to earn more than they would otherwise earn, and that sorting due to divorce isn’t what is driving the differences we see. The lower earnings rates for widowed men appears to further corroborate this, but it is possible that part of what we are observing for widowed men could be explained by joint lifestyle choices or some other factor.
Emmanuel Goldstein expertly traces the cracks in the crumbling narrative in his post A Vindication Of The Writings Of Men over at Return of Kings (language warning).

Behind all these excuses is the determination to see everything but the girls themselves as factors in the demise of dating. Everything else, particularly the men, must be fingered as responsible. Women are not allowed to be human, to have agency. They cannot even be animals, base impulses and all. When it comes time to assign culpability, only men have moral agency.
No room for headship here.

by Dalrock | August 3, 2013 | Link

As I explained before, all too often the topic of domestic violence is raised not in a good faith effort to protect against real abuse, but as a club against husbands to bring them into submission. The concept of a husband as head of household is unbearable to feminists, and framing the ordinary husband as a rabid potential abuser who must be held in check (lest he terrorize his innocent and defenseless wife) is the feminist’s most effective tool in destroying the concept of headship. This is as true for Christian feminists as it is for their secular counterparts.

Joel and Kathy Davisson are so over the top and farcical in applying this method that they come across as more of a caricature of it than serious practitioners. But nevertheless they are serious, and if you want to understand the mechanics of how feminists go to war with biblical headship, study the Davissons first. Once you see the mechanics of the tactic used so brazenly and clumsily by the Davissons, the more subtle and sophisticated use of the tactic by more mainstream Christian feminists becomes transparent as well.

No matter who is using it, the key to the effectiveness of this tactic is in putting the defenders of biblical headship in a position of trying to explain why they aren’t either abusers themselves or supporting abuse. This move clears the table of the biblical relationship between husbands and wives, and dares those who aren’t at war with the Bible to try to plead for space to allow even a little of the biblical framing of marriage back in. The begging and pleading is doomed to fail, as the feminists have entirely reset the frame and created new rules for the game:

| Prove that the Word of God isn’t abusive and sexist, and that you aren’t really just a monster hiding behind the Bible! |

The defenders fail before the first word has left their mouths, because they fail by accepting this frame. No amount of pleading or earnest assurance will placate the new spiritual authority and convince them that the portions of the Bible which offend them actually mean what they say. Abuse is the Christian feminists’ nuclear trump card against headship, and they play it with impunity.

I came across a textbook use of this tactic the other day on Catholic Answers Forum. The thread is old but the exchange is timeless. One poster asked what 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 meant:

| 34women should remain silent in the churches. They are not allowed to speak, but must be in submission, as the Law says. 35if they want to inquire about something, they should ask their own husbands at home; for it is disgraceful for a woman to speak in the church. |

Commenter Zundrah responded with an amusing rationalization before clumsily playing the abuse card:
My minister once told me – the women were separate from the men. One side of chapel male – one side all female. Apparently the women would shout out to their husbands for answers on queries. I personally don’t believe that though (who would shout out in church?) But seriously... let’s be honest, the writer of this letter is obviously abusing women. Unfortunately, that is common in churches especially back in those days!

Hope women are not hurt by this – remember that Jesus did not say that. A human man did but not our Lord Christ who loves us unconditionally!

This mixed tactic of denial while half heartedly claiming abuse wasn’t effective though, and several other commenters grudgingly stated that the passage indeed appeared to mean what it says, and that it related to the spiritual headship of husbands. Zundrah gathered her composure and replayed the abuse card, this time with feeling:

Hmm, well excuse me but I will not hear this. Christ said love you neighbour. He did not say “34women should remain silent in the churches. They are not allowed to speak, but must be in submission.”

Christ said “come to me, all you who labour and are burdened, and I will grant you peace.” How ever he did not say “Women are second rate and should be submissive even if their husbands batter and abuse them. Christ clear single message was; LOVE ONE ANOTHER AS THE FATHER LOVES YOU! He would never say to women “be submissive”. Submission is what a dog does when you kick it! Not women of eve that God made with his own divine and loving hands. Think before you say so little on a very sensitive subject. Some women who read this might have been raped at some point of their lives. So to just say to them “be fully submissive” sounds very malicious and pure evil to me!

This was much more effective, although ultimately some of the men commenting were able to bring the conversation back to the long established Catholic reading of the passage. Throughout the discussion Zundrah follows the standard Christian feminist pattern of throwing out mutually exclusive explanations for why the verse in question should be ignored. She started with the funny story about wives calling over to their husbands in another section during the middle of the service, and then moved to the argument that it meant what it said but that it needed to be disregarded because some women have been raped. Ultimately she signs off on another woman’s explanation with a heart felt “Amen!”:

It doesn’t mean anything. At least not for today’s Christians, it was just speaking about the people that lived thousands of years ago. God left this in the bible to show us how things have changed.

The important thing to remember when you encounter women like Zundrah is none of her arguments have any real meaning, and shouldn’t be responded to as if they were a logical and/or sincere discussion of the Scripture. She is furious with this part of the Bible, and what comes out is pure emotion imitating the form of a logical argument; it isn’t an attempt to discuss the issue logically.

This tactic tends to be even more effective on Protestants, and Focus On The Family has an entire series of articles on “emotional abuse” by Mary J. Yerkes. She introduces the topic
in Understanding Emotional Abuse, explaining that churches are teeming with abusive husbands who need to be kept in check:

While statistics are elusive, experts agree that emotional abuse—for mostly women, but some men as well—have reached epidemic proportions. And despite its everyday occurrence, few of us recognize it, identify it or even do anything about it.

Elsewhere she explains:

- Emotional abuse is rampant in our culture, and Christians are not immune.

In Emotional Abuse in the Local Church she quotes another woman:

- “In the pews of every church, including yours, are women who are victims of abuse,”

She explains that the problem is abusive men twisting Scripture:

- In regards to abuse within marriage, some misinterpret Ephesians 5:22 to justify abusive behavior.

She offers as an example the same piece of Scripture which enraged Zundrah at Catholic Answers Forums. We learn of one abusive husband named “Mark” who abused his wife by quoting the hurtful verse:

- Although Janet had questions, she remained silent in order to “submit” to her husband. Like many abusers, Mark distorted Scripture to manipulate his wife’s behavior.

Just as the secular feminists define a man who holds traditional gender roles as abusive, the Christian feminist warns women that a traditional reading of the Bible is the tell tale sign of an abuser. Christian wives need to be ever vigilant, lest they become abused. In Healing the Wounds of Emotional Abuse, she offers “biblical principles and practical tips for healing”. Chief among these is the importance of recognizing your Christian husband as an abuser.

- If you are reading this article, chances are you or someone you love is in an emotionally abusive relationship.

This is where the biblical approach becomes so crucial:

- Invite the Holy Spirit to reveal the reality about a potentially abusive relationship.
- Admit you are being abused and recognize the damage it has done.

The other key approach for wives is to recognize the danger of submitting to their husbands. This traditional (and therefore twisted) reading of the Bible overlooks the Bible’s real wisdom for wives, the need to set boundaries:

- **Set appropriate boundaries.** In the excellent book, Boundaries—When to Say Yes, When to Say No to Take Control of Your Life, Dr. Henry Cloud and Dr. John Townsend, explain how and when to set appropriate, biblical boundaries.
I’ve offered just two examples, but once you recognize the tactic you will notice it everywhere. The problem with the tactic is it makes it impossible to have an honest discussion of either biblical headship and submission or how to respond to actual abuse. It is a pungent emotional stink bomb designed to clear the room, and it is incredibly effective at this. Our best tactic against this is to recognize it for what it really is and deal with it accordingly.
Intrasexual Competition and the Strong Independent Woman.

by Dalrock | August 11, 2013 | Link

When we talk in the sphere about what motivates women we focus heavily on the “tingle”, or sexual attraction. There is good reason for this, and nearly all men need to focus more on attraction. We also talk about the tangible benefits women receive from men in the form of provision, protection, and parenting. Sexual attraction to alpha traits is generally accepted as the (imperfect) manifestation of the female need to provide her children with the most advantageous genes in the form of sperm. Women are looking for all of these things, but not all choose to acquire them from the same man. The tendency of many women to pursue a split strategy when securing sperm and provision/protection is summed up in the catch phrase:

| Alpha f**** and beta bucks.

For those who are new to the topic of female sex related drives understanding and accepting the basic truth of the above is essential whether your goal is to be a player or a husband. Moreover, looking at feminism through the lens of the female mating strategy has caused many to note that feminism has worked to free women to focus more on the pursuit of the tingle while enlisting the state to compel beta men to provide them with provisioning and protection outside of the traditional arrangement of marriage. This is certainly true, and even the most conservative elements in our society now embrace the replacement of marriage as the central organizing structure for the family.

However, after acknowledging these facts many in the sphere make the mistake of claiming that all of women’s needs are being met in this new post marriage family structure; women simply don’t need marriage anymore, they claim. With the aid of feminists and conservatives alike, strong independent women are now empowered to revel in casual sex with alphas while using their career and/or the state compelled transfer of money from betas to buy their own status symbols. These strong independent women even have their own anthem performed by Beyoncé:

| Question: Tell me what you think about me  
| I buy my own diamonds and I buy my own rings  
| Only ring your celly when I’m feelin’ lonely  
| When it’s all over, please get up and leave

Reinforcing the point is the triumphant refrain “I bought it”:

| The rock I’m rockin’ — I bought it  
| ‘Cause I depend on me  
| The watch I’m wearin’ — I bought it  
| The house I live in — I bought it
The car I’m driving — I bought it
I depend on me

That feminists would love this song is obvious, but why are so many in the manosphere singing the same tune? And more importantly, is it even true?

The problem for feminists is in their effort to change the rules of their status competition with other women they have overlooked a fundamental aspect of female intrasexual competition. Those status symbols women use to compete with each other don’t have the same meaning if a woman has to buy them for herself. Women don’t just need men for tingles and provision/protection, they need men for status and validation. Women gain status and validation from men in a number of ways, but all of them are perfectly tuned to make a good feminist want to pull her leg hair out. Even the sex positive feminist’s favorite, the alpha booty call, is more important for status and validation than it is for sexual fulfillment in the way men think of sex. Roosh goes so far as to argue that The Female Orgasm Is Trivial.

Maddeningly even the non-sexual status and fulfillment feminists seek can really only be provided by men. Feminists desperately crave to be accepted as one of the guys in a mostly futile effort to experience manly pride. This obsession is core to our integration of the military and is a staple in feminist fiction. In The Last Psychiatrist’s brilliant review of the Hunger Games he describes the unlikely scene in the movie which has feminists so enthralled:

There’s a banquet and the contestants have to show off their skills, but the overlords are eating a roast pig and bored with Katniss (because she misses a target) so Katniss turns her arrow towards them and shoots an apple. Katniss says, “you better recognize, mothafuckas!”, flashes a gang sign, and the audience swoons. That’s when she’s a badass. Yes, she was wonderful in the Games, I’m sure, but what got your adrenaline going, what made her a badass, is showing off her abilities- to men.

TLP goes on to assert that to the delighted female viewers Badass = showing she can compete on a male level, but if you watch the scene it is very obviously not about competing on a male level but instead a plea for attention and acceptance from the men. The look on Katniss’ face screams:

Notice me! Take me seriously!

This is exactly how Entertainment Tonight characterized the same scene:

While in the training area getting prepared to enter the arena for the Hunger Games, a literal fight to the death, Jennifer’s character Katniss Everdeen shows her skill with a bow and arrow. But when the game makers seem more interested in a pig that just arrived, an angry Katniss gets their attention.

Getting back to women’s intrasexual competition, what matters most is proving investment by a worthy man. In this sense the claim that women are the gatekeepers of sex but men are the gatekeepers of commitment is incomplete. More accurately men are the gatekeepers
of investment, a category which includes commitment. When Roissy or Roosh have sex with a woman, they automatically confer on her the validation which comes from being desired by and sexually satisfying an attractive man. They simply can’t get what they want without giving this to the woman in the process. But while the women they bed crave this validation, it is of limited and fleeting value in the woman’s competition for status with other women. For this she needs something public that she can show other women. Winning the alpha away from the other women present for the night or a few hours has some cachet, but what she really wants is a public display of his investment in her. She wants him to give her things she can show off to other women, things that prove that she is his woman. She wants him to formally call her his woman, either as his girlfriend or far better, his wife. This is why Beyoncé changes her tune when she wants to rub other women’s noses in her superior status. The foolish boast of “I bought it” is forgotten, and the erstwhile strong independent woman rolls out the big gun of female status symbols, the title of Mrs.

Coming soon to a city near you
The Mrs. Carter show world tour

Bow down bitches. The ladies at Slate’s Double X are of course beside themselves.

Unlike the tingle, women competing for the investment of worthy men aren’t just evaluating these men on alpha traits. In fact, while alpha traits are a definite positive beta provision and protection traits are a must. While Roissy may well be correct in his assertion that Prince William is a beta chump, Kate Middleton has won the female intrasexual world championship by becoming his wife. Even if he doesn’t make her tingle, there is huge status associated with not just becoming but remaining Prince William’s wife.

Beyoncé and Duchess Kate are married to men on the extreme end of the male status curve, but the wives of more ordinary men also receive a very large status boost by the title Mrs. While feminists tried to eradicate the term on the grounds that it belittled women, the average woman is actually quite proud of the term and the status which it confers. You can see this in among other things, the popularity of the Mrs. necklace.

That women receive status from marriage even to men who aren’t high on the tingle factor likely is counter-intuitive to many in the manosphere. However, not only is it easy to observe, but there is a good biological reason to think that this in fact should be the case. While we have in many ways divorced sex and marriage from children, the unconscious drives that govern men and women in this area generally come down to seeking a reproductive advantage. It is popular to try to distill the advantage fathers provide to their children to financial support and physical protection, with the added benefit to the mother of general “parenting assistance”. Those who are feeling generous may even acknowledge that fathers bring a stability to the home which fatherless homes generally lack and that fathers are especially helpful when it comes to discipline.

But there is another extremely important but less tangible benefit which fathers provide, and this is best described as legitimacy. Fathers matter in ways that are difficult to quantify or describe, but the cost to children who don’t have the benefit of growing up in a traditional father lead home are undisputed. Legitimacy can best be thought of as the public
acceptance of the child by the father. The child benefits from a sense of status and identity, both internally and by reputation.

To understand the concept of legitimacy and tie this back to the topic of women’s intrasexual competition it helps to recognize that legitimacy isn’t an all or nothing prospect, especially in our current culture. For example, not all newborn children of unwed mothers have equal legitimacy. Some of them are welcomed into a home where their father resides, even though their parents aren’t married. Some might even receive their father’s last name. As time goes on, some of these children will continue to live in the home of their father, while others will have their father leave or be ejected by the mother. Even for those whose father doesn’t remain in the home there will be differences. Some will mostly grow up with their father in the home, while others will separate from their fathers much sooner. There will also be differences in the relationships the children retain with their fathers when he is out of the home. With no fault divorce all of the same is true for newborns of married couples.

Another way to look at legitimacy as a sliding scale is to consider the impact the mother’s relationship with the father has on the child’s relationship with him in cases where a man has children by more than one woman. Duchess Kate recently gave birth to a son who is third in line for the throne. Were it to (hypothetically) turn out that another woman secretly gave birth to another son of William around the same time, the difference in advantage for the two women’s sons is obvious. While this is admittedly an extreme and hypothetical case, it should help to conceptuallyize the real benefits the newly born Prince George receives from his mother being William’s wife. Aside from the public fact that he is officially in line for the throne, his personal identity as William’s son is also much stronger. Even if the other (hypothetical) son was eventually acknowledged to be William’s, and even if William made a serious effort to be in the child’s life the difference in advantage would always be huge. In the modern era we have used child support to try to overcome the advantages of legitimacy (to free women from the restriction of marriage), but even massive amounts of child support can not overcome this gulf.

Feminists want to argue that the status of the father is irrelevant, and that the mother can replace the father with respect to the child’s identity. Certainly children receive their identity from both their mother and father, but there will always be a difference. As the feminist experiment has inadvertently demonstrated, there is something special about the status of men.

Thinking about legitimacy as a sliding scale also helps explain a number of peculiar things about women’s reaction to men’s infidelity. Wives of sufficiently alpha men tend to overlook the periodic infidelity of their husbands, so long as the infidelity doesn’t become public and the man himself consistently denies the infidelity. What is unforgivable by these wives is when the husband crosses the line of carrying on in public with another woman, publicly acknowledges the other woman, or even worse, acknowledges a child he fathered by another woman. This last humiliation is too much even for a woman from the Kennedy family to bear.

The question of legitimacy also helps explain why it is so incredibly painful for wives who divorce their boring loyal dude husband only to have him marry a younger woman, especially if he either has children with the new wife or she has young children of her own. The
paternal investment of her now ex husband is diluted by the other woman’s children, who because they now live with the father arguably have a greater public claim to him. Similarly we can understand why widows don’t take the status hit that divorcées do and why their children largely escape the negative effects of single motherhood; there is no question that their mother was their father’s woman, and their identify and status are secure.

**Note:** In a future post I’ll tackle the question of why women’s intrasexual competition for status takes on different forms over time.
Good stuff.
by Dalrock | August 12, 2013 | Link

Likely the fastest growing Game site in the Manosphere, Just Four Guys has a new post up reworking the never married data I shared here. I haven’t gone through the numbers close enough to vouch for them, but I think you will find their analysis interesting. Check out Marriage Rates Plummet—Projection of Never-Married Rates to 2017.

To celebrate their offering of charty goodness, I thought I’d pull out some additional graphics which didn’t make the cut for this post on earnings. I’m not sure exactly what to make of them except that inflation seems to overshadow any real trends, but you have to admit they look pretty cool.

Data source: http://www.census.gov/hhes/families/data/cps.html
http://dalrock.wordpress.com/
Even better than leftover animated charts, grerp is back with new posts. Check out Opting in, opting out as well as her other new posts.

In case you missed it, Vox Day had an excellent post the other day on the importance of nexting women who don’t demonstrate attraction:

> Conclusion: as soon as you even suspect that a woman may have disqualified you, NEXT her and move on to the next one. When in doubt, NEXT. If you’re not sure, NEXT. If it’s a little confusing, NEXT. If she’s sending mixed signals, NEXT. If you are getting anything but genuine enthusiasm to see you, unnecessary touching, and enthusiastic physical contact, NEXT. Do not hesitate, ever. No more than two dates should ever be necessary to make this determination from the male perspective.

When I originally asked my wife out, she gave me some lame excuse about having to pick a friend up at the airport. I don’t really recall the exchange but I took it as a lame excuse and started to next her. She insisted that it wasn’t a lame excuse, and at her encouragement I proposed we go out another day and she accepted. This was roughly 20 years ago, and she still goes into a passionate explanation that she really wasn’t blowing me off if I tease her about it even a little.
Is Europe proof that intact families don’t really matter?
by Dalrock | August 15, 2013 | Link

Introverted Playboy made the following statement over at Just Four Guys as part of a larger argument that marriage no longer matters:

European countries today have even lower marriage rates than the US. I think something like 80% of Swedish children are born out of wedlock. Yet society has not collapsed. It just evolves.

There are a couple of relevant questions here. What are the out of wedlock birth rates for Sweden and other European countries? And, what percent of children in each country grows up with both their mother and their father? From the point of view of the child, parents who never had a wedding but stayed together are arguably more “married” than parents who had a wedding but split while the child was growing up.

I did a bit of searching and found recent data for out of wedlock birth rates as well as the percent of adolescents (11, 13, and 15 year olds) living with both parents from the OECD family database. I combined data from tables SF1.3.B and SF2.4.A and discarded countries which weren’t represented in both tables. I left in the countries from outside of Europe so long as they were included in both tables. Normally data on marital status at birth is presented as the percent born out of wedlock, but I converted this to the percent born in wedlock so the chart would be comparing like numbers. Click on the chart for a larger version, and see the tables linked above for the numeric values represented in the chart as well as more information on the data sets.
Since it combines data from two different data sets there are some irregularities which should be noted. The first is the different dates. The data on percent of births in wedlock is for 2009, and the data on adolescents living with both parents is from 2005 and 2006. In addition, a few countries are listed with two different estimates for the percent of adolescents living with both parents. For example, note that there are two values for the US, labeled United States and United States 2. The “2” indicates a different data source:

2 Data from questionnaire as sent directly to countries, children 0 to 17 (this contributes to differences with the HBSC-results).

Also, the adolescent living arrangement label for the UK says England only while the data on births in wedlock doesn’t include this restriction. The former data set breaks out Belgium to French and Flemish speakers, while the latter does not.

However, there is a bigger problem with the chart above. Out of wedlock birth rates are rising over time, and today’s adolescents would have been born during a time of lower out of wedlock birth rates. Even worse, the adolescent living arrangement data is older than the birth data, so the date relationship is backwards. I kept the chart above and shared it because it is still helpful to see the latest data in comparison, but if we are looking to understand the relationship between the two a different date relationship is needed.

Ideally we would want to look at 1999 birth data and 2012 living arrangement data, which would give us a 13 year spread; this way we would be looking at data for roughly the same
cohort at birth and as adolescents. Unfortunately I can’t find living arrangement data that new. However, I did find 1995 birth data and matching this up with the 2005/2006 living arrangement data gets us very close to the relationship I wanted to see. The 1995 birth data for all countries listed except the US is from table SF2.4.B. Birth data for the US is from Table 86 of the Statistical Abstract of the United States.

With this chart the benefit of higher in wedlock birthrates on ultimate family stability is more obvious. Still, the relationship is weaker than I would have guessed. The relationship might appear slightly weaker than it really is due to the adolescents in the chart having been born a few years earlier than the out of wedlock birth data. The data on adolescent living arrangements appears to be due for a refresh, so hopefully updated information will be published by the OECD in the near future so we can see what this looks like with the exact date gap.

The other thing which stands out in both charts is that there is a huge variation across Europe in out of wedlock birth rates and a much smaller variation in the percent of adolescents living with both parents. Greece has an in wedlock birth rate of 94%, while only 36% of children in Iceland are now born in wedlock. The percent of adolescents in the respective countries living with both parents is a much closer 86% and 70%.

Also, note that no country in Europe is evidence that a collapsing two parent family is no cause for alarm. The most recent data available shows that all European countries have a
higher percentage of adolescents living with both parents than the US*; **it isn't Europe that is leading in the area of broken homes, it is the US!** Nearly all of the European countries listed have 70% or more of their children raised in an intact home, whether the parents had married prior to the birth of the child or not. Given the continuing fall in out of wedlock birth rates, the results will certainly look worse for adolescents ten and fifteen years from now. The costs to our society are in many ways baked in, even though we won’t fully experience them for many years.

*Romania isn’t listed in the charts above because out of wedlock birth data wasn’t available. It had the next lowest percentage of adolescents living with both parents at 58% compared to the US with 57%. The separate measurement of 62% for the US uses a different methodology (skewed toward younger children) and is therefore not comparable.
Brilliant advertising.

by Dalrock | August 17, 2013 | Link

Viva La Manosphere highlighted a Barbarossaa post today with a new (to me) man up video featuring Pastor Mark Driscoll and Bill Bennett. These guys are the all stars of the man up brigade, so it was impressive to see both of them in the same video. Those peter pan manboys don’t stand a chance!

The video itself is some of the best advertising I’ve ever seen. It is perfectly tuned to appeal to the key target audience, which is quite obviously Christian women. At the same time it is designed to appeal to the secondary audience, Christian men. Christian men can watch the video and think:

| Finally, someone is fighting the feminism in the church and teaching men to reclaim their position as head of the household! I’ll go ask my wife if she will allow me to attend. |

Following the lead of Courageous, the video features a thoroughly broken husband being harangued by his ballbusting wife. For a moment he weakly pushes back, but then she threatens to move out and he submits to her authority. Those who support traditional marriage are no doubt encouraged by this exchange and the larger message of the video, assuming this video series is secretly about returning to the biblical instruction on headship and submission. If their wife gives the ok, they can’t wait to attend the sessions!

But as I mentioned above the true target audience of this video is obviously the head of modern Christian households, the wives. The video is perfectly tuned to create a grass roots facebook/email marketing campaign by Christian wives:

| Finally someone is willing to fix our broken men! Maybe these folks can get our man-children to step up and lead us the way we tell them to. |

This works because those who believe in traditional marriage will spot the out of control harridan wife and assume the video is a rebuke of women like this, while women like this can identify with the harridan wife constantly telling her pathetic husband to man up. The whole video is tuned this way, with vague references to “divorce” changing society, without ever saying anything which would make a rebellious Christian wife uncomfortable. You won’t know what is actually included in the series until your church plunks down the $150 and the wives send their husbands and sons in to be fixed. My money says the rebellious wives won’t be disappointed.

No one ever went broke pandering to feminist Christian wives, and this is the whole problem. While the video is telling men they need to step up and reclaim their position in the family, the message to modern Christian wives is anything but submission. Many of the men whose wives send them to the Stepping Up™ video series likely were dragged to a similar type of video series titled The Art of Marriage™. If you are a married Christian man in North America, odds are your wife was emailed by another Christian woman telling her about how great the
program is (mine was). SunshineMary mentioned having viewed that series in a comment a while back:

(my husband and I recently went through this study at our church). It’s the same old same old. Lots of false information about what generates attraction, lots of “servant” leadership (i.e. supplication by husbands) and mutual submission.

What the creators of the Stepping Up™ advertisement above are ignoring is that feminist rebellion is rampant in nearly all modern churches. This rebellion is being catered to by Christian movies and a whole slew of Christian publications, marriage retreats, books, etc. It is so bad that biblical headship is now framed as abuse. We don’t need more man up rants, we need to man up and confront the rebellion. But since Christian men have been beaten down by pastors and other religious leaders pandering to the rebellion of Christian wives, telling men to man up is easy, while calling on Christian wives to submit is terrifying.

Christian husbands won’t argue if you tell them they need to “step up”, they will agree and then tell you about how their wife is light years closer to God than they are. This is a serious pathology, but no one in a position of leadership wants to truly confront it. There is not only a sense of terror at offending the feminist rebellion, but a deep sense of shame that the Bible is so profoundly unfeminist.

Pastor Voddie Baucham Jr. gave an excellent sermon on the topic of submission on a radio program by FamilyLife back in June of last year. The message is titled The Value of Submission, and you can download the mp3 or read the transcript. He does a masterful job of addressing the rebellion while softening the message enough to prevent an outright riot in the pews. Here is a short quote, but I highly recommend listening to or reading the entire thing:

But here’s what else I know—even if your husband led perfectly, you would rebel against it because that was the curse in the Garden. “Yes, well, what if my husband is not even being obedient to God?” Isn’t it great that there’s a Bible verse for that? First Peter, Chapter 3, “Likewise, wives, be submissive to your own husbands so that even if any of them are disobedient to the Word—” Yes, it’s in there!

By the way, when he says, “Likewise, wives,” do you ever wonder, “Like what?” If you go back to the previous chapter, and the previous paragraph, he’s talking about slaves who have evil masters and how a slave, with an evil master, should submit, even to the evil master. It’s after that that he says, “Likewise, wives.” I don’t write the mail; I just deliver it. [Laughter]

Pastor Baucham is a master, and very few other pastors could honestly navigate this issue without being thrown out of the room. What the Bible says is so radically different than how modern Christians believe that hearing the truth can be quite startling. Yet if we are Christians first, we need to bend to the Word, not the other way around. But very few Christian teachers are willing to take a bold stand for the Bible, especially when it comes to the topic of women and marriage. Telling men to “step up” is easy, a true crowd pleaser; telling women to submit is dangerous, not to mention bad for business.

After Baucham’s sermon completes the host of the show and president of FamilyLife Dennis
Rainey expressed his thoughts on what Pastor Baucham just explained:

**Dennis:** I've got a feeling it’s probably pretty quiet in some cars and, maybe, on some headsets, listening to this broadcast.

**Bob:** Let me just say that we still have Part Two to come. That is where Voddie is going to talk to men about loving their wives as Christ loves the church. This message has some balance to it, but—pretty strong stuff.

**Dennis:** It is strong stuff. As I was sitting there listening to Voddie give that message, I thought, “You know, this would be a tough message for a woman, in this culture, to hear, if it was given by a woman.

**Bob:** Yes.

**Dennis:** But hearing it from a man—it is interesting. I think for some women—that makes it tough to hear. I would just say to the wife or the young lady who is listening to that and says, “I don’t like that!”—you know what? He didn’t write it. He does deliver the mail. He’s just trying to share with you what the Scriptures teach, in terms of how a marriage relationship between a husband and a wife—how they’re to complement each other and not compete with each other. There’s a lot about the Bible that causes the hair on the back of my neck to stand up.

**Bob:** [Laughing] You go, “I don’t like that part either!”

**Dennis:** As a man, absolutely! And yet, in this culture, Bob, I feel like we poisoned the stream about—I don’t know—four decades ago and really made it almost objectionable for a message like this to be preached by a pastor—by a man—to a mixed audience, at this point. I don’t want you to hear me apologizing that we did it—that’s not my point. I want to recognize that, in this culture, we understand that it does go against the grain of what a lot of women are taught. All I would say is, “If you can find a better way for a marriage to work, I’d like to see it.” This passage, here—along with the rest of Scripture—really points out how two imperfect people can go the distance and how they can glorify God in the process.

He doesn’t want you to *hear* him apologizing for airing Pastor Baucham’s sermon, but what else is he doing if not apologizing for what is in the Bible? He even says there is *a lot about the Bible that causes the hair on the back of [his] neck to stand up!* When else would a leader of a Christian organization say something so outrageous, so shameful, except when it comes to pandering to the feminist rebellion?

And exactly who *poisoned the well?* Feminists? Could he mean women like Sheila Wray Gregoire? I doubt it, because Sheila and her husband are regular speakers at his *FamilyLife* weekend marriage conferences. Sheila *describes* on her blog how the women at the conferences get visibly uncomfortable when she talks about “what a woman can do to make marriage great”. She explains that this always happens, so she stops and tells the women:
I know you women are uncomfortable with me saying all these things that you should do. But let me reassure you that right now my husband has all of your husbands in another room, and he is blasting them and telling them what they need to do, too, in no uncertain terms. So don’t worry. Your husbands are hearing an important message. So get your minds off of them and let’s just spend this time thinking about what we as women can do to make the marriage great.

Does anyone doubt that these wives are the same target audience for the ad at the beginning of the post? What is amazing is Sheila isn’t preaching like Baucham on wives submitting to their husbands. Sheila is all over the map on the topic, but in her signature book she explains that biblical submission means giving your husband a list of housework to do so the wife feels pampered and the husband feels useful. Sheila isn’t fighting against the feminist rebellion; she has a master’s degree in women’s studies. Yet even Sheila’s words are too much for modern Christian wives to hear!

Sheila doesn’t just speak at marriage weekends for FamilyLife, she also writes articles for them, including one sternly warning Christian wives not to be doormats (emphasis hers):

---

**Do not enable childish behavior in your marriage**

*Here’s my feeling: God does not want us to enable unChristlike behaviour.*

When Christ served, he often did very lowly things, like washing people’s feet. But it didn’t mean He himself was lowly. And when He served, He pointed people to God.

I believe that we can get into relationship patterns in marriage where our service to our husbands does not point them to God; it points them away from God. **If our husbands are able to act however they please, and be completely selfish, immature, and border on controlling**, then the marriage is not honouring God.

She warns her FamilyLife readers not to suggest that wives should submit to their husbands and win them over without a word (emphasis hers):

---

So please, ladies, I am truly imploring you today: **don’t come up with the pat answers**. Honestly, without leaving the marriage, what should she do (or can she do) to turn it into a more God-honouring relationship? Telling her to sit there and take it, or that she needs to submit, even if you word it nicer than that, is not going to help.

By staying away from “pat answers”, I can only assume she means avoiding the instruction Pastor Baucham referenced in 1 Peter 3.

*FamilyLife* president Dennis Rainey featured another teacher on the topic of Headship and Submission a few months before he featured Pastor Baucham’s message. Just like with the Baucham clip, you can listen to the mp3 or read the transcript. Not surprisingly, the woman he featured wandered around the issue for some time before closing with the abuse canard:

---

I’m sure there’s still questions in your minds, but let me just try and preempt the most common question so that I don’t get 50 or 500 of them, all saying the same thing. A woman would probably say—many of you women are probably saying in
your minds, “Okay. I get what you’re saying, but my husband doesn’t. He thinks his authority is a blank check to get his way in every circumstance. He’s controlling, threatening (maybe even abusive). Am I supposed to submit to all of this?”

The answer is, “No!” Your submission to a husband who is sinning against God is to oppose him. Remember, you’re supposed to be helping, serving in your submission...

If he’s abusive, call the police—I mean, if necessary—but with the motive of trying to serve and save him—not punish, or dominate, or threaten him...

Unlike Baucham’s message, Dennis Rainey didn’t express any discomfort at hearing this message on submission. Instead of talking about how the Bible makes the hair on the back of his neck stand up, he invited listeners to sign up for one of FamilyLife’s marriage retreat weekends.

If you ask me, he should have taken the opportunity to invite his listeners to attend the video seminar on marriage FamilyLife created, called The Art of Marriage™. While he was at it, why not also invite his audience to read his new book or attend the seminars based on it; are you familiar with Stepping Up™? I hear it is just what we need to fix the problem with Christian manhood.
In my last post I waved a bit of red meat in front of the crowd before explaining what was going on. Many of the readers never got that image of the juicy steak out of their minds and were thereafter unable to form a clear thought.

This was in fact the whole point of the post. The modern Christian man is unable to overcome the Pavlovian response, and those with something to sell know they can rely on this. Christian women are in feminist rebellion, and as Pastor Baucham points out this goes back to Genesis. But Christian men are enabling this rebellion, partly out of fear and partly out of following their emotions. The advertisement for Stepping Up™ is masterfully tuned to push all of your non-threatening-Christian-headship buttons. It is pure genius, as I conceded in the title and the post. But the pathology is so deep many Christian men can’t overcome their feelings to understand the problem even when it is plainly put in front of them.

For those who still don’t get the point of the last post, I’ll recap. Don’t worry, I’m not talking about women in that post. Rebuking women is hard, and more importantly uncomfortable. It doesn’t feel good. I am talking about a man. That feels better, doesn’t it?

There is a man named Dennis Rainey, and he leads an organization called FamilyLife. The organization he leads hires women like Sheila Gregoire to teach Christian wives that biblical submission means not submitting to their husbands. See the OP for the quotes. Sheila’s teaching on submission shouldn’t come as a surprise to FamilyLife because Sheila has a long history of writing the most ridiculous things about what the Bible says regarding men and women and marriage. Even if it was a surprise, FamilyLife never took the article I referenced down. In contrast, when Dennis Rainey, a man, heard Pastor Baucham clearly preach on submission for Christian wives, Dennis Rainey felt the need to explain:

> There’s a lot about the Bible that causes the hair on the back of my neck to stand up.

He also expressed discomfort that a man would be preaching the Word to women:

> But hearing it from a man—it is interesting. I think for some women—that makes it tough to hear....

> ...I feel like we poisoned the stream about—I don’t know—four decades ago and really made it almost objectionable for a message like this to be preached by a pastor—by a man—to a mixed audience, at this point. I don’t want you to hear me apologizing that we did it...

This same man, Dennis Rainey, is waving a feel good message pushing all of your non-threatening-Christian-headship buttons in order to sell his latest project, Stepping Up™. And Christian men will buy this message in droves, because it feels good, and doesn’t offend their feminist wives, mothers, and sisters.
Christian men need to stop acting like chicks and following their *feelings* over the Word of God. Yes it is uncomfortable, but over time it will become more natural.
Lord God, as well, I pray for those men who are here that are cowards. They are silent passive impish worthless men. They are making a mess of everything in their life. And they are such sweet little boys that no one ever confronts them on that. I pray for the women who enable them, who permit them to continue in folly, those who are mothers, sisters, girlfriends and wives. I pray Lord God for men who are chauvinists. Those who are mean who are brash who are rude who are harsh. Who Lord God think they are tough when in fact they are satanic...

-Pastor Mark Driscoll’s prayer* in front of an audience of men and women after reading the instruction to husbands in 1 Peter 3:7

Commenter Michael identified the most potent snare in the Stepping Up™ advertisement:

Why does the husband have to be “harangued by his ballbusting wife”?

Answer: Because he is not doing what he is supposed to do. He isn’t taking the initiative with his son. He isn’t being a man. He’s a fat slob parked on the couch watching T.V. eating Cheeto’s and drinking beer.

This guy, this fat Dad with a bad back, this guy isn’t a real man. He is a lazy ball-less slob.

The advertisement dangles a poor example of a Christian husband in front of the audience, and invites the audience to tear down the position of husband in Christian marriage and excuse feminist rebellion. This is of course exactly what a number of commenters proceeded to do. Matthew King fired the first salvo on Christian headship in defense of feminist rebellion (emphasis his):

...when men begin acting like men, women will follow their command. It is our fault, it is our responsibility, that is the message they are trying to get across. But you would rather defend the prerogative of middle-aged adolescent parasites because, like, feminism and stuff.

In another comment he continued, failing to see the irony of his accusing others of excusing while himself excusing feminist rebellion:

Men can just assert their prerogatives and the rest will fall into place. If they wanted to. But you are adding excuse upon excuse upon excuse for their ongoing lethargy, for the thousand reasons why it never should have come to this...

Matt not only excuses feminist rebellion if husbands aren’t good enough, he is an armchair husband with boasts of courage he has never displayed in the face of risks he has never confronted:
But what if she doesn’t listen? What if she goes her own way? What if she files for divorce, takes my kids? Or calls the police? What if she writes a mean blog post about how horrible a husband I am? These are phantoms, fantastical fears you would rather have direct you in the abstract hypothetical than confront them in the face and thereby demonstrate they are not real.

Fellow armchair husband and thirty-something peterpan manboy Earl soon joined Matt in excusing feminist rebellion against the Bible because Christian husbands aren’t perfect:

Women’s rebellion only happens because a strong man isn’t there to guide her.

... 

Men are the representation of God on earth. When men rebel against God...women rebel against men. It starts with the father...and continues with the husband.

... 

Most women only get evil in this day and age because men are afraid what would happen if they stand up by taking the good side.

For all of their hollow bluster about men’s obligation to lead women, neither of these two men considered the fact that their own writings are leading women into sin. They wrote these words to an audience of married men and women. They know modern Christian women are strongly tempted to rebel against the biblical instruction to wives to submit to their husbands, and like the serpent in the garden they whisper words of temptation instead of encouraging them to remain faithful.

If your husband were a worthy man like me, you wouldn’t feel tempted to rebel.

Make no mistake, there is no courage in this act of treachery. What takes courage, obedience, and faith is to witness a failing Christian husband and remember that the Bible is clear that husbands are the head of the household, and wives are called to submit to their husbands even if the husband is not leading her as Christ leads the Church.

These men are overcome by their own pride and a desire to curry favor with the wives they are speaking to. In the case of Pastors who sin this way it is to strengthen their position of leadership over their congregation, and this is by far the most damaging act of treachery. In the case of the omegas circling the camp hoping to find a shortcut to manhood by currying favor with unhappy wives, the treachery is no less real but it is far less damaging because these men are failures whom neither men nor women respect. But either way, this is how feminist rebellion is sold to modern Christians, and it perfectly explains why movies like Fireproof and Couragous are so eagerly accepted. Christian women in feminist rebellion are eager to hear a message which absolves them of the clear instruction to submit to their husbands, and far too many Christian men are looking to ingratiate themselves to the women in rebellion.

*H/T Robert Yates

Jan 24 2015 Update: The original video link has been marked private, but I found another copy on youtube and have updated the link above. However, since Driscoll’s videos have been disappearing from the web the new link may stop working at some point as well. Here
are two pages which include transcripts of the sermon “Marriage and Men” for reference, here and here.
The statement in the title is true, but is often used as a canard to nullify headship. It is offered as fine print which secretly negates the clear terms of Christian marriage. As an example of how this is used to (practically) nullify submission, see Kathy Keller’s sermon Headship and Submission at FamilyLife. The folks at FamilyLife liked this part so much they called it out separately (second emphasis mine):

Kathy: If there are husbands out there that are saying, “Yes, I’m the head. This is good teaching. I like this head stuff.” It’s respectful submission between equals. **Submission is something that a wife gives. It’s not something that a husband can demand.** Christ emptied Himself. He didn’t grasp equality with God. It was a voluntary submission. This proves that headship does not imply superiority, nor does submission imply inferiority.

The misdirection is nested in the word “demand”. If by demand she means force, this is technically true. But it gives the impression that it isn’t something a husband has a right to expect from his Christian wife, that she hasn’t already promised to give it by the very act of agreeing to marry him. She already made the choice to become his wife, and wives are to submit to their husbands.

To put it another way, here is a list of other things which a husband can’t force:

1. His wife’s sexual fidelity; she has to freely choose not to pull the train at the local biker bar. The same goes for her having to freely choose not to divorce him and marry another man (adultery).
2. His wife’s choice not to murder him and/or his children. She has to freely choose this.
3. His wife’s choice to follow the instruction in 1 Cor 7 not to deny sex to him. She has to freely choose this.
I promised Opus a post on how the status of marriage (or lack thereof) changes for women as they age*. I hope to write that up this weekend, but in the interim this should lighten things up and fill the gap.

My wife found an article on the Daily Mail about Cher’s new girl-power anthem. My first thought was at 67 it is really a golden girl-power anthem, but when I watched the video I realized it is funnier than anything I could possibly write about it. See the Daily Mail page for the exclusive and hilarious video featuring Cher’s fantasy of aging, overweight and/or unattractive women banking on the sexual power of young thin and pretty women.

When looking in vain for the video on youtube I found that I wasn’t the first one to think of the Golden Girls regarding this song. This video was uploaded by a fan of both the Golden Girls and Cher.

I’ve always been a big Cher fan and when I heard her new single, I knew I had to do this!

*I wrote this post in preparation for the one I promised Opus.
Government check dad.

by Dalrock | August 23, 2013 | Link

From Captain Capitalism:
Women’s morphing need for male investment.

by Dalrock | August 24, 2013 | Link

In a previous post I discussed the importance of male investment in women’s intrasexual status competition. This investment can range from the validation which comes from being selected for a one time hookup, all the way to the very public declaration of lifetime investment which marriage signals. This post picks up where the last one left off, so if you haven’t already read the previous post I would encourage you to do so before continuing with this one.

The previous post explained the basic reality of women’s need for male investment in their status competition with other women. However, this still leaves the question of why women make different choices as they age.

It is important to remember that the desire for male investment isn’t the only force at work here. In the previous post I described how the desire for investment both complements and competes with the desire for “the tingle”. Another factor we need to always keep in mind is the realities of the Sexual Marketplace (SMP) and how men’s and women’s Sexual Market Value (SMV) change with age. Rollo Tomassi has created an excellent graphic to help his readers conceptualize this. See Rollo’s Final Exam – Navigating the SMP for more information on the chart below:

As with anything like this, individuals are likely to disagree slightly over the fine tuning of the curves. However, even if you don’t agree on the exact details I think most in this sphere will agree that Rollo has captured the essence of men and women’s changing SMV with age. Note also that it isn’t just Rollo, or even just the manosphere which understands the basic truth behind the graphic. OK Cupid has mined their own data and found the same structure.

One way to look at the chart above is not just in terms of attractiveness, but the relative power this gives the respective sexes as they age. Young women are the rockstars of the
dating world. In one sense Rollo’s chart understates the scale of young women’s SMV power, because very few 38 year old men (the male peak in the graphic) will experience the kind of raw attraction power that the average 23 year old woman experiences. It is only when you include the female desire for male investment that the relative heights of the two curves come into balance.

**Seeing the SMP through the lens of courtship**

In addition to the chart above, the other paradigm all of this needs to be viewed through is the narrative the young women are playing out in their minds, and this is the narrative of courtship. With very few exceptions, women haven’t embraced the idea of a permanently freewheeling SMP. Instead, the vast majority of promiscuous women have sought to increasingly enlarge the concept of courtship. They have done this by both expanding the duration of courtship, as well as by expanding the definition of what level of sexual contact is appropriate during courtship. Freewheeling promiscuity isn’t seen by young women as an end unto itself, it is seen as a path to marriage. The sheer absurdity of what they are doing makes this hard to accept, but it is very clearly what they are doing, or more accurately what they intend to do. Note that even in the recent wave making piece about sex on campus by the New York Times the slutty coeds discuss their dionysian embrace of casual sex as part of a path to marriage:

| Almost universally, the women said they did not plan to marry until their late 20s or early 30s. |
| In this context, some women, like A., seized the opportunity to have sex without relationships... |

For those who haven’t read the article, it is important to note that A is a young woman who only has drunken sex because she wouldn’t want to be around her f*** buddy sober, and that she makes it a point to always do it in his bed so she won’t have to deal with the wetspot. This young woman still plans to marry:

| “I’ve always heard this phrase, ‘Oh, marriage is great, or relationships are great — you get to go on this journey of change together,’ ” she said. “That sounds terrible. |
| “I don’t want to go through those changes with you. I want you to have changed and become enough of your own person so that when you meet me, we can have a stable life and be very happy.” |

This is why she would only agree to be interviewed if they didn’t use her name:

| Ten years from now, no one will remember — I will not remember — who I have slept with... |

You can see the same thing in the famous Kate Bolick piece in the Atlantic a few years ago. Bolick interviewed the young women in Susan Walsh’s “focus group”. After explaining that these young women had a great deal of experience with casual sex, she tells us:
...when I asked if they wanted to get married when they grew up, and if so, at what age, to a one they answered “yes” and “27 or 28.”

She then reinforced this point:

“Take a look at me,” I said. “I’ve never been married, and I have no idea if I ever will be. There’s a good chance that this will be your reality, too. Does that freak you out?”

Again they nodded.

“I don’t think I can bear doing this for that long!” whispered one, with undisguised alarm.

This is of course the whole **mission** of Susan Walsh’s *Hooking Up Smart*; Susan hopes to teach young women to leverage their hookups as a path to “relationships” and ultimately marriage.

**Putting the courtship narrative into the context of Rollo’s chart.**

When women are young and have the power position in the SMP, promiscuity is intoxicating to them. Since they have the power, the short term nature of most of their relationships isn’t seen as them being rejected by men, but as *them rejecting men*. Young women today don’t feel the need that previous generations did to secure commitment in their late teens and early 20s because:

1. Only small numbers of other women their age are going after the more public and durable forms of male investment.
2. Their hopping from man to man is seen as occurring on their own terms.

However, as women progress into their late twenties all of this starts to change. Their SMP power relative to men starts to decline and at the same time their peers start to marry in much greater numbers. In other words, their need to secure male investment occurs fairly suddenly, and at the very time their SMP power is starting to dive. This is surprising to many young women because of our cultural denial of the SMP realities Rollo describes.

*The Washington Times*: piece *Economy of sex: It’s cheap these days* describes this phenomenon:

Although plenty of women dabble in sexual-market relationships and then settle down successfully with life partners, he said, many women are “not witnessing marriage happening on the timetables they prefer and expected.”

This is because, as economist Timothy Reickert has found, power shifts away from women as they move toward their 30s

This is where as we continuously see in the media the panic starts to set in. Yet despite the fact that marriage trends are moving in the wrong direction, the vast majority of women in
the US still do manage to marry. Only 20% of current 35-39 year old women in the US (all races) have never married. If you understand the reality of hypergamy and women’s tendency to focus only on the top tier of men, you can see how powerful the desire to secure male investment is for women.

**But why don’t women remain married?**

There are several factors which come into play when asking why women value the status signal of marriage so much and yet women are also the ones driving our epidemic of divorce. Part of the issue is the average man has been fooled into acting in ways his wife is nearly guaranteed to find **frustrating and unattractive**. Another critical factor is the constant barrage of articles, books, and movies telling women that divorce will make them happy. These themes are so common in our culture that very few people even notice them. Whether it is the local paper, Fireproof, Eat Pray Love, How Stella Got Her Groove Back, or Single In The Suburbs, the message to women is the same:

![Divorce is the beginning of something wonderful...](image)

There is also of course the issue of cash and prizes. Our current structure of family law is **designed** to maximize the cash and noncash incentives to wives to divorce. Add to this the choice by the churches to look the other way regarding divorce and even **lionize single mothers**, and the question should become not why do so many wives choose divorce, but why are so many able to resist this temptation? Certainly some women have the integrity to keep their marriage vows even in an era where neither the church nor the state would discourage them from divorce, but this can’t fully explain why so many women resist the siren call of divorce empowerment.

To understand the answer to this question we need to remember that marriage (or **something like it**) is critical for women’s intrasexual status competition, at least past a certain age. Divorce isn’t desired by women as the end of the married phase of their life, but as just another extension of the courtship phase on the path to their **real** marriage. It isn’t a desire to simply jettison a husband, it is a desire to **trade up** to a new husband.

As with young women seeing their promiscuity as a path to marriage, don’t allow the absurdity of the **divorce and trade up** plan to confuse you. Yes the plan is nearly guaranteed to end in failure, especially if the woman is past her twenties and/or already has children. The woman would have married when her SMV was higher (often much higher), and when her present husband’s SMV was lower. To this disadvantage we must add the baggage of divorce and especially children. But this is still what nearly all divorcing women have in mind. This is why the divorce empowerment tales ***all*** end with the divorcée either accepting or at least
fielding offers of lifetime commitment from better men than the one she divorced.

Yes the plan is absurd, but don’t forget that women are constantly being told it will work out if only they have faith and divorce. Messages to the contrary are angrily shouted down in a feminist attempt to rework reality by simply denying it. Even here, most women know better, even if they let their greed get the best of them. But the allure of winning on such a grand scale for many women overcomes their better judgment. With time running out, they take on incredible risk in hopes of winning big and skyrocketing in status. This may not translate to other regions, but here in Texas we have a term for this kind of decision.

![Image](http://dairock.wordpress.com)

It isn’t that it never works, it is that the choice being made is statistically a very bad one. At times however this choice can pay off spectacularly. Consider the case of Bathsheba in the Bible. She was married to a man of fairly middling status. Yet through the power of advertising, some extreme risk taking, and a good deal of luck she was able to not only trade up to wife of the King of Israel, but also have her own son become next in line for the throne.

This is how gambling works though. The lure of the easy and spectacular payoff blinds us to the risks involved, and for women who call a divorce lawyer and say the equivalent of our Texas phrase above the odds are very much against them.

As you can see from Rollo’s chart at the top of the page, the odds are not only against them, but getting worse by the year. Remarriage stats don’t capture the realities of trading up vs down, but they give us a barometer of what is going on. Even with the family courts financially crippling men, men still have a much higher rate of remarriage than women, and
this advantage increases dramatically with age.

As if it couldn’t get worse, remarriage rates are also declining rapidly. Again, these statistics don’t tell us about the quality of mate divorcées are able to secure when remarrying, but the realities of the SMV curves tell us that on average these pairings represent a step down, very often a huge step down, for the divorcée. Added to her pain is the high likelihood that the husband she discarded will wind up with a younger/prettier woman than she is. The stakes are huge, and while the payoff is spectacular when it works as intended, so is the failure which is much more common.

DA Wolf describes the reality of post divorce dating in her Huffington Post piece Post-Divorce Dating: Time or Timing? She explains that immediately after divorce she was focused on coping with the destruction and havoc her divorce had created and recovering mentally. By the time she was ready to start dating again she was reaching middle age.

| Now, now. Let’s be realistic. When it comes to marketing the feminine vehicle, the 40-something or 50-something model with kids in tow is a tough sell. Even if you’re well-built and properly maintained — it’s a niche market. Supply outstrips demand, and competition is tough. You’re up against the younger and rebuilt versions, not to mention those without kids, debts, and other baggage. |

Even for younger women the attempt to reenter courtship is generally a huge shock. Unless they married extremely young and divorced only a few years later, their SMP power is far lower than it was when they were looking for husband #1. And this is before factoring in trying to find a man who wants to commit to a single mother, a woman with a track record of not keeping her own commitments.

The other immediate problem divorcing women run into is their status among other women, the very status they sought to increase, takes a nosedive. While in their late teens and early twenties not having secured public and long term (ideally lifetime) investment from a man was overlooked, now it is seen as a failure. Divorcées are initially given a bit of status leeway, because initially at least the narrative that they are in the process of trading up to a better husband seems at least somewhat plausible to other women. They’ve watched Eat Pray Love and Fireproof too, so they don’t immediately assume this will be the 99% failure and not the 1% spectacular success. But fairly quickly this tends to change. Women whose divorces are final and aren’t on a verifiable track to remarriage are seen as desperate, and because of this are seen as a risk to other womens’ marriages. Delaine Moore describes experiencing this in her own piece in the Huffington Post:

| And because I’m not just a woman, but a Divorced Mom, the harsh judgments potentially cast my way scare me to death... |

| ...the stereotype “divorcée.” That’s right; the insidious “D” word. Better lock up your husbands, ladies. No — decent divorced mothers should only want a serious relationship. And they better get on that quick, because with each year that passes, they’re apt to grow more bitter and undesirable and desperate. They are women with cargo. Women who failed. Women who didn’t deserve any better. Spit. |
Note the huge status drop this involves. She didn’t reenter the intoxicating and *empowering* dating phase she had experienced in her twenties, and other women now see her inability to secure public investment from a man entirely differently. Instead of the promised “empowerment” of divorce, since she hadn’t secured a replacement husband she was seen as *desperate*, as a *failure*. Another divorcée commented on the same piece describing her own experience:

I got great support from my married friends during and immediately after my divorce. Six months after it was finalized, I felt ready to start dating again. I mentioned this at a girls’ night out and the temperature dropped 20 degrees. Suddenly, it was though I’d become a threat. Mixed social invitations dried up and I noticed that friends who had been loaning out their husbands to give me a hand with simple home or car repairs began dropping by while he was working at my place. I can only suppose they were chaperoning their men. I hadn’t changed my behavior, only my marital status...

...I kept chit chat with husbands to a minimum while at parties or after church. But it never improved. Today, my friends are largely other single moms.

On a comment to a separate Huffington Post article another divorcée describes how even her doctors viewed her in this light:

I had a medical problem a few years after I was divorced, and several doctors tried to write it off to “post-divorce depression.” Instead of pursuing a medical cause for the symptoms, they just handed me anti-depressants; when those didn’t work, they handed me a different type of anti-depressants because “not every person has the same reaction to this variety”, and made it clear that I was going to try all 300 brands of anti-depressant before they would look for another reason for the problems.

Without even asking if I was in a new relationship, one of them told me that I just had to deal with it that I was middle-aged and chubby, no one was ever going to want to date me, pull myself together and stop being depressed over being alone.

**Enter the hamster.**

Once the reality of their incredibly foolish decision becomes obvious, divorcées then set about creating a plausible story explaining that they didn’t really fail. These break down into three basic rationalizations:

1. They have a new man and he is even better than the ex husband. Never mind the fact that he hasn’t worked in years, is painfully beta, and/or has serious psychological problems or addictions.
2. They have a new high status man, or perhaps even a whole stable of such men competing for their approval, but unfortunately these men are too busy to accompany her to social engagements.
3. Now that she’s older she no longer feels the need to have lifetime investment from a man.
Women on the verge of their own “hold my beer and watch this” moment are especially tempted to accept rationalizations 1&2 at face value, while keeping rationalization #3 as a disaster recovery plan. Other married women however generally see right through these rationalizations.

It should be obvious how to test rationalizations 1&2 in your own social circle. For rationalization #1, compare the whole man to the woman’s ex husband. Chances are there is a reason this man was not only single and interested in marriage, but why he settled for a divorcée instead of a younger never married woman. For rationalization #2, insist on meeting these mystery men, and watch to see if he actually appears or the story somehow always seems to change. If he does appear, test him like you would for rationalization #1.

Rationalization #3 is the backstop rationalization, when all else has failed. At an individual level of course we can’t prove that it isn’t true. There must be some women who coincidentally lose the desire to have a man at the same time their options have dried up. However, statistically we know this isn’t the case. While divorced women don’t have good options regarding remarriage, we know that women who are married lose their interest in divorce as they get older. The pattern is quite striking. We also know from the AARP study on late life divorce that divorcees who don’t remarry tend to end up incredibly alone. Divorced men are not only more likely to date and remarry than divorced women, they are also far more likely to have sex or any kind of sexual contact without remarriage. Again if you consider Rollo’s SMP chart, the reasons for this should be obvious. The AARP study also found that remarriage was a strong factor in divorced women’s (and men’s) sense of well being. 72% of the divorcees who had remarried responded that they were at the top of the “ladder of life”, while only 51% of those women who hadn’t remarried answered the same.

The reality is the vast majority of women would very much want to be married to a worthy man later in life if they could, but through a combination of media cheerleading and profound miscalculation very large numbers of women are finding themselves on the wrong side of the divorce and remarriage calculation. That the decisions of many women turn out after the fact to be catastrophic doesn’t change the fact that they intended for things to turn out very differently. The evidence for this is all around us, so long as we are willing to see it. More importantly, once you understand this it becomes much easier to help aspiring frivorcees in your social circle avoid making the same mistake.

SMP graphic used by permission from Rollo Tomassi. Dominos image licensed as creative commons by aussiegall.
When preparing for my last post I came across an interview of Kate Bolick by Edith Zimmerman at *The Hairpin: Kate Bolick on Refusing to Settle (Part One)*. Zimmerman describes two options for dating and family formation (emphasis mine):

...for people who want to have kids and raise them with someone else, I wonder what the next alternative for love/sex/reproduction is. Because it seems like for women there’s currently two options: Option A, which is *dating, marriage, kids (and divorce and remarriage, etc.*)*, or Option B, which is every other nontraditional alternative, where it’s everyone for him/herself, trying to figure out what fits. Option A being pretty clear, and Option B being wide open.

Zimmerman gives away a great deal in framing her question, because in *option A* men are operating under the old constraints while women aren’t bound to anything. Option A is women go feral while men play by the rules and pick up the tab. She seems to want to rebel from the ostensible constraints of this model, but she can’t even *imagine* what an alternative might look like. She frames it as if option B would be liberating for women, but she can’t imagine a model which doesn’t lead up to marriage (and then divorce and remarriage).
The UK equivalent of the Girl Scouts recently decided to change their vow, replacing “love my God” with “be true to myself and develop my beliefs”. As the BBC explains this is not the first change for girls to that portion of the oath. In 1910 that portion of the oath was “do my duty to God”. This was changed in 1994 to the “love my God” wording, which has now been replaced with a promise to be true to themselves.

The Telegraph interviewed Gill Slocombe, the woman who heads the Girl Guides. When asked what being true to themselves really meant, Slocombe explained:

| It’s a moral compass |

When asked what this means in the absence of external morality, Slocombe rationalized:

| There is a sense in which you could say, ‘Well, to be true to myself I’m going to go and rob a post office’, but it has to be read in conjunction with the context of what we’re doing: the rest of the Promise and the Guide laws, which clearly do not say it’s OK to rob a post office. |

But when pressed for what the rest of the Promise and Guide laws say, Slocombe replied:

| Please don’t ask me what they are, because I can’t recite them to you |
Beware the Cougar
by Dalrock | August 30, 2013 | Link

H/T PUKEKO
Call the Kendrick brothers!
by Dalrock | September 5, 2013 | Link

I think we’ve found the script for the sequel to *Fireproof*.

Empathologism shares a lesson to Christian husbands in his post *The reverse nuclear option, the submissive Christian wife*. The lesson is from Dennis Rainey’s *FamilyLife*, and opens with a quote from Scripture to emphasize the message:

> Before destruction the heart of man is haughty, but humility goes before honor.
> PROVERBS 18:12

In the lesson we learn of a husband and wife who run a ministry. One day the husband makes a decision regarding the ministry without first consulting his wife. The husband recounts this story of his transgression with shame and tears in his eyes. Being a modern Christian wife, she confronts his audacity in making a decision without clearing it with her first. The husband makes the mistake of standing his ground, telling her:

> The decision has been made, and it’s too late to change our plans now.

Overcome with rage and emotion, the wife decides to blow up the family. She packs the kids in the car and announces they are leaving him:

> Okay, Bill Bright! I’ll just leave! I’m not going to live where I have nothing to say about what goes on.

Now time for some patented misdirection. The couple’s son chastises the mother for her decision to detonate the family:

> Mom, this shows me the kind of person you really are.

This is crucial, because for the slower in the audience this will be read as teaching wives that they *shouldn’t* use threats to blow up the family to make their husbands submit. But as both the opening quote from Scripture and the ending of the lesson make clear, the message that this is how a wife humbles a disobedient husband and brings him to heel is the real takeaway:

> As her son’s words stung her, Bill burst through the front door and deliberately got in front of her car. He pleaded, “Don’t go, Vonette.”

> He went on to apologize, and she did too. Then Bill backed up his words of apology by changing the decision...
The moral of the story is husbands must always back down when their wives threaten to blow up the family. *Once the husband submits* the wife can then apologize for threatening to destroy the family. The wife explains:

> I stayed because he took the first step toward reconciliation and working out our problems. It took a real man of God to admit he was wrong, and this gave me the courage to confess my poor attitude.

I know the story is too short to make an entire movie about, but it reinforces the modern Christian message on marriage beautifully while including sufficient misdirection to confuse those who claim to believe in traditional marriage. My suggestion would be to create three or four different variants on this basic story, and tell parallel stories like they did in *Courageous*. Make the men all heroic blue collar types, and show each one being beaten into submission by their wives with threats of familial destruction.

My first thought was to really grind in this message of the Holy Threatpoint by having one of the husbands play the role of the villain; he would fail to submit to his wife when threatened and she would follow through and destroy their family. Then she would use the family courts to bleed him white with child support and alimony. In the end of the movie we would see him in a prison cell, having been driven to a life of crime in an attempt to pay the required sums to his wife. However, then I remembered that this story was already included in the original *Courageous*. I’ll leave it up to the Kendrick Brothers to decide if they want to weave a retelling of this moral into the sequel for *Fireproof* (should they accept the idea). Either way, I think the sequel should take a page out of *Courageous* and end with the husbands all signing a formal pledge to *submit to their wives in all things*, and acknowledging that now they are *doubly accountable*.

You can read the full lesson here, and don’t miss Empath’s expert analysis here. Also, if you haven’t already picked up a copy, check out Rainey’s book *Stepping Up: A Call to Courageous Manhood*. You can see the advertisement for the video series based on the book here.
Reader aa asked for my thoughts on an article by JD Gunter at the Council of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (CBMW) titled We’re Just “Talking”. Gunter has misunderstood the increased ambiguity in the Sexual Marketplace (SMP); where women have pushed to extend both the duration and the definition of courtship, Gunter sees men unwilling to grow up and state their intentions. The median age of first marriage for women in the US is now 27, and this doesn’t factor in the women who have delayed marriage so long they are unable to marry. The average American woman now expects to be courted for a decade or more. Men stating their intentions to women who see empowerment in ambiguity and fear commitment won’t solve the problem. Far better advice would be to warn the men to avoid women who aren’t clearly looking to marry, and to advise women who actually do wish to marry to be clear about their own intentions.

But this is very basic stuff, and misunderstanding the nature of the SMP is so common it is entirely forgivable. I was more interested in the organization itself. Very often organizations which form in response to feminism unwittingly adopt a surprisingly feminist worldview in the process. With a click on their about page I found that unfortunately the CBMW has indeed swallowed large parts of feminism whole.

The first sign is the conspicuous inclusion of a Statement on Abuse on equal footing with their Core Beliefs and their Mission and Vision statements. As I have recently written about, vague accusations that the average Christian husband is abusive are a very common way to assault the very idea of biblical headship. It turns out that a vague and hysterical fear that the modern Christian husband is abusive is one of the 10 core reasons the CBMW was founded. In their founding document (the Danvers Statement) of the 10 contemporary developments which [CBMW’s founders] observe[d] with deep concern, a sudden and mysterious increase in abuse is number 6:

| 6. the upsurge of physical and emotional abuse in the family; |

This idea that modern men are somehow more brutish than the ostensible sensitive new age guys of the ancient world is flat out bizarre, yet this is a very common assumption.

Even more troubling though is their framing of biblical headship and submission. In the Affirmations section they explain their fear that Christian wives will fall into the sin of servility instead of what they call “intelligent submission” (emphasis mine):

| 4. The Fall introduced distortions into the relationships between men and women (Genesis 3:1-7, 12, 16). |
| - In the home, the husband’s loving, humble headship tends to be replaced by domination or passivity; the wife’s intelligent, willing submission tends to be replaced by usurpation or servility. |

This paranoia that Christian wives won’t have enough moxie is every bit as modern and
feminist as the ideas the CBMW claims to be founded to combat, yet this is part of their very charter. They present a modern Christian wife’s obligation as having to balance not being so feminist as to be overt about it, but being feminist enough to avoid the [feminist] charge of being servile. They are a hair’s breadth away from accusing sincere Christian wives of not being true to themselves.

There is no need to lay this extra burden on Christian wives, especially at a time when following the instruction of Scripture is already a radical act. No doubt they feel this new improved version of biblical submission is an act of kindness to Christian wives, but it is only more cruelty.
Empowerment turned demotion.
by Dalrock | September 19, 2013 | Link

Blogger Michele Zipp at Cafe Mom confirms the status marker marriage serves for women in 5 Reasons ‘Boyfriend’ Is the Worst Word for Divorcees:

3. **It feels like a demotion.** The word “boyfriend” feels juvenile. “Fiance” feels snooty. “Husband” feels accomplished. Anyone can have a boyfriend...

But since marriage ended, you’re back to (shudder) boyfriend. It’s like you’ve been left back when all your friends graduated.

Note the text regarding the “like” button at the bottom of the Cafe Mom pages:

Click “Like” if you’re a single mom — and proud!

The linked Proud Single Moms Facebook page must be enough to make Glenn Stanton’s heart nearly burst! So many heroes in one place.

Another divorcée writes to Slate’s Dear Prudence asking if it is normal that the divorce empowerment hasn’t kicked in yet (emphasis mine):

I divorced my husband of six years this spring, and even though the initial excitement of a new lease on life was exhilarating, I have found actuality to be just dreary and dismal. I fear I am spiraling downward and I have no way to stop it. My friends have given me some support, but I really don’t think they fully understand the depth of my despair. I really don’t know if I am reacting normally to this life change or if I need some help. When I pleasure myself (which unfortunately has been necessary since the split), I always end up in tears because it reinforces how lonely I am. **Recently, I have even taken to only shaving one leg so when I lie in bed at night I feel like a man is next to me.** Should I expect this sort of reaction even after close to a year of mentally ending my marriage?
The key to breaking the marriage strike.
by Dalrock | September 25, 2013 | Link

Sammiches.

From the New York Post: ‘I’m 124 sandwiches away from an engagement ring’

Each morning, he would ask, “Honey, how long you have been awake?”

“About 15 minutes,” I’d reply.

“You’ve been up for 15 minutes and you haven’t made me a sandwich?”
If it isn’t fun, you probably aren’t doing it right.

by Dalrock | September 26, 2013 | Link

When I posted the link yesterday to the NY Post article about the 300 sandwiches I didn’t include much explanation. The subtext most who read that article will miss is that when the author describes her boyfriend waking up and asking why she hasn’t made him a sandwich yet she is bragging. The article isn’t about a woman slavishly making sandwiches out of fear she won’t get a marriage proposal. She is bragging about how much fun it is to be with her boyfriend and how much she enjoys making sandwiches for him. Don’t picture her waking up each morning dreading her boyfriend asking why she hasn’t made him a sandwich yet; picture her waking up each morning and staying in bed in anticipation of her boyfriend waking up so the delightful game can begin all over again.

The first key to understanding how she can possibly be bragging is recognizing the lie of feminism when it comes to marriage (and other relationships). If feminism made women happy, we’d have a world of delighted women. It doesn’t, and we don’t.

The second key to this is understanding the proper delivery of the punchline. When I was first (formally) learning about Game I struggled to believe that women would actually respond positively to many of the examples offered. What I had to do was imagine a line not as I would assume an evil mean misogynistic gamer to deliver it, and not as my more beta self would deliver it. I started to imagine how my player roommate in college would deliver these lines. If he said it it would be funny. It wouldn’t come off as mean, it would come off as loving. This doesn’t mean that he wouldn’t also mean the embedded request, but that the delivery of the message would almost certainly be enjoyable to the woman.

Game in this sense is very much like humor. If you hadn’t ever heard a particular style of humor and simply read a transcript of someone telling jokes, it very likely wouldn’t be funny. Verbal and written communication are very different, and much can be lost in the translation going either direction. If you’ve never witnessed a couple where the man was playfully teasing his wife (or girlfriend) and she was clearly loving it, it is very difficult to imagine such a thing. However, if you have witnessed this, imagine the husband of that couple delivering lines of Game that have you stumped. Don’t worry about keeping the exact wording, because spoken language isn’t like that. Imagine how this man would say the same thing you just read, only playful, fun, and loving.

Slight changes to wording can at times help a great deal, but understand that this has more to do with personal style than anything. The exchange I quoted is brilliant relationship game. I used the same line on my wife yesterday evening and she loved it, and she is the one who originally found the article. For me the key to delivering a line like this is to add the word “woman”. If I were saying the line in the same context (my wife writing about us waking up and us having the exchange), it would probably go more like:

  Each morning, he would ask, “How long you have been awake woman?”

  “About 15 minutes,” I’d reply.
“You’ve been up for 15 minutes and you haven’t made me a sandwich?”
She sensed a disturbance in the mound.

by Dalrock | September 30, 2013 | Link

A few weeks back a comment came up for moderation on Romance 101: How to stop frustrating your wife. The commenter’s handle was “you are all idiots”, and she explained that I’ve gotten it all wrong:

Hi, as a married female I’d like to point out a few things:

1. Woman don’t hate your flowers because your not attractive enough or domineering enough
2. You are all pigs.
3. Real men make efforts to be romantic on a regular basis (not just once or twice a year) and are appreciated for it. They share in the household and child rearing chores equally. They listen. They love.

I’ve restricted the comments section on that specific post so I decided not to let this troll’s comment through there. However, I thought I’d share it in a separate post. For those who are on the fence about Game, I propose you try her advice and see how it works. If it doesn’t work at first, I’m fairly confident she would explain that you must not be trying hard enough; so be sure to try really, really hard.
Rollo Tomassi has his new book available on Createspace, and on Amazon. Rollo has been patiently and expertly explaining the SMP to men for free for over a decade, and he has taken all of those years of experience and poured them into a book. After all of those years donating his time to help others, I’m glad to see that he is now in a position to profit financially while helping even more men (and women). See Rollo’s description/announcement here.

Congratulations Rollo.
Advice from an expert (on failing as a husband).
by Dalrock | October 7, 2013 | Link

Be afraid, be very afraid.

This is the advice to husbands from modern Christian leaders. Where the Bible stresses headship and that our marriage vows bind us for life, the modern Christian leader has fully embraced the threatpoint feminists have implemented to overturn headship. These two changes go hand in hand, as the threatpoint is essential in order to effectively destroy biblical headship. The threatpoint also is an effective marketing tool for an entire industry of Christian marriage counseling, reading from the Book of Oprah. Dennis Rainey of FamilyLife captured the essence of this pitch in his followup on a sermon on submission he aired by Kathy Keller*:

I have to believe, Bob, this weekend conference really is the finest marriage insurance that you could ever buy to be able to, not guarantee your marriage is going to go the distance, but certainly to equip it to go the distance.

Not surprisingly, Rainey also teaches that a Christian husband’s job is to give in when his wife threatens to blow up the family (see also: Fireproof). As you may recall, Rainey is not just the president and CEO of FamilyLife, but he also wrote the book-turned-video-series Stepping Up™, which is a modern Christian call to “godly” manhood. In Scripture, husbands are called to be the spiritual leader of the family, and wash their wives in the water of the word. In the modern Christian frame wives are light years closer to God and are called to lead and instruct their husbands. Rainey’s own wife explains how a modern Christian wife can lead her husband to manhood in her article 5 Ways to Help Your Husband Step Up to Manhood. Mrs. Rainey’s post is overall quite good by modern Christian standards, but it starts from the flawed premise that the wife’s job is to lead her husband, to get him to “Step Up” and become a man:

You’ve probably heard the saying, “Behind every successful man is a strong woman.” Though the statement has been ridiculed as anti-woman, it is, in fact, very true. When you married your husband, he was unsure of himself as a man and was unskilled as a husband. It’s true of all boys who have grown up and gotten married. What males need—what your husband needs—is a wife who believes in him, encourages him, and helps him step up to become the man God created him to be.

...  

2. Speak the truth in love. In our marriage, I’ve come to Dennis many times to speak the truth about what’s going on in our family or what I feel is missing in our relationship. There have been seasons when he was traveling too much.

Wives “speaking the truth” to their husbands about what they feel is missing is a very common theme in modern Christian advice on marriage. Mrs. Rainey’s article doesn’t frame this as an ultimatum, but most often it is framed this way. Another FamilyLife article
Cycle of Unresolved Issues offers an example from Rainey favorites Tim and Kathy Keller:

The cycle goes something like this: a problem surfaces in your relationship, and one of you says, “We have a problem...” but the other person does not take it seriously so the problem is not really addressed. This happens again, then again and again! Despair takes over. One day the one that has been saying, “I need help” gives up and says, “We’re done!” or leaves a note that says, “I’m gone!” This finally gets the other person’s attention, but it may be too late.

“What will it take to get your attention?” In the book The Meaning of Marriage, authors Tim and Kathy Keller relate how Kathy got Tim’s attention by lining up some of her good china, and as soon as Tim walked in the door, breaking it with a hammer. She got his attention!

The author suggests a “less dramatic” way for a wife to do the same thing would be to say to her husband:

I’m starting to feel so discouraged, that unless we address this issue, I don’t think I can continue like this.

I feel really alone. I don’t want to go on like this.

I have this feeling that we are drifting apart. I do not want to live this way.

Note how in a very short article the topic has moved from threats of divorce, to violently breaking valuables, and back to threats of divorce. Rainey’s marriage weekend sales pitch and the message of the Unresolved article remind me of an old Monty Python skit where the mafia tries to extort protection money from an army base commander:

Luigi: (looking round office casually) You’ve ... you’ve got a nice army base here, Colonel.

Colonel: Yes.

Luigi: We wouldn’t want anything to happen to it.

Colonel: What?

Dino: No, what my brother means is it would be a shame if... (smashes a piece of china he picked up off the mantel)

It makes me wonder if Kathy Kelley got her idea to break the china on the mantel from the same skit. In the modern Christian version of this old skit, the punchline goes:

It’s a nice family you got here, you wouldn’t want something to happen to it...

The answer of course is to buy marriage insurance (or if you prefer protection) in the form of
books, movies, marriage counseling, etc. All of these protection schemes include the same basic advice to husbands:

- Grovel.
- Grovel hard enough and long enough so she won’t decide to frivolously divorce you.
- Grovel like your marriage and family depend on it, because they do.

This advice is not only unbiblical; this anti scriptural message also happens to be disastrous in practice. Groveling won’t make your wife happy, and in all likelihood it will make her even more frustrated.

The latest installment in the *grovel like your marriage depends on it* message comes from motivational speaker Gerald Rogers**. Rogers found himself on the receiving end of a frivolous divorce a while back:

> I was married for about 16 years to an amazing, remarkable woman. I think for most of our marriage, I was under the illusion that everything was perfect. I felt like I was a good husband...
>
> What I didn’t realize was how much of a mask I was living under and how I really didn’t understand how to fill her deepest needs as a woman. And so it was about a year ago that she first let me know she wanted a divorce.

His wife’s brave decision not to honor her marriage vow inspired Rogers to write a list of advice to husbands which has spread like wildfire. Christian marriage author James Russell Lingerfelt was so delighted with the message that he republished the advice as a “love story” under the title *Beautiful advice from a divorced man after 16 years of marriage*. Piece of advice #1 is *Never stop courting*… *NEVER GET LAZY in your love*, while item number three warns that marriage vows aren’t intended to be for life:

> Change will come, and in that you have to re-choose each other everyday. SHE DOESN’T HAVE TO STAY WITH YOU, and if you don’t take care of her heart, she may give that heart to someone else or seal you out completely, and you may never be able to get it back. Always fight to win her love just as you did when you were courting her.

While constantly reacting to her changing, we are taught that a husband must be careful never to try to lead his wife. In the modern Christian view washing her in the water of the Word has been replaced by:

> 5. It’s not your job to change or fix her… your job is to love her as she is with no expectation of her ever changing.

*I linked to the Kathy Keller sermon from my post Brilliant Advertising several weeks ago, but I see now that the page is gone.* I don’t know if they pulled it entirely or it simply moved. Fortunately I saved a PDF copy of the January 17th 2012 transcript for my own records so I
could still quote from it.

**Edit:** The Wayback Machine was down for maintenance when I first posted this, but now it is back up. They have the main page, but not the mp3 and the pdf cached. However, Marcus D found the link to the pdf which still appears to be on the FamilyLife site (for the time being at least).

**Roissy listed Gerald Rogers as candidate number 3 in a recent (crass site warning) Beta Of the Month post.**
The elevation of romantic love and the wisdom of a beta orbiter.

by Dalrock | October 10, 2013 | Link

Since my last post I’ve poked around a bit on James Russell Lingerfelt’s blog love story from the male perspective. The title of the blog itself gives a great deal away, starting with him referring to himself as a male and not a man. The other striking feature of the blog is something I’ve written about before, which is the fundamental problem of elevating romantic love to a virtue. As I explained in Lovestruck:

What nearly all modern Christians have done is place romantic love above marriage. Instead of seeing marriage as the moral context to pursue romantic love and sex, romantic love is now seen as the moral place to experience sex and marriage. This inversion is subtle enough that no one seems to have noticed, but if you look for it you will see it everywhere.

Indeed, the elevation of romantic love as a good in and of itself is something Lingerfelt argues with a passion in the few posts he authors himself, and it is implicit in his choice of content from other authors. In his post Don’t apologize for loving someone – not ever Lingerfelt argues that offering unrequited romantic love is both wise and courageous:

We can love, love, love but sometimes that love isn’t returned. That’s not our fault. To love or not to love is a choice. We chose to love. They chose not to. This does not mean we are unloveable or unworthy of love. We’re not idiots, fools, or weak for loving. Rather, we have courage.

Whether chaste or not (it isn’t clear from what I have read), he argues from the moral and philosophical frame of the serial monogamist:

Because we chose to be vulnerable and self-sacrificing; a requirement for love. And when it was over, though the echoes of the painful experiences reverberate in the depths of our being, we picked ourselves up, dusted ourselves off, and we keep pressing onward.

Either way, misusing romantic love outside of marriage isn’t moral just because one decides not to misuse sex in the same way. In fact, as Zippy Catholic explains in Women have harems too, the man who offers romantic love inappropriately is in some ways the male equivalent of a slut:

from an intersexual behavior standpoint, the male equivalent of a slut is the beta orbiter. Modernity has turned sexuality into a buffet: what used to be a loving commitment for life to a particular person, where sexual intimacy and provision formed the mutual society of a family, has turned into cafeteria sexuality wherein people are encouraged to assemble their ideal virtual mate from the disparate
contributions of different real people. Like the slut who gives away her sexuality on
the cheap, accepting sexual attention with no commitment or provision, the beta
orbiter gives away his provision and commitment without any corresponding
receptivity to his sexual attentions.

But Lingerfelt and countless others would turn the vice of misusing romantic love into a
virtue. In the same post Lingerfelt quotes from his novel *The Mason Jar* to make this case:

> The following letter is from an eighty year old grandfather to his son, Clayton “Finn”
Fincannon. After a relationship ends between he and his first love “Eden” during his
senior year of college in California...

The use of a letter from a fictitious grandfather is a smart literary trick to package new age
foolishness to *seem* like old school wisdom. In the novel the letters are passed from
grandfather to grandson via a mason jar on the grandfather’s desk. Again, here we have
more old school packaging literally surrounding and delivering new age ideas.

In another post Lingerfelt offers a *synopsis of the book*, and it reads like a beta orbiter’s
manifesto. A character named Finn (bearing a striking resemblance to *Lingerfelt’s own bio*)
falls deeply in love with a strong independent woman named Savannah and flies out to
Colorado to meet her parents. During that meeting this sudden love-of-his-life steps away to
take a call, and from then on she is distant from him. Shortly thereafter she breaks it off with
Finn and returns to her abusive ex boyfriend. The rest of the story are the painful adventures
of a beta orbiter, and his grandfather’s wisdom never to stop being what Vox Day has *dubbed*
a *feelings slut*:

> Unable to shake away his experiences in Africa, coupled with his memories of
Savannah, Finn writes a heart’s cry on paper, and leaves it in the Mason jar on his
grandfather’s desk...

> ...grandfather [tells] Finn that if he continues pouring himself out in love for others,
he will find the healing he seeks.

In the end Savannah decides that she isn’t attracted to Finn, but with the intervention of her
own father on behalf of Finn Savannah decides to formally LJBF him. Furthering my
suspicions that this is an autobiographical story from Lingerfelt, in the book Finn also writes a
book about Savannah which Savannah reads before deciding to LJBF him.

Not only does the book falsely elevate romantic love into a moral virtue, it confuses the
sacrificial love a husband is instructed to offer to his wife with *romantic love*, and suggests
that it is not only appropriate but wise for a Christian man to offer this sacrificial/romantic
love to women (like Savannah) who aren’t his wife:

> ...Savannah explains to Finn that she is leaving him to reunite with an abusive ex-
boyfriend.

Finn returns to the family farm that following weekend to clear his mind, where he
and his grandfather have a lengthy conversation concerning sacrificial love.

---

*www.TheRedArchive.com*
While the plot device of *wisdom from grandfather* is an effective way to repackage foolish modern ideas as old school wisdom, the weakness in the device should be readily apparent. While I certainly can imagine grandparents who have imbibed our culture’s foolishness and then state it as old time wisdom, imagining *Finn* as a wise grandfather passing the same advice along to a grandson is something else entirely. Finn’s grandfather didn’t become a father and then grandfather by pining after career gal sluts, waiting for one of them to tire of hopping from one bad boy to the next to ultimately marry him. Likewise, I can’t imagine Finn’s grandmother as said ex career gal slut, a woman who rode the carousel of alpha bad boys before ultimately realizing that she needed a man to *put a ring on it*. While the plot device is effective, the world view it transmits has the effect of ensuring that those foolish enough to adopt it won’t be likely to find themselves the grandparents to a future generation, and if they are, they certainly won’t be seen as wise men and women whom future generations turn to for advice.

**Edit:** From his page on *The Mason Jar*, the book is being made into a movie:

*The Mason Jar* feature film is scheduled for *pre-production in 2015* and will be directed in the same dramatic and romantic tones as *The Notebook* (Ryan Gosling, Rachel McAdams, 2004) and *Pride & Prejudice* (Keira Knightley, Matthew Mcfadyen, 2005).
The crazy dictator.
by Dalrock | October 15, 2013 | Link

My wife and I watched a movie titled Joshua a while back (plot spoiler alert). We ended up fast forwarding the second half of the film just to see how it ended, but the first half was both fascinating and painful. The movie is about a husband and father who is trying to keep his family together in the face of constant disruption from his clinically depressed wife and their sociopath nine year old son.

What was so striking to me was how normal the movie portrayed a husband having to placate an emotionally unstable wife. She was a one woman disaster, and her husband was constantly trying to find ways to resolve the problems she created without provoking her. She wouldn’t care for their newborn daughter, and she flew into a rage when others tried to fill in the gaps. In one sense this shouldn’t surprise me, because what the movie portrayed is our current legal climate. The husband/father can be ejected from the home at any time and for any (or no) reason by the wife/mother. When the boss is crazy, there isn’t much the helper can do.

I was curious if I was alone in reading the movie as portraying the placating husband/crazy wife dynamic as normal. The plot summary on wiki doesn’t even mention the mother as a source of problems, only as a victim of the son; the dynamic was so normal it didn’t merit mentioning. The reviewer for the New York Times however did notice the fact that the husband was constantly having to placate an emotional and less than sane wife, calling the movie a highly effective family drama cloaked in the stale tropes of the demon-seed thriller.

The review zeroes in on this at the end with:

But it’s Sam Rockwell’s spectacular turn as the harried paterfamilias that simultaneously binds the film and pushes its boundaries. Whether coddling his character’s doped-up wife or reaching out to his wacky son, Mr. Rockwell is never less than convincing as a stressed-out dad whose life is slowly disintegrating.

This dynamic between the coddling husband and the crazy wife is so compelling you could easily re cut the movie to take out the son as the fundamental source of conflict. In fact, you could leave in the early scenes with the son and in psychological thriller form temporarily mislead the audience into suspecting he might be a sociopath and the source of the problems. Such a film would be compelling, as the NY Times reviewer seems to agree. Imagine an entire movie where the protagonist husband constantly has to tiptoe around his crazy wife to somehow care for the children while avoiding provoking his ever-provoked wife. Oh, and he also needs to hold down his high stress job on Wall Street too. While such a movie would not pass the censors in our current culture, it would describe a family dynamic far more common than the “demon seed” plotline that bored the reviewer for the Times.

I thought of the movie again when reading a comment by the always excellent Social Pathologist:

…you’d be quite surprised just how many women find child rearing to being
psychologically difficult, to the point of involuntary psychiatric disease. One of the things that “blew me away” when I starting working as a family physician is the significant toll on psychiatric health that children bring, especially to women.

While as a physician he is understandably focused on helping the patient he is treating, the question that came to my mind was *what about the husband who has to deal with an emotionally unstable wife who has the power to destroy the family at any moment?* No one is taking her finger off the nuclear button. In fact, a husband convincing an emotionally unstable wife that she is unstable is widely seen as a *form of abuse*.

This is serious business, because not only is our family law system designed to empower wives and mothers (crazy or otherwise) at the expense of husbands and fathers, but crazy is sold to women as a form of empowerment. Cartoons regularly show young girls using emotional outbursts as a form of power, and the message to adult women is the same. Feminism in many ways is the celebration of the *power of emotional outbursts to change the world*.

This message that *crazy gets you power* (and that more power is what women need) isn’t limited to secular feminists. Modern Christians have embraced this idea to an astonishing extent. Are you feeling dissatisfied with your marriage/husband? Why not take a trip down crazy lane? It is sure to solve your problem. If you don’t already know how to put crazy to work in your own life, try an *emotional temper tantrum* involving loading the kids in the car and threatening to break up the family if you don’t get your way. Or if that isn’t your preferred brand of crazy, try **lining up expensive china on the mantle and breaking it with a hammer**.

Making all of this worse is the near universal assumption that divorce and the ensuing process is a *just punishment* for men. Dr. Helen had a post a while back about a man who was regularly thrown in jail due to his inability to pay exorbitant amounts of alimony and child support:

> “When I tell people what’s happened to me these last two years they say, ‘Your story can’t possibly be true, and you must be in court because you beat your wife,’” Schochet said.

The message to husbands is **find a way to keep her happy, and if you can’t you deserve what is coming to you**. But what happens when the woman isn’t just using crazy the way society tells her to use it, as a pragmatic tool to gain power? What if she isn’t driving the crazy, and instead the crazy is driving her?

Unfortunately there is no legal process to distinguish between wives who are using crazy pragmatically, and those who aren’t **playing crazy**. The Good Men Project posted an article back in August titled *What Do You Do When A Girl Hits You?* The author recounted being arrested after his wife brutally assaulted him in a successful ploy to gain an upper hand in their divorce:

> She kicked my head into the solid wood base. I blacked out, came to, stood up, bleeding. My daughter was screaming, “Stop hurting daddy!”
Even though she beat him, all the wife had to do was say the magic words and he ended up being arrested and unable to see his children:

The two officers escorting me to and from the hospital and then to central booking didn’t have any advice when I asked what I should have done. “Sorry, man.”

...

Thirty hours later I stood in front of a judge and had a county prosecutor argue against me: “His wife is afraid of him. She said he...”

Released on my own recognizance; order of protection outlaws me from contacting her or my kids for a year.

The thing to remember is this isn’t the failure of a system designed to protect men and women. This is the system working as designed. This is the whole point of the Good Men article; what should he have done differently given a violent and unstable wife? The only answer is to walk on eggshells and keep her from becoming unhappy, and focus on taking precautions to make it harder for her to use the domestic violence system against him. If a wife gets unhappy and either beats her husband or he ends up in jail due to unpayable child support or alimony, then he obviously had it coming.

Aside from keeping her happy, a husband with an emotionally unstable wife needs to focus on avoiding the domestic violence machinery. Web MD quotes an expert from a domestic violence hotline for men in their article Help for Battered Men:

We tell men if they have to be in an argument, do it in a room with two doors so they can leave; a lot of times a woman will block the door, the man will try to move her, and that will be enough for him to get arrested.
Feminism would work if we didn’t have weak men screwing everything up.

by Dalrock | October 17, 2013 | Link

Beta orbiting blogger James Russell Lingerfelt’s latest post is a republication of a post by Roger Sterling Jr titled 5 benefits of having a smart and successful wife. Sterling was deeply troubled after reading a study which found that men took a self esteem hit when told their partner scored in the top 12% of university students:

If you needed any further proof that the current state of masculinity has decayed to a skinny jeans-wearing, over-emotional, self-esteem lacking embarrassment, there it is. There are few things more “beta male” in this world than taking an emotional hit when the person you supposedly care about most knocks it out of the park.

It isn’t clear to me whether Sterling is a feminist or a traditional conservative, but this is part of the point. Since feminism is now the established order feminists are finding themselves the new conservatives, and many conservatives can be found unwittingly conserving feminism.

However they arrive at the new conservative position, the idea that feminism would work if it weren’t for weak men screwing everything up is extremely common. This argument only makes sense if you take feminism as a given, as the new, natural, and permanent order. Under this paradigm, men who aren’t living up to feminist women’s expectations are defective, and need to “grow a pair”.

The “grow a pair” argument is of course compelling because this is the masculine way to look at the world. Advising men to grow a pair is excellent advice, but the question is why they should “man up”, and what form men’s self improvement should take. Should men improve themselves to facilitate the delusional dreams of feminists, or should men improve themselves because excellence and overcoming adversity is inherent in being a man? The reason men choose to “grow a pair” will instruct the form of said growth. Growing a pair under the new feminist/conservative order means manning up and marrying a career woman to prove that you are strong enough to handle her, so much so that you are willing to overlook more attractive women to prove your strength in supporting feminism.
If women can’t be manly Marines, then manly Marines must wear girly hats.
by Dalrock | October 24, 2013 | Link

Juli Weiner of Vanity Fair mocks the idea that manly Marines would want to remain manly:

Marine officers vote on Friday whether they want to adopt the new hats and look like the cast of RENT eating a damn banana smoothie at a David Barton gym or whether they to keep the old hats and with them, their masculinity. [Spits chewing tobacco on ground.]

According to the NY Post after voting by Marines on the proposed covers ends on Friday the final decision will be made by Gen James Amos.

NY Post: Obama wants Marines to wear ‘girly’ hats
Marine Corps Times: Marine Corps seeks feedback on universal cover for men and women

Update: How to cover up a girly Marine cover.

See Also:

- The Long March of Envy.
- Feminist territory marking.
Is there a “shortage” of single fathers?
by Dalrock | October 28, 2013 | Link

Captain Capitalism found an article on eHarmony titled **15 Reasons to Date a Single Mom**. The fifteen reasons boil down to various ways of stating that single moms are easy, they will mother you, and you get to have fun with kids. They also threw some whoppers in for color, like:

| 2. She’s already a great mom. (And weren’t you looking for someone who would be a great mother? Look no further!) |

Unless she is a widow, single motherhood is an indication that she has **failed profoundly** as a mother. This doesn’t mean she isn’t trying desperately to overcome this, and there are some **exceptions**, but to claim that failing to create a stable home for her children is proof that a woman is a “great mom” is ludicrous on its face.

Here is another one I can’t imagine they typed up with a straight face (emphasis mine):

| 7. **She’s loyal** — and is fiercely protective of her little brood. |

Not being married to the father of her children isn’t a marker of loyalty. Again, there can be good reasons why a woman might find herself without the father of her children in the household, but the fact that he’s not around isn’t proof of her loyalty; statistically speaking it is more likely than not an indication that she ejected the father from the home. Aside from widows, it is at the very least a red flag which needs to be **thoroughly vetted**.

I also enjoyed the next one, which while part of the “Single moms are easy” category, is still worth noting separately:

| 10. She’s no longer a party girl, but a fun night out is still very welcome. |

Good news! She’s had her alpha f****, so now it is time for your beta bucks!

The good captain understandably has tired of the pleas for him and men like him to “man up” and take on a single mother. He wondered why single mothers can’t focus their romantic attention on single fathers, instead of constantly having to enlist men without children. Part of this no doubt is due to **strip mining**, but the captain wondered if there wasn’t an imbalance of single fathers to single mothers. **Check out his full post** for details, but he found data indicating that there is a 15 million single mother surplus in the US.

One question the captain had with the data he found is how increased male mortality might be factoring in. How much of that 15 million single mother surplus is due to older age brackets where women outnumber men, and how much is due to hypergamy. I did a bit of searching on my own, and found a **report from fatherhood.gov**. The data is from 2000, but it still gives a somewhat recent snapshot of the percent of men and women by age bracket who have ever had children.
Figure 1.
Percentage of adults ages 18 and older who have ever had a biological child: 2000

Like the captain’s numbers, this doesn’t separate out single vs married mothers and fathers, but the overall imbalance for the age brackets under 45 certainly fits with the captain’s hypothesis.
Taking a short break.
by Dalrock | October 31, 2013 | Link

I need to focus on other priorities for a bit so I’ve turned on comment moderation. I’ll be back to approve comments and with a new post some time next week. In the meantime, I suggest you check out the wealth of other writers in the sphere; my blogroll is a good place to start.

Update Wed Nov 6th PM: Comment moderation is back to normal and another post is scheduled for autopublish in the morning.
The New York Post touched off a media firestorm two weeks ago with their headline Obama wants Marines to wear ‘girly’ hats. Following the firestorm, there has been a concerted effort to reframe the issue to make it appear that the Post and other news organizations got it all wrong. The Stars and Stripes ran an article announcing not only that the the proposal had been pulled, but claiming that the proposal had never been serious in the first place:

Still, Marines say the Daly cover was added to the survey as a throwaway option.

“The Marine Corps commandant had and has zero intention of changing the male cover,” Marine officials said.

This post-media-firestorm claim contradicts an Oct 21st story by the Marine Corps Times which predates the New York Post story:

The Marine Corps Uniform Board may recommend the adoption of a universal cover for men and women to be worn with dress and service uniforms.

The change could take one of two forms. Either women could begin wearing current male covers with slight modifications, or all Marines could begin wearing new “Dan Daly caps,” according to a Marine news release.

Either the Marine Corps Times made up a Marine news release, or the idea was under serious enough consideration to announce to the press.

The vaguely sourced claim in the Stars and Stripes that the proposal was never serious is a difficult one to swallow since as the same article points out the USMC has been directed by the Secretary of the Navy to adopt a universal cover for male and female Marines. The Secretary of the Navy’s goal is for male and female Marines not to be distinguishable by their uniforms:

Navy Secretary Ray Mabus has asked the Navy and Marine Corps to look at moving to one cover for men and women.

“The secretary believes that when you look at a group of sailors and Marines, you should see a group of sailors and Marines, indistinguishable by uniform,” said Cmdr. Tamra Lawrence, a spokeswoman for Mabus.

Where did the Dan Daly cap come from?

Mixed in with the denial that the Dan Daly cap was ever seriously considered for adoption by male Marines is denial that the cap is “girly”. The Stars and Stripes article takes care to identify the proposed cap with the heroism of its namesake, while suggesting (without outright stating) that the cap under consideration is a recreation of the one Daly wore:
Sgt. Maj. Dan Daly, a two-time Medal of Honor recipient who yelled, “Come on, you sons of bitches, do you want to live forever?” as he led Marines into the fight at Belleau Wood during World War I, wore a cap similar to the option proposed by the survey, as did other Marines in the early 1900s. The current male Marine dress cover was adopted in 1922.

This girly cap comes with a manly story; maybe the Post has it all wrong. But the New York Post in defending their original article has published a memo which they describe as background for the survey. The memo explains that the cap in question was originally designed as a cap for female Marines in 2002/2003. This cap was approved as the “improved female cap” by the Commandant of the Marine Corps (CMC) in 2007, but procurement efforts were halted in 2012 in order to explore a DoD mandate for a universal cover.

The memo further explains that when the improved female cap was proposed as a universal cover for male and female Marines, it was renamed the “Dan Daly” cap (emphasis mine):

It was suggested, via the on-line survey process, that the improved female cap is very similar to the uniform cap worn by Sgt Maj Daniel Daly (see enclosure (2)), and would make an acceptable “universal” cap for all Marines. The cap worn by Dan Daly was in the Marine Corps inventory from 1904-1918, but its shape dates back as far as 1897. From this point forward the improved female cap will be known as the “Dan Daly” cap.

As far as I can tell, neither the veracity of the memo itself nor the history it presents of the Dan Daly cap is in dispute. The Wall Street Journal’s Ben Kesling explains the same basic history. Isaac Cubillos of militaryreporter.net went after the NY Post hard with When a phony military story is written for political reasons, it hurts real journalism and readers. Yet Cubillos not only republished the memo, he used it to make his case that the Post was wrong:

The New York Post released The Marine Corps Uniform Board document (all yellow highlights are from the Post). You will note, there is nothing indicating the President of the United States was involved in this. Additionally, you will note the Marines specifically say the manufacturer went out of business, not because it’s less expensive as the original NY Post story claimed.

But even here, the original Post article never stated that adopting the women’s cap for both men and women was proposed to save money. In fact, the Post had explained that the proposal was made despite the fact that it would cost money:

According to the memo obtained by The Post, requiring all troops to use the Daly cover will cost $8,221,958. Going with the traditional cap will save $284,043, because the current female caps are more expensive.

This seems par for the course for the critics of the Post on this topic. Straw man arguments are set up and knocked down, but the core of the story remains undisputed. Probably the best example of this is the ridicule of the Post for connecting the Obama administration with the proposal. While it is true that the Post headline and story named Obama, in the story itself it clarified that the specific direction for a universal cover was from the DoD.
Technically the criticism is accurate; there doesn’t seem to be any evidence that President Obama asked to have the men who hold his umbrella wear girly hats. However, what doesn’t appear to be disputed is that under pressure from Obama’s Secretary of the Navy for a universal cap, the USMC Uniform Board renamed a female cap the “Dan Daly” cap and offered it (as one of two options) as a universal cap to be worn by male and female Marines. An official photo shoot was ordered with men wearing women’s caps, and this allegedly non serious proposal was presented as one of only two options in a survey to all Marines in preparation for the final decision to be made by Gen James Amos, CMC.

Assuming the history of the Daly cap presented by the Post and the Wall Street Journal is accurate, the critics of the New York Post are arguing that the Post and before them the Marine Corps Times were taken in by an elaborate scheme by the Marine Corps Uniform Board and Marine press department to make it appear that the CMC was seriously considering ordering all male Marines to wear women’s caps. Due to the obvious public relations nightmare such a scheme is bound to create, this strikes me as highly unlikely. However, either way the blame for the public relations disaster must rest with the leadership and press department of the Marine Corps itself, and not with the Post and the other news organizations who were ostensibly fooled by the charade.

See Also: If women can’t be manly Marines, then manly Marines must wear girly hats.
He came to teach.
by Dalrock | November 13, 2013 | Link

Commenter Know How isn’t yet married, but this didn’t stop him from explaining that I and others have it all wrong in his response to my post Romance 101: How to stop frustrating your wife. As with another recent comment in response to that post, I pulled it to moderation to avoid derailing the discussion on that post. However, since I don’t have a new post handy and in the interest of allowing Know How a platform to share his armchair husband wisdom I’m posting it here.

“Cooking breakfast and getting into bed” is not what makes a wife. When a man makes the statement about “discussing her feminity”, that sounds like he intends to change her. We don’t want women to change us, why do we expect them to allow us to change them? According to what many women will tell you, they are not created to cook, clean, and have sex. They are our helpmeets, not our slaves. My dad is a marriage therapists with 47 years of practice. I grew up with a house full of sisters and one brother, so the two of us, have heard and seen it all and certainly admit that we can be at fault a lot more times than the woman.

Many of you here are somewhat skewed in your attitudes. It is not the way real men would approach the problems in relationships. Some things that we should not fall into the trap of is, making bad jokes, demeaning them, and expecting them not to react, to our demeaning and belittling. This is some of what gave rise to feminists. They got tired of us limiting them and being too dominant. Women are people, not animals. Omit the jokes about spanking and the attitude about a woman wanting a career. I love my girlfriend and try to keep check of my behavior and expect for her to check herself, but I certainly do not want a passive woman without goals. We will be married after Christmas.

Everything in the relationship is not about her, nor about me. We both want to be respected and romanced. A decent balance is needed and the only way you will keep the relationship working is to be fair to her and not expect for her to bow down to you.
Why men are withdrawing from courtship.
by Dalrock | November 15, 2013 | Link

One of the more common refrains in the “Where have all of the good men gone!” lament is men’s increasing unwillingness to court women the way women expect to be courted. This is almost always framed as either a great mystery or a case of weak men screwing up feminism (or both).

Examples of this concern abound, from Aunt Haley’s last three posts, to the divorced single mother who found out men weren’t willing to spend very much to court her, to the woman in Vox’s recent post lamenting that her 59 year old friend was only offered half a sandwich by a recent date. Commenter Tom H weighed in with the same concern the other day about his two 30ish career women daughters who struggle to find men who will date them without “pushing for sex”.

How did we get here?

To better understand why men are withdrawing from courtship we need to consider the roles men and women play in the process and how the sexual revolution has impacted the landscape. Men foot the searching costs in the marriage and sexual marketplace (MMP & SMP). This means bearing most of the risk of rejection and expending the bulk of the resources to facilitate the process of meeting and getting to know one another. As the ones who bear the costs of courtship, men have a strong incentive to minimize the number of women they court and the overall duration of time spent in the process. However, as the consumers of courtship, women have an incentive to draw the process out as long as possible and to receive courtship from as many men as possible.

Over the last few decades the expectation that men bear the bulk of the costs and risks of courtship has remained relatively constant, but the time period women expect to be courted has expanded dramatically.
As recently as 1980, the median age of marriage for women in the US was 22. By 2011 this was 26.5, but this significantly understates the nature of the change since it doesn’t account for the rapidly expanding group of 30 something women who haven’t been able to marry. A full 25% of all US White 30-34 year old women have yet to marry, and these aging would be brides are the loudest voices complaining about the lack of courtship.

The problem with women’s complaints about courtship is easier to understand if you consider the needs of the man. He needs to manage risk vs reward. When courting, there are two fundamental risks. These are the risk of wasting resources on the wrong women, and the risk of rejection harming the man’s reputation/MMV.

**Risk of wasting resources on the wrong women.**

There are three subcategories of resource risk:

1. Expend courtship resources on women not interested in marriage (in general).
2. Expend courtship resources on women who are interested in marriage, but not interested in marrying him (aiming too high).
3. Risk of aiming too low.

**Risk of rejection harming the man’s reputation/MMV.**

This basic risk can in turn be broken down into two subcategories:

1. Risk of nuclear rejection.
2. Cumulative risk of rejection.

For the ladies reading who might be offended at this, I’ll frame it differently. Picture your ideal husband. Do you want him to propose to you after having been rejected by numerous other women? Of course not. You don’t want to feel like the consolation prize, and you don’t want to marry a man whom other women are known to have rejected. In order to avoid this, the man you ultimately marry must be careful with how freely he expresses interest in women who aren’t signaling an interest in him.

On the question of wasting resources, do you want your future husband to divide his courtship resources between you and many other women? Or do you want all of his available courtship investment to be devoted solely to you?

What does a woman’s age have to do with courtship?

For a man who is managing the risks of courtship outlined above, the age of a woman is very important. The older a woman is, the more likely it is that she is very picky and/or not seriously looking for a husband. Older women also are less attractive from a courtship perspective because they have used up more of their most attractive/fertile years, and while their attractiveness for marriage has declined their expectations for courtship have only increased. In short, the older a woman gets the worse a bet she becomes (on average) when it comes to courting her.

There is another impact of women increasing the time period they expect courtship, and this is on men’s willingness to court younger women. Consider the 25% of current early thirties White women who still haven’t married; unless they are terminally unattractive an awful lot of courtship has almost certainly been wasted on them. They aren’t just bad bets for courtship today, but (in retrospect) they clearly were bad bets for courtship for the last 15 years. Even more telling, just shy of half of all late twenties White women have never married, which means five years ago 50% of early twenties White women were a complete and total waste of traditional courtship risk and resources. Given the direction of the trends over the last five years, the risk is even higher today.

Put simply, the extended delay of marriage by women has placed marriage minded men in a dilemma; older women are (generally speaking) known bad bets for courtship, but half of early twenties women are also poor bets for courtship. And this is before the man in question starts to consider which of the good bets for courtship (in general) would be a good bet for him personally to court.

It is also worth noting that it isn’t just in delaying marriage that women are extending the period of expected courtship. Women are also driving our divorce revolution, and even with a track record of being the worst possible courtship risk (the kind who marries and then gets unhaaaaapy) they still expect to be courted all over again.

The logical adjustment by men.

There are only two logical ways men can respond to women’s extension of courtship. The first logical choice is to recognize that these women are debasing marriage, and decide to
“court” for sex and not marriage. For most late teens and early twenties women, this is the only form of courtship which makes sense. This is true in even higher percentages for women in their late twenties or higher. For women looking to soak up courtship in today’s hookup culture there is another serious problem; when courting for sex it is in a man’s best interest to greatly limit the amount of resources he spends before getting sex from a woman. This allows him to cast a wide net while keeping his expenditures down. Ironically, as we have learned from Game a man’s chances of receiving sex from a woman are actually higher when practicing the skittles method of courtship (crass site warning).

But while “courting” for sex is a logical choice, it is not a moral choice, and we still do see men courting for marriage. For these men, having a fairly low age cutoff makes a great deal of sense. A woman in her late twenties who claims to be serious about traditional marriage is far less believable and attractive than a woman who indicates the same thing in her late teens or early twenties. Admittedly few women in their early twenties are believably signaling an interest in marrying soon, but this is a plus when trying to minimize spreading courtship resources around too freely. There are of course a number of other markers a man should consider when determining if a woman is a good bet for marriage, which will narrow the field down further. Making things worse for women looking to soak up “traditional” courtship, the logical strategy for traditional courtship isn’t that different than the strategy for men courting for sex; logically speaking, traditional men should keep courtship expenditure to a minimum until a woman has indicated a fairly strong interest in marrying him. Given the large numbers of women not actually interested in marrying at any given time and the opportunity cost of focusing on a non serious candidate, traditional men will do best to greatly limit their courtship efforts and expenditure until around the time of an engagement, and if they are smart they will also insist on keeping the length of the engagement as short as logistically possible.

See Also: How should women respond to men withdrawing from courtship?
How should women respond to men withdrawing from courtship?

by Dalrock | November 17, 2013 | Link

In my last post I explained why it makes logical sense for men to greatly limit the amount of “courtship” they offer women in today’s post sexual revolution sexual and marriage marketplace (SMP & MMP). But this leaves the question of what this means for women, and how they should rationally respond to men’s rational choices.

For women who want to meet and marry a suitable man.

The key to answering the question involves understanding the woman’s primary objective. If the goal is to maximize the amount of courtship she receives, skip below to the section on courting for sex. If a woman’s goal is to meet a suitable husband and get married, then she should focus on that goal and not worry about how much courtship she soaks up in the process. There is nothing magical about meal at a restaurant or other forms of semi-expensive entertainment which conveys the important character traits of a prospective husband. At best these serve as a (very poor) barometer of the man’s financial success.

Many women would also argue that a man spending money on her during a date (especially early dates) expresses a sincere desire to get to know her. In this sense paying for a date serves as a sort of courting earnest money; it demonstrates that the man has some skin in the game. However, the reason women want this proof-of-seriousness is exactly why it isn’t rational for men to offer it. In the past courtship was not only restricted in duration, but it was also generally restricted to people in the man and woman’s extended social circle. While the couple might be strangers to each other, there were generally enough social connections for them (or their families) to learn some basic information about the status and character of the other person before deciding to court. If a man had a history of being a scoundrel, the woman could learn this without ever agreeing to court him. Likewise, if a woman had a history of not taking courtship seriously and stringing along suitors, the man could learn this upfront.

Contrast the past with today, where large numbers of women not only want to extend their period of courtship to a decade and a half, but where they want to date extensively outside of their extended social circle. Anytime you are dealing with strangers it creates a trust deficit. Since men are traditionally the ones who bear the risks in courtship, it isn’t surprising that women want men to demonstrate their seriousness first. However, the problem is that women aren’t doing anything similar in kind. Commenter Robert Slanton linked to an article about a Toronto woman who uses online dating as a source of free meals and entertainment. The problem with women expecting men to expend money on getting to know them is the issue of trusting a stranger runs both ways. While the Toronto woman is unusual in her brazenness, she isn’t the only woman to figure out that online dating is a way to get free dinners.

I assume at this point some of my female readers are saying:
But I’m not like that, and since I’m not men should be willing to pay for a date if they want to get to know me!

Of course you aren’t. But how can a man find out you aren’t like that?

He just needs to ask me on a date and get to know me.

Women who think this way aren’t thinking this all the way through. They are saying men should pay upfront to find out if they are serious or not. The problem is, this makes it nearly impossible to avoid becoming the dupe for women like the one in Toronto. The only way to know she isn’t gaming the system is to enable other women to game the system.

The good news.

As I mentioned before, there is nothing magical about a paid date when it comes to getting to know someone. Men and women can get to know each other and experience attraction for each other in a huge variety of casual and formal interactions. The average woman complaining about not being able to “meet men” (date) has in fact already met very large numbers of single men. Casting a wide net is an excellent idea, but the perception of abundance can at times create a perception that the woman is in a different SMP and especially MMP league than she really is. However, even with this and men’s general pullback from courtship the vast majority of young women do still manage to marry. With this in mind, here is my advice to women looking to find a husband:

1. Be young, or more accurately get serious about finding a husband as soon as possible. This not only allows you to choose when your own hand is strongest, but also when your choices are greatest. Picking last is always a terrible strategy, and this is no less true for finding a husband than when buying produce.

2. Keep your chastity. Women’s happiness with marriage declines with partner count, and their expectations also rise (without an increase in options).

3. Look for market inefficiencies. There is a time around a man’s early twenties when he starts to really show his promise. Such men are just starting to become attractive to women, but haven’t yet gotten used to being attractive. These men are excellent marriage prospects, especially for a woman a few years younger than them. Learn to identify and locate these young men and place yourself in a position to interact with them.

4. Don’t lose hope. Just because few men are willing to take you out on paid dates to get to know you, doesn’t rule out the likelihood that a significant number of men would be willing to marry you. Put another way, just because you may be a bad bet for (traditional, expensive) courtship doesn’t mean you are a bad bet for marriage. The same data which shows that women are having a harder time marrying also shows that the vast majority of women still marry, and some of them are marrying well into their 30s. Take advantage of the social interactions you already have to meet men. Women are better than men at sending signals of interest while keeping plausible deniability; don’t be afraid to use this when you think a single man in your larger circle might be a good match. You don’t want to ask him out, but you should probably help him figure out that it is a good idea for him to initiate either dates or other interactions.

5. Be as kind and private as possible when rejecting interested men. Rejection comes with
the territory, but you don’t want to cause Mr. Right to have reason to avoid making contact.

6. If your goal is to marry but not to marry now, let your social circle know you aren’t dating at the moment because you aren’t ready to look for a husband; then follow through with this and don’t date or encourage interest until you are ready to seriously look for a husband.

7. When you are ready to look for a husband, let your social circle know this is the case. This will (somewhat) filter out the men who express interest in you for sex, but this filtering is a positive. It would in fact be better if it were more effective at filtering out interest from men looking for sex.

8. Make as honest an assessment of your MMP league as possible. You don’t want to set your sights too low, but you also don’t want to turn away men you will only learn too late were your best prospects. Also, be sure not to confuse the league of man you can attract for sex with the league of man you can attract for marriage.

9. Don’t settle: If after spending a suitable period of time with a man you find you aren’t falling for him, cut it off (gently) and move along. Don’t worry, another woman will almost undoubtedly be able to fall for this man (if he wasn’t generally attractive you wouldn’t even be considering him).

10. Don’t ask a man to be your celibate boyfriend. Waiting for marriage is a good thing, unless you are using it as an excuse to keep the man as a beta orbiter while you consider other options. If you aren’t anxious for the day you marry and can have sex with the man, cut it off. Otherwise, keep the term of your engagement to a minimum.

**Courting for sex.**

If the goal is maximum courtship, then a woman should (logically, not morally) choose to be courted for sex. There are a number of ways to go about this same basic goal, including looking for a one night hookup, a fling, or a boyfriend. Given the basic similarities between these things, the strategy for finding such men is essentially the same. Many women also use hookups as their intended path to finding a husband.

Being courted for sex is a woman’s best chance to soak up maximum attention and resources from men because the payoff tends to be immediate. While it is fairly unlikely that a woman will marry in the near term, the chances that she will have casual sex in the same time frame are much higher. By moving into this space you lower the risks for men who offer you courtship and will therefore have more takers.

Keep in mind that men who best know how to woo for sex also know that paying for dates before you have sex with them is a terrible bet. However, if you are pleasant and attractive enough and continue having sex with them they will be more likely to pay for dates. Note that players have turned the tables here, and it is now women who have to first demonstrate skin in the game.
Hold my beer
by Dalrock | November 20, 2013 | Link

and watch this.

Note the “like” counts for Proud Single Moms and I Love My Husband at the bottom of the article. **Edit:** The counts appear to be cumulative for the respective Facebook pages, and not specific to this one article.
**Those who would stop the joy of the dance.**

by Dalrock | November 22, 2013 | Link

---

**Hat Tip** Vox

A quote from John C. Wright; a perfect metaphor for how feminists wish to steal the joy out of marriage:

> Those who object that men should not lead in the dance, whatever they say, are not friends of women; they just want to stop the joy of the dance.
Christian mommyblogger Jenny Erikson is outraged that her pastor ruined the surprise she had planned for her husband. She explains in How My Husband Found Out I Was Leaving Him:

So there you go. My Pastor had actually told my husband, based on a fourth-hand rumor, without talking to me first, that I was planning on leaving him. That. Just. Happened.

“I filed for divorce last week,” I told him flatly. “I was planning on telling you this Friday.”

That her husband would defend such an outrage is one of the many reasons she decided the father of her children had to go:

My husband defended him as doing his pastoral duty. I looked him straight in the eyeballs and said, “The fact that you are defending this man’s actions yesterday is one of a thousand reasons I cannot stay married to you.”

The comments are quite telling about the state of modern Christianity, with a few Christians going against the grain pointing out her obvious rebellion and the majority (including Catholic, Greek Orthodox, and Protestant commenters) lining up to throw her pastor (and marriage) under the bus. I can only assume she needs all the internet support she can get, because dating as a single mom is hard enough without google making it harder for her.
2013 never married data.
by Dalrock | November 26, 2013 | Link

The 2013 Census data came out today, and Han Solo at Just Four Guys has already made good use of it. My initial take is that the trends we have seen over the last few years may be leveling off for the later age brackets. At the same time, never married rates jumped over 2% for the 20-24 age bracket.

However, one year’s worth of data doesn’t give us enough information to assume a change in the trend. I’ll chew on this some more and if I think I have enough for a post I’ll put one together. In the meantime, check out Han Solo’s narrative and charty goodness here.
Soothing words for the unrepentant baby mama.
by Dalrock | November 26, 2013 | Link

Christian mommyblogger Jenny Erikson is furious that her pastor first ruined the surprise she had in store for her husband and then called her out on her sin, but she is understandably delighted with blogger Matt Walsh. Yesterday Ms. Erikson tweeted (H/T Keoni Galt):

Married men: your porn habit is an adultery habit
http://themattwalshblog.com/2013/11/25/married-men-your-porn-habit-is-an-adultery-habit/ ... (I love this guy)

See Cane Caldo’s expert takedown of the blog post Jenny finds so comforting in her time of rebellion: Matt Walsh Gets Bored and Blows Up Families
As we’ve stumbled our way to the post marriage family one of the conversations we’ve never seriously engaged at a cultural level is the evil of child support and alimony. That these things are evil should be manifest in the fact that they are the answer to the question:

How shall we organize the family without marriage?

In fairness those who detest marriage would argue that replacing marriage is a fundamentally good thing, and that therefore anything which destroys marriage is not only not evil, but good. However, even the most marriage hating radical feminist would still have to recognize that child support and alimony are the answer to the question of how to replace marriage.

For those who believe in marriage the only legitimate question is not whether child support and alimony are evil, but whether (and how often) they might at times be a necessary evil.

In the not too distant past the consensus in the Christian West was that only in very rare and extreme circumstances were child support and alimony necessary evils. Husbands who abandoned their families or who were seriously abusive or serial adulterers were the kinds of extreme corner cases where the necessity of replacing marriage outweighed the evil of replacing marriage.

But either way, make no mistake; destroying families is evil, and replacing marriage is evil. Marriage is sacred, and anyone who is not a foe of marriage should approach its destruction/replacement with great trepidation. This is a grave matter, and should be treated as such. Even in the cases where the husband is acting terribly we should be extremely hesitant to step in and destroy a family, or to do anything to facilitate the destruction of that family. There is no neat and clean way to break up a family. Breaking up families isn’t like neatly amputating an offending limb; it is more like remodeling with dynamite. Honoring marriage vows can at times be very difficult, and having a rescue crew waiting in the wings to declare the marriage “over” and offer an alternative creates huge temptation for sin and the great harm to children which follows the destruction of the family.

Until around the mid 60s we treated alimony and child support as necessary evils. Women who had children out of wedlock were strongly encouraged to marry (and remain married to) the father of their child because the bastardy laws carried a strong stigma. Men or women who married and then decided honoring their marriage vows was too hard had to prove in divorce court that their case was one of the rare exceptions where destroying the family was a necessary evil. This kept divorce rare and made it clear that if such extreme measures were justified either the husband or the wife must have acted so terribly that destroying the family was the only viable option.

From necessary evil to moral imperative.

But then starting in the late sixties we reorganized our legal and social structure with the
(unquestioned) assumption that replacing marriage wasn’t a necessary evil, but a moral imperative. We replaced a patchwork of bastardy laws with a declaration that legitimacy doesn’t matter. Around the same time, we ushered in no fault divorce with very strong bias towards mother custody, while leaving in place the punitive practices of child support and alimony. Suddenly child support and alimony went from necessary evil to an open bribe available to any woman who was willing to betray her husband and children.

Now we not only promise a woman cash and prizes if she will agree to betray her family, but we have created a presumption of guilt on the part of the very husband she sells out. As Lydia McGrew explains here it is misogyny to not assume that our pandemic of wife initiated divorce is proof that the men must have had it coming.

This assumption that the sin of divorce must be justified is combining with the lure of the financial reward to sin and snaring very large numbers of women. Where Christians should be defending marriage and discouraging sin, most are enthusiastic supporters of child support and stand forever ready to offer justifications for women to divorce their husbands, however flimsy. However, remaining silent about the evil of child support and alimony and encouraging frivolous divorce is not kind to women and children; it is cruelty. Yet where are the Christian leaders warning against the great temptation that child support and alimony present to women?

In our current rush to find some fault, any fault, by the husband to justify the divorcing wife we aren’t being honest that the standing offer of a cash reward for ending her marriage can’t help but cloud her judgment. Any Christian treatment of the subject should start by pointing out that in either every case or nearly every case a wife divorcing her husband is sinning gravely. Even in the case where the husband is divorcing the wife, the fact that she knows she will get a cash reward if he decides to divorce her is a huge temptation for her not to honor the Bible’s instruction to wives. From this perspective her husband’s bad behavior and the lure of financial reward are the sources of temptations to grave sin, not moral justifications to sin. In a more clear headed time this is what Christians would warn women who were considering destroying their families or even rejecting their obligations as wives. However, we don’t live in clear headed times, and even the supposed champions of the family Focus on the Family are now so vulgar as to openly teach women how to collect their 30 pieces of silver.
Twisted Scripture.
by Dalrock | December 1, 2013 | Link

Nearly all of the instruction to husbands and wives in the New Testament tends to make modern Christians very uncomfortable. There is for example a cottage industry to explain away headship and submission in Ephesians 5:22-27. This cottage industry has built a veritable tower of babel consisting of mutually exclusive rationalizations for why the Apostle Paul can’t possibly have meant what he very clearly wrote.

This basic pattern of rationalizing away biblical instruction which doesn’t jibe with feminism is pervasive, but one verse in particular which troubles modern Christians is the Apostle Peter’s instruction to wives in 1 Pet 3:1-6. In fairness, the instructions in that verse not only go entirely against our modern sensibility of moxie-as-virtue, it also asks a great deal of Christian wives. Wives are instructed to respond to failing husbands with more submission, so that they might win their husband over without a word. This is the verse which blows Ephesians 5 rationalizers out of the water with their “wives only have to submit if their husband is loving them like Christ loves the Church” because it calls on wives to submit even to husbands who don’t believe/obey the word. While husbands are instructed in Ephesians 5 to actively lead their wives by washing them with the water of the word, wives are instructed 1 Pet 3 to let their silent submission and purity win over their wayward husband’s hearts.

But why exactly are modern Christians so uncomfortable with the instruction in 1 Pet 3:1-6? Is it because they lack faith that God’s instruction to wives is good and wise, or is it the shockingly anti moxie part of the message offending their feminist sensibilities? Clearly the answer is both, but there is a twist. We can see this by changing the instruction to wives in 1 Pet 3 into instruction to husbands and see how modern Christians respond. Imagine if Peter’s words were instead instructing husbands to:

- Submit to their wives as Sarah submitted to Abraham (calling him her lord).
- Focus on winning their wayward wives without a word, through their untiring demonstration of purity and submission.

With just this small modification to 1 Pet 3:1-6, we suddenly have Scripture the ladies in your church and perhaps even your pastor can eagerly get behind. This is the kind of teaching modern Christians are thirsty for. All it took was a little twist, and these out of fashion words from the Bible are suddenly transformed from (modern Christian) turd-in-the-punchbowl to divinely inspired philosophy: unlike the distressing original, it is a message modern Christians never tire of sharing with both Christians and non Christians alike, especially whenever speaking to a husband who is experiencing marital difficulty.

Not only are modern Christians thoroughly enamored with this new improved version of Scripture, practically no one seems to have noticed the slight twisting required to make Christian marriage something to gush over. Don’t take my word for it; ask the men and women on any Christian online forum what they think about Fireproof, and the Love Dare and see what I mean.
They hated the Book, but they loved the movie.
Their open marriages are threatening her serial monogamy.
by Dalrock | December 2, 2013 | Link

Jenny Erikson worries that some parents aren’t doing promiscuity the right way, and as a result they are creating the wrong kind of chaos for their children:

Of course promises get broken, but how can you raise children in such chaos that no promise is ever even made, let alone attempted to be lived?
Jenny Erikson is trapped! No, not in an unhappy marriage. That is stage 4 in having it all. Please try to keep up. Jenny is currently in stage 5, moving quickly to stage 6:

5: Is forced to divorce the bad man who made her unhappy by doing everything she demanded he do.

6: Basks in the drama of a newly divorced woman, wronged by her ex husband and the society which forced her to marry the wrong man.

Steps 7 & 8 are just around the corner, although she has a great deal of discretion on how long she chooses to spend in step 7 and of course a great deal of uncertainty about step 8:

7: Has sex with the most attractive men who are (still) willing to have sex with her. Since this misguided attempt at reliving the glory of her twenties is generally an immense disappointment, she then wants to quickly move on to:

8: Finds her secret multimillionaire hunky handyman who insists that she marry him, thus returning her to the higher social status of wife.

Jenny has made it her life’s work to be a living breathing manosphere cliché. First she married her beta orbiter. Then she had her two children in wedlock while writing about how she loved her husband for his foot rubs. Then 9 months after writing Happy 10th Anniversary to My Darling Husband Leif she suddenly discovered that she had been trapped in an unhappy marriage for years. You can’t make this stuff up.

The real problem for Jenny is the profound contradiction between her trademark claim of placing God first while setting out to be the lowest form of mommyblogger, the professional divorcée. Her signature twist as a professional divorcée is that she does this from the conservative, pro God, pro stay married perspective.
This is a trap of her own creation. If she wants to continue to receive the attention fix of her chosen profession, she will be faced with the unrelenting demand to write posts about how her divorce has harmed her children, how her household experiences chaos without a father/husband, how much she likes being divorced, and the ups and downs of her quest for more men (see her head start on this essential topic here). This is just the baseline publish or perish requirement for a professional divorcée mommy blogger though. To keep her signature twist, she will also have to write posts moralizing about marriage and the importance of staying married even if you aren’t happy.

Identity crisis

As an entertainment site for mothers, The Stir has two fundamental demographics: I Love My Husband and Proud Single Moms. Moving from the former category to the latter (and back) isn’t a problem for a mommyblogger, but Jenny can’t claim the former as a professional divorcée, and can’t claim the latter while claiming to place God first, moralizing about marriage, etc.
As I’ve mentioned before, women delaying marriage are playing a collective game of chicken in order to avoid wasting any more of their youth and fertility on their husbands than absolutely necessary. Obviously not all women are playing this game, but those who are delaying marriage are implicitly betting that the men their own age or a few years older than them will ultimately decide marrying an older, less fertile, more demanding and more sexually promiscuous bride is better than not marrying at all. For this to work younger women need to continue to be driven by greed (therefore keeping up the marriage delaying trend), and the men in question need to be driven by fear of ending up alone. While we are seeing signs that it is getting more difficult for marriage delaying women on the margins, the basic bet has so far panned out.

Still, there is always the risk that an inherent limit will be reached which could disrupt the strategy. For example, we already have an indication that delayed marriage is reducing the incentive for men to work to become providers. The risk here is that never married late twenties and early 30s women could start to panic, and this panic could spread to younger women. If early to mid twenties women were to switch from greed to fear, the older marriage delayers could end up being squeezed out of marriage by younger and more attractive brides. But beyond the problems with the weakened signal creating a shortage of eligible 30 something husbands, there is also the risk that eventually marriage will be delayed long enough for the SMV tables to turn. If this happens, men will be the ones driven by greed instead of fear, and the resulting panic by marriage delaying women would only reinforce this.

While we are certainly seeing changes on the margins, I don’t think we have enough data to suggest that we are witnessing a sea change regarding delayed marriage. However, Vox Day recently quoted an article in The Atlantic which shows exactly what a man moving from fear to greed as his SMV increases with age looks like. The Atlantic author misreads the change as being due to the technology of online dating, but online dating only makes it easier for the sex with the SMV advantage to be pickier.

From The Atlantic:  A Million First Dates
Cane drives it home.
by Dalrock | December 11, 2013 | Link

Check out Cane Caldo’s excellent post on the topic of young women finding a husband. 
Neither Saved Nor Spent, But Invested
Vox pointed out in a recent post that Matt Walsh gets it right when it comes to husbands calling their wives “the boss”. As Walsh explains in Stop calling your wife “the boss“:

The culture encourages men to assume a submissive posture and shrink away from the challenges of being the captains of their ships.

Many men are happy to comply. They can sit on the couch, let their wives carry the burden, and pat themselves on the back for having the courage to live by such egalitarian principles.

Unfortunately Walsh then hopelessly confuses the issue by asserting that a husband has an obligation to lead but must not be a “boss“:

I believe that men have a duty to lead, and I believe that there are many, many women who agree with me.

Notice: I’m not saying that the man should be the boss. Being a leader doesn’t mean being a “boss.” But I don’t need to spend time dispelling the notion that men ought to be the boss, because, as we’ve covered, that notion doesn’t really exist.

But calling your wife “the boss" isn't the only temptation Christian men face when it comes to headship. There is another temptation which Walsh and many other Christian men succumb to, and this is the temptation to denigrate other Christian husbands in an attempt to puff themselves up and gain attention and approval from frustrated Christian wives. Unfortunately Walsh gives in to this temptation in the very same post, denigrating the husband of a woman who contacted him on Facebook:
She told me about her own prize catch; he wakes up at around 11 AM to play video games, meanwhile she brings their two sons to church. Something tells me this is the sort of guy who would call his wife “the boss.”

…I don’t know this woman. But I’m guessing she’d be overjoyed if hubby dropped the video game controller and picked up the Cross of Leadership.

The husband he describes certainly does sound like he is failing to lead his family spiritually. However, aside from Walsh puffing himself up, what is to be gained by tearing this woman’s husband down like this? Note that not only does this make it harder for the husband to recover and lead like he should, it also does absolutely no good for the frustrated Christian wife. Expressing contempt for her husband doesn’t make it any easier for her to submit to her husband’s leadership or increase her patience in dealing with his failings. Instead, it places additional strain on a family which is already struggling, and during a time of rampant divorce. This doesn’t help the husband, the wife, or the children. The only benefit gained by this kind of chest thumping is to Walsh himself.

The problem is throwing other men under the bus feels courageous, and it has the added benefit of being very easy. Undermining the headship of other husbands is far easier and more satisfying than reminding wives (and ourselves) of the Apostle Peter’s instruction to the wives of failing husbands. But the easy path is not the courageous one, no matter how it feels. What takes courage, obedience, and faith is to witness a failing Christian husband and remember that the Bible is clear that husbands are the head of the household, and wives are called to submit to their husbands even if the husband is not leading her as Christ leads the Church.

Unfortunately throwing the husbands of women who write to him under the bus is something Walsh seems to do quite frequently. In another recent post, a woman wrote in who was arguing with her husband over whether she should be trying to get back in shape after having a baby. In this case the husband cited one of Walsh’s previous posts when discussing the issue with his wife. Walsh responded by sowing discord in the other man’s household (emphasis mine):

I’m about to do something that is very rare in my life, and possibly unprecedented on the internet: I’m going to admit that I was wrong. You’re right, Kim. I was wrong. I don’t want to spend too much time rehashing a post from a month and a half ago (which is approximately 40 centuries in cyber years) but I also don’t want to sit here and let your husband cite me as justification to harass you about the weight you gained while carrying his child for nine months.

A little further down Walsh explains that her husband is a jerk:

…if I may be so bold, your husband is acting like a jerk. He might be a great guy, for all I know. I’m sure you married him and had babies with him for some reason. He could otherwise be a gentleman and a scholar, but, on this point, he’s a jerk. I mean, a huge, massive, towering jerk of impressive proportions. You had his child a MONTH AGO and he’s calling you lazy and accusing you of not “working hard enough”?

Really?
While Walsh claims this is “something rare” in his life, histrionic attempts to curry favor with women are anything but rare on his blog. In another post he responds to a recently divorced mother who is frustrated with people who don’t tip her at her job as a waitress:

This woman has challenged me to speak out against non-tipping tyrants, and I could not live with myself if I failed to answer her call.

Given his histrionic style, I assume that Walsh is a very young man. As such, it will become easier over time as he grows in wisdom and self confidence to avoid the temptation to curry favor with other men’s wives. Unfortunately we have large numbers of Christian men who are falling prey to the same temptation but lack the excuse of youth and inexperience. Christian marriage and headship is sacred, serious business, and as Christian men we need to be very careful to treat it as such. Standing up for Christian marriage will seldom make us popular in this feminist era, but it is the only faithful choice and is also the loving choice when considering the needs of husbands, wives, and their children.

Original bus image released as public domain by Mulad.
James Taranto has an outstanding opinion piece up on the Wall Street Journal titled Are Boys Irrational?* Taranto responds to the same quote by MIT economics professor Michael Greenstone that I responded to back in March in my post Why aren’t men responding to economic signals?

I think the greatest, most astonishing fact that I am aware of in social science right now is that women have been able to hear the labor market screaming out ‘You need more education’ and have been able to respond to that, and men have not, and it’s very, very scary for economists because people should be responding to price signals. And men are not. It’s a fact in need of an explanation.

- Michael Greenstone, M.I.T. economics professor

Taranto comes to the same obvious conclusion I did, that men are in fact reacting quite rationally to our radical redesign of the family from a marriage based model to a child support based model. Taranto asks why men should strive to become the “reliable husbands and fathers” Kay Hymowitz laments they are no longer striving to be (emphasis mine):

Well, why should men? Except perhaps in very conservative communities, men with sufficient social skills can find sex and companionship without need of a matrimonial commitment (and for those who lack social skills, a willingness to marry is unlikely to provide much compensation). The culture’s unrelenting message–repeated in Hymowitz’s article–is that women are doing fine on their own. If a woman doesn’t need a man, there’s little reason for him to devote his life to her service. Further, in the age of no-fault divorce, “reliable husbands and fathers” not infrequently find themselves impoverished by child support and restricted by court order from spending time with their children.

Taranto closes the piece with:

Boys and young men are no less rational, or capable of adapting to incentives, than girls and young women are. They are, in fact, adapting very well to the incentives for female power and independence–which inevitably also serve as disincentives to male reliability and self-sacrifice.

As simple and obvious as all of this is, it is uncommon to see this kind of clarity in the mainstream media. However, while Taranto lays the basic problem out with clarity, he doesn’t make the next logical step and tie this back to the larger economic implications of men rationally responding to the new incentives. My guess is he is already thinking this, but understands that his audience and his peers in the media aren’t ready to take the next step. However, as the reality of the incentives to men under the new social and family structure become accepted sooner or later the question will inevitably turn to:
Then whom shall we tax?

This is when the penny will really drop, and the full cost of our radical experiment will start to become obvious. The tax question is critical, because the elites see tax revenues as their funds to spend to better our society and the world at large. Given our welfare state and progressive tax structure we need high earners to pay for the system, but women (married or otherwise) and unmarried men aren’t going to replace the tax base we are forfeiting by destroying marriage:

As our elites begin to understand this they will eventually have to rethink their love of child support over marriage and their commitment to the threatpoint as a way to improve marriage. We are probably many years if not several decades off from the day that this is fully accepted by our elites, but once they accept this reality I’m convinced we will start to see low profile efforts to slowly roll back the worst excesses of the family courts and a higher profile push in the media and entertainment industry selling marriage and fatherhood to men. However, in the meantime the cultural impact of our husband/father hostile society will continue to greatly harm the institution of marriage and the economic and human costs will continue to add up.

*H/T Don Riefstahl (see a summary of Riefstahl’s book [here](http://www.TheRedArchive.com))
Merry Christmas
by Dalrock | December 25, 2013 | Link

I’m shutting down comments for the next few days. Have a merry Christmas and a happy new year!
Who loves best?
by Dalrock | December 27, 2013 | Link

Women are utterly incapable of loving a man in the way that a man expects to be loved.

–Iron Rule of Tomassi #6

Rollo Tomassi’s writing on how women love has generated a good deal of controversy in the manosphere. You can see Sunshine Mary’s thoughts here, and Elusive Wapiti’s thoughts here. Until now I’ve held off on weighing in on this to give the issue more consideration.

Depending on how you read Rollo’s thoughts above on women and love, he is either entirely right or mostly right. One thing which is often lost in the discussion is that Rollo’s primary target in the quote above is not women, but men. Rollo reinforces this with his very next sentence in Women in love:

In its simplicity this speaks volumes about about the condition of Men.

Rollo is discussing the mis-set and unrealistic expectations of men. This isn’t a problem of a deficiency inherent to women, but a problem of men’s unrealistic expectations. So far I’m quite confident that Rollo and I are in full alignment. One of Rollo’s core areas of focus is disabusing men of their foolish expectations regarding women and romantic love; and here Rollo is right as well. Romantic love is truly wonderful in the appropriate context, but we have elevated it beyond all sanity. Modern men now expect women to experience romantic love (desire) for them in an unconditional, selfless form. This is profoundly foolish, because this is not the nature of romantic love/desire. As Rollo regularly reminds us, you can’t negotiate desire.

Again, so far I’m certain that Rollo and I remain in alignment. Where Rollo and I might part ways is dependent on how he means the following:

...on some rudimentary psychological level we ought to realized that a woman’s love is contingent upon our capacity to maintain that love in spite of a woman’s hypergamy. By order of degrees, hypergamy will define who a woman loves and who she will not, depending upon her own opportunities and capacity to attract it.

To the extent that Rollo is talking only about romantic love, the statement immediately above is in fact correct. Not only is it correct for women, but with some slight changes the same basic statement is correct for men. Romantic love (desire, passion) is to a large degree involuntary, and in its feral (modern) form is inherently fickle. This is a nearly universal misconception of our era, and if you don’t truly understand this you would do well to allow Rollo to thoroughly disabuse you of foolish modern notions of romantic love.

Where Rollo would be mistaken is if he is applying this statement to both romantic and other forms of love. If Rollo is saying that women aren’t capable of loving their husbands beyond
their immediate feeling of sexual desire/infatuation, he is wrong.

Sadly this is far more rare than it should be in our present culture, but women loving their husbands on more than a pure opportunistic (romantic) level is still something you can observe. The easiest way to observe this is with older couples, where the wife is fiercely protective of her husband especially in an area where he has a weakness. This is different than a woman being infatuated with a man and being in fundamental denial of the man’s faults; in this case the wife will be both aware of the weakness and fiercely protective of her husband in this regard. While this is tragically not the norm, I see this with some regularity. One example which comes immediately to mind is a woman I spoke with a few months back who was talking about her husband’s recent diagnosis of rheumatoid arthritis. They are in the process of building their dream home, and she switched effortlessly from describing how capable her husband is as a designer and builder to her concerns for his health and the need to build the new home to accommodate the possibility of him becoming confined to a wheelchair. Very often when when women speak of a husband’s infirmity there is at least a tinge of disgust or contempt in their tone, but in this case there was nothing but love and protectiveness.

If you haven’t witnessed this and wish to see it for yourself, pay attention when groups of middle aged and older wives are talking amongst themselves. Out of a group of say 10 wives, 8 or 9 of them are likely to be busy discussing the long list of faults they perceive in their husbands. However, look for the one or two who either remain silent or (occasionally) redirect the other women into a discussion of the positive aspects of their husbands. It will take more time, but if you pay attention to the 1 or 2 women not complaining about their husbands you will find that at least some of these women display the kind of fierce protectiveness of their husbands which I describe. If you or anyone else puts down their husband (even subtly), especially in an area where he has some real weakness, you will see a white hot flash of protective anger directed at the person who put her husband down. These same women take great pleasure in small and large acts of kindness aimed at bringing joy and comfort to their husbands. While the average wife sighs in self perceived victimhood while cooking or cleaning for her husband (or children), the loving wife (and mother) does these things with a distinct joy at the opportunity to serve and care for the ones they love.

While the love I’m describing is often (quite pleasantly) mingled with feelings of romantic love, this is more accurately described as familial love. In addition to their feelings of romantic love, these women love their husbands the way a woman should love her parents or her children. To these women marriage isn’t a mercenary vehicle to extract resources from men or a formal certification of her feelings of romantic love; to these women marriage is a declaration that her husband is her man, for better or for worse. Just as a woman who loves her father will be fiercely protective of him especially when his manly strength is failing, a wife who loves her husband as family will retain loving and protective feelings for him even in cases where his lack of strength is at odds with her hypergamy.

The truth is that both men and women are fallen, and both have to be taught love and loyalty over selfishness. We accept this for men, but have developed profoundly foolish notions regarding women. In fact, our culture is gripped by a mass paranoia that a spirit of love, loyalty, and selflessness is a disease all women must be protected from with eternal
vigilance. Ironically this sense of paranoia is so prevalent, few can spot it for anything but “normal”.

Modern women are warned constantly that acts of service and caring for others are traps they must avoid at all costs, lest they be tricked into a spirit of love and selflessness and “lose themselves”. The very idea of cooking, cleaning, and caring for her husband and family are repulsive and terrifying to the modern woman. If unable to avoid an act of service altogether, modern women are taught to diligently fortify their hearts with a spirit of resentment while doing the act to prevent a spirit of love and selflessness from entering. This sense of determined miserliness extends even to the modern woman’s marital bed. Should even a slight sense of selflessness somehow slip though, modern women are constantly reminded to “be true to themselves” and stamp out any thoughts of love, loyalty, and doing for others before they grow into something terrifying. A woman who is even suspected of serving others is urgently prescribed a treatment of “pampering themselves” to reorient their frame of mind back to selfishness. Selfishness in fact has been elevated into the primary female virtue, replacing God as the female moral compass. Even ostensibly traditional modern Christians have weighed in here by inventing an entirely new sin for wives to be on constant lookout for, that of servility.

Clearly women can love selflessly, as witnessed by our modern paranoia that they might actually do so.
This is an old charge against feminists, but one which has typically only been considered superficially. The real reason feminists are ugly has nothing to do with their physical appearance. Feminists are ugly because they are miserly with love.

One of the effects of feminism is that men of my generation have had a much wider opportunity to cook. I can’t think of any men my age or younger who don’t know how to cook. Moreover, I can’t think of any men of my generation or younger who don’t enjoy cooking. This is in stark contrast to the women of the same generations, who (typically) view cooking as an indignity. The reason for the difference in attitude boils down to what cooking is all about. Cooking is an act of love, an act of service to others. It is an opportunity to care for others in a very fundamental way, to literally nourish them through the work of your own hands. This is precisely what troubles the modern woman so much about cooking (or cleaning, or changing diapers). Serving others in the mind of a feminist is an indignity, so cooking, cleaning, or any other act of service and love is the object of revulsion. Women now actually compete to show off their miserliness in caring for others, each trying to outdo the rest in proving they are the greatest scrooge with love. It has gone so far that large numbers of women are quite proud of the fact that they have never learned to cook or otherwise care for others. Their miserliness is a badge of honor. Not all women have adopted this extremely ugly worldview, but the ones who are going against the grain of the culture here understand better than anyone how uncommon their loving and caring attitudes really are today.

The ugliness of the feminist mind-frame towards cooking, cleaning, and caring for others is so profound that it is difficult to process. These women are so obsessed with not showing Christian love that they make it a priority not to serve their own families. Cooking, cleaning, and caring for their own husbands and children is a concept which is repulsive to them. Acts of service to others are in their twisted minds traps to be avoided, and many go so far as to order their entire lives around avoiding showing love to others, especially their families. These women are so gripped by miserliness they have made it a priority not to show love to their own children. When they find themselves unable to avoid an act of service and love to their families altogether, they first steel their hearts with resentment, turning their hearts to stone to avoid the feelings of selfless love they live in constant terror of developing.

It is important to remember that while these women have avoided love and service to others in an attempt to profit, this does not profit them at all. The philosophy of the miser is profoundly destructive to the miser themselves. While we shouldn’t lie about the extreme ugliness in this frame of mind, we should remember that the miser is suffering immensely from their own perverted outlook. There is also great opportunity here. While what I’m describing is quite plain to see once you consider it, very few have ever had the opportunity to really examine it. We can help explain the profound ugliness of a miserly heart, and in doing so (if we are doing it right) we are doing an act of love.

The new year is a time of resolutions, and one resolution I would offer for us all is to truly
consider the folly of a miserly heart and not only repent ourselves, but help others to do the same.

May each of you have a happy and blessed new year.
Dr. Helen has a thoughtful post up asking if the title of her book is an accurate description of men’s response to the changes in the law and culture. While the title of her book is extremely effective in opening the discussion (which is what it needs to do), it isn’t an accurate description of problem we face in the West. A strike can be negotiated with; offer them a bit more and they’ll get back to work. Better yet, offer a few of them a side deal and break the cohesion. True strikes require moral or legal force to avoid this sort of peeling off.

The problem for the modern West is far worse. What we are seeing isn’t men throwing a collective temper tantrum, noble or otherwise. What we are seeing is men responding to incentives. Even worse, inertia has delayed the response to incentives, which means much more adjustment is likely on the way.

There was an old joke in the Soviet Union to the effect of:

| We pretend to work. They pretend to pay us. |

The problem for the Soviets was this wasn’t a movement. They knew how to handle a movement, and Siberia had plenty of room above ground and below. The Soviets were masters at coercion through fear, but the problem wasn’t a rebellion, it was that they had reached the limits of incentive through fear. In the short and even medium term fear is a very effective motivator. But over time if overused it loses some of its power, especially when it comes to the kind of productivity which requires creativity and risk taking. Standing out is risky; you don’t want to be the worst worker on the line in a fear based system, but you also have reason to fear being the best worker on the line. This doesn’t happen so much by conscious choice, but due to the influence of the incentive structure on the culture over time. Conscious choices can be bargained with, and threats of punishment are still effective. The culture itself is far harder to negotiate with. No one is refusing anything. So the Soviets had no choice but to assign quotas, and severely punish those who failed to meet them. But while the quota/coercion system keeps production running, it works against human nature. If you become the best producer you end up being assigned a larger share of the quota burden; from each according to his abilities. Over time the logic of this works its way into the culture, as everyone gets just a little more inclined to go with the flow and not do more than required. The problem is while momentum causes the response to be slow, it also means it is very difficult to deal with once you have enough of it to recognize.

The problem we presently face in the West is similar. While we have a small number of men who have decided to slack off as a form of protest, the far more insidious risk to our economy is the across the board weakening of the incentive that a marriage based social structure creates for men to produce at their full potential. We’ve moved from a mostly reward based incentive structure to a model the Soviets would have been proud of.

You can see this at the micro level with a man whose wife goes Jenny Erikson on him. The courts understand that throwing a man out of the home and taking away his children naturally reduces the man’s normal incentive to work to support his family. How could it not?
It isn’t that most men in this situation will stand by and watch their children starve, but they won’t be motivated to produce quite as much. You can confiscate a percentage of his income in the form of child support, but he no longer has the incentive to fight his way quite so high up our progressive tax structure. This is why the courts have to assign the man an income quota he has to meet, Soviet style. Imputation of income isn’t incidental to the child support family model; it is essential to the function of the model. Note that this doesn’t mean the courts have to formally calculate an income quota for each man who ends up in the new child support family structure; in most cases the man has already assigned himself a quota based on past production. All the family courts need to do in most cases is make sure he doesn’t fall below this quota.

As I mentioned above coercion is generally a very effective incentive in the near and medium term. Part of the reason conservatives are so enamored with child support is the threatpoint it provides to keep existing husbands working as hard as possible. While in the long run this will ultimately create a culture where husbands are less inclined to become stand out earners, as Keynes famously put it in the long run we are all dead. The other problem is the changes in the culture in response to over use of coercion are by their very nature difficult to identify and quantify. This isn’t unlike the Laffer Curve; while both liberals and conservatives agree regarding the principle of the curve, the shape of the curve is impossible to get agreement on. Eventually you can raise tax rates so high that you end up with lower revenue, but due to the problems of momentum identifying exactly when you have (or will) hit that point can be very difficult.

The more immediate problem in the West is the reduced incentive young men perceive to compete as breadwinners due to the continuing delay in the age of marriage. Again this isn’t a movement, it is a delayed response by the culture to reality. When the average woman marries in her late teens or even her early twenties, the average young man will see himself as competing with his peers for the job of husband. Not only is he competing to not be left out of the game entirely, but he is jockeying for a better choice of wife. But move the age of marriage out far enough, and eventually young men don’t see themselves so clearly as competing for the job of husband. Extend the age of marriage far enough and eventually the culture of young men will be less focused on competing to signal provider status, and their priorities will shift (on the margin) toward slacking off. The question isn’t if this will happen, but how long you can push the age of marriage out before this starts to happen, how much this will reduce the motivation of young men, and how long between the change in reality and the change in culture. Note also that this doesn’t require men to swear off marriage entirely for this to greatly impact our tax base. Changing the culture of men in their formative years will have a lasting impact. You can’t rewind time and undo a decade of (relative) slacking. Additionally, momentum tends to start working against you at some point. As the expectations of men as providers declines it eventually creates an expectation of decline. As each generation of new husbands come to the table with less to offer as providers, we eventually will start to expect future generations of husbands to offer even less.

As I’ve said before, all of this places our elites in a very difficult bind. Eventually the momentum which initially masked the problem makes it extremely difficult to address. Denial of the problem is a flawed strategy but it has important advantages. Once you
acknowledge that the incentive structure is flawed you tend to accelerate the delayed response to the new structure. At the same time, the changes at the core of the problem are very close to the hearts of both liberals and conservatives. However, ignoring the problem will become more and more difficult because of the impact on the bottom line. Because of this, we can expect to see more of what we already see. Feminists will continue their handwringing tentatively asking if perhaps we have gone a bit too far, and conservatives will redouble their efforts to convince men they need to man up and stop sabotaging the glorious feminist progress. Less conspicuously I also expect we will see some dialing back of the worst excesses of the family courts. However, because of the momentum involved and the reluctance to acknowledge the fundamental problem, these changes will at best only slow the problem, and they will always run the risk of initially accelerating it.
As expected.
by Dalrock | January 7, 2014 | Link

Several commenters have expressed disbelief at my **prediction** that we will see a (generally low key) movement to curtail the worst abuses of the family court. Honestly this isn’t a bold prediction on my part. I’m only predicting more of what we are already seeing. Dr. Helen has linked to a soon to be released movie about corruption in the family courts titled *Divorce Corp*.

Not surprisingly the trailers of the film include comments from Glenn Sacks. More noteworthy however is the narrator of the film, Dr. Drew Pinsky of “Dr. Drew” sex advice fame. From the main trailer, the general perspective of the film is that the family courts are corrupt and inefficient in the way they are breaking up families. We pay the courts good money to destroy families, and they are making a mess of this noble work.

However, the movie does touch on the problem of false abuse claims:

They also have trailers covering the abuses of child support and lifetime alimony. Here is the one for child support:

Here is the one for lifetime alimony:

As I’ve explained before, this kind of push to roll back the worst abuses of the family court is not at all surprising but shouldn’t be misunderstood for a genuine movement to fundamentally change our family structure back towards one of traditional marriage or even anything resembling equal treatment of men and women. While different participants will have different perspectives and motivations, overall this is about mending it, not ending it. The elites have no desire to end the no fault divorce/child support gravy train, they just want to streamline the process some and remove some of the most indefensible abuses. However, while the intent is to create support for a tune up and not a true overhaul, there is always the risk that by highlighting the incredibly evil and corrupt system that men will start to refuse to marry. Also, when the liberal elites acknowledge the incredible corruption in the system they are cutting conservative groups like Focus On the Family off at the knees. When even Dr. Drew is outraged about the family courts, Christian organizations eagerly reminding women to be sure to collect their 30 pieces of silver when destroying their families are suddenly in an embarrassing position.
Child support and the threat point.
by Dalrock | January 8, 2014 | Link

In the discussion of a recent post the history of the term “threat point” came up. While I’ve used the term and explained how the family courts are being deliberately used to destabilize marriages for feminist ends, I can’t take credit for originating the term. The term itself if part of Game Theory®.

When social scientists study marriage one of the things they are very interested in is how intact marriages are impacted by government working to make divorce both easier and more attractive for women. The well known feminist goal of our divorce/child support revolution is the opportunity for women to “leave bad marriages”. But the goal in incenting women to divorce isn’t just to encourage them to leave marriages when they are unhappy. There is another fundamental objective, and that is to improve marriage by destabilizing marriages. This may sound absurd at first reading, but if you consider it a bit you will see that it is actually conventional wisdom. The overriding assumption of both conservatives and feminists is that husbands must be held in check, and that wives need tools to threaten their husbands to keep them at bay. Giving wives authority over their husbands is seen as not just good for the wife herself, but for the family and society as a whole.

I’ve given examples of how the concept is used in academic studies previously, but you can observe the same thing with regard to Child Support in the working paper The Effect of Child Support Enforcement on Bargaining Power Among Married and Cohabitating Couples:

This paper examines the relationship between child support enforcement and bargaining power among married and cohabiting couples. A simple economic bargaining model predicts that living in a state with stricter child support enforcement increases the bargaining power of married mothers, who can more credibly threaten divorce.

The perspective of the study regarding women threatening divorce is the mainstream view, the perspective of both feminists and conservatives; women threatening divorce is good (emphasis mine):

...child support enforcement policies may also have a beneficial impact on households with two parents by increasing the bargaining power of mothers.

The paper explains the mechanics of child support encouraging mothers to threaten to leave the father of their children:

In Figure 1, the mother’s threat point is her external utility level..., the utility level at which she is indifferent between the status quo and carrying out her threat to end the relationship. For mothers threatening to leave the father, child support enforcement increases her external utility level... such that she will choose to carry out her threat unless he takes less leisure and consumes less at her expense.
While the paper’s basic use of Game Theory for married parents is sound, it is extremely poorly thought out regarding unmarried cohabiting parents. It bizarrely asserts that stricter child support enforcement can give unmarried cohabiting fathers a bargaining advantage over unmarried cohabiting mothers because the father can threaten to marry the mother against her will if she doesn’t do as he wishes (emphasis mine):

Our theory for cohabiting mothers predicts that these mothers can be better off or worse off in strict enforcement states. **They will be worse off if the fathers want to get married and the mothers do not; in this case, cohabiting fathers will have more bargaining power.** Cohabiting mothers will be better off in strict states if they are threatening to leave the relationship because enforcement provides them with a greater probability of receiving child support, and thus a more credible threat.

What matters here though is not the poor thought process of the authors of the paper regarding unmarried parents, but the embrace of women threatening to take a man’s children away as a tool to make the world a better place.

It is important to remember that the premise that threats of wife-initiated divorce and taking children away from their fathers makes intact families better isn’t limited to academics and policy makers, or even just to feminists. The idea that wives threatening divorce makes marriages better and is good for society is all but universal. This is why if you ask your Christian friends to recommend a movie about marriage, they are all but guaranteed to enthusiastically suggest a movie not about biblical marriage, but a **celebration of the awesome power of the threatpoint.**

All of this is essential to understand when considering **calls to reform the family court.** The vast majority of people not only see no fault divorce and child support as beneficial because they allow women to leave if they are unhappy honoring their vows, the vast majority of people also are deeply invested in the idea that women threatening divorce makes marriage much better. This doesn’t mean reforms are impossible, but it means that any proposed reform which would significantly reduce the incentive for most women to divorce will be met with fierce resistance not just from feminists but from conservatives too. However, at least some modern Christians and conservatives have adopted this favorable view of destabilizing marriage without truly considering it. The bad news is this view is nearly universal, but the good news is it is indefensible for anyone who believes in traditional marriage. A good number of those who embrace putting a cash bounty on fathers do so only because they have never considered how foolish and destructive this is.

*Game Theory is from economics, and not to be confused with Game and female attraction. Think John Nash of A Beautiful Mind, not Roissy of Pretty Lies.*
A new commenter grossly misunderstood the implication of the earnings chart in my post Progress:

One counter point to consider: with married men making considerably more money than unmarried in the 45-54 group, even with the obvious disincentives to marry, many men will still pursue marriage the way people play the lottery. If there’s money to be had, there will be no shortage of players.

As foolish as this thinking is, it is important to remember that depending on the context this is also conventional wisdom. There are a number of factors at play here, including men’s ethic not to complain about their role as providers or even to draw attention to this role. This is a form of graciousness, not unlike a hostess responding “It’s nothing” when thanked for her hospitality. It is important to remember that there is nothing wrong with this kind of gracious mindset, as it is what Christ taught us (see also here). That men don’t expect acknowledgment for their roles as providers, and even that they generally don’t even consider this themselves isn’t the problem. The problem is when this widespread graciousness by men is met by a culture of miserliness. Our inability to recognize the obvious fact that men take on significant responsibilities when they marry comes from this very combination of graciousness by men and miserliness by feminists.

The problem is not the person giving graciously saying “it is nothing” (and meaning it); the problem is with the recipient convincing themselves that it really is nothing. Even worse is when profound gifts are not only accepted with ingratitude, but then transformed into a debt by the receivers. This is at the core of the feminist complaint that men earn more after marriage while women earn less after marrying (H/T Sunshine Mary).

But even the denial of men’s sacrifice as providers is context specific. When considering the social benefits of women threatening divorce, economists suddenly are very aware that husbands are in the role of providers. Even Pastor Driscoll, who wears his contempt for husbands and fathers on his sleeve, grudgingly acknowledges the sacrifice of such men when he is berating the men who aren’t signing up to be husbands and fathers:

Men are like trucks: they drive straighter with a weighted load. Young men are supposed to load themselves up first by being responsible for themselves and not expecting their mom to fill up their sippy cup with beer and push them in a stroller to the unemployment line. Young men who take responsibility for themselves are then ready to marry and take responsibility for the life and joy of their wife.

As I mentioned above, our problem is not that men are being gracious, but that we have institutionalized unthankfulness as our response to gracious acts by men. This is extremely corrosive to our culture, and ultimately risks creating a culture where men see marriage and fatherhood as foolhardy.
Father Hood
by Dalrock | January 21, 2014 | Link

Commenter AlanB at Gucci Little Piggy describes the ghetto version of what I outlined in Intrasexual Competition and the Strong Independent Woman. The following are excerpts from the first of several lengthy comments by AlanB on the topic (language warning):

But, if the couple gets along, and they accept their station in life, the woman receives her governmental support, well, the ONLY thing the baby daddy needs to do in life is be... A DADDY. He need not work, He need not be drug free, he need not be married or monogamous with the baby momma, he need not live with his babymomma or spawn, he needs only show the slightest fatherly respect towards his children to receive “the praise of all the hood rats”.. “he such a good dad”, “he plays with his kids”, etc etc .. So much praise, that the guy starts believing that even tho he is smoking weed all day and playing x-box, that if he picks his kid up from school 1x a week, he is a GREAT FATHER.. (that said, relative to A LOT of those jerk-off lower-class dads, he IS a great dad).

...

The actual value of the father comes from the mother hens (the older community women) clucking that he is a good dad cause he picked his kid up last Monday. And let me tell you, there is NOT alot to be proud of or happy about if you are living in the projects. not a fucking thing, least of all the MEN. So, if the neighborhood queens are crowing about how fucking amazing your man is. You as the mother of HIS CHILD (see the diff, good man, HIS child) will allow him as much access as necessary so that you can continue to be the center of GOOD attention in the hood. And by extension, if he is a good DAD, he must be a good “husband” (quotes cause they aint married) and therefore she will STILL have sex with him and maintain a relationship with him regardless of where he lives or who else he is fucking (and he with her, regardless of the same). Its not about him, its not about the kid, its about the attention/envy/admiration she receives for BEING ABLE TO HOLD ONTO HIM IN ANY MANNER. The fact that she is able to HOLD ONTO THAT GOOD MAN regardless of the situation is a testament to her strength as a woman (that how the woman thinks about it) and will eventually lead to her being one of the strong respected matriarchs of that community.
Tingle detecting bra.
by Dalrock | January 28, 2014 | Link

Courtesy of the Daily Mail, a concept bra which only unlatches when the woman feels “true love”.

If you listen carefully you can hear the sound of players around the world rejoicing. Meanwhile rationalization hamsters don't know whether they should welcome an opportunity to take a much needed rest, or fear being replaced entirely by smartphone apps and tingle detecting underwear.
There is a moral frame embedded in the tingle detecting bra video which most viewers won’t notice because this frame is our new normal. The three types of men thwarted by the bra are presented as bad not because they are trying to pick up the bar sluts, but because they aren’t providing the bar sluts with the feeling they are searching for. These are the bad men the bra in the video is designed to protect women from.

It’s time to save women from these guys!

The bar sluts themselves however are presented as moral for seeking out what they want:

Women always seek true love.

These women are on a noble quest, and need to be saved from the bad men who don’t make them tingle. There is however one good man presented in the video, and we know this because he alone is able to unlock the bra.

This elevation of the tingle/feelings of romantic love by women to the new moral test for men isn’t limited to modern secular culture. Modern Christians have internalized this new sexual morality as well. The ability to make the bra pop is the Arthurian task modern Christian husbands need to pass to prove their righteousness.

President of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Dr. R. Albert Mohler Jr. is surprisingly bold in laying out this new moral vision (emphasis mine):

...when I say that a husband must regularly “earn” privileged access to the marital bed, I mean that a husband owes his wife the confidence, affection, and emotional support that would lead her to freely give herself to her husband in the act of sex.

...Put most bluntly, I believe that God means for a man to be civilized, directed, and stimulated toward marital faithfulness by the fact that his wife will freely give herself to him sexually only when he presents himself as worthy of her attention and desire.

Dennis Rainey’s FamilyLife is a bit more circumspect in their description of this in their widely distributed* 5 Five Essentials for a Thriving Marriage:

From relational intimacy springs sexual intimacy. The safety of being known and still being accepted—in spite of our flaws—finds its expression in marriage through sex. It is a gift to married couples from God. Relational and sexual intimacy keeps a marriage from deteriorating into little more than a legally arranged partnership. Remember, it takes time and attentiveness to nurture this kind of relationship.
For those who need more explanation as to how a man’s goodness is the source of his wife’s sexual desire towards him, see Dennis Rainey’s *The irresistible man* Part 1 and Part 2 from the Stepping Up™ website. You can read Empathologism’s thoughts on the articles here and here.

Lastly, we can see the same new morality in the modern Christian’s favorite movie on marriage, *Fireproof* (spoiler alert). The hero in the movie (Caleb) is on a quest to win his wife Catherine’s heart (and tingle) from the man she wants to divorce him for. The movie spells this out unmistakably when Caleb goes to meet the doctor and notifies him that he intends to fight the doctor for his own wife’s heart:

> I have no intention of stepping aside as you try to steal my wife’s heart. I’ve made some mistakes, but I still love her. So just know I am going after her too. And since I’m married to her, I’d say I’ve got a head start.

There are multiple scenes in *Fireproof* where Catherine’s bra would certainly pop if she were wearing a tingle detecting bra, but unfortunately in the vast majority of the movie it would only pop for the doctor. Then we have the scene where the conflict in the story is resolved, when Catherine is picking out extra items for her mother at the medical supply store. Fortunately Catherine isn’t wearing a tingle detecting bra because it would surely pop early in the scene when she is thinking about the doctor; this would have made for an awkward moment as she paused to reconnect it. Then just a bit later in the scene the bra would have popped again, but this time (the first time in the movie) it would have popped because she was thinking of *Caleb*. Now that Caleb finally knows the combination to Catherine’s bra, the conflict in the story is resolved. Christians everywhere swooned.

*My wife recently found a laminated copy of this being used as a bookmark in a book at a garage sale.*
How Christians can take credit for Game.

by Dalrock | February 2, 2014 | Link

In a recent exchange at Zippy Catholic, Alte and Elspeth discussed the controversy over teaching Christian husbands “Game” (emphasis mine):

Elspeth:

When my husband “negs” me, or any of the other little pieces I’ve read here and there that are just part of the way he is, it’s fun. Fun should be a part of any healthy marital relationship.

Alte:

Seriously. Maybe it’s because I didn’t grow up over there, but a lot of the criticism about husbands using Game seems puritanical, based upon a sort of melancholy. Like, “Oh noes, a married couple is flirting! We must stop this or they might end up having sex for reasons other than the solemn duty of procreation. Doesn’t that wife have a toilet to scrub somewhere?”

There’s a sort of passion and excitement in some of our marriages that we enjoy, and that Game enhances. Sex starts in the kitchen, and all that jazz. Why so dour?

Elspeth:

The argument V, is that what you’re describing is not game. That it has always existed in loving marriages just as the neg has have been around since Hobbits tilled the soil of the Shire.

That giving Roissyites credit for something that enhances Christian marriage is just plain wrong, morally. Not only is it incompatible, but it gives them credit for something which they deserve no credit for.

I believe that the concern Elspeth describes is shared by many (but not necessarily all) of those who oppose teaching Christian husbands Game. The problem is, the Roissyites do deserve credit for collating and codifying the concepts we refer to as “Game”, and this is assuming that there was absolutely no new understanding developed by the Roissyites in the process. The Brothers Grimm didn’t write a single new tale, yet they rightly are credited with advancing our knowledge and understanding of folk tales.

This leaves Christians with a dilemma. Some of the knowledge the Roissyites have described as Game could help Christian husbands be more effective when trying to lead their wives, and as both Alte and Elspeth point out if you are doing it right using Game in a marriage is very likely to be fun. However, teaching Game has the problem of giving credit to men whose focus is to enjoy our present culture of sexual immorality. One possible option would
be to lie, and claim that not only is the basic knowledge old, but that we haven’t benefited at all from the experiences and efforts of a group of men engaged in a sinful pursuit.

However, while Christians can’t claim credit for collating and codifying the information, we can take credit for creating the conditions required for such an activity to take place. It is no accident that a formalization of the concepts we call Game only occurred recently and wasn’t completed some other time over the last several thousand years. In the past such knowledge wasn’t generally required for the average man, because we were still practicing traditional marriage. In addition, there wasn’t the concentration of experiences with multiple women to make it possible to hypothesize and test the kinds of patterns PUAs have seen.

As Christians we (collectively) can take credit for making all of this happen. Christians have provided the moral cover for both the sexual revolution and the divorce revolution. At the core of the Christian backing of the sexual/divorce revolution is the modern Christian rebellion against biblical headship. A woman who marries as a young virgin is far more likely to be willing to submit to her husband, and (modern) Christian fathers everywhere are terrified of such a prospect. For existing marriages Christians endorse the use of threats of divorce to ensure that a wife feels secure in her position of authority over her husband, and groups like FOTF make it a point to remind divorcing women not to forget to collect their cash and prizes. Likewise the modern Christian rebellion against headship has lead Christians to endorse an entirely new and perverted sexual morality. If you have ever wondered why the Protestant churches in the US have been so quiet on the divorce revolution taking place within their very congregations, or why the RCC responded to the explosion in divorces in the US by firing up the annulment mill, this is why.

So if you fear teaching Game to Christian husbands because Christians can’t take credit for the knowledge you are teaching, rest easy. We can’t take credit for the Roissyites, but we can and must take credit for creating the conditions required for the Roissyites to thrive.

Pointing at Roissy and company’s sin is easy, as it allows us to confront the sin of others without acknowledging and repenting from our own collective culpability. Acknowledging that Christians have collectively displayed shame and hostility for something so beautiful and wise as biblical marriage is much less comfortable. However, we would do well to remember that Roissy wasn’t trusted to share the wisdom and beauty of Christian marriage and sexual morality with the world; Christians were.

**Moderator’s note:** Since the definition of Game has been a long term derailer of discussions I’m asking commenters to refrain from engaging in yet another debate on the true definition of Game. This doesn’t mean you can’t state your own view so that others can understand how you are using the term. In fact, defining how you use the term if different from others will add clarity to the discussion. For example if you believe Christians shouldn’t use Game, you should clearly define what you include in the category you are prohibiting. This also doesn’t mean you can’t ever discuss the proper definition of the term; if you are interested in this I encourage you to do so, just not here, on this post. If you wish to discuss the definition of Game on my blog, I invite you to do so on the post Cypher’s Problem where
discussing the definition of the term has been occurring since August of 2012. If you wish to discuss the definition of the terms used in the definition of Game, Cane Caldo has a post for this [here](#). If you wish to discuss the definition of the terms used in the definition of the terms used in the definition of Game, I’m not aware of a specific post addressing this yet but I have every confidence that someone will create one soon.
With our recent discussion on the appropriate use of Game for Christian men, I thought it would be helpful to offer some detail on how this can be done. I’ve titled this Headship Game, and as the title suggests this isn’t for unmarried men looking to attract a wife, but focused on how a married Christian man can use Game with respect to his role as a husband.

**Frame**

Your frame is essential, and in Headship Game your frame must be a biblical frame*. To attain this you must first study, pray, and be humbly prepared to bend your beliefs and opinions to Christianity, not the other way around. As a Christian husband you are called to wash your wife in the water of the word, and you must take this extremely seriously. Your frame as a Christian husband must be one of unshakable righteousness, neither turning to the right hand nor the left. Know in advance that what the Bible teaches us is extremely unpopular in our modern age, and if parts of it don’t initially make you uncomfortable, chances are you aren’t studying closely enough.

Part of this will require a careful study of the commands to husbands and wives in the New Testament. If you want a place to start, you can start with the Scripture referenced in the table at the bottom of my post Reframing Christian marriage. That post is the beginning of a series of posts outlining how feminist Christians have reframed biblical marriage into something new and unChristian; understanding how the original is frequently reframed will make it easier for you to maintain your footing as you are tempted by the culture to turn to the right hand or the left. Other posts which should help you identify and resist common tactics to reframe away from a biblical frame of marriage are Rebuilding the mound and Don't be tricked into responding to a reframe with an intellectual argument.

**Fitness Tests**

Your wife is craving your leadership, especially when she is in rebellion. Sometimes your leadership will be active, but other times all that she really needs is for you to remain immovable, her rock. When she storms over you with her emotions, what she is craving is the reassurance that you won’t be overwhelmed by the very thing which is overwhelming her at the moment. Be kind and loving in how you do this, but be the immovable anchor she can cling to and don’t allow her emotions to sweep you both away. This is a profound gift you can offer your wife.

At times this will mean your wife will make unreasonable demands or do outrageous things to see how you will respond. Your response to these must be ruled by your role as a loving Christian husband, but this doesn’t mean you should cave in to unreasonable demands or encourage bad behavior. Elspeth recounts the good advice her husband offered another man here which gives an excellent example of how to respond to a fitness test. Other times the best response is to simply say “no”, with the firmness which comes from the confidence a righteous man displays when being obedient to the Lord. Sometimes your best response to a
wife who is being overwhelmed by her emotions is to simply pull her into you in a strong embrace, letting her feel your gentle firmness as she makes a show of trying to push you away**.

If you find your faith in your ability to fulfill the role of headship faltering, recall the words of young David before he faced Goliath:

34 But David said to Saul, “Your servant has been keeping his father’s sheep. When a lion or a bear came and carried off a sheep from the flock, 35 I went after it, struck it and rescued the sheep from its mouth. When it turned on me, I seized it by its hair, struck it and killed it. 36 Your servant has killed both the lion and the bear; this uncircumcised Philistine will be like one of them, because he has defied the armies of the living God. 37 The Lord who rescued me from the paw of the lion and the paw of the bear will rescue me from the hand of this Philistine.”

If David could summon the strength to stand up to the Philistine Goliath, can you not summon the strength to do something far easier? If you respond with confidence and in accord with your role as head of the household, very often you will find your wife’s mood changes with bewildering speed. However, your steadfastness must come from your faith in God and obedience to your responsibility as a husband, not from your faith in human psychology. If your response was righteous and loving is what matters, not whether your wife responds as desired. Note that this doesn’t mean that you shouldn’t be attentive to understanding your wife’s own personality and needs, and tuning your leadership style to make it easier for her to honor her own obligation to submit to you. It also doesn’t mean you shouldn’t seek and seriously consider your wife’s counsel when making decisions which impact the family. The Bible tells us that husbands are the head of the wife, but it also tells us to dwell with them in understanding. You don’t need to (and must not) become a tyrant, but you need to be sensitive to when your headship is being challenged and respond firmly with Christian love when it is.

**Leading With Joy**

As Cane recently reminded us, a wife is a gift from God. Never see your responsibility as a husband as a burden, but as something sacred. Never allow yourself to become frustrated with your wife for needing your strength. Instead, take joy in the opportunity to be strong for her. God in His wisdom has seen fit to make women and men different, and yet He also joins us in the mystery of one flesh. Rejoice in this, and learn to treasure your wife’s differences. After nearly two decades of marriage I find my wife’s idiosyncrasies profoundly endearing. Some fitness tests represent true rebellion, and as such are serious business. But if things are going right these will be rare. There are also marriages where the husband or the wife are stubbornly unwilling to follow their biblical roles. But assuming your wife is not in serious rebellion, for the bulk of the time leading your wife with Headship Game should be full of laughter and joy. Learn to use humor to playfully establish your frame of leadership, and learn to see the humor in everyday interactions. One of the things my wife says with some regularity (in mock protest) is:
A wife is not an endless source of amusement!

She of course knows this isn’t true, and she knows I love her all the more for it not being true.

**Perspective**

Understand that even in times when headship and submission were widely accepted, wives struggled with submission and husbands struggled with headship. You can’t do her part for her, you can only do your part as best as you can and try to make it a bit easier for her to do hers (as she can for you). You also can’t expect to make this all happen all at once, and once you both are in line with headship and submission you can’t expect not to have to continue working on it or to never experience slippage. Your role as a husband is a life long role, and you need to remember that you are in this for the long run. Neither of you are going to be perfect, but God has kindly given us instructions to work through over a lifetime to gain in wisdom, faith, and obedience.

**Avoiding Sin**

If you followed the first steps and are leading from a biblical frame, sorting out what is appropriate and what is sinful should be much easier. Still, as a reminder I propose the following simple test when considering if applying a Game concept is sinful or not:

1. Is it loving, and in accordance with your role as a biblical husband?
2. Is it otherwise sinful, or does it encourage either of you to sin?

If you can’t answer yes to question number one and no to question number two, you should avoid the action.

*Catholics and Orthodox Christians among others will want to also include the core teachings of their church.

**This requires good judgment on the part of the husband as in some extreme cases she won’t be pretending to push you away. One good sign to look for is when your wife’s facial expression and posture shifts from white hot anger to one of exhaustion or feeling lost.

**Moderator’s note:** Since the definition of Game has been a long term derailer of discussions I’m asking commenters to refrain from engaging in yet another debate on the true definition of Game. This doesn’t mean you can’t state your own view so that others can understand how you are using the term. In fact, defining how you use the term if different from others will add clarity to the discussion. For example if you believe Christians shouldn’t use Game, you should clearly define what you include in the category you are prohibiting. This also doesn’t mean you can’t ever discuss the proper definition of the term; if you are interested in this I encourage you to do so, just not here, on this post. If you wish to discuss the definition of Game on my blog, I invite you to do so on the post Cypher’s Problem where discussing the definition of the term has been occurring since August of 2012. If you wish to
discuss the definition of the terms used in the definition of Game, Cane Caldo has a post for this [here](#). If you wish to discuss the definition of the terms used in the definition of the terms used in the definition of Game, I’m not aware of a specific post addressing this yet but I have every confidence that someone will create one soon.
The competition for the title of the Christian Manosphere’s biggest cliché is heating up. Watch out Jenny Erikson, the upcoming movie Christian Mingle will be hard to beat:

‘Christian Mingle’ is about a young, modern, single woman. She’s trying to achieve it all - a successful career, amazing friends and finding Mr. Right

She stumbles into the world of online dating looking for an instant ‘soul mate solution,’ but ultimately ends up taking a personal journey transforming her life.

As the article explains, our husband hunting Christian career gal is a “30-something marketing executive”.

You can’t make this stuff up.
Matt Walsh has a new post* up pointing out the problem of Christians focusing on gay marriage while ignoring divorce. One of the commenters demonstrated why it is so difficult to hold divorcing women accountable. As I’ve mentioned before, when men call other men out on their sins, they tend to feel brave doing so, and men generally will acknowledge their failure. When men call women out they feel like they are being a bully, and even worse when you call a woman out you are off for a day at the (hamster) races.

Even though Matt specifically excluded divorce in cases of serial adultery and abuse (and Matt is absurdly inclusive in his definition of adultery), commenter Kristin called Matt out for the sin of making her feel bad about her divorce.

Matt, I know marriage is sacred. And I think your post was alright. But the thing is I am a pretty hard-core, love one another person and it was unsafe for me and harmful for my kids or me to stay married to that particular man who ‘surprise’ was a completely different man than who he presented himself to be when we wed. This is so devastating to me, especially because in my beliefs, marriage is more than ‘til death do us part’. The thing is, I agree that divorces hurt marriage more than gay marriage hurts marriage but I’m kind of a bit crushed by your post. I thought in times past that you sounded like one of the really good christian guys but man, this was pretty darn harsh on people who’ve been divorced.

Note that while she hints that her husband was abusive, she doesn’t actually make the charge. This is especially telling, since after establishing her victimized woman cred she goes on the offensive, explaining to Matt that one shouldn’t ever judge the reason someone divorced (emphasis mine):

Maybe the answer is that divorce is more complicated than you give it credit. I do think that it is a tragedy for people to easily give up on marriages but I also know that I would never again judge, especially as harshly as you have, the reasons why people are divorced. You did write about the abhorring spread of
porn recently, did you not? I’m surprised you didn’t even mention that in the above post. Just saying.

A lot of people are trying their best to do the best they can with what they know. And maybe not everybody has as good of an ‘image’ as you do, being ‘married until you die’ and being so sure of that. But don’t be so hard on people. It’s not even remotely Christlike. And yes, I’m stating that as a fact.

What is fascinating about this tactic is not only how common it is, but how often the woman using it goes entirely unchallenged. Everyone gets so caught up in protecting the woman suffering the fate of feeling bad that they don’t notice the bait and switch. She starts by complaining that she was unfairly lumped in with those other kinds of divorcées, and then shifts to defending the very divorcées she doesn’t want to be associated with. Which is it? She isn’t like those other divorcees? Or you can’t judge anyone who divorces?

She closes by holding out the possibility that she might find it in her heart to forgive Matt for the sin of making her feel bad:

That being said, I think I can forgive the hopeless feeling you seemed to impose on me. I think if you only knew more, you’d have written a much different post. Big picture, I agree with you, but overall that post did not appear to be written out of love.

Whenever I see this tactic I always think of this scene from The Blues Brothers:

*H/T Free Northerner

Hamster pic from Love hamster. Checkered flag from Ewan ar Born. I combined the last two to create the hamster 500 pic. You are free to use this new picture so long as you are in compliance with the original two image licenses.
How to spot a player.
by Dalrock | February 7, 2014 | Link

A frequent question in the sphere is how to help young women spot a player. The answer is he will be that perfect boyfriend she has been searching for. Laura Fraser at Marie Claire describes the experience (H/T Vox & Han Solo):

I met [him] in line for a film screening while visiting Manhattan from San Francisco. I was convinced I’d found my ideal man: intellectual, witty, artistic, and hot. We spent a passionate week together, and when I left town, I thought I was leaving behind a new long-distance boyfriend—one who, it turned out, didn’t like to call or e-mail...ever. I thought our fling was the start of a relationship; he thought it was a fling, period.

This wasn’t a fluke:

Disappointing, but it fit my usual pattern. I would fall for a brilliant guy with an irresistible smile who never quite fell for me but who possessed all the qualities I liked in a man: a sense of humor, certified smarts, smoldering looks. Each time, these men—dashing chefs, moody architects—would give me just enough attention to keep me in their narcissistic orbit. Whether or not they’d ever call was just part of the thrill, always keeping me on edge. Outwardly, I told myself I was having fun and it was just a matter of time before someone wanted to settle down; inside, I started to worry that I wasn’t lovable or exciting enough.

There are a number of reasons this is the case. The first is that these are the men who know how to open the bra, and opening the bra means being the kind of man a feral woman will fall in love with. Such men are in limited supply to begin with, but this brings us to the second reason the man a feral woman falls in love with is almost guaranteed to be a player; men who can open the bra and want to settle down are not only rare, those who fit this description have almost certainly already settled down.

Don’t hate the player, hate the game...

This is an unpopular truth, because the ability to open the bra is our new test for moral righteousness. There must be some mistake, since everyone knows players are easy to spot and obviously unattractive to women. But there is no mistake. So long as a woman is playing the uncommitted sex game, she is going to find herself seeking the best players of that game. The mistake is in pretending she wasn’t playing the uncommitted sex game in the first place, not in failing to identify a man who will play it better than she does.
Advanced divorce sales...
by Dalrock | February 12, 2014 | Link


See Also:

- A Beginners Guide to Selling Divorce.
- Intermediate guide to selling divorce; overcoming women’s better judgment.
It would be immoral *not* to blow up her family.

by Dalrock | February 14, 2014 | Link

Bell has a difficult marriage and turned to Yahoo Answers for advice: I want out I can’t take him any longer?

We have been to counseling and he stopped going. He refuses to go back. He has an attitude most of the time. He complains and talks about me behind my back. He says things to me like what’s his is his and I don’t have anything he has the job. I take care of the kids, and later says he’s kidding. I’m not on the bank account. He only talks to his family and friends on the phone when I’m not around. He never wants to go out with me. When I make plans with friends they always get ruined. Because he can’t watch the kids. Twice this year already on my birthday and on Sunday. We never do anything I want to do. If I bring anything up, he blows me off. When I try talking to him his response is, whatever! His sister takes screen shots from my fb wall and text them to him, and they talk about me. He looks at girls in front of me, than claim he doesn’t know he’s doing it. He smiled and winked at our female realtor. Claims he didn’t know he did. Advice? I’m now beyond that breaking point.

Upon learning that this woman is on the verge of going back on her sacred vow and throwing her children’s lives into turmoil, the Answers community is nervous. However, their fear is not that she will put her kids through the divorce meat grinder, but that she will fail to do so.

Answerer Kay describes herself as a counselor and advocate at a domestic violence shelter, and offers insight which would make FotF proud:

His departure from counseling tells me that he isn’t invested in changing any of his behaviors. I hope you’re still going so you can start exploring options for taking care of yourself and the children. I’m talking about protecting your self-esteem and feelings. It doesn’t sound like he has regard for anyone else’s feelings.

In my field we call his treatment of you emotional and verbal abuse. The fact that your name isn’t on the bank account is a very bad sign of his need to be in total control. I’m quite sure that he knows what he’s doing when he stares at or winks at other women—I think we call that lying. Abusers often play the game of “you must be imagining things.” I’m very concerned about what goes on with his family.

I remember a co-worker asking a counseling client what she wanted to teach her children about love and mutual respect. I think it’s time for you to decide how healthy this marriage is for you and whether it’s time to move on. It’s not an easy decision, I know. Talk to your counselor, talk to an attorney, join a support for abused women to learn how others have handled things. Get everything in place before you make your move. Controllers tend to play hardball when their sense of control is threatened. Be very careful what you put on FB and who you tell what.
Best wishes for a happier life.

l8tr g8tr is more brief:

Sounds like it's time to end it.

RobertRay responds with practical advice:

You are beyond the breaking point and it’s obvious that it’s time for you to get out. I know it’s easier said than done but there is nothing left for you in this marriage. It is completely one sided and you have been taken advantage of for far too long.

Do you have a friend or relative that you can stay with while you sort this out? You really need to start looking for a job because you are going to need to be self supportive if you want to leave.

King Swahili explains that the problem is her lack of an effective threatpoint:

Well you see there Bell he thinks very little of you. You’re no where near his equal and he treats you as so. You’re job is to take care of his kids, that’s about it. You’re a breeding partner and that’s the only partnership you have in this relationship. He stopped counseling because he didn’t want to do it, and what say did you have in the matter? None. You can’t afford to leave because you have no income. As far as the winking and other stuff all guys do that, it’s only when the wife takes offense to it that it becomes and issue. Do you nag him alot? It sounds like you do. Maybe you can start nagging less and start trying to be his friend a little? Oh, and btw, what are you going to do when you “break”, because if you’re thinking of harming yourself or your children you need to find help now. Otherwise you are in a position where you have no leverage. Good luck.

Renee also advises ratcheting up the threatpoint:

It takes 2 to make your marriage work, sounds like you tried. Your husband is pretty much not seeing that your not happy. So now that your at this point, you need to follow through. Maybe separatation is best for now. Your husband will see that your serious, and he needs to make changes. You need a game plan, and then just go for it. Good luck

I haven’t included my own answer, but it was the only one (out of 6) which counseled against divorce.
Beta Orbiter Conversation Hearts
by Dalrock | February 16, 2014 | Link

Courtesy of The Atlanta Banana
Even strong independent women want to be possessed.

by Dalrock | February 17, 2014 | Link

I buy my own diamonds and I buy my own rings
Only ring your celly when I’m feelin’ lonely
When it’s all over, please get up and leave

-Beyoncé, Independent Woman

Ladies, it is time to reject outdated ideas like showing off proof of your man’s investment in you in the form of jewelry! Those baubles are signs that he owns you; cast off the golden shackles of the patriarchy!

And yet as I pointed out before, when Beyoncé wants to pull rank on other women she rolls out the title of Mrs. Now Beyoncé has something else to brag about, a new bracelet. It is hard to imagine the Daily Mail gushing about a multimillionaire giving his wife a $2,000 piece of jewelry, but clearly there is something special about this particular bracelet. In an age of feminist pretense this bracelet scratches an itch which can’t be openly admitted. It is fascinating to watch the marketing video dance around the allure it holds:

Despite the dancing around, the women commenting on youtube clearly are entranced by the idea of wearing a bracelet which locks and can only be removed by their man:

Francis V. Ierschot 4 weeks ago
I wanna have it I shoul wear the bracelet and my boyfriend would have the key. Where can I find in in holland like in the Hague

Reply . 👇

Trish Nguyen 3 weeks ago
It's much better if the key would be the jewelry ( necklace) for the guy who lock the bracelet!

Reply . 2 👍 👇

Tacori 3 weeks ago
Dear Trish - that's a great idea and we agree wholeheartedly! We intentionally created a Key that has a bale attachment so that it can be added to a necklace, or a keychain, or otherwise be attached to the Promise Keeper. Thank you so much for your comment! Best, TACORI

Reply . 👇
How men could make themselves useful to Katarina Kroslakova.
by Dalrock | February 20, 2014 | Link

How could you make yourself more useful to Katarina Kroslakova while she is traveling on business? Katarina spells it out: Quit hitting on me and help me out.

Has anyone ever helped pop my bag up into the overhead compartment? Nope. Have I seen any other woman helped? Nope.

This week, an engineer in his 50s just stood there in the aisle, his hands clasped, as I played Olympic weight-lifting with my suitcase right in front of him. Just stood there, looking intently at the sticky carpet. Probably afraid to chip a nail or something.

Articles like the above (and this one) are interesting not because the author is so stuck in her own head she can’t see how absurd her childish demands are, but that her editor didn’t see the problem either. It is also worth noting that Ms. Kroslakova’s problem isn’t that men are afraid of being useful to her, or even that this is a movement designed to teach women a lesson. Her problem is that this is the entirely foreseeable cultural change feminists like her have been championing.

She may not like the fact that men twenty years her senior don’t feel the need to lift the bag a 30 something businesswoman overpacked, and she may be unhappy after the first year of her marriage, but the feminist genie isn’t going back into the bottle any time soon.
Mysterious forces at work.
by Dalrock | February 27, 2014 | Link

Beth writes The Frisky’s Ask a Married Guy wondering what is wrong with men? Why are they afraid to commit?

I am an attractive writer, divorced for almost four years. For as long as I can remember, I have never been at a loss for male attention. Since my separation, I have dated plenty of guys. But, the only guys I seem to attract who are not paralyzed by the idea of even commitment-lite are already married to someone else!

Two obvious explanations for Beth’s experience come immediately to mind:

1. The SMV fortunes for men and women reverse as they age; the older a woman gets the harder it becomes for her to get commitment from an attractive man. Based on the information provided I would guess Beth is at least 40 years old, and most likely 45 or older.

2. As a divorcée Beth’s track record regarding commitment is at best suspect. She doesn’t say if she is the one who ended the marriage, but statistically this is very likely. She doesn’t help her case when she writes of her “15 year marriage of convenience — for timing and ‘appropriateness’ more than affection, sex, or love.”

Married guy doesn’t touch on either unpopular reality, and instead suggests that she think of her search for a man as a sort of strip mining operation:

Genuine commitment is like a diamond, or a good vintage shirt at a thrift store. For sure, it’s there to be found. And there is enough on the planet for everyone. But this wonderful thing happens to be buried under a giant mountain of worthless shit you don’t want.

... You are going on a lot of dates, and the guys usually drift away from contact. Good. They are doing you a favor. They are ruling themselves out of contention. They are another shovelful of dirt, or handful of crappy sweaters, cleared from your path toward the perfect man/shirt/diamond.

Going with the false assumption that the romantic fortunes of men and women rise and fall in tandem, he explains that the man she is looking for not only exists, but that this man is “GOING THROUGH THE EXACT SAME THING”.

Married guy also reassures her that her decision to focus on being the perfect boyfriend is the right way to find the perfect boyfriend. Beth writes:

For my entire dating life, I have shied away from appearing needy, bitter, or desperate because those three qualities make my skin crawl.
Married guy responds:

| Good. Great, in fact. If this is true, you are miles ahead of the emotional game. Any trace of these qualities is the death-knell for attraction. Stay the course. |
How her affair and the Book of Oprah fixed their marriage and brought them closer to God.

by Dalrock | March 3, 2014 | Link

From the DFW megachurch that brought us the man site, I present ReEngage. If Fireproof didn't make you a believer*, the video here will.

There is of course a twist; it wasn’t her fault after all.

*That a wife seeking an affair (not submission) has the awesome power to restore a marriage and bring the couple to God.
The wake-up call.
by Dalrock | March 3, 2014 | Link

Even as wives are commanded to submit to the authority of their husbands, the husband is called to a far higher standard of Christ-like love and devotion toward the wife.

— Dr. Albert Mohler, President of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

There is a tendency to downplay the magnitude of what Christian wives are called to do compared with Christian husbands. Wives are merely called to submit, we are told, while husbands are called to something higher. This diminishment of the purpose and the difficulty of submission is both inaccurate and unfair to Christian wives. Scripture calls Christian husbands to actively lead their wives to Christ (Eph 5:25-27), but it also calls on Christian wives to use submission to inspire their husbands to follow Christ (1 Pet 3:1-2).

Wives, likewise, be submissive to your own husbands, that even if some do not obey the word, they, without a word, may be won by the conduct of their wives, 2 when they observe your chaste conduct accompanied by fear.

Both husbands and wives are called to lead their spouse to Christ through love, but since the roles of husbands and wives are different the method is likewise different. However, the idea of a wife submitting to a failing husband is extremely unpopular in our modern era, and probably always has been. This is if we are honest not an easy thing for a wife to do, or for men or women to accept.

Replacing submission with the wake-up call narrative

Because submission to a failing husband is something we find difficult to accept, modern Christians have substituted the exact opposite in its place. In the new narrative what failing Christian husbands need is a wake-up call from their wives. In the wake-up call narrative, the husband is making his wife unhappy but is blissfully unaware of what he is doing to her.

Founder of Focus on the Family Dr. James Dobson explained this over thirty years ago in his book Straight Talk to Men and Their Wives; What Wives Wish Their Husbands Knew About Women (H/T Ballista74). Dr. Dobson starts by describing an event where his father inadvertently tortured a cat while preaching:

During the course of his sermon, one large alley cat decided to take a nap on the platform. Inevitably, my father took a step backward and planted his heel squarely on the tail of the tom. The cat literally went crazy, scratching and clawing to free his tail from my father’s 6-foot 3-inch frame. But Dad could become very preoccupied while preaching, and he didn’t notice the disturbance. There at his feet was a panicky animal, digging holes in the carpet and screaming for mercy, yet the heel did not move.

Dad later said he thought the screech came from the brakes of automobiles at a
nearby corner. When my father finally walked off the cat’s tail, still unaware of the commotion, the tom took off like a Saturn rocket.

He tells us the suffering cat and the unaware man causing the misery is a metaphor for the problems in modern Christian marriage:

This story typifies many twentieth-century marriages. The wife is screaming and clawing the air and writhing in pain, but the husband is oblivious to her panic. He is preoccupied with his own thoughts, not realizing that a single step to the right or left could alleviate the crisis. I never cease to be amazed at just how deaf a man can become under these circumstances.

In the new narrative (the one which replaces Scripture), what is required to fix the husband is for the wife not to submit but to give him a wake-up call. Joel and Kathy Davisson are the most overt with this message, going so far as to directly advocate that the wife first threaten and then if needed carry through with divorce to lower the boom on the unresponsive husband. However, the much more common narrative is more subtle. Whatever sinful action the wife takes to give her husband the wake-up call typically isn’t overtly sanctioned, but it is consistently presented as the required catalyst to change both the man and the marriage. Because of this, we end up with a celebration of the outcome of the wife’s sin while either ignoring, minimizing, or paying lip service to the sin itself.

The wake-up call sin from the wife can take many forms, but the sin is always designed to cause the husband discomfort and very typically it is something which directly or indirectly threatens to destroy the family. FamilyLife describes how this works in Cycle of Unresolved Issues:

The cycle goes something like this: a problem surfaces in your relationship, and one of you says, “We have a problem...” but the other person does not take it seriously so the problem is not really addressed. This happens again, then again and again! Despair takes over. One day the one that has been saying, “I need help” gives up and says, “We’re done!” or leaves a note that says, “I’m gone!” This finally gets the other person’s attention, but it may be too late.

“What will it take to get your attention?” In the book The Meaning of Marriage, authors Tim and Kathy Keller relate how Kathy got Tim’s attention by lining up some of her good china, and as soon as Tim walked in the door, breaking it with a hammer. She got his attention!

Dr. Albert Mohler offers instead that wives should get their husband’s attention via denial of sex:

The emotional aspect of sex cannot be divorced from the physical dimension of the sex act. Though men are often tempted to forget this, women possess more and less gentle means of making that need clear.

Consider the fact that a woman has every right to expect that her husband will earn access to the marriage bed.
In the Stepping Up™ advertisement the wake-up call to the husband came when his wife threatened to move out. As commenter Michael observed in the discussion of the video:

Why does the husband have to be “harangued by his ballbusting wife“?

Answer: Because he is not doing what he is supposed to do. He isn’t taking the initiative with his son. He isn’t being a man. He’s a fat slob parked on the couch watching T.V. eating Cheeto’s and drinking beer.

This guy, this fat Dad with a bad back, this guy isn’t a real man. He is a lazy ball-less slob.

Pastor Driscoll prayed for a wake-up call:

Lord God, as well, I pray for those men who are here that are cowards. They are silent passive impish worthless men. They are making a mess of everything in their life. And they are such sweet little boys that no one ever confronts them on that. I pray for the women who enable them, who permit them to continue in folly, those who are mothers, sisters, girlfriends and wives.

In Fireproof the wake-up call came in the form of the wife filing for divorce and starting an affair. In the advertisement for ReEngaged the wakeup-call came in the form of the wife having an affair. In the case of Bill and Vonette Bright, Vonette gave Bill a wake-up call by packing the kids in the car and threatening to leave him.

**The wake-up call narrative by the numbers.**

1. A poor excuse for a man and husband does something (often something mysterious) to make his wife unhaaapy.
2. As a result, the wife lashes out, very often in a way that threatens the family.
3. Her sinful actions while of course not sanctioned (We swear! Really! No, I’m serious! Stop laughing!) turn out to be just the ticket required to shake her complacent husband into attention and get him to seek out God.
4. His seeking out God (triggered by her lack of submission) fixes their marriage, makes him a better man, and brings them both to God.
Dude got a wake-up call.
by Dalrock | March 5, 2014 | Link

He must have. If he didn’t, he wouldn’t be reading this (H/T Empath):

Suddenly, divorce isn’t just some vague threat in your marital future. And now, the word you never thought you’d hear your spouse say is out in the open. It’s possible. It’s real. It has become an option, and you’re afraid.

Note also the inversion of the relationship between romantic love and marriage. Where marriage used to be the moral place to pursue sex and romantic love, now romantic love is the moral place to pursue sex and marriage. If not, why is the primary goal to fix the (romantic) relationship and not to teach Christians the biblical roles of husband and wife?

Marriage intensives exist for one reason only: to help couples on the verge of divorce and to begin the healing process for severely damaged relationships.

Modern Christian marriage is just another flavor of romantic relationship, wherein we turn to the Book of Oprah for guidance. It is boyfriend and girlfriend officially recognized by the church and state.
Denying the existence of feminism.
by Dalrock | March 12, 2014 | Link

Women want to marry and have daddies for their babies. But if they can’t find good men to commit themselves to, well... Our most pressing social problem today is a man deficit.

— Glenn Stanton, *Secure Daughters, Confident Sons: How Parents Guide Their Children into Authentic Masculinity and Femininity*

One of the most striking features about modern Christianity is the pervasive denial that feminism has radically changed our culture, and as a result modern Christian women are in rebellion against all Scripture which offends feminism. This is especially the case when discussing the social problems feminism has created. Nearly every piece I read by modern conservative Christian leaders reads like an essay assigned with the direction “Pretend that feminism never happened; what then would be the source of our problem?” But feminism did happen, and denying that it happened is incredibly foolish.

In the piece by Dr. Dobson that I quoted from the other day, Dobson describes the putative oppression of modern day wives very much the way Betty Friedan did twenty years prior with her problem with no name. At the same time he was channeling Friedan, he also denied that feminism still existed (in 1980):

2. She can become very angry at men and society for their perceived insults and disrespect. This source of hostility helped to power the now defunct women’s liberation movement and gave it an aggressive character. Fortunately, both men and women quickly recognized that that was not the answer.

In this article by Covenant Keepers they address the question of why men aren’t taking the lead in their homes.

(2) Some pastors do not teach about a husband’s leadership role because they fear being charged with male chauvinism.

Yes, but why are the pastors afraid of that today? In dodging this question they are displaying the same cowardice as the pastors who are afraid to confront the rampant feminist rebellion in their own congregations. This denial of feminist rebellion inevitably leads to the Christian leader trying to defend Scripture from charges that it isn’t feminist. We can see this in another example from Covenant Keepers *What Is God’s Design And Calling For You As A Wife?*

I believe the reason why this idea of submission is so abhorrent to many wives is because the concept has been taken out of its biblical context, and this has resulted in many abuses.

Later in the same piece they explain (emphasis mine):
4. Be a submissive wife. I know for some of you, as you read the word submission, you are becoming very uneasy. If the idea of submission rubs you the wrong way, I want to encourage you to take another look at the definition according to Scripture. **Submission should never be considered a word that denotes inferiority or a position that is contemptible to you. If this is your belief, let me assure you that your understanding of this issue is not a biblical one.**

To the contrary; while he is right that it doesn’t denote inferiority, with a handful of exceptions (women who aren’t in feminist rebellion) if a modern Christian woman isn’t “uneasy” with the biblical command of submission this is a sign that she isn’t understanding the Scripture. The idea of a wife following her husband is contemptible to the modern woman because feminism has taught women that men are oppressors. The only way to make submission palatable to the modern feminist woman is to distort Scripture beyond all recognition. The right answer is not to explain that the Bible secretly agrees with feminism, but to be honest that the two are in irreconcilable conflict. Thus the modern Christian woman has to choose between faiths; she can either hold on to her feminism and follow Friedan, etc. or she can follow Christ.

**That of which we do not speak.**

Dennis Rainey of Family Life expressed discomfort at the thought of his female audience hearing Pastor Baucham (a man!) preach on submission in Ephesians chapter 5, but he couldn’t bring himself to name the problem:

And yet, in this culture, Bob, I feel like we poisoned the stream about—I don’t know—four decades ago and really made it almost objectionable for a message like this to be preached by a pastor—by a man—to a mixed audience, at this point. I don’t want you to hear me apologizing that we did it—that’s not my point. I want to recognize that, in this culture, we understand that it does go against the grain of what a lot of women are taught. All I would say is, “If you can find a better way for a marriage to work, I’d like to see it.”

Who is this “we” who poisoned the stream? Feminism has such a grip on modern Christian culture it has become something too terrifying even to name.

Rainey’s simultaneous embrace of and denial of feminism is even more clearly on display in Encouraging Our Guys (H/T Empath). Rainey and his guest Kenny Luck are selling their respective DVD programs exhorting men to man up. As they make their pitch for men to view these two programs on the Saturday before Superbowl Sunday, they are very sensitive of the fact that in nearly all Christian households the wife has usurped the position of headship. They don’t criticize this at all, they just beseech the wife to give her husband permission to attend the event even though this will mean she misses a day’s worth of ordering her husband around.

**Bob:** ...You know, on Super Bowl Sunday, on the day of the game, you can pretty much count on the fact that most guys are going to want to kind of have that time blocked out and they’re going to want to watch the game. They are not going to be available to do a whole lot of “Honey, do” stuff around the house that afternoon;
right?

**Dennis:** That’s correct. That’s correct.

**Bob:** So, I"m thinking of a wife who is planning for that weekend. She’s got the option of either her husband, on Saturday, doing all the projects around the house so that he can watch the game on Sunday; or she can send him to the Stepping Up® Super Saturday event, down at the church, that’s happening in their community. We’ve got hundreds of churches that are participating in this; but she’s not going to get any “Honey, do” lists done that day. What would your counsel to her be, Dennis?

**Dennis:** Give up the “Honey, do” list for a day.

**Bob:** How did I know that was what you would suggest?

**Dennis:** Give it up! I’m not trying to be a guy who is abdicating responsibility. I’m actually—I’m actually encouraging you, as a wife, to look beyond the “Honey, do” list and beyond to making an investment in your husband’s life—to encourage him, not discourage him— but encourage him to become the man God made him to be. If you send him down to the Stepping Up Super Saturday event—I can’t guarantee this because he’s got a choice—he’s got a real choice, and some guys don’t make it; but a lot will. I’d encourage you to send him down here and find out more information.

...

**Kenny:** I was just saying—the hall pass—“Ladies, here’s the deal. When you do give permission for a desired activity—but more importantly, when you encourage your man to take ownership of his life—spiritually, relationally, maritally— in the context of other men, that’s when you get a solid result versus hinting, hoping, nagging...

So, when you were talking about “Hey, let him go. Ladies, let him go! It will be so encouraging to him,” —that’s the first point.

...

**Dennis:** ...The wife needs to be very foxy, and smart, and know exactly what to say to her husband to get him to help champion this in your community.

All of this of course reassures the wives that the men who come back from the video event won’t expect to follow biblical roles in marriage; the wife’s position of headship will not be threatened by this event.

Kenny then explains that the problem his video is intended to address is the broken male subculture. Bizarrely, he claims the problem goes back 20 centuries. Is he blaming Christ, or perhaps the early church fathers for corrupting the previously healthy culture of the ancient
world? He doesn’t explain, but he does state that while modern women have a much healthier culture than men do, women are now starting to show some problems as well (emphasis mine):

...what you have is men retreating from the caricature and withdrawing from responsibility. What’s interesting, though, on the female-side, is that, with the advent of, what I would call—female-independence, politically; female independence, financially; female independence, educationally; relationally, from men—with distancing of the need for a woman to depend on a man they now have the power, and pressure, and responsibility that goes with that.

And guess what? They are developing their own broken female-subculture as evidenced by Fifty Shades of Grey. They’re looking for diversions and relief from that pressure of assuming life, without partnership with a man.

Why can’t Kenny bring himself to speak the word feminism? Also, note that he doesn’t frame this as a problem, except to the degree that it makes women unhappy or causes them to consume chick porn.

The irony of all of this is modern Christian men are guilty of failing Christian women, but a huge component of our failure has been to enable the feminist rebellion by refusing to confront it.
Bad dog!
by Dalrock | March 13, 2014 | Link

For that you must marry a divorcée.
Taking a break.
by Dalrock | March 21, 2014 | Link

It will most likely be several more days before I can get another post out. In the meantime I’m turning on comment moderation and will free held comments early next week.

**March 25th:** Turning off blanket moderation. I’m not sure when I will be able to write up a new post though.
Jenny Erikson writes in Dear Mr. Unavailable ... (H/T Aaron the Just):

I always thought I could fix you, Mr. Unavailable. That if I were patient enough, loving enough, kind enough, smart enough, enough enough, you would suddenly and magically transform into someone that wanted to go all in with me.

...

I say I want a nice guy, but instead I’ve been picking the challenging ones. The ones that don’t love Jesus, or the ones that say they do but don’t mean it. The workaholics, the underachievers, the closeted gays, the ones that aren’t over their exes, or the ones that only text at midnight after a few drinks — I’m not making excuses for you anymore.

* With her vagina.
Rationalizing sluttery as a path to marriage.
by Dalrock | April 1, 2014 | Link

Meet Kristina from Rolling Stone’s Tales From the Millennials’ Sexual Revolution:

...she doesn’t want to date; she wants to have sex, which thanks to the fact that she is cute and vivacious, she seems to do quite frequently. “My friends and I are like sexual vultures. We just go out and hunt for the guy that we’re going to get with. Like, my pheromones are insane right now.” Her current tally of men she’s slept with is 29...

Like many of her peers, Kristina sees her sluttyness through a lens of courtship. She is confident that all of this time on her back will one day lead to the husband of her dreams:

...Kristina hopes to graduate and spend a few more years playing the field before getting married. In the process, she says, she hopes she never has to go on an actual date. “I’m obsessed with wedding crap, like I Pin wedding stuff all the time, and I love [celebrity-wedding planner] David Tutera and Say Yes to the Dress. Like, I’m obsessed with the idea of getting married, but I want to skip the dating part and just know who I’m going to marry.” She believes hookup culture might actually make this possible for her generation. “We’ll be so experienced in all the people that we don’t want, when we find the person who we do want, it’s just going to happen.”
Where have all the good earners gone?

by Dalrock | April 7, 2014 | Link

The WSJ is perplexed. The Unemployment Puzzle: Where Have All the Workers Gone?

No doubt there is more than one answer to this question, but our forfeiting the patriarchal dividend has to be a factor.

---

Data Source: http://www.census.gov/hhes/families/data/cps.html
http://dalrock.wordpress.com/
Rolling back the odometer
by Dalrock | April 9, 2014 | Link

The AFP explains how Tunisian women are suffering the injustice of having to trick men into marriage after they tire of riding the carousel: Social pressures force Tunisia women to fake virginity

...she was forced into it by “the hypocrisy of men and of our society”.

The young woman decided one day that she would be honest with her boyfriend, whom she had not slept with, and told him she was not a virgin.

“But as soon as he knew, he refused to marry and did everything he could to get me into his bed. That’s the way Tunisian men think. A woman who has had sex before marriage is just a slut and can’t be a good mother!”

Commenter Rob offers a different perspective:

My first inclination is to laugh at these Arab men for wanting a virgin. But then I look at my situation. My wife of 26 years was “completely honest” with me about her sexual history. She told me she didn’t know the last name of the first man who got her pregnant. (A pregnancy that ended in abortion.) There were many other unions in which body fluids but not last names were exchanged. And then she told me that no one she had ever dated had to wait longer than I did before “union” occurred. (She had multiples more partners than I did.) This has left me with a sense of being the sucker left holding the bag for the entire duration of our marriage....... Perhaps these Arab men, whom I have an overall low opinion of, are not so far off base wanting a situation a little more male affirming than mine?
Vice.com has a piece up titled How Sad Young Douchebags Took Over Modern Britain (H/T Captain Capitalism). In the piece the author struggles to identify why the culture of young men has changed in recent years:

But while it’s easy to scorn the banality—and the vanity—of the modern British douchebag, they’re only products of their environment. An environment that has very little to offer them anymore, other than gym memberships, intentionally ripped clothes, alcohol, and creatine. The institutions that gave British men a sense of well-being have been ripped apart. Nobody trusts the police any more; nobody wants to join the army because no one believes in its wars; traditional industries have been decimated, and the only thing to replace them are stifling, mind-numbing positions in service and retail.

Because of this, British men have tried to reimagine masculinity, in a hyper-realized, childish, desperate way. A new kind of machismo, built on fake bravado and vanity. British men are looking up to faux-hawked, peacocking, rich maniacs like Mario Balotelli for inspiration, because they really have nowhere else to look.

There is probably a kernel of truth to his suspected causes, but there is a much more fundamental cause which he overlooks entirely; the decline of marriage. Sexual access to
the most attractive women is a primary motivator for men. In just a few decades the UK has gone from a society where the best way for a man to get access to an attractive woman was via marriage (or at least signaling husband potential) to the modern hookup culture where douchebags rule.

You can see the full extent of the change in the data on marriage rates from Table A1 in the report *Cohabitation and marriage in Britain since the 1970s*. In the early 1980s over 70% of British women had married by age 25. By 2004-2007 only 23% of British women had married by the same age.

![Percent of Men and Women in Great Britain Married by Age 25](http://dalrock.wordpress.com/

Men will always compete with each other for access to the most attractive women, but how they compete is determined by the culture and the choices of the women themselves. A young man in the UK who wants to have sex with the most attractive women has a very obvious rational choice, and that is to become the douchebag Britain's young women crave. This is without even considering the hostility towards husbands and fathers in the family courts, churches, and the culture at large. British society is sending young men a very strong message:

| Steddie Eddie need not apply, but douchebags are most welcome. |

Don’t feed the animals image by Jim Champion
I'm turning on moderation so I can step away for a week or two.
Why isn’t Carl good enough?
by Dalrock | April 29, 2014 | Link

I’ve joked in the past that it can be impossible to tell the difference between Traditional Conservatives and Feminists, but a Slate DoubleX article on women deliberately choosing single motherhood quoted by Steve Sailer and Vox Day has me rethinking this.

Theoretical Opposites: Feminists vs Family Values Conservatives

In theory when it comes to issues of the family and traditional morality we have two polar opposite groups. On the one side we have feminists who see traditional marriage as a relic of the past and a constraint on women. On the other side we have the family values group which longs to return to the traditional family model at the expense of feminist goals/gains. This is the theory, in practice the two groups are surprisingly similar in their response to our current explosion in out of wedlock births (chart source):

![Figure 1. Number of births, birth rate, and percentage of births to unmarried women: United States, 1940-2007](https://example.com/chart.png)

The Similarities

Both feminists and family values conservatives tend to see the explosion in out of wedlock births as a problem, and both are certain that women are being forced to choose broken homes over marriage because men aren’t worth marrying. To both, the women of our modern feminist era are desperate to commit for life and honor traditional marriage vows, if only there were men fit to marry. The feminists at Slate’s DoubleX lay it on thick when describing Lily, a pregnant woman uninterested in marrying or even remaining with the father (Carl) of her soon to be born child (emphasis mine):

When Lily looks around at the available men, they don’t offer what she is looking for.
Lily, just like better-off men and women, believes that marriage means an unqualified commitment to the other spouse. When you marry someone, you support him in hard times. You stick with him when he disappoints you. You visit him if he ends up in jail. And you encourage him to become an important part of your children’s lives. It’s just that Lily doesn’t believe that Carl is worth that commitment. Nor does she believe that she will meet someone who will meet her standards anytime soon, and the statistics back her up.

This is of course pure (and laughable) conjecture on the part of the authors, as Lily has done nothing to even remotely suggest she believes in the commitment of traditional marriage. Why do they assume that a woman who is deliberately having a child out of wedlock has a higher level of commitment to marriage than women who manage to avoid giving birth out of wedlock? If Lily is the face of women who believe in traditional marriage, what would a woman who rejected marriage look like?

However, as I noted the basic assumption about the explosion in unwed mothers in the DoubleX article is shared by the leading members of the family values movement. Focus on the Family is the leading organization in the United States representing the family values point of view, and their Director for Family Formation Studies has come to the same conclusion. According to Director Stanton, unwed mothers haven’t rejected the constraints of marriage, they are responding to a sudden and mysterious deficit in men. Stanton makes this case in his book Secure Daughters, Confident Sons: How Parents Guide Their Children into Authentic Masculinity and Femininity:

If women can’t find good men to marry, they will instead compromise themselves by merely living with a make-do man or getting babies from him without marriage. Unfortunately, this describes exactly the new shape of family growth in Western nations by exploding margins... Women want to marry and have daddies for their babies. But if they can’t find good men to commit themselves to, well... Our most pressing social problem today is a man deficit.

Pastor Mark Driscoll makes the same case (emphasis mine):

...if you’re a single gal hoping to get married someday. You’re like: “Seriously, that’s the candidate pool? You’ve got to be kidding me.” That’s why 41 percent of births right now are to unmarried women. A lot of women have decided: “I’m never going to find a guy who is actually dependable and responsible to have a life with. So I’ll just get a career and have a baby and just intentionally be a single mother because there are no guys worth spending life with.”

The Differences

As similar as the two sides are in assuring us that the horde of mothers who reject marriage aren’t really rejecting marriage, there are subtle differences in their arguments. Not surprisingly, the feminists at Slate celebrate the changes feminism has put in place to create a world where Lily sees unwed motherhood as a viable option:
...socioeconomic, cultural, and economic changes have brought white working-class women like Lily to the point where going it alone can be the wiser choice. And the final irony: The same changes that have made marriages more equitable and successful among elite couples have made it less likely that marriage will look attractive to Lily.

Later in the article they reiterate that as feminists they would oppose any marriage related policies which would restrict Lily’s independence:

Does society have an interest in helping couples like Lily and Carl stay together? Probably, but not in the way many policymakers have proposed. Those who would promote marriage seek to do so largely by taking away Lily’s independence.

This is where the distinction between feminists and the family values leaders can be spotted. While feminists celebrate the radical way we have reordered marriage and our society to make the explosion in unwed motherhood happen, family values leaders simply deny such a change occurred in the first place. Because of this, the feminists are far less contemptuous of men than the family values crowd. Feminists like the ones at DoubleX see the explosion in out of wedlock births and want to petition for some fine tuning to social policy, especially with regard to economic opportunity for young men. In contrast, the family values group lays the blame for the feminist destruction of the family squarely on men, arguing (implicitly) that feminism would work if it weren’t for weak men screwing everything up.

The elephant in the middle of the room.

What neither the feminists nor the family values proponents are willing to address is that the decision to move from a marriage based family structure was made in the US several decades ago. Prior to the 1960s unwed mothers could not count on child support or welfare. Most states had a patchwork of bastardy laws in place, but even here the laws varied and there was a clear stigma on illegitimacy. Prior to the 1960s, a woman like Lily couldn’t count on the state funding her irresponsible decision to skip marriage, nor could she count on cultural leaders, including the most ostensibly “conservative” ones, publicly stating that her decision to skip marriage on her path to motherhood was not only understandable but wise.

Carl isn’t available to give his own side of the story, but at best he chose to knock up an irresponsible woman. But while Carl is responsible for his own bad choices and the harm this will do to his child, he isn’t the reason we are watching the continued destruction of marriage. The truth is that neither feminists nor family values conservatives can stomach the limitations on Lily’s independence which a return to a marriage based system would impose. The only difference is that feminists admit this outright, while conservatives manage this through denial and redoubling their efforts to make men find a way to make feminism work.
A most impressive trail of wreckage in her wake.

by Dalrock | May 5, 2014 | Link

Vox Day has a post up this morning about a female CEO who suffered from a problem with no name and ended up wiping out both her own savings and $640k of investor capital. But don’t worry, she isn’t taking it too hard. From her letter/blog post Dear Investors, My Company Failed and We Lost All Your Money. Here’s What Happened:

Am I upset that I lost my investors’ money? Only in the sense that many of our investors were my friends and I didn’t want to disappoint them. But the me coming out from this hurricane of chaos is a much stronger me, able to acknowledge the mistakes I’ve made, able to open up and be emotionally raw with my friends and my team-qualities that every great leader must possess.

...

As a person, I am worlds apart from the one who raised money back in 2012. I was not confident in myself back then. I had a gritty edge. I was scared.

Fortunately the bulk of the trail of wreckage is purely financial. No doubt much of this money represented the hopes and dreams of real life people, but at least no children will need to take a trip through the divorce meat grinder as a result of this woman’s need to focus on herself.

See Vox’s post Bulletproof Self Regard for a link to the original post/letter and his analysis of it.
Someone [with a penis] must do something!

A commenter at the Daily Mail pointed out the absurdity of Mrs. Obama’s pouty faced tweet:

Don’t give me your hastags Mrs Obama your husband is the President of the United States for crying out loud.

He raises an excellent point. She is married to the president. Her best chance to help the kidnapped girls is to privately bring her concerns to her husband, wait for him to devise a plan*, and then publicly support his efforts.

But supporting her husband in his efforts has a number of drawbacks. It requires submission as well as a degree of accountability. If she supports her husband and his plan fails, she is associated with that failure. This way she can take credit for any success and avoid accountability for failure. If someone (someone with a penis) tries and fails, she can point out that of course that plan wasn’t the plan she had in mind all along. If someone (with a penis) tries and succeeds, she and all of the other women in the campaign can take credit for the success:

Nothing would have happened if men were left to their own devices! The world owes women a debt for pushing to have those girls rescued.

Mrs. Obama won’t be alone in taking credit for any success in rescuing the kidnapped girls of course. She will have to share the credit for any success with her fellow pouty faced (or
angry faced) tweeters as well as the brave women in Nigeria:

...concerned women have threatened to converge in Lagos and other parts of the country and later proceed to Borno State, from where they would walk naked into the forest in search of the students.

As absurd as threatening to go naked into a snake infested jungle in order to punish kidnappers and rapists may sound, there is some logic here. First of course is the fact that they have no intention of actually doing such a thing, and if they did they would be careful not to venture far enough to place themselves in real danger. Second, by stripping naked (even metaphorically) they remind the world that they themselves do not have penises, so clearly they aren’t the ones who must do something. Just like with Mrs. Obama’s pouty faced tweet, they also don’t have to stand by either a plan or a leader. If their histrionics ultimately push their government to botch a risky rescue, they can accurately point out that their plan (running naked through the jungle) carried no such risk to the kidnapped girls. If their histrionics result in successful government action, they will be praised for their wisdom and courage in making sure the girls were rescued.

Make no mistake, heaping praise on women for making pouty/angry faces and threatening to run into the jungle naked is exactly what we will see if the kidnapped girls are rescued. Feminists will celebrate the wisdom of women, and conservatives will stand reaffirmed in their faith in men (provided they are given a proper wake-up call).

*If President Obama needs help devising a plan, Professor Hale has kindly laid out some options.
As I’ve mentioned before after the initial empowerment fades divorced women tend to find themselves excluded from their previous social networks. Married women tend to prefer to socialize with other married women. Since marriage confers status on women (which divorcées lose if they aren’t able to remarry), being dropped from the married social circle and being forced to move to the divorcée social circle is a painful loss.

This simple fact has Ask Amy outraged, as a married mother wrote in explaining that she and her fellow married sister and cousins don’t find they have much in common with her single mother/divorced sister. Ask Amy is of course free to rage against human nature all she likes, but she won’t be able to undo the status hit women take when they divorce.

As an added bonus, the letter writer deftly played the husband card:

She takes it very personally, and last year even came over to my home unannounced crying about it, which upset my children and caused my husband to threaten to call the police if she did not leave.

In the interest of bringing all parties together, I will offer a solution which I think Ask Amy and the letter writer can both get behind. Instead of not inviting the divorced sister, why not promise, no swear, in front of God and everyone they know that they will include her in their outings in the future. Then, when the time comes that honoring this promise would make them unhappy, simply leave her out.
These fathers need a wake-up call.

by Dalrock | May 16, 2014 | Link

Christian movie makers are tired of sitting on the sidelines while the popular culture destroys the family. Why can’t they get in on the action too?

See Cane Caldo’s expert takedown of the latest “Christian” assault on married fathers. If you have been jonesing for a fix of Christian endorsed familial subversion ever since Courageous left the box office, you won’t want to miss Mom’s Night Out:

The snippet that really drives home the beautiful alliance of the bikers and the wives...

Did I forget to mention those wives are also smoking hot when they’re not being kept down by the idiot bastards to whom they’re married?

...is when they show the massive and tattoo’d leader[1] of the bikers sitting with the wife in the little black dress at the police station. Bikers—as everybody knows—aren’t only in it with your wife for the excitement. They’re in it for the long haul of fretful nights, too. One imagines those bikers could be in all kinds of things for wives.

There’s your Family-Friendly Film warriors at work; bringing us an “ethically sound”, clean and relatively painless lethal injection of fatherhood that frees up wives to have real adventures, sexy bikers, great clothes, the joy of kids...everything.
From the UK based The Marriage Foundation publication *Divorce rates have halved for new brides. Why?*

Because it is almost entirely the reduction of wife-granted divorces concentrated into the early years of marriage that accounts for the overall 22% reduction in divorce rates since the 1993 peak, any explanation for this phenomenon has to account for wives being less prone to divorce. By far the most plausible explanation relates to wives' perception of husbands.

In other words, husbands are doing better during the early years of marriage.

Why is this? Because commitment matters. He continues (emphasis mine):

The best current theory of commitment holds a plausible explanation for why this might be the case. Commitment theory proposes that *men - but not women - who “decide” rather than “slide” through important relationship transitions are more dedicated and therefore have more stable relationships* (Stanley et al, 2010).

The paper he cites to back up his assertion that men's commitment matters in marriage and women's doesn't is *Commitment: Functions, Formation, and the Securing of Romantic Attachment*. Strangely I can't find such a claim being made in that paper.

Still, the original Marriage Foundation paper is worth a look for the charts. The chart titled "Number of divorces (by party to whom granted)" on page 8 shows how initiation of divorce by men and women was roughly the same (with women initiating slightly more) until 1973. At that point women's initiation of divorce skyrocketed and men's initiation leveled off. Perhaps some of my readers from the UK can shed some light on what happened around 1973 to cause this change.

See also the chart titled "WIFE divorce rates, 2010 vs 1993" on page 9.
Getting to the church on time (a second time).
by Dalrock | May 28, 2014 | Link

Deep Strength offered his own explanation on why young wives in the UK are divorcing in much lower numbers:

However, when you take into context women getting married closer to the wall — 26-27+ range on average — you get the women over the average of 29s and 30s where they’re not blowing up their marriages because they want children. It’s after they get their children that they start to blow up their marriages.

He brings up an excellent point. Women wanting to have it all have a delicate balancing act to perform, and this gets more difficult every year. Much of this comes from the ever increasing age of first marriage combined with the realities of fertility and the wall. A woman who marries in her late twenties or early thirties doesn’t have time on her side if she hopes to divorce and remarry. If she divorces without having children it isn’t a given that she will be able to remarry in time to have children with partner-for-life number two. Also, she may feel that it is classier to have at least two of her children by the same baby daddy, so this would mean remaining married to her starter husband long enough to have two children.

But it isn’t just having children that the woman attempting to have it all needs to consider when deciding how long to stay married to her starter husband. She also wants to maximize the cash and prizes she receives in the process. Having a child, or better yet two is extremely helpful here, but if she wants alimony depending on the state she may have to wait ten years to discover that she is unhappy. If she wants to be eligible for Social Security benefits based on her first husband’s income (should she not be able to remarry) ten years is the cutoff for that as well.

Waiting ten years to divorce her starter husband doesn’t give today’s have-it-aller much time to enjoy her divorce empowerment and then remarry. If she marries in her late twenties and waits ten years to divorce she will be in her late thirties before she can start sampling penises again. By then her chances to remarry have dropped dramatically, and they will continue to drop each year she fails to remarry*. The problem is worse than the remarriage stats would suggest though, because they don’t take into account the quality of her prospects for remarriage. She found her first husband when she was younger and didn’t have the baggage of another man’s children and a history of not keeping her sacred promise. She now has to sell an older baggage laden version of herself to a smaller pool of eligible men. Not only are single men her own age sought after by the newest crop of marriage delayers, but a large percentage of them earn nothing or next to nothing.

Even if a woman marries and divorces by her early twenties, remarriage will be far more difficult today than it would have been in the past. Remarriage rates for women 20-25 today are half of what they were twenty years ago*.

*See Fig 3 in this new NCFMR paper on remarriage rates. This breaks the age categories to much smaller ones than I was able to do here.
Figure 3 in this NCFMR paper on remarriage rates doesn’t include the actual values of the data being charted, so I pulled the chart into GIMP, blew it up, and estimated the point values based on the pixel height of the bars. The values may be slightly off, but this should be very close*

What I’ve wanted to do for some time is compare the shape of the women’s divorce rate curve with the remarriage curve. With this more granular data on divorce rates by age, I can now compare the divorce rate curve I calculated using the Census and ACS data with the remarriage curve. I set them with separate scales so the shapes of the curves are easier to compare**:
The slope of the remarriage curve is steeper than the slope of the divorce curve in the chart above. This isn’t obvious because I’m using different Y axis scales. I should have made this more clear. Here is a chart using the same scale for both:

**US Women's Divorce and Remarriage Rates by Age**

Scales are the same

http://dairock.wordpress.com/
I've focused on the stats for women because it is women who are driving the divorce rates. As you can see, divorce rates track very closely with women’s opportunity to remarry. Note also that the old canard that as women age their desire to be married goes away; if this were true the divorce curve would slope upward, not downward.

*I've contacted the NCFMR asking for the actual data points, and if they provide them I will update the chart in this post.

** For the < 25 category this represents 20-24 for remarriage rates and 15-24 for divorce rates.
Note: I greatly appreciate the work the National Marriage Project is doing, especially in putting out easy to read and meaningful data in their State Of Our Unions reports. In addition, their director W. Bradford Wilcox strikes me as a very sharp and stand up man, and he has very kindly assisted me in the past. This post isn’t a shot at the Marriage Project, but an attempt to demonstrate how ubiquitous our blind spot is regarding women’s accountability and the insidious way that child support has replaced marriage as our fundamental family model both legally and in the popular conception, even for those who consider themselves pro marriage.

In the 2012 State of Our Unions report they offer ten suggestions to strengthen the institution of marriage:

...we offer ten recommendations—for federal policy, state policy, and cultural change—for renewing marriage in Middle America.

Suggestion number four is to end “anonymous fatherhood”, with an emphasis on sending a cultural message that fathers matter (emphasis mine):

In the U.S. today we have a fundamental contradiction in our policy on fatherhood. If a woman gets pregnant after a one-night stand, the father can be held accountable financially for that child for eighteen years. An elaborate, nationwide child support enforcement apparatus has been erected in support of this goal. But if a woman buys anonymous sperm from a sperm bank, the anonymous man who provided his sperm walks away with no obligation. In the first case the state has decided that children have the right at the bare minimum to the financial support of two parents. In the second case, the state has decided that children have no such right.

While only a small (but possibly growing) minority of would-be parents use sperm donation or similar technologies to get pregnant, the cultural power of the idea that it’s acceptable deliberately to create a fatherless child and for biological fathers to walk away from their children is real. Further, studies reveal that majorities of adults who were conceived via sperm donation believe that anonymity should be ended. Therefore, we propose that the United States follow the model of other nations that have banned anonymity in sperm donation—such as Britain, Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, and Switzerland—and reinforce the consistent message that fathers matter.

Note how even when talking about women deliberately creating fatherless children in the most undeniable sense, the only moral judgment is on the man who donated the sperm. They aren’t objecting to the cultural idea that a woman would deliberately create a fatherless child, but to the cultural idea that the man should not have to pay her large sums of money as a reward for her making this awful choice. The inability to see women as
responsible for their very deliberate choices regarding marriage and motherhood is a tremendous blind spot in our culture.

Also note that the solution to unwed motherhood isn’t to send a moral message that unwed motherhood deprives children of fathers. The solution is to bolster unwed motherhood by making sure our new family model is consistently followed. Morally marriage is no longer the solution, and this will remain the case so long as we wrongly embrace child support as something moral, instead something evil.

Anything which replaces marriage is evil, and this is exactly what child support is designed to do. The best defense of child support is that it may be in certain extreme circumstances a necessary evil. But even here, this is only a qualification of the fact, not a refutation of the evil nature of child support.

**Edit:** To reinforce the way that child support has become our fundamental model of the family, consider what the solution to the sperm bank problem would be if we instead had a marriage based family structure. In that case the solution would be obvious; bar unmarried women from using the services of sperm banks, and only permit married women to use them with the written consent of their husband (which would serve as formal adoption of the child on his part). But this solution is obvious only in a culture where marriage is the fundamental family structure.
Dude, where’s my courtship?
by Dalrock | June 2, 2014 | Link

She’s still her same fabulous self, but the edgy and exciting men are no longer magically appearing to take her out. Clearly this is Amazon.com’s fault.

Do you know any abnormal men?
A long time reader asked me to do a post on a recent article by Damon Linker titled Men are the worst. Here’s how they can be better. My initial answer was to decline, because Linker just isn’t worthy of rebuttal. The whole screed has a begging and pleading quality to it which left me feeling more sorry for Linker than anything else.

What is interesting though is how frequently throughout the piece Linker’s words sound like something I would expect from Pastor Driscoll. Driscoll is the master of the man up rant, so why is Linker’s piece so ineffective? After giving it some consideration I believe I’ve identified the problems.

The first problem is fairly subtle. Pastor Driscoll’s fundamental message is that weak men are screwing feminism up. While this is absurd it works for Driscoll because he is in denial that feminism ever happened. Because Driscoll is able to sell this denial, the absurdity of the message isn’t readily visible.

But Linker wears his feminism on his sleeve, so what would be very effective lines in the hands of Driscoll (or FoTF, or FamilyLife, etc) come out very differently. When Linker writes:

| It is long past time for men to own their emotional lives and stop shirking responsibility for the brutish, disrespectful, and sometimes ruinous actions they undertake while under the sway of their unruly passions and drives. |

It comes after he has already written:

| Throughout our violent, sexist history, the world has had a very big man problem. |

This brings us to Linker’s other and more serious problem. His piece isn’t framed as a call for men to regain their lost masculinity, but as a personal plea so that Linker can have the feminism he so desperately craves. He closes the article with a stomp of his delicate foot:

| The woman you long to sleep with, like the world itself, owes you absolutely nothing. Let that be seared into the brain of every leering, groping, cat-calling, date-raping, would-be mass-murdering man in America. |

| That, and nothing less, is what it would take to solve my man problem — and ours. |

Won’t some big strong man come rescue Linker from this torment?

What Linker doesn’t understand is the man up rant must be framed as a call to noble manhood by a heroic leader. Follow me and I’ll make men of you! While Linker gets some of the words right, he makes his plea from the position of a pouty faced damsel in distress begging to be rescued by the very men he is trying to exhort to man up. This will never work.
Why are modern Christians so delighted with current divorce rates?
by Dalrock | June 5, 2014 | Link

There is an article from the Christian Post making the rounds which has modern Christians giddy: Author Debunks Myths About Divorce Rates, Including of Churchgoers. The article and the book it promotes The Good News About Marriage: Debunking Discouraging Myths about Marriage and Divorce is welcome news to modern Christians.

My first reaction to the article was that the author is using questionable statistics*, even if there is a kernel of truth to what she is sharing. However, what I think is far more important is the nature of article, book, and the responses to the book. It would be easy to miss that they aren’t celebrating a recent decline in divorce rates. Her main point in the Christian Post article is that the no fault divorce regime isn’t really that bad (and never has been):

Feldhahn: The most important big-picture truth: contrary to popular opinion, most marriages are strong and happy for a lifetime. That doesn’t mean most marriages are perfect; there are still plenty of legitimate concerns out there. But for our culture as a whole, the marriages that are unhappy, the ones that don’t make it, are the exception rather than the rule.

She reinforces this with positive data about Boomer divorce rates, as well as divorce rates for second marriages and churchgoing Christians.

So if they aren’t celebrating an encouraging decline in recent divorce rates, what are they celebrating? They are celebrating what they see as a validation of the new (anti biblical) model of marriage. All of those naysayers claiming the wakeup call model of marriage is destroying marriage were wrong! It is working just fine!

If divorce levels were unacceptably high and marriage was collapsing as an institution, then they would need to rethink their rejection of biblical marriage. But according to this author marriage is just fine, the only problem is that people have been tricked into believing that it is falling apart at the seams. According to the author high divorce rates under our no fault divorce regime are caused by concern about high divorce rates, not the other way around. This denies our recent history, where an explosion in divorce rates followed the legal and cultural gutting of marriage, and concern about the exploding divorce rates followed the actual phenomenon.

The reaction to the book is the same reaction Director Glenn Stanton of Focus on the Family had when he found that the most devout Christians only have a 38% divorce rate. He was so elated he sent out announcements of the good news two years in a row.

Reality

The biggest problem with the message is that the focus on reassuring Christians that our anti biblical model of marriage is working just fine is furthering rebellion. But the problem doesn’t
end there. Aside from the problematic stats, the reality is that marriage *really is* falling apart at the seams. 40% of children are now born out of wedlock, and the US has a higher rate of children growing up without fathers than every country in Europe I could find data for. Marriage is crumbling as an institution, and as a result each year we find that Americans spend an ever smaller percentage of their adult lives married:

These declining numbers represent a combination of delayed marriage, marriage avoided outright, and lower remarriage rates after divorce. As you can see from the chart above marriage patterns vary greatly by race. What it doesn’t show is that other factors like education and class are also very important. This new anti biblical model of marriage works much better for the upper middle class than it does for lower classes. As a result, marriage is starting to become something only the elite can afford to dabble in. Hidden in this tragedy is a potential silver lining. As marriage becomes seen as something only for the elite, those groups which have experienced the highest divorce rates have retreated from marriage. As a result, we should expect to see a decline in overall divorce rates. But even here, this isn’t really good news for marriage, because it is due to marriage becoming weaker as an institution, not a sign that it is becoming stronger.

*As I mentioned above I think the questionable statistics in the Cristian Post article and another one on Catalyst are not the root of the issue, as bad as some of the problems are.*
I’ve deliberately avoided taking the bait and focusing on the stats in this post in order not to lose sight of the much more important picture.

**See Also:**

- Does Shaunti Feldhahn’s rosy divorce data prove that no fault divorce is working out pretty well after all?
- Nowhere close to true.
- How to make Glenn Stanton’s day.
Worse than fear. Worse than malice.
by Dalrock | June 7, 2014 | Link

In the discussion of my last post Gunner Q suggested that the reason modern Christians don’t support biblical marriage is due to fear:

Perhaps the answer is that modern Christians just can’t accept the consequences of fighting no-fault divorce. Bucking the divorce trend would require binding standards of conduct, public excommunication of rebellious women, pressuring fathers to get their Princesses married instead of college-educated, political activism to restore traditional laws... seriously counter-cultural stuff.

I explained that it is far worse than this, and the lie that Christians are fighting the good fight (if only in their heads) is part of the apparatus which protects the status quo. The truth is that modern Christians are deeply invested in the new model of marriage. Fireproof took the teaching in 1 Pet 3 and switched the sexes, and Christians couldn’t find words suitable to express how delighted they were with this cross dressed version of Scripture. As I’ve shown in countless examples, modern Christians really like the new model, what I’ve dubbed the wakeup-call model of marriage. I have no doubt they wish that it didn’t result in as many divorces as it does, but credible threats of divorce are key to this new improved model of marriage. So an argument which claims that actual divorce isn’t required very often to keep wives in a position of headship will go over extremely well with modern Christians.

My explanation resonated with Gunner Q, but for obvious reasons it also troubled him:

Can this be true? Not just the inevitable top evil-doers but the majority of priests, pastors and chaplains are acting out of malice, not ignorance and fear?

Hmm. I left my most recent church in January when it began having women openly teaching men. I’d invested in the church and had the sympathetic ear of the leadership. I had talked repeatedly to them about female submission in church and their response was believing that the relevant passages of the Bible only applied to the first-century Christians Paul wrote his letters to, and so all other Christians were allowed to do the exact opposite. None of those people struck me as evil but I never understood how educated pastors could believe that, or not realize the consequences of “that was then, this is now" thinking.

To think that they were inventing lies to justify disobedience... well, Occam’s Razor. It fits. They would have at least considered my words, otherwise. Nobody would believe those ridiculous false statements... unless they wanted to... not ignorant... Oh, God. This is bad.

While he is right that it isn’t about ignorance and fear, I disagree that it is about malice. Malice would require that they knew that biblical marriage is a profound blessing, and that they wanted to deprive others of this blessing. The truth is worse; they don’t believe that what God has given us is good.
They believe that God has made a terrible mistake, and somehow gotten the instructions for something *He created for His creation* backwards. This is the source of the badly concealed embarrassment you will notice when you discuss the clear biblical teaching on divorce and to a much larger degree on headship and submission. They are embarrassed for God, and embarrassed that they had to fix something which in their minds He has gotten so terribly wrong.
A little over a week ago a Catholic woman by the handle Be Courageous was disturbed that her husband wasn’t properly submitting to her headship, and decided to break out the detonator with a forum post Is There Hope for My Marriage?

In her post we learn how truly awful her layabout husband is, and how his laziness, boringness, video game “addiction”, smoking, and stock investing are destroying the family:

I am typing this a very tired and extremely frustrated mom of two little boys at 2:30 a.m. because I cannot sleep due to my husband and his video game addiction. I am starting to wonder if there is hope for my marriage? We have been married for 5 years and the video gaming has been a major problem. It even caused problems for me and breastfeeding both of my boys as infants because I was so exhausted and not getting any help from my husband while he hid away upstairs in our office playing this video game he has played for over 15 years of his life. He refuses to go anywhere with me and the kids as a family and prefers to stay at home if he is not working...

He also smokes heavily and plays the stock market as if he is gambling with our money. He is in charge of all of our finances, and when I ask him about things he always has an answer, but things just don’t add up. He also doesn’t warm up to me emotionally unless he wants to me to be intimate with him and then it seems like he rewards me for it. I get extremely depressed at times because I feel like I am on an emotional roller coaster and I wish he was a better role model for our little ones and present for them more instead of glued to the computer with his game or stocks or outside smoking constantly. I feel like a single mother much of the time. Any advice?
He doesn’t think he has a problem and refuses counseling, I have already tried that.

Not surprisingly she wasn’t reminded of Saint Peter’s instruction to wives in 1 Pet 3*, but instead was very quickly advised to give her husband a *wakeup-call* by commenter Christy Beth:

Personally, I think it’s time to play hardball with him. Tell him you want a separation (and mean it) if his game playing continues. Check to see if you can stay with someone in your family at least temporarily. This will give you a break and maybe show him where he would be without you...

Commenter Cat agreed with the need to “play hardball”:

I agree with this.

I would actually check with an organization that deals with addictive behaviors, like Al-Anon, and ask them how to best deal with your husband.

At the moment, you’re enabling him to continue his destructive behavior. I’m NOT saying that his behavior is your fault. Heavens no! It’s HIS decision to play games. But you are making it easy for him to keep playing.

So I think that Christy Beth’s advice is very good.

Do you have a family that you can go home to and live with for a while? Or a really good female friend who will take you in?

Commenter bmaj advises Be Courageous that she has a *moral duty* to *not* submit to her husband, and that God wants her to be happy:

Our Lord wants us to love our husbands, but He also doesn’t expect us to be doormats – and He truly wants us to be happy.

Others offered less overt ways to bring her husband back into submission, including insisting that he takes classes she chooses for him, or go to marriage counseling. This reaction continued for a few days until her husband spoiled the fun of sowing discord by showing up and sharing his own side of the story. He also pleaded with this online community to stop spreading toxic anti marriage advice (emphasis mine):

Hi Everyone,

Just thought I’d share a little. I’m the husband in this scenario, I happened to look at the internet history when I came home from work and nothing had been done (laundry piled up, dishes over flowing in the sink, house is a disaster) and I see my
2.5 year old unaccompanied in the pantry where we have things that he should not be in to, some even dangerous. My wife is on the computer not paying attention to anything when I come in, I figured she’s on Facebook again as so much of the day I catch her staring in to.

I wanted to see how much of the day she had spent on it so I could confront her about her time on the computer during the day when she (in my humble opinion) should be contributing to the household. Is it wrong to think that a family has one person that stays home and watches the children should also try to keep the house in order if time permits?

That’s when I see “Is there hope for my marriage”, which comes as a HUGE surprise to me. Reading the posts, I’ve got a few things to say.

First, she failed to mention that 75% of my time is spent either at work were I have spent a lot of trying “climbing the ladder” to try to secure a better future for my family, on work, or studying. I just completed a Master’s Degree, full time school, while trying to stay on top of everything at work, I DO MY SHARE OF TAKING CARE OF THE CHILDREN after work when I’m home (which she seems to have failed to mention), as well as study for the EXTREMELY tough CPA exam, again to further my families financial security. In a self assessment, I personally think I manage a fairly busy schedule quite well, and although it didn’t seem that way in previous posts, balance time with my family as well as career (or at least make every effort). The SATURDAY night that she refers to, I just finished a week of studying for the CPA exam, on top of a very stressful work week, and completed a three hour exam; yes I do enjoy video games but not as an addiction. It is a pass time for me, a way to cool down and let me mind relax a little bit before I have to hit the ground running again. I don’t drink or do any drugs, I think video gaming is a fairly responsible thing to do to unwind, personally. (Please note, this was 2:30am, when the children are sleeping...)

Just wanted to make a quick note, and maybe ask that everyone do some self reflecting. The person that mentioned that she “should play hard ball”, you about (and still might) cost us a family. The thing is, if anyone has to put up with unfair things in this marriage, it’s me. But I generally don’t complain, I don’t bother trying to change things. So long as everyone ELSE is content, comfortable, and safe, I don’t really mind. My place is to provide, and yet I constantly get stepped on. With this thread, I about had enough. The dangers of these “helpful” threads are that you don’t know all the circumstances, but still you give advice that might be taken seriously. Would you trust a doctor to diagnose you with something over an email? Everyone wants to swoop in and “help” or “save” a needy stranger, but without knowing any of the details other than what was given.

Context is important, and in the current day that seems to be forgotten.

Thanks for making me last 24 hours hell, and probably ruining my family.
Predictably this lead to him being accused of being an abusive husband by FrenzyJen. More striking is that while the thread was eventually closed (after an endorsement of Mom’s Night Out by FrenzyJen Xanthippe), the moderators never stepped in and reminded the participants that as a Catholic forum intended to “Explain and Defend the Faith”, the focus should not be on sowing feminist rebellion and discord, but on reaffirming Catholic teaching on submission and divorce.

With this in mind, I echo the husband’s plea to the moderators of Catholic Answers Forum. Shut down these poisonous threads which whisper destruction and rebellion into the ears of wives and remind those participating what Catholic teaching actually says*. While it may be enjoyable for those participating, there are real living breathing people (including children) who are being terribly harmed by this.

*I understand that Catholics do not rely solely on the Bible, but also on RCC teaching. As a non Catholic I’m not aware that RCC teaching has overturned Saint Peter’s instruction to wives in 1 Pet 3, but if this is the case I humbly ask my Catholic readers to correct my error.

**Update:** Shortly after I posted this Catholic Answers Forum made the shameful thread I wrote about hidden, although for now at least you can still see it in cached form. Based on this reaction I can only assume they are aware of the plea to stop enabling the destruction of families and felt enough shame to hide the evidence. What isn’t clear is if they will make an appropriate policy change at the moderator’s level. I invite the moderators at Catholic Answer’s Forum to explain what steps are being taken to stop this from happening in the future.

Original housewife image by Tetra Pak (creative commons). Dynamite detonator from this picture by Lilu under WTF Public License (NSFW)
During the discussion of *Worse than fear. Worse than malice*, Escoffier offered an outstanding explanation of our modern sense of moral progress. This was worthy of a stand alone post, and Novaseeker has been kind enough to create one for it: *Escoffier on Modernity and the Embarrassment of Christians*

Nearly everyone today believes in this “arc” at least in a simplified way. The present is believed to be inherently more enlightened that the past. We Don’t Do That Anymore Because We Know Better. And the future will be inevitably more enlightened than the present.

The source of this impression is ultimately perverted or corrupted or mistaken philosophy, but one does not need to have studied philosophy at all to have been affected, even “convinced.”

... 

This, then, is a significant source of the embarrassment. The modern Christian (modern first, Christian second) is embarrassed by the evident conflicts between his nominal faith and his actual, if unconscious, modernity. Modernity trumps. So the offending Scriptures have to be dealt with one way or another...

Follow the link above to Novaseeker’s blog for the full post and discussion.
Empathologism has an excellent post up dissecting a FamilyLife/Dennis Rainey memo on marriage. See the link for Empath’s post and the ensuing discussion, but what struck me about the FamilyLife piece is how utterly devoid it is of a sense of biblical morality. After explaining that at least two thirds of divorces have no possible biblical justification*, Rainey urges his Christian audience:

> If you know people in that situation, urge them to fight for their marriage. Tell them not to quit without taking another lap around the track—without stopping to realize that the best marriage to be in is the one they already have.

The advice to not give up isn’t bad from a practical perspective, as statistically divorce doesn’t tend to make people happy. But by focusing solely on the quality of the romantic relationship, modern Christians like Rainey have accepted the modern secular view of marriage. They have abandoned all that truly makes marriage moral and sacred, and substituted in its place a pledge of allegiance to the fickleness of emotion.

In this new Oprahied view of marriage, marriages need constant “fighting” to ward off the ever present risk of divorce, as if divorce was some magical beast which picks out the weaklings from the herd. Rainey uses this framing throughout the piece:

> One researcher told me that if a couple can find as little as 20 percent of their marriage that they would call satisfactory, they have a better than 90 percent chance of making their marriage better in two years—if they stick with it, if they keep fighting, if they don’t give up and throw in the towel too soon.

This overlooks the simple fact that there is one surefire way to avoid divorce, and it doesn’t involve fighting, going to marriage weekends, or watching the latest “Christian” marriage video series. The surefire way to avoid divorce is simply not to file for divorce. Not divorcing doesn’t require fighting for your marriage, but instead honoring your sacred vow. Should a divorce occur (absent biblical justification) the person who filed is solely responsible, not some failure on the part of the couple to “fight for their marriage”. But this simple fact disarms the apparatus designed to keep husbands in line, and also doesn’t sell books, videos, and marriage retreats.

This leaves the modern marriage defender completely naked to a very common form of criticism. Seeing the reality of modern marriage, the question many astute young people will ask is:

> Isn’t marriage just a piece of paper?

The answer sadly is yes. This new definition of marriage focused on warding off mysterious spirits of unhappiness instead of honoring traditional roles and (true) lifelong commitment really is no different than living together. And living together is itself merely a subcategory of
boyfriend and girlfriend. This new form of marriage modern Christians have adopted is truly nothing more than a state registered form of boyfriend and girlfriend.

The truth of all of this is evident with the great difficulty modern Christians face when trying to explain why this new form of marriage has moral meaning. Back in 2008 FamilyLife spilled a great deal of virtual ink attempting in vain to explain why marriage isn’t just a piece of paper. This should be very easy for any Christian to explain, but they just couldn’t do it.

What is it about marriage which makes it different from other forms of romantic relationships? What makes it moral and sacred? Is it the certificate from the government suitable for framing? Or, perhaps it is the fact that when a woman ends this form of serial monogamous romantic relationship she is rewarded with cash and prizes? Perhaps it is the fact that married people wear rings, as Director Stanton argues in the title of his book?

As Christians we must stop trying to justify the modern definition of marriage and be honest that the question as posed is spot on. Biblical marriage is sacred, holy, and moral, but it isn’t what the vast majority of Christians are thinking of when they answer this question. We have a great deal of baggage here which we must overcome, but once we do we can answer this incisive question with something other than gibberish.

*This is an area where Protestants and Catholics disagree, as Protestants tend to accept a very limited list of reasons as biblically permitted while the Catholic position is that there are no valid reasons for divorce. However, there is also some disagreement between Protestants on what is biblically permitted and either way in practice the very short list of biblical exceptions tends to be ignored. In addition, from a practical perspective the Protestant and Catholic positions aren’t that far apart, as divorce and annulments are taken incredibly lightly, and very few cases of Catholic divorce turn out to actually involve a marriage after all.
When Dennis Rainey got it right.
by Dalrock | June 19, 2014 | Link

I was poking around the FamilyLife site and saw that they have a section for staying married/commitment. In the first post on the list titled 5 Ways to Keep Your Marriage Covenant, Rainey gets the question of divorce right. He focuses on the fact that divorce is not an option and marriage vows are sacred. Interestingly this is a post he wrote after considering the issue for his daughter’s wedding sixteen years ago.

It is striking how differently he describes teaching his daughter on the topic of marriage than FamilyLife has taught so many other men’s daughters. When it came to his daughter’s wedding he doesn’t describe focusing on fighting for their marriage to ward off mysterious spirits of unhappiness, only fighting against the acceptance of divorce:

Finally, urge others to keep their covenant. In the Christian community we need to band together to fight divorce. We serve a God who has gone on record on this topic: “I hate divorce” (Malachi 2:16). We need to combat divorce in the most positive way—by honoring our covenants and encouraging others to do the same. Together we can become known in our culture as the keepers and protectors of the marriage covenant.

In the article he doesn’t describe teaching his daughter how to give her husband a wakeup call by throwing crazed fits or packing up the car and threatening to break up the family. For a wedding gift he doesn’t tell us he offered them one of FamilyLife’s weekend marriage conferences (perhaps with Sheila Gregoire), what he elsewhere calls marriage insurance:

I have to believe, Bob, this weekend conference really is the finest marriage insurance that you could ever buy to be able to, not guarantee your marriage is going to go the distance, but certainly to equip it to go the distance.

No, he tells us he gave them a plaque with their marriage vows, and an unmistakable message that he expected them to honor those vows:

With Ashley’s wedding coming up, I wondered how we could incorporate the concept of covenant in the ceremony. Then I had an inspiration. We took Ashley and Michael’s wedding vows to a calligrapher who inscribed them on a sheet of pure cotton paper.

During their wedding ceremony, after stating their vows verbally, the couple turned and signed their marriage covenant. There was space at the bottom of the covenant for others to sign, and the pastor asked if anyone in the audience wanted to witness the marriage covenant. By doing so people would pledge to pray for Michael and Ashley and promise to hold them accountable for keeping their covenant. A line formed quickly.

...
Ashley and Michael’s covenant now hangs in their home, a constant reminder of their promise of fidelity to each other and of the promise of God to guard and sustain their marriage. It also reminds the rest of us to pray for them and hold them accountable to their vows.

Rainey’s gift stressing the permanence of marriage vows to his daughter and son in law was both loving and wise. If only he carried this loving wisdom into his daily ministry, he would be a powerful force protecting millions of children from the divorce meat-grinder. Moreover, if this was the message consistently coming from FamilyLife, Christians would be much more likely to (in his words):

become known in our culture as the keepers and protectors of the marriage covenant.

**Moderator’s note:** I will remove any comments which are disrespectful of Rainey’s daughter.
ROCD: A clinical case of the Whispers.
by Dalrock | June 23, 2014 | Link

Business Insider has a new article today titled How To Know If You Have The New Condition Called ‘Relationship OCD’. The article suggests the problem is rare, but what they are describing sounds like a clinical version of something I call the whispers, something our culture bombards women with on a daily basis. Here is how Wikipedia describes the symptoms of what it calls Relationship Centered ROCD:

A person may continuously doubt whether they love their partner, whether their relationship is the “right” relationship or whether their partner “really” loves them.[6] Even when they know they love someone or that someone loves them, they constantly check and reassure themselves that it is the right feeling. When they attempt to end the relationship, they are overwhelmed with anxiety. Staying in the relationship, however, they are haunted by continuous doubts regarding the relationship.

Then there are the Partner Focused ROCD symptoms:

Another form of ROCD includes preoccupation, checking, and reassurance seeking behaviors relating to the partner’s perceived flaws.[7] Instead of finding good in their partner, they are constantly focused on their shortcomings. They often exaggerate these “flaws” and use them to prove the relationship is fundamentally bad. The fact that they are unable to concentrate on anything but their partner’s flaws causes the sufferer great anxiety, and often leads to a strained relationship.

While this is a defined disorder, it also describes pretty much every blog or magazine aimed at women in the western world. Seemingly every week there is a new Cosmo quiz to determine if your man is (still) the right man for you. Newspapers around the world warn women that they might be trapped in a semi happy marriage.

Divorcedmoms.com has thoughtfully created a separate section just for moms Thinking About Divorce. This important resource warns women everywhere (but especially mothers) that they may be settling for less than they deserve in a relationship. The Huffington Post helpfully republished the same article to warn their own readers of this hidden danger. In another article divorcedmoms.com offers tips on deciding if you should divorce, including this nifty graphic.

Click to see nifty graphic.

I could go on at length, because entertainment aimed at women is drenched in this. This isn’t just a secular problem either. Every modern Christian’s favorite movie on marriage Fireproof is a story about a woman who has to decide if she should divorce her husband for the doctor she works with. She doesn’t have a Cosmo quiz to help, but with the help of the
Book of Oprah she is able to determine if she loves him or not, and if he loves her enough for them to stay married. I won’t ruin the fun for those ladies who haven’t seen the movie yet, because figuring out if she should stay married or embark on an exciting path of divorce empowerment is the whole fun of the movie.

When you think about the harm this constant sowing of discord causes, it is amazing that our divorce rate isn’t even higher than it is. However, even when this doesn’t lead to a broken home it still creates an incalculable strife in families across the western world.
A young woman turns to the experts at the Ask an Apologist section of Catholic Answers Forum to make sure an evil voice isn’t leading her to sin: Would our heavenly Father give signs to file for divorce? (H/T Daniel Gilson):

Please forgive me if this sounds naive. I am a young woman who is incredibly confused, heart sick and stricken with worries beyond anything I can articulate.

I often meditate as I pray in alone time with God and can sense a powerful, goosebump-evoking presence when I do so. I ask the Lord questions in my heart and I hear answers back but I am so worried that I could be confusing those answers for my own humanly voice or my biggest fear – the voice of the evil one trying to persuade me to go down the wrong path.

I feel in my heart that I need to leave my marriage. There is no abuse or evil happening to me from my spouse and I would clog up this question box if I went into all of the details. When I pray about it, I hear the answer telling me to “GO” and to have faith that the Lord will help me survive. A fear I face, is that if I go on my own, I will face many troubles financially which is a reality that I will have to endure. I’m driven and motivated, and I feel that God has given me talents, blessings, and an opportunity to do something magnificent with the life He has given me. And I feel an overwhelming sense that I need to just trust Him that it will all be ok if I just take this risk and do this.

Would our Lord ever try to guide someone to leave a spouse??? Please, I beg you if you can’t answer my question Apologist, I desperately and humbly ask for your prayer.

Fr. Vincent Serpa, O.P. answered:

Dear friend,

The Catholic Church does allow a Catholic to file for divorce as a legal means of equitably dividing goods that were held in common. This is not to say that the state has the power to dissolve a valid marriage.

As to whether God is telling you to leave, I cannot say. You haven’t given your reasons. Certainly, you are in our prayers.

Fr. Vincent Serpa, O.P.

Note: I’ve saved a page print for my own reference because the last time I exposed something shameful at CAF the moderators responded by hiding the evidence.  As of the
writing of this post the linked question and answer are still visible, but this could well be hidden by the moderators at CAF soon.
In the discussion of the last post Cail noted what seems to be a non sequitur in the priest’s reply:

I commented on this on the other thread before I realized you’d started a new one from it, so I’ll just summarize: this is typical CAF, technically correct (the part on divorce, not the last part), but ultimately misleading. What he says about the state’s power to dissolve the legal relationship but not the sacrament (wish he’d used that word) is true, but irrelevant to the question of a woman who feels the urge to leave her husband for no particular reason and is working very hard to convince herself that God is personally telling her to do so. She’s looking for spiritual guidance and he goes on a tangent about who gets the lawnmower. That part is just weird.

I thought that at first as well, but after re reading the exchange it isn’t a non sequitur at all. As part of her question she said she wants to frivorce but fears doing so will cause her to struggle financially. In response, he reminds her about the cash and prizes she will be rewarded with if she betrays her marriage vows. Here are the relevant excerpts from the full exchange.

Her:

A fear I face, is that if I go on my own, I will face many troubles financially which is a reality that I will have to endure. I’m driven and motivated, and I feel that God has given me talents, blessings, and an opportunity to do something magnificent with the life He has given me. And I feel an overwhelming sense that I need to just trust Him that it will all be ok if I just take this risk and do this[divorce].

The priest:

The Catholic Church does allow a Catholic to file for divorce as a legal means of equitably dividing goods that were held in common.

See also: Don’t forget your 30 pieces of silver.
Do not let your adornment be merely outward—arranging the hair, wearing gold, or putting on fine apparel—rather let it be the hidden person of the heart, with the incorruptible beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is very precious in the sight of God. For in this manner, in former times, the holy women who trusted in God also adorned themselves, being submissive to their own husbands,

— 1 Pet 3:3-5 (NKJV)

My wife described the message of the following Pantene commercial as “Don’t say sorry and have pretty hair”. What struck me about it is how it is the direct opposite of what the Apostle Peter tells us is pleasing to God.
As I’ve mentioned in the past the convergence of feminists and conservatives, especially on the issue of marriage, is quite striking. Since conservatives lack an immovable reference point to anchor their views, they inadvertently find themselves conserving the radical changes feminists have wrought on our culture. Feminism is the new social order, and conservatives conserve the social order. Likewise since feminism is the new social order, feminists find themselves less and less pushing for radical change and more and more working to conserve the social order they have created.

Feminist and manosphere tag-along Bodycrimes has a post up which is the latest in a long line of examples of this. In Misogyny makes men poorer, she voices her fear that today’s young men are losing sight of the value of (modern) marriage:

What’s so interesting about the hard-core misogynists is that they believe women divorce men for no other reason than to get “cash and prizes” – an unfair share of the wealth that men have built up. Here’s the thing, though – without their wives, these men wouldn’t have the assets. They would have remained like MajorStyles, pissing their money away in having a good time, and thereby wrecking their financial future.

She of course starts by misrepresenting the problem with frivolous divorce. I don’t know anyone who claims that women only divorce for cash and prizes. With perhaps a few exceptions, women divorce for the same reason men like Roissy avoid marriage and instead maintain a harem; they feel that it is to their benefit to do so, and they aren’t about to be constrained by what they see as outdated rules of sexual morality. For women the most sexually profitable time to eschew marriage is when they are young and beautiful, and as a result we see women not just delaying marriage but showing a marked preference for young divorce. The cash and prizes are merely a reward women receive for not honoring their marriage vows when they feel that not honoring their vows would be to their advantage.

Note that ignoring or denying the problem with paying women cash and prizes as a reward for divorcing is the mainstream conservative view. If men find themselves on the business end of a frivolous divorce, they must have had it coming. Much of this view on the conservative side is due to the contempt for biblical headship modern Christians share with feminists. Without thinking the issue through, modern Christians have thoroughly embraced the idea that women deserve cash and prizes when they break their vows. This is why everyone from FotF to a Catholic priest makes it a point to remind women not to forget their 30 pieces of silver when betraying their marriage vows.

All of this is of course done while denying the shameless obsession modern women have with divorce. Nothing to see here folks, move along...

But dismissing frivolous divorce rewarded by cash and prizes is something Bodycrimes does on the way to making her larger point, that marriage is a wealth generating engine. While
this is true, she is ignoring the fact that marriage as currently designed is an engine whereby women can and very often do trick men into creating wealth which (along with his children) they can then take from him. Those who would object to the observation that this is how modern marriage is designed to work are of course welcome to point out what meaningful checks are included in our family court structure to prevent women from abusing this new (sexual morality free) form of marriage. Of course there are no checks against using modern marriage this way, because this truly is how it is designed.

The other part of the denial here is the unspoken premise that men magically “enjoy” a productivity increase when they marry. In this as well she is not alone, in that conservatives have wholeheartedly adopted the same view. This overlooks the obvious, that under a marriage based system men have powerful incentives to work hard to first attract a wife and then to support his wife and children. Academics are dumbfounded as to why men become more productive after marrying, while women become less productive. The answer of course is right there in plain sight but it doesn’t fit the feminist worldview, which of course is the new conservative worldview as well. Certainly every family court judge knows that when you strip a man of his role as husband and take away his children a new mechanism must be employed to keep this man working as hard as he has previously worked.

Bodycrimes herself is at least casually acquainted with the mechanism which makes married men more productive, as she explained in her previous post Did men think up civilization all by themselves?

...this made me realise the truth of the old saying – behind every great man is a woman. Some bloke may well have built the first toilet. But it probably wasn’t his idea. Behind that first design was a woman telling him exactly where the shit should go, and how to redirect the smells, and how comfy the seat needed to be. She probably even sketched it out for him. She certainly nagged him and nagged him until he got up and built the thing. And then once he’d done that she started in on the need for toilet paper.

This is as you might have already recognized the stock argument conservatives have regarding marriage. Having a wife nagging you will make you better, or as Pastor Driscoll likes to say:

Men are like trucks: they drive straighter with a weighted load.

It is important to remember that while it is true that biblical marriage is profoundly beneficial for men, women, children, and our society, this isn’t what bodycrimes and Pastor Driscoll are selling. Moreover, it isn’t women who civilize men, but marriage which civilizes men and men who civilize women.

That Bodycrimes and Pastor Driscoll both are brooding over the fact that weak men are screwing feminism up should no longer be a surprise to my readers. Both are after all deeply troubled that fewer and fewer men are signing up to marry women once they have attained their feminist merit badge. If we don’t change this course soon, large numbers of women could become trapped working like a man. However, Bodycrimes herself expresses astonishment that she is now a champion of (modern) marriage:
I want to add that I’m kind of amazed to find myself writing this. In my uni days, I was very against marriage, because the traditional institution can be very cruel to women. I’ve revised my thinking for a number of reasons, some of which I want to explore further in this blog. But for the moment, just remember one thing when it comes to marriage: the numbers don’t lie. Marriage is a vehicle for wealth creation.

It really shouldn’t amaze her, since the “marriage” she is championing is a wholly feminist creation. The ones who should be shocked are the conservatives conserving feminism, but so far very few seem to be willing to acknowledge this.

Regardless, feminists like Bodycrimes and her conservative allies are barking up the wrong tree. The decline in marriage rates isn’t due to a marriage strike, at least not in the traditional sense of the word strike. Articles telling men to man up won’t solve this problem, because what we are seeing is the logical cultural response to moving from a rewards based structure to a quota based structure. We are in this sense re-fighting the cold war, but this time on the losing side.
Does Shaunti Feldhahn’s rosy divorce data prove that no fault divorce is working out pretty well after all?

by Dalrock | July 5, 2014 | Link

A few weeks ago I asked why modern Christians are so delighted with current divorce rates. As I explained in the post, Shaunti Feldhahn has a new book* and multiple articles proclaiming the good news about our current no fault divorce/sexual morality free form of marriage. I previously avoided delving into her questionable statistics to focus on what I see as a defense of our new form of marriage. In this post I’ll review some of her bold claims and the problematic statistics she offers as evidence to support those claims.

Before I dive into her claims and statistics, it is important to note that statistics around marriage and divorce can be difficult to pin down. In some cases this is because the data doesn’t exist, either because no one has collected the data or we are talking about future events. But even when the data is available and free from controversy it is easy to become confused as to what the data means. When looking at marriage and divorce data you need to always be clear about what question you are trying to answer, and what any given statistic actually tells you. For example, it has been widely reported that we are currently experiencing an “explosion” of grey divorce. There is a kernel of truth here, as divorce rates per 1,000 married women have risen in the older age brackets over the last 20 years, while divorce rates for younger age brackets have declined some. However, this has been widely misreported as couples experiencing an increase in divorce rates around retirement age. This is simply untrue, as divorce rates decline dramatically as the wife ages. Likewise, I’ve previously explained the problem with the way the marriage rate per 1,000 unmarried women is often interpreted.

The answer to these challenges is to be very careful in what data you use and what conclusions you draw from it. This is unfortunately where Feldhahn goes terribly wrong right out of the gate, with the very title of her Catalyst article: Everything We Think We Know About Marriage and Divorce is Wrong. She reinforces this in bold and all caps at the beginning of the article:

I ALSO HAD NO IDEA THAT EVERY ONE OF THE STATISTICS I WAS QUOTING – STATISTICS THAT FIT BOTH WITH CONVENTIONAL WISDOM AND WHAT I SAW REPORTED IN THE MEDIA – WERE NOWHERE CLOSE TO TRUE!

Feldhahn isn’t trying to explain some of the finer points on divorce data, she is claiming the data commonly used is nowhere close to true. This is a bold claim, and proving it would require bold evidence. What she offers instead is more confusion.

Do 40-50% of marriages really end in divorce?

To answer this question in a meaningful way we need to be specific about which marriages we are discussing. Divorce rates vary widely depending on the demographic you are looking at as well as the time frame in question. Also, if we are talking about lifetime divorce rates
for a cohort which is still alive, all we can do is create our best model to guess at what the cohort’s lifetime divorce rate will ultimately be.

Feldham makes the extraordinary claim that divorce rates have never come close to the 40-50% statistic often quoted:

Now, expert demographers continue to project that 40-50% of couples will get divorced - but it is important to remember that those are projections. And I’m skeptical because the actual numbers have never come close, and divorce rates continue to drop, not rise! Even among the highest-risk age group - baby boomers—seven in ten are still married to their first spouse. Most of them have had 30 years’ worth of chances to get divorced...and they are still together.

However, her claim about baby boomer divorce rates is misleading at best, or perhaps outright untrue. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 45% of the youngest (ever married) boomers have experienced one or more divorces:

Eighty-seven percent of baby boomers born in the years 1957-1964 had married at least once by the time they reached age 46. Of those who had married, 45 percent had experienced at least one divorce.

Note that above she claimed actual divorce rates have never come close to the 40-50% range, and offered the boomers as proof of this. Yet according to the BLS, the younger half of the boomers already have a 45% divorce rate, exactly in the middle of the very range she is claiming we have never come close to. Note also that this is the floor of this cohort’s divorce rates, as more divorces will occur until they have all passed away.

Feldhahn offers her own estimate of the lifetime divorce rate:

No-one knows what the average first-marriage divorce rate actually is, but based on the rate of widowhood and other factors, we can estimate it is probably closer to 20-25%. For all marriages (including second marriages, and so on), it is in the 31-35% range, depending on the study.

As she herself points out, the kind of lifetime divorce rates she is describing are projections based on the best guess of the person making the prediction. There is no hard data on what the divorce rates will turn out to be (in retrospect) 20 years from today. All we have are educated guesses based on the past, and these are highly dependent on the credibility of the person making the guess. Nothing that I’ve seen of Feldhahn’s handling of the data gives me any reason to believe that she is better at modeling this than the demographers she is claiming to debunk.

Torturing the Barna data until it confesses.

Feldhahn also explains that the Barna data has been terribly misunderstood. I don’t doubt that, given the nature of the statistics involved. However, she goes a step further and re runs the Barna data to see what divorce rates look like for Christians who regularly attend church:
The Barna Group studies were focusing specifically on the divorce rates of those with Christian and non-Christian belief systems and didn’t take worship attendance into account. So I partnered with the Barna Group and we re-ran the numbers: and if the person was in church last week, their divorce rate dropped by 27%. And that is one of the smallest drops found in recent studies: overall, regular church attendance lowers the divorce rate anywhere from 25-50%, depending on the study you look at.

This is very problematic, because she is using current (at the time of the survey) church attendance to explain previous divorce. It could well be that going to church regularly leads to lower divorce rates. However, it could just as easily be that getting divorced tends to cause people to not attend church. The mechanism for this latter possibility could be that the person feels too ashamed of their decision to divorce to continue attending. It could also be that the person who was divorced against their will left the church in outrage when their church failed to stand by biblical marriage.

But even if we could determine that people who go to church today have a lower risk of experiencing divorce in the future, there is still the problem of telling how much of this is due the impact of going to church verses a correlation with something else. For example, divorce rates vary dramatically based on education levels:

![Divorces per 1,000 Married Women by the Wife's Educational Attainment](http://dalrock.wordpress.com/)

Values from Fig 1 of [http://www.bgsu.edu/content/dam/BGSU/college-of-arts-and-sciences/NCFMR/documents/FP/FP-14-09-divorce-rate-2012.pdf](http://www.bgsu.edu/content/dam/BGSU/college-of-arts-and-sciences/NCFMR/documents/FP/FP-14-09-divorce-rate-2012.pdf)

Is there something being taught in college or something about campus life which helps women honor their marriage vows? Almost certainly not, because if so then we would expect women with some college to do better than those who never went at all. And why do those who didn’t graduate high school have lower divorce rates than those who graduated or received their GED? The simplest answer is that when we look at educational attainment it very often tends to tell us more about the person themselves rather than what they learned on campus**.
Regarding college attendance vs graduation, the key factor would seem to be the person’s tendency to see a long term project through. This is relevant to Feldhahn’s analysis of the Barna data because going to church every week is also very likely a measure of follow through. The message about sexual morality at the church could be no better than the message young people are learning at college, and we would still expect to find that regular church attendance is strongly correlated with lower levels of divorce.

**Conclusion**

Feldhahn makes sweeping claims about divorce rate statistics without offering compelling evidence to back them up. Her claim that we have never seen a 40-50% divorce rate is simply untrue, and several other statistics she offers are highly misleading at best. However, even with the glaring problems with the statistics she presents, the far bigger issue is the desire to put a happy face on our new sexual-morality-free view of marriage. In this new view marriage isn’t about making and keeping a lifetime vow, it is about couples therapy. Lifetime marriage is no longer seen as the moral place for romantic love and sex, but instead romantic love is seen as the moral place for sex and marriage. Nearly all Christians have adopted the same view as the rest of the culture, where the focus is now to make the couple (mostly the wife) happy enough in their marriage that they won’t choose to divorce. This new view of marriage is front and center in Feldhahn’s conclusion of the Catalyst article (emphasis mine):

> Those of us who work with marriages may secretly wonder whether there is reason for our ministry, if the news about the divorce rate is better than we think. And the answer is a resounding yes. Because I have seen in the research what every marriage counselor knows intimately: divorce isn’t the greatest threat to marriage. Discouragement is.

*I have not read the book, so this post is focused on the statistics she presents in the articles. However, the articles are part of the promotion of her book, and far more people will be influenced by the statistics she presents in her articles than will read her book.

**In the case of divorce rates for those who didn’t graduate high school being lower than those who did graduate, the unexpected result here appears to be explained by different divorce patterns among first generation immigrants. When foreign born women are excluded, this paper notes that high school graduates divorce at lower rates than those who didn’t complete high school:

> When analyses are limited to native-born women, the relationship is no longer curvilinear; the highest educated women have the lowest rates of first divorce (14.5) compared to those with less than a high school education (20.9), high school diploma/GED (18.0) and some college (24.2) per 1,000.

**See Also:** Nowhere close to true.
Nowhere close to true.
by Dalrock | July 10, 2014 | Link

I’ve done a bit more digging for the source of the data Shaunti Feldhahn shared in the articles promoting her book (see previous post). She mentions 2009 Census data, and I recalled that the SIPP data from the US Census Bureau includes information on marital and divorce history. The publication Number, Timing and Duration of Marriages and Divorces: 2009 looked at first like it might be the source of the data she references when she writes in her Catalyst article (emphasis hers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Good News</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Perhaps most surprising, half of all marriages are not ending in divorce. According to the Census Bureau, **72% of those who have ever been married, are still married to their first spouse!** And the 28% who aren’t, includes everyone who was married for many years, until a spouse died. No-one knows what the average first-marriage divorce rate actually is, but based on the rate of widowhood and other factors, we can estimate it is probably closer to 20-25%. For all marriages (including second marriages, and so on), it is in the 31-35% range, depending on the study.

In the Christian Post article she describes the 72% statistic as coming from US Census data for 2009:

> …according to 2009 Census Bureau numbers, 72% of people are still married to their first spouse – and the 28% who aren’t, includes people who were married for years until a spouse died!

As I mentioned above, this made me optimistic that I had found the right publication, or at least the right data set. However, the data in the Census report doesn’t match the statistic she is quoting. Table 6 has the data to make this calculation, but when I look at the table for those 15 and over and divide the percent still married to their first spouse by the percent ever married, it comes out to 63% (42.5/67) for men and 56% (40.6/72.8) for women. The weighted average for both sexes is 59%. None of these numbers are close to the 72% she is asserting.

One possibility is that she was mistakenly dividing the percent still in their first marriage by the percent who married only once, as commenter jf12 suspected. For women 15 and older this comes out to 70.6% (40.6/57.5). This still isn’t a perfect match, but it is very close (only one point away after rounding). However, this method of calculation excludes all cases where the first marriage ended (due to death or divorce) and the woman went on to remarry. Remarriage shouldn’t be considered at all when making this calculation.

If I come across her book in a bookstore I’ll see if I can find the exact data source and calculation she used to come up with her 72% number. Either way, even the 72% figure contradicts her other assertion that the “real” divorce rate is closer to 20-25%. Since this calculation is for all age groups, it is going to include a fair number of relatively recently
married people who haven’t yet had much exposure to the risk of divorce. A far better option would be to focus on those later in life. Fortunately Table 2 in the same Census publication breaks out the percentage of ever married women who have ever divorced by age (click for larger view):

Table 2.
Percent Ever Divorced for Ever-Married Women by Age, Race, and Hispanic Origin, for Selected Years: 1996 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>25 to 29 years</th>
<th>30 to 34 years</th>
<th>35 to 39 years</th>
<th>40 to 44 years</th>
<th>45 to 49 years</th>
<th>50 to 54 years</th>
<th>55 to 59 years</th>
<th>60 to 64 years</th>
<th>65 to 69 years</th>
<th>70 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, this is slightly different than the percentage of women whose first marriage ended in divorce, since it is possible that for some women their first marriage ended with the death of their husband and one or more subsequent remarriages ended in divorce. Still, this figure doesn’t fit with her claim in the Catalyst article that 70% of ever married boomers are still with their first spouses:

| Even among the highest-risk age group—baby boomers—seven in ten are still married to their first spouse. Most of them have had 30 years’ worth of chances to get divorced...and they are still together. |

Since 41% of ever married women in their 50s and 37% of ever married women in their 60s have divorced at least once, this means that no more than 59% of the former and 63% the latter are still together in their first marriage (and the numbers would be even smaller if we accounted for first marriage widows who didn’t remarry and later divorce). Thus this data set doesn’t fit with her 70% claim. It is possible that she used a different data source to come up with her seven in ten figure, but at the very least there is alternate data (Table 2 above, as well as here) showing something quite different than what she claims.

As I mentioned in my last post another claim she made is that we haven’t seen anything close to a 40-50% divorce rate:

| Now, expert demographers continue to project that 40-50% of couples will get divorced – but it is important to remember that those are projections. And I’m skeptical because the actual numbers have never come close, and divorce rates continue to drop, not rise! |

The same Census publication has a chart showing that as of 2009 the first marriage divorce rate for women leveled out at around 40%. While the data points presented above have problems around potential deaths of the first spouse, this chart only calculates cumulative divorce rates for first marriages: (click for larger version)
If she had said the actual rate is closer to 40% than the 40-50% range often quoted, she would be on much more solid footing. But her claim is that the divorce rate has never been *anywhere near* the 40-50% range, as well as stating that our average first marriage divorce rate is roughly 20-25%. Neither of these claims can be correct unless there is a major problem with the data the Census Bureau used to compile the chart in Figure 5.

**Update:** Reader Micha Elyi offered more detail from Feldhahn’s book. I had the right table but the wrong calculation. However, the numbers still don’t match.
The Dalrock research department* brought the latest divorce empowerment movie to my attention:

My first thought was that we are due for another epic divorce fantasy (courtesy of Oprah of course), with Eat Pray Love showing its age. On the surface, this movie has modern women written all over it:

- ROCD? Check
- Divorce Empowerment? Check!
- Moxie? Check!
- Having it all? Check!

It even stars Reese Witherspoon. Even so, and even though divorce fantasy is normally a foolproof formula for attracting a female audience, I don’t think this movie will do well. The creators have forgotten a key rationalization modern women still require with their divorce fantasies, the rationalization of spiritual morality. This rationalization is absolutely essential to avoid raising the audience’s slut shield.

Seeing the divorcée as a slut inhibits a woman’s ability to truly fantasize about breaking up her family. For most modern women the specific kind of spiritual cover for the empowered divorcée’s sluttiness is mostly unimportant, or at the most a matter of taste. What matters is that the cover is there and that the woman breaking up her family is seen as moral. For most modern women the Hindu aspect of Eat Pray Love was sufficient, with the very title assuring them of Elizabeth’s spiritual purity. However, at least some modern Christian women would have been put off by the fact that the moral cover for Elizabeth’s sluttery was something other than Christianity. In this case Fireproof is the natural alternative. Some of my longtime readers may recall when Sheila Gregoire commented on this site strongly objecting to my characterization of the wife in Fireproof as “whorish”. Thinking of the wife as whorish would prevent the women in the audience from identifying with the wife and thereby ruin the whole divorce fantasy.

This is where the Wild movie trailer falls down in a serious way, because even modern women have their limits on what level of sluttiness they will accept. Not only does the trailer fail to provide sufficient moral cover for the intrepid divorcée, it portrays her as having been both a hard drug addict and a slut:

| You’re using heroin, and you are having sex with anyone who asks.

*Mrs Dalrock
Aside from our inverting the roles of romantic love and marriage, another striking feature of our new view of sexual morality is the embrace of serial monogamy as the pinnacle of sexual virtue. Indeed, serial monogamy is now generally considered more moral than lifetime marriage, because it facilitates an unfettered focus on romantic love. Women especially are regularly advised that it would be an act of virtue and courage for them to leave their marriage should they be experiencing anything but quintessential romantic love.

Serial monogamy is elevated to such lofty heights in our society that it would be easy to forget that all it really means is one at a time. Women will always search for a societal definition of the boundary between good girls and sluts, and our current answer is:

| Good girls don’t do more than one man at a time. |

Many would assume that modern women no longer care about such trivialities as the difference between good girls and sluts, especially since we now have sluts literally marching down the streets of every major western city. While this mistake is understandable, it misconstrues what the slutwalks are all about. The slutwalkers claim to embrace the term slut, but if they didn’t feel a powerful stigma they wouldn’t be protesting. If the slutwalkers really wanted to show how unconcerned they are with the stigma of the word, they would proudly display the number of penises they had personally sampled, each eager to one up the more prude and inexperienced in their ranks. But this would be taking the whole slut thing a bit too far, so very few women would be willing to march with an honest number.
Rebecca Vipond Brink at The Frisky recently posted an excellent example of all of this in *Girl Talk: It’s Not Wrong To Date While You’re Divorcing*:

I started dating immediately after I told my now-ex that I wanted to get a divorce. This was because, as one of my friends very aptly put it, I wasn’t really “rebounding” so much as just “bounding” — rebounding assumes that you’re bouncing off of something, and I wanted a divorce because my marriage no longer qualified as a relationship.

The problem occurred when some of the men she was dating declined to have sex with her because she was still legally married:

I think I dated maybe eight men in a six-month period. Two of them (so we’re talking 25 percent) enjoyed my company, enjoyed the sex, and then all of a sudden decided to tell me that they “couldn’t” date me because it was morally wrong because I was “still married.”

Obviously she felt the burn of being slut shamed by these men, or she wouldn’t have bothered writing an article complaining about the terrible unfairness of it all. For those who aren’t familiar with the Frisky, it is important to note that this isn’t a site with anything like a traditional bent, and Ms. Brink is anything but conservative. If you doubt this, take a look at Ms Brink’s [other articles], her [Flickr page], or this picture, one of many of her [self portraits].

Yet even a free spirited woman like Ms. Brink feels compelled to write an article explaining that in having sex with new men before her divorce was finalized, she wasn’t really violating the “one at a time” rule of modern chastity.

All of this is important to remember when you hear women complaining about how terribly oppressive the old rules of sexual morality were to women:

1. No matter how free spirited the woman, she will still seek out the current definition of chastity in order to separate herself from those slutty women who don’t follow the rules.
2. No matter how low the bar is, women will always loudly complain that the rules are too constricive, and therefore cruel to women.

Take a number picture by [Eric B](archive).

*July 18th Edit:* The original link for “other articles” mistakenly pointed to a meetup page of for Ms. Brink. I had intended to link to the full list of her articles at The Frisky. I have since corrected this error.
Bad Grandpa Solipsism.
by Dalrock | July 15, 2014 | Link

Bad Grandpa is Johnny Knoxville doing a Jackass skit extended to a feature film. I’ve coded the video to start at 1 minute 11 seconds where they start discussing the bed he is selling. Note that if you choose to start it from the beginning instead it is pretty vulgar at points.

| Lets not make this all about you honey. |
Atheist Adam Lee’s smear campaign to silence my discussion of Christian sexual morality.
by Dalrock | July 17, 2014 | Link

Adam Lee AKA the Daylight Atheist has asked his twitter followers to falsely report my blog to wordpress for abuse. I’m writing this post to help anyone from wordpress understand the nature of the smear campaign against me, and to also ensure that I have the opportunity to defend myself against this smear campaign while I still have a platform to do so.

Adam Lee is a blogger on Patheos who focuses on attacking Christians whom he accuses of being liars. However, Lee isn’t above lying himself when he gets the opportunity to silence a blogger like myself who dares to write about Christian sexual morality:

First, this isn’t an MRA blog. I am not an MRA, I am a Christian and I write almost exclusively about a topic I have great passion for; marriage. However, MRAs do read my blog and are part of the conversation.

More importantly, the blog post which caused Adam Lee to organize a campaign to have me silenced wasn’t abuse, it was a discussion of sexual morality. In my post One at a time, please I pointed out that since we have abandoned biblical sexual morality we have ended up with the incredibly low standard of serial monogamy, which when you boil it down simply means “one at a time”. In that post I pointed to a columnist on the gossip site* The Frisky who wrote about having sex with multiple men after telling her husband she wanted a divorce but before the divorce was official. To be clear, this is a woman gossiping about her sex life on a gossip site she writes for. This wasn’t me exposing anything in her personal life that she hadn’t decided to share with everyone who will listen. In the same post, I linked to the woman’s personal blog where she has a dedicated section of self portraits, as well as to her public Flickr page. These links were in context with the point of my post which was that even a free spirit like the woman at the Frisky felt compelled to demonstrate that she was complying with our new (but meaningless) definition of sexual morality.

The gossip columnist was incensed, and reached out over Twitter to fellow atheist Adam Lee
asking him to organize a campaign of atheists to (falsely) report this blog to wordpress for abuse:

I want to reiterate that this is an entirely false charge. All I am guilty of is discussing sexual morality from a Christian perspective. This is something Adam Lee is on record as being against, so I’m not surprised that he would dislike my post as well as my site. However, this cowardly attempt to silence someone who doesn’t share his anti Christian views of sexual morality is beneath contempt. If Lee had any faith in his own beliefs and talent as a writer he wouldn’t feel the need to silence those he disagrees with.

I have faith in WordPress’ stated commitment to supporting free speech, including the speech of traditional Christians like myself, no matter how much my very existence offends atheists like Adam Lee.

*The Frisky’s main title is:
Commitment issues.
by Dalrock | July 18, 2014 | Link

The dominant, unchallenged narrative is that men have problems with commitment, while women are naturally inclined to commit for life. Yet the difference between the dominant narrative and reality couldn’t be more stark. Women in the western world are obsessed with fantasies of divorce and ending relationships, for any or no reason at all.

Jennifer McDonald at Slate offers us the latest installment in this shameless obsession with her review of the chick crack book Nobody Is Ever Missing*:

> There are days when you awake and want to blow up your relationship. Perhaps things are mildly bad, or perhaps they are horrible, or perhaps there’s nothing for any reasonable human to complain about, but anyhow, something has happened, something has shifted, and in that moment of waking, were you to follow your whims, they would spirit you away to another bed, another city, another life. Sometimes this fantasy swoops in only for a quick spot of tea. Other times it arrives loaded with baggage and settles in for a good long visit, long enough that your discontentedness grows, and you begin acting strangely. You cheat. You…

> …inform your other half, who may or may not have seen it coming. Belongings are packed. Excuses are made. “It’s not you, it’s me.”

For those who find this too subtle, as you scroll down the review up pops:

> SOMETIMES YOU JUST FEEL LIKE BLOWING UP YOUR MARRIAGE.

There are even helpful shortcuts to facilitate sharing this message of familial destruction with other women on Twitter and Facebook.

Of course it isn’t just the ladies at Slate who pass their days fantasizing about broken homes. This is a staple in women’s entertainment because it is what the audience demands. As just one example, a reviewer on Amazon.com praises the book’s empowering message with a four star review titled “Finding yourself”:

> Elyria takes off for New Zealand, without even giving a heads up to her husband. She is seeking, searching, for her truest self, and attempting to unscramble the cognitive dissonance between her outer and inner selves. She senses what she calls the wildebeest in her, caught between two impulses of wanting to be here in love and wanting to walk away like it never happened. Her way of thinking is often circuitous and epigrammatic, such as “…and it seems the wildebeest was what was wrong with me, but I wasn’t entirely sure of what was wrong with the wildebeest.” This strain of opposites and paradox filled out Elyria’s psyche and also made her feel shriveled.

This kind of obsession in all forms of women’s entertainment is now so common that no one notices it. Our denial is so strong that we overlook what the divorce data makes abundantly
clear. Women (in general) have serious issues with commitment, to a far greater degree than men (in general) do. Were we to acknowledge this we could save millions of children the pain of growing up with their fathers expelled from the home. Sooner or later we are bound to adjust the narrative to reflect reality. The sooner we do so the better for all involved. It isn't just men and children who suffer because this pathology is openly encouraged in our culture, but women themselves. Nurturing these obsessive and destructive fantasies is no more healthy or empowering for a woman than a flask of bourbon is to an alcoholic.

*Hat Tip ISA and Pirran.*
Repackaging feminism as Christian wisdom.

by Dalrock | July 20, 2014 | Link

Repackaging modern thought into a Christian and counter cultural sounding message is extremely common, and something I’m convinced conservative Christian men and women do without ever being aware of what they are doing. We’ve seen this with the CBMW inventing the (feminist) sin of servility, laying an extra (and unbiblical) burden on Christian wives trying to fight the culture in order to follow the Bible. We can also see this with Director Stanton explaining that women are innately good, as well as pastors explaining that women are light years closer to God than men are. As I’ve explained, much of the problem is that conservatives find themselves conserving the new social order (feminism), while feminists ironically find themselves becoming conservative to protect the new feminist order they have created.

But another part of this is the blind spot modern Christians have when it comes to women sinning. There is a near complete inability to recognize what women sinning looks like. The only sin modern Christians can imagine women committing is the (again feminist) sin of lacking self esteem. Whenever modern Christians see signs of women sinning, they look for the devious man who must have forced the poor woman to go against her innately-good-but-servile nature. This takes a good deal of rationalizing, but it is something we (collectively) have gotten quite good at. We see a woman seeking out sexual attention in any number of sinful ways, ways the Old Testament describes in detail, and we just know they are only looking for love and lifelong commitment. All of the young women competing to hook up with the campus alpha or dancing topless on tables at spring break? They are really just trying to find a man who will commit to them. This isn’t what the sinful expression of women’s sexual nature looks like; they are only victims. A woman blew an entire bar? Men must have tricked her into it (H/T Oscar). When women delay marriage until the last possible minute and shamelessly obsess about escaping commitment, we just know this is because men aren’t manning up and committing to women*.

Don’t get me wrong. Women don’t have the market cornered on being fallen. Men are plenty sinful too. The problem we have however is while we have a fairly accurate understanding of the way men tend to be tempted into sin, we are in complete denial of the temptations women experience. Some might misunderstand this as giving women an “unfair advantage” when it comes to sin, but the truth is just the opposite. Giving women a leg up into sin isn’t kindness, it is cruelty. It isn’t loving or protective, it is cowardly. Yet at the same time it feels brave, kind, loving, and protective. Ironically the way men are currently failing women is at the heart of men’s sinful nature, all the way back to our original sin.

As just one example of packaging modern/feminist thought as Christian wisdom, Matt Walsh has a post up titled Dear daughter, please believe me that you’re beautiful. Nearly all of it could have come straight from a Women’s Studies course, but what modern Christian would recognize this? Even the extremely sharp and highly respected John C. Wright doesn’t see it.
Walsh explains that the main problem with our current culture is that it doesn't tell women that they are beautiful enough, strong enough, and special enough. It isn't that our culture isn't broken; it certainly is. But Walsh's critique is the feminist critique. He even bemoans his own male privilege:

I guess I've learned to take a few things for granted. As a guy, I can walk into any clothing store and find something that A) fits, and B) provides my body with basic coverage, which is the whole reason clothing exists in the first place, according to Wikipedia. As you will eventually discover, women have an entirely different experience. For them, even something as simple as clothes shopping becomes an all out assault on their values, priorities, and body image.

While this is a post Walsh has framed as a letter to his daughter, I'll respond to this as a general post on advice to young Christian women (see moderator's note below). The problem with the post is its feminist frame, and its denial of the role women's temptations to sin are playing in shaping the culture. The shops at the mall haven't conspired to force young women to misuse their sexuality. Not too long ago we collectively decided that moral constraints on women's sexuality were unfair, and tossed them aside. What we are seeing now is where this lack of moral constraint is taking us. Women are being tempted by the culture, but they are being tempted to do something any student of the Old Testament should understand. They are being tempted to do things our great grandmothers understood. We can’t even think let alone use the word harlot, yet we have sluts marching down main-street. While it is true that it is a challenge for a modest woman to find suitable clothing, the reason for this isn’t because men or evil capitalists have colluded to keep modest clothing away from the rack, it is because the vast majority of women are choosing immodest clothing out of a desire to misuse their sexual power.

We don’t help women by denying all of this, or by repeatedly telling women they are beautiful no matter what and begging them to believe it. We don’t help women by adopting their own blind spot regarding their temptation to sin. We help women by manning up and helping them be honest about their own temptations to sin, and we help them by teaching them what God finds beautiful:

Do not let your adornment be merely outward—arranging the hair, wearing gold, or putting on fine apparel—4 rather let it be the hidden person of the heart, with the incorruptible beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is very precious in the sight of God. 5 For in this manner, in former times, the holy women who trusted in God also adorned themselves, being submissive to their own husbands.

- 1 Pet 3:3-5 (NKJV)

The problem isn’t that modern women want to be beautiful, nor is it that they aren’t told enough how beautiful they are, how special they are, or how perfect they are. The problem is that modern women aren’t focusing their desire to be beautiful in the right ways. They shouldn’t strive to be beautiful for the other women around them, nor for the men they meet in public. They should strive to be beautiful to the Lord, and to be beautiful to their own husbands.
*I shared my thoughts on this other post by Walsh when asked about it in the discussion of a previous post. My comments in response are here and here.

**Moderator's Note:** Please avoid referencing Walsh’s children (or anyone else’s) in the discussion of the post and instead focus on what is wise advice regarding young Christian women (or men) in general. Comments which don’t follow this rule will be deleted.

**See Also:** If we were as foolish about male sexuality as we are about female sexuality.
Christian blank slatism.
by Dalrock | July 21, 2014 | Link

I started this as a comment in the discussion of my previous post. However, given the difficulty many had spotting the problem with Walsh’s framing I think this is worth pulling out as a separate post.

There is a sort of blank slatism on display here and in Stanton’s writing where the female child is perfect and the only source of sin comes from the culture. Stanton explains how parents should address raising girls in his book on parenting (emphasis mine):

As parents guide their girls into the complex and wonderful world of healthy womanhood, what do they need to be aware of?

What are the essential qualities that transform our daughters into mature, secure women?

As you read through the qualities described below, please keep in mind that much of this is innate, but because our culture seems to fight so hard to suppress certain natural tendencies, it’s our privilege and responsibility as parents to watch out for opportunities to nurture and guide in these areas.

Fortunately Stanton doesn’t make the same mistake with boys, who he explains need continuous direction to become good men (emphasis mine):

Who will help your little boy become a man? How will this be achieved?

These are profound parenting questions that demand great and long reflection. Note that I wasn’t entirely correct earlier. Each conveyor belt leads not necessarily to manhood but to male aging, because that’s what the mere passage of time produces. But good men don’t just happen. Good men are most often created in good families, and great intention needs to be put into the process. Fathers and other men play a key role!

In his letter to his daughter post, Walsh writes with the same blank slatist frame Stanton does about daughters (emphasis mine):

I hope you always stay exactly as you are right now. Innocent, carefree, unencumbered, pure.

But these could only be the hopes of a foolish idealist like your Dad. I can rub the genie lamp and make a thousand stupid wishes, but you will grow. You will start to learn about the culture that surrounds you. You will form opinions about yourself. Your vivacious, bubbly happiness will give way to more complex emotions. You will develop new dimensions.
In these times, here in your very early life, you only cry because you’re hungry or
tired or you want me to hold you. One day, though, your tears will come from a
deeper place.

Note how she goes from pure to wretched, and the agent of change is the culture. This is
really no different than Marx, etc wanting to make the New Socialist Man, or what feminists
are trying to do. The idea is that people don’t have a nature (and certainly not a sin nature),
and therefore you can solve humanity’s problems by fixing the culture. Just to be clear, I
don’t deny the profound impact of the culture, as this is an area I focus on a great deal. But
as Christians we err greatly if we ignore the true source of our fallen nature, pretending
instead that it comes from the culture.

This may seem subtle, but there is a huge difference between pointing out the problem of the
culture reinforcing the worst aspects of our nature, and claiming the culture is the source of
the worst aspects of our nature. This is the problem with Walsh’s piece, and it isn’t found in
just one segment, but throughout the piece. Closely related is his baffling obsession with
making sure the young girl always knows she is beautiful. Whether this means strictly her
physical appearance, knowing that she is inherently good, or is about her self esteem seems
to be under debate here. My personal read is he is talking about all three, but obsessing
about any of these isn’t remotely Christian, which I’m surprised isn’t more easily spotted. I
pray this truly isn’t the “advanced class”, but either way we have a truckload of modern
cultural baggage to unpack. We may as well start right here, right now.

Moderator’s Note: The same rules apply to this post as the last one. Keep the focus on
general advice and protection of a Christian girl. Any references to Walsh’s children or
anyone else’s children will be removed.
Radio Silence and Dread.
by Dalrock | July 22, 2014 | Link

Vox weighed in on the sex denial spreadsheet that has gone viral with his post Mortification Game:

The fact is that she’s feeling incredibly humiliated and defensive. And since in women, defensive crouches are followed by instinctively sexual responses, if he maintains his frame, the chances are that she’ll return from her trip more sexually willing than before. (Personally, I doubt he will, he’ll probably contact her too soon, apologize profusely, buy her flowers, and they’ll be back to their old routine within a week.) But what he has inadvertently done is to introduce Mortification Game to a worldwide audience, Mortification Game being a subset of Dread Game.

Dread Game isn’t for healthy relationships, but it can temporarily improve unhealthy ones and buy them time to fix things. This spreadsheet isn’t indicative of immaturity, but rather desperation combined with a desire to save his marriage while honoring his wedding vows. It would be much more effective for him to have simply gone radio silent and had sex with other women while she’s gone; the sexually hypercompetitive nature of women would likely have her sensing his subsequent indifference to her deprivation upon her return. But he chose not to do that, instead he plunged once more into the gap to try to salvage what looks like a fairly hopeless cause.

Vox has clarified that just because he pointed out that having sex with other women would likely have been more effective, that doesn’t mean he would advise a married man to do so. But even without the husband cheating, sudden radio silence could be a very effective tool. It isn’t guaranteed to work, but it is hard to imagine it would work worse than continuing to beg for sex. As Cane Caldo advised in Tacomas: Desires Steadfast Love:

In the meantime, TM, do not ask that woman for sex.

My wife found an example of radio silence working on the women’s confession site Scary Mommy yesterday:

I never wanted sex with DH. Always with the excuses....too tired, too sweaty, on my period, maybe coming down with a cold...now he stopped asking. So worried he found somebody who actually wants sex with him.

Like (4) Hug (39) Me Too! (23)

Note that a husband using radio silence game hasn’t violated the two part test I included in Headship Game. A husband causing his wife to feel discomfort about her sin isn’t unloving, it is in fact the opposite. He also isn’t sinning or encouraging his wife to sin by no longer begging for sex. The moral problem with Dread Game as (generally defined) isn’t the dread, it is the mechanism typically used to create the dread. Cheating on your wife, carrying on
inappropriately with other women, or threatening to cheat on your wife isn’t consistent with
the role of a Christian husband. Ceasing to (inadvertently) provide your wife a sense of
comfort in her sin isn’t sinful, and it is in fact loving.

Likewise, Dread Game is loving when practiced by a mother on her married daughters, as
Mentu’s mother did:

- Take good care of that man, or some other woman will!
Yiayia wouldn’t approve
by Dalrock | July 24, 2014 | Link

In Repackaging feminism as Christian wisdom I pointed out that our great grandmothers understood the nature of women’s temptation to sin. What is fascinating is we know this, even though we have forgotten what our great grandmothers knew. There is a kind of cultural doublethink involved here, where we generally deny that women are tempted by sexual sin (and deny that we are denying it) while we also mock people in the past for having failed to deny this. This comes out in interesting ways, and one of them is in jokes about how our unenlightened ancestors used to have such backward views.

Yet while Yiayia would be horrified, as Opus explained compared to modern Europe the women in the US seem like prudes:

In Europe, in the summer, women can be found topless and bottomless but in America the females are all auditioning – Back to the Future style – for a role in a Doris Day flick by wearing one piece bathing-costumes – at least they were when I was Stateside.

But women going nude in Europe shows the fallacy of Walsh blaming women’s desire to bare as much as society will permit on the stores at the mall. Surely the stores at the mall are quite happy to assist them in their race to nakedness, but there isn’t any money to be made selling birthday suits. If anything, we would expect the shops at the mall to hold the line at high priced but maximally seductive bathing suits. Perhaps it is the stores at the mall in capitalist America which are holding women back from adopting European women’s embrace of full nudity. Likewise as another commenter mentioned, how can the stores at the mall be to blame for the nude and partially nude selfie phenomenon?

Director Stanton tells us that:

...women left to themselves will develop into good women, more responsible women, just naturally, for various reasons and we could talk about that.

But the truth is that women and older girls left to themselves will collectively push to continuously redefine decency down in their efforts to compete for sexual attention. This is exactly what eleventh grader Olympia Nelson describes in her Op-ed at The Age on the selfie phenomenon:

How confident can you appear at being lascivious? How credible is your air of lewdness? A girl who is just a try-hard will lose credibility and become an outcast. So a lot depends on how much support you can get from other girls.

Note that the problem isn’t that Nelson and the other girls don’t know that they are beautiful. The girls in the selfies already have confidence that they are beautiful; what they are trying to do is leverage that beauty to climb the social ladder. To Nelson it is the patriarchy and not the shops at the mall which is to blame, because those dirty boys make her and the other
girls do it. If the boys only had more sophisticated taste in selfies she explains, the girls could compete for the boy’s attention in a more positive way. This is undoubtedly true but overlooks women’s temptations entirely. While she complains throughout the piece about the horrors of unrestricted selfie warfare, she closes by forcefully arguing that it would be wrong for parents to place limits on what young girls can post. Assuming she gets her wish, we will continue to test Stanton’s foolish theory.

All of this of course would be mortifying to Yiayia, who would be troubled enough by what today would be considered a tame red dress:
Slow your roll
by Dalrock | July 25, 2014 | Link

A little over 400 comments into the discussion of Radio Silence and Dread, a blogger by the handle Prov Erbs asked:

Please help Dalrock or anyone else! What does Christian dread look like in detail for a married couple of 15+ years? I feel like what I need is dread in my marriage now. It's not healthy, though it has improved significantly with much prayer and this site. I want to honor Christ. I want to have lots of sex with just my wife and the mother of my two children. I've never been with another woman. I have temptations b/c I'm like the guy in the spreadsheet. Heck, I'd take his ratio now compared to what I'm getting. Please help! Thank you.

Gin Martini suspects we are being wound up here, and that is always possible. However, either way the question is an excellent opening for a much needed follow on post.

In the Radio Silence post I carefully carved out a sliver of Dread, and many are taking that as an invitation to take the whole cheese wheel. Writing about Game from a Christian perspective is extremely difficult because this is in many ways new territory and there are very important moral considerations to get right. At the same time, we have two distinct groups desperate to pull us to either the right hand or the left.

On the one side we have the prevailing view of modern Christianity, which is an unknowing but enthusiastic adoption of a cross dressing view of biblical roles. Under this theological gender bending view husbands aren't to lead their wives in biblical headship, but are to submit to their wives as the Apostle Peter instructed wives to do with their husbands in 1 Pet 3. Actually it is worse than this, because this cross dressing view wouldn’t even permit husbands to win their wives over without a word. Under the cross dressing view of marital roles, husbands can’t even remain silent if it means allowing their wives to feel discomfort with their sin.

On the other side we have those who want to toss out biblical instruction on marriage or at least rationalize it away, when being faithful gets in the way of effective Game. No, you can't cheat or put yourself in compromising positions. No you can’t threaten to cheat. No you can’t divorce or threaten to divorce if she doesn’t have sex with you, or if she isn’t as excited about it as we all would wish. If your primary goal is to have sex, you aren’t at the right place. Why expend all of this effort on Biblical Rationalization Game when $50 and a trip across town would almost surely accomplish the goal? I’m not minimizing the importance of sex in biblical marriage, as the Apostle Paul explains in 1 Cor 7 that you would be better off not marrying unless you feel passionate desire, and that denying sex is a sin and creates temptation for sexual sin. But never forget that when he says to marry if you burn with passion he isn’t talking about how to get sex, he is talking about how to be obedient to Christ.

Getting to the question from Prov Erbs, I took only a quick scan of his latest post and one
other page. I certainly can’t have the whole picture, but from what little I’ve read my advice would be to stop thinking about sex and focus on being a Christian husband and father. His focus needs to be on being head of a Christian home where the wife is in profound rebellion while the children are taking everything in. If he brings his house back into order he very likely will make real gains on the sex front, but focusing on sex is killing him. From his male action plan page:

I don’t want to have sex with anyone else. I only want to have sex with her. Even in my dreams, and I’ve been dreaming a lot about sex, I only want to have sex with her. Sex is not boring with her b/c I love her and she’s the mother of my children. It was never boring for me at least, which is why I’ve gotten even more onitis. God is my one and only, she is not my one and only. Yet, I’m struggling here....

This script is killing him. She has the cookie and he keeps eyeing it in his mind, wishing she would give it to him. What he needs to focus on is being head of the family. Unfortunately the cross dressing fetishists have been extremely creative in subverting him legally, and most fellow Christians won’t be of much help as they are enraptured with the cross dressing model. He needs to keep a clear head and remember his role of biblical headship. I would start by reading Headship Game, but I’m sure my readers will have suggestions as well. But either way his goal needs to be to lead his wife as a loving Christian husband. She is mired in sin and rebellion, and he needs to do everything he can to help her reject the path she is on.

In his latest post Ice Melting, he gives a summary of their situation and describes what he sees as signs of improvement. I think he’s taking some big red flags way too lightly, as his wife is repeatedly and deliberately putting herself in a position to have sex with other men:

1. She still has been going out to CrossFit across town. She’s been going 4-5x/week.
2. She still has been going out to lunches, no more dinners, with her gym mates. I’ve seen pictures online on Facebook, and it’s almost always – at least on 5 different occasions – her and 5-7 men. There are almost never any women in these pictures.  
3. She has been communicating with her old CrossFit friends in our new area, and she’s been itching to go again.

He explains in closing that he isn’t taking action on this because:

I still don’t like that she goes out with men so much, but I see no evidence of flirting or adultery so I can’t say much. She continues to say she’s an older sister to them. (Christian women often say this.) She looks really young for a 40 year old, but she’s still a 40 year old hanging out with 20 and early 30’s men, so I can’t say I’m too worried. Plus mate guarding isn’t going to help me at all, so I’m just pulling back.

There is no biblical role where married women go out to lunch with men. Also, at 40 her targeting younger men, often much younger men, fits with their relative SMVs. This is what the cougar phenomenon is all about. Women who are declining in attractiveness are pursuing younger men who haven’t yet come into their own. Such men aren’t yet attractive enough to attract a suitable wife or girlfriend, but they are very often willing to accept some no strings sex from an aging woman who is still hot enough.
He needs to make it clear that this is wildly, horribly inappropriate. They aren’t living in the same house and she is carrying on like a whore. She may not be cheating on him, but she is acting like a whore. Forget mate guarding, what would a loving father say to his daughter if she were acting like a whore? What would Yiayia say? I would make it painfully clear what she is acting like, from the frame of the man who is charged with washing her in the water of the word, not from a frame of “you won’t have sex with me but you are going out with these other men!” I would make addressing this and what I’m sure is a whole host of related behavior a priority. There is nothing innocent or appropriate about it. She needs to acknowledge what she is doing and repent. I would treat it like an alcoholic, not just stopping the specific set of inappropriate behavior but stopping the pattern she is engaged in here.

I would focus on this issue with his pastor. Hopefully the pastor understands how wildly inappropriate this is for a Christian wife. If this doesn’t get some fire in his belly, nothing will. If possible, members of the church should reinforce the husband’s message that this is unacceptable. Ideally he should find an older woman who has strong Christian sexual values to counsel his wife in line with Titus 2:

> the older women likewise, that they be reverent in behavior, not slanderers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things—
> 4 that they admonish the young women to love their husbands, to love their children, 5 to be discreet, chaste, homemakers, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God may not be blasphemed.

His wife will of course go nuts when called out on her whorish behavior. Be ready for emotional outbursts in a fevered attempt to rebuild the mound. Don’t take the bait and let her change the frame. Moreover, she will absolutely hate the idea of an older Christian woman teaching her about how to be a proper Christian wife. She will hate it because it gives the good faithful woman status over her while it calls out her need for repentance. It is essential not to give in to her excuses not to do this, no matter how convincing, hysterical and emotional they get (and they will). He can’t force her to do it, but she can’t force him to back down from what he knows is right. Part of the beauty of this is it will help the pastor and others see the wife’s wild rebellion. Why won’t she talk to this nice lady from the church? This is straight out of the Bible. Don’t waver on this or help her make excuses for it to the pastor or the older woman or anyone else. Let her rebellion speak for itself.

His other immediate focus should be on reestablishing his overall frame of leader of the home. His prior decision to leave the marital home could make this more difficult, because basically moving out is like an ultimatum. Straighten up or I won’t come back. Do as I say, or else. The problem with ultimatums is if the other person chooses or else. Moving back in will almost certainly be seen as him caving, but it probably is still the right thing to do if he wants to try to establish himself as head of the house. One opportunity here is that they are already apparently planning a joint move to a new home. However, she is leading the process and picking out the home:

> 5. We will have a 4BR home waiting for us when we move. She said she got a 4BR instead of a 3BR so that we could live together/separate bedrooms. When I told her that husbands and wives should sleep together, she said this is the first step. I did
not agree to move in yet.

He needs to at least lead the process to pick the house, and better yet flat out pick it out and start everything in motion. He needs to hold firm on the smaller home, and she can sleep on the couch if she refuses to sleep with her husband. If he needs to budge here, he could go so far as to sleep on the couch himself. I know this is heresy from a Game perspective, but he may need to make this compromise to get the rest in motion.

One thing to keep in mind in all of this is the kids are watching. He also has a sacred leadership role to his own children. He needs to make it clear what Christian marriage really is, and not feed the confusion his wife is trying to create. She wants to create a situation where divorce or separation is his fault or nobody’s fault. He needs to conduct himself in such a way that they can clearly see and understand what should be happening even if his wife ultimately blows up the family (and there is in my opinion a very high risk this is what will happen). This isn’t just about here and now or the next five years, it is about their understanding of marriage when they become adults. Having one of them sleep on the couch fits with this aim, as it will counteract her efforts to normalize what she is doing (turning her husband into a beta orbiter). Along the same lines:

1. Don’t threaten to divorce or divorce without clear and unambiguous cause. I won’t go into the differences between Protestants and Catholics and Orthodox here, but whatever your denomination follow it and don’t try to get creative in justifying divorce.
2. Don’t pretend their mother isn’t in rebellion and doing wildly inappropriate things. He doesn’t need to bring them into it, but he shouldn’t pretend this is no big deal. They already know this is a big deal, and not only is it better not to lie but it will be less troubling for them as well.
3. Unfortunately he is going to have to model the fact that Christians will at times have to suffer for their obedience to God. His example should be one of strength of conviction, not showing self pity or calling attention to his suffering.

This isn’t going to be easy, and as I already said I think there is unfortunately a good chance his wife will blow up the family. However, this only reinforces the importance of focusing on faithful headship and setting an example for his children.

If he can manage the immediate problems eventually he should be able to get to a place where he can benefit from Cane’s advice to Tacomaster. Somewhere along the way his wife is likely to stop denying sex, if only temporarily. This could be an attempt by her to manipulate him, it could be due to returning attraction as he takes on the role of leader, or it could be due to a desire on her part to fulfill the biblical role of wife. Most likely it will be some combination of the three. Her motivation doesn’t matter, he should simply take her as is his right. One of the other things I noticed in his male action plan page is a concern about his performance:

I can’t seem to bring her to orgasm through intercourse. I have to use my hands, mouth, etc. She doesn’t really want to orgasm too much, she says that it’s too intense. She’s repeatedly saying she wants a gentle lover. We we’re virgins when we got married, so we have only had sex with one another. It was really great the first 7 years or so just learning, exploring, and being playful with one another. I just wanted
it more than her after we had kids, but even then she complied and I remember it being happy. She’s never complained strongly unless I really pushed her to have sex when she’s not into it.

A loving husband will want to satisfy his wife, but his frame is of a performer being judged. This is a hook for his wife to manipulate him with and he needs to banish it. Especially until things change dramatically his fundamental frame should be that wives who aren’t frigid have sex with their husbands, and a husband should feel no shame in taking his own wife. Stop the rest of the script, and get back to basics. Ironically, this change in mind frame is more likely to bring her to orgasm than the modern “she comes first” script. Women don’t fantasize about a careful attentive lover. They fantasize about being bent over the nearest piece of furniture and screwed silly.
I thought I was done with this, but I see that Matt Walsh is continuing with his insistence that marketers are the reason women behave badly.

Imagine the message that would send. Imagine the Hollywood elites as they look at one another, stunned and shell shocked. “Dear Lord, the plebeians have become self-aware. They have... standards. They won't sit obediently and devour whatever load of vapid, lifeless excrement we try to shovel into their anonymous faces. The jig is up, boys, we’re doomed.”

Elsewhere in the post he refers to the movie as a “cynical, boring, corporate marketing ploy”. The great irony is that 50 Shades of Grey is a case where the marketers weren’t providing the type of depravity women demanded, so women went around the marketers. 50 SOG is a work of fan fiction which went viral. By all accounts the mass enthusiasm for the book isn’t due to it being masterfully written. Pretty much everyone agrees that it is horribly written, but that women are willing to overlook that because it scratches a powerful itch. Even when women go around the marketers to get what they want, Walsh still can only blame the marketers. He assumes women are being forced to consume this against their will.

The reality is that women will reward marketers who give them what they want and punish those who don’t. Walsh really needs to get his head around this because marketing to women is the very business he is in. At some level he has to know this, because he receives mountains of praise when he does things like undermine headship, provide excuses for women to divorce their husbands, and tell women they are beautiful. He has to have also noticed that when he criticizes frivolous divorce, his otherwise delighted readers get hysterical and accuse him of being unChristian. Matt even touches on the fact that many of the same Christian women who loved his posts against men using pornography are equally enthusiastic about 50 SOG.

I’ve noticed that some of the women who give me a hearty ‘AMEN’ every time I write a post condemning pornography, are the same ones gushing frantically about this film. They don’t want their husbands watching porn, but they’ll not only watch and read porn themselves — they’ll advertise that fact to the entire world. As if the hypocrisy isn’t bad enough, they had to add in a touch of public emasculation.

Classy move.

This had me curious what Jenny Erikson has written on the 50 SOG movie, since she was so comforted in her sinful divorce by Walsh’s writing. Not surprisingly, she is awaiting its release with bated breath.

But even Walsh’s creeping recognition overlooks the fact that when he called men out for
using pornography he declared it as adultery (full stop). Yet while he quotes plenty of Scripture in his 50 SOG post, he doesn’t manage to get around to making the same claim for women’s much more shameless consumption of porn.

If Walsh still requires proof that women (in general) are in the driver’s seat, he should look no further than the hysterical feedback he received for writing negatively about 50 SOG. Once he understands this, he will realize that while plenty of marketers are knowingly encouraging women to sin in the ways women most want to sin, most of the time they are just going with what brings the results they want. Telling the truth and standing up for the parts of biblical morality which offend women isn’t good for business when your business is pleasing women, especially in our time of unprecedented feminist rebellion. Once Walsh accepts this all too obvious fact, his next question should be what business does he want to be in?
Five years of keeping her happy proves David Swindle is a better man than you.

by Dalrock | July 29, 2014 | Link

Dr Helen has been exchanging posts with PJ Media Associate Editor David Swindle about the famous sex excuse spreadsheet. Swindle expresses contempt for the frustrated husband whose wife made their private life public:

I have absolutely ZERO SYMPATHY WHATSOEVER for this loser. Why?

Because it’s not a wife’s responsibility to be her husband’s happy whore, eagerly providing him with his orgasms on demand.

Note how Swindle takes the modern day moral elevation of desire/romantic love to its natural extreme, declaring that biblical/traditional wives are the new whores. As I’ve previously explained, we have inverted the roles of marriage and romantic love. Now instead of seeing marriage as the moral place to pursue sex and romantic love, we see romantic love as the moral place for sex and marriage. While most don’t take this idea to the extreme that Swindle does, the basic premise is so common that virtually no one notices that we have adopted a new code of sexual morality.

Rollo expressed a similar moral sentiment in the discussion of the Radio Silence post:

...one truth becomes glaringly apparent: under our current social mores, premarital sex and its inspired urgency is a more honest, motivated and passionate proposition than married sex will ever be.

However, there is a fundamental difference between Swindle and Rollo’s positions. Swindle declares that a sense of duty is immoral while arguing for marriage, while Rollo is not only less strident but logically consistent by arguing that it is better for a man to keep a rotation of women in order to maximize the authenticity of the act. If you believe that really liking something is the fundamental test of morality, obligation is anti-morality. Under that point of view, marriage and duty are at best foolish, and are at worst (under Swindle’s view) evil.

Swindle’s profound internal contradiction about marriage becomes more understandable when you read further, as he trots out conventional wisdom which would make Oprah proud:

Dissatisfied husbands, want to know the secret to having sex with your wife whenever you want? It is not your wife’s responsibility to be ready to go on command, it’s YOUR responsibility to know your wife so well that you are capable of seducing her anytime. When you want to have sex with her you don’t ask her, you put her in the mood yourself. It’s really that simple: know you wife well enough so you can push the right buttons, say the right things, and create an environment where sex just naturally happens.
Unfortunately, that’s more work than most men are used to for getting orgasms. Twenty or thirty minutes of close attention, massage, and foreplay first? Taking the effort to really get to know your wife’s unique preferences and turn-ons? Learning how to read her moods? That’s effort — and energy.

I’m a bit disappointed in Swindle. He forgot to mention foot rubs. And what about learning her love language? Giving her a footrub while speaking her love language is guaranteed to get her hot. If it doesn’t, you probably aren’t doing enough choreplay.

Dr. Helen accurately identifies Swindle as a white knight, but I would argue his windmill tilting comes from him assuming the position of *hostage negotiator*. Swindle has convinced himself that his ability to keep his wife happy in the face of laws and a culture which encourage her to divorce him is proof of his superiority to other men. Swindle actually has a long track record of espousing this view. Well, it is long when compared to the length of his marriage.

Back in *May of 2011* Swindle wrote a post explaining why columnist John Hawkins shouldn’t be concerned about modern marriage.

John, let me tell you something directly: people with hearts as big as yours shouldn’t worry so much about divorce. I don’t foresee you having a hard time making a woman feel loved, cherished, and appreciated — as long as you put your mind to it. The failure rate of divorces says more about our broken human nature than a problem with the institution of marriage itself. Marriage is a job like any other. (I sometimes feel like when I’m clocking out at NRB that I’m just clocking in with the Swindle-Bey household.)

If you are good enough John, she will be happy. If she is happy, she won’t push the detonator. Those men who are divorced by their wives deserve it. Swindle continues:

*Marriages don’t have to fail when both people in them take them seriously and don’t allow them to crumble under the pressures of life and our own selfish, broken nature. Read a few books on marriages — The Five Love Languages is very useful — spend enough quality time together, and pay attention to their needs and things will work out.*

As I mentioned above, Swindle is an old hand at explaining that husbands just have to be *good enough* and marriage 2.0 will work just fine. He gave the advice to Hawkins just before his second wedding anniversary.

*This Monday will be my wife April and my second wedding anniversary. It hasn’t always been easy. We’ve had big changes, angry fights, and plenty of surprises. But we’ve both grown and are starting to evolve slowly into better people than we were before we came into each other’s life.*

Now that he is three years wiser and his family has grown (they now have a dog), Swindle has of course moved on to newer books explaining the secret to a great relationship. He now knows that the secret to a good marriage is to follow the Bible, at least the Bible as
reinterpreted through Jewish mysticism.

You can’t make this stuff up.

I should note that not elevating sexual desire and romantic love to a position of moral barometer doesn’t mean diminishing or eschewing either one. Recognizing that liking something doesn’t make it moral doesn’t mean you don’t like it. The irony is that by elevating romantic love and desire out of their rightful place both become much harder to sustain. The (real) biblical model of marriage does work. It isn’t guaranteed to produce passion and romantic love, but there is immense wisdom in the design. I’m always amused when people mistake my wife and me for newlyweds (only when we are out without our kids). When my wife explains that we have been married for twenty years the look of surprise is comical.

Moreover, I strongly disagree with Swindle that a good marriage is all about work. Swindle describes being married as a second full time job, but my wife has frequently expressed puzzlement at the claim that a marriage is about work. She is right. Marriage is far more about commitment than work. While we have the same kinds of disagreements that every couple has, most of the time our marriage is downright fun. It is far more like a lifelong slumber party than work. Much of this is due to the closeness which comes when the path to the marriage bed isn’t strewn with obstacles, and much of it comes from being blessed beyond what we deserve. Our marriage isn’t proof that I’m a better man than others, but our marriage and countless others like it are proof that the biblical model which so offends Swindle is infinitely wiser than those who would try to improve upon God’s design.
Don’t judge a book by its cover
by Dalrock | August 1, 2014 | Link

The most common complaint in the comboxes of Matt Walsh’s criticism of Fifty Shades of Grey is that Walsh has not actually read the book. 50SOG is according to its defenders a work which must be experienced to be understood. It is, they claim, a work of fine literature, not smut. Fortunately ballista74 has located a dramatic reading of 50SOG which I am confident will help bridge our gap in understanding this modern literary work. Audio is not safe for work.
Frigidity and power.
by Dalrock | August 3, 2014 | Link

With as much as has been written about the sex denial spreadsheet, one aspect I haven’t seen addressed is the issue of power and how the fear of losing power was a core motivating factor for the women involved. This is evident with both the wife who published the spreadsheet and women’s responses as the spreadsheet went viral. The wife who published the spreadsheet was horrified that:

1. Her husband had blown through her attempted deception.
2. As a result, he declared (and to a degree demonstrated) that she could no longer use fleeting promises of sex to hold power over him.

The original reddit post has been removed, but the text of her posting is copied all over the internet, including at Elle.com (emphasis mine):

Yesterday morning, while in a taxi on the way to the airport, Husband sends a message to my work email which is connected to my phone. He’s never done this, we always communicate in person or by text. I open it up, and it’s a sarcastic diatribe basically saying he won’t miss me for the 10 days I’m gone. Attached is a SPREADSHEET of all the times he has tried to initiate sex since June 1st, with a column for my “excuses”, using verbatim quotes of why I didn’t feel like having sex at that very moment. According to his ‘document’, we’ve only had sex 3 times in the last 7 weeks, out of 27 “attempts” on his part.

The wife was horrified that she had over played her hand in using sex to keep her husband firmly in her orbit. She turned to the internet for soothing reassurance from team woman, but instead of a pure team woman response, solipsism kicked in and the women responding were more interested in distancing themselves from the image of a frigid, powerless wife than they were in punishing the bad man.

Women’s sexuality has always been a primary source of their power, but in our feminist culture this has been taken to the extreme. We openly celebrate the epic power of the vagina:

It isn’t just secular culture chanting Hail to the V. Modern Christians are as enthralled by the awesome power of the vagina as everyone else is. As Dr. Mohler explains:

Put most bluntly, I believe that God means for a man to be civilized, directed, and stimulated toward marital faithfulness by the fact that his wife will freely give herself to him sexually only when he presents himself as worthy of her attention and desire.

This is the culture we live in, where everyone from feminists to the president of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary is in awe of the world changing power between a woman’s legs.

Now imagine being the spreadsheet wife, who has suddenly realized that her V has lost its
power through her own misuse. In a fit of terror, hurt, and outrage, she turned to her sisters on the internet. But instead of rallying around her, they were afraid that the disease could be catchy. What if their V suddenly stopped working as well?

Scary Mommy responded to the viral spreadsheet story with an article titled Why You Should Say Yes Tonight:

...before we realize it, the no’s can add up into a long yoga pant drawstring of days and weeks. Months. Suddenly we are counting back on fingers, and toes...and with a sickening sense of worry, we can’t even remember the last time we had said YES to a roll in the hay.

And we worry even more that our husbands remember EXACTLY how long it’s been.

Or that they are keeping a log of our refusals, like this guy did.

While the spreadsheet method almost certainly failed for the frustrated beta who created it, he did manage to explode the denial around not only his own frigid wife’s refusal of sex, but that of frigid wives around the world. The danger of this was immediately and viscerally evident to the women who read it, which is why solipsism kicked in where team woman was expected. Instead of closing ranks to declare in unison that the husband was a bad man and wives don’t owe their husbands sex, the response was a half hearted attempt to shame the man back into submission, with the primary focus being on damage control to prevent the woman’s own V from losing its power.

The Frisky’s Jessica Wakeman opened her piece on the spreadsheet with the obligatory demonstration of team woman solidarity:

Last week, women reading the Internet collectively reached for their wallets to check how much cash they had, because there was a fellow lady out there who needed a drink.

Yet despite weak efforts to demonstrate solidarity, the subtext of the whole piece is about how horrified now married Wakeman still is about the time when she overplayed her own hand with a boyfriend, causing her V to lose its power:

I have no idea why Ex-Mr. Jessica didn’t bring it up (he just sorted dumped me and washed his hands of our relationship), but looking back, I can see exactly what was happening on, why, and how it all went to shit

With all of the complaining about spreadsheet beta and how he should have communicated better, even more terrifying is the thought of a man who didn’t bother complaining, who simply lost interest in the ever more rationed V.

I did feel genuinely regretful that I didn’t give Ex-Mr. Jessica what he wanted in terms of our sex life because I never got the chance to even try to fix them. But he never brought them up to me until he broke up with me. I wish he had had the courage to talk to me.
The whole episode has been shocking for modern women, because while deep in their minds they always knew there was such a risk, they thought they had banished the risk by banishing the word used to describe it. Yet even though the word frigid is now all but unspeakable, here was a wife who inadvertently warned the internet about the dangers of being frigid. Frigid is such a powerful term, and is so hated by feminists, because it names the risk of losing sexual power by overplaying the control hand.

The problem for women is their sexual power can be difficult to effectively wield, especially now that our culture has abandoned lifelong marriage. Women’s sexual power is fleeting, and only patriarchal marriage allows a woman to leverage her youthful sexual power to the power of a respected wife and mother and ultimately to the power of Yiayia. But the fleeting nature of women’s sexual power is just one problem, it is also fragile. Appearing available and eager for sex is essential for a woman to appear sexy. Yet a woman who appears too eager, or more accurately eager for too many men, risks being labeled as a slut. Sluts still have the power of being desired, but as everyone knows only a foolish man would fall in love with a slut. Sluts are in this narrow (romantic) sense, unlovable. Note how quickly being attractive went to being ugly. On the other end of the spectrum is frigidity. A wife who almost never wants to have sex with her husband is a terrible wife. As with a slut, only a foolish man would (knowingly) fall in love with a frigid woman. However, unlike the slut she isn’t even desirable. A frigid wife is powerless, undesirable, and (romantically) unlovable. This recognition is what so horrified women around the world when the spreadsheet went viral.

Feminists have done an incredible job in temporarily removing words like slut and frigid from our lexicon, but they won’t be able to banish them for good because of the realities behind the terms. What we are seeing with the viral spreadsheet is the concept of frigidity working its way back into our thought process, even though the word itself is still forbidden.
Frigidity is ugly.

by Dalrock | August 5, 2014 | Link

Commenter Jen reminds us that miserliness isn’t the only option for a wife:

Honestly, if a woman loves her husband, even if she’s NOT in the mood, she’ll be more than happy to acquiesce simply out of her love for and desire to please him & make him happy (which ought to, by default, make her even happier she said yes). And this is not “duty sex” or “Oh, FINE” sex, but “All right, Sweetheart!” and happily off the couple goes. IMO there is no room for the “duty” or grudging sex in marriage, because the woman is only “giving” grudgingly, and that is not giving at all, and may be just as cruel as denying. I wouldn’t like it if my husband acted that way. (God loves a cheerful giver! Perhaps that ought to be embroidered onto bedsheets...)

Many have grown so accustomed to the miserly perspective of feminism, where even love for family is subject to a penny pinching curmudgeonly attitude, that they forget that it doesn’t have to be this way. Feminism is ugly because it teaches women to be misers with love, and frigidity is all about being miserly with love. This feminist obsession with miserliness has caused large numbers of women to scorn what is beautiful to God; what could be uglier than that?

There is a tendency in the sphere to make everything about Game/attraction, as if women can’t be loving unless their genitals are leading them that way. This is the opposite extreme of Dr. Mohler seeing a woman’s clitoris as a divining rod for good men, and equally as foolish. It isn’t that attraction and romantic love don’t matter; they are very important. But they aren’t the only thing. We do miserly women a disservice if we claim the only way they can overcome their ugly attitude is for their husbands to lead them via their genitals. We also do good and loving women a disservice by assuming they are only good and loving because they are following their genitals.
What is modern marriage for?

by Dalrock | August 10, 2014 | Link

Why, divorce, of course:

The singular reason I wish I were actually married to my SO is so I could divorce his fucking ass.

Many would no doubt argue that this woman is an exception, and/or that no fault divorce isn’t about punishing men. However, punishing men who make their wives unhappy is exactly what no fault divorce is designed to do, and everyone from academics to religious leaders is outright delighted by this.

While most will deny seeing no fault divorce as a system to punish men, nearly everyone implicitly acknowledges that no fault divorce is designed to punish men. The ubiquitous retort to complaints about the unfairness of the divorce process for men is:

Prove that the men who lost their children, homes, and assets didn’t deserve to be punished.

It is worth noting that while no fault divorce is undeniably designed to be used to punish men, it is not designed to determine if the man in question is in fact guilty of anything. This is the false veneer of fairness, because every man gets treated the same, guilty or not. Of course in theory women could find themselves being the ones punished, but only in the very rare cases where a woman has taken on the traditional male role of primary breadwinner. Given women’s strong preference for marrying men who out earn them, very few women are at risk of being mistaken for the man by the man-punishing machinery of no fault divorce and the family courts.

See Also: Let them eat cake.
Corrupted purity.
by Dalrock | August 17, 2014 | Link

MarcusD pointed out a recent article by Samantha Pugsley: I Waited Until My Wedding Night To Lose My Virginity And I Wish I Hadn’t. Salon published the same article under the title My Christian virginity pledge nearly destroyed me.

This is of course catnip for feminists (Christian or otherwise), who have been diligently inverting the very concept of sexual morality. According to this new view, teaching sexual morality is immoral. It is considered immoral because in the feminist view it disempowers women, especially young women. Not surprisingly, an essential part of Pugsley’s “healing” is to remember that sex is only moral when it is miserly:

When I have sex with my husband, I make sure it’s because I have a sexual need and not because I feel I’m required to fulfill his desires.

Most of this is exactly what it seems, a rationalization for sexual immorality by women and feminists. With that said, there is something creepy about the modern purity movement. However, the perversion in modern Christianity is not teaching women (or men) virginity until marriage, but the often unspoken belief that women should delay marriage. Sexual desire isn’t presented as bad or dirty in the Bible. The biblical solution to sexual desire is to marry and have sex, but the vast majority of modern Christians are horrified at the idea of young marriage, especially for women. As a result of trying to teach purity while being hostile to traditional marriage, we end up with the perverse replacement of the father for the groom (scroll down to see all of the photos), the groom he is keeping her from marrying.

But make no mistake, the perversion isn’t in teaching virginity until marriage, but the accompanying hostility to women marrying in their late teens or early twenties.
From celibate boyfriend to celibate husband (true love doesn’t wait).

by Dalrock | August 18, 2014 | Link

Pugsley’s story shows the folly of the celibate boyfriend:

When I met my then boyfriend-now husband, I told him right away that I was saving myself for marriage and he was fine with that because it was my body, my choice and he loved me.

We were together for six years before we got married.

Not surprisingly, her celibate boyfriend went on to become her celibate husband. Part of this has to come from the selection process. When a young woman sets out to find a celibate boyfriend instead of a husband, her selection criteria are going to be totally different. A young woman looking for a husband will look for the best man she can attract, a man who fits the role of a husband and whom she can fall head over heels in love with. A celibate boyfriend on the other hand is a totally different animal. She needs to find someone without better options than to sign on as her official beta orbiter. She also needs to find someone whom she isn’t too attracted to, or she might slip up herself. Then after a suitable number of years of proving that she wasn’t in any hurry to marry (and most likely attaining her feminist merit badge), the celibate boyfriend is very often converted into a husband.

Again, this isn’t the biblical model. The biblical model says marry if you burn with passion, then do it like rabbits. The churchian model says to prove you really are in love by waiting to marry, most often several years, in a celibate romantic relationship. The modern (unbiblical) view is that romantic love is purer than sex, and is what makes sex and marriage moral. This overlooks the fact that like sex, romantic love is for marriage, and marriage is what makes sex and romantic love moral.
Denying that marriage has moral meaning is the new virtue.

by Dalrock | August 29, 2014 | Link

As I’ve previously explained, there is a very common misconception that our society no longer believes in sexual morality. While this misconception is understandable, it overlooks the new sexual morality which has replaced the old one. The new sexual morality inverts the natural order. Now instead of lifetime marriage being the moral place to pursue sex and romantic love, romantic love is the moral place for sex and marriage.

You can see this new view with the huge social push to position couples who embrace divorce as demonstrating the height of virtue. The Huffington Post published an article earlier this week gushing over a couple who took a “divorce selfie”. Since marriage vows have no moral meaning, divorce doesn’t involve breaking any vows. Divorce (they rationalize) should be about celebrating the fact that there once was romantic love, not about the destruction of a family or a failure to honor a solemn vow made in front of God and their closest family and friends. The ex husband in the divorce selfie explains:

Here’s to the most friendly, respectful, and loving split imaginable. We smile not because it’s over, but because it happened...

...we also wanted to let people know that this didn’t have to be a negative experience. We are choosing to move forward with love. We’ve been separated a year, and throughout that time, we’ve both been committed to preserving our friendship.

...

To share that kind of bond with another is one of the most divine gifts given to us...

I feel blessed to have had the opportunity to love and be loved in return. I truly smile because I lived in that beautiful sunlight of love for a bit.

Back in March Gwyneth Paltrow and Chris Martin announced their divorce as a “conscious uncoupling”. The Daily Telegraph and countless other media sources were delighted with this new and more enlightened approach to divorce. More recently Jewel and her husband announced that they were engaged in a “thoughtful and tender undoing of ourselves.”

Ty and I have always tried to live the most authentic life possible, and we wanted our separation as husband and wife to be nothing less loving than the way we came together. For some time we have been engaged in a private and difficult, but thoughtful and tender undoing of ourselves. Allowing ourselves the time and space to redefine what we are to each other with love rather than malice.

We have been so aware that it is easiest to use the inertia of anger to leverage two
souls apart who have been bound together by so much living. By a child. But we did not want anger to burn the ties that bound us. Instead we have chosen the much more difficult task of undoing ourselves stitch by stitch, and releasing each other with love so that we may take on our new form: dear friends and devoted co-parents of our beloved son Kase. We have no desire to damage ourselves and each other in the process. Who better than each other to bear witness to the heart ache of redefining our family? And who better as ally, while we learn to redraw ourselves in whatever new shape we find as separate people who are still striving to be the best versions of ourselves- as humans and as parents.

This new moral view is so ubiquitous that no one seems to notice what should be obvious. If the ideal divorce is one where no one is to blame, then the ideal marriage is one where the vows have no moral meaning.

See Also: Lovestruck
MarcusD pointed out a thread on CAF where a 34 year old divorcée and alpha widow is troubled that God hasn’t answered her prayers for a new husband she can fall head over heels in love with:

I never knew if I could “fall in love” with someone because I had never dated anyone prior to my ex husband, and I definitely wasn’t “in love” with him. After our divorce/annulment I did date one other guy (prior to my current boyfriend) who I was head over heels in love with. I would have moved to the moon with this guy. We had our issues, but I still would have been crazy excited to marry him. Granted, it didn’t work out, and he ended up completely breaking my heart... looking back I recognize that he is not who God wanted me to marry. HOWEVER, I find it interesting that I was given that relationship – despite the heartbreak, it gave me a glimpse of what it feels like to be crazy about someone, and it made me recognize that I am ABLE to experience that sort of feeling for a man.

SO. I would say if that relationship had never happened, I probably wouldn’t be as torn up about not being “in love” with my current boyfriend. But I have that as a comparison...and he also has a similar situation where he was head over heels crazy about his ex girlfriend, and so he has THAT as a comparison.

While her story is tightly packed with manosphere clichés, it is important to remember that she is a living, breathing, and hurting person. Our (collective) rejection of biblical marriage has created a sea of human misery, which is as easy to witness on Catholic Answers Forum and ChristianForums.com as it is on Yahoo Answers.

What most caught my attention in the thread however is her moment of clarity:

And yes, I know that I have trust issues with God on this matter - but I think my issues are founded in the fact that I have already failed at marriage once, am getting old – close to the point where I can’t have children, have made lots of mistakes in the past, and have seen my much more devout friends who are even older than I am still not find their spouse either, despite fervent prayer.

Even if you look on the Catholic dating sites - when you narrow the search to guys in your reasonable age range who actually follow the Church’s teachings, there are VERY few. Then find the ones of that group who you are actually attracted to? Hardly any.

So yeah...I feel sometimes like a girl in a war-stricken country where all the eligible men have literally been called away to war and there truly aren’t any left to marry. Dramatic? perhaps...but in the times we live in, our men face a secular battle
against satan, and to find one who is devoted to his faith is becoming harder and harder.

Yet even when she can see the grim reality of the MMP for 30 something divorcées, she can only see the sin of men. In her mind, the reason it is so hard for a mid thirties woman to find a good husband and fall in love is something is wrong with men.

...in the times we live in, our men face a secular battle against satan
Dianna Anderson at The Frisky explains how rejecting sexual morality makes her more moral in Girl Talk: What Losing My Virginity Taught Me About Faith

This also isn’t a conversion story of how losing my virginity made me realize how far away I’d fallen and now I’m chastened, back on the straight-and-narrow and celibate. I’m not celibate and I’m dating around. And I’m a Christian whose faith, at this point, is probably stronger than at any point in my younger years. And I know that this faith, this commitment, wouldn’t have been possible had I not actively made the decision to give up on purity.

...

Losing my virginity outside of a marriage relationship taught me how to be a better person and a better Christian. It challenged my presuppositions about what sexual health looks like, and brought into stark relief the gaps in my education about ethics and holiness. Sex, in this way, can be a sacrament, a movement toward understanding God, a form of holiness experienced in a deep, mystical way. Sex can be holy, whether or not you have a ring on your finger.

See Also: Denying that marriage has moral meaning is the new virtue.
Exploding 50 something pregnant women.

by Dalrock | September 11, 2014 | Link

Drudge had a link today titled “More women waiting until 50 to have children...”. The article it points to is from myfoxny.com, titled 51 and pregnant:

Tracey Kahn is a successful publicist. She is single, lives in a beautiful apartment in Manhattan, has a 2-year-old daughter, and is pregnant with [sic] again. She is 51.

... And Kahn is not alone. A growing number of women [sic] putting off motherhood until middle age, especially in New York City, where younger women are career driven and put off growing a family.

Between 1997 in 2008 there was a fourfold increase in the number of women [sic] born to moms over 50 in the United States.

We’ve been through this before, but I decided to take a new look at the data since a few years have passed. The Fox article doesn’t cite the source for the fourfold increase claim, but either way the essential fact they are leaving out is how incredibly rare it is for women over 50 to give birth. It may well be a fourfold increase, but the actual numbers are so small as to be meaningless from a societal perspective.

I can’t find data specifically for women 50 and over, but the 2012 Statistical Abstract of the United States lists the number of births to women age 45 to 54 in Table 80 (PDF, xls). Here is the age distribution of births in 2008, the most recent year data is available for:
Note the minuscule bar to the far right. That is what all of the fuss is about. Actually that isn’t even it, since it includes women 45 to 49 as well. This lead me to see if I could tease out the difference by looking for years where births to mothers 45-49 and births to mothers 45-54 are both available. By comparing the difference for known years, we can get a sense of how many of the most recent births are to women 50 and over.

Fortunately, the 2010 Statistical Abstract presents the data for 45-49 year old mothers, and the 2012 Statistical Abstract presents it for the larger bracket. Here is the data for the oldest age bracket in the respective reports in one table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that while there isn’t 2008 data for 45-49, the 45-54 values for 2006-2008 are constant. Also note that there is no reported difference between births to women 45-49 and births to women in the larger bracket. Whatever the fourfold increased value is for births to women 50 and older, it isn’t enough to round up to the next 1,000 in any of the years we have both figures for. This means we are talking about fewer than 1,000 births in any given year. The
45-54 bar on the graph above is a minuscule sliver, and births to women 50 and over are a *too small to register* sliver of that sliver. While we may have gone from 25 to 100, or perhaps from 200 to 800 births to women over 50 between 1997 and 2008, this isn’t the kind sweeping change the news story no doubt left its readers thinking has occurred. Births to women over 50 remain extremely uncommon, despite feminist propaganda to the contrary.

**See also:** Charts on delayed motherhood.
Not the real stepdad.
by Dalrock | September 12, 2014 | Link

Not new, but new to me from the Onion: You’re Not My Real Stepdad!

You’re not the boss of me. You’re not the guy who married my mom after she got divorced. You think you can just show up and start ordering me around like you’re the father figure I first met when I was 8? Well, you’re not...

...you’re just a phony who’s trying to make us forget my mom was already married, then divorced, then single for a while, then real sad, then remarried.

Well, screw you, Greg! I won’t let you replace the man who replaced my father. And I don’t care how long you stay married to my Mom—I’ll never call you Dennis!

I’m not going to sit by and watch you try to fill in for my true stepdad, who was there for me during those tough times in court until it was mandated by a judge that he not be there anymore.
Lisa Fogerty at Cafe Mom spins a mother thinking with her genitals as an act of kindness:

But plenty of women make that call to get involved with men who aren’t law-abiding citizens. Some of them are able to see the good inside of that person — and sometimes they’re right and deserve respect for giving a person who made a mistake another chance at love. Other times, they discover that person is incapable of changing his bad ways.
Marcus D linked to a column by feminist and historian Rebecca Onion titled Lock up your wives! Advice columns from decades past provide a chilling glimpse into the horrors of marriage counselling before feminism. While the title claims that marriage counselling predates feminism, the article describes how marriage counseling as we understand it today grew out of feminism in general, and specifically the rejection of the idea that marriage vows are permanent (emphasis mine):

Marriage counselling, once the informal job of clergy, parents and trusted elders, became its own profession in the 1920s. Following increased advocacy for women’s rights, divorce rates in the US rose 15-fold between 1870 and 1920. Meanwhile, psychology and social work found their footing as professions. Some marriage advocates, unable to stem the tide of divorces through legal strictures, turned to counselling as the answer.

In short, marriage counseling is a product of the divorce revolution. The underlying premise here is not so much that divorce is beneficial because it ends unhappy marriages, but that it is beneficial because it gives wives leverage to force their husbands to do as the wife demands. Once the husband does as the wife demands, goes the logic, the marriage will become happy (See also: Fireproof). While it is refreshing to see this spoken about honestly, it isn’t just feminists who celebrate this ostensible improvement on marriage. Modern Christians have eagerly embraced this new view of marriage, a view I’ve dubbed the wake-up call model. Although this modern Christian approach is drenched in denial, deception, and rationalization, it isn’t difficult to spot the modern Christian embrace of divorce if you look for it.

As just one example, traditional Catholics have expressed great concern with the explosion in annulments the RCC grants in the United States. In response to these concerns, the Archdioceses of Boston has published a document defending the explosion in annulments. The document explains that the explosion in US annulments is a positive development, a sign of justice and progress. The problem is not that too many marriages in the US are being declared null by the RCC, the real problem is the rest of the world is behind the times and doesn’t grant enough annulments (emphasis mine):

In the last twenty years, the numbers of declarations are much higher in this country than they had been in the past. Yet this is due to the fact that the procedural laws governing marriage cases were expanded in the late 1960’s. Cases no longer had to go to Rome. They could be adjudicated locally. The appellate system was also somewhat streamlined. Furthermore, Roman jurisprudence was expanded in the light of the teaching of the Second Vatican Council. Cases could be heard on new grounds of jurisprudence.

Tribunals across the United States are operative so that individuals may vindicate
their rights. The bishops of our country have invested personnel and resources to ensure the church’s jurisprudence and procedural law are fulfilled. **Unfortunately, such an investment in justice is not as evident in other parts of the world.** This is why the numbers in the United States appear high. In fact they are skewed.

The other thing I found interesting about Onion’s piece is her repeated reference to the eugenics movement’s involvement with the creation of modern marriage counseling. I wasn’t aware of the connection here, but found a similar claim on wikipedia:

Marriage counseling originated in Germany in the 1920s as part of the eugenics movement.[1] The first institutes for marriage counseling in the USA began in the 1930s, partly in response to Germany’s medically directed, racial purification marriage counseling centres. It was promoted in the USA by both eugenicists such as Paul Popenoe and Robert Latou Dickinson and by birth control advocates such as Abraham and Hannah Stone who wrote ‘A Marriage Manual’ in 1935 and were involved with Planned Parenthood.[2] Other founders in USA include Lena Levine and Margaret Sanger.

Margaret Sanger as you may recall is one of the founders of Planned Parenthood. With a bit of searching I found an old radio broadcasts where she promotes marriage counseling. From How to Avoid Post War Divorces:

> The pity of unhappy, ruined marriages is that with a little scientific advice and the use of common sense so many of them could be saved.

She offers as an example a woman who resents her husband for traveling to exciting places around the world (as a soldier in WW II):

> the wife.. who was really just a girl.. was feeling trapped and rebellious. She loved her baby ↑of course↓, and well she might, because he was a beautiful child, but she was beginning to feel very bitter toward her husband because she said that she could tell from his letters that he was actually enjoying the ↑excitement of↓ war! Already he had been to Iceland, England, Africa, and Italy! Oh, she was willing to admit there were plenty of hardships connected with it... but what had she been doing all this long while? Just staying home day after day minding the baby! “When he gets home,” she told me, “he can just sit with the baby for a while and she what it’s like. I’m going out and have some fun!”

This was back in 1944, nearly 20 years before Friedan coined the term “the problem with no name”, yet all of the same tired feminist cliches about marriage we hear today were already fully formed and being sold to the general public.

> I could see her point of view... what woman couldn’t. You don’t have to be a war bride to feel trapped... many a house-wife gets that feeling just watching her husband go off to the office every morning while she stays home facing the same meals, dishes, and children. How many divorces have their beginnings in just this very feeling of imprisoned futility.
In my last post I quoted from a radio program delivered by Margaret Sanger discussing the hardships women face in marriage and the importance of marriage counseling. Sanger described a young mother she met the day before on the train:

…she was beginning to feel very bitter toward her husband because she said that she could tell from his letters that he was actually enjoying the ↑excitement of↓ war! Already he had been to Iceland, England, Africa, and Italy! Oh, she was willing to admit there were plenty of hardships connected with it... but what had she been doing all this long while? Just staying home day after day minding the baby! “When he gets home,” she told me, “he can just sit with the baby for a while and she what it's like. I'm going out and have some fun!”

I could see her point of view... what woman couldn’t. You don’t have to be a war bride to feel trapped... many a house-wife gets that feeling just watching her husband go off to the office every morning while she stays home facing the same meals, dishes, and children. How many divorces have their beginnings in just this very feeling of imprisoned futility.

The date of the program was July 19, 1944. This was just a little over a month after D Day and before the Normandy breakout. World War II was very much still raging in Europe, and
American men were still fighting and dying there. Yet at this very time we had (if we believe the story), a woman complaining to strangers on a train about the exciting adventures her husband was enjoying in the European theater (most likely as a result of being drafted). Moreover, this was a story Sanger felt perfectly comfortable sharing on the radio at home to the wives and mothers of US servicemen, as those men continued to fight and die overseas.

American Cemetery at Normandy photo released as public domain by Bjarki Sigursveinsson.
Several commenters have objected to my connecting Margaret Sanger’s radio program with the larger feminist movement. Bluedog has a long and complicated explanation involving class which is specific to the one woman Sanger ostensibly was talking to. New commenter openidname struggles with the math but comes to much the same conclusion:

Hmmm. One dumb-ass woman says one dumb-ass thing 650 FREAKING YEARS ago. Get over it already.

Another new commenter by the handle Ann first explained that she was molested as a child and had an abusive porn viewing husband, before explaining that in exposing the ugliness of feminists like Sanger I am hurting women:

Groups do not abuse, individuals abuse. Sometimes, evil people, women like Sanger or men like Manson collect evil people and attract victims. Unfortunately, some are successful.

When evil people, like Sanger, get individual men to paint in this case, “all women” as evil, they win. When you hate women because of Sanger and her followers, you feel OK hurting women (since they are all evil). You have then become the thing you hate. Sadly, you hurt women, who may then become more attracted to Sanger and her ilk.

The simple truth is that Sanger was a radical feminist. In 1914 she began publishing the radical feminist monthly *Woman Rebel*. She was well connected within the progressive movement, including Eleanor Roosevelt.

Moreover, the ideas she was selling in the radio program are the same ideas modern feminism is founded on, the same ideas which are now mainstream even for conservatives. Sanger founded Planned Parenthood, but the text of the program could have easily been written by the founder of NOW, Betty Friedan. Friedan is credited with kicking off modern feminism with her book The Feminine Mystique. Here is the synopsis of that book from Wikipedia:

*The Feminine Mystique* begins with an introduction describing what Friedan called “the problem that has no name”—the widespread unhappiness of women in the 1950s and early 1960s. It discusses the lives of several housewives from around the United States who were unhappy despite living in material comfort and being married with children.

What bothers these commenters is feminism is undeniably ugly, and I’m laying that out bare for all to see.

The myth is that modern feminism suddenly kicked off with Friedan’s book raising women’s
consciousness of the oppression of marriage and motherhood. The truth is that feminists had been beating the drums of envy and petty unhappiness for many decades, with perhaps a slight reduction in volume during the depression and World War II. But whether you trace the roots back to Friedan, Sanger, or even further, you will find the same ugly philosophy of envy, miserliness, and petty unhappiness.

Feminism can’t shed that ugly legacy because this is what feminism is all about. This is why even after radically reworking our entire society we still have feminist leaders like Hillary Clinton explaining that “Women have always been the primary victims of war. Women lose their husbands, their fathers, their sons in combat.” It is also why we will always have women eyeing the military with envy.

**Edit:** Corrected the title of Sanger’s feminist monthly from *The Women Rebel* to *Woman Rebel.*
Vox succinctly describes Social Justice Warriors:

Social Justice Enforcers would be a more apt term. The SJWs are nothing less than the mutaween of the godless West, the self-appointed enforcers of the would-be globalist elite’s hellish parody of morality.
Drudge via Time has picked up Jenny Bahn’s piece at XO Jane 30 Is the New 50: “Old Age” is Killing My Dating Life. What is fascinating is that while Bahn has stumbled on the painful truth, she still can’t fully connect the dots regarding her own choices. She can’t see that the young women she is unable to compete against are the younger version of herself. They don’t want to settle down now, but give them a decade and they will be singing the same song Bahn is singing now, complaining that men don’t want to commit. What is wrong with men?

It’s this logic that has most of my 30-something guy friends dating girls fresh out of college. Girls who, in my experience, are less impressive, less striving, less volatile, less successful, less intimidating, less questioning, less pressing, less complex, less damaged, less opinionated, less powerful, less womanly. They are less, and, to a guy not ready for anything — like most of the guys I have dated in New York — less is more.

A 30-year-old woman is an undertaking...

Now that she has more baggage and is more difficult, she expects more from men than she expected when she was younger and prettier. Is that too much to ask?

See Also: Women’s morphing need for male investment.
She’s saving her farts for you.
by Dalrock | September 23, 2014 | Link

From Men You Marry Vs. Men You Bang:

Marry: A man who lets you fart around him.

Bang: A man who is grossed out by female functions.

Sure all of those other men banged her when she was younger and hotter, but you get something special.
A rebuke for Yohami
by Dalrock | September 24, 2014 | Link

Yohami requested a rebuke for himself and others in his lifestyle, and it would be unloving of me to not provide one. This started as a comment but it was suggested that it deserves its own post, and I agree:

The lifestyle you are living is sinful. You are greatly harming yourself and the women you are with, not to mention countless children and husbands who are or will be in the picture. You aren’t leaving them better than you found them, you are leaving them worse off (as you are harmed by each time as well). You (and her) are using people for your own selfish pleasure, and the cost to yourselves and everyone else involved doesn’t matter to you.

As Heartiste explains:

- It would be wise for you Don Juans to remember that, the next time you rationalize that your leaving her will actually make her a better person. There is no spinning away the ugly reality with a sappy cliche. Better to embrace your wicked choice and feast on the brutality of it all. Makes for a more invigorating life.
Earlier this week Bill Frezza rhetorically asked at Forbes why drunk female students are never described as irresponsible jerks.

In our age of sexual equality, why drunk female students are almost never characterized as irresponsible jerks is a question I leave to the feminists.

Frezza quickly received the answer to this question when Forbes immediately removed the column and severed their relationship with him as a contributor. No one characterizes drunk female students as irresponsible jerks because this isn’t permitted.

Unfortunately Frezza caved and said that Forbes was right to pull the piece. But after caving he followed up with a hard point to argue with:

Any woman on campus knows that she is safe in our house, which is perhaps why some choose to behave with such reckless abandon.
The backup plan.

by Dalrock | September 29, 2014 | Link

The Mirror has an article up titled Nearly half of women in relationships have ‘Plan B’ man they can run away with (H/T Earl). There isn’t much actual data presented, but the enthusiasm for women’s infidelity is standard fare. They quote a spokesman for onepoll.com celebrating modern women’s fickleness:

“This news may cause a few men in relationships to think twice about not taking the rubbish out or choosing a night down the pub in favour of a cosy night in with his partner.

“This could spark fear in men across the UK and be great news for women looking for that extra bit of love and care so that their attentions aren’t swayed.”

...

“One thing is for certain, men across the UK today will be giving their partners that extra kiss goodnight this evening.”

While it is hard to imagine a form of bad behavior by women which wouldn’t be celebrated by the media, keep in mind that the sentiment in the article is merely the secular form of the Modern Christian view of marriage.

Although the data presented is murky, the basic pattern is something my wife and I have observed. Women who divorce almost always expect to replace their current husband with a new one, and they very often already have the replacement selected when they decide to pull the trigger. However, what tends to happen is they have either misinterpreted an interest in sex for a desire to take the betrayed husband’s place, or they have miscalculated the intended replacement’s attractiveness for marriage.

One woman we know explained to my wife that when she left her husband she always expected to marry her (beta orbiter) friend. On paper this looked like a good plan. Her beta orbiter had a good job and was eager to marry her. When she spoke with him on the phone she could imagine herself marrying him. But whenever he came over she found his obsessing over her so repulsive that she never was able to even bring herself to kiss him. There was a reason this man dreamed of wifing up a fickle woman; he had no better options. Since then her romantic prospects have steadily declined, and now she is a late 30s divorcée instead of a 29 year old divorcée. Meanwhile, her ex husband has married a younger woman and received a prestigious promotion.
Margaret Sanger is long gone, but her life’s work of fomenting feminist rebellion remains alive and well. We don’t need Sanger, because we have (collectively) taken up the mantle of her and her pioneering colleagues. Feminist rebellion is now a core value in the West, and as I’ve discussed previously it shows up in the most unexpected places.

Much of the problem comes from our extreme difficulty in spotting feminist rebellion in the first place. As feminist thought has taken hold across our culture, instead of becoming more vigilant to feminist rebellion we have become desensitized to it. We can now reliably spot it only in its most outlandish forms. If a woman isn’t carrying a sign in a slutwalk or doing something similar, we can’t spot the sin.

This played out recently after Donald McClarey at The American Catholic was kind enough to link to and quote one of my recent posts on Margaret Sanger. As is quite common, pretty quickly in the discussion a woman showed up reframing the absurd rebellious wife into a sympathetic character. To do this, she began by inventing an entire backstory on behalf of Sanger’s rebellious housewife:

If we can leave Margaret Sanger out of it for a moment and just focus on what this anonymous housewife reportedly said, it is quite plausible. I would think that her husband, in writing letters home, would probably leave out most of the gory details, not wanting to burden her or make her worry about his safety, and would try to focus on the positive. Plus, his letters were almost certainly censored by the military and any details that could reveal where he was fighting or the number or type of casualties his unit was suffering, or inflicting on the enemy, would have to be left out. So all that he COULD talk about, perhaps, would be stuff that would make it sound as if he were on a great adventure of some kind, and even if she knew intellectually that his job was not all “fun” she probably couldn’t help but feel a bit envious. Bear in mind, also, that gasoline rationing and car ownership not being as prevalent at that time probably meant she didn’t get out of her house or neighborhood very often. Also, we are not told why she was on the train or where she was going. It may not have been a “pleasure” trip; perhaps she was on her way to visit an ill or distressed or difficult relative.

But she was just warming up. Next she introduced a new character into the discussion, an exemplary Catholic wife who couldn’t help but feel the same way Sanger’s character did when her own husband went overseas in the military:

About 20 years ago I met a very exemplary Catholic wife, whose husband was in the military over in, I believe, Bosnia, who admitted to similar feelings of jealousy toward him at times — “you get to see the world and I’m stuck at home wiping the kids’ noses all day!” This woman was NOT naive or spoiled, she knew her husband’s job
was dangerous, but she admitted to feeling that way at times.

Expertly done, but creating a feeling of sympathy and understanding for wives mired in envy of their husbands was only preparation for her next step, to propose a feminist solution for the problem of feminist rebellion. The logical solution, she explained, is for husbands with envious and rebellious wives to take over more of the child care duties:

All that said, the solution to the bored/trapped housewife’s problem was not for her to divorce her husband or abort her children, but simply for someone to give her an occasional break by offering to babysit or take her kids to the park, etc. while she did something else. If her husband were not willing to do it, a friend, relative or neighbor could have.

Note the lack of repentance here. The solution to the sin of feminist rebellion is not for the wife to repent, but for the husband to become more egalitarian. This important part tends to get lost in the emotion of the situation, as what husband doesn’t love his wife enough to help her out from time to time? But in this specific context the husband helping out with childcare isn’t about helping out a busy wife (a normal and loving thing), but catering to a rebellious wife.

After I responded pointing out the problem with her recasting the rebellious wife in the most sympathetic light possible while proposing more feminism and not repentance as the solution, she initially changed her stance. She claimed she was aware of the feminist rebellion in the wives under discussion all along. She explained that she only mentioned the Catholic housewife because it was an example of how even a very devout woman would need to resist this kind of temptation (emphasis mine):

I never said these women were right or justified in how they felt, only that I tended to believe the woman-on-the-train story COULD have actually happened, in contrast to those who suggested that Sanger probably just made it up to advance her point. The second woman I described as an “exemplary Catholic” not because her OCCASIONAL twinges of jealousy were worthy of emulation, but because she was a committed, orthodox Catholic, very involved in her parish and in the pro-life movement, and also homeschooled her older children. In other words, she was one of the last people on earth I would have suspected of being guilty of the “sin of feminist rebellion”.

But this new tack was short lived. After I challenged her a bit further and some local white knights galloped in to her defense, she doubled down on the need for more feminism, not repentance. If wives in feminist rebellion don’t have their demands met, she explained, bad things are in store for their children and husband. Focusing on repentance will only lead women to divorce, have abortions, commit child abuse, have nervous breakdowns, and develop addictions:

So giving a stay at home mom an occasional break from taking care of her kids is sinful in your book? If she’s going bananas cooped up at home, she should just “repent” of her “rebellion” and push all thoughts of having even a couple of hours to herself out of her mind? That way of thinking, sorry to say, feeds right into Sanger’s
argument — that divorce, contraception and abortion are the ONLY alternative to a life of unrelieved drudgery and isolation for women.

Call it a “feminist solution” but I would think that if asking one’s husband or a friend or relative to watch the kids so you can get an occasional afternoon or evening out keeps you from having a nervous breakdown, developing an addiction, or taking out your frustrations on your kids via verbal or physical abuse, I see nothing wrong with that. If Sanger “would have approved” of this idea, well, a stopped clock is right twice a day, and a good idea doesn’t become evil just because an evil person happens to approve of it. If that were the case, we should denounce interstate highways and Volkswagens as evil because they were Hitler’s ideas.

It is important to remember that the example we are discussing is a woman with a single child who was complaining to strangers on a train about all of the “fun” her husband was having fighting in the European theater. This was a few weeks after the Normandy landings and prior to the Normandy breakout. No matter how absurd and outrageous the example of feminist envy, the lure and emotional power of rebellion can quickly carry all reason away.

Note: Donald McClarey has been a gracious host to me, and my strong preference is to keep further discussion of this here on my blog unless he indicates a desire to host it on his blog as well. I have no power to enforce this, but I ask this as a personal favor of my readers.

My other request, and something I can and will enforce, is to refrain from personal attacks against anyone participating in the discussion at The American Catholic. Disagreement is of course fine, as is pointing out what you believe is their error (and agreement is of course fine as well).
A bastard of a job.

by Dalrock | October 2, 2014 | Link

First we had Margaret Sanger telling us of the woes of American housewives trapped in boredom and drudgery during WWII, unable to experience the freedom, fun, and excitement of going off to war. Then Betty Friedan helped us (not) name the horror housewives endure, so we could understand the pain of being trapped in drudgery and boredom. Now feminist Germaine Greer blows the lid off of the trapped boring drudgery of being the Duchess of Cambridge (H/T Minesweeper):

“"It’s not so much that she has to be a womb, but she has to be a mother. I would hope after this one she says, ‘That’s it. No more.’”
Single men with jobs are becoming a scarce commodity.

by Dalrock | October 2, 2014 | Link

The new Pew study has gotten a great deal of attention. Suddenly everyone is noticing that as women continue to delay marriage their prospects are getting less rosy. One finding which should come as no surprise (but nevertheless surprised many) is that women strongly prefer to marry men with jobs. The problem is, single men with jobs are getting more and more scarce. Now that we’ve moved from a marriage based family structure to a child support based family structure, unmarried men are now working like women.

To understand the real world impact of this on the marriage market, check out this interactive chart Pew put together showing the ratio of 25-34 year old single men to 25-34 year old single women in different metro areas. Click on the tab for the number of employed men for every 100 women and then hover over the metro area of your choice. According to the chart here in DFW there are only 85 employed single men for every 100 single women.

The obvious flaw in the chart is the age ranges examined. It would make more sense to have different age ranges for men and women given the differing realities of fertility and attractiveness. Still, opening the age range to include older single men wouldn’t help all that much, since older single men are less likely to have any earnings than younger single men are. Also, there tends to be a reason a man with a decent job reaches a certain age without marrying. For the most part, they either weren’t attractive or they weren’t interested in marriage. Lastly, feminism has convinced large numbers of women that it would be weird for them to marry a man who was more than a few years older than them. My own purely anecdotal observation is that by the time a woman starts to expand her search to include potential husbands ten years older than her, her fertility window is all but closed.

There is also a great deal of foolishness still circulating around the modern marriage market. Pamela Engel at Business Insider looked at Pew’s interactive chart and rationalized that women have the upper hand, since men must value the same traits in a wife that women value in a husband:

Men are going to have a much harder time than women in finding a partner who’s employed. There doesn’t appear to be a single metro area that’s shown on Pew’s map where employed, unmarried women outnumber employed, unmarried men.

See also:

- More grim news for carousellers hoping to jump at the last minute.
- More ominous than a strike.
Fewer men are working, and marriage is dying.

by Dalrock | October 3, 2014 | Link

The Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis has the following handy chart showing the long decline in men’s employment in the US (shaded areas represent recessions):

During this same time period the strength of marriage as an institution has declined as well. Out of wedlock births are up (source):
The percentage of the population which is married is going down:

Median age of first marriage is going up (Source):
The closest to good news for marriage is that divorce rates stopped increasing after reaching 22 per 1,000 couples (per year) in 1980. However, remarriage rates are in a steep decline:
Conventional Wisdom

Conventional wisdom is that the decline in men’s labor force participation and the weakening of marriage as an institution are linked, but only in one direction. The standard narrative is that as men have (for whatever reason) worked less, marriage has been weakened because men are no longer filling the role of breadwinner. There is certainly some logic here, and this must be a least part of the explanation. However, in asserting that the connection works in only one direction the standard narrative requires a series of incredible assumptions.

The first assumption conventional wisdom requires is that a marriage based culture doesn’t create powerful incentives for married men to work hard and maximize their earnings. Denying the incentive marriage provides to men to work harder has left a cottage industry of sociologists and economists scratching their heads trying to figure out why marriage makes men more productive and doesn’t do the same for women. This incentive is denied despite the fact that we implicitly recognize that it is a powerful motivating force in other contexts. Every family court judge in the land knows that marriage creates strong incentives for men to work harder, which is why courts feel the need to assign income quotas (imputed income) to divorced men in order to keep them working as hard after the divorce as they did while married.

http://dalrock.wordpress.com/
2010 Data Source: http://ncfmr.bgsu.edu/pdf/family_profiles/file114853.pdf
The second assumption is that the desire to marry in a marriage based culture doesn’t create an incentive for young men to work hard to signal breadwinner capability or at least breadwinner potential. To believe this, one would have to assume that young men aren’t aware that women place a high value on a man’s employment and earnings status when selecting a prospective husband. This is absurd. The reality is that sex is a powerful motivator for men (young and old); just ask any marketer.

The third assumption is that feminism and the sexual revolution never happened, or at least that they didn’t fundamentally change marriage patterns. Under this assumption, the only reason women are delaying or forgoing marriage is because women simply can’t find men with jobs. Yet we know this isn’t true. Feminists have completed a long and wildly successful march through all of our institutions, and young women are quite open about their plans to maximize their period of casual sex and only marry once they start to see their window of fertility close. The reality is that women are delaying marriage not because marriagable men are scarce, but because they perceive them as so abundant they don’t feel the need to hurry and lock one down.

**Conclusion**

In a marriage based society, getting sexual access to the most attractive women requires men to work hard to signal provider status. After the wedding, men feel the responsibility which comes with the position of head of the household. Both of these are extremely powerful incentives for men to work hard and maximize their earnings. However, we have moved from a marriage based/incentive structure for men to a quota/coercion based society. As a result, we are seeing a shift in men’s attitudes about work.

Tying this back to the chart on men’s employment, what this means is one of two things is going on:

1) The entire reduction in men’s earnings and labor force participation is due to the loss of incentives which were in place when we were a marriage based society.

or

2) Structural forces have reduced men’s participation in the workforce (a shifting economy, global trade, an increase in welfare/disability payments, etc), while at the same time men’s incentive to push past these obstacles has been greatly reduced. Put another way, we have reduced men’s incentive to work hard at exactly the time we need them working their hardest. Even worse, each of these two problems feeds the other in a vicious circle. Weaker incentives for men to excel results in a weaker economy, which weakens marriage, which then further weakens the incentives for men to excel.

No matter how you view it, we are paying a huge price for our decision to move from a marriage based family structure to a child support family model. Moreover, this price is going to continue to increase as the inertia left over from the former model fades away.

**See also:** How the destruction of marriage is strangling the feminist welfare state.
Edit Oct 6 2014: Updated the remarriage chart to one showing the correct time scale.
There was a problem with the time scaling of the remarriage rate chart in my last post. Here is the fixed version:

I also decided to take another look at the data in the NCFMR paper I used for this post. I created all of the charts below using point estimates I derived from the NCFMR charts with the Engauge Digitizer tool (H/T Inge). I used a different estimation method when creating this chart in the past so some of the estimates are slightly different.

Here is a comparison of men’s remarriage rates in 1990 and 2011 broken down into ten year categories. Note that the over 65 value for 1990 doesn’t match the same value in the chart at the top of the page (16 vs 19). These appear to be different data sources, and some of the difference could be due to my having to estimate the numbers in the chart below. However, the 2011 value for men over 65 below is almost exactly the same as the 2010 value in the chart at the top of the page (13 vs 12).
Here is the same chart for women. Interestingly while men in all age brackets have become less likely to remarry, all of the reduction in remarriage rates for women happened in the younger age brackets. Even for men however the biggest changes happened in the youngest brackets. This reduction in remarriage in the younger age brackets is bad news for women who want to **have it all**, because nearly two thirds of the women divorcing are under 45.

http://daihock.wordpress.com/
The next chart lets you compare men’s and women’s remarriage rates across age brackets in the present:
Here you can compare men’s and women’s remarriage rates back in 1990. Note the same crossover as the 2011 chart between the first and second age bracket where men become more likely to remarry than women. This fits nicely with Rollo’s chart on SMV.
Finally, I focused on the 25-54 age brackets and showed the trend for each sex and age category combination from 1990 to 2011:
US Remarriage Rates for Men and Women 25-54, 1990-2011

Annual number of remarriages per 1,000 divorced and widowed men and women.

http://dalrock.wordpress.com/
Selling sin.

by Dalrock | October 10, 2014 | Link

Recently a self described conservative Christian mother of 5 came to scold me for criticizing the Christian Broadcasting Network’s endorsement of actress Janine Turner’s book praising single mothers:

I encountered your blog because I had found Janine Turner’s book in my church library and a Google search led me here. I am pretty disgusted with the condescension and misogyny that you express in so many of your articles. I am a very, very conservative Christian, married for 20 years with 5 kids to a wonderful man, and I can’t ever imagine Our Lord looking down on human beings with the contempt that you display in your writing. You do not have the heart of Jesus—he came to save, not to condemn...

It’s very sad to me that you can’t seem to recognize that there are many women out there who lived sinful lives, who now have sole care of a child from their past, and who have had a conversion BECAUSE of their struggles. One of God’s greatest talents is to bring good even from our sinfulness, as He did on the Cross. These single mothers are trying to work out their salvation with fear and trembling just like you and me, and all Janine Turner was doing with her book was trying to encourage women in that situation to hold fast to Jesus and not despair that God can’t do amazing things for their lives and their children because their circumstances don’t “look” wholesome and perfect...

As I’ve written before, as feminist thought has taken hold across our culture instead of becoming more vigilant to feminist rebellion Christians have become desensitized to it. No matter how blatant the expression of feminist rebellion, we just can’t see it. As a result, we no longer need radical feminists like Sanger and Friedan; ordinary Christians now reflexively toe the feminist line. In a world where unwed motherhood and kicking the father out of the home are celebrated feminist rights, objecting to Christians declaring these sins as godly is the new heresy. Objecting to declaring evil good is now hateful, misogyny.

Make no mistake; Miss Turner is quite open about what she intended to accomplish in writing her book. This is not as the commenter implied a book about repentance. In the forward to the book Miss Turner describes her own out of wedlock pregnancy and birth without a hint of repentance. She presents her out of wedlock birth not as a foreseeable result of sinful choices, but something which life did to her (emphasis mine):

My Journey
I’ve often reflected, How did a Baptist girl from Texas end up as a single mother? My pregnancy, however, was the most miraculous event of my life. I would read to her in the womb, play Mozart, and pray with her. I even felt the joy when she kicked, literally, to the music of a Broadway show.
As my pregnancy progressed, however, it became increasingly evident that my journey as a mother was to be a singular event. One day I predicted that my daughter’s father would not be there when our baby was born. He responded by holding me tightly and saying that, yes, he would be there. I knew in my heart that he would not. Call it women’s intuition, but I knew. This is not how I envisioned the drama of my life, the joy of bringing a child into the world, but life presented itself to me in this way.

A bit further down she explains her mission in writing the book:

My Mission
There’s one thing I believe fervently, and that is that 90 percent of single mothers never intended to be single mothers. Most young girls, as they daydream about the day when they will have children, rarely say, “When I grow up I want to have a child and raise the child without a father.” Or, “When I grow up I want to get a divorce and raise my children all by myself.” It rarely happens.

I wrote this book to inspire these women. I wrote it so that single mothers of today would not feel alone, troubled, burdened, shamed, or depressed.

To drive home the need for such a book, Miss Turner points out that we are experiencing an explosion of single mothers:

The U.S. Census Bureau data published in 2004 reports that approximately 43 percent of women raising children are single mothers; this number is likely higher today. 51 percent of women in America are not married. The wisdom that the women of this book impart to us is that we are not alone. Women have been doing it for centuries and through tragic circumstances in social environments that, for the most part, pale to any we could encounter today.

This is the message Miss Turner with the help of CBN, the married mother of 5, and her church (by placing this book in the church library) is selling to young women. There is no sin, only circumstances that life hands you. With a little girlpower and moxie you don’t need a husband, and your children don’t need a father. Hold your head high. You’ve come a long way baby.
A woman’s work is never done.

by Dalrock | October 13, 2014 | Link

The indignities of marriage never stop piling up for feminists. On top of being trapped in boring drudgery, Kelsey McKinney explains at Vox (the other Vox) that Obama’s latest bit of male groveling insidiously forces wives to train their husbands. Clearly now the patriarchy has finally stooped too low:

What President Obama is suggesting, really, is that women — on top of dealing with internet trolls, domestic abuse, higher rates of sexual assault, and being paid less than men for the same work — must also deal with the mighty task of reforming all of the world’s males into decent husbands.

At the event, Obama also said, “Eventually we learn, but it takes us a little longer, because we’re not as smart.”

The president may have gotten this idea from his wife, who claimed in August that women are the more intelligent sex. But if that’s true, then it’s important women are able spend their time developing cures for cancer and renewable energy sources rather than training men to do the dishes.

What we need is a great hero, someone who can rescue feminists from this endless misery instead of expecting women to solve it themselves. Won’t some big strong not-woman come rescue the poor feminists?
CNN Money has a new article up claiming that men with children magically earn more than childless men (H/T Sunshine Mary): **It pays to be a dad**

Dads had a median salary of $49,000 compared to around $29,000 for men without kids.

…”Parenthood is giving advantages to men but not to women,” said Justine Calcagno, a social psychologist and author of the report.

The sad thing is very few can spot the problem with this logic. Men who have families to support have larger expenses than single, childless men. This means they have to work harder to earn more money. They all but tripped over this fact while rushing to their false conclusion:

Overall, 92% of dads are employed full-time compared to 77% of non-dads, who are more likely to be part-time workers.

Even to the extent that managers prefer fathers over childless men, the reason is that they know the father is much more motivated.

Everyone understands this when talking to a young man who wants to someday have a family. Everyone knows the young man had better work hard if he wants to be able to support a family. But once the family man has done what he needs to do, this is suddenly proof not of sacrifice by men, but of unfairness to women. Even most conservatives can’t spot the flawed thinking.

We see the same nonsensical thinking regarding findings that married men earn more than unmarried men:

“Particularly for men, marriage typically brings what has been called the ‘marriage premium’ where married men with identical experience and education make more money than their single counterparts.”

**Edit:** Here is a link to the original study. The ‘Mommy Tax’ and ‘Daddy Bonus’
I stumbled on a recent piece by Ezra Klein at Vox titled “Yes Means Yes” is a terrible law, and I completely support it. It is a remarkably frank discussion of California’s new law defining how universities which receive state funds are to handle allegations of rape. My initial reaction on the whole “Yes Means Yes” question was one of limited interest. As I’ve explained before, I’m not interested in creating rules of the road for fornication. It isn’t that I don’t care about injustice, but that I don’t see a way to make fornication safe.

My own initial response is I’m quite certain the standard response for most conservatives. To their credit, feminists have done a brilliant job of maneuvering conservatives as a blocking force around the battlefield of the culture wars. The problem however is not that conservatives aren’t interested in creating rules of the road for fornication, it is that they are all too eager to assist feminists in doing this. The greatest precedent for this is in the area of child support. Feminists complained that it wasn’t fair for the fornicating woman to be responsible for any resulting pregnancies while fornicating men get off scott-free. The idea of a cad not being responsible for supporting his children understandably enrages conservatives, and you will be hard pressed to find a conservative who objects to child support in theory or in practice.

The problem with child support however is that in trying to make fornication fair, conservatives have unwittingly given their approval for the replacement of marriage as the fundamental family structure in the Western world. Making fornication “fair” (for women) turned out to come at a profound cost, something we haven’t begun to process.

What we see in the Yes Means Yes law is the next level of legislation attempting to make fornication as pleasant and rewarding an experience for women as possible. As Klein explains in the opening of the piece, it is in fact a ridiculous law:

It tries to change, through brute legislative force, the most private and intimate of adult acts. It is sweeping in its redefinition of acceptable consent; two college seniors who’ve been in a loving relationship since they met during the first week of their freshman years, and who, with the ease of the committed, slip naturally from cuddling to sex, could fail its test.

Yet while he is very open about the absurdity of the law, he goes on to explain that it is needed in order to create a culture of promiscuity where men are afraid and women are not:

If the Yes Means Yes law is taken even remotely seriously it will settle like a cold winter on college campuses, throwing everyday sexual practice into doubt and creating a haze of fear and confusion over what counts as consent. This is the case against it, and also the case for it...

...”No Means No” has created a world where women are afraid. To work, “Yes Means Yes” needs to create a world where men are afraid.
Klein explains that this other piece by Amanda Taub was largely responsible for bringing him to support this view. Taub’s piece is even more eye opening, explaining that women’s fear of doing risky things is “a tax on women”.

That status quo puts women in the position of having to constantly police their own behavior to make sure that they are not giving the appearance of passive consent. That’s not only exhausting; it’s limiting. It reinforces power imbalances that keep women out of positions of success and authority.

This is the core idea behind the slogan “Teach men not to rape”. Feminists are pushing for a world where female promiscuity is encouraged and defended with the full force of society. The danger is, conservatives could be baited into backing this as they were baited into backing child support. Those who don’t formally approve of the new order are likely to want to stay out of it, out of a reluctance to being perceived as going to bat for promiscuous men. Ironically the standard argument against the law, that it will create a chilling effect on the hookup culture, only confirms to conservatives that this is in fact a good law. But the law isn’t designed to put a damper on the hookup culture, it is designed to grease the skids for women to participate more fully in the hookup culture.

Taub describes the problem of the status quo in greater detail:

As a result, certain opportunities are left unavailable to women, while still others are subject to expensive safety precautions, such as not traveling for professional networking unless you can afford your own hotel room. It amounts, essentially, to a tax that is levied exclusively on women. And it sucks.

The example she is referring to here is a woman named Sophia Katz who by her own account traveled to New York City to take a man she had never met up on his offer to share his bed. The first night she spent in his bed she rebuffed his sexual advances with “Hey, I’m really tired. Could we not do this right now?” On the second night she first argued that his roommates would hear before giving in.

Katz is the poster child for the Yes Means Yes law, because while neither she nor the man she slept with were involved with California universities, the intent is to make it safe for women to do exactly what Katz did without fear of feeling pressured to have sex. Likewise, the intent is to make it safe for women to go home with random hook up partners and not risk feeling regret later. In order to accomplish this, the law must as Klein explains create a world where men are afraid so women will feel comfortable in doing foolish, risky things.

Right now this law only impacts students at California universities. However, the push is clearly to modify the criminal code across the West in similar fashion. Nothing short of this will make women and girls feel safe pursuing promiscuity with wild abandon, even though making something dangerous feel safe will only put women at far greater risk.

The question is how will non feminists react to this latest gambit. Will they actively support it, or at least not protest as it is pushed through, out of a sense of disgust at cads like the one who shared his bed with Katz expecting sex in return? Or will non feminists recognize the folly in yet further laws attempting to make promiscuity and foolishness as fun and rewarding
for women as possible?

**Related:** *We are trapped on Slut Island and Traditional Conservatives are our Gilligan*
Commenter theasdgamer asked how Yes Means Yes is intended to grease the skids of hookup culture for women. This is a crucial question, because conservatives are tempted to assume the law will greatly constrict the hookup culture, as Heather Mac Donald of The Weekly Standard argues (H/T Martel):

Sexual liberation is having a nervous breakdown on college campuses. Conservatives should be cheering on its collapse; instead they sometimes sound as if they want to administer the victim smelling salts...

The ultimate result of the feminists’ crusade may be the same as if they were explicitly calling for a return to sexual modesty: a sharp decrease in casual, drunken sex. There is no downside to this development.

But this fantasy denies what the promoters of the law are saying outright. The intent of the law is to make women feel freer to engage in the hookup culture, as Ezra Klein explains:

The Yes Means Yes law could also be called the You Better Be Pretty Damn Sure law...

A version of the You Better Be Pretty Damn Sure law is already in effect at college campuses. It just sits as an impossible burden on women, who need to Be Pretty Damn Sure that the guy who was so nice to them at the party isn’t going to turn into a rapist if they let him into their dorm room — and that’s not something anyone can be sure about.

As the proponents of the law are very openly explaining, the point is to make it feel safe for women to take strange men back to their dorm rooms, or to travel to unknown cities and sleep in strange men’s beds. This is what feminists have in mind, and this is what such a law will promote.

It is worth reiterating that the law will only make these foolish choices seem safe. It won’t actually make doing these things safe. Just like “Teach men not to rape” won’t reduce rape, giving women comfort in making risky choices won’t actually make those choices safe.
There is a naive celebration by many conservatives of California’s new Yes Means Yes law. The theory is that unleashing a feminist jihad of false rape punishment will somehow end the sexual revolution, bringing us back to either Victorian or Puritan sexual mores. Conn Carroll looks forward to an explosion in false rape accusations leading to a sudden boon of “committed relationships”. Heather Mac Donald entertains similar fantasies, explaining:

Mothers worried that their college-bound sons will be hauled before a biased campus sex tribunal by a vindictive female should tell them: “Wait. Find a girlfriend and smother her with affection and respect. Write her love letters in the middle of the night. Escort her home after a date and then go home yourself.”

These fantasies and those which will surely follow are the result of a fundamental misunderstanding of why we have the hookup culture in the first place. It wasn’t men who drove the creation of hookup culture, it was women. The sexual revolution asked young women to reshape our culture to best suit their desires, and hookup culture is what young women created. Giving women even more capricious power over men won’t suddenly make today’s campus sluts desire marriage, or even marriage lite. While the new rules will undoubtedly take some young men (perhaps a large number of them) out of the hookup market they won’t reduce young women’s desire or opportunity to fully indulge in promiscuity.

The law also won’t help the young women fighting against the hookup culture, those who are looking for marriage or at least a “serious relationship”. The law is designed to create mistrust between men and women, and to destabilize all heterosexual relationships on campus.

To the extent that the law drives (some) young men away from the hookup culture, what will fill the void is not a sudden resurgence in marriage or even a path to marriage, but some combination of men checking out (the dreaded peter pan manboys/grass eaters), turning to porn/VR sex, and homosexuality. If your favorite sexual marketplace player is represented in that lineup, then aside from the cruelty and injustice of the law you might have something to look forward to. But for those who want to see a return to marriage, this next wave of feminist sexual insanity will only take us farther from the end goal.
The more meager a woman’s choices, the more attractive she must be.

by Dalrock | October 20, 2014 | Link

Over at the throwaway post that keeps on giving, new commenter Deborah explains that since attractive men aren’t messaging her, women must have the SMP advantage as they age (emphasis mine):

My husband and my marriage has been over a little over a year after he walked out and feel that I want to start dating again. I keep my figure up, weigh 106 lbs, 5’3” and put on my makeup and dress appropriately for my age of 57.

*But I have tried the “new type of dating” since I haven’t dated since 1979 and married in 1980, so I have signed up on 5 dating sites, some free, most not -JDate since I am Jewish, Match, OurTime for those over 50, OKCupid which is free and not Zoosk, which I am thinking I won’t sign up for a paid subscription.

Yes, I am lonely, and do love men, even though my husband hurt me deeply. But, when I look at the profile photos of the men on these dating sites, they turn my stomach, and feel these men have no idea just how bad they look, older than their years on their profile, fat, scruffy, and look like they have been road hard, put away wet, and don’t have a clue that most women who are my age, will not find them the least bit attractive, surely not to date. Most just look like they are narcissists, and self centered, and think us women want to go out with a fish, or boat or souped up car, because that is what these guys pose with and many don’t even smile on their profiles. Are their teeth rotten or do they just hate life? Not sure about any of this.

What I do know is I have more self esteem and want anyone I date to clean up their act too. These men, aver the age of 50, want us women to look good, even thin and sexy, but do they? Nope.

If you don’t believe me about these dating sites.sign up for one or two, create a profile, of yourself, and then sit back and watch and wait to see who sends you a wink or a message. These men are also rude, crude and disrespectful of women, and think that we are devoid of having a brain, or carrying on a conversation. To even try and screen out some of the men that are NOT a fit for me at all, I put in my profile that I love the theater, the ballet, the arts, as most men on these dating sites wouldn’t know what a tutu is, or who Picasso is. LOL Too bad it’s so pathetic:(

See Also: Grannies Gone Wild!
With Gamergate, we may finally have found the line in the sand when it comes to how far men will allow feminists to go in eradicating male spaces. As Social Justice Warrior (SJW) Brianna Wu explains at The Washington Post (H/T Vox):

> Gamergate is ostensibly about journalistic ethics. Supporters say they want to address conflicts of interest between the people that make games and the people that support them. In reality, Gamergate is a group of gamers that are willing to destroy the women who have invaded their clubhouse.

SJW hyperbole aside, there is some truth to what she is saying. At its core Gamergate is about gamers rejecting feminists and other SJWs who are trying to feminize their games. The move to mark video games as feminine comes after a long series of capitulations. In the eyes of feminists everything must be marked as feminine, from our nuclear submarines and special forces to the NFL. And everywhere feminists have marched, men have capitulated. That is everywhere but video games, as Wu explains:

> For 30 years, video games have been designed by men, marketed to men and sold to men. It's obvious to anyone outside the industry that video games have serious issues with the portrayal of women...

> The consequence of this culture is male gamers have been trained to feel video games are their turf. In stopping Gamergate, the men who dominate it – not just women — must address the culture that created Gamergate.

Conservatives, especially Christian conservatives are quick to deride men who play video games as “Peter Pan manboys”. However, gamers as a group have found the courage to stand up to feminism, and this kind of courage is something which so far Christians have been unable to muster. Some things are too important to give up without a fight. Perhaps if the gamers ultimately prevail, Christians will be inspired and decide that Christianity is also worth defending from the feminist onslaught.
Elissa Strauss at The Week is distressed by a recent Chanel No. 5 extended commercial. Strauss is troubled that “having it all” has gone terribly wrong. In the commercial the wife is the new husband, surfing powerful waves while her unhappily married husband (the new wife) frets over his unhappiness. He decides to follow his heart and she has to give chase. They don’t come right out and say it but I’m pretty sure it ends with the wife having to do a 40 day “dare” to prove her love and win his heart back from a sexy nurse:

Clearly the only thing more frightening to feminists than not getting what they demand is actually getting it.
Commenter InnocentBystanderBoston asks why feminists are so intent on marking video games as feminine:

I don’t understand why feminist women want to be part of the world of “gaming.” It just doesn’t make much sense to me. Gaming is purely competitive, entirely meritocracy based. There simply is no space for feminists and their reach for government oversite for authority to equalize the arena. Any attempt to do this means that all the other games simply exit that arena and choose another arena.

More to the point, these people are nerds. I know I was when I gamed. Feminists don’t want to be around nerds. All they want is resources provided by the nerds (by way of tax increases) that nerds must pay to government so the feminists can get their life of Julia.

Feminism at its core is envy of men and a desire to usurp their position. It would be difficult to overstate just how deep this feeling is. This isn’t just about the apex fallacy, it is about a deep desire to “be one of the guys”. Any group of men getting together to create or enjoy anything will result in women wanting in. The only question is which category the women belong to. Some will want to try to experience the manly enjoyment/pride directly, and will take real steps to be (like) one of the guys. These are the ones who tend to defend the male space. They don’t want it ruined because they want to experience it. But others (a much larger group) will realize that they can’t actually experience this, and will then set out to stamp out what they can’t have. The first category inadvertently paves the way for the second, assuming they don’t themselves shift priorities mid stream.

This is Eve’s curse played out over and over again. If you don’t get this, you can’t really get what motivates feminists, nor why they will forever be miserable.
Teach women not to lie about rape.
by Dalrock | October 25, 2014 | Link

Policemag.com has story about a woman who claimed a New Mexico police officer sexually assaulted her when he arrested her for a DUI. Fortunately for the officer he was wearing a lapel cam and the video exonerated him. Still, you can hear the concern in his voice when life ruining charges were made against him. This is serious business, as the president of the Albuquerque Police Department union explained:

The desire to frame officers for wrongdoing is a growing issue facing officers every day. We believe that the public should be held accountable for filing false reports against police officers. These incidents can be very damaging to an officer’s career, so we hope that this individual and others face appropriate consequences for their malicious actions.

The Blaze followed up on the same story and learned that charges won’t be filed because a false accuser of sexual assault isn’t fundamentally different than a real victim:

...despite the apparent falsehood of her sexual assault claim, police did not want to set a precedent that could discourage other potential victims of sexual assault from coming forward.

Taken at face value this suggests that women can’t tell the difference between making a false claim and making a real one. But if women can’t tell the difference, how could we ever take any claim by women seriously? This only makes sense when you consider what feminists are already telling us; they don’t just want to stop real cases of rape and sexual assault, they want to create a culture where men are afraid of women. For feminists rape isn’t about (forced) sex, it is about power.
Several commenters have taken me to task for the ostensible naivety of the title of my post Teach women not to lie about rape. For those who didn’t understand the title, feminists have rejected any advice to women on avoiding rape as part of “rape culture”. Instead, the feminist solution is to simply “teach men not to rape”. You can see examples of this thinking here and here, and The Boston Globe has written about it here.

Ironically the great risk here is that the idea is so absurd others won’t take feminists seriously. It is tempting to assume they don’t really mean it, that they can’t really mean it. However, as I’ve noted before the poster child for the Yes Means Yes law is Sophia Katz and her decision to travel to a strange city upon receiving an offer to sleep in a stranger’s bed. From reading her own account she clearly kept her bed-mate confused about whether she was attracted to him, and she avoided rejecting him sexually because she wanted to continue to receive the freebies he was offering:

I had no interest in making out with him or having sex with him, but had a feeling that it would ‘turn into an ordeal’ if I rejected him. I had never been in a situation where I was living with someone for a period of time who wanted to have sex with me, that I didn’t want to have sex with. I knew I had nowhere else to stay, and if I upset him that I might be forced to leave.

... 

“It’s okay. I get it. You don’t find me attractive.”

He was correct, but that wasn’t the only problem, and I somehow felt saying that would be cruel.

“It’s not that, I just don’t want to get into a sexual or romantic thing with anyone while I’m here.”

... 

I got ready for bed with the hope that I would be treated to another evening of sleep without exhausting sexual assault, but was denied. Once again I found myself trying (and failing) to convince Stan that I didn’t find him unattractive, but still did not want to have sex with him, and was not consenting, by any means, to having sex with him. Once again I failed, and he had sex with my body while I stared up at the ceiling. I imagined what it would be like to be raped violently.

When feminists say “teach men not to rape”, they mean don’t teach women to avoid risky or even foolish choices. They mean don’t teach women not to travel to a strange city and sleep in a strange man’s bed. No matter how obvious and sound the teaching would be, no matter
how much it would protect women, feminists would have us remain silent. Feminist Amanda Taub explains (emphasis mine):

And yet those who criticize Katz for her role in what happened are not only saying that she was wrong to accept the opportunity Dierks offered; they are also saying that other young women should not do what Katz did. If other young women find themselves in her position, these people would argue, they should not accept the invitation, should not travel to a new place to make new professional connections, should not take that step to benefit their careers.

That attitude nibbles away at the edges of women’s opportunities.

This is the nonsense of the “teach men not to rape” slogan, and Instapundit Glenn Reynolds has written a series of posts lampooning this foolish slogan by turning it around. Vox Day has picked this up and run with it as well. The title of my post was a variation on the same theme. However after looking through his archives I see that Instapundit beat me to it at least twice.

If you have a moment I highly recommend reviewing his posts on the topic as well as his blog in general. He continuously adds new and interesting content.

Full Disclosure: Instapundit has been very kind in sending traffic my way. I can always tell when he has linked to something I have written because the resulting instalanche creates a pronounced spike in my wordpress toolbar:
It’s hard on her, but not on her kids.

by Dalrock | October 29, 2014 | Link

YourTango has a post titled *11 Things Single Parents Don’t Want To Hear*. Note the euphemism “single parent” when what they really mean is “single mother”. The stigma against single mothers is clearly *creeping back*, and this will only accelerate.

Number one on the list is not to refer to single mothers as a “baby mama” and their child’s father as “baby daddy”. No surprise here. These terms make unwed motherhood sound trashy, low status, and low class. Again, the stigma is creeping back in, and it will only get worse.

But what really stands out is how not having the father in the household is a great hardship for the *mother*, but somehow not for her *kids*. When the hardship of a broken home is experienced by mom it is all too real:

11. **How do you afford it?** By working my butt off every day of the week!

11. **Oh, come on. Being a single parent isn’t that hard.** Really? Would you like to try it?

But any suggestion that her kids suffer as a result of growing up in the chaos of a broken home is dismissed outright:

4. **Your poor kids have to grow up without a positive male role model.** Between their grandfathers, uncles, teachers, and their father, I think they’ll be ok.

5. **It’s shame. Kids really need both their parents.** Would you say that to a single parent whose partner passed away?

8. **Your kids are going to have some serious relationship issues.** Oh, I’m sorry. I didn’t see the crystal ball in your hands. Please, tell me more about my children’s futures.

The only time she recognizes the harm this does to her kids is from the context of how their misery impacts *her*:

6. **It must be nice to get a break from the kids every now and then.** You’re right. It’s so nice to hear my kids cry because they’re sick of being shuttled between houses every week.
Mommyish has a post by a woman* who complains about all of the nice things people do for her. This kind of feminist ugliness is pretty standard stuff, but her explanation of why people don’t need to protect her from convicts or walk her to her car at night stood out as one of the funniest things I’ve read in several weeks:

I should start by saying that I’m not a particularly small or helpless person. Sure, I’m 5’4” in sneakers, but I’ve always been athletic and loud, by no means a shrinking violet.

Violent thugs beware; she may be tiny, but she is loud and sporty. She also has sorority girl street cred:

...when I was in college and on vacation with my sorority sisters, they once told me that in the event of a burglary, I was the one they would turn to for protection and a plan of attack.

*Correction: After reading her post again, I realize that I was mistaken when I originally referred to her as a single mother.
Chick logic.
by Dalrock | November 8, 2014 | Link

Professor Patricia O’Brien argues at The Washington Post that women shouldn’t be incarcerated because it isn’t fair that men are more likely to go to prison than women. From We should stop putting women in jail. For anything.

The argument is actually quite straightforward: There are far fewer women in prison than men to start with — women make up just 7 percent of the prison population. This means that these women are disproportionately affected by a system designed for men.

Hat Tip Dr. Helen.
Too busy planning for retirement to find a husband.

by Dalrock | November 9, 2014 | Link

She may have waited a bit too long...

**Edit:** The youtube version of the commercial seems to be gone, but you can still see the add on ispot.
She doesn’t have what it takes to be a professional divorcée, but she does have cats.

by Dalrock | November 9, 2014 | Link

The Other McCain on ‘Broken People,’ Cats and Prozac:

See, this is the thing with young feminist writer types nowadays. They can’t go to Podunk State University. No, they must attend one of those private schools where annual tuition is at or near the median U.S. household income. This is the only way to become that glorious being, The Writer. And, probably because as girls dreaming of becoming The Writer, they watched a sitcom or movie about the lives of quirky bachelorettes in Brooklyn, they simply must live there after graduation.

Well, you may ask, what does The Writer write about?

Herself, of course! Do these elite colleges offer a major in Solipsism Studies nowadays? Because Ms. Stokes’s oeuvre is typical of the genre — menstruation, her sex dreams, things that make her cry.

See the whole post for a year’s supply of ugly feminism expertly distilled by Robert Stacy McCain. All I will add is if the XO Jane blogger had an ounce of initiative she would do it right by getting married, having kids, and then give us all a front row seat as she puts her kids through the meat grinder.

Hat Tip Instapundit.
A criminal lack of Game?
by Dalrock | November 13, 2014 | Link

From the University of Waterloo student newspaper:  Two incidents involving suspicious persons on campus reported (updated)

Update: UW Police Services (UWPS) confirmed that the two incidents involving a tall, Asian, male suspect who approached two female students on campus were cases of an individual being “socially awkward.”

According to the UWPS spokesman, the police coached the man on how to improve his cold approaches:

“We’ve given him suggestions on how to properly and appropriately start those interactions [with women].”

While the man’s lack of Game didn’t rise to a criminal level of creepiness, he may yet be disciplined:

“I’m sure some of them were very concerned about how this guy approached, but we still had to deal with university policies and laws, and we’re not seeing he’s breached any of those,” Anderson said.

Anderson could not confidently say whether or not the student will face further disciplinary action.
Fragile Feminism
by Dalrock | November 14, 2014 | Link

Senior Editor and cofounder of The Verge Chris Plante explains the extreme fragility of feminist progress. One man wearing the wrong shirt can bring the whole system down:

This is the sort of casual misogyny that stops women from entering certain scientific fields. They see a guy like that on TV and they don’t feel welcome.

Hat Tip Vox Day.

Update: See also Instapundit’s take on shirtdige here.

Just to be clear, Rose Eveleth of The Atlantic is a horrible person, who took what should have been one of the best days of a man’s life, a day of doing something no human beings had ever done before, and ruined it in order to feel important. She should be apologizing, not taking Twitter victory laps.
The Christian alternative to 50 Shades Of Grey.
by Dalrock | November 18, 2014 | Link

It is hard to tell for sure from the trailer, but hopefully this isn’t selling the message:

| Man up and marry that free spirit.

Either way, at least it doesn’t appear to be a Christian divorce fantasy, and I didn’t see anything tearing down Christian fathers. Despite it being a Christian chick flick, in the scheme of Christian films this one looks like a cut above the usual fare.
Feminists have long complained about the unrealistic proportions of Barbie dolls, and Lammily was introduced to offer girls a realistic doll to play with. Now Lammily doll owners can make their feminist dolls even uglier, with Lammily Marks:

Includes:

- Cellulite
- Stretch marks
- Freckles
- Acne
- Glasses
- Blushing
- Adhesive bandages
- Moles
- Temporary Tattoo
- Stitches
- Scrapes & Scratches
- Bruises
- Cast
- Scars
- Mosquito Bites
- Grass and Dirt Stains

See the Huffington Post write up on the topic, including pictures. My personal favorite is the last picture, where Lammily is dressed in a flannel shirt and sensible shoes. Add a prominent scar, a tramp stamp, stretch marks, cellulite, a few moles, acne, and some stitches and she is every little girl’s dream doll.
Confusing make-believe with reality; why feminists obsess over Barbie.

by Dalrock | November 21, 2014 | Link

The feminist obsession with Barbie dolls seems odd at first glance. Whether it is their compulsion to create ugly feminist Barbie or Computer Engineer Barbie, we see a great deal of focus on make-believe for a group of grown women. But feminism at its core is very much about make-believe, and feminists have demonstrated an incredible capacity to treat make-believe as if it were reality.

You can see this historically with the feminist/media creation of Amelia Earhart. After Charles Lindbergh captured the world’s imagination by flying solo across the Atlantic in an aircraft he had custom built for the flight, feminists wanted to show that women could do that too. Earhart was selected because she looked the part and had a pilot’s license. However while she looked the part, she was not a gifted pilot:

There is no denying that Earhart had difficulty learning to fly. It took her more than 15 hours of flight time and nearly a year to solo the Kinner, and she had a number of mishaps afterward, most of them during landings. As one biographer noted:

“Unfortunately, though highly intelligent, a quick learner, and possessed of great enthusiasm, Amelia did not, it seems, possess natural ability as a pilot.”

But skill as a pilot wasn’t needed for what Earhart’s media handlers had in mind. They commissioned two men to fly her across a short span of the Atlantic in a Fokker Tri Motor. After Earhart did her part by looking pretty in the passenger seat while the menfolk did the flying, her media handlers triumphantly dubbed her “Lady Lindy”, threw her a ticker tape parade, and arranged an invitation to the White House to meet President Calvin Coolidge. As a newly minted feminist icon, Earhart then wrote a book and gave lectures about her experience riding across the Atlantic. It could be no other way, as The World History Project explains in Amelia Earhart becomes first woman to fly across the Atlantic:

Since most of the flight was on “instruments” and Amelia had no training for this type of flying, she did not pilot the aircraft. When interviewed after landing, she said, “Stultz did all the flying—had to. I was just baggage, like a sack of potatoes.” She added, “...maybe someday I’ll try it alone.”

But make believe is good enough for feminists, which brings us back to Barbies. Back in July of 2013 Jessica Wakeman wrote an article at The Frisky about her failed attempt to play feminist Barbie with her nieces. Wakeman wanted to pretend Barbie was a pediatric oncologist:

I pulled a naked Barbie from a box and dressed her in a yellow gown. (Barbie’s closet seems to be entirely gowns and miniskirts.) Then I announced, “My Barbie is a doctor.”
I cleared my throat. “She’s a pediatric oncologist. That means she helps kids with cancer. She graduated at the top of her class from Yale. No, Harvard. She is trying to find the cure for lymphoma.”

But her nieces didn’t want to play pediatric oncologist Barbie. They wanted Barbie to be focused on girly things like fashion, hairstyles, and meeting Mr. Right. No matter how many times Wakeman tried to return to the feminist narrative, her nieces always steered back to traditional girl areas of focus:

Elly’s Barbie then started “doing” my Barbie’s hair. I tried again. “Maybe one day, she’ll run for office,” I mused. “She could be a senator. She could sit on the Senate Judiciary Committee.”

“I like her gown,” Mackenzie replied.

What is so unintentionally comical about Wakeman’s piece is that there were two games of make-believe going on. One game had her nieces imagining Barbie going to balls, dressing in the latest fashion, and attracting prince charming. The other game of make-believe had Wakeman imagining herself as possessing great professional gravity and as a feminist role model for young girls to follow. Ironically Wakeman lives in the very world her nieces wanted to play in, she was just too busy playing make-believe to see it. In the real world Wakeman is a staff writer for a gossip site, not a senator or a doctor. The first five main categories in The Frisky’s banner are:

1. Sex
2. Relationships
3. Celebs
4. Style
5. Horoscopes

Had Wakeman only played Barbie the way she has played her real life and not her make-believe life, her nieces would have been delighted.

**Update:** It gets better.
It gets better.
by Dalrock | November 21, 2014 | Link

In my last post I pointed out the irony of feminist Jessica Wakeman wanting her nieces to play pediatric oncologist Barbie when she herself worked for a gossip site. Why constantly try to steer her nieces away from focusing on hair, beauty, fashion, and relationships (like the blog she wrote for) and towards career choices she wasn’t interested in enough to follow herself?

It turns out that Wakeman has recently left her post at The Frisky, and moved instead to YouBeauty.com:

I don’t think that blogging about hair and skin care and beauty will be be easy by any means, but I’m pretty sure it won’t make me cry!
Put a ring on it!

by Dalrock | November 23, 2014 | Link

So she can take it off.

Until you had enough then you took that ring off
You took that ring off
So tired of the lies and trying, fighting, crying
Took that ring off
Oh, now the fun begins
Dust yourself off and you love again
You found a new man now you shine and you’re fine

For those playing at home, the Beyoncé female empowerment lyrical progression on marriage and rings is:

1. 2000: Independent Women “I buy my own diamonds and I buy my own rings”
2. 2008: Put a ring on it.
4. 2014: Ring Off (a divorce empowerment anthem for her mother)

See also:

- Losing control of the narrative.
- Women’s morphing need for male investment.
Breasts can’t be sexual if there is a baby in the picture.
by Dalrock | November 25, 2014 | Link

Facebook has received quite a bit of criticism the last few years over their policy on pictures involving breastfeeding. I’m not a fan of either Facebook or Zuckerberg, but there is an absurd yet common argument that breastfeeding pictures are never part of the online arms race for sexual attention, and public displays of breastfeeding are never done to garner sexual attention. As Salon explained in their article Facebook’s hypocritical breast-feeding controversy:

...a person whose photo is deemed by Facebook to have an unacceptable degree of nipple will not just find the picture removed, but often her account temporarily deleted on a vague “breach of terms of use” charge. Treating women like petty criminals for posting what are obviously not sexually explicit images is just stupid business.

...

[Facebook’s Policy] illuminates the depressing reality that breast-feeding, after all this time, is still deemed inappropriate, unproductive and just plain icky. And that a nipple, even one with a hungry baby nearby, is just darn scandalous.

Blogger Dena makes the same basic argument with even greater force about women breastfeeding in public:

There is no such thing as indiscreet nursing. Mothers do not walk around topless, flash the general public on purpose, or shake their tatas in passerby’s faces in an effort to feed their babies. All nursing is discreet nursing. You expose your breast, your child latches on, and nursing begins. Period.

With this argument in mind I present today’s “intimate” photo-shoot at The Daily Mail, which of course cannot possibly be intended to present Tamara Ecclestone as an object of sexual desire. After all, there is a baby in the first picture. Sure she is only wearing a towel in this picture, but I can only assume the photographer showed up without notice and didn’t give her time to get dressed. Besides, after seeing the first picture (with a baby), we already know we aren’t supposed to see her in a sexual light. That would be absurd. Likewise, since there is a baby carriage in this picture, it is clearly all about motherhood, not an attempt to out compete other women for sexual attention on the internet.
More feminist make-believe
by Dalrock | November 26, 2014 | Link

From the Daily Mail: Brave female Papa Johns manager tackles pair of Ferguson looters with her bare hands as they kick in windows... and quickly sends them packing

Yet neither the text nor the video support such a claim. Instead of a feminist hero tackling thugs with nothing but the power of moxie, what the video shows is a modern day Blanche DuBois relying on the kindness of looters.

The comments are nearly as funny as the headline. Some celebrate her girlpower, while another bemoans the lack of a white knight riding to her rescue.

demakers is on the girlpower side:

This is what it takes, more good people standing up to these backward thugs and saying enough. She has more balls than most men I know.

As is Lea:

What a great woman! She has shown real courage! This is how people should be.

But summers53 was alarmed that the manager was permitted to put herself in danger.

A woman is being pushed around and threatened and a guy is filming it. What is wrong with people today?!

Edit: I found the same video on youtube:
A simple test.
by Dalrock | December 4, 2014 | Link

Vox Day warns his readers not to place too much stock in a woman’s stated opinion on divorce when considering her suitability for marriage:

Don’t pay much attention to her asserted opinion of divorce, unless she is convinced it was a good thing. Most women will talk about divorce being A Bad Thing, but that has very little significance with regards to the likelihood of her following her parents’ example.

This is in my opinion good advice, and I offered some thoughts on how to better break through this question in the comments section to Vox’s post. I included this basic advice in a post of my own over four years ago, but I think it is worth calling out again:

One test I would offer is to ask a prospective wife what she would teach your future children about divorce. Would she teach them that “Sometimes marriages just don’t work out”, etc? Or would she teach them that divorce is unacceptable (with depending on your faith perhaps some very selective and well defined exceptions)?

As I’ve written about before, when our daughter was around 4 years old we were at a Thanksgiving dinner and one of the kids there told our daughter his parents were divorced because “sometimes mommies and daddies stop loving each other”. We didn’t know what was up, but our daughter was terrified for several days and kept looking for reassurance that my wife and I still loved each other. Once we found out what had happened we explained that the boy was mistaken, and his mommy was a brat who broke their family because she was unhappy. Once our daughter understood that her home wasn’t at risk for the fate that befell the poor boy she slept fine at nights.

Tell a prospective wife about this story you read on the internet and see how she responds. Specifically, look to see who she instinctively protects when she hears the story. Does she instinctively want to protect the innocent girl, or the guilty woman?

Nothing is foolproof, but this should help cut through the stock BS. It also sets the frame for you to teach your young children from the beginning about the seriousness of marriage. This will not only make it harder for your wife to pull a Jenny Erickson, it will also give your children a strong foundation for lifelong sexual morality.
The NY Times has a new article complaining that people still think divorce is a problem (H/T Rollo Tomassi): The Divorce Surge Is Over, but the Myth Lives On

But here is the thing: It is no longer true that the divorce rate is rising, or that half of all marriages end in divorce. It has not been for some time. Even though social scientists have tried to debunk those myths, somehow the conventional wisdom has held.

Despite hand-wringing about the institution of marriage, marriages in this country are stronger today than they have been in a long time. The divorce rate peaked in the 1970s and early 1980s and has been declining for the three decades since.

If only this were true. Even the links provided ostensibly debunking the “myth” of a 50% divorce rate don’t back up the claim. The first one argues that pinning down a single divorce rate stat is difficult, and then explains that for the subset of the US which graduated college divorce rates are much lower than the overall average. I explained the same thing in my post Whistling through the graveyard? two years ago when Susan Walsh made the same basic claim about high divorce rates being a myth. Ironically, the second link in the quote above is to one of the sources I quoted in my graveyard post:

Dr. Larry Bumpass, an emeritus professor of sociology at the University of Wisconsin’s Center for Demography and Ecology, has long held that divorce rates will eventually reach or exceed 50 percent. In an interview, he said that it was “probably right” that the official divorce statistics might fall below 50 percent, but that the rate would still be close.

“About half is still a very sensible statement,” he said.

Likewise the claim that divorce rates have been declining since the early 1980s goes against the best data we have. As I explained back in 2012, for a long time the US divorce rate appeared to be declining, but the trend occurred as more and more states were no longer part of the data set:

<p>| Table 133. Marriages and Divorces—Number and Rate by State: 1990 to 2009 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Marriages</th>
<th>Divorces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number (1,000)</td>
<td>Rate per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2,443,239,2077</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>43,1</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>338, 397, 362</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>36,0</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>2371, 1969, 2130</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eventually there was a new source of data from the American Community Survey which measured divorce across the entire country, and the National Center for Family & Marriage Research (NCFMR) at Bowling Green State University used this data to conclude that divorce rates had remained constant in the US for the last 20 years:

The overall U.S. divorce rate has remained essentially unchanged over the past 20 years. In 1990, 19 people divorced for every 1,000 marrieds versus 18 per 1,000 in 2010.

When the NCFMR released this conclusion I reached out to the Director of the National Marriage Project, W. Bradford Wilcox for his comment on the ACS data set. Dr. Wilcox replied:

Thanks for your note. Because the ACS data provides a more geographically comprehensive portrait of current divorce trends than does the data from the National Center for Health Statistics, the National Marriage Project is considering switching to ACS data in the 2012 edition of the State of Our Unions.

The Marriage Project followed through and switched to the ACS data for their 2012 State of Our Unions report.

Of the two claims the NY Times article leads with regarding divorce, both are easily provable as false. The first claim (50% divorce rate “myth”) is refuted by the very sources the article links to, one of which is another NY Times article. The second claim is itself the dated “myth”, which is disproved by US Census American Community Survey, a data set which has been accepted by both the NCFMR and the National Marriage Project.

This leaves the remaining claim of the article, that divorce isn’t really a problem because college educated women aren’t divorcing at the same high rates as other women. This is the NY Times doing it’s well worn Marie Antoinette imitation; our new family structure seems to be working ok for the UMC, so why are the lower classes unhappy? The obvious problem is that a family system which works only for the UMC is a colossal failure by the standards of all but the most snobbish observer. But there is a problem with even the bright ray in the data the NY Times has globbed onto. UMC women are marrying later, and since divorce rates decline dramatically as women age the divorce rate is actually rising on an age adjusted basis.

With the refuting evidence so easy to locate, this leaves me wondering why the NY Times would bother trying to convince the public that divorce is no longer really a problem. My best guess is that our secular elites are beginning to become nervous about the difficulty our ever increasing population of never married women are just starting to experience finding grooms.

As a result, the secular elites at the NY Times seem to find themselves compelled to peddle the same nonsense modern Christians are selling. If this is the case, the interesting thing is that we have only just begun seeing any kind of a measurable trend here. If the elites are nervous now, I can only imagine how they will respond if we start to see significant numbers of White women unable to marry.
There is also the problem that this is a risky strategy if the goal is to coax more men into modern marriage. The upside is limited because much of the problem comes from the growing shortage of men with good earnings. The only way to truly fix this would be to go back in time and have the now panicked 30 something husband hunters spend their youth looking for a provider instead of cads. But while the upside is very limited, the risk is that by opening the conversation they draw attention to the very problem they are attempting to deny. This is already happening, with The Week writing a rebuttal: Sorry, New York Times: The state of marriage in America is not good

Even the Times article itself lets the cat out of the bag by admitting that the divorce revolution is being driven by women not honoring their wedding vows:

“Two-thirds of divorces are initiated by women,” said William Doherty, a marriage therapist and professor of family social science at University of Minnesota, “so when you’re talking about changes in divorce rates, in many ways you’re talking about changes in women’s expectations.”

Whether this was an honest attempt to set the record straight on divorce rate statistics or an attempt to assuage men’s well founded apprehensions about marriage, either way the NY Times piece is an abysmal failure. Our new family model is fundamentally broken, and no amount of happy talk or attempts to fudge the numbers will make this go away.
Commenter adam pointed out that I am not alone in challenging Claire Cain Miller’s NY Times article on divorce. Professor Steven Ruggles of the University of Minnesota has likewise refuted Miller’s claim that the public’s understanding has failed to keep up with what she asserts is settled science on divorce rates:

The article recycles old research based on bad data. As Sheela Kennedy and I demonstrated in our recent article “Breaking Up is Hard to Count: The Rise of Divorce in the United States, 1980-2010” Demography (2014), available at http://www.hist.umn.edu/~ruggles/Articles/breaking_up.pdf, the much-vaunted decline in divorce is an artifact of bad data and poor measurement. As we show, the only reliable data on current U.S. divorce rates derive from the American Community Survey (ACS). Controlling for the aging of the married population, the ACS data reveal a continuing and dramatic increase in the risk of divorce since 1990. The rise of divorce is especially striking among older adults: among those aged 55 to 64, the divorce rate has quadrupled over the past three decades.

The Miller article appears to be based mainly on a working paper by Betsy Stevenson and Justin Wolfers that first appeared in 2007 and then was published in an obscure British volume of collected essays in 2011. Wolfers is a contributor to the Upshot, but I don’t believe Miller actually interviewed him. I know he is well aware of more recent research based on new data, and I very much doubt that he would endorse the premise of the Miller article.

In response, Professor Justin Wolfers of the University of Michigan followed up with a defense of Miller’s original article, How We Know the Divorce Rate Is Falling. Wolfers’ defense meanders around the data, and at times he contradicts himself:

There is no question that the data on divorce, like so much social-science data, are imperfect. It’s a good thing that researchers are pointing out these imperfections, because we will get a clearer picture of reality if we can get better data. But the best evidence all points in the same direction: The old claim that one in two marriages ends in divorce is no longer true.

Of course, we don’t know what will happen in the future. Even if recently married couples are divorcing at lower rates, there is some reason to think that divorce rates among long-married couples will rise.

First he says the lifetime divorce rate (a forward looking number) isn’t 50%. Then he explains that we can’t know what this number will look like today, because it involves guessing the future. His only evidence that the forward looking number will probably be
lower than 50% is a small decline in early divorce rates. However, he then points out that the divorce rates for older couples is increasing.

It is important to remember that Wolfers’ article is a defense of Miller’s claim that the science is settled, and divorce rates have declined since the early 1980s. Wolfers opens his article with:

The divorce rate has been falling for more than three decades. That fact is not news, but it still surprises a lot of people. And so when Claire Cain Miller wrote about the trend for The Upshot this week, several readers asked for more detail, with some citing a Huffington Post article questioning the official Census Bureau data on the trends. As one of the researchers who has studied the issue, I thought it worth digging deeper into the data.

In order to back up Miller’s claim, Wolfers would have to prove that the science really is settled here, and that those who don’t believe that divorce rates have declined for 30 years believe in a “myth”. Instead Wolfers points to problematic and contradictory data, and argues that none of the data sources available can be trusted to accurately represent current divorce rates. With this in mind, even with the most charitable possible reading Wolfers failed to defend the core claims in Miller’s article, and therefore failed to support his own thesis.

Professor Ruggles responded to Wolfers’ article as well. Ruggles pointed out specific flaws in Wolfers’ argument, along with the fact that Wolfers had failed to support his own thesis:

Steven Ruggles Minneapolis Yesterday
Dear Justin,

As we noted in the paper, in the 2006 pretest the Census Bureau found that 7.8% of women who reported getting a divorce in the past year did not actually receive a divorce decree in that period. The pretest was not able, however, to determine what percentage of the women who actually did get a divorce in the past 12 months failed to report it on the ACS. Overcount and undercount would cancel, so the pretest implies a net overcount of less than 7.8%.

If we control for the aging of the married population, divorce risk has gone up 40% since 1980. To erase that, you have to assume that the ACS is off by a factor of two. I don’t buy it. It is much more plausible that the discrepancy lies with your alternative source, the SIPP, which has substantially lower divorce rates than the vital statistics, and where nearly half of the divorce dates are imputed in the most recent data.

The number of demographers who believe that overall divorce risk has declined is small. Other than Stevenson and Wolfers, we identified only Heaton (2002) and Ivers and Stevenson (2010). The consensus of most demographers, as Schoen and Canudas-Romo (2006) put it, “it is premature to believe that the probability of divorce has begun to decline.” You are entitled to argue that ACS is wrong and SIPP
is right. Nevertheless, I think you should acknowledge that the decline of divorce
narrative is a minority viewpoint among professional demographers.

Steve
Celebrating divorce by denying its existence.
by Dalrock | December 6, 2014 | Link

At first glance it may seem strange that feminists like Claire Cain Miller and Justin Wolfers would go to such lengths to convince the public that high divorce rates are a thing of the past. One might expect that feminists in their hostility to marriage would be more likely to celebrate high divorce rates. Isn’t each new divorce a woman saved from the terrible fate of being trapped in marriage? Why do feminists simultaneously celebrate divorce as a tool of empowerment for women while claiming that no fault divorce doesn’t really lead to many divorces? Don’t they want as many women as possible to experience the profound spiritual growth and personal empowerment that Elizabeth experienced in Eat Pray Love? Why are feminists arguing that no fault divorce is safe, miraculous, empowering, and rare?

We can find the answer to this paradox by looking at a paper Justin Wolfers authored with his wife Betsey Stevenson, Bargaining in the Shadow of the Law: Divorce Laws and Family Distress

Unilateral divorce changed the bargaining power in marriages and therefore impacted many marriages...

The mechanism examined in this paper is a change in divorce regime and we interpret the evidence collected here as an empirical endorsement of the idea that family law provides a potent tool for affecting outcomes within families.

Wolfers and Stevenson were delighted to find that no fault divorce and the accompanying biased family courts encouraged wives to destabilize their families with threats of divorce. Divorce itself isn’t the intended outcome, but having all husbands live in a state of at least a low level and constant fear of divorce is the goal. Keep in mind that it isn’t just husbands who now live in fear that their families will at any moment for any or no reason be torn apart. While they aren’t the intended target, children also now must live in this fear.

This is the system Wolfers and Miller are defending when they claim the public is unaware that high divorce rates are a thing of the past. Ironically they are complaining about people experiencing the very fear the system is designed to instill. More accurately they are trying to fine tune the amount of fear the population feels about divorce. They want husbands to greatly fear divorce so they will follow their wives’ every whim. But they don’t want prospective husbands to fear divorce so much that they don’t marry in the first place, and they don’t want policy makers to become afraid enough of divorce to reduce the legal encouragement for women to divorce. Once we understand the goal of no fault divorce the schizophrenic message around divorce suddenly makes sense.

It is critical to note that it isn’t just overt feminists like Wolfers, Stevenson, and Miller who are selling this message. Modern Christians have adopted the same posture with incredible enthusiasm. This is why the Director of Family Formation Studies for Focus On the Family has spent so much effort sharing the triumphant news that only 38% of the most devout Christian marriages end in divorce. It is also why Christians around the world were so
excited to hear Shaunti Feldhahn make the same case as the NY Times about the sustainability of no fault divorce.

If only modern Christians were as faithful to biblical marriage as they are to their marriage with feminism. If anything, modern Christians have gotten out ahead of feminists on this issue. Modern Christians embrace the power of wives threatening to divorce, depicting it as a miraculous tool to transform marriages in accordance with God’s will. But to modern Christians threats of divorce are only one of many ways a wife can transform her marriage and assume headship. In addition to threatening divorce, modern Christians encourage wives to use emotional outbursts, acts of insanity and destruction, denial of sex, and leaving the home (preferably with the children) as tools to gain and maintain primacy in the home. This new feminist Christian doctrine is what I have dubbed the wake-up call narrative, and it is coming from the conservative wing of modern Christianity. That all of these things are sinful doesn’t stop modern Christians from embracing them, because what they are trying to create is a sort of theological gender bending.

The primary difference between feminists like Wolfers and modern Christians is that feminists are less deceitful about their actual goals. But whether you get your feminist embrace of the wondrous power of divorce from the New York Times or the conservative church down the road, the ultimate source of the wicked message is the same, and the damage to children and families is immense.
Feminists get sick on their own dog food.

by Dalrock | December 9, 2014 | Link

Feminists have been lecturing us for years that we need to automatically believe women who accuse men of rape. To carefully investigate these serious accusations and wait until the facts come in is to perpetuate “rape culture”, feminists tell us. Slate’s DoubleX warned about the danger of this foolish philosophy back in September with False rape accusations exist, and they are a serious problem:

More than a quarter-century ago, feminist legal theorist Catharine MacKinnon wrote that “feminism is built on believing women’s accounts of sexual use and abuse by men”; today, Jessica Valenti urges us to “believe victims en masse,” because only then will we recognize the true prevalence of sexual assault.

But the warning from within their own ranks wasn’t heeded. In late November Sabrina Rubin Erdely and her editors at Rolling Stone made the mistake of eating their own feminist dog food, and ran with a fantastic story of ritualized rape at the University of Virginia. Feminists around the nation devoured this fantastic story without a second thought, using it as the poster child for “rape culture”. Chloe Angyal of feministing.com went on MSNBC and praised Erdely for revealing the truth to her about America’s rape culture:

I have to thank you, Sabrina, for writing this. I think you’ve done a tremendous act of public service, and I’m genuinely very, very grateful. It is hard to read an article like this and avoid the conclusion that we live in a culture that hates women, just hates us. It’s hard to read an article like this and conclude that the men in this culture, the boys and men in this culture, are raised to see women as not just less than them but in some cases as less than human.

... This is not just a frat problem. This is an American problem.

Feminists had barely finished their meal before they started to feel the rumblings of trouble to come. It was obvious to everyone that they had swallowed something putrid. Instead of purging themselves of the problem, feminists tried to fudge the diagnosis. Julia Horowitz, the assistant managing editor at the University of Virginia’s student newspaper, wrote in Politico that “to let fact checking define the narrative would be a huge mistake.” Zerlina Maxwell wrote an article in the Washington Post titled No matter what Jackie said, we should generally believe rape claims*

Many people (not least U-Va. administrators) will be tempted to see this as a reminder that officials, reporters and the general public should hear both sides of the story and collect all the evidence before coming to a conclusion in rape cases. This is what we mean in America when we say someone is “innocent until proven guilty.”...

In important ways, this is wrong. We should believe, as a matter of default, what an
accuser says. Ultimately, the costs of wrongly disbelieving a survivor far outweigh the costs of calling someone a rapist...

The accused would have a rough period. He might be suspended from his job; friends might defriend him on Facebook... But false accusations are exceedingly rare, and errors can be undone by an investigation that clears the accused, especially if it is done quickly.

But those rumblings didn’t go away. Rolling Stone’s editors are now a mess, and they are starting to recognize the problem with consuming the gelatinous mass of canine cuisine in the first place:

We published the article with the firm belief that it was accurate. Given all of these reports, however, we have come to the conclusion that we were mistaken in honoring Jackie’s request to not contact the alleged assailters to get their account. In trying to be sensitive to the unfair shame and humiliation many women feel after a sexual assault, we made a judgment – the kind of judgment reporters and editors make every day. We should have not made this agreement with Jackie and we should have worked harder to convince her that the truth would have been better served by getting the other side of the story. These mistakes are on Rolling Stone, not on Jackie. We apologize to anyone who was affected by the story and we will continue to investigate the events of that evening.

All of this was a huge misstep by feminists, an unforced error. Just a few weeks ago they were methodically advancing their new rules for handling sexual assault allegations on campus which place a huge burden on the accused. They even had many conservatives signing on to California’s new Yes Means Yes law in the deluded hope that it would usher in a post-hookup sexual marketplace. Now they are a sad, stinking, wretched mess, trying to figure out how to undo the damage they did to their own cause.

One thing strikes me as fairly certain; I don’t think feminists have learned their lesson.

Bon appétit, feminists.

*The title of the Washington Post article may have been changed after initial publication, because the title in the url is “no-matter-what-jackie-said-we-should-automatically-believe-rape-claims”*
You see our last ditch nuclear deterrent, feminists see an underwater frat house.

by Dalrock | December 11, 2014 | Link

An unmistakable symbol of male privilege.

Time magazine published an article last week about sexual assault in the military titled This Is What It Looks Like When Women Come Out of the Shadows. The article compares the work of Social Justice Warriors (SJWs) in the military to the work the same group is doing on college campuses:

But at a moment when awareness of violence against women has hit a high water mark after highly publicized incidents on campuses, in the military, in professional sports and in Hollywood, Thursday’s news holds out promise that victims will continue to feel more empowered to come out of the shadows across the country.

In fact, while the url for the article ends with “military-sexual-assault”, it is part of the “Campus Sexual Assault” section of the Time website:

It is clear that to hard core feminists and SJWs colleges and the military look the same. The end goal is to do to the military what they have already done to college campuses. The military is a SJW’s dream playground. Colleges can only create SJW kangaroo courts with the
power to expel men who are accused of violating the SJW code. The military has real courts SJWs can use to dishonorably discharge men and even put them in prison. SJWs are of course already well entrenched here, but it is worth considering that the end game is the same for the military as it is on campus. If Yes Means Yes is needed in dorm rooms surely it is needed even more in the barracks.

When the nation debated integrating women into the military, especially areas like nuclear submarines, the argument from conservatives was that putting men and women in close quarters under high stress situations for extended periods of time would create problems of sexual assault and sexual misconduct. This would potentially harm women as well as distract from the mission. What conservatives didn’t understand is that to SJWs sexual assault and misconduct aren’t bugs, they are features. As we have witnessed, if SJWs can’t find verifiable claims of horrific abuse to justify a full rework of the system they are quite happy to go with unverifiable claims. The facts don’t matter because the point isn’t to protect women, but to inject them into high risk situations as pawns to justify the radical change of institutions. This won’t distract from the mission from the SJW perspective because protecting the nation isn’t the mission they have in mind. To SJWs the military is just another frat house that needs to be broken and remade with Social Justice as the primary organizing philosophy.

Fortunately for SJWs, the plan to put women on nuclear submarines is working as desired. Now that we are here, the conservative response is only natural. Don’t look for a concerted push by conservatives to return to a male only submarine fleet (that boat has sailed). Look for a combined effort by feminists and conservatives to do something about those weak men who are screwing feminism up.

While most women who join the military are not SJWs, the reality is it was never possible to let women in without SJWs coming along with them.

[UGM-133A Trident II photo created by the US Navy (140602-N-ZZ999-202).]
Was Jackie’s date invented to get her out of the friend zone?
by Dalrock | December 12, 2014 | Link

The Washington Post story U-Va. students challenge Rolling Stone account of alleged sexual assault offers “Jackie’s” friends’ explanation of how Jackie came to go out on her date with the man she told them had orchestrated her rape. Given the way the WaPo story is written it is somewhat difficult to follow, and I have to wonder if this isn’t intentional. I might be reading the WaPo story wrong, but here is what I gather from the article:

Jackie was friend-zoned by a fellow freshman the story calls “Randall”. Sometime after Randall gave her the LJBF talk, Jackie started talking to her group of friends (“Randall” “Andy” and “Cindy”) about an attractive guy in her chemistry class who was interested in her (I’ll call him chem guy moving forward). Jackie provided her friends with chem guy’s phone number, and they started exchanging texts with him. Chem guy explained that Jackie was amazing, but that sadly she was interested in some lucky freshman and not chem guy. The lucky freshman isn’t named but all indicators seem to point to Randall, who coincidentally was one of the friends receiving the texts. Chem guy even texted pictures of his study self to Jackie’s friends, which WaPo describes as pictures of “a man with a sculpted jaw line and ocean-blue eyes”.

One day Jackie announced to her friends that she was going on a date with chem guy. This is the night Jackie’s friends say she told them she was raped, and chem guy is the man her friends say Jackie told them orchestrated it.

The pictures of chem guy Jackie’s friend provided to WaPo appear to be social media pictures of someone Jackie went to high school with:

- The Post identified the person in the pictures and learned that his name does not match the one Jackie gave friends in 2012. In an interview, the man said he was Jackie’s high school classmate but “never really spoke to her.”

- “I have nothing to do with it,” he said. He said it appears that the circulated photos were pulled from social media Web sites.

Chem guy continued to communicate with Randall even after the rape:

- After the alleged attack, the chemistry student who Jackie said had taken her on the date wrote an e-mail to Randall, passing along praise that Jackie apparently had for him.
Doing rape hysteria right.
by Dalrock | December 13, 2014 | Link

Freddie deBoer at The Week argues in What progressives don’t want to talk about in the Rolling Stone scandal*:

A presumption of truth in every rape accusation is an impossible standard. And it’s doing real damage to the cause of fighting sexual assaults.

The first sentence in the quote above is so obvious that the need to argue it shows how far we have gone in the direction of rape hysteria. The second sentence has become conventional wisdom for conservatives, and this is another (less obvious) indicator of how foolish we have become in the discussion about rape.

deBoer warns his readers that mysterious and powerful forces are gathering to cause our society to stop taking rape seriously:

If the story turns out to be significantly fabricated (and the doubts expressed do not yet amount to proof that it was), then the costs could be considerable. With a committed group of rape denialists active in our culture, typically made up of “men’s rights activists” and conservative anti-feminists, the danger of this type of scandal lies in the potential for a false accusation to crowd out attention to rape writ large.

He doesn’t offer any examples of these allegedly pro-rape barbarians at the gate. I certainly haven’t seen any popular MRA or conservative anti-feminist bloggers arguing that we should look the other way when it comes to rape. Instead, what deBoer is no doubt reacting to are influential authors like Glenn Reynolds and his wife Dr. Helen who write passionately about the need for due process when handling accusations of rape. deBoer touches on the problem of due process when trying to explain why highly publicized false claims would take us backward when it comes to rape. High visibility false claims of robbery or murder don’t make him nervous like false claims of rape do, because unlike with rape he is perfectly comfortable with due process for those crimes:

The question is, why? Why would revelations that a particular high-profile accusation was false be so potentially damaging to efforts to oppose that crime in general? This logic does not extend to other crimes; no one believes that a false claim of robbery means that robbery doesn’t happen or only happens rarely. Why would sexual assault be any different? Why is our understanding of rape seen as so vulnerable to the corrosive power of false accusations?

If you want more proof that wanting due process is what now passes for being pro-rape, consider the feminist “progress” we have made in recent decades. There is an iconic image of a protest sign which sums the feminist perspective up. “Don’t get raped” is edited to read “Don’t Rape”. This is the change feminists are telling us they are trying to create. The first version of the text is a straw man version of our due process system of justice. Under due process with a presumption of innocence, the burden of proof when accusing someone of
rape is high. Even with this high burden of proof, some cases are still fairly easy to prove. If a woman is physically attacked by a man she isn’t involved with, this is more than a simple “he said, she said” case. But other cases are less clear. “Don’t get raped” is a straw man for the good advice we used to give to women not only to avoid the trauma of being raped, but the pain of being raped and not being able to prove it in a court of law. Feminists hate this kind of advice because it discourages women from making risky choices, and discouraging women in any way is unbearable to feminists. Feminists conflate any and all attempts to advise women on how to protect themselves from rape as “Don’t get raped”. In the place of trying to help women avoid the horrific crime of rape, feminists offer instead the hysteria of “rape culture”, which is embodied in the feminist slogan “Don't rape”.

If it does come down to the word of the accuser vs the word of the accused, how do you decide under due process? The answer is to try to first understand if sex happened, and then try to determine if the sex was consensual. Unfortunately human sexuality, especially female sexuality, tends to be by its very nature at least somewhat ambiguous. Assuming the sex act itself is sufficiently proved, the question becomes what was the nature of the sexual encounter. To answer this question juries naturally want to understand more about the context of the situation. Did the woman and the man jointly seek out a secluded space before the sex occurred? Did they have a sexual history, or were they in a relationship which appeared to be building up to sex? Did the woman’s observable actions before and after the incident tend to be consistent with consensual sex or rape? If a woman is accusing a man of rape in a context which closely mimics consensual sex, the presumption of innocence can be an insurmountable barrier. This doesn’t mean it wasn’t rape, but it does make it extremely difficult to prove. The presumption of innocence is the problem feminists have been working so hard to remove, and they have been surprisingly successful here. This success is precisely what deBoer fears is in jeopardy when feminists trumpet cases of rape which later turn out to be false.

This isn’t about either being anti-rape or anti-anti-rape (pro-rape?), it is about due process vs rape hysteria. The reason due process is so crucial is not because rape isn’t important, but because real rapists are monsters who merit harsh punishment. Before we decide to deliver a harsh sentence, we need to make sure we aren’t convicting an innocent man. Yet this is the very perspective the self styled moderate deBoer wants to label as pro-rape. The giveaway comes in his opening sentence (emphasis mine):

| A presumption of truth in every rape accusation is an impossible standard. |

He isn’t arguing for due process and the presumption of innocence, he is arguing that his fellow feminists should at times suspend their presumption of guilt and hear out the facts of the case. deBoer is arguing that rape hysteria is all well and good, but lets keep our heads about it. The piece isn’t a call to a presumption of innocence, but a call to be more clever when conducting witch hunts. Having defined the stakes, deBoer explains the mechanics of how excessive rape hysteria ultimately leads to harming the cause of rape hysteria.

| The insistence that every rape accusation must be presumed to be true inevitably means that the credibility of those opposing rape will always be bound up with the least credible accusation. This, perversely, makes it harder for those people to speak |
out against rape, not easier. The notion that rape victims should be believed by default seems humane and understandable. But in practice it leads to a condition where all rape accusations must be true for any individual standard to be taken seriously. That’s an impossible standard, one no crime should ever have to meet.

deBoer’s problem is it isn’t possible to have a little less hysteria. His passionate plea for a kinder, gentler witch hunt won’t have any effect, because his audience surrendered themselves to emotion over logic and justice long ago. Once you unleash the mob you can’t steer it like a precision guided munition, all you can hope to do is stay out of its path. The mob is going to run its course, and eventually even those who weren’t initially paying close attention will come to understand the mania which has possessed the mob.

H/T Instapundit
As most already know, Sabrina Rubin Erdely went looking for a story which would be a “rape culture” fantasy story, one activists like her dream about. According to an early Washington Post article on the UVA rape piece*, Erdely searched for six weeks before she found her dream story. But when she found it, it clearly was worth the wait. It had everything a “rape culture” activist dreams of: White privilege, an evil fraternity initiation, hours of gang rape on a floor of broken glass, friends and university administration who urged the victim to keep silent, and much more. Based on more recent WaPo reporting and the apologies of the Rolling Stone editors, it appears that Erdely was so much in love with this fantasy story that she decided it was too good to check out. Not only did Erdely not interview the accused, she didn’t even interview “Jackie’s” three friends, the only other people who could corroborate Jackie’s story. It seems that Erdely understood how risky trying to verify a story this perfect would be.

It wasn’t just Erdely who fell in love with this perfect story. Feminists across the media fell in love with the fantasy story as well. But now the fantasy has been dashed, and Amanda Hess at Slate DoubleX is doing damage control. Hess is pleading with her fellow feminists to let the UVA rape story fantasy go to avoid doing even more harm to the carefully crafted “rape culture” narrative. This is important, Hess explains, because there are people out there nurturing the fantasy that feminists are inventing rape stories to advance their narrative (emphasis mine):

There are people on the fringe who believe that any rape story with any discrepancies is evidence of a vast feminist conspiracy aimed at inventing rapes and vilifying innocent men, but these rape truthers are not reasonable people, nor are they most people, and it is unwise to mold the conversation around their fantasies.

I am, however, concerned with how some feminists and progressives have responded to the ever-expanding holes in Rolling Stone’s story.

In fairness to Erdely, she does not appear to have made up the fantastic story herself. By all accounts, she merely shopped around for a month and a half until she could find the one woman willing to tell her the story she wanted to write, and then published Jackie’s tale without doing the most basic investigation into the veracity of the story. However, Hess’ claim is a straw man; I’m not aware of any popular bloggers claiming that Erdely took the final shortcut of directly making up the story in her zeal to advance the feminist narrative of “rape culture”. Moreover, the widespread collusion by feminists to find, print, and propagate fantastic stories to advance the “rape culture” narrative is now beyond any serious contention.

*Written before the story started to fall apart. Note the headline picture of the accused fraternity with the angry mob in front.
Marry the man other women wish they could marry.

But rather than focus on Amal’s successful career as a human rights lawyer, the TV host said she had been given the top spot because she snapped up Clooney as her husband.

‘You could say hers was the wedding of the year, but let’s put it into perspective, it was really one of the greatest achievements in human history,” Walters said.

Edit: The feminists at vox.com are experiencing predictable twisting in their undergarments. Kelsey McKinney writes in Amal Clooney married down. She’s way more fascinating than George:

Barbara Walters is wrong. Amal Clooney isn’t fascinating because she joined “the ranks of Jackie Onassis, Princess Diana and Kate Middleton” by marrying a rich and noteworthy man. Amal Clooney is fascinating because she is, in her own right, a badass.

This is the same Kelsey McKinney who complained last year in the Atlantic about how frustrating it is that novels aimed at women are always about finding a man:

Literary girls don’t take road-trips to find themselves; they take trips to find men.

See Also: Intrasexual Competition and the Strong Independent Woman.
Fathers [sometimes] matter!

by Dalrock | December 19, 2014 | Link

A reader recently asked if I’ve moved away from my prediction in More ominous than a strike that we will eventually see some dialing back of the worst excesses of the family court:

...ignoring the problem will become more and more difficult because of the impact on the bottom line. Because of this, we can expect to see more of what we already see. Feminists will continue their handwringing tentatively asking if perhaps we have gone a bit too far, and conservatives will redouble their efforts to convince men they need to man up and stop sabotaging the glorious feminist progress. Less conspicuously I also expect we will see some dialing back of the worst excesses of the family courts. However, because of the momentum involved and the reluctance to acknowledge the fundamental problem, these changes will at best only slow the problem, and they will always run the risk of initially accelerating it.

The short answer is I haven’t changed my view on this. However, as I stated previously we should expect a slew of divergent responses to the problem of declining marriage rates, and the dialing back will follow a period of continued denial. In fact, we can see this happening today. On one side we have feminists Claire Cain Miller and Justin Wolfers at the NY Times declaring that fears about high divorce rates are unfounded. It is fear of divorce, not divorce itself, that is the real problem. This is the same set of talking points Shaunti Feldhahn is advancing to the delight of modern Christians.

Yet at the same time we also have periodic bursts of fear that all is not well coming from both liberals and conservatives. The recent Washington Examiner piece Shock study: Marriage rate declines with porn use, threatening economy, society is an excellent example of this. 45 years of policies designed to eject fathers from the home? Boring. But pornography is a problem both conservatives and feminists can get behind! Weak men are screwing feminism up! Pornography must be dealt with because fathers matter:

“stable marriages create substantial welfare improvements for society, especially to the degree that marital stability produces high-quality children.”

The problem is fathers don’t matter enough to challenge our new family structure. We can see this same pattern in quotes from Glenn Stanton in The Atlantic’s Sperm Donor, Life Partner (H/T pavetack). Stanton argues tepidly that fathers matter, but then casts around when trying to explain why marriage is essential but divorce is not that big a deal:

It’s true that sometimes people marry and have children with the best intentions and then split up, but they raise their children “doing the best they can in spite of the curveball life has thrown them,” he said. “The idea of putting yourself intentionally in that situation is a whole other matter.”

To be fair to Stanton it is possible The Atlantic is misrepresenting his stance. But I hope this isn’t the case, because Stanton’s tepid defense of marriage in the article is an improvement.
over his own writing and speaking on the topic. There is no quote in the article of him declaring single mothers heroic, for example. Stanton also appears to now recognize the possibility that men aren’t always to blame for single motherhood, unlike his framing of the problem in his book:

If women can’t find good men to marry, they will instead compromise themselves by merely living with a make-do man or getting babies from him without marriage. Unfortunately, this describes exactly the new shape of family growth in Western nations by exploding margins...

Women want to marry and have daddies for their babies. But if they can’t find good men to commit themselves to, well... Our most pressing social problem today is a man deficit.

But even the new and slightly improved Stanton can’t seem to bring himself to call our epidemic of wife initiated divorce evil for the terrible harm it is doing to children. Instead, we learn that sometimes life throws women curveballs. According to Stanton it is better to make a solemn vow and break it than to never make the vow at all.

When Focus on the Family’s Director for Family Formation Studies can’t be relied on to stand up for traditional marriage, it isn’t surprising that secular conservatives aren’t willing to rock the boat as well. The latest conservative conventional wisdom on marriage is that since our new definition of marriage is a disaster for all but the Upper Middle Class (UMC), the solution is to get everyone to become like the UMC. W. Bradford Wilcox, a scholar for the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) and director of the National Marriage Project, argues that we need to teach everyone to emulate what he has coined the “success sequence” by delaying marriage and children to focus first on education and work. This, along with suggestions on tax incentives is the foundation of the AEI’s advice on how to save marriage in the report For richer, for poorer: How family structures economic success in America

Civic institutions—joined by a range of private and public partners, from businesses to state governments to public schools—should launch a national campaign around a “success sequence” that would encourage young adults to sequence schooling, work, marriage, and then parenthood. This campaign would stress the ways children are more likely to flourish when they are born to married parents with a secure economic foundation.

Willcox is in my opinion the leading public policy figure arguing that marriage is in trouble and if we don’t change course the economic and human costs will be enormous. The problem is, right now making meaningful changes to the legal structure designed to remove fathers from the home (child support and no fault divorce) is unthinkable. This is the case because the true costs of our system are still not evident. So far nearly all White women are still able to marry, and we haven’t seen the full dysfunction large scale multi-generational fatherlessness will cause. But as the costs become more undeniable we will first see more and more calls for men to man up and make our feminist redesigned family structure work, and eventually we will start to see more and more calls to dial back the worst excesses of the family court. But at least at first these will only be half measures, moving from denial to
bargaining as reality sets in.

What isn’t clear to me is how much economic and social pain our elites will be willing to bear before starting to acknowledge the problem. It also isn’t clear that when the half measures they then grudgingly propose fail, they will be willing and able to reform the system enough to turn around both the family and the economy. We are squandering an incredible amount of goodwill by men regarding marriage, and the longer we wait to seriously address the issue the harder it will be to turn the problem around.
The unworkable bachelor tax.
by Dalrock | December 21, 2014 | Link

One of the ideas often put forward when discussing declining marriage rates is that our elites are likely to enact a Roman Empire style bachelor tax. I admittedly don’t have much background knowledge of how the Romans went about this, but from the bit I’ve read from W.F. Price it seems that the bachelor laws were as much about brutally reinforcing Roman patriarchy as they were about coercing men into marriage via taxation. I assume those talking about a bachelor tax aren’t talking about reinforcing the patriarchy, so for this discussion I’ll focus on government coercing men to marry.

I see three main reasons a bachelor tax is an unviable solution for our elites:

Problem #1: Reversing our feminist mindset

Even focusing strictly on coercion would require a reversal of much of our present feminist mindset. Under the feminist view when men work harder and do more dangerous and difficult jobs than women do, this is proof that men are enjoying some sort of gift of the patriarchy. This is most commonly expressed as the gender pay gap, with the claim that women are only paid roughly 80 cents for every dollar men are paid doing similar work. This same foolishness is also accepted unquestioningly by the academics studying marriage, but instead of calling it the gender pay gap, it is called the marriage premium. Here is how the American Enterprise Institute explains the marriage premium:

Men obtain a substantial “marriage premium” and women bear no marriage penalty in their individual incomes, and both men and women enjoy substantially higher family incomes, compared to peers with otherwise similar characteristics. For instance, men enjoy a marriage premium of at least $15,900 per year in their individual income compared to their single peers.

Whether you are a feminist and call it the gender pay gap, or are a conservative and call it the marriage premium, what we are talking about are the choices men make to prioritize earnings over leisure, safety, a pleasant working environment, the “fulfilling” nature of work, etc. This is why married men (especially married fathers) tend to hold high stress time intensive jobs which are more likely to involve a substantial commute, while women (whether married or not) tend to focus more on jobs which are lower stress, offer more flexible hours, and are more personally fulfilling.

The problem is the decline of marriage is proving feminist theory for the foolishness that it has always been. With marriage weakening we are starting to see that unmarried men tend to earn like women. This is a serious problem for our elites, because the nation’s earnings are the play money they use on their pet projects. If fewer men are working like husbands and more are working like women, there will be far less money available in the form of taxes, alimony, child support, etc. However, confronting this problem will require admitting that it is a problem. This would mean admitting that there is no such thing as a “marriage premium” for men, only men prioritizing the needs of their families over their own personal preferences.
Moreover, admitting that there is no marriage premium would mean also admitting that there is no “gender pay gap”, because the two are one and the same. Even if our elites try to fudge the issue, this isn’t a secret they will be able to keep.

Aside from the feminist view of men’s earnings, our elites would also have to go against other deeply embedded areas of conventional wisdom to enact a bachelor tax. These pillars of conventional wisdom are less overtly feminist than the marriage premium view, but are still rooted in feminism because they are rationalizations about how our new feminist family system can be made to work. As I pointed out in my last post, conventional wisdom is that our current broken family model will work if only everyone thinks and acts like our UMC, by following the “success sequence” and leaving marriage until their late 20s or early 30s. This brings up the problem of timing, which I explore later in this post. Another pillar of conventional wisdom is that the secret to making our broken system work is for the bride and groom to exhibit maximum intentionality in their path to marriage. The National Marriage Project makes the case for this in their most recent report Before “I DO”:

2 – Sliding versus deciding. Couples who make intentional decisions regarding “major relationship transitions” are more likely to flourish than those who slide through transitions. For instance, among those who cohabited, couples who decided to live together before marriage in an intentional way are more likely to enjoy happy marriages, compared to couples who just slid into cohabitation before marriage.

Coercing men into marriage would go against this pillar of conventional wisdom, as a man pushed into marriage doesn’t fit the paradigm for a successful marriage.

Problem #2: The welfare state

Even if our elites were willing to abandon the feminist tenets I describe above, they would still have the formidable problem of the welfare state. How do you coerce someone into working harder and earning more using a system designed to punish working harder and reward earning less? It simply can’t be done.

One of the most commonly cited bachelor taxes today is obamacare. Yet while obamacare does work as a transfer of wealth from men to women, it doesn’t create a financial incentive for men to marry. More importantly, it doesn’t create a financial incentive for young men to work hard in order to make themselves more attractive potential grooms by signaling provider status. To the contrary, obamacare makes coasting easier, because career success is no longer required to be able to afford health care.

Problem #3: Timing

The final problem is the problem of timing. The long interval between coming of age and the median age of marriage is nearly universally overlooked. You can see this in nearly every study on the topic of men choosing marriage, most recently in the study regarding the tradeoff between pornography and marriage. Even if our elites were willing to abandon core feminist beliefs and overturn the welfare state, they would still have the problem of timing. Women are delaying searching for a husband until their late 20s or early thirties, and it is the thirty-something unmarried women staring down the barrel of spinsterhood who are driving
the panic about men being on a “marriage strike”.

The problem for a policy maker is that even if we assume all unmarried 30 something and 40 something men are properly motivated to marry, a very large number of them earn nothing or next to nothing. Even if these men respond to coercion and propose en masse, the women will decline. What a bachelor tax would need to do to solve this problem is somehow coerce young men to devote their 20s to signaling provider status so they would be in a position to be coerced into marriage starting around age 30. I can’t imagine a public policy which would be effective in this regard, especially in our era which has embraced promiscuity for young women. Even if our elites could somehow craft such a set of incentives, they would still have to wait a decade or more to see the results in the form of higher marriage rates.
The ugly feminists of Christmas
by Dalrock | December 22, 2014 | Link

As I explained in my first post of the new year, feminists are ugly because they are miserly with love. But the year is almost over, and as the seasons change so do feminists. This is the time of year when a feminist’s thoughts turn from resentment of the toil and drudgery of everyday life, to resentment of the toil and drudgery of Christmas. Jessica Valenti at The Guardian speaks for ugly feminists everywhere with her heart felt Christmas missive No, I will NOT wrap all the presents. Why are women still responsible for the holiday joy?

...jingle bell time aside, it’s a goddamn clusterfuck.

We all know that women do the majority of domestic work like child care, housework and cooking. But the holidays bring on a whole new set of gendered expectations that make the season less about simply enjoying fun and family and more about enduring consumerism, chores and resentment so that everyone else can enjoy rockin’ around the Christmas tree. (I bet even Mrs Claus gets upset that Santa works one night a year but she’s dealing with hungry elves 24/7. That would be almost enough to make you want to over-indulge in eggnog and hurl yourself in front of a reindeer-pulled sleigh.)

Being the holiday point-person can be drudgery. Making lists, wrapping presents, finding sales to indulge a particularly demanding relative’s requests to Santa ... baby, let’s just say the brisk winter weather starts to feel bitter cold outside.

Of course the worst part of all for Ms. Valenti is the need to cover her meticulously cultivated feminist sense of victim-hood with a cheerful demeanor:

And it’s not enough that women actually manage to finish all of these chores – we’re also expected to plaster Christmas grins on our faces the whole time, lest the masses think we’re not thrilled with all the wrapping-paper-inflicted paper cuts.

Christmas is a special hell for feminists, and I can only imagine Valenti’s paper cuts are nearly as hard to bear as being forced to stay home with the baby while men fight and die.
Crazy cat lady logic
by Dalrock | December 24, 2014 | Link

I’ll be shutting down comments later in the day, but in the meantime enjoy (Courtesy of The Other McCain) the first rate feminist logic of Katy Kreitler in Sad Spinsters And Crazy Cat Ladies: Why Society Shames Single Women And Why We Should Celebrate The Single Life Instead. Kreitler wants us to know there is no shame in being a woman of a certain age who is still single.

Because being single is AWESOME!

And really important.

And very healthy.

It is a political statement, a refuge from sexism, and an opportunity to show that women can be self-sufficient (Boston marriages, anyone?)

At the same time, she distances herself from the category:

I’m sure someone out there will read this article and imagine that I am writing in the defensive, at home on a Saturday night, curled up on my couch in a Hello Kitty onesie, eating a Lean Cuisine, and watching reruns of The Bachelor while I sob quietly under a blanket of cats...

And because trolls love Everyday Feminism (aw, thanks, trolls!), these retorts will likely include cliché misogynist words like “man-hater,” “ice queen,” “slut,” “manster,” or “hag.”

They will say these things even though they have never met me.

They will say these things even though I haven’t even said that I am single!

Of course she isn’t single, or she might be, but either way she isn’t writing about her own pain! She is, of course, also upset that she is stereotyped for being single, as she explains earlier in the post:

Single women are routinely ostracized at work, stigmatized within their families, and stereotyped by the larger community.

I’m sure it’s happening right now - to me.

She cleverly must mean her own audience is (accurately or inaccurately) stereotyping her. And of course since she didn’t say she is single, the pain she writes of can’t be her own (whether she is single or not). Kreitler stands with single women, just not so closely that she will be identified as one herself. Single women should stand proud in their singleness, unless
of course it is too painful to admit.

Katy Kreitler is a Contributing Writer for Everyday Feminism as well as a counselor and youth advocate. She can be found wandering the streets of San Francisco with a purse full of used fiction, a pair of emergency yoga pants, and half a burrito.

One last nugget from the article is Kreitler describing the way women view single women, including divorcees (emphasis mine):

We reproduce notions of the ticking biological clock, the unfulfilling career path, the predatory divorcee, and the crazy cat lady.

We shame each other. We shame ourselves.

And we have done so for centuries.

And by centuries, she means thousands of years:

So, for thousands of years, we believed these ideas about single women being lost, alone, unhappy, sad, and even dumb and ugly.

As Kreitler explains women have done this to other women for thousands of years/centuries not because of biology, but because the patriarchy tricks them into doing so. Keep up the good work gentlemen, and Merry Christmas!
Merry Christmas
by Dalrock | December 25, 2014 | Link

I’m turning on comment moderation now and will leave it on until I return in a few days.

I pray for God’s blessing for you and your family.
A year of ugly feminists
by Dalrock | December 31, 2014 | Link

In my first post of 2014 I introduced the topic of the ugly feminist. As I explained at the time, this is an old charge but is typically aimed at the superficial instead of the core problem. Feminists are ugly because the philosophy of feminism is ugly. It is based on avoiding caring for others and being miserly with love. Several commenters pointed out that this is a devastating charge against feminism, as they could see no viable counter argument for it.

For Christians of course the answer should have always been obvious. The feminist mindset is the opposite of what the Apostle Peter explains is beautiful to God. Even so, I was curious as to how feminists would try to deny the obvious. What I observed over the year as I continued to write about the topic is a continuation of strategy which first appeared in response to the topic. When feminists are faced with this charge, they trip over themselves to describe themselves as the opposite of feminist. Shell was the first to demonstrate the pattern. Keep in mind, Shell is (was) here to argue the merits of feminism:

...frankly, I do not think it is possible to dialog with people who write posts like “Feminists are ugly” and those who use this as an opportunity to unload their misogyny and personal unhappiness it has created in their lives.

So how did Shell respond to the charge that feminists are ugly? She did so by explaining that while she is a feminist, she delights in her role as a very traditional wife:

I have been a stay-at-home mom most of my married life, at a certain point starting my own business to help my husband supplement our income and to do what I’ve always loved to do. He works very hard to be an excellent provider for us and has been doing it for years. Now that the kids are grown, we both have our own businesses and help each other running them when necessary. We are together 24/7 and this allows us plenty of opportunities for great sex, which has only become better since the kids left home.

Not that you will have to believe me, but I am thin and elegant, always taking good care of myself for my husband’s and my own pleasure. He likes that, very much. I also cook, clean, shop, mend our clothes and occasionally make them. I take pleasure in that, although I don’t think this is such a big deal. My husband never cooks, BTW (nor cleans), I don’t think he even knows how to, but he likes watching me do it (oh, and how). We have a fruit and vegetable garden, and we still can our harvest, although less than we used to.

This is the power of the observation that feminism is ugly. The most hard boiled feminists suddenly feel compelled to describe themselves as the opposite of feminist in order to distance themselves from the undeniable ugliness of the feminist mindset. This power is so strong it even compelled a player to white knight for a feminist friend on a later post.

Eventually the original post must have attracted the attention of feminists on the web,
as feminists started showing up to deny the charge. As with Shell the common response was to morph into a modern day June Cleaver when confronted with the ugliness of feminist miserliness. Commenter Dude explained:

You silly bugger. I am female, a feminist, and I bake bread every day, make dinner and lunch every day, home-made soup twice a week and brunch on Sundays.

Dude kept her feminist bona fides in tact by explaining that she does all of this while also being the breadwinner.

The pattern continued, with Dawn and Karley Heiman arriving to defend feminism on the grounds that feminists don’t have any objection to women performing the roles of cooking and cleaning. inmynuddypants arrived and was inspired to tell us about her desire to please the man in her life:

I feel so sorry that you have met so many cruel feminists. Let me assure you that we are not all this way. I not only made my boyfriend dinner tonight, but I fully plan on sucking his dick later. And I don’t think that feminism is suffering at all because of it!

The problem of course is while the women are able to distance themselves from the ugliness of feminism with these tactics, it is disingenuous to claim that feminism isn’t hostile to women cooking and cleaning for their families, or to the idea of a wife satisfying her husband sexually. Feminism is deeply antagonistic to these ideas, despite the fact that individual feminists tend to compete to outdo each other in how much they love cooking for, cleaning for, and pleasuring their men when the ugliness of feminism is pointed out.

I continued on with the theme throughout the year, wondering if I would ever see a truly different response as I continued to provoke feminists with the ugly truth. But the pattern never changed from the special version of Dalrock’s law I describe above. My last post on the topic covered Jessica Valenti’s ugliness at the Guardian, where Valenti spewed feminist venom at Christmas:

We all know that women do the majority of domestic work like child care, housework and cooking. But the holidays bring on a whole new set of gendered expectations that make the season less about simply enjoying fun and family and more about enduring consumerism, chores and resentment so that everyone else can enjoy rockin’ around the Christmas tree. (I bet even Mrs Claus gets upset that Santa works one night a year but she’s dealing with hungry elves 24/7. That would be almost enough to make you want to over-indulge in eggnog and hurl yourself in front of a reindeer-pulled sleigh.)

Valenti is the founder of the feminist site Feministing, and is arguably the poster child for the ugly feminist. She also wrote a book on motherhood from a feminist perspective shortly after having her daughter. Feminist Jesse Ellison at the Daily Beast was disappointed in Valenti’s book because after making the standard feminist complaints about motherhood Valenti never got around to making the case for motherhood:
The problem is, she never convincingly argues the opposite point, which means she never actually answers her question—or my own. There’s no doubting what decision she made; it’s right there in the subtitle: A New Mom Explores the Truth About Parenting and Happiness. What we don’t know is how she got there.

More recently Valenti has written about her multiple abortions, while also *complaining* that she wasn’t able to have as many children as she wished to have.

My Christmas post on Valenti’s ugly feminism inspired manosphere tag-along Bodycrimes to *try her hand* at defending feminism from the charge of ugliness. However, before defending feminism Bodycrimes of course explained that she personally found herself responding to Christmas by feeling gratitude at the engineering wonders men have provided her. She does this with feminist sarcasm, but she nevertheless starts by positioning herself as deeply grateful for the work of men:

> And this miracle of engineering was made possible, for the most part, by men.

> Oh, sure, there are women here toiling away with mops and – since Germany has a fair contingent of female engineers – it’s possible one of them had a hand in choosing the drapes.

> By and large, however, us passengers are enjoying the fruits of a male enterprise.

> Am I grateful to the unknown men who made it possible for me to speed safely towards Scandinavia for Christmas?

> Does it lift my spirits to partake of a miracle of engineering that rivals flying in its complexity and comfort?

> Am I enjoying the free box of Christmas chocolates?

> Sod off.

> I’m a feminist.

After first protecting *herself* from the charge of being an ugly feminist, Bodycrimes then focused on trying to defend feminism. To her credit, most feminists stop at protecting themselves from the charge, so even though her defense of feminism is quite weak she should at least get credit for trying. Bodycrimes explains that when Valenti was decrying traditional gender roles, Valenti wasn’t being a *feminist*, she was being *British*:

> What’s particularly galling is that Valenti wasn’t even talking from a politically correct feminist standpoint. She probably just wrote that article after The Guardian rang round its writers, needing someone to take on extra Christmas Complaint duties.

> See, what the Christian Taliban don’t get – being optimistic, sunny-natured
Americans as they are - is that complaining is integral to the British Christmas. It’s an ancient tradition that probably dates to the first time the druids found their carefully-planned Solstice rituals ruined because some pillock forgot the mistletoe.

This might make a bit more sense (but still not much) if Valenti were British and not an American. But even then, the entire form of Valenti’s screed is feminist from beginning to end. At best, Bodycrime’s claim would explain why a British paper was so willing to run a miserly feminist post about Christmas. If all miserly posts about Christmas are welcome, then Valenti’s year round miserly approach fits right in at Christmas. But even this explanation fails, because Valenti is a regular at the Guardian and her miserly feminist approach is welcome the rest of the year as well.

I look forward to another year of writing about the folly of miserliness, and the astounding power such posts have to make even the most hard boiled feminists appreciate the patriarchy and fervently desire to cook, clean, and care for others.

May God bless you with a loving, healthy, and prosperous 2015.
How to close the gender pay gap once and for all.

by Dalrock | January 1, 2015 | Link

Closing the gender pay gap is a national priority, but due to misunderstanding the problem we have failed to fully close it. The good news is we are already making great progress in this area, albeit largely by accident. Even better, now that we understand the true culprit we can speed up our progress via more deliberate efforts.

Misunderstanding the nature of the problem.

For decades we have labored under the misconception that the gender earnings gap was due to institutional discrimination against women. In order to combat this, we have focused our efforts on affirmative action programs and equal opportunity laws and enforcement. However, as economists have stubbornly pointed out, if women were being systematically paid less than men for the same productivity this would create an opportunity for employers to gain a competitive advantage by only hiring women. What we now understand is that the earnings gap is actually caused by women and men making different choices regarding education and employment.

The simple solution

Some have looked at the root cause of the earnings gap and determined that there is either no real problem, or that the problem can’t be solved. This is untrue. Equality of the sexes is a national priority and we are a wealthy nation. No matter what the cost, it will be worth it to close the earnings gap. Now that we understand the root cause of the problem, the solution is surprisingly obvious. We need to remove the incentives which are causing men to prioritize higher earnings. Men prioritize earnings under the outdated patriarchal system where men are seen as the breadwinners. Until we solve this problem, the wage gap will persist. Part of the problem is biological, but we know that there are institutional ways to circumvent these differences of biology.

What we need to do is remove the powerful incentives men and boys perceive to being the family breadwinner. These incentives are the root cause of men choosing harder but higher paying majors, accepting a longer commute, working longer hours, choosing a more demanding or even dangerous work environment, etc. It is important to understand that these choices are cumulative and begin very early in life. As I mentioned above part of the problem is biological; men are motivated to make these sexist choices by a desire to be more successful sexually. While we can’t change men’s and women’s sexual natures, we know we can do a great deal to change the rules of the sexual marketplace. We need to move away from the old sexist view of men as breadwinners, and instead have men focus on being as sexually desirable as possible. To do this, we need to move away from our outdated and sexually restrictive marriage based sexual/family system to one based on continuous sexual re-choosing.

How do we know this will work?
Radically changing our sexual and family structure is going to be expensive (although we have already made great progress here), so it is important to know ahead of time that doing so will achieve our goals. Fortunately because we have already been moving in this direction, we can test the hypothesis. For brevity I’ll only offer three separate data points in this essay, but the evidence that a marriage based system creates incentives for men to study/work/earn excessively is overwhelming. The first data point I’ll offer is from the American Enterprise Institute. Their most recent study on the topic found that married men earn at least $15,900 per year more than unmarried men. This greatly understates the perverse incentives marriage causes for men to work harder however, because it doesn’t account for the incentives men experience to maximize their earnings potential in the years leading up to marriage. Men who choose marriage as a sexual/family strategy know that the more they can earn the better their options in marriage will be, and this is why so many men persist in making problematic choices in their education and early career which lead to much of the gender pay gap.

The second data point I’ll offer is more tangible. To prove that marriage is the source of the pay gap problem we need to find a community which has moved away from marriage and see if the earnings gap has actually disappeared. In the US the logical choice for this test is Blacks, as marriage has all but collapsed among Black Americans. Over 70% of Black children are now born out of wedlock, and this statistic continues to improve. At the same time, we also know that the Black gender earnings gap has all but disappeared. As Hanna Rosin explains, Black women earn 94% of the weekly earnings of Black men. Black men are leading the way here, and all we have to do is get the rest of the nation’s men to follow.

But do we know that moving away from marriage works to reduce the productivity of White men as well? Can we count on White men ceasing to disrupt our efforts at gender equality if we do something as simple as move away from marriage? We know the answer to this is yes. In just the past few years our decades long investment in weakening marriage has become undeniable, and White men have made incredible progress in closing the gender earnings gap. The charts below show the exciting nature of this progress over time, and as you can see the greatest improvements are being made for the older age brackets. White unmarried men are now nearly as likely to earn nothing as White married and unmarried women:
These Peter Pan men are national heroes who are leading the way to a much more equal society. Unfortunately as you can see the married men continue to be the source of the problem by continuing to earn at nearly the same rates during the Great Recession as they did in the years leading up to it. The same pattern of married men creating gender inequality is also visible if we look at the top earnings brackets:

Data Source: http://www.census.gov/hhes/families/data/cps.html
http://dalrock.wordpress.com/

We need a national strategy.
Now that we know that marriage is the problem, how do we solve it? Unfortunately we won’t be able to ever entirely eradicate marriage. However, even where we can’t entirely prevent weddings we can sufficiently weaken the institution to achieve something very close to gender equality. To do this, we will need a coordinated effort across all of our legal, social, and religious institutions.

**Legislature & Family Courts:**

Our lawmakers and family courts have already done much of the work required to weaken marriage as an institution, so our focus should be on ensuring that we don’t lose existing progress while further weakening marriage. Child Support teamed up with No Fault Divorce are our best policy tools to eradicate marriage and the incentive for men to work harder. With these two policies working together, we can remove all or nearly all of the status of husbands.

No Fault Divorce is a potent tool not only to convert husbands into child support payers, but to weaken the status of husbands within marriage. By continuing our national policy of No Fault Divorce those young men who don’t witness their fathers being evicted from the home will see that their father can only remain in the household so long as he caters to their mother. By continuing with this policy we send a powerful message to young men that being a husband is low status and not something to aspire to. This message is reinforced every time a young man sees his own father or the father of a peer evicted from the home and treated harshly by our family courts.

We need to remind our family court judges that the work they are doing in destroying marriage is a multi-generational effort. While judges can’t immediately see the positive social results each time they reduce a husband and father to impoverished child support payer, with each man they crush they are sending a powerful message to future generations of men. Family court judges are the true heroes of our efforts to destroy marriage, and they must continue investing in generational progress. Even in cases where the father is not married to the mother, family court judges are crucial to erasing the incentives for men to earn more than women. Unlike marriage which creates an incentive for men to work as hard as possible, child support is a structure which discourages productivity by assigning men an earnings quota (imputed income) and threatening them with imprisonment if they fail to meet this quota.

Family court judges and even legislators may be tempted to see harsh penalties against men for not meeting earnings quotas as working against the goal of reducing men’s earnings, but since the earnings quotas are assigned based on each man’s past earnings over time this creates a culture where men learn that productivity is punished. The point to remember is the goal is to change the culture so that men no longer perceive an incentive to work harder. Just like with the Soviet Union, a quota system will (and already has) greatly reduce men’s perceptions of the importance of working as hard as possible.

**The entertainment industry:**

As with any drive to change the culture, our entertainment industry will be crucial in destroying marriage. They are already doing an excellent job in creating books and movies
selling divorce to women, but we can do better. I propose the President create a blue ribbon commission to look for ways to create more visibility to the importance of selling divorce to women. The commission should use the book/movie Eat Pray Love as the template for success in this regard. Young men already see that divorce is openly celebrated by women, but we can still make this more clear. We need to create a national dialog on why divorce is empowering for women, while reminding men that discarded husbands are villains who deserve the harsh treatment our courts reserve for them. This effort by our entertainment industry will reinforce the message our family courts are working so hard to send to young men. All young men need to learn that marriage and even fatherhood are foolish choices for men, and that working hard to be a breadwinner will make them both a fool and a villain. One area of special focus for the entertainment industry should be plot lines which blame husbands for making their wives unhappy by focusing on work.

**Our churches and religious institutions:**

Last but not least is the essential role our churches and other religious institutions are playing in the crucial goal of destroying marriage. If you haven’t already spoken with your pastor about this, be sure to remind him of the importance of giving moral cover to women who divorce and/or have children out of wedlock. Whenever possible, religious leaders need to refer to single mothers as “heroic”, and suggest that they should be treated as widows. In addition, pastors and other religious leaders need to abolish the outdated and dangerous concept of headship. If young men are allowed to see husbands as the head of the household, they will have an incentive to focus on preparing for marriage instead of mastering their skills at picking up women. As I have shown, men who focus on marriage are creating our gender earnings gap by working too hard and producing too much. To solve this problem, pastors should simply ignore the parts of the Bible and Christian tradition teaching headship and submission. In addition to ignoring Christian teaching on headship, religious leaders should also work to teach Christian men that headship is really a form of abuse. Instead of traditional headship, religious leaders should teach Christian husbands that their proper role is to submit to their wives. They should also teach wives that threats of divorce are a powerful and appropriate way to grasp power in their marriages. The movie Fireproof and the accompanying book The Love Dare are excellent teaching tools in this area, but we need to make sure that the message is continually driven home.

**Beware the naysayers.**

While what we need to do is obvious, we need to constantly guard against reactionary forces which could cause us to lose progress. As we can already see, the more successful we are at destroying marriage the greater the costs will be. As we continue to achieve the glorious progress of gender equality, reactionary forces are going to try to stand in the way by pointing out that our tax revenues and economic growth will stagnate and fall while our social welfare costs increase dramatically. In addition, opponents of progress will point to the host of social problems a nation of fatherless children causes. We need to steel our resolve and never turn back from achieving our goals. No matter how many more social workers and police we need to hire, or how many more prisons we need to build, we need to hold fast and keep the importance of gender equality in mind. We have already come a long way, and we are too close to give up now.
Stanton’s wake-up call.

by Dalrock | January 10, 2015 | Link

Ballista74 shared a youtube video where Glenn Stanton of Focus on the Family explains why marriage is important. The title of the video is “Marriage is a Feminist Institution”, and the caption on youtube reads:

“Research shows marriage is what truly has done the most not only to level the playing field between the sexes, but to actually shift the balance of power in women’s favor.” Surprised? Watch this video!

The video is over an hour long, and the message of the lecture is that women are naturally moral while men are not, and therefore we need to put men under the leadership of women. This is, Stanton claims, how God made us and how marriage should work. I will only quote small portions of the video, but I encourage you to watch as much for yourself as you can so you can see that I’m faithfully representing Stanton’s teaching. See also Ballista74’s take on the video here and here.

Core to Stanton’s theology of the family is that women are naturally good, while men need to be taught to be good. This is an idea Stanton has advanced in lectures as well as his book on parenthood. Stanton explains that without women telling them what to do, the men of the original Jamestown colony were a bunch of clueless layabouts. Fortunately the bumbling men were eventually saved by a contingent of women sent to direct their operations:

...what is the fundamental role that women, the most positive powerful role that they had in building america?

She said that was very easy, very simple: “making men behave”.

...

What happened was the mother country said we know how we can get the men working. We’re not going to send drivers, you know crack the whip and get them working, we’re going to send women. And the women, the men will be interested in the women, and the women will set the tone for what the men should do. You know what, before you have access to me, I want a nice cabin, and I want to be able to cook stew, tomorrow. So the men have to start doing, and that’s what they did. And one thing led to another, the women got men to work, they got them to buckle down, and 200 years later, boom. We have America, one of the greatest nations, the greatest nation in the world. Why? Because women showed up, and got men doing what men are supposed to do. That is what marriage does.

Stanton is confusing women with marriage. Traditional marriage is a powerful motivating force for men. It gives men a stake in society, in part by allowing them to lead their own family. But Stanton has twisted this to mean that the mere presence of women is a civilizing force, with women firmly at the head of the family.
In Stanton’s view women’s sexual desires if left to express themselves naturally will automatically bring about both sexual morality and good men. Stanton offers up the example of the feral boys in Lord of the Flies. All those boys needed, Stanton explains, was one girl to set them straight:

It is like Lord of the Flies. I mean, I love that example, if you’re familiar with that story. There’s all these little boys, and they just turn into savages.

If there had been one little girl on that island, she would have changed the whole nature and there would be the cocky, arrogant boys. I’m going to win you over just by my absolute coolness. What is she going to do? You know what, you’re an idiot, okay. So, the other boys see him get shot down. You’ve got the other boy over here. You know what, he’s kind, he’s nice, he’s not a Betty, he’s got some masculinity about him, but he’s not super-macho. He’s considerate, he’s thoughtful. He asks her about her day. He’s watching out for her. He’s the one who’s going to get her attention. And the other guys are like “it’s actually working”. I’m going to start being like that. Manners exist because women exist. Just absolutely plain out. And so, the bargaining chip is for the man is becoming the man that a woman wants him to become.

This isn’t just bad theology, it goes against what secular scientists observe as well. Women’s sexual/romantic desires aren’t divining rods leading the way to righteousness. Women left to their own devices will tend to fall for the rogue over the upright man, although they will rationalize to themselves that it is because the rogue would make a great father. In our post sexual revolution era women spend a decade or more picking the men they are attracted to before confining themselves (if only temporarily) in marriage. If Stanton’s view of female sexuality were correct, our current generation of young men would be the best mannered in history. But well mannered men isn’t what we have received with young women calling the shots. What we have instead is a generation of douchebags. If you want well mannered men, then make sure young men need to impress the woman’s father to be successful. If you want douchebags, leave the choice up to the daughter.

But in Stanton’s world fathers are just as hopeless as the boys in Lord of the Flies. Fathers need to be kept in line by their wives, and Stanton offers up his own marriage as the template*:

My situation, I grew up as a skateboarder in the panhandle of Florida. Surfer. I was a good kid, didn’t get involved in drugs, didn’t do bad things. But that was my life. School, I didn’t spend a whole lot of time in that. So I continued in that, after I got married and Jackie said, “you know what Glenn, here’s how it’s going to be” and what did I do? Okay, I guess I’m going to have to go to college. I was scared to death of college. Didn’t think I could survive there. Didn’t think I could compete there. But this woman was making me do something, this either or, so I went and did it and I became a better person.

Again, I would have never imagined that I get to do the things that I get to do today. Written a number of books, things like that. But I am who I am because Jackie said
not you can do it, you will do it. And every man here knows that that’s true. So the bargaining chip for the man is, it’s going to work out better for me if I be what she wants me to be.

It’s quieter at home, she’s more likely to make the kind of food I like, I’m going to get physical access to her more often, and that sound simplistic, but there are those things. So the guy’s bargaining chip is to be a guy, and guess what he finds out it works pretty well for him. And that he’s happier than his “free” bachelor friends.

Note the implied threat of divorce if Stanton hadn’t followed his wife’s orders (emphasis mine):

But this woman was making me do something, this either or, so I went and did it and I became a better person.

Note also that Stanton has not only reversed the roles of headship and submission, but that he is explaining that the sins of wives are actually virtues. Wives denying sex, threatening divorce, being contentious, etc are shown as acting out God’s plan. As you can see, women can truly do no wrong in Stanton’s view, because women’s sin is actually virtue. When women sin, it is only because they are so much more virtuous than men.

The biggest problem with this teaching is that Stanton isn’t really teaching something new. What Stanton is teaching is what is already conventional wisdom in modern Christian culture. Christian culture is gravely ill, which is why Stanton can come to a random church and comfortably spout this very unChristian view of women and marriage without any fear of being challenged.

But there is a bright side here. While Christian culture has been corrupted, the battle hasn’t been lost simply because it has never been fought. These ideas flourish in the darkness, because they aren’t capable of standing up to scrutiny. The view of marriage that Stanton is advancing is what I’ve dubbed the wake-up call view of marriage, and is found across modern Christian teaching. What is different with Stanton however is he is less adept at hiding what he is selling. He forgets to pretend that he really isn’t overturning everything the Bible teaches about men, women, and marriage. Where others are more circumspect, Stanton outright explains that wives dominating their husbands is the reason for marriage. He goes too far, states it all too plainly, and this is the mistake.

In stating this so openly Stanton gives us an excellent opportunity to discuss our sick modern Christian culture with our fellow Christians. These ideas slithered into Christian culture over decades, so we shouldn’t expect to overturn them quickly. But we should try wherever we can, as it is cruel to deceive young women by telling them they are morally superior, and cruel to families to inject subversion and strife into Christian marriage.

*Stanton likes the story of his wife taking charge of his life so much he shared it two separate times during the lecture. Here is link to the other time he describes it.
She bought a fake engagement ring.
by Dalrock | January 13, 2015 | Link

Jo Piazza is managing editor of Yahoo Travel, but instead of being jealous all her girlfriends talk about is the fact that she is 34 and still not married:

My girlfriends love to gossip. They’re bitches like that.

They particularly love to gossip about me, the last single woman standing in our group of college friends, the only one who didn’t get married last year.

“Poor Jo! She travels all the time. How is she ever going to find a husband?”

“She should have just married the last guy.”

Note to young women: your status won’t come from your career.
A male Stanford student recounts how a female student sexually assaulted him (emphasis mine):

I arrived at a party with a group of friends and struck up a conversation with a girl. We both were a bit drunk, but not to any dangerous levels, and slowly moved our conversation to the dance floor. We started dancing, then making out, then before I knew it, her hand was down my pants. I was surprised, as I hadn’t given her consent to take things a step farther, but I was nevertheless okay with it. Time passed with us together on the dance floor until she began whispering in my ear that she wanted to have sex. While I was enjoying myself, sex was not on the agenda for the night.

Still, he felt responsible for getting her home safely, which his attacker took advantage of:

We started walking home together, but our walk was prolonged by frequent stop-offs. We’d take a few steps holding hands, then take a moment to move off the path and make out with each other for a bit. After a while, these stop-offs became less of a mutual decision and more of a demand from her. I began denying her advances; it was late and I just wanted to get her home safely so I could get some sleep. She continued to engage with me and I denied her requests with a verbal “no” several times. After several failed attempts to push off her advances, we got to the point where I was trading kisses and gropes for steps back to her dorm. Several times her hands went down my pants, and I was not okay with it. I did my best to stick to my “no” every time she demanded more, but at each denial she would stop dead in her tracks and refused to walk with me unless I complied. I felt stuck. Dragging her back to her dorm with her fighting against me simply didn’t feel right. Physically fighting her struggle was not the safest means to that end. But, it didn’t feel right to abandon her there either. She was drunk and could not be left alone in the state she was in. So I felt I had only one option: I complied.

It wasn’t until eight months later that he started to realize he had been attacked:

Trading kisses and gropes for steps back toward her dorm? The whole situation seemed laughable, all centering on the inconceivable image of a horny college male denying a female’s sexual advances.

In June, I started asking why the events happened even though I said no. It didn’t seem like sexual assault. I wasn’t physically beaten or forced to engage with her. This wasn’t some traumatic event that threw me into a deep depression.

But Stanford’s current definition of sexual assault states, “Sexual assault is the actual, attempted or threatened unwanted sexual act, whether by an acquaintance or by a stranger, accomplished against a person’s will by means of force (express or
implied), violence, duress, menace, fear or fraud. If coercion, intimidation, threats and/or physical force are used, there is no consent.”

Actual unwanted sexual act? Check. Coercion? Check. There was no consent.

He reached out to the YWCA Sexual Assault Center, but ran smack into the victim blaming of Rape Culture:

I began recounting my experience to the woman on the other line. I told my side of the story and she listened attentively until I ended with the simple question, “Does this qualify as sexual assault?” After a short moment acknowledging the difficulty of all the factors at play, what she said left me flabbergasted.

“You just have to be careful,” she said to me plainly. She began to outline how situations like these are difficult when alcohol is involved, but when I reiterated that I clearly said “no” and felt trapped in the situation she continued to astound me with her suggestions at what I should or could have done. “You could have just left her,” she insisted. “If I were a man in your shoes, I would have definitely called 911.” At this point it was tough to hold back my frustration. I was calling this hotline because I was trying to figure out if what I experienced was sexual assault. How could I have called 911 in the moment if I didn’t even know I was being sexually assaulted?

The whole thing reads like a perfectly tuned piece of black knighting, which makes me wonder if the author is a reader of Vox Day.
Not a SJW true believer.
by Dalrock | January 15, 2015 | Link

Several readers have argued that the Stanford student who wrote the op-ed about being sexually assaulted is a SJW true believer who is sincerely crusading to have Yes Means Yes applied equally to women as it is to men. I find this highly doubtful because of the way the piece is crafted.

The first tell is the nature of the assault itself. He starts with a bit of misdirection; he was surprised when she put her hands down his pants without asking for consent. But this isn’t the alleged assault, because he immediately follows this by stating that he was ok with it. The assault he is alleging is her continuing to kiss and grope him as he walked her home. He tells us that he was into the kissing and groping at first, and that throughout the process he was “horny”. He also makes it clear that he deliberately decided to allow her to continue this because he decided it would further his aim of getting her home safely. He said no, after he meant yes, while he was clearly aroused, and while he deliberately allowed her to continue.

He tells us this didn’t traumatize him, and that he didn’t think about this for months. Then he realized that what happened sounds an awful lot like sexual assault as defined by the university. But even after reading the university definition, he tells us, he wasn’t convinced that this was actually assault. So he set out on a quest to answer this question; was he assaulted?

He shops this question around to the various organizations supporting “Yes means Yes”, and details the hypocrisy he finds. After he busts the rape counselor for blaming the victim, he keeps asking until a representative of the university finally confirmed that yes, this (ridiculous scenario) was assault.

Once he gets the answer he was looking for, he takes a clear shot at the absurdity of the campus policy (emphasis mine):

What she does not deserve is expulsion. We need to understand that we can’t solve these grey issues with black and white statements and punishments.

By demanding a “strong presumption in favor of expulsion” through last quarter’s ASSU Task Force Proposal, we begin to force the hand of the administration in cases where they should instead be using a discerning eye. Under the proposal, the only mitigating factor that can be brought forth to fight expulsion is the presence of a “pertinent, acute mental illness.” Mistaken consent, cooperation with the judicial review process and evidence of a lack of malicious intent are all outlined as factors that are inadequate to bring forth an argument against expulsion. It is completely understandable why the ASSU would deem these as inappropriate, but in practice this results in harsh punishments that fail to account for the differing degrees of sexual misconduct and rape.

Keep in mind that the scenario is a perfectly defined case of mistaken consent. If you play
the story from her shoes, the man is excited and initially clearly into her. Then he starts saying no but continues to kiss her and deliberately allows her to grope him. This is the “assault”.

It has been argued that this is not an example of black knighting because the author isn’t out to have anyone expelled. I don’t know if that is truly a requirement for the term, but perhaps a better description of the article is a form of satire. This is a policy which can only be discussed by those claiming victim status. Other perspectives are not allowed. The only way to ridicule the policy is to pose as a ridiculous victim.

This leaves the question of whether the events described actually occurred at all. Unlike the Rolling Stone UVA story, this one seems at least plausible. The author may well have thought about how the absurd campus rules would look if applied to a real incident he experienced and decided to go from there. However, feminists have already set the rules here. It isn’t permitted to question the story of someone who claims they were assaulted. Either way, there is nothing solid which could be disproved about this story, just like so many of the stories used to create the policy in the first place. And if the author recants the entire story tomorrow, he could continue to drive his (satirical) point home by pointing out that fact checking shouldn’t define the narrative, and that the important thing is that men are victims of sexual assault.
He left out harlots.

by Dalrock | January 18, 2015 | Link

Deep Strength pointed out a blog post by NYC Pastor which has feminists (Christian and otherwise) up in arms: 10 Women Christian Men Should Not Marry. As Deep Strength notes, there is a massive imbalance between the 643 (and counting) comments the post on selecting a wife has generated and the mere 26 comments on a similar post on selecting a husband the author wrote previously. In fact, the post on selecting a husband received only one comment prior to the publication of the post on selecting a wife, and this one was an objection to headship in marriage:

I agree with most of those statements except for the husbands controlling their wives part. In theory it should work out if the man is godly and good. However, there are men that will take advantage of that statement and use the Bible as a means for covering up abuse, neglect, rape, and whatever else to claim his “dominance”. Better I say, to have the relationship an equal partnership, lest one take advantage of the other.

As is so common, the uproar on both posts is that Christian women are called out. There is no outrage when you call out Christian men, and in fact doing so will make you wildly popular with Christian men as well as Christian women. But calling out women, including Christian women, is extremely difficult and will result in an extended emotional outburst. Making this worse, it feels heroic to call out other men, and it feels cruel to call out women. Thus, when faced with the choice of doing something which is easy and feels heroic, or something which is very difficult and feels unkind, it isn’t surprising that men will nearly always focus their criticism on other men, and do whatever it takes to turn a blind eye to the sins of women.

However, it is important to remember that this is unkind and unloving to women, and it involves a terrible lapse of leadership by Christian men.

See also: Single mothers and the failure of Christian men; it is time to Man Up!
As I explained in my last post, there are powerful incentives for Christian men to turn a blind eye to the sins of women. As we saw previously, Glenn Stanton of FotF explains that wives usurping headship is not a sin, but part of God’s design, something required for civilization:

We have America, one of the greatest nations, the greatest nation in the world.
Why? Because women showed up, and got men doing what men are supposed to do.
That is what marriage does.

This embrace of wives usurping headship is a very common theme in modern Christianity. But it doesn’t stop there. Stanton also makes the outrageous claim (H/T Hermes) that women’s sexuality does not require social control:

While there have been rare examples – such as the Flapper of the Roaring Twenties – female sexuality remains largely stable from culture to culture and age to age, requiring little cultural control. This is not true of the human male. His requires consistent control.

It is ironic that Stanton would point to the Flapper era, because modern women would (as a group) make Flappers look like prudes. Yet despite being surrounded by proof of women’s sinful nature, Stanton chooses not to see it. All he can see is the sinful nature of men.

We can see the same blindness in more traditional Christian groups as well. I hesitate to bring up Doug Phillips and his Vision Forum, because there has already been so much piling on after his affair became public. See Cane Caldo’s excellent posts here and here for background on Phillips and the scandal. You can also see an example of how Phillips’ personal sins are being used to discredit the idea of biblical patriarchy here. My intent isn’t to pile on further. As Cane Caldo explains the man has repented. Part of his repentance appears to be the removal of his vision forum from the web. Not only is the site no longer active, but more than a decades worth of writing by Phillips and others has been removed. Fortunately the content is still available on the internet archive.

I mention Phillips and Vision Forum, not to pile on, but because one day another Christian leader will hopefully pick up the mantle and defend biblical patriarchy. When they do, the temptation to turn a blind eye to the sins of women will be as strong as ever. Phillips wrote passionately about headship and the biblical structure of the family. But in his writing on the importance of following the biblical structure of the family, he tended to overlook the elephant in the middle of the room. The articles on Vision Forum focused on the need for men to accept their role as head of the family, but the articles didn’t focus on the widespread usurpation of this role by Christian wives. Likewise, the tools of usurpation were left out of the discussion almost entirely.

Back in October of 2012 I did some research on Vision Forum at the request of Sunshine Mary. As I’ve explained in detail, divorce and threats of divorce are one of the primary tools
in a rebellious wife’s arsenal. Modern Christians actually celebrate the power of wives threatening divorce to assume headship, which is most visible in the movie *Fireproof*. In the search I did of Vision Forum back in 2012, only 16 articles referenced the word *divorce* in the previous ten years. Nearly all of these were generic references to divorce as a social problem, with only one that I could find referencing divorce as a tool of feminism.

For comparison, in the same search I found 318 articles on Vision Forum with the word “military”. In fact, women in the military was an area of primary focus for the Vision Forum. But even here, the sins of women were largely if not entirely ignored. Here is one of the easiest issues to see women usurping the position of men. Women are acting out of envy for the position of men, demanding to be allowed to usurp men’s role as protector. Yet Vision Forum framed this not as women sinning by usurping men’s roles, but men forcing women to become protectors due to men abdicating their role. The description of the issue on the Vision Forum issues page sums this perspective up:

Women in the Military

It is biblically impermissible for men to abdicate their role as protectors and warriors by perpetuating the practice of women in the military.

The page devoted to women in the military re emphasized this perspective:

If certain federal lawmakers have their way, your eighteen-year-old daughters will be registered for selective service and drafted for combat by the next war. Many women’s rights advocates claim that Christians have long since abandoned the issue of women in the military. Sadly, far too many pastors and politicians were embarrassingly silent on this issue in the days leading up to the war against Iraq. In this special forum of key theologians and Christian thinkers, we throw down the gauntlet of God’s Holy Word, to proclaim that it is biblically impermissible and a profound judgment upon our nation for men to abdicate their role as protectors and warriors by permitting and perpetuating the practice of women in the military.

Women aren’t trying to usurp men’s roles (no matter how plainly they tell us they are), men are failing to protect women. As a result of the bad actions of men unwilling to fight for their country, women are at risk of being drafted.

Not surprisingly the same tone permeates the articles on the subject as well. *America the Barbarous: New Pentagon Policy Sanctions Women in Combat* brushes close to calling out women’s rebellion and usurpation with:

It represents an abolition of womanhood and the perversion of God’s design. It represents a deeply-rooted rebellion against the natural roles and functions by which God has distinguished manhood from womanhood.

But having come so close to calling out the usurpation, the article quickly recovers and reframes the issue back to men forcing women to usurp men’s roles:

Women are to be cherished as the weaker sex, not exploited to fill the roster of an
army. Combat is the province of men, and God calls on men to protect women and children. Men fight when their homes and communities are threatened by wicked regimes and lawless rogues who would despoil their loved ones. When necessary, men carry weapons into battle and give their lives to preserve the liberty and sanctity of those they hold dear.

It is barbarians who place their women in the midst of war’s brutalities to fight as men.

The article closes with a call to action:

It is high time that we as a people repent of our barbarism — that we cherish our women as women, and call on our men to act as men.

What is so noteworthy in this denial of the very obvious feminist usurpation of men’s roles is that this should have been an extremely easy group of women for Vision Forum to call out. The target audience is a very traditional group of Christian families. Calling out wives using threats of divorce, denial of sex, emotional outbursts, etc. to usurp (de facto) headship would no doubt have created the kind of extended emotional outburst we see elsewhere. But women joining the military is an overt feminist act, something that one would expect would be safe to call out in such a traditional space. That Vision Forum feared calling out even this is very telling.

This isn’t an easy question. Calling out the sins of women has no doubt always been harder than calling out the sins of men. But now that we have gone so far down this road, despite the most obvious feminist rebellion all around us, calling it out will be harder than ever. Yet this needs to be done. There is no kindness in denying reality, and by failing to call out the sins of women we abdicate our role as leaders. It will take great courage to turn this around, but I have faith that there are Christian leaders out there who are up to such a difficult task.
The only real man in the room.

by Dalrock | January 21, 2015 | Link

In the discussion of Turning a blind eye a commenter mentioned Pastor Mark Driscoll. Driscoll is an interesting case because while he generally couldn’t see women’s sins, his signature was as the champion of masculinity. However, while loudly championing masculine virtues, Driscoll never missed a chance to berate the men in his church as less than real men. The combination of the two messages made it clear; Driscoll was the only real man in the room. This of course delighted both the men and the women in the church. Modern Christian men simply can’t get enough abuse, and modern Christian women enjoy watching their husbands be abused almost as much as the husbands enjoy the abuse. Driscoll didn’t just put down the fathers and husbands in the room, he even put down Gideon and Noah.

Usurping the headship of the husbands in the congregation is a brilliant way to secure a power base in a time when women are in rebellion. Driscoll bypassed dealing with the rebellion, and convinced the wives to follow him as the strong man. While this is a terrific way to secure a power base, it is a terrible way to build a church.

Aside from the theological problems with a pastor usurping the headship of the husbands in the congregation, there is also the problem of sustaining the model. For the strongest-man-in-the-room model to work, the pastor has to always sustain this position. Over time some of the men he steps on are going to hold a grudge, especially those closest to him in leadership roles. The more time passes, the more essential it is to maintain the ultimate tough guy image to keep dissent under control. This appears to be what did Driscoll in. Not long before his fall we started seeing a much softer, weaker looking Driscoll. Compare the picture I just linked with a previous one to get a sense of the transformation.

According to the image properties, the softer picture was taken on October 23, 2013 (even though the photo itself is named Mark-and-Grace_2014.jpg). This appears to be right around the time his problems started. According to the Seattle Times the beginning of the end for Driscoll was when Pastor Dave Kraft resigned on September 13, 2013. From this it would appear that Driscoll was already in some danger when the photo was taken, but the softer, weaker look certainly would have predated the photo. Whether the softer image was an attempt at appeasement that backfired, or simply a softening/weakening which came with age, it is no surprise that when Driscoll looked weak a list of old grievances caused him to be forced from leadership.
Friday afternoon ugly feminists: Hot farts edition.
by Dalrock | January 23, 2015 | Link

Tracy Moore at Jezebel is troubled that a fellow mother writes of the unexpected beauty and blessings of childbirth. Moore quotes an upbeat post by Jensy in Very Blessed New Mom Wishes She Had Been Warned More About Blessings:

They should’ve warned me that after all those hours of labor (half of which with an epidural, which made things totally bearable), the first time I saw her face my heart would burst out of my chest and shatter onto the floor. They should’ve warned me that crying because you’re happy is actually a thing, and it’s a thing you can’t control when you’re a mommy and you behold the beauty in your arms. So you’d better keep tissues on hand at all times, and stock up on the waterproof eyeliner.

They should’ve warned me that I would love my husband so much more once he was the father of my bundle of perfection, that I wouldn’t remember what the old love had felt like.

All of this talk of blessings, beauty, love, and feeling grateful is an existential threat to the feminist mindset, so Moore quickly reframes the discussion to something ugly (emphasis mine):

Having my daughter was still the most important thing I’ve ever done. But I also had really hot farts, the baby blues, a terrible time learning how to nurse, inexplicable sobbing, and a complete and utter fog for the first several months due to profound sleeplessness, hormone crashes, and a really big learning curve.

I don’t feel bad about talking about that, because the harder thing to talk about of the two experiences is not the all-encompassing love, but the hot farts, okay? The sobbing and the fog is stuff people don’t seem comfortable with, and—particularly in the case of hot farts—who could blame them? That’s the stuff we need to get out there (not the hot farts themselves, but rather the fact of them). That’s the stuff women have historically not had the freedom and space to express without a lot of side-eye implying they don’t love their baby and husband enough.
Don’t overlook single mothers.

by Dalrock | January 26, 2015 | Link

Following The only real man in the room I’ve been trying to track down replacements for the Pastor Driscoll sermons which are disappearing from the web. I finally found a replacement video and two transcripts for the sermon I quoted at the top of Fragging Christian Headship. That sermon is the second part of a two part series on men, women, and marriage.

In the end of Part 1, Women and Marriage, Driscoll chastises Christian men who desire a wife who doesn’t come ready made with another man’s child, explaining that God may not wish this. He also explains that today’s unwed mothers (and I presume divorcées) are what Paul had in mind when he discussed “widows” (emphasis mine):

I’ll say one more thing, and that is for those of you men who are single, don’t overlook single moms. Don’t overlook single moms. Paul talks about this at the end of Timothy, where he talks about there are some godly single moms, he calls them widows, who should not be overlooked. But some men are looking for sort of a particular script they have written out. They want a woman just to show up, who meets the criteria and can read the lines. That’s not what God might have for you. Don’t overlook the single moms, and don’t overlook the opportunity to do what Joseph did for Jesus and that is to adopt a child that is not your biological child, and to raise them lovingly as Joseph did for the Lord Jesus. And so, this is a huge part of our theology as well and I would exhort the men not to overlook the single moms.

This confirms that Driscoll wasn’t just drunk tweeting when he made the same basic statement over twitter. To Driscoll, there is a serious problem with Christian men having the unrealistic, and even unChristian expectation that their Christian bride won’t come with another man’s children.

See Also: Newspeak: scrubbing the English language.

Moderator’s Note: A small minority of commenters have recently used any and every opportunity to take the discussion off topic by inciting Catholic/Protestant division. Since this post indirectly references Mary I imagine the temptation to incite division will be higher than usual. If you are part of this small minority, please understand that all but the most uninformed Catholics and Protestants already know that there are differences of belief regarding Mary, and resist the compulsion to announce that you personally disagree with either side.

Also, I’ll probably have a few more short posts and perhaps one longer post this week from the Driscoll content I’ve read while searching for replacement versions of removed sermons. If I do a longer post it will probably be over the weekend.
Driscoll, where do baby-mamas come from?
by Dalrock | January 27, 2015 | Link

Just one week after explaining that good Christian men can't find wives because they unrealistically expect one who doesn't already have another man’s children, Driscoll explained that women have no choice but to have children out of wedlock because there are no good men willing to marry them:

The latest statistics, 40 percent of all children are born out of wedlock. It is now at the point where women aren’t even pretending they’re gonna ever get married. They go to college, get a good job, get pregnant, have a kid. They’ve lost any hope of ever finding a guy who can actually carry the load, and that’s tragic. We’re a culture that is working hard to protect women and children, and no one has the common sense to beat on the guys who are the cause of so much of the pain.

Note: For those of you who are feeling Driscoll fatigue (as am I), I’ll warn you that I have another three posts in the works this week before I move on. Keep in mind however that what is most important is not what Driscoll says, but what he tells us about modern (conservative) Christian culture. As with Stanton, Rainey, the Kendrick brothers, etc, Driscoll knows what modern conservative Christians want to hear, and he delivers.
Message received.
by Dalrock | January 28, 2015 | Link

I’ve referenced Pastor Driscoll’s sermon *Men and Marriage* in several recent posts. This is the sermon to watch, or better yet, read, if you wan’t to understand what I was describing in *The only real man in the room*. In this sermon Driscoll opens with the prayer I quoted from in *Fragging Christian Headship*:

Father God, I pray that our time would be pleasing to you, that it would be profitable to us, Lord God, as well. I pray for those men who are here that are cowards, they’re silent, passive, impish, worthless men, they’re making a mess of everything in their life and they’re such sweet little boys that no one ever confronts them on that. I pray for the women who enable them, who permit them to continue in falling, those who are mothers and sisters and girlfriends and wives. I pray, Lord God, for those men who are chauvinists, those who are mean, who are brash, who are rude, who are harsh, who, Lord God, think they are tough when in fact they are Satanic. God, I pray for those men that they would have the courage today to not fight with a woman, but to fight with you, to actually find their rightful place in creation, that they might receive a good rebuke so that they can become honorable rather than dishonorable sons. God, I pray for my tone, I pray for our men, and I pray for the women who are listening in. I pray, Lord God, that they would know this comes from a heart of passion, deep concern, and love. I pray, Lord God, that we would think biblically, critically, humbly, and repentantly, and that, Lord God, there would be dramatic life change by the power of the Holy Spirit in the name of Jesus, Amen.

If you read the sermon, you will see that Driscoll repeatedly makes it clear that when he uses terms like *dishonorable, Satanic, cowards, passive, impish, worthless, jokes, losers, imbeciles, fools, etc.* he isn’t just referring to a few “peter pan” men who don’t have jobs and/or aren’t married. He is talking about the husbands and fathers who sought out the church lead by Driscoll, the men who brought their wives and children to the sermon.

…most of you men don’t know what masculinity truly is

Driscoll defines the eight types of worthless men he regularly comes across. They are all either cowards or chauvinists and bullies. And again, Driscoll is addressing this not to men outside the congregation, or even a smallish subset of the men in the congregation. He means nearly all of the men in the congregation:

Were this a women’s conference, I would not call you all idiots and imbeciles and fools, that you’re a joke, okay? But you men, this is where it needs to go. You’ve been glad-handed and buddied up and positive thinking and you’re a winner and Jesus loves you and you can do better. And I’m telling you, you’re a joke. And the real men in the room know it and they see it. And maybe there’s one woman that you fooled and she doesn’t see it because like Eve, she’s deceived.

The hallmark of a real man, a real Christian man, according to Driscoll, is looking around at
the other men in the room and knowing that they are pathetic compared to you. This is of course exactly what Driscoll is doing throughout the sermon.

Again, this is a sermon about men and marriage, and married men are Driscoll’s primary target. While he makes a short stop in Genesis for background, the inspiration for the sermon is one single verse, 1 Pet. 3:7

Likewise, husbands, live with your wives in an understanding way, showing honor to the woman as the weaker vessel, since they are heirs with you of the grace of life, so that your prayers may not be hindered.

The disparaging of the men in the room goes on to the very end of the hour and seven minute sermon. I’ll repeat that I highly encourage you to read the transcript (archive). There is simply too much to quote, as the stream of invective against the men in the room is non stop.

Most in the manosphere are familiar with Driscoll’s famous How dare you! tirade. What you may not know is that the famous tirade is from this very sermon. It is the sermon’s grand finale, closing out over an hour of constant belittlement and abuse of the men in the congregation. Driscoll has so much disparagement to share that he packs both the opening and closing prayers with abuse and insults of the men. Driscoll ends the closing prayer with:

And God, I pray for those women and children who suffer under men who are cowards and chauvinists. May they speak up. May they have the courage to articulate their frustration and, Lord God, may it wreck our men. In Jesus’ name.

Many of Driscoll’s sermons are disappearing from youtube in what appears to be an effort by Mars Hill to quietly distance itself from him. The video I found of this sermon wasn’t the original one uploaded by Mars Hill, but a copy uploaded by a woman with the youtube handle Miss Flowahs. She published the video with praise for Driscoll, the only real man in the room:

He gives me hope that there are still men out there like him, and I pray that God prepares me to be worthy of a man like him.

Miss Flowahs got Driscoll’s message, and no doubt so did the women in attendance.
I came across this while researching Pastor Driscoll’s apologies for one of my two final posts in the series. Relevant magazine links to a Driscoll sermon from 2007 titled A Rebel’s Guide to Joy and Humility. Driscoll starts by jokingly acknowledging that he isn’t the best man to be preaching on humility:

Well as we get into it, tonight’s theme is humility. We’re calling tonight’s sermon “The Rebel’s Guide to Joy in Humility”. And I will start by saying I have no right to teach on this subject. I know many of you are probably thinking, “Pastor Mark is teaching us on humility. That’s funny.” I guess Brittany Spears will come in and do a parenting seminar at Mars Hill as well since we’re at it.

He goes on to state that a lack of humility has been his biggest failure over the last 11 years, and explains that he is really preaching this sermon to himself. So far, so good. But then in classic Driscoll style, he manages to brag about how great he is while explaining that he needs to be humble:

…I truly believe that were there one thing I could do over in the history of Mars Hill, it would be in my attitude and in my actions and in my words, to not only emphasize sound doctrine and courage and strength and commitment and conviction, but to add in addition to that, humility as a virtue.

Forget Brittany Spears, how about Mac Davis.

Then Driscoll continues his apology for lacking humility all of these years at Mars Hill, in this sermon he is preaching to himself, by identifying the problem:

And so I’ll start by your forgiveness and sincerely acknowledging that this has been a great failure. And I believe that it is showing up in our church in the lives of men and women who have sound doctrine, but not sound attitude - that they may contend for good things, but their motives are bad, and their methods are bad, and their tone is bad, and their tactics are bad, and their actions are bad because their attitude is bad, even though their objectives sometimes is good. I see this in particular with the men. I see this with men young and old – men who have known Jesus for a long time and should know better, and men who are new to Jesus and are learning sometimes the hard way. I will take some responsibility for this.

Luke 6:40 says that when fully trained, disciples are like their teacher. And I am primary teaching pastor of this church, and I can’t simply look at the pride in some of our people and say that I am in no way responsible or complaisant.
One thing I have to admit about Pastor Driscoll is that he is an incredibly talented preacher. Part of this is his unmatched charisma and a gift for teaching. He also has a highly developed understanding of his audience, and he knows how far he can safely push them. This last gift gives us a unique window into modern Christian culture.

The overt message of Driscoll’s sermons on men and women is that modern Christian women are too passive and submissive, while the mass of Christian men are in rebellion, refusing all authority and misusing headship as an excuse for despotism. Yet his preaching betrays just the opposite. Driscoll knows Christian men are eager to submit to authority, and are delighted to be corrected. He knows he can abuse the men in the congregation with impunity, and they will not only keep coming, but other men will learn of this and seek his church out. He knows he can accuse the men of being abusive and lording their authority over their wives, and that delivering this message is an ideal opportunity to abuse the men while lording his authority over them. Driscoll has no reason to fear the husbands and fathers in the congregation, and he knows this. But Driscoll does have reason to fear the women in the congregation. Our society celebrates feminist rebellion as the highest virtue, and this is part of modern Christian culture. Even the mighty Driscoll fears this rebellion.

An excellent way to see this dynamic in action is to review Driscoll’s matched pair of sermons on biblical marriage roles; one sermon is to the women, and the other is to the men a week later. I’ve already written about the one to the men. It is a sermon packed tightly with abuse and disparagement of the men in his congregation. It is so tightly packed with abuse that this begins with the opening prayer and continues on even in the closing prayer. When preaching to men, Driscoll has the boldness and self confidence of a bully who knows he has picked the right victim. Yet when preaching to women his demeanor is one of fear. We can see this in the other sermon in the pair, Driscoll’s sermon on Women and Marriage.

Driscoll knows the women in the congregation are in open rebellion against biblical marriage. If he teaches biblical marriage roles for women he will become the focus of the rebellion of half of his congregation. This is made worse because the source of this rebellion is the wives usurping headship, so as de facto heads of the family the women are the ones who hold the purse strings and ultimately decide which church the family will attend. He knows that he couldn’t survive such a rebellion and remain in his position. Yet teaching on biblical roles in marriage is one of Driscoll’s signatures. He simply has to teach headship and submission, but he has to find a way to show that he has taught it without offending the women he is terrified of.

How Driscoll manages this is nothing short of fascinating. He begins by taking a page out of Jacob’s playbook in Genesis 32 when he was terrified of meeting his brother Esau. Driscoll starts by sending wave after wave of peace offerings to the wives he lives in fear of offending. The first peace offering is an explanation that what he is going to teach today is optional for Christian wives, but he thinks they will be happier if they elect to adopt this
optional form of marriage. He also explains that while he believes what he is teaching to be true, it is highly controversial:

I'll say this as well, that Christians disagree, actually often times very vocally, on this issue. You can be a Christian and disagree on this issue, but in my humble opinion it will have negative consequences if you are unbiblical in how you organize your marriage. You can be a Christian but I don’t think you can be a fully biblical happily married Christian as God intends, unless you obey the things that He has set forth as principles today.

The peace offerings don’t end there. Next he reminds the wives that they have the power to punish their husband via the police or the church if they ever feel that he is sinning:

What this means is that the husband is not the highest authority, ok, God is. And that over the husband there are other authorities like the government, we already dealt with that in chapter 2. And the church, we will deal with that in chapter 5. What that means is if a husband is in sin the wife and kids don’t need to live under unjust tyranny; they appeal to the higher authorities of God, and the authorities which God has established both by the state. She can call the cops, and the church, she can call the elders and begin church discipline.

For his next peace offering Driscoll assures the women that he isn’t just going to preach this week on the (optional) role of wives in 1 Pet 3:1-6. He also has a sermon prepared for husbands next week on the (not optional) role of husbands in 1 Pet 3:7.

Proceeding forward to 1 Peter chapter 3. He says this, these are commands and exhortations to the ladies. I’m not just picking on the women this week, we’ll pick on the men next week as well so do come back.

Elsewhere in the sermon he reinforces this message (emphasis mine):

Submission Does Not Mean that a husband is in ultimate authority. Above the husband is the church. If he is sinning, call the elders, lets start church discipline. Also, there is the government. If he is breaking the law, call the police. A husband is not an ultimate authority. All of his authority is derived. It’s derivative authority, it is not innate authority. He’s not God. Some guys think they are. We’ll deal with those guys next week and it will be unpleasant.

He continues minimizing the authority of headship, then pivots to suggest that submission is only required if the husband is godly enough:

And this same word here for being subject to or submitted to is what kicked off the whole discussion of 1 Peter chapter 2, verse 18. It is the theme of the second half of the book of 1st Peter. Now, what we mean by be subject to or submit to is that the husband is to lovingly, humbly, sacrificially, selflessly, let me put lots of words behind this, lead his family. And that the wife is to respect him and follow his leadership.
In doing this he has substituted a definition of headship for submission, and suggested that only wives with godly husbands need to submit. This is the opposite of the message in the verses he is teaching (1 Peter 3:1-6).

With the waves of peace offerings complete, Driscoll finally starts to get to the meat of the issue. First he explains that ideally husbands and wives should be able to come to agreement. It is only when they are unable to come to agreement that headship applies. He further explains that headship doesn’t apply to day to day decisions. If the husband and wife disagree on anything but a “big” issue, the husband is to give the wife what she wants:

Those are easy, just give her what she wants. Those are easy. Just love her, serve her, do what she wants. What we are talking about here are big issues. When do we start having kids. When do we buy a house. What house do we buy. How many kids do we have, where do we attend church. Some big monumental cataclysmic life decisions. The big ones.

Having excluded headship and submission from all but a handful of occasions in married life, Driscoll then further restricts headship. He explains that for these rare occasions where a husband and wife don’t agree on a “big” issue, the husband is to do one of three things. Driscoll’s rules of headship can be summarized as:

1. Delay (do nothing)
2. Defer (let someone else decide)
3. Decide

The first choice of a husband is to do nothing, and instead to wait for his wife to agree:

What do you do? Well at that point, the husband has three options. Number one, he can just prayerfully wait for his wife to come to agreement with him. And this isn’t that immediately that the man makes the decision the wife has to submit to it. There are various things that as the head the man can do. The first can be, you know what, my wife is struggling with this, I want to be considerate, I want to be patient, as God is considerate and patient with me. I’m going to love her, pray with her, talk to her, we are going to work through all of the variables, and I think she is going to come around I just need to wait a while.

The next option Driscoll presents is to give the authority to someone else:

Number two: The husband may decide to appeal to a higher authority. He may choose to bring in a mediator. We are deadlocked. I’m going to call a Pastor or a biblical counselor, or an older married couple that we both really respect, and we are going to let them play the role of umpire and we are going to let them make the call. A husband may want to defer that decision.

Up until now Driscoll has been dithering, but now he can dither no more. Having minimized the husband’s authority, explained that biblical marriage roles are optional, that headship doesn’t apply 99% of the time, and for the one percent of the time it does (optionally) apply the husband should mostly either do nothing or give the decision to someone else, Driscoll
finally explains that there are extremely rare occasions where a husband will actually **make a decision**:

The third option, is, he can make the decision– sometimes this is because the matter is pressing and the decision has to be made, and he makes the decision. She is then to submit to him, to be subject to him, to respect his decision, and to follow his leadership as the head of the household. That’s the language that the Bible repeatedly uses. That is what it says.

Driscoll follows up with examples from his own marriage, which he presents as the template to follow. He starts by acknowledging that the women in the audience are going to bristle at the examples he is about to provide because the women in the congregation are **feminists** (emphasis mine):

Now, I asked Grace, I said can I share some examples from our life, and she said sure. So, these are some examples that she has given. **And some of you ladies will immediately bristle at this, because, truth be told, the vast majority if not all of the people that attend Mars Hill church are feminist to some degree.** They don’t begin with a biblical understanding, and when they read the Bible, **they sort of roll their eyes and [sighs loudly] take those deep heavy sighs, and then start looking for books that say thats not what it means.** That’s your natural disposition. Romans 1 calls it suppressing the truth, because you just want to keep on doing what you are doing.

Having warned the women that they will bristle at the examples, he gives three of them. All three involve Driscoll **spoiling** his wife:

...every example she gave me to share with you is a situation, and this may shock you, where she didn’t want to take as good a care of herself as I wanted to take care of her, and I asked her to submit to me so that I could spoil her. See you think of submission, sometimes all you think of is “well the husband is making his wife do terrible things”. Most of the time, if the wife has godly character, is really humble, works really hard, the husband is trying to spoil her because she is not taking enough care of herself.

One of the examples he provides of headship is the time he gave her “lots of money” and forced her to go on a **shopping spree**:

Another one was when we first got married, my wife hadn’t updated her wardrobe in a really long time because she didn’t want to spend money on herself. She felt bad. I finally looked at her and I said “Honey, you need to go get some new clothes.” “No I don’t want to spend the money.” So I gave her lots of money and I said “Go buy yourself whatever you want.” She said “I don’t want to.” I said “Well you need to follow the leadership of your husband. Go shopping.” True story. We do that quite often in the Driscoll house.

Notice that Driscoll is playing an **old game**, signalling to the wives in the congregation that it would be easier for them if they were married to **him**.
Driscoll reinforces that headship really means the husband spoiling the wife after offering the three examples:

Almost all of the disagreements that we have had, where I have pulled out the “Sweetheart I love you, follow me on this” is that she doesn’t want to spend the money, and she wants to work even harder, and I know that she is busy and I know that she is tired, and I want to do something to help her. And because she works hard and she is a good steward and she has a hard time receiving. So often times submission is the husband wants to take care of his wife, than she is taking care of herself, and she feels a little bad about that. But he pulls out the “Hey, I love you let me do this for you. Let me make this decision for you.”

If you are oftentimes disagreeing, there is a problem in the marriage, and you hit these disagreement points, if it is over fundamental issues you may have a real crisis, because you disagree biblically. But if it is the details of life where the husband is trying to protect, love, serve, and spoil the wife, you are probably on the right track.

With this we can update our summary of Driscoll’s three rules of headship to:

1. Delay (do nothing)
2. Defer (let someone else decide)
3. Decide (spoil her)

Later in the sermon he tackles the fact that Peter offers Sarah as the example for wives to follow regarding submission. He explains that this bothered him initially because Sarah is known for submitting to Abraham even when his directions were foolish, even dangerous. Driscoll then explains that what Peter really meant when he said wives should follow Sarah’s example is that wives should consider her example and learn from her mistakes (emphasis mine):

Additionally, he [Abraham] is the one who said “Uh oh I’m going to get hurt, lets lie to this person and then you go with them and then pretend that we are sister and brother” and she went along with it twice.

And its always bothered me, why would he say, “ladies look to Sarah”? Couldn’t we find someone better, ie Ruth? But see Sarah was the mother of the nation of Israel, and I think he in his wisdom, as I meditated on this, I realized, there is a good strategic reason that God put Sarah in the Bible, not because she is perfect, but because she is imperfect.

What he [Peter] is saying is this: Ladies, you aren’t always going to be a perfect wife, Sarah wasn’t. You are not going to always give good counsel, Sarah didn’t. Sometimes you are going to follow your husband when you shouldn’t, because he is not following God. That is what Sarah did on more than one occasion. And sometimes you will not follow your husband when he is following God, and that is what Sarah did as well. That she was a godly woman but an
imperfect woman, and if you look at the totality of her life you will see a godly woman but if you look at segments and occasions in her life, you will see a woman who made some tragic mistakes. And she committed some actual sins. And that’s hope for you women, you don’t expect to be perfect but you hope to make progress by the grace of God.

Driscoll has turned a clear instruction to follow the example of Sarah regarding submission into a warning not to make the mistake of submitting like Sarah did.

After all of this, Driscoll finally gets around to calling wives out on their feminist rebellion in the most gentle way possible:

Additionally, I think this is perhaps why I find Sarah most intriguing. God came to her on one occasion and said “Sarah, this is how your life is going to go”. And she laughed at God. Some of you women even in hearing me read this text, you’ve done the same. Outwardly, chuckle chuckle chuckle, submit to my husband? Here he is, look at him, obviously that will never happen. Or you chuckle in your heart, you chuckle in your mind, like “This is dumb. This is an old book. I went to college. This is not for me. I’m very smart talented gifted and capable, I don’t need this old book to give me old ideas. Many women first hearing God’s expectation for them as women and wives, their first instinct is like Sarahs to laugh at God. What a joke. He must be kidding. I hope He knows He is funny. And what he is saying is that as Sarah laughed at God ladies, some of you have laughed at God. As she thought that God was foolish, some of you have thought God is foolish, in fact that is foolish. God is not foolish He is wise.

And he is inviting you to laugh your laughs and to commit your sins and to make your mistakes, and to learn from them, to repent of them, to grow through them, to increasingly become more godly. So I think Sarah is a wonderful example. She’s a wonderful example, for all the women and wives. Not in that she is perfect, but in that by the grace of God she made progress.

For those who doubt that Driscoll is truly a gifted preacher, revisit that last quote as well as his description of the fall and women’s inclination to rebel here. After explaining women’s inclination to rebel, he explains what original sin means for men:

That’s Genesis 3. It’s a culdesac that humanity has been driving around in for thousands of years. Men abdicate their responsibility, and women are deceived.

In other words, women’s sinful inclination regarding their husbands is to rebel, and men’s sinful inclination toward their responsibility of headship is to err toward:

1. Delay (do nothing)
2. Defer (let someone else decide)
3. Give her what she wants (spoil her)

Note: All of the quotes I provided are from my own transcription of the sermon. If you spot
any errors in wording please note them. I have worked to keep the quotes as short as possible while including links jumping to the part of the sermon where they came from. In some cases the links start earlier than the quote so you can get more context of the quote. Despite the length of this post I have only quoted and addressed part of the sermon, so don’t take this as a definitive summary of the sermon. If you are interested I encourage you to listen to the entire sermon. Lastly, I had planned on doing one more post on Driscoll, but with this post I have decided that I’m done with the topic.
Mychael at Courtship Pledge describes a powerful lesson for her and her husband Scott’s daughter:

Last night, I decided to put on one of Scott’s favorite skirts and a nice sweater while I cooked and served dinner.

Just as I was about to serve the food, our daughter noticed and asked,

“Mommy, why are you wearing that skirt?”

I replied “because daddy likes it.”

Her face turned a little red, and I could see Scott was very satisfied with the response as well.

This simple act is profoundly countercultural, because feminism teaches women that wanting to please their husbands is beneath them. Yet, as Mychael explains, it felt natural. Her example is the opposite of the ugly feminist.

As I’ve shared before my own wife and daughter on occasion will put on a bit of a fashion show as my wife models new clothes that she bought (to see which ones I like the best so she can return the rest). It is truly joyful, and our daughter delights in it as much as my wife does.

Feminism has robbed modern women of much of the joy of life, but this is a fragile victory since there is always the risk that a new generation of women will catch a glimpse of the beauty, love, and joy that they are missing.
Hear them roar.
by Dalrock | February 3, 2015 | Link

Infowars on feminist music.

The need to make what should be beautiful ugly is of course standard for feminists. Hat Tip MarcusD
From Yahoo Australia:  Kate Winslet: ‘Divorce has been good for my kids’

The 39-year-old Oscar-winning actress says her two divorces have helped teach her children how to “struggle”.

“I think it’s very important to teach your children to struggle on some level,” she said.

If her rule of thumb is the more mom induced family chaos the better, Winslet is living up to her own standards. According to the article Winslett has three children by three baby daddies:

Kate is mum to Mia, 14, from her marriage to Jim Threapleton, and Joe, 11, from her second marriage to director Sam Mendes and she gave birth two-year-old son Bear in 2013 with husband Ned Rocknroll.

The Independent has a similar article.

Update: In a 2013 article (HT CCG) the Daily Mail quoted an interview with Vogue where Winslet told a different story. While Winslet now claims the suffering her divorces caused her children was good for them, she previously claimed they didn’t suffer at all:

‘People go, “Oh, my God! Those poor children! They must have gone through so much”.

‘Says who? They’ve always been with me. They don’t go from pillar to post; they’re not flown here and there with nannies.

‘That’s never happened. My kids don’t go back and forth; none of this 50/50 time with the mums and dads - my children live with me; that is it. That is it!’

The Daily Mail article notes that this statement lead to an advertising campaign by Fathers 4Justice centered around Winslet. It also notes that one of Winslet’s baby daddies has been supportive of the group:

In 2004 Mr Threapleton spoke out in support of the group, claiming he went months without seeing Mia.
A reader recently asked for my thoughts on the upcoming Kendrick brothers movie “War Room”. After doing some digging on the movie, my initial thought was of the line from the Tropic Thunder spoof about overdone sequels:

Here we go again.

Again.

War Room is the latest “Christian” movie from the Kendrick brothers, and from the information available it stays true to the theme of the last two (Fireproof and Courageous). Modern secular culture loves to denigrate husbands and fathers, portraying them as clueless buffoons. Yet modern Christian culture has a much deeper level of contempt for husbands and fathers than secular culture does. As a result the Christian movies tearing down husbands and fathers tend to be much darker than their secular counterparts. Fireproof reveled in the power no fault divorce gives wives over their husbands, in a cross-dressing presentation of biblical headship and submission modern Christians couldn’t get enough of. Courageous was even darker, but equally loved. Somewhat lighter was Mom’s Night Out, which more closely aped the secular mocking of buffoonish husbands and fathers, but it had a more subtle darker side as well.

Even the feminists at Dame were startled by the contempt modern Christians have for fathers:

And that’s the biggest problem with Moms’ Night Out: The moral of the story isn’t that the women are supposed to stay home and not have fun, but that the men are totally hapless morons without them around—and that this lesson is still being drilled into our heads in 2014. We’re supposed to feel better about this “men are total idiots, the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world” philosophy (and that latter piece of wisdom was actually uttered in the movie in case you missed the point). But this story of the helpless manchild is a disservice to men—and families—everywhere.

All I have to share on War Room is an early piece of advertising for it, but it does appear that the movie will remain true to modern Christian culture:

My guess is that the advice to the wife is intended to brush close enough to “win him over without a word” to allow supporters to rationalize that it is teaching the message of 1 Pet 3:1-6

Wives, likewise, be submissive to your own husbands, that even if some do not obey the word, they, without a word, may be won by the conduct of their wives, 2 when they observe your chaste conduct accompanied by fear. 3 Do not let your
adornment be merely outward—arranging the hair, wearing gold, or putting on fine apparel—rather let it be the hidden person of the heart, with the incorruptible beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is very precious in the sight of God. For in this manner, in former times, the holy women who trusted in God also adorned themselves, being submissive to their own husbands, as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord, whose daughters you are if you do good and are not afraid with any terror.

It is possible that the Kendrick brothers will make a U-turn and actually teach biblical roles in marriage. However, based on the preview, their past presentations, and the strong preferences of modern Christians I’m not optimistic. My guess instead is that the advice to the wife is a headfake towards submission while teaching her that her job is not to cultivate a quiet gentle spirit, but to become a warrior praying for her no good husband to get his act together.

Here we go again.

Again.

I would of course be delighted to be proven wrong.
The Census finally got around to publishing the 2014 Families and Living Arrangements tables. As I’ve done in the past, my focus is on the trend of never married White women. Marriage rates vary widely by race, and looking at composite figures hides these distinctions and also has the problem of introducing the potential of demographic changes driving the trend. Whites are still the largest racial group in the US, and since nearly all of the carping about a husband shortage is coming from White women in the media this is the obvious choice. If you want to see a breakdown by race, I have charts breaking out race for 2000 and 2012 here. Also, if you wish to do your own charts and analysis for another race, let me know and I’ll add a link to your post.

Last year’s data made me wonder if we weren’t seeing a leveling off of never married rates in the 25 and older brackets. This year however it was the 20-25 bracket which stayed roughly the same while the never married rate for all of the 25-39 year old brackets increased.

While no one year shows a dramatic change, the cumulative trend from the last 10 years is astonishing, especially since we are now (officially) well past the recession. Back in 2004 the nevermarried rate for 25-29 year old White women was just under 37%, a number which remained roughly the same from 2002-2005. Now less than half of all White women in their
late 20s have ever married.

When I first started charting this the most recent data was from 2009. At the time, I didn’t see compelling data backing up the notion that men were on a marriage strike. I’m still not convinced that a “marriage strike” describes what we are seeing, but with five years of additional data it is obvious that we are undergoing a significant change in marriage patterns.

If we take out the 20-24 year olds, there is more room in the chart to see the changes for the older brackets:

Here is what it looks like if we just include White women 30 and over:
Here is the view for 35 and older. The jump in the late thirties bracket is striking, with 17% of White women in their late 30s having never married:
It is interesting that White women in their 40s have so far escaped much of the change. My guess is this reflects some combination of delayed reaction as the change cascades through the age brackets, and increased willingness to settle. Either way, women marrying after forty means their fertility window is all but closed by the time they walk down the aisle. It still counts as a marriage, but from a societal point of view it is something very different than a woman marrying in her 20s or even early 30s. This is also not what young marriage delaying women are telling us they have in mind. They are hoping to delay marriage as long as possible while still marrying in time to have children. Even the 17% of White women who haven’t married by their late thirties have for the most part missed the mark.

**Edit:** Thanks Glenn Reynolds for the instalanch.
Guilty until proven innocent, and nothing proves you innocent.

by Dalrock | February 9, 2015 | Link

In the wake of mattress carrying Emma Sulkowicz’s claim of rape falling apart, Emma Gray at the Huffington Post has created a chart to detail what kinds of situations would indicate that a man accused of rape should not be presumed guilty. According to the flow chart there is no scenario where after being accused a man should no longer be presumed guilty. Once the accusation is made the man is presumed guilty, and nothing the accuser does or says should undermine that assumption. As Gray explains, we shouldn’t get caught up trying to see if an accusation is truthful or not, because somehow this is unfair to the accused:

Instead of picking apart the narratives of every woman (or man) who comes forward with claims of assault, let’s put that time and effort towards reforming policies that do a disservice to both survivors of assault and those they are accusing.

There are no perfect stories. There are no perfect victims.

Based on this, I would say the only way to not be presumed guilty of rape is to either not be accused, or not exist.
Yiayia and the empress’s new clothes
by Dalrock | February 12, 2015 | Link

3 Likewise, teach the older women to be reverent in the way they live, not to be slanderers or addicted to much wine, but to teach what is good. 4 Then they can urge the younger women to love their husbands and children, 5 to be self-controlled and pure, to be busy at home, to be kind, and to be subject to their husbands, so that no one will malign the word of God.

–Titus 2:3-5 NIV

Emma Gray with the Huffington Post has another* post up titled The Truth About Sluts. In the post she interviews feminist author Leora Tanenbaum, who admits something feminists have long been in denial of; the word slut can’t be reclaimed.

My central argument is that it doesn’t matter what the intent of the name-caller is, because the result is always negative. It always leads to policing and judgment and shame, even when the initial intent is lighthearted or neutral.

The problem with trying to reclaim the word is it has real meaning. While sluts have the power of being desired, only a foolish man would fall in love with a slut. Sluts are in this narrow sense unlovable, not to mention unfit to marry. As a result, even hard core sex positive feminists fear being labeled either directly or indirectly as a slut. As Tanenbaum explains, this creates a dilemma for women as they compete for men’s attention:

Digital culture and social media have ramped up this unspoken rule of femininity: You’re always supposed to be sexy, but you’re not supposed to be slutty. And today we’re all living in this world of wall-to-wall surveillance. When your female body is being tagged, tracked, liked, it creates all this pressure to present yourself as this sexy — yet never slutty — person.

... You don’t wanna be a prude and you don’t wanna be a slut. It’s really impossible. We are evaluated and judged through a sexual prism no matter what we do. Either we’re not sexual enough or we’re too sexual.

The problem for modern women is that feminists have succeeded in destroying the very protection they now crave. In the past, older women like Yiayia enforced the rules of modesty. Now older women are more likely to shop at Forever 21 than do or say anything to police modesty. While Yiayia’s rules of modesty might seem arbitrary, change some from one culture to another, and even change some over time, what mattered was that the rules were clear. This is essential because young women naturally compete with one another for sexual attention, and knowing the exact location of the line between good girl and slut is required in order for them to effectively compete.
In a sense this isn’t all that different than auto racing. While NASCAR, IndyCar, Formula 1, etc. have different rules about what is permitted, what matters is that the rules are understood. In order to compete effectively you have to go right up to the line but not over it. But with modesty there are no longer any clear rules. Each woman finds herself trying to go up to what appears to be the line based on what the other women around her are doing. This has been going on for several decades, and not surprisingly it has resulted in a continuous drift of what is deemed acceptable. Yet what seems like a rule is an illusion. Without Yiayia defining and policing the rules the only rules are the laws of indecency, and even these are somewhat subjective.

While the rules of modesty are undefined, one of the clear rules of women’s intrasexual competition is that women can’t be seen as overtly competing for men’s sexual attention. As Tanenbaum explains:

...femininity is all about “effortless perfection.” The slut is somebody who never understood that or understands it and is disregarding it. She’s being sexy in a way that is considered overt or too attention-seeking.

...young women have to walk on this razor-thin tightrope to not be a prude, not be a slut, be sexy but just the right amount, not show that they’re exerting any effort — you just woke up looking sexy in this very understated way.

Like other aspects of women’s sexuality, misdirection and denial are critical when competing for men’s sexual attention.

**Modern Christian Modesty: The Empress’s New Clothes**

All of this is in play not just for feminists, but for modern Christian women as well. They are also compelled to compete while denying they are competing, and lack any clear set of rules on what is permitted and what is slutty. However, for modern Christian women the stakes are higher, and as a result the level of denial is higher. This is why the issue of modesty is such a radioactive topic with Christian women. Any discussion of modesty by Christians carries an implicit but generally unintended charge that the woman who is being immodest is a slut. The unspoken rule is:

Good girls don’t advertise the goods; only sluts do that!

This leads to all sorts of rationalizations for why modern Christian women (just like women in the larger culture) wear revealing clothing. The hamsters start spinning, and anyone who references modesty is treated to a stern lecture about how Christian women are entirely unaware that the outfit they chose looks sexy, because they dress strictly for practicality and/or comfort. They have no idea you can see down their low cut blouse, that you can see everything with the yoga pants they are wearing, or that their strategically placed rhinestone cross directs men’s eyes to their rear end. This is of course nonsense, and is proven by the first thing every woman does when she puts on a pair of pants; she checks to see how her butt looks in them.

Christian blogger Veronica Partridge inadvertently set off a firestorm last month when she
announced her decision to stop wearing yoga pants and leggings in public. As she explained in her follow up post:

These past few weeks have been shocking, to say the least. I have weathered the most hateful comments of my life. People have called me a countless number of names, some I can’t even repeat. Women have talked about my husband with graphic sexuality asking for favors and soliciting their bodies to him.

What Partridge hadn’t anticipated is that by announcing that she was choosing to be more modest she instantly put women who didn’t follow this rule on the wrong side of the good girl/slut line. She poked the anthill and the ants came out stinging. This is true even though she took great pains to explain that this was her personal decision, and not something she expected other women to follow.

Partridge couldn’t anticipate this because she was in denial of what was really going on. In her mind she wasn’t wearing revealing clothing to compete with other women for men’s sexual attention. In her first post she explains that she originally struggled to believe that wearing this kind of revealing clothing had any impact on men (emphasis mine):

Was it possible my wearing leggings could cause a man, other than my husband, to think lustfully about my body? I asked my husband his thoughts on the matter when he got home. I appreciated his honesty when he told me, “yeah, when I walk into a place and there are women wearing yoga pants everywhere, it’s hard to not look. I try not to, but it’s not easy.”

Sure, if a man wants to look, they are going to look, but why entice them? Is it possible that the thin, form-fitting yoga pants or leggings could make a married (or single) man look at a woman in a way he should only look at his wife?

While Partridge deserves to be commended for going against the grain and doing the right thing, her level of denial here is breathtaking. She had no idea that these pants showed off everything and therefore caused men to notice her. She didn’t stop wearing them to repent of her own sin of desiring inappropriate sexual attention, she merely wants to avoid tempting those dirty men into sinning. Interestingly though in her follow on post she notes that other women do indeed wear leggings to get sexual attention (emphasis mine):

...To men, the clearer the woman’s form to their eyes, the more sexually stimulated they are. In my opinion, this is also one of the reasons why leggings have become so popular. Women have naturally noticed more male eyes in their direction when wearing form-fitting leggings. This has reinforced their choice to wear them more often. At the biological level, this is normal...

...when a man can see the outline of a woman’s butt, or her underwear line, or even the outline of her vagina, their sexual stimulation naturally increases.
In my experience, many women wear leggings that show such details...

The fundamental problem is not that men like to look at women’s bodies and women like to have their bodies looked at. This is as Partridge explains natural. Just like anything else, there are proper expressions of these natural desires. A man should direct his desire to look toward his wife’s body and avoid indulging it with other women. Likewise, a woman should direct her desire to have her body looked at toward her husband, and not other men. The problem we have is the modern Christian blind spot to women’s temptation to sin, combined with women’s vehement denial of their own desire for sexual attention. As a result, we have a comical pattern where whenever anyone points out that something is immodest, the immediate retort is that the person who pointed this out wouldn’t have noticed if they hadn’t been looking. Only a pervert would notice such a thing.

Custody of the eyes has gone from a reminder to men to avoid sin, to a cover for women to indulge in the counterpart sin. You have to admit this is a deviously clever tool to silence all discussion of modesty. Yet the problem remains. Without a defined line of modesty women will drift towards all out nakedness in their competition for sexual attention, and there is no line they can point to proving that they are one of the good girls. Large numbers of women are now in both a literal and figurative sense naked, and the only thing covering them is the cultural taboo against acknowledging it.

*Gray created the flowchart I referenced in my previous post.*
50 SoG movie panned as too tame.

by Dalrock | February 13, 2015 | Link

The Daily Mail has a funny article bemoaning the 50 Shades of Grey movie as too tame. Fifty Shades Of Grey is deemed so tame in France, children as young as 12 will be able to see it in cinemas*:

In a barrage of reviews published on Tuesday night, most of those who sat down with the raunchy adaptation ahead of its 13 February release date lamented its ‘run-of-the-mill’ lovemaking.

One critic pointed out that sex only makes up 15 minutes of the two-hour runtime. Another pointed out that there are no visible genitals, no orgasms – and not that much nudity.

Conventional wisdom is that women want their porn to be softer and more romantic/emotional than men do. This fits with the misconceptions that women’s sexual desires are purer than men’s, and that romantic love purifies sex. To the extent that women are found consuming hard core porn, the argument is that marketers must be forcing this on women. 50 SoG has shattered this myth, and proved that if anything the marketers were standing between women and the raunchy porn they desire. The book began as a work of fan fiction, as Vanity Fair explains:

[E. L. James] created a compendium of her sexual fantasies, called the book Fifty Shades of Grey, and watched in shock as the book and its two sequels (Fifty Shades Darker and Fifty Shades Freed) sold more than 100 million copies worldwide.

The book was an end run around the marketers. It was just one woman writing her deepest fantasies, fantasies which millions of women around the world shared. But the movie is a return to the world of marketing, where the gatekeepers can again impose their view of what kind of porn women really want. The director and the author are widely reported as having been in conflict throughout the production of the movie. According to The Hollywood Reporter:

James is said to have pressed for more explicit sex, while Taylor-Johnson pushed for a more subtle approach.

Based on the criticisms in the Daily Mail article it sounds like James lost. Even so, it was still dubbed the raunchiest film of the decade:

The ‘raunchiest of the decade’ accolade was awarded the film after website Mr Skin, which ranks films by amount of sex scenes, released data seen by the Sunday Times.
However, the film’s director, Sam Taylor-Johnson, has said that although the film is true to E L James’s best-selling book, it may not be as explicit as people might be hoping for.

That the raunchiest film of the decade isn’t raunchy enough for women should give people reason to reconsider the popular misconceptions about women’s sexuality. However, I doubt many will be willing to consider something which so thoroughly goes against the dominant paradigm. The NBC News story on the movie’s rating managed to overlook the fact that women made a work of BDSM fan fiction into a worldwide sensation, and instead reminded readers that 12 year old boys have dirty minds:

And that’s how 12-year-old boys across France suddenly became very interested in cinema.

*The Daily Mail headline reminds me of the line in The Dictator where he describes a particular instrument of torture as having been “banned in Saudi Arabia for being too safe”.*
Sounds like bunch of 12 year olds.
by Dalrock | February 13, 2015 | Link

The ladies of Jezebel describe the audience of 50 SoG:

The audience is about 98 percent female, and mostly in their early 20s. ...here we are, dragged in public like trenchcoated patrons at a porn palace. As the film begins, though, there’s a silken ripple of excited giggling. The whole thing feels very much like a sleepover.

A raunchy sleepover, that is. These are New York women: each sex scene is met with gasps, applause, appreciative snorts. Every joke, no matter how limp, goes over big. When we see a half-second shot of Christian’s pubes and the base of his dick, a woman behind me lets out a stifled half-gasp, half-moan, quarter-giggle. The same woman growls “yessssssss” at several relevant moments. She is not alone. This crowd is rowdy. This crowd means it.

I’m not surprised the audience was immature, but I am surprised the audience was so young. I would have expected more of the Twilight Moms demo.
Several years ago Captain Capitalism first made the observation that many women in HR act more like they are looking for a boyfriend than looking for professional talent. The Daily Mail has a post up today which only makes sense if you consider it through this lens. The article is about Ms Haseler, a director of a family owned company, and the letter she sent to Mr Allen, a man who had interviewed to be a “self-employed labourer” with the company. After Allen sent Haseler a note chiding her for not keeping her word about contacting him, Haseler went ballistic in her reply. Keep in mind that this is regarding a job interview, and not a first date:

James,

Sincere apologies for not replying to you today, as it happens I actually have a job, and other things to do with my day other than reply to you, when I had already had the misfortune of wasting 30 very long minutes of my life speaking to; not only the most inappropriate person for this job role, but probably for any role, you will spend the next few years applying for, only to get rejected as soon as they meet you.

You are without doubt one of the most irritating, rude, obnoxious and arrogant people I have had the misfortune to meet, and your email just solidifies this.

Also, for an old aesthetically challenged guy with no teeth you have an unbelievable amount of confidence!

What appears to have driven Ms Haseler over the edge is not just that she finds him unattractive, but that he clearly doesn’t know that she (her firm) is out of his league:

James had therefore rejected the self-employed role in this email, so he was not looking for feedback. He said he was not interested.
Rebuilding what is forgotten.
by Dalrock | February 14, 2015 | Link

Scott with Courtship Pledge was kind enough to take up a question of mine in his post: How to send the right signal to the red-pill guys in church?

I’ve left my own thoughts in the comments there*, and I’m guessing some of my readers will have an interest in this as well. Please remember if commenting there that the audience for his blog is traditional men and women (and their parents) who are trying to go against the grain of our culture in pursuit of marriage. This is a noble endeavor, and I’m glad Scott and his wife are leading in this critical area.

*To avoid a fragmented discussion I have disabled comments on this post.
The previous post at Courtship Pledge garnered an excellent discussion with 139 (and counting) comments. Donal Graeme furthers the conversation with his guest post: Getting the Ball Rolling: Networking.
When I first pointed out the Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood’s discomfort with headship and submission, a discomfort which goes back to their founding document, Sunshine Mary explained:

Understand that when Christianity Today (the most influential publication in American evangelicalism) wants the conservative, complementarian, anti-feminist point of view, they ask CBMW for a statement. CBMW is seen as radically anti-feminist by virtually all evangelicals. That should tell you something right there.

However, if you read a bit of their site it becomes very clear that they are essentially a Boundless clone*, except with extra Driscoll. That is, they are very much about modern Christian culture, but where Boundless has Stanton teaching that God made women to lead men, CBMW replaces this with a special emphasis on hammering Christian men.

For a sense of what Boundless with extra Driscoll looks like, CBMW promotes dating as a gift from God, similar to marriage, and tells young men they have biblical obligations which don’t actually exist in the Bible. On the most popular article on the site, Pastor Jason Dees explains:

Dating doesn’t exist to have someone that you can hang out with or “make out” with on the side, dating is designed for the pursuit of marriage.

I’m not against dating, but suggesting that it is something given to us by God as His designed path to marriage, and not (in the form we know it) a very modern invention is extremely problematic. In part two of the series, Pastor Dees reinforces this view of dating as a gift from God (emphasis mine):

If you are trying to find ultimate fulfillment in dating and marriage you never will. God designed you to find fulfillment in him above all else. Dating and marriage are great gifts, but they are not able to give you the ultimate fulfillment that you desire, only God can do that.

In part one of the series Pastor Dees explains that Ephesians 5 applies not just in marriage, but from the moment a man asks a woman out on a date:

**RULE NUMBER THREE:** Always return your date home “more holy” than she was when you picked her up.

This rule really applies more to men than it does to women, and it is something that my college buddies and I used to tell each other whenever we took a girl out. Ultimately people date in order to pursue marriage (see rule #2) so then our dating should be a reflection of marriage. The call of men in scripture (Ephesians 5) is to wash our women with God’s Word so that she might be holy and without blemish. Is
that your goal when you take a girl out? To help sanctify her? That is what God desires of you every time you go out with a girl (men) and women that is what you should desire when a guy takes you out.

Keep in mind that the CBMW isn’t comfortable with headship and submission within marriage, yet they are quite eager to cherry pick parts of it and apply them outside of marriage. However, this sense of moral certainty about (invented) biblical obligations for men vanishes when the topic is (actual) biblical restrictions on women. Not only is the CBMW ambivalent on headship and submission, but they are even skittish when it comes to less controversial subjects like the prohibition against women as pastors. In Don’t Be Sidelined by the Gender Debate, Trillia Newbell writes (emphasis mine):

I realize my experience may not be shared by all women. Perhaps you have not been able to serve for various reasons. Maybe you desire to serve as a pastor and chafe against passages such as 1 Timothy 2:12, where the apostle Paul says, “I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man.”

No matter your interpretation of this much-debated passage, Scripture also teaches us that if God has put you in a church, he wants you to serve.

The debate over gender roles can distract women from serving with all their might in the church. It’s tempting to focus on one aspect of church involvement closed to women rather than rejoice over the hundreds of ways we can and should be serving. If I am not a pastor, does that mean my service means less?

Here the CBMW openly acknowledges that a large part of the women reading are in rebellion against clear biblical instruction. Instead of urging them to repent, it tells them to find other positions of leadership and influence within the church. The whole focus is on how “debated” clear instructions of the Bible are, instead of addressing the rebellion at the root of this “debate”.

This sense of hammering men on the one hand and getting skittish about what the Bible actually says about the roles of men and women (the organization’s specialty) isn’t just in one or two articles, but pervades their writing. As I referenced above, this goes back to their very founding. You can also see this in what is their fifth most popular post, Summaries of the Egalitarian and Complementarian Positions. Understand that this isn’t an explanation of why biblical roles are correct and modern egalitarian views are incorrect. It is a summary of why some people prefer one view, and others prefer another. There is no introduction or conclusion explaining the importance of following what the Bible clearly says over the rebellious desires of feminists. In fact, there is no introduction or conclusion at all. The first half is the case for egalitarianism, with a laughably weak rebuttal, and the second half is the case for complementarianism, also with a rebuttal. For example, in the section explaining egalitarianism it trots out the canard that the Greek word Paul used for “head” didn’t mean leader, it only meant “source”. This has been thoroughly debunked by a member of CBMW’s own board, but it is presented as winning (or at least ending) the debate:
D. Objection: When Paul says that the man (1 Cor. 11:3) or husband (Eph. 5:23) is the head of the woman, doesn’t he mean that the man has the position of authority and responsibility over the woman?

Response: No, and this can be shown by looking at the word translated as “head” (Gr.: kephale). This term is widely used in Greek literature outside of the NT to mean “source” (as with the “head” of a river). Therefore, what this means, then, is that woman owes her existence to the fact that man was created first and, in his incomplete state, God made from him the woman. The woman, then, is “sourced” in man. As such, this word does not suggest, as many think, that man is has some rightful authority over woman.

Only much later, at the very bottom of the long even handed post, is it pointed out that this claim is bogus. At any rate, for an organization founded on a central idea to be so completely uncomfortable with boldly arguing for that very idea is bizarre. An analogy would be an organization founded to support heterosexual marriage against the drive for acceptance of gay marriage, which instead of clearly making the case for heterosexual marriage and explaining why those who want gay marriage are wrong, would publish a lengthy treatise on the strengths and weaknesses of both sides, being careful not to be seen as biased on the issue. With friends like the CBMW, biblical marriage needs no enemies.

Ultimately though this is really an indictment of modern Christian culture far more than it is about the men and women of the CBMW. Sunshine Mary is right when she says that the CBMW is seen as radically anti-feminist by virtually all evangelicals. This is because being vocally conflicted about biblical marriage roles is the far end of the spectrum here. While the CBMW is afraid of its own shadow when discussing its namesake issue, by not being either overtly hostile or silent on biblical teaching on men and women it is truly radical in modern Christian culture.

*The similarity to Boundless isn’t an accident, as the CBMW hired Steve and Candice Watters, the husband and wife who created Boundless, to lead the family section of CBMW.*
Frequent readers of Vox Day will already know about the move by Social Justice Warriors to turn Science Fiction into a SJW fiefdom. Today Vox and the Dread Ilk are fighting back, with a book bomb:

Today we are Book Bombing the three suggested novellas from the Sad Puppies slate. These are novellas that the Evil Legion of Evil thinks are great, and should be considered for fancy awards. No gimmicks, no BS, just awesome stuff.

How a Book Bomb works is that we try to get as many people to buy them off of Amazon in the same day. Because they have a rolling average best seller list that updates hourly, this causes the book to move up the list. The higher it gets, the more people outside the Book Bomb see it, and check it out too. Success breeds success, and best of all, the author GETS PAID.

I took Vox’s advice and ordered One Bright Star to Guide Them. For a mere $3 I get to check out John C. Wright’s writing and help out a good cause. If you think you might be interested, see the full post over at Vox’s blog.
Chick porn
by Dalrock | February 19, 2015 | Link

In noticed this yesterday as number eight in the Kindle top 100 paid list Prick: A Stepbrother Romance. The book description reads:

I can’t stop thinking about that prick.

Caulter Sterling is a prick.

A filthy-mouthed, womanizing, crude, spoiled, arrogant prick.

The tattooed, pierced, panty-melting-hot son of a celebrity.

I hate him.

He’s slept his way through practically every girl at Brighton Academy.

Except for me.

I’m the good girl. The responsible girl. The 4.0, class president, studied-so-much-she-never-lost-the-big-V girl.

And in celebration of graduation and adulthood, I just made the worst decision in the history of ever.

I lost my V-card to the devil himself.

It was just one night. So what if it was mind-blowing? Hit it and quit it.

Except I just found out that my father – the Senator, the Presidential hopeful – is marrying Caulter’s mother. Oh, and this summer? We’re hitting the campaign trail.

One big happy family.

I’m totally f**ked.

What is fascinating is the contrast between our deep cultural belief that women are sexually pure by nature, and the shameless consumption of porn by women. Prick has moved from number eight to number 11 overnight, but even with it off the top ten list four of the top ten are “Romance Novels”, including several variants of 50 SoG.

To get a sense of the level of denial here, consider Jenny Erikson. Erikson is the mother of two who complained about her pastor spoiling her plans to ambush her husband with divorce papers. While she was very open that she was divorcing because she wasn’t happy any
more, she also cast about for some sort of rationalization for her choice to destroy her family. The best she could come up with was that her husband had viewed porn, and she took great solace in Matt Walsh stating that this is adultery. Erikson was not surprisingly delighted to receive this moral cover from Walsh, and tweeted:

Married men: your porn habit is an adultery habit
http://themattwalshblog.com/2013/11/25/married-men-your-porn-habit-is-an-adultery-habit/ ... (I love this guy)

Yet at the same time Erikson is quite open about her own consumption of porn, which no doubt she sees as something entirely different. Not long after being comforted by Walsh for her decision to blow up her family, Erikson wrote at The Stir:

Hold onto your hats, Fifty Shades of Grey fans! It feels like we've been waiting forever to see Jamie Dornan and Dakota Johnson in action as our favorite star-crossed lovers with a penchant for BDSM, but it looks like we're finally going to get a little something to whet our appetites.

This stuff is most toxic because it isn’t seen as toxic at all. This isn’t porn, they rationalize, these people are in love!

In the scheme of things this kind of porn isn’t nearly as harmful as divorce fantasies like Eat Pray Love and Fireproof. However, we do women a great disservice by pretending that their porn is different, and that their sexual impulses are more pure than those of men.
Custody of the heart.

by Dalrock | February 19, 2015 | Link

Several commenters on my post Chick porn asked why men’s mostly visual porn is seen as sinful while women’s mostly written porn is seen as something different. I see two components to this, although both are merely part of our rationalization that women are somehow more pure than men and therefore less tempted to sin.

The first component is the widely accepted fallacy that romantic love makes sex pure. This gives women cover to call their porn “romance”, and claim it is somehow different than porn consisting mainly of images. This is why Jenny Erikson makes it a point to refer to the characters in 50 SoG as “star-crossed lovers with a penchant for BDSM”. The frame of mind here is that fornication is different if they are in love. The same is true with the title Prick: A Stepbrother Romance. This isn’t incest porn, it is romance. To be clear, romance doesn’t have anything to do with whether sex is moral or not, but it is an effective cover because nearly everyone believes that it does.

The other component is an over emphasis on men’s eyes. Custody of the eyes is a good reminder, but it is not fundamentally about our eyes. What matters is our hearts. We can see this in the frivolous divorcée’s favorite Bible passage (Matt 5:27-30), where Christ warns about looking at a woman with lust (emphasis mine):

27 “You have heard that it was said to those of old,[c] ‘You shall not commit adultery.’[d] 28 But I say to you that whoever looks at a woman to lust for her has already committed adultery with her in his heart. 29 If your right eye causes you to sin, pluck it out and cast it from you; for it is more profitable for you that one of your members perish, than for your whole body to be cast into hell. 30 And if your right hand causes you to sin, cut it off and cast it from you; for it is more profitable for you that one of your members perish, than for your whole body to be cast into hell.

The misconception here is that the sin is of the eyes. But it isn’t, it is a sin of the heart. The eyes can be a source of temptation, but they aren’t the source of the sin. Christ reinforces this in Matt 15:10-11:

10 When He had called the multitude to Himself, He said to them, “Hear and understand: 11 Not what goes into the mouth defiles a man; but what comes out of the mouth, this defiles a man.”

Christ explains what this means in verses 17-20 (emphasis mine):

17 Do you not yet understand that whatever enters the mouth goes into the stomach and is eliminated? 18 But those things which proceed out of the mouth come from the heart, and they defile a man. 19 For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies. 20 These are the things which defile a man, but to eat with unwashed
hands does not defile a man.”

Those who claim men’s porn is sinful because it involves lusting with the eyes are right, because if a man is lusting he is lusting with his heart. But this doesn’t mean that women’s written fantasies are any better. Ironically women’s claim that their porn isn’t sinful because it involves the heart and not the eyes only reinforces why their porn is sinful, just like men’s.

Ultimately though what this is all about is women’s tendency to deny their own sin, and men’s tendency to enable women in this.
She isn’t getting enough dates.

by Dalrock | February 22, 2015 | Link

Eddie Kaufholz at Relevant Magazine has an article on an old standby topic, Why Don’t the Guys in my Church Ask Women on Dates? (H/T Robert Yates). Relevant reader Erica kicks off the discussion with a letter asking why weak men are screwing feminism up:

Where are all the brave men? I will not go on a rant—and I firmly believe women can be just as brave—but I do notice a lot of Christian men who are afraid to pass the friend threshold. This is why so many women date non-Christians; because Christian guys rarely can just keep it casual and go on a date, give it a chance. What are your thoughts on this?

Thanks!
Erica

Kaufholz is smitten by Erica’s display of what he sees as deep wisdom in asking such a profound question, and by her ability to complain about men not filling traditional roles while simultaneously establishing her feminist bona fides:

Daaaaaaaaaaang! Erica bringin’ the wisdom with a punch-in-the-face question as sentence #1, a sly wink to societal norms in sentence #2, and a scathing (and true) assessment in sentence #3. Well done, and great question!

Kaufholz explains that there is nothing for Erica to improve, because she is doing everything right but the men are screwing it all up. The rest of his article is therefore directed to the men who read Relevant:

Sweet Erica is sitting next to you in church. She is brilliant, wise, articulate and principled. And you know you’ve noticed her because you notice every brilliant, wise, etc., woman in your circle. They think you don’t notice, but we we know better, don’t we?

Kaufholz lays this at the feet of Joshua Harris and his book I Kissed Dating Goodbye, and per standard operating procedure identifies a need for men to man up. There is of course nothing wrong with advising men to be men. However, while everyone knows men need to man up, the Christian cultural advice on how to do this is very often meaningless and even contradictory from one man up rant to the next. Kaufholz is certain that the problem is that men aren’t interested enough in casual dating:

We have some serious issues to work out, namely, the lack of courage displayed by really good men who are hiding their heads in the sand, even as their heart longs to connect. But why?

We’ve got yet another Christian culture problem. Somewhere in the formative and oh-so-tacky ‘80s and ‘90s, a message spread through Christian bookstores (R.I.P.),
pulpits, youth groups, and all the nooks and crannies of God-fearing culture. This message was that casual dating is not good, women’s hearts must be guarded by men, and all romantic relationships better have marriage in mind—or the people in them are just using each other.

According to Kaufholz, courage means man up and date casually. Stop focusing on stating intentions regarding marriage. Instead focus on just talking:

Today’s conversation is about sweet Erica, and the Ericas that are sitting right next to you. They’re not looking for a husband right this second, and they’re sure as heck not looking for a savior. They’re looking for a kind conversation, a respectful follow-up, and a nice cup of ethically sourced, fair-trade coffee.

Yet at the CBMW JD Gunter is telling these same men to stop being such cowards by dating too casually; they need to man up and state their intentions. In *We’re Just “Talking”* Gunter explains that only weak men have casual conversations with women:

Our culture suffers from a large number of males wallowing around in quasi-manhood for many years. Boys used to grow up, get a job, and move out of the house. But we have inserted this chain of life stages from adolescence, to the college years, to early career, and so on – all of which permit young men to put off growing up, taking responsibility, and generally acting like a man.

This new phase of pre-dating called “talking” is like adolescence for relationships: an unnecessary stage in the relationship allowing young men to avoid taking responsibility and acting like men. It prevents the man from having to be clear about his intentions to pursue or end the relationship.

Notice that not only are both prescriptions for being a real man contradictory, but each starts from contradictory assumptions about why modern Christian women are so frustrated with modern Christian men. Kaufholz is certain that fabulous Christian women are being left entirely alone, with no Christian man willing to even engage in a casual conversation with them. Gunter is sure that the unmarried women at church are being talked to death, and are powerless to direct the relationship towards the marriages they desperately crave.

The problem is neither one of them have bothered to get a good fix on what Christian women want regarding dating, because the complaints of women are merely a springboard for telling other men to man up. Telling other men to man up secures their own place as the only real man in the room. The only thing Kaufholz, Gunter, and many other Christian leaders agree on is that other men are a bunch of cowards, and if only other men will become real men like themselves all of the problems feminism has wrought on dating and marriage will be solved. While this pattern is extremely popular for obvious reasons, it doesn’t do anything to help either the frustrated young women or the deeply confused young men.

Since we started with Erica’s letter, it makes sense to go back to her complaint. What Kaufholz should have asked is if Erica is looking for a husband, or if she merely wants to be entertained. If Erica is looking to be entertained, as I highly suspect is the case, her best chance for this is to court for sex. This isn’t the moral choice, but it is the practical way to
get what she is likely searching for. All she needs to do is put herself out there with a promise of relatively quick sex in exchange for being suitably entertained. I believe Erica already knows this though, as she hints at it when she writes:

| This is why so many women date non-Christians |

If Kaufholz had determined that Erica wanted to be entertained, he could have reminded her that she already knows how this is done and pointed out the moral problems with this path. In doing so he would have avoided assisting her in rationalizing this as part of a noble pursuit of Christian marriage.

There is however an odd chance that Kaufholz's diagnosis of the situation is correct; it is possible that Erica is looking to become a biblical wife, and that her problem is that she brings her fabulous self to church every Sunday but can't manage to get to know the men in her field of prospects. In this case Kaufholz has still badly failed Erica, because he left her with the impression that sitting pretty is her only possible course of action. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

There is a very easy way Erica can quickly find out which men in the church are eligible for marriage*, and also find herself casually introduced to each of these men. All Erica needs to do is let one or more of the married women in the church know that she is looking to get married. Married women love to play matchmaker, but only if it is for marriage. They will go to great lengths to scour their extended social network for potential suitors, but only if the ultimate payoff is the potential for a marriage. To the extent that the married ladies in the church aren't tripping over themselves to locate every last eligible bachelor in the land and finding any and every excuse to put Erica in a position to interact with these men, it is because they don't believe Erica is looking to marry. This isn't to say they need to believe that Erica will marry any given man they subtly or not so subtly put her in contact with, but that they don't believe that if they find enough good matches for her that marriage is in the cards.

The irony here is Erica's problem with the married ladies in the church is the same problem she has with the unmarried men in the church. The reason Erica isn't getting asked out on dates by marriage minded young men isn't because of a fad which fell out of favor before the men her age quit fearing a terminal case of the cooties. Her problem is no one but already married men like Kaufholz and Gunter believes she is seriously looking to marry. The unmarried men and the married women believe that Erica is very likely a waste of time and effort. Based on her letter to Kaufholz, I can't think of any reason to believe that this assessment is wrong.

However, some of the young women reading this post and Kaufholz's article will be sincerely looking to marry. My advice for them is to find a way to convince the married women at church (or even just the married women they know) that they want to marry. If they are young and pure(ish) and seem sincerely interested in getting married soon, this should be fairly easy to do by simply mentioning it to a married woman or two. But the reality here is such young women already know this, and are generally terrified of what they know will come next. They know that for the next year or so they will constantly be invited to social events or maneuvered to one side of the room or another while the married women make
introductions to eligible men. This is embarrassing, because it means asking for (or at least accepting) help, and more importantly it doesn’t involve sexy strangers running day game on them at the most unlikely times and places. But again, this all comes down to the fundamental goal. If the goal is to be entertained, court for sex. If the goal is to look for a husband, find a way to convince those who know you best that this is what you actually want.

*There is a bit of corollary advice for men looking to marry. Such men only need to convince the married women that they meet the basic requirements of eligibility. Note that convincing married women that a man wishes to marry isn’t on the list. Unless a man goes out of his way to signal that he does not wish to marry, the married women know it is a pretty good bet that he would be willing to marry if introduced to the right young woman:

1. The man has a good job.
2. He isn’t already married and doesn’t have a girlfriend.
3. He has moved out of his parent’s house and supports himself.
What a setup looks like.
by Dalrock | February 23, 2015 | Link

Pancakeloach describes how she met her husband in a comment at Courtship Pledge:

I needed a ride to the [church singles] retreat, an acquaintance of mine had an older brother who was going - we chatted a lot in the car on the drive to the retreat and discovered we had a lot of interests in common. I think Dalrock’s right when it comes to structuring interactions so that they’re low-stakes. If we hadn’t had anything in common, it wouldn’t have been the end of the world - he was just doing a favor for his sister, and I was only carpooling with a friend’s brother.

At the retreat itself, I wasn’t approached by any of the men - but then, I had super-short hair and no fashion sense, so I was no doubt the least attractive woman there. But the silver lining of lacking the “traditional femininity” training was that I was perfectly willing to initiate conversation with men on my own. It turned out that the one I’d carpooled with was far more suitable than any of the others, so when he invited me to visit the theater with himself and his sister I made sure to say yes and dress in my Sunday-best long dress.

1. This probably wasn’t a setup by the the mothers or other married women at the church, but this is exactly the kind of set up a clever mother would arrange. The best setups have either minimal or no fingerprints visible by the married woman doing the setup.

2. Note that she describes casting a very wide net in this comment, yet only describes one man asking her on a date. Unless they are using internet dating, dates very often aren’t how young people get to know one another and build initial attraction. Very often the woman has already done her market research and attraction is building with a particular man before she is asked out on the date that matters.

3. Being young helps a great deal. There is a common complaint by older husband seekers that they need more time to fall in love with a potential husband than the man is willing to invest before nexting her. Young people don’t suffer from this problem. Falling in love is quite easy when young, which is why our concern with young people is trying to stop them from falling in love when we fear the match is wrong.
Suzanne Cope describes her long battle to overcome crippling dysfunction. As often happens, she learned her hangups at an early age from her mother and grandmother. They taught her that giving pleasure to someone, giving of herself, is degrading and shameful; good girls don’t do those sorts of things, even for their husband or boyfriend. But her experience proves that there is always hope. If you know of a woman suffering from culinary frigidity, please assist her in recognizing her dysfunction and seeking out the help she desperately needs.
I happened to be on Shiela Gregoire’s blog the other day and noticed one of her top trending posts was from a year ago, titled When Women Start Saying “No” to Church Activities. As Gregoire explains, this is a column* she wrote for Faith Today, Canada’s largest Christian magazine. It opens with:

I hate it when someone from our church family dies.

I’m not talking about hating grief. Grief is a normal part of life. I’m talking about hating guilt.

And when someone I don’t know from our church passes away, I invariably receive that guilt-inducing phone call: Can you make sandwiches for the funeral?

I must have missed the Sunday School lesson when they taught girls how to make funeral sandwiches...

The premise of the column is that women in the church are working too hard while men coast. In order to right the situation women need to collectively stop saying “yes” when asked to do things like make sandwiches:

...this dysfunctional system can’t right itself until the over-functioning people start saying no.

Looking around, I think we’re just about at that point. Women are just too tired, and few men will willingly take on the jobs women have been doing in the background for years. If churches want to support the women in their midst, then, they will start adapting to the new reality.

Gregoire frames this as being asked to do too much, but the reality is it isn’t the amount of work which offends her but the kinds of work she and other women are being asked to do. Her feminist obsession with getting men to make sandwiches and casseroles and take an equal interest in decorating the church for Easter and Christmas is transparent. The entire column is riddled with feminist clichés; the harried super mom who manages to do it all, the lazy husband, guilt, the “new reality” etc. Like her secular counterparts Jessica Valenti and Margaret Sanger, Gregoire is resentful of being a woman and deeply envious of men.

Gregoire’s burning resentment of cooking and cleaning and all things womanly didn’t end when she traded in her graduate work in women’s studies for the title of Christian wife and mother. To confirm this, you need look no farther than the title of her blog:

To Love, Honor, and Vacuum ...when you feel more like a maid than a wife and mother.
In her book by the same name Gregoire explains that biblical headship and submission means wives need to give their husbands lists of housework to do:

My husband is motivated by lists. If I just tell him I would like him to help clean up after dinner, he doesn’t know what to do. But if there is a list of daily and weekly chores on the fridge, and he can see what is left to be done, he’s like a Tasmanian devil whirling around the house, cleaning.

But no amount of twirling, decorating, or sandwich making by her husband or the men of the church will make Gregoire’s torment go away. So long as she resents being a woman she will be consumed with envy of men.

*You can see the original print version of the column here.*
Rollo commented on the similarities between Sheila Gregoire and Jessica Valenti, founder of Feministing.

Let’s play the one degree of feminist separation: https://dalrock.wordpress.com/2014/12/22/the-ugly-feminists-of-christmas/

“But…I’m not a feminist. I’m a Strong Independent Christian Woman®”

I touched on this in the original post, but it is worth showing a few bits side by side. The similarity between Gregoire’s funeral sandwich rant in Faith Today and Valenti’s Christmas rant at The Guardian is uncanny:

Valenti on feminist resentment: (actual title) No, I will NOT wrap all the presents. Why are women still responsible for the holiday joy?

Gregoire on feminist resentment: (paraphrase) No, I will NOT make all the sandwiches. Why are women still responsible for feeding mourners?

———

Valenti on gendered expectations:

We all know that women do the majority of domestic work like child care, housework and cooking. But the holidays bring on a whole new set of gendered expectations...

Gregoire on gendered expectations:

…I must have missed the Sunday School lesson when they taught girls how to make funeral sandwiches...

———

Valenti on feminist guilt:

But we know that, if a present doesn’t get somewhere on time (if at all), if the cookies for the school’s holiday bake-off are store-bought, or your family holiday cards arrive just shy of February, it’s not men who get looked at askance.

Gregoire on feminist guilt:

I’m talking about hating guilt.

And when someone I don’t know from our church passes away, I invariably receive that guilt-inducing phone call: Can you make sandwiches for the funeral?
Valenti on society needing to recognize feminist progress:

After decades of feminist progress, women are still considered primarily responsible for an entire family’s holiday joy.

Gregoire on the church needing to recognize feminist progress:

Women have become busier, but church life hasn’t adapted to this new reality.
Feminist: Men don’t complain enough when taking over tasks from women.

by Dalrock | February 26, 2015 | Link

Hat Tip Instapundit. In her WaPo article Why don’t dads complain about parenthood like moms do? Samantha Rodman describes what she calls an alarming trend:

It seems like women are being publicly applauded for complaining about parenthood. And dads, well, aren’t. At all.

Rodman is delighted that women now feel freer than ever to complain. But she is deeply troubled that while men are taking on more and more of the responsibilities feminist women have shunned, men aren’t doing it right. Specifically, men are not complaining about these responsibilities like women do:

Imagine being at a play date and hearing someone say, “God, I needed a drink all day today. The kids were behaving terribly, I couldn’t deal.” You’re picturing a mom, right?

However, what if the speaker is a dad? The question is moot because I have yet to hear a dad complain this openly and honestly about his kids, and this is not for lack of trying. Dads don’t even take the conversational bait. If asked to commiserate about parenting, the average mom breathes a sigh of relief and sits forward in her seat, but the average dad looks around like he’s on Candid Camera and gives a vague answer about having lots of fun sitting around watching dance class through a two way mirror for the 15th week in a row.

What has not yet dawned on feminists is that men not complaining didn’t mean men got a better deal than women. It is just that men are far less likely to complain. Most men understand that bitching, moaning, and being miserly with love is ugly. On the other hand, complaining about anything, everything, and even nothing is at the core of feminism.

Not surprisingly, Rodman sees confession sites like Scary Mommy as hallmarks of feminist progress. Let it all hang out is the new slogan for motherhood, and being true to yourself is now the ultimate maternal virtue. She is delighted at the thought of her daughters growing up to not be ashamed to be terrible mothers, liberated from the feminist arch-enemy, guilt.

Mommy guilt seems to be on its way out, shepherded by the honesty in the blogosphere and, more recently, by books like All Joy and No Fun by Jennifer Senior. The mom confessional zeitgeist has grown so dramatically that it is barely a trend anymore. Rather, it’s ushering in of a new era of honesty and self-disclosure for moms. This is all wonderful news, and I hope that mommy guilt is vestigial by the time my daughters may decide to become moms.

But in a baffling twist, weak men (who aren’t brave enough to bitch) and evil society are
ruining it all.

| Note: I am not judging any of these behaviors. I’m saying this: Tell me what the reaction would be if a dad talked about yelling too much and smoking pot in front of his kids. |

... 

If Daddy is going to be an equal parent, then Scary Daddy needs to be recognized and supported too.
Meet your new master: Her feelings

by Dalrock | February 27, 2015 | Link

In the discussion of Sandwich strike preachinginthewilderness commented on one of Sheila Gregoire’s most recent blog posts:

Yesterday she was encouraging her thousands of christian women to make sure they withhold sex or make their husbands sleep on the couch or take the kids and leave if the husbands watches TV with nudity or violence. I don’t know even where to begin...

The post he is referring to is Wifey Wednesday: My Husband Watches Nudity on TV, and it is actually even worse than he describes. While the sin of watching the wrong TV shows is the headline topic, what Gregoire is really teaching her readers is:

1. A wife’s job is to make sure her husband never sins, and punish him whenever he does sin. This is so important that she created a large graphic to burn this message home. Teaching from the Book of Oprah, Gregoire explains that wives should constantly be on the lookout for things their husband might be doing which Jesus would not approve of and find ways to make their husbands’ lives miserable until they stop. Anything less and the wife is failing in her God given role. She summarizes this with the question “What are you tolerating that Jesus wouldn’t?”
2. This isn't really about sin, but the wife’s feelings*. If a wife feels unloved, she is commanded by God to punish her husband.

Rule number one is:

1. Focus on your feelings, rather than the infraction.

Elsewhere in the article she explains what this means:

Focus the conversation on your reaction to the show, not on whether he should be watching it

If you focus the conversation around “it’s pornography and you shouldn’t be watching it”, then you’ll get into an argument about whether or not it really qualifies, and you can’t win that.

Instead, talk about the real issue, which is this: “I feel disrespected and humiliated when you watch that, and I don’t know why you want to do something which makes me feel disrespected and humiliated. When you watch that, I feel sad. I feel ugly. I feel like you don’t care about me and don’t really love me.

Gregoire lists a variety of punishments wives should use against their husbands whenever their feelings are hurt. These range from the wife breaking things she associates with her hurt feelings (like the TV), to making him sleep on the couch, denying sex, or leaving with the
children. She also does a dance around threatening divorce. She doesn’t say to threaten divorce, but she strongly suggests that not imposing these other punishments will ultimately lead to divorce. This leaves divorce as the reserve threat while claiming not to be supporting divorce:

I wonder how many divorces could have been avoided if people used good conflict resolution early and stopped tolerating things that are wrong?

We start tolerating little things, these little things escalate, and soon we have a huge problem.

You don’t have to make things into World War III, but some things just need to be done for the good of the marriage, and for the good of your husband’s soul. Not everything is that big a deal, of course, but some things are. And the principle here isn’t just the nudity; it’s the fact that he’s choosing to hurt her terribly. That can’t be tolerated, either.

This is all textbook wake-up call theology. However, with the exception of Joel and Kathy Davisson I don’t know that I’ve ever seen it spelled out so shamelessly as Gregoire does. This model not only inverts Scripture** but also leaves both the husband and wife at the mercy of the wife’s emotions, which makes them both miserable.

*Don’t worry about the fact that these two messages are contradictory. Gregoire doesn’t, and neither do the women who read her blog.

**Not only does Gregoire teach wives to do the opposite of what the Apostles Peter and Paul teach wives in the Bible, but her inverted view of headship is quite strong (even if we leave out Gregoire’s doctrine of emotions as divine compass). Gregoire clearly believes in a very robust interpretation of headship; she just wants to reorder the roles.
Riding the brake
by Dalrock | February 28, 2015 | Link

Opus notes that Sheila Gregoire has realized that sex sells:

she has a book or three to sell and with such salacious titles as Thirty One Days to Great Sex, The Good Girl’s Guide to Great Sex, and Honey I don’t have a Headache. Tonight, you can see that this woman is selling a form of snake-oil and not without success as the second of these is at number 3,559 on [insert name of long south American river] .com. Getting God to give a plug for your book (blurb on dust-cover – ‘I could not put it down’ – God) is surely the ultimate in endorsements.

But this goes beyond mere clever marketing. Gregoire is clearly obsessed with sex, and deeply conflicted about it. When it comes to sex she and her readers have one foot on the gas and the other on the brake. You can see this from her books as well as the posts on her blog. There is a great deal of energy on using sex as a weapon, including when, how, and why to deny sex. The other side to this is all of the energy coming from the deep fear that they will overplay this card and as I described in Frigidity and power, lose their power. What if he watches porn, or even Game of Thrones while I’m denying sex? Then my V will lose its power over him! How do I overcome my own frigidity? If I’m frigid, my V has no power!

They’ve turned having sex into a Rube Goldberg contraption. But all of this works because the audience is already there. They already know how to use sex as a weapon, and they already have deep fears that by doing this they risk losing the very power they are trying to wield. They already sensed that misusing sex was making them frigid. Gregoire and her readers can rationalize to themselves that this is all about healthy Christian sexuality, despite the sea of red flags. Many husbands probably foolishly encourage their wives to read Gregoire, based on the promise of fixing their frigid wife.

See also: A Tale of Two Beaches
Back in July I predicted that the (then) up and coming divorce fantasy movie Wild would not have the kind of success Eat Pray Love had back in 2010. A good divorce fantasy needs to show the divorcée ending up with a better man, and it needs to provide moral cover for divorce by showing that divorce makes a woman a better person. Eat Pray Love and Fireproof are the secular and Christian gold standards for this genre, and both of those movies deliver.

Based on the trailer, it appeared to me that Wild would not deliver these core elements. I haven’t seen the movie, but from the reviews I’ve read my initial take appears to be born out. Leah Finnegan at Gawker wrote in Wild Is a Bad Movie and Reese Witherspoon Is Bad In It:

Will Reese Witherspoon win an Oscar for “Wild” because she overcomes the hardship of wearing a really heavy backpack for most of the film? I sure as hell hope not, but she probably will, because Hollywood is stupid. In any case, this movie was awful, and terrible for women. Wild was by far the worst movie I saw this year—and I saw Heaven Is For Real.

The problem is the main character comes across as ugly and the message of divorce leading to redemption falls apart:

Witherspoon is a sniveling, Flickian, narcissistic bitch, and therefore this so-called story of redemption—Woman Goes on 1,000-Mile Hike to Cleanse Herself of Sins and Find Herself—comes across not as real or raw or uplifting but just another tale of easy blonde triumph.

Finnegan makes it clear that she is a big fan of Eat Pray Love, so this can’t be a critique of the genre. Even worse for the movie, the comments on Finneghan’s review at Gawker were overwhelmingly in agreement with her. The reviews at IMDB don’t look any better.

This lack of enthusiasm translated into the box office. I pulled up the weekly takes from Box Office Mojo for the respective movies here and here, and charted them out:
Overall Wild grossed $37,339,313 during the first 12 weeks of its release (actually 13 weeks, including $47,248 for “week 0”). In comparison, Eat Pray Love grossed over twice that amount, bringing in $80,574,010 during its first 12 weeks. If we adjust the EPL gross into 2015 dollars*, the mismatch is slightly larger with EPL grossing an inflation adjusted $86,214,191**.

Given the reviews and the box office figures, the moral should be clear for moviemakers looking to cash in on modern women’s shameless obsession with divorce. Make sure your divorce empowerment movie provides plenty of moral cover for women blowing up their families; show divorce as the catalyst for the woman becoming a better and more holy person. Likewise, be sure to clearly show the woman profiting from blowing up her family in the form of lifetime commitment from a better man than her ex husband. Follow these two simple rules and you have a license to print money. Get one or both of these wrong and your divorce empowerment movie will fail.

*Adjusting for inflation, one dollar in 2010 bought as much as $1.07 buys in 2015.

**Here are the weekly inflation adjusted figures in chart form.
If this is true, it would certainly top Driscoll. From The Independent: Spiritual leader allegedly manipulated 400 men into removing testicles to be ‘closer to God’
Another bombing run
by Dalrock | March 4, 2015 | Link

Check out Vox’s post if you are interested in the latest book bomb:

Larry Correia has posted the third and last of the 2015 Sad Puppies Book Bombs, this one for Related Works and the Campbell nominees:
New commenter ayatollah1988 asked how much a husband should turn to his wife for emotional support:

Dalrock, I was wondering if you had any thoughts on this. I’ve heard it talked about in the Manosphere a lot about how men cannot rely on women, even their wives, for emotional support, especially if it involves the men demonstrating any sort of weakness. Basically, the idea that you are her shoulder to cry on and she is NEVER your shoulder to cry on. Redpill guys chalk it up to female solipsism and the idea that they are the most responsible teenager in the house.

It is true that a husband shouldn’t just dump his feelings on his wife, but the concern here can also be overstated. The first thing I would suggest is changing the way you view the situation from one of frustration/disappointment towards women to one of empathy towards them. Imagine working for a small firm and having the boss/owner tell you all of his fears for the business. If you are relying on that job to support your family this could very quickly become unsettling. The same is true if your surgeon, dentist, or airline pilot doesn’t communicate confidence and a command of the situation.

Your wife (and even your girlfriend) wants you to be her rock, especially if her own emotions are storming over her. This is a profound gift a husband can give his wife, and should not be seen as something negative. A wife also relies on her husband for protection and financial support of the family. For these reasons there is a limit as to what kinds of things and more importantly how, how much, and how often you talk about these things with your wife. This isn’t because there is something wrong with women, it is due to the difference between men and women, and more importantly the nature of the roles of husband and wife.

However, this doesn’t mean you should shut her out when something is troubling you, it just means there is a balance. Especially after you are married for a number of years, your wife will know when something is troubling you. If you pretend that nothing is bothering you, or refuse to discuss it at all, this could be even more unsettling to her. Just like with all communication the key is to understand how what you are communicating is impacting your audience (her). What you don’t want is for the received message to be “you are in danger because I’m not fit to be your husband”. This is true even in cases where there is real danger that she needs to understand. In those cases you want to communicate clearly about the threat, but not push her into hopelessness. The message should be, “problem X exists, and we’re going to solve it” (or if a solution isn’t possible, replace solve with manage). The way to manage this is to communicate not just through well chosen words, but with your tone of voice and body language.

I embedded a clip from the movie Unbreakable in a post I did on vulnerability Game. In the clip he communicates strength and protectiveness, while also communicating that something troubled him, as well as “I need you”. She knows that she is safe and loved, and she also feels connected to her husband. You don’t have to physically pick her up, but pulling her
toward you and letting her feel protected in your strength is something which should become natural to you when you sense that she may need this.

If you keep these things in mind, and pay attention more to what she does than what she says, you will get a gut feel of how much and what types of things you should be communicating to her. As a man looking to marry you can also keep this in mind when choosing a wife. Some women are going to be a better fit for you than others in this regard. If she needs more alpha aloofness than is natural and comfortable for you, you either need to change your own comfort zone or (more likely) find a better fit for both of your sakes.

It also sort of goes along with the idea of “Man Flu,” where women seem to be unable to show empathy for their husbands when they are sick, and the idea that women seem incapable of showing empathy towards men in any context.

There is some feminist ugliness here, and it is something else to consider when choosing a wife. You don’t want her to baby you, but you do want a woman who can feel empathy. A wife should also avoid indulging in the feminist urge to strip her husband of his manhood. A wise and well adjusted wife should instead feel protective of your masculinity, just as you should feel protective of her femininity.

I’m asking because I go to a church that is real big on being “vulnerable” and that if you are not constantly talking to your friends and especially your wife about all your struggles and weaknesses, then you are being sinfully self-protective and “un-spiritual.” I’m not married yet, but this is something that really bothers me because in relationships past when girlfriends would beg me to “open up” and “express my emotions more,” I would do so. I thought I was doing the “spiritual” thing but in retrospect it may have been a bad idea to be vulnerable. I wonder if it caused them to lose respect for me.

This kind of teaching comes from the same place as the push in parts of Europe to get men to sit down to pee. The idea that men and women are the same isn’t biblical, and of course it isn’t true. I can understand your frustration at having gone through this, but I would encourage you to see your new understanding of this not as something to be bitter about, but something freeing. As Cane Caldo points out, you aren’t losing pretty lies (lies are inherently ugly), you are gaining a beautiful truth. Feminists inside and outside the church had to sell this false message for decades because what they are asking men to do doesn’t feel natural, because it isn’t natural. It took generations of deception. Healthy well adjusted men aren’t emotive like women, and we aren’t chatty. Men tend to communicate much of our message non-verbally. When we do speak, we tend to use fewer words*. There is nothing wrong with this, and if you do this well as I noted above you will be lovingly meeting her needs.

And all I was opening up about was depression, it’s not like I was opening up about thoughts of pedophilia or something really deviant and pathetic like that. One of them in particular was very critical and neurotic and our relationship was usually her criticizing me for every little thing until I apologized (back when I was on the blue pill). She often wanted me to open up, but looking back on it I think she was just probing for weakness. So I guess my question is, can your wife really be your friend...
in addition to her being your first mate? And to what extent can you be emotionally vulnerable in a marriage without it compromising the headship/submission dynamic?

I think I’ve addressed everything here except the specific issue of depression. I would say the same basic advice I suggested above would apply, in that you probably want to let her know if you are struggling with something and give a bit of detail, but you don’t want to overdo it. This doesn’t mean you won’t be emotionally close with her. In fact, doing this right makes you closer. As you experienced, doing it according to modern conventional wisdom will destroy your closeness. If you need help you should get it, but that should probably be mainly from a male friend, a counselor, etc.

*One thing I would suggest is to practice using the tone of your voice to lead others. If you are in a position of leadership this is easiest, but you can even practice this with ordinary interactions. You will find that if you speak with a deeper (but still natural) voice you will tend to get people’s attention better than speaking louder. My father has a great trick where he speaks more softly when he really wants to get your attention. A deep voice spoken calmly will tend to calm people (if they are fearful of something this only works if you demonstrate that you understand their concern), and just as most people’s fathers demonstrate it is possible to also use inflection with a deeper voice to communicate volumes with a single word. This is an ability men have been taught is inappropriate for us to use because it is seen as “unfair” to women to capitalize on our natural strengths as men. However, women have their own methods of communicating which are different than men, and either way it makes no sense to abandon our masculinity because feminists are envious of it.

See Also: Headship Game
What is closeness?

by Dalrock | March 9, 2015 | Link

Much of the objection to my last post stems from a misunderstanding of what constitutes closeness between a husband and wife.

**What closeness is**

Cane’s description of the laugh he shared with his wife after church is a perfect example of closeness.

Today, after church, I was sitting on the edge of the bed and staring into the closet. I was thinking on how better to foster peace among my sometimes unruly children. Mrs. Caldo, seeing me, inquired again what I was thinking about. I replied, “I’m calculating the cost to cover the entire house in 1’2″ steel plating.” We laughed. Together.

He was thinking of something which concerned him. His wife no doubt had a pretty good guess what it was; they have been married for many years, not to mention that parenting is a shared concern. When she asked, he joked about something he wasn’t concerned about, and they shared a moment of closeness. Closeness doesn’t come from the sort of over talking Opus notes as a distasteful American habit. Husbands and wives share the ultimate closeness, the mystery of one flesh, and this doesn’t require a single word.

It isn’t that talking isn’t important, but that we have elevated talking and especially emoting to perverse levels. Part of this is the misconception that communication means talking, instead of talking merely being one of many ways to communicate. Part of this is the absurd notion that marital sex needs to be purified through various oprahfications. Closeness can be talking non stop about the funny or fascinating things the two of you experienced during your respective days, or is can be two words bringing back a shared memory about something one of the children did long ago. At times closeness can also be feeling perfectly comfortable not saying a word. Closeness can mean walking up and silently rubbing your spouse’s shoulders because you know that this is something they need. It can mean all of these things, and more.

**What closeness is not**
Rollo has a new book.
by Dalrock | March 10, 2015 | Link

Word on the street is that Rollo has a new book: The Rational Male – Preventive Medicine
Female UFC fighter Ronda Rousey has caused a stir with her boasting that there isn’t a man in the UFC in her weight class she couldn’t beat:

I never say that I’m incapable of beating anybody, because I don’t believe in putting limits on myself.

So I mean, I would have to say if you’re just talking about what’s in the realm of possibility of what’s possible of who I could beat, well, I could beat 100 percent of them. But, um, you can’t tell me that there’s a zero percent chance that I can beat anyone on the planet, so I’m never gonna say that.

Rousey’s own mother thought this was foolish enough that she contradicted this to the press:

Seriously, that’s a stupid idea. I’m as much a feminist as anyone but the fact is that biologically, there’s a difference between men and women.

Hello. Duh. A woman who is 135 pounds and a man who is 135 pounds are not physically equal.

When pressed about her boasting Rousey didn’t back down, but explained that she rightfully won’t ever be allowed to prove her boasts because doing so would mean allowing a man to hit a woman. She objects to fighting a man on philosophical grounds, because while she is quite pleased with with the image of a woman beating up a man, the thought of a man hitting back is unconscionable:

It’s not a reality. They’re not gonna do anything like that. Fights are chaotic. Anything can happen. And there’s no setting in which we should condone a man hitting a woman. I really just don’t think that any athletic commission on Earth would ever condone something like that.

Fights are going to go both ways. You’re going to see both people hitting each other. I don’t think we should celebrate a man hitting a woman in any kind of setting.

I can only assume Rousey is a staunch opponent of women in combat. If a man punching a woman is taboo, a man shooting a woman or blowing her up must disturb her all the more.

Rousey knows she will receive a great deal of deference from men, and she is so free to boast about her ability to beat them precisely because she can rely on this deference. What isn’t discussed is what kind of deference Rousey owes to men in return.
Relishing sin
by Dalrock | March 14, 2015 | Link

2 But as for you, speak the things which are proper for sound doctrine: 2 that the older men be sober, reverent, temperate, sound in faith, in love, in patience; 3 the older women likewise, that they be reverent in behavior, not slanderers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things— 4 that they admonish the young women to love their husbands, to love their children, 5 to be discreet, chaste, homemakers, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God may not be blasphemed.

— Titus 2 1-5, NKJV

A few days back Rollo linked to a post on a missionary couple’s blog titled How to Make Your Wife Submit to Your Authority -6 Tips. The tone of the post is an attempt at comedy, mocking the idea that a husband would want his wife to follow the biblical command to submit to her husband. The author Caleb is clearly very uncomfortable with headship and submission as it is written in the Bible. This last part is key, because from the post it seems that he is very much in the mood for headship and submission if he can do a bit of crossdressing.

The very title of the post is designed to encourage feminist rebellion in an age defined by feminist rebellion. The title is a reminder to wives that they need to be on the lookout for what feminists and their own rebellious urges are already telling them: Watch out! Your husband is a brute who is going to try to dominate you and make you not be true to yourself! Don't be a doormat!

Alright men here’s another post for you! Let’s not beat around the bush, the Bible commands our wives to submit to us!

Modern wives of course don’t need this reminder, but Caleb doesn’t leave this to chance. He reinforces this by implying that there are an army of Christian husbands chomping at the bit to make their wives submit to them:

While God’s Word commands women to submit to their husbands it never tells men that it’s their job to make sure their wives submit to them. Don’t think for second that you need to lay down the law and “show her who’s boss”!

This isn’t true, at least not in any meaningful sense. It is true that the Bible doesn’t say “show her who’s boss”. This is language feminists use to inspire rebellion. It isn’t biblical; it comes from Caleb. It is also true that the responsibility to submit lies with the wife; the Bible doesn’t say wives should only submit to husbands who are worthy of submission. In fact, it clearly says wives need to submit even to unworthy husbands. Ironically it is Caleb who frames submission as something the husband must be worthy of in order for the wife to comply. What the Bible does tell husbands is that we have an obligation to teach our wives what is right according to the Bible. You can find this in Ephesians 5:25-27 where husbands are commanded to wash their wives in the water of the word in order to present them as holy
and without blemish. You can also see this in 1 Cor 14:34-35 where wives are told to turn to their husbands for biblical instruction.

But feminist rebellion is a sin that Caleb clearly finds funny, and one would be forgiven for suspecting Caleb quite likes this particular sin. Again, it doesn’t appear that Caleb is truly against the idea of headship and submission in the abstract; his objections appear to stem strictly from the ordering of the roles in the Bible. Caleb delights in the thought of wives refusing to submit to their husbands, and takes this as an opportunity to instruct husbands to submit to their wives. He instructs Christian husbands step by step in the theological equivalent of putting on a bra and panties, applying lipstick, speaking in falsetto, etc.

Caleb takes the Apostle Peter’s teaching to wives and applies it instead to husbands. While Peter teaches wives:

Wives, likewise, be submissive to your own husbands, that even if some do not obey the word, they, without a word, may be won by the conduct of their wives,

Caleb teaches husbands to win their wives without a word, by quietly fixing any mistakes she makes. This will win her love Caleb explains, and will thereby make her want to submit.

...suck it up and fix it for her without saying a word. She’ll love you for it and next time she’ll be a lot more likely to listen to your advice.

Caleb sprinkles this cross-dressing theology in with actual theology (the parts which don’t offend modern Christian feminists). He effortlessly switches between teaching men they have an obligation to lead their family in study and in prayer, to reminding men to be diligent in doing the things their wives command them to do (emphasis mine):

Take the initiative to be a spiritual leader in your family and lead by example.

Be regular in your Study of God’s Word and personal prayer time.

If you have kids make sure you have a regular time when you can read and teach God’s Word with them too.

**Don’t be lazy about your “honey-do” list or anything else for that matter!**

Be known for honesty and faithfulness at home and work.

Beyond the problem of Caleb’s fetish for cross-dressing, there is also the problem of him telling husbands to teach the Word in this part of the post, while at the same time claiming husbands aren’t to tell their wives to submit. This isn’t possible unless a husband censors the parts of the Bible which teach wives to submit to their husbands. A husband would have to blot out Eph 5:22-33, 1 Pet 3:1-6, Col 3:18, 1 Tim 2:11-15, Tit 2:1-5, and Gen 3:16 to avoid teaching his wife to submit to him.

Instead of teaching their wives to submit, Caleb wants husbands to take over as much of the role of home maker as possible:
When you come through that door after work don’t automatically expect that your wife has waited all day to run circles around you and make sure you are comfortable and well fed.

The fact is she’s probably glad you’re home so that SHE can take a rest!

As husbands we are called to love as Jesus loved and that means serving!

Ask her what you can do to help, find ways to lighten her load and she will thank you.

The irony here is that no doubt Caleb thinks in encouraging wives in their spirit of rebellion that he is sticking it to husbands while helping wives. While he claims that it isn’t a husband’s place to tell his wife to submit, the way he frames the post is that a wife withholding submission is something which primarily harms the husband. This harm is after all the very source of the intended joke in the post. But the reality is this is about far more than the husband. Peter tells us wives should submit because it is what is beautiful to God. With his framing of the issue Caleb is encouraging wives to do the opposite, to do what is ugly to God, in order to take his petty jabs at husbands. He is so concerned with taking feminist shots at husbands that he encourages wives to do what the Apostle Paul explains in Titus 2 causes the word of God to be blasphemed.

There is also the temporal cost in the form of men, women, and children suffering in families plagued by feminist inspired strife. This is a huge price to pay for a few cheap laughs, but of course this isn’t really about laughs at all.
Hollywood’s hero can’t save the day
by Dalrock | March 16, 2015 | Link

IBB linked to an interesting article by Megan McArdle on Bloomberg View: How Hollywood Can Save Our Families. McArdle points out the enormous disadvantage broken homes create for children and our society. She proposes having Hollywood use its moral force to sell two parent families:

I’m not talking about sticking a few propaganda story lines into Very Special Episodes of some sitcom, which wouldn’t do a darn thing. Rather, I’m saying that if Hollywood actually believed that married two-parent families were overwhelmingly optimal, that would naturally shape what they wrote, in a way that would in turn probably shape what Americans believe, and do.

However, she notes that this would require liberal Hollywood to sell a socially conservative message:

But this is an inherently socially conservative message, and Hollywood is about the furthest thing you can name from socially conservative — our entertainment industry tends to send socially conservative messages only accidentally, as it did with “16 and Pregnant.”

This is true, but the problem is much bigger than even McArdle identifies. Even “social conservatives” aren’t truly comfortable with the message she would ask Hollywood to sell. When it comes to portraying husbands and fathers as fools and villains, even Spielberg can’t hold a candle to the movies modern Christians make. It isn’t just the left we would have to convince to value fathers and honor intact families. First we must convince the right to do so.

There is after all another way we could send a message to our entire culture that broken families are a bad thing; we could stop offering a cash reward for each broken family in the form of child support, or we could at least reduce the attractiveness of child support by greatly limiting it. If you want to understand how difficult selling intact families will be to social conservatives, try raising the idea of eliminating or greatly reducing child support to them. Child support is our modern alternative family structure, the structure we designed to replace marriage. Despite only existing for a few decades in its current form, child support has been profoundly successful in displacing marriage. Prior to child support single mothers and divorce were all but unheard of. Now both are extremely common and out of wedlock births continue to rapidly increase.*

Nearly all conservatives are very much in favor of intact families in theory, but when it comes to subsidizing the destruction of families conservatives are all but unmoving. The reason for this is conservatives are just as invested in divorce and single motherhood as empowerment for women as feminists are. As an astute commenter on a related post at Ricochet titled What Do the Ten Most Dangerous Cities in America Have in Common? noted:

On a side note, this post catalogs the effects of marriage; but not just any kind of
marriage. It documents the need for the kind of marriage where parents, especially men, exert a substantial moral influence, and doing so in neighborhoods which maintain that moral influence. It’s not only that we have parents, but that those parents have a job to do, and society depends on them doing it effectively.

Child support, far more than no fault divorce, abortion, and contraception, is the legal force which underpins modern feminism. Child support is the solution to shotgun weddings, unhappy marriages, and strong husbands & fathers. No fault divorce is designed not just to destroy families, but to weaken husbands in all marriages. However child support is the economic arm which makes divorce an attractive option for wives, and therefore makes divorce a credible threat when there are children involved. Child support is also the incentive which makes it more attractive for single mothers to remain single than to marry the father.

In short, long before we convince Hollywood that marriage is sacred and fathers matter, we will have to convince conservatives and then moderates that this is true. By the time we get around to selling liberals on the importance of marriage and fathers we won’t need Hollywood’s help anyway. In theory it should be easiest to convince Christian conservatives that marriage is sacred, but realistically it will probably be secular conservatives who come around on this first. Merely being vocally ambivalent on the role of husbands and fathers is now at the extreme right of modern Christian culture. While convincing anyone, even conservatives, that marriage and fathers matter may seem impossible now, this will become easier as the full cost of the broken homes underwriting feminist “empowerment” becomes harder and harder to ignore. Eventually when the costs get high enough the unthinkable has a way of suddenly seeming obvious. The only question is how much pain we are collectively willing to endure before this happens.

*Correction: Out of wedlocks have remained flat since 2009.*
Out of wedlock births have leveled off in the United States since 2009

by Dalrock | March 17, 2015 | Link

In my previous post I stated that out of wedlock birth rates were continuing to increase. However, I was incorrect. According to the August 2014 Census paper Recent Declines in Nonmarital Childbearing in the United States out of wedlock birth rates have declined slightly in the last few years:

The most dramatic change is in the number of out of wedlock births. However, since these were falling at the same rate as in wedlock births the percent of births which were out of wedlock remained nearly unchanged. The peak for out of wedlock birth rates was in 2009 at 41%, and this dropped down to 40.6% in 2013.

But the overall number masks what is going on by age and race. Since 2007 out of wedlock birth rates have fallen for women under 30, have remained roughly flat for women 30-34, and increased for women 35 and over:
Out of wedlock birth rates have fallen the most for Hispanics, and to a lesser degree for Blacks. White and Asian out of wedlock birth rates have declined slightly as well.
Out of wedlock births are now more likely to involve cohabiting parents than in the recent past:

Figure 4. Nonmarital births, by cohabiting status and intendedness of pregnancy: United States, 2002 and 2006–2010

NOTE: Due to rounding, percentages may not add to 100. Based on births that were within 5 years of the interview date.

SOURCE: CDC/NCHS, National Survey of Family Growth.
Laura Lifshitz hits the bigtime

by Dalrock | March 18, 2015 | Link

Divorce is big business, and this isn’t limited to the family courts and the wide range of cogs in the machinery that destroys families. When women aren’t destroying their own families, they like to read, watch, and think about other women destroying their families. But while the demand is enough for online magazines like Huffington Post to create a separate section just for divorce, there is an army of women who want to be writers. Moreover, with nearly half of all marriages ending in divorce, divorcées are a dime a dozen.

Laura Lifshitz got her start as a professional divorcée at Huffington Post Divorce back in late January of this year. Her maiden post Why You Should Date My Ex-Husband was a passable contribution to the category, but not good enough to make her stand out. In the six weeks that followed she cranked out another 12 posts for Huffington Post Divorce, but being productive in a crowded genre isn’t enough. Like all professional divorcées, Lifshitz needs something extra, something that makes her stand out in the din of all of the other divorcées writing about the destruction of their family.

Last week Lifshitz found her niche. She took a page from Susan Gregory Thomas’ playbook and wrote about how much her frivolous divorce is harming her young child. This is always a crowd pleaser, allowing women fantasizing about divorce to imagine the divorce causing immense pain to innocent children. While Lifshitz is no Susan Gregory Thomas, her piece ‘I Miss My Daddy. Divorce Stinks.’ was enough to get her published in the New York Times mommyblog, Motherlode.
Taking a break.
by Dalrock | March 19, 2015 | Link

I'll be turning on comment moderation later tonight, and should be back some time next week. In the meantime I leave you with the wisdom of Roger Miller and Johnny Knoxville.

March 23 update: Comments are back open, but I might not have a new post up for several days.
As I’ve noted previously, Robert Stacy McCain* brilliantly describes what he calls “The Writer” in ‘Broken People,’ Cats and Prozac. There are several very common characteristics of “The Writer“ which McCain has noted. One of them is their education:

See, this is the thing with young feminist writer types nowadays. They can’t go to Podunk State University. No, they must attend one of those private schools where annual tuition is at or near the median U.S. household income. This is the only way to become that glorious being, The Writer.

Another, even more central characteristic is what The Writer writes about:

Well, you may ask, what does The Writer write about?

Herself, of course! Do these elite colleges offer a major in Solipsism Studies nowadays?

... To say the very least. Where do they come from, these painfully sensitive writer girls with interior dialogues full of shame and fear?

“Feminine instinct without its proper object or purpose,” my gut tells me, speaking like an old-fashioned psychologist, or perhaps an anthropologist of the evolutionary “brain science” type.

With this in mind, I offer you some excerpts from Laura Lifshitz’s comment in reply to my recent post about her so that we might further test The Other McCain’s prescience:

#3- I went to college for writing. An established institution– Columbia University. I am not be Shakespeare or the other author you mentioned, but I love writing, I write constantly, and try to the best of my ability.

Went to an expensive private university to study writing? Check. The Other McCain has this part dialed in. But did he guess the subject material correctly?

#6 Yup. I make money off writing about divorce, parenthood, sex, marriage, and more.

If that makes me a jerk, well please, I’m waiting for my capital J.

This is a tougher call. The post I linked to and the others of hers I read were very much about her own divorce, her own parenthood, etc. But Lifshitz frames this as writing about the topics in the abstract, not using these topics as an excuse to endlessly write about herself, baring her own pain, etc. However, I am perhaps not the most unbiased observer here, so I suggest...
instead we take this question to someone who is sympathetic to Lifshitz. William Benton was one of several commenters who came to this blog to defend Lifshitz:

2) Laura is not profiting from her divorce. She supports herself. She is a hard working, creative, witty soul who wishes nothing more than to find the light at the far end of this dark tunnel she has found herself in. She has no delusions that somehow divorce is an inconvenient event that will ultimately be inconsequential, and her daughter will simply get past it. No, she is looking for hope in the future as she deals with the pains she fought to prevent from slamming down on herself and her daughter.

3) Laura writes from her heart. She bares her soul so graphically that I cannot bring myself to read everything that she writes. She reflects upon pain and anguish to control the demons of her past. That is how she copes and how she survives. And it opens her up to critical judgement from those who don’t know or understand the rest of the story.

So far McCain is two for two. This brings up his third prediction, regarding where “The Writer” lives while practicing her trade of writing about herself:

And, probably because as girls dreaming of becoming The Writer, they watched a sitcom or movie about the lives of quirky bachelorettes in Brooklyn, they simply must live there after graduation.

From just a bit of searching it appears that this particular “The Writer” doesn’t actually live in Brooklyn, but does trace her roots to Brooklyn. For this I think it is ony gracious to give McCain partial credit.

But as I mentioned in my previous post, Lifshitz isn’t just another The Writer, she is part of a subset of The Writers who realized that in order to properly navel gaze, they needed to bring more to the table than just ordinary feminist dysfunction. Lifshitz is a cut above ordinary The Writers; she has gone that essential extra mile to become not just any The Writer, but a Professional Divorcée. Divorce papers and devastated young child in hand, she finally has the kind of painful inner dialog her readers crave. As commenter Alexandra Segal explains:

You’re just jealous that she got published in the New York Times and you didn’t. And by the way, how dare you criticize a mother who worries about her child? Don’t even pretend to think that you know what that kind of bond is like.

Let this be a lesson to all would be The Writers. If you want to make it big and put your expensive private school education to use, be sure to leave a trail of wreckage in your wake.
See Also: Harming your kids for attention and profit.

*I understand from Instapundit that The Other McCain has a new book out: Sex Trouble: Essays on Radical Feminism and the War Against Human Nature.
Ying Ma bemoans the loss of chivalry in Men Who Don’t Pay (H/T Instapundit):

We live in a society where lots of men do not pay. Not only do they fail to pay for the women with whom they go on a date, they increasingly do not even pay for themselves.

The men afflicted with this syndrome tend to be young, and are usually under the age of forty. Those who suffer most severely tend to be products of the nation’s top universities or respectable urban workplaces—where political correctness and leftwing ideology regularly trample over concepts such as chivalry and honor. At these institutions, the worst thing that could happen is to be perceived as racist, sexist or homophobic. Being a weasel that does not pay is not considered a source of embarrassment.

Ma’s critique of modern men is the conservative critique, reinforced by the page title:

Leftist Ideology Makes Men Cheap and Go Dutch

Ma no doubt wants to know why this is happening. The reason of course is simple, as I explained in Why men are withdrawing from courtship. Women are greatly extending the period they expect to be courted, very often expecting to be courted for decades. As women have started dating for sex instead of marriage, men have adjusted their courtship strategies in response. At some level Ma understands this, because her complaint is that men want to have sex with women without buying dinner first:

...on his date, he shelled out only $2.50 for an ice cream cone for the lady and then quickly got to the point: to secure what young men usually want from women.

Pretending that buying a woman dinner to have sex with her is “traditional” or “manly” is absurd, but Ma doesn’t seem to notice.

All of this left me curious whether Ma understood the current sexual marketplace. Perhaps she married young under different cultural customs. She has a personal blog, and I thought the about page would let me know how long she has been married. However there is no reference to a husband in her about page. This doesn’t mean she isn’t married, but if she is it isn’t something she notes about herself on her own blog. In fact, she goes to surprising lengths to avoid giving away her marital status. Her entire about page is written in the third person, and she repeatedly refers to herself using the feminist title “Ms.”

Ms. Ma is a policy advisor at the Heartland Institute, a free-market think tank, and a columnist for The Wall Street Journal’s China blog.

Ms. Ma has previously served as a visiting fellow at the Hoover Institution of War,
Revolution and Peace at Stanford University, a premier conservative think tank; practiced law at **Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP**, a leading global law firm headquartered in New York; managed corporate communications at **Sina.com**, the first Mainland China-based Internet company to list on the Nasdaq Stock Market; and served on the first professional staff of the **U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission**, a congressional commission established to examine the security implications of America’s economic relationship with China.

Weak men are screwing Ms. Ma’s feminism up. Won’t someone come to her aid?
Laura Lifshitz fails to honor my right to write without being written about in *What It’s Like to Be an Evil Jewish Divorcee*:

A group of supposed “Christian” men bantered back and forth under a blog written with the sole intention of saying that women divorce so they can profit off of it by writing about it and I Laura Lifshitz, am one of the most evil women profiting off her dissolved marriage. Oh and by the way, the article is categorized under “ugly feminists.”

As I suspect Lifshitz understands all too well, the ugly feminist tag refers not to outward appearance, but to the profound ugliness of the feminist mindset.

I will never understand why women don’t have the right to write, perform, be, exist, divorce or lead without a man feeling the need to judge, lord and criticize us at every turn only to end the battle against us with, “Oh and she’s very ugly.”

If I have this right, The Writer writes about being written about while writing. This is navel gazing taken to new heights.

Commenter Judy Higgins rationalizes that Lifshitz is doing her daughter a profound favor by continuing to profit from the pain Lifshitz is causing her:

Good for you to keep writing to show your daughter that there are people out in the world who are ignorant and not letting that stop you from sharing your voice.

Indeed.

**Must a professional divorcée lack talent?**
Commenter silverpie asks on my post The Writer writes:

Question about the Venn diagram. What does one do if one pretended to commit for life, wants to be a writer, but fails to lack talent (i.e. does have it)?

In theory a writer with talent could become a professional divorcée. However, if a writer has talent they won’t be forced to make airing their dirty laundry and their failure to honor their sacred vows the foundation of their writing career.
Was it real?
by Dalrock | March 30, 2015 | Link

I happened to come across the “In the Air Tonight” scene from the pilot for the old TV series Miami Vice the other day (below). For those who aren’t familiar with the show and the scene (and yet still care), there is of course a wiki page for it, as there is for nearly everything involving pop culture. What struck me when watching the scene was the bizarre stop off in the middle of the lead up to the climax of the pilot. One minute they are cruising along in Crockett’s Ferrari with Tubbs loading his shotgun, and then suddenly they take a pit-stop into the land of divorce drama:

During the long drive towards the inevitable confrontation with Calderone and his goons, Crockett pulls over at a desolate phonebooth to call his ex-wife Caroline, asking her if their relationship was “real”, knowing this may be his last chance to speak to her. She confirms that it was. As the climactic drum crash of the song kicks in, Crockett and Tubbs pull away, their minds now focused on the impending showdown with their nemesis.

This is just a cheesy TV show, but it does give a sense for how immersed our culture is in the embrace of frivolous divorce and the elevation of romantic love (with the accompanying obsession over accurately identifying “true love”). These themes weren’t new 30 years ago when the episode aired, and of course now we have Christian movie makers picking up the mantle teaching the same themes, only darker. Still, it struck me that a scene I had enjoyed so much as a teenager had this painfully awkward chick crack moment welded into the middle of it and I hadn’t recalled that this was the case.

There is a bit of irony here as well, since Phil Collins wrote the song while going through a divorce:

What exactly is ‘In The Air Tonight’ about?
I don’t know what this song is about. When I was writing this I was going through a divorce. And the only thing I can say about it is that it’s obviously in anger. It’s the angry side, or the bitter side of a separation.
Eva Mendes said you can’t keep a man.

by Dalrock | April 1, 2015 | Link

A few weeks ago Eva Mendes caused what the Telegraph characterized as a “fierce online row” with a seemingly innocuous statement about sweatpants:

You can’t do sweatpants... ladies, number one cause of divorce in America, sweatpants, no!

The controversy wasn’t really about sweatpants, but about framing divorce*. The ugly feminist narrative is that divorce is empowerment as well as a tool to acquire power within marriage. Mendes in her joke reframed divorce as ugly and a failure for women. This predictably touched off a fury of mound rebuilding, and Mendes ended up offering a sort of apology.

What is noteworthy here is that Mendes accidentally stumbled upon a weak spot in the feminist narrative, and this weak spot remains. Feminism has recast something ugly as something positive, but the reality remains. We could have another 100 years of feminism, and there would still be the risk of someone pointing out the obvious; divorce means failure, and a woman who is able to remain married, especially to the father of her children, gains status over other women.

**Note:** I was curious if sweatpants had anything to do with Laura Lifshitz’s divorce. Given that she makes a habit of airing every last bit of her personal life on the internet, I suspect this won’t come as a surprise for my readers.

*That Mendes herself isn’t married doesn’t change this fact.
Vox Day has a post up today on an article from Lauren Martin at Elite Daily: Ladies, The Smarter You Are, The More Likely You Are To Be Single

The Elite Daily article is truly a target rich environment. Cane Caldo has already covered the true meaning of Easter, so I thought I’d use this piece to host a (belated) manosphere Easter egg hunt. Astute readers should be able to find all of the following, and perhaps several others:

- Hypergamy (see Vox’s post)
- Ugly feminist
- Weak men screwing feminism up
- Sailers Law of Female Journalism
- The Writer
- Women with plenty of time to think about how men should treat them
- Rollo’s chart
- Choosing last is a terrible strategy

I’ve touched on the last item here and here, but Martin describes the fundamental problem for women who select a strategy of allowing other women to choose first:

Unfortunately, for all those women who thought a man would come later, other women capitalized on their youth, snatching up all the boyfriends and husbands while they focused on building their careers.

Women went into college with an intent to come out wives, slowly but steadily snatching up the number of available men for all those women who chose to attack their professional dreams.
In the discussion of *What is closeness?* I pointed out that the Sensitive Elliot clip does an excellent job of showing that what we culturally think of as “sensitive” really isn’t sensitive at all. Elliot is oblivious the entire time, missing very obvious mostly non verbal communication from her from the very beginning. Even the man who kicks sand in his face is communicating very clearly, but Elliot is oblivious and wants to “start a dialog” as if one hasn’t been occurring. The only person Elliot is sensitive to is Elliot. He is sensitive to his feelings about sunsets, dolphins, etc. He is fully inwardly focused, yet he has convinced himself that his inward focus is proof that he is really sensitive to others.

This is an old film/theater technique, where the audience is in on a joke that one or more of the actors on stage aren’t privy to. It works so well in this case because of the underlying truth. Sensitive Elliot represents something very common in our society.

You can see the same thing in a post by Dallas area Christian blogger Steven Nelms. Nelms gained worldwide notoriety with a groveling blog post he wrote about his wife: *Fathers, you can’t afford a Stay-At-Home Mom.* In many ways this is standard fare for modern Christian culture. It is an excellent example of what Empath has coined “lift chasing”, in the form of a passive-aggressive attempt by Nelms to place himself above other husbands and fathers by publicly out groveling them. It also has a feminist frame* complaining that it isn’t fair that stay at home wives don’t get a paycheck they can point to for the value of their work. None of this is especially noteworthy, as it is the very air that modern Christians breathe. However, Nelms’s post is an excellent example of an attempt at sensitivity which is strikingly insensitive.

Nelms explains why he wrote the post:

> My wife sometimes feels patronized when I ask her permission to buy something for myself. She feels like it’s my money and my name on the paycheck so I shouldn’t have to ask permission to get myself something every once in a while.

His wife clearly communicated to him that she doesn’t feel comfortable with him deferring his leadership to her in this way. But Nelms isn’t interested in how this impacts her, because he is focused on his own feelings. His very next words are:

> The truth is, I’m ashamed of any time I’ve ever made her feel guilty or humored when she’s purchased something for herself. I’m ashamed that she has ever felt like she doesn’t have just as much right to our income as I do. The fact of the matter is that our income doesn’t even come close to covering what she does for our family. I would have to make over 100K to even begin to be able to cover my living expenses as well as employ my wife as a Stay-At-Home Mom!

She tells him she wants him to lead, or at least to stop deferring to her, and he writes a blog
post doing the exact opposite. This is not about her, it is about his feelings of being unworthy as a leader, his discomfort with headship, and his desire for approval from women.

In abdicating his headship in such a public fashion Nelms is placing an unfair burden on his wife. For her part she seems to be responding very graciously. However, even if she did want to assume headship, it would still be wrong of Nelms to abdicate it. It is even worse that he has set out to teach this abdication and feminist viewpoint as being the Christian view of marriage. Nelms may feel unworthy to lead, but this doesn’t change the fact that the Bible teaches us that as the husband he is the head of the family.

**Related:**

- Update from Ann
- Untethered

*The very title of the post is crafted to avoid offending feminists. The argument he is really making is that he couldn’t afford a career woman for a wife, but this has the problem of offending feminists.*
Effortless
by Dalrock | April 15, 2015 | Link

soulthirstjc puts on a clinic in Christian feminist reframing in response to Reframing Christian marriage part 2: rebelling wives aren’t to blame for their own rebellion.

Research shows that husbands who do take part in household chores, cleaning, etc. are actually statistically happier, than those who do not. (It could be because they are taking pride in their living space, and because they are creating some really happy wives...which, even in natural, non-christian marriages, has a chain reaction.

She is getting ahead of the class here, because this is a defense of what I called out in the very next post of the Reframing Christian Marriage series, husbands as helpmeets.

However, she quickly returns to the task at hand, reframing the rebellion of wives as the fault of their husbands. soulthirstjc explains that the source of women’s temptation to feminist rebellion is unworthy men, and that men are what causes women to rebel against God and the order He has established (emphasis mine):

Now- I am- as a woman- called to “submit” (I know this. Even most unbelieving women have heard this.. We’ve ALL been hearing this for decades. LOL), It IS very encouraging to me that there are ministries out there that do place responsibility on the husband of LEADING the home in a LOVING manner (Ie. being the ultimate example of Christ). That one thing gains soooo much respect from women- women long to be loved like Christ loved the church (unselfish leadership). I think this one thing can SAVE a wife. And I feel the absence of that is what created the women’s “liberation” in the first place. I don’t feel my love for my husband is contingent on these things (as a believer- it’s called to be beyond that)- But let me tell you- if your husband is constantly totally unloving (calls you names, flips you off, acts superior, etc.)...it can lead a wife to a place of feeling total injustice and naturally wanting to rebel- not just against him, but GOD. Now that’s a dangerous place to be. I can see how having a Christian husband working on his 110% and a wife working on her 110% would greatly improve the marriage. I can’t speak for all women, in general, i think we are wired to respond well to Christ like love- “laying down of ones life (as Christ did)” ...in fact- I can have nothing but total admiration and respect for that man (and -that’s- just a natural reaction :). I’ve explained previously the problem with responding to a reframe with an intellectual argument. The temptation here is great, but as you can see soulthirstjc quite casually responded to my post explaining how biblical teaching on marriage has been corrupted by effortlessly shoring up the corruption. Remember, the title of the post she is responding to is:

Reframing Christian marriage part 2: rebelling wives aren’t to blame for their own rebellion.
This isn’t an intellectual discussion. If it were, soulthirstjc would have acknowledged and discussed the reframing the post was focused on instead of doing more of the same. In most cases the woman doing the reframing isn’t doing so with clear conscious intent. It is in most cases a thoughtless, automatic act; they merely notice that their rebellious feminist frame has been replaced with Christianity, and instantly set about discarding Christianity and returning to feminist rebellion.
How would you respond if your husband lead/loved you like Christ?

by Dalrock | April 16, 2015 | Link

In the discussion of Effortless the conversation turned to how wives should expect to be lead, and how they would naturally react if their husband lead them as the Bible teaches. There are two parts to this, which correspond to the separate instructions to husbands and wives:

1. Wives are to submit to their husbands even if their husband doesn’t obey the word. The idea that a wife should expect her husband to first lead (and lead correctly) before submitting is not only not supported by Scripture, but it is in direct contradiction to 1 Pet 3:1-6.
2. Husbands are to love their wives as Christ loves the Church (Eph 5:25-29).

The first point is generally ignored, although it is worth noting that modern Christians are quite enthusiastic about 1 Pet 3:1-6 with a twist. The second point is much more popular, and this is what I want to touch on with this post. While as fallen men and women none of us will achieve Christ’s perfection, it is still important to look at His example.

One of the problems with modern Christian culture is the misconception that loving is a synonym for nice. Jesus is often considered to be a sort of passive non judgmental friend, instead of our Lord, our Master. Husbands are then compared to this false standard. For example, in How to Make Your Wife Submit to Your Authority -6 Tips Caleb Suko starts with:

As a husband your job is to love like Christ loves. One of the best ways you can do that is by simply being a friend to your wife.

The first sentence is straight out of Ephesians, but the second sentence has origins from the Book of Oprah. A bit further down Suko claims that loving like Christ means never holding your wife accountable:

Here’s the real quality of a man, if you make a mistake you’d better admit it and fix it!

If she makes a mistake you need to fix that too but you don’t have to say anything!

You know what I’m talking about, that time when she made a poor judgement call about buying a new kitchen gadget which promptly broke the following week.

Even though it’s tempting, don’t say,

“I told you so!”

Instead suck it up and fix it for her without saying a word. She’ll love you for it and next time she’ll be a lot more likely to listen to your advice.
Wives read and hear this sort of message all the time and come away thinking “Why can’t my husband be more like Jesus?” They become convinced that their own rebellion is purely a reflection of their husband’s imperfection. The problem is the Jesus Christian leaders like Suko are describing doesn’t match the Gospels. Nowhere in the Bible is there a rule that a leader can’t correct the one they are leading. Moreover, Jesus very strongly rebuked the Apostle Peter after Peter failed exactly in the way that Jesus had predicted. In John 21 we learn about the reunion of Jesus and Peter after the Resurrection. Peter eagerly dives into the sea and swims to Jesus, but Jesus doesn’t address Peter until after everyone has eaten. Jesus then repeatedly rebukes Peter, to the point where Peter is absolutely heartbroken:

15 So when they had eaten breakfast, Jesus said to Simon Peter, “Simon, son of Jonah,[b] do you love Me more than these?”

He said to Him, “Yes, Lord; You know that I love You.”

He said to him, “Feed My lambs.”

16 He said to him again a second time, “Simon, son of Jonah,[c] do you love Me?”

He said to Him, “Yes, Lord; You know that I love You.”

He said to him, “Tend My sheep.”

17 He said to him the third time, “Simon, son of Jonah,[d] do you love Me?” Peter was grieved because He said to him the third time, “Do you love Me?”

And he said to Him, “Lord, You know all things; You know that I love You.”

According to Suko’s theory of Christian leadership, Jesus has failed to act as a Christian leader by not sucking it up and pretending that Peter hadn’t failed exactly as Jesus had foretold. Implicit in Jesus’ rebuke is a very serious “I told you so”. Moreover, Peter is right; Jesus could see into Peter’s heart, and knew he loved Him. The problem of course is not that Jesus was unloving, but that we have been sold a great deal of nonsense about what loving means. Jesus loved Peter, and never stopped loving him even when Peter denied Him. After Peter pleads with Jesus to look in his heart, Jesus then lets Peter know He indeed does know that Peter has repented. Jesus responds to Peter’s plea by explaining that because Peter has repented and will faithfully follow Him in the future, Peter will suffer an excruciating and humiliating death:

Jesus said to him, “Feed My sheep. 18 Most assuredly, I say to you, when you were younger, you girded yourself and walked where you wished; but when you are old, you will stretch out your hands, and another will gird you and carry you where you do not wish.” 19 This He spoke, signifying by what death he would glorify God. And when He had spoken this, He said to him, “Follow Me.”

In foretelling Peter’s excruciating, humiliating death Jesus is paying Peter a great honor. But this only makes sense if you remember that Peter (just like us) was called to obey Jesus.
I bring up this example not to offer it as the single template for Christian leadership*, but to explode the false idea that being a loving Christian leader always means being passive or nice. At the same time, this should demolish the related assertion that if husbands were to lead like Christ wives would naturally want to submit:

I can’t speak for all women, in general, i think we are wired to respond well to Christ like love- “laying down of ones life (as Christ did)” ...in fact- I can have nothing but total admiration and respect for that man (and -that’s- just a natural reaction :-).

For those wives like soulthirstjc who believe they would naturally want to submit if their husband lead like Jesus, I suggest you place yourself in Peter’s shoes in John 21:15-19. You have failed in a truly spectacular way, a way which will be remembered for all eternity. You are deeply ashamed of your failure, and the moment you realized what you had done you wept bitterly. You have also been physically separated from Christ and are reunited with Him for the first time. You are so excited to see Him again that you dove into the sea to swim to Him. But before Christ welcomes you back, He strongly rebukes you three times, reminding you of your failure and questioning if you love Him. Only once you demonstrate that you are truly heartbroken does He acknowledge that He knows you are sorry, telling you that because of your repentance you will die a painful and humiliating death.

Do you still think your reaction to the leadership of Jesus in the flesh would always be to automatically want to submit? Isn’t it much more likely you would sometimes at least initially** be hurt and angry, and accuse Him of being unloving and unworthy of your submission?

Isn’t this precisely how you feel at times about your own husband?

*This is one of many examples of Christ’s leadership in the Gospels, and it would be a mistake to either focus solely on it or pretend it didn’t exist when considering Christ’s leadership. However, other examples demonstrate that Jesus wasn’t passive or “nice” in his always loving leadership; He first called out the embarrassed woman with menstrual blood who touched His garment as well as the Gentile woman who asked Him to help her possessed daughter, before ultimately blessing both of them. Husbands should also remember that we are called to dwell with our wives in understanding, giving honor to them as the weaker vessel.

**Until you repented.
New commenter Punditius* proposes that biblical submission is an artifact of the times in which the New Testament was written:

As a man in a marriage to a woman (sigh, that has to be said these days), both much better than I deserve, I have to say that I have trouble following this notion that a woman must be submissive to her husband. My own experience is that what is required of both husband and wife is good faith in each other’s intentions. The idea of “submissiveness” strikes me as an artifact of the society Christianity was rooted in, and I suspect that as with much of what Jesus and his disciples said, it contains a truth that is deeper than the superficial seeming. There is something else going on here, covered up by a veneer of ancient custom. I confess that I don’t know what it is. Still working on that.

The problem with the “rooted in the times” theory is the texts are very specific that this is eternal. In 1 Pet 3:3-5 Peter tells us wives should be submissive because this is beautiful to God:

3 Do not let your adornment be merely outward—arranging the hair, wearing gold, or putting on fine apparel—rather let it be the hidden person of the heart, with the incorruptible beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is very precious in the sight of God. 5 For in this manner, in former times, the holy women who trusted in God also adorned themselves, being submissive to their own husbands,

God isn’t influenced by our fashion trends. He is the same yesterday, today, and tomorrow. Clothes, hairstyles, and jewelry are all subject to the whim of fashion; Peter is telling Christian women to not get caught up in the fashion of the day and instead focus on what is eternal.

Then in the next verse (6), Peter tells us this is timeless once again by tying this back to Genesis and the original covenant with Abraham:

6 as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord, whose daughters you are if you do good and are not afraid with any terror.

There are other problems with this theory, including Paul’s explanation of the husband-wife relationship being a mirror to the relationship between Christ and the Church in Ephesians.

What is undeniable is that someone is/was being influenced by their times. The only question is who. It is either God, Peter, and Paul, who were following the fashion of the day and overlooking what is eternally true, or us who are overlooking what is eternal because we are blinded by the customs of our time.

*Welcome Punditius, and welcome Instapundit readers who were referred to the previous post.
The Daily Mail has a new article by Peter Lloyd plugging his book *Stand by Your Manhood*, and also referencing Dr. Helen’s *Men on Strike*.

**Why men refuse to marry: Women complain chaps today won’t settle down. Sorry, ladies, but it’s all your fault, argues a wickedly provocative new book...**

Lloyd goes through the string of problems with our modern family courts, an institution which exists in order to break apart families. He identifies the root of the issue as a fear of ever holding single mothers accountable:

...everyone is petrified of inadvertently apportioning blame to single mothers, even though it’s not about them. Only recently, in a bid to woo the female vote, David Cameron said deadbeat dads ‘should be looked at like drink drivers’, yet said nothing about the mothers who deliberately steer them off the road.

As I’ve written previously, I don’t believe we are seeing a marriage strike; I believe we are seeing something more ominous. Still, the problems with the insane family courts and our social contempt for husbands and fathers are all too real, and it is clear that marriage delaying women are starting to become concerned. This is a real problem for proponents of the status quo, because as women become more concerned the problems which have been swept under the rug for decades will now be discussed in the open.

The whole system is built on denial, with feminists and traditional conservatives standing in agreement that the only problem is weak men screwing feminism up. But the more that this is discussed in the media, the greater the likelihood that we could start to see men striking, at least on the margins. For this reason even attempts to improve the system are likely to make it harder for women to find husbands, at least initially.

All of the momentum which to date has propped up the system is pent up and will one day swing the other way. When our society started changing the meaning of marriage nearly all women married in their late teens and very early twenties. Now large numbers of women are delaying marriage to their late twenties and early thirties and more and more women are finding it impossible to jump into marriage at the last minute. The problem for marriage delaying women is that they now approach marriage not in the power position in the SMP, but at an age when men are in the power position. A panic at this stage would fundamentally shift the dynamics of the marriage marketplace.
They can’t experience manly pride, so neither can men...

by Dalrock | April 22, 2015 | Link

When I first saw the story making the rounds about ROTC cadets being forced to march in women’s shoes I thought it was a hoax. But I see that the Washington Times has picked up the story and has a photo from a similar march at a different university showing ROTC men marching in uniform wearing red high heels. The caption under the picture reads:

ROTC cadets participate in a “Walk a Mile in Her Shoes” event held at Temple University on April 1, 2015.

While the date of the Temple photo is (suspiciously) April first, the date of the Times article is April 21st. The Temple march also shows up on April first on the event calendar for the organization, so the photo appears to be legitimate (although perhaps somewhat misleading). As the Times mentions this isn’t a new event for the Army, and I was able to find a photo on army.mil of U.S. men in uniform marching in high heels in Germany back in 2011:

“We are here to raise awareness,” said Capt. Lonnie Colbert, company commander for Delta Company, 1st Battalion, 2nd Infantry Regiment, 172nd Infantry Brigade. “Raising awareness ensures our Soldiers are educated on the subject to better take care of our families and always be ready to deploy and take care of each other. We want our spouses to thrive while they are back home waiting for their Soldiers.”

It still hasn’t been confirmed that the recent ROTC event was really mandatory, so I would take the claim with a grain of salt until proven. According to this article a spokesman from US Army Cadet Command (commanded by Major General Peggy C. Combs) confirmed that the ROTC detachments were directed to participate in the event, but marching in women’s shoes was not mandatory:

I contacted the US Army Cadet Command and asked them about this. I received a response from the command public affairs officer, Mister Mike Johnson. According to Mr. Johnson, ROTC detachments were directed to participate in university activities that focus on reducing sexual assault. No instructions were given on how they were to participate. Participation by cadets was not mandatory and no directive was given to penalize absent cadets. According to Mr. Johnson, only 15 or so cadets at Temple participated as the walk was held during class hours. The Army did not require the purchase of high heels and is looking into that question.

Either way, the ugly feminist compulsion to extinguish manly pride is on full display.

Edit: Welcome Instapundit readers.

See Also:

- The Long March of Envy.
• If women can’t be manly Marines, then manly Marines must wear girly hats.
In an effort to improve communication between Glenn Reynolds of Instapundit and Lisa Madigan, I offer the following suggested correction. What Madigan no doubt meant was (corrections in bold):

If someone **without a penis** tells you they’ve been a victim of sexual assault **by someone with a penis**, I want you to believe them.

You’re welcome.
As reported by Ashe Schow at the Washington Examiner in Columbia student defamed by mattress girl is suing, survivor Paul Nungesser alleges that he was forced to remain silent during his long, humiliating, ordeal. After a seven month university disciplinary process cleared Nungesser of the claims Sulkowicz (mattress girl) made against him, and after Sulkowicz’s appeal was denied, Nungesser claims he had no choice but to shut up, lie back, and take it while Sulkowicz and the university had their vile way with him:

Just days after Sulkowicz’s appeal was denied, she began getting advice from a publicist and Nungesser began being followed by the media, the lawsuit alleges. The accusers shared Nungesser’s name to the New York Post, despite a confidentiality agreement with Columbia. Sulkowicz also gave Nungesser’s name to a Columbia student reporter.

Nungesser had been abiding by the confidentiality agreement, and says in his lawsuit that Columbia University advised him to ignore the media. Nungesser says the school never took action against his accusers for breaching the confidentiality policy.

At the core of this alleged brutality is an astounding inability the university president and Sulkowicz to feel empathy for Nungesser as a fellow human being:

Columbia president Lee Bollinger is included in the lawsuit for publicly supporting Sulkowicz’s harassment campaign against Nungesser.

“This is a person who is one of my students, and I care about all of my students,” Bollinger told New York Magazine. “And when one of them feels that she has been a victim of mistreatment, I am affected by that. This is all very painful.”

Of course, no such care was taken for Nungesser.

…

Threats to Nungesser have appeared online and on Sulkowicz’s Facebook account, including one message suggesting Nungesser commit suicide. (Sulkowicz “liked” that comment.)

Hat Tip Instapundit.

Edit: Courtesy of Jezebel. According to Nungesser’s lawsuit, Sulkowicz’s ugly attack on Nungesser occured after her desires for him were unrequited:

As is evident from Emma’s Facebook messages to Paul during the summer prior to their sophomore year, Emma’s yearning for Paul had become very intense. Emma
repeatedly messaged Paul throughout that summer that she loved and missed him. She was quick to inquire whether he was in love with the woman he was seeing abroad.

Thereafter, she continued pursuing him, reiterating that she loved him. However, when Paul did not reciprocate these intense feelings, and instead showed interest in dating other women, Emma became viciously angry.

**See also:** *Guilty until proven innocent, and nothing proves you innocent.*
The advantage of leaving Sulkowicz (Mattress Girl) off the lawsuit.

by Dalrock | April 25, 2015 | Link

The Other McCain explains the advantage of Nungesser not including Sulkowicz in his suit against Columbia in Emma Sulkowicz Is a Vindictive, Dishonest and Crazy Slut — Allegedly

Now, if we ponder every possible avenue by which Paul Nungesser could (a) vindicate his reputation, (b) possibly collect a large cash settlement, and (c) deliver a brutal payback to Sulkowicz for her effort to destroy him, I doubt he could have done better than what he has done: Instead of suing Sulkowicz, he sues Columbia. Why?

1. Columbia’s endowment is reported at $9.2 billion — that’s billion with a “b” — which means they may (and probably should) decide that quietly paying Nungesser a couple of million bucks is a small price to pay for ridding themselves of this bad publicity.

2. Suing Columbia calls attention to how the university violated its own policy by permitting Sulkowicz to breach the confidentially requirements of the university’s sexual misconduct hearing process and, indeed, by endorsing this breach through Professor Kessler’s role in Sulkowicz’s “performance art” project.

3. Most of all, by not naming Sulkowicz as a defendant, this means that Sulkowicz does not have cause to respond to the allegations he makes against her in the Columbia lawsuit, and guess what? You can’t be sued for defamation because of allegations made in a lawsuit.

I claim no legal insight here, but this sounds like a very clever strategy. See McCain’s full post for more.
**Debtors prisons are an essential tool of our new public policy.**

by Dalrock | April 26, 2015 | Link

Earlier this month Christopher Mathias at Huffington Post connected the Walter Scott case to our new family model in: **One-Eighth Of South Carolina Inmates Were Jailed Over Child Support Payments. Walter Scott Was One Of Them.**

But Scott, who was killed on Saturday by police officer Michael Slager in North Charleston, South Carolina, had also long struggled to pay child support. In 2008, he went to jail for a full six months after falling behind by $6,800 in child support payments, according to The Associated Press. Scott spent one night in jail in both 2011 and 2012, again because he owed thousands in child support. At the time of Scott’s death, there was a warrant out for his arrest due to failure to make child support payments. (Scott also had a history of convictions and arrests for other offenses, according to The Post And Courier, a Charleston paper.)

The knowledge of the arrest warrant for failed payments is likely what spurred Scott to run from Slager on Saturday during a traffic stop over a broken taillight.

“He said that’s what he would do, he would run, because he’s not going to jail for child support,” Scott’s other brother, Rodney, told MSNBC.

In a video shot by a bystander, Slager can be seen shooting Scott — who was unarmed — eight times as he ran away. Scott died, and Slager is now facing murder charges.

Mathias presents astounding statistics on the number of men who are incarcerated in South Carolina at the order of family court judges:

In 2009, Patterson conducted a survey of 33 county jails in South Carolina, which found that one out of every eight inmates — or 13.2 percent of the inmate population — was behind bars for contempt of civil court after falling behind on child support payments. In Charleston County, where Walter owed his back payments on child support, Patterson’s survey found that over 15 percent of inmates had been imprisoned for not paying child support. In a handful of the other counties studied, the figure was as high as 20 percent.

Men caught in this system do not have basic due process rights:

Turner’s case ended up in front of the Supreme Court, which ruled in a 5-4 decision in 2011 that the right to counsel only applied to criminal cases, not to people in civil or family court proceedings.

As capricious as this all sounds, there is a method to the madness here. These men are
being imprisoned to sustain a very recent and profound social revolution. They are being imprisoned to facilitate the destruction of traditional marriage so that a new family structure, one instead based on child support, can take the place of marriage. To understand this, you need to understand the four key objectives which are being achieved by imprisoning so many men.

1) **Create the illusion that unwed mothers are not in fact irresponsible welfare queens.**

This is crucial to the moral acceptance of unwed motherhood. For our new system to function as desired, single mothers must be absolved of all social stigma. Our new system goes to great lengths to absolve single mothers of stigma, and part of this is removing the stigma of welfare paid to single mothers. The new assumption is that financially secure unwed motherhood is a right of all women, and that any welfare payments unwed mothers receive are really just child support by another name:

Out of the $105 billion in child support debt nationwide, the government claims half so it can seek to recoup the costs of welfare benefits provided to low-income families. Our current welfare program, called Temporary Aid to Needy Families (“TANF”), requires custodial parents applying for benefits to cooperate in establishing child support obligations against the absent parents and to simultaneously assign the resulting child support payments to the government. Mothers, fathers, and children all become government debtors—the mothers and children owe their child support rights and the fathers owe the payments until the welfare benefits are repaid in full.

As Mathias notes, very large numbers of the men in prison for unpaid child support are poor. These men are in prison not because they refused to pay, but because they couldn’t afford to pay. More to the point, they are in prison because unwed motherhood causes tremendous harm to children and our society. In order to absolve the mothers themselves, we must transfer the entire stigma and responsibility to men. A crime against children requires that *someone* be punished harshly. The men in prison for child support are in this sense sacrificial lambs, being punished in order to absolve all unwed mothers of their moral responsibility for the suffering of their children.

2) **Enforce the new quota based system.**

A marriage based family structure creates natural incentives for men to work hard to support their families. We have replaced the Western/Christian marriage based family system with a soviet style system, and just like the soviet system our new system requires threats of imprisonment for men who don’t produce as much as the state thinks they should.

3) **Facilitate the removal of the father from the home to “empower” women.**

The aim of our new child support based family model is to enable women to destroy their families but still receive the benefits which previously only came with marriage. Child support (and the threats of imprisonment which sustain it) is designed to allow women to have children with men who are unfit to be husbands, and/or to eject a husband from the
home. South Carolina divorce attorney Gregory S. Forman explains that in cases where the couple is married the child support process generally can’t start until the wife ejects the husband from the home in Five Ways to Get a Spouse Out of the House:

When a marriage is no longer working, one spouse typically wants the other spouse to leave. However, until the parties actually separate, the Family Court lacks the power to determine custody or support issues (though the court can, under circumstances noted below, order one spouse to leave and then set custody and support). Thus, absent a written separation agreement, there are important strategic advantages to staying in the house...

It is quite common for unhappy wives to ask their husbands to leave. Since the husband is typically the person with the financial obligations and the wife will typically be the residential custodial parent, it behooves the husband to remain in the home until he negotiates a separation agreement with financial obligations he can meet and parenting rights he can accept.

Forman goes on to describe the legal strategies wives most commonly use to get their husbands out of the home so the whole process can begin. Number one on his list of legal strategies is for the wife to claim* domestic abuse. This both ejects the father from the home and converts him from (nominal) head of household to child support payer:

The two major advantages to Domestic Abuse actions are that they are provide prompt access to the court and that there is not a high threshold to prove domestic abuse. Hearings must be set within fifteen days of the filing of a petition (§ 20-4-50 (b)) and can be set within 24 hours in an emergency situation. § 20-4-50 (a). The definition of abuse includes “assault, or the threat of physical harm,” so an actual physical harm does not have to be proven. § 20-4-20 (a)(1).

In addition to providing the abused petitioner possession of the marital domicile, the Domestic Abuse order can also provide for temporary spousal and child support, custody and visitation.

Not surprisingly, this process is frequently manipulated by wives in exactly the way it is designed to be used:

Since Domestic Abuse orders are quick and efficient methods for getting a spouse out of the house, they are subject to abuse. Spouses will often attempt to prompt or instigate fights in order to call the police and set up domestic abuse proceedings. Since much domestic abuse becomes a “he said/she said” swearing contest, it is important to protect a client from false allegations of domestic abuse. In situations in which a client might be subjected to false allegations of domestic abuse, the purchase of a small hand-held tape (or even video) recorder is useful. Then, whenever the other spouse attempts to prompt a physical altercation, the client merely needs to hold the recorder up and start recording (announcing “tell it to the nice Family Court Judge, honey” when the client begins recording, adds an entertaining-though not always calming-touch).
Note that men are guilty until proven innocent in this case, and that it is well known that wives will commonly act as aggressors in order to claim victim-hood. Forman’s Marie Antoinette-esque solution to “let them carry tape recorders” overlooks the reality that the system is working precisely as designed. Iraq war vet Joseph Kerr describes how the system is designed in “What Do You Do When A Girl Hits You?”

Finally it was going to end. She wanted to move out of state with the kids and had no interest in discussing sharing custody. “We’re not discussing it, you can’t stop us from leaving. Sign it or I’ll get a lawyer and make you sign it.” She handed me a do-it-yourself version of divorce papers.

I reached out to some divorce lawyers. This life sucks for me, for the kids, for everyone. What do I do? “It’s a game of chicken in your house now,” the he said. “Neither one of you can leave with the kids, and the first one who leaves without them is a step behind in trying to get custody.”

Is there a worse possible way to resolve such a pending disaster?

Then the email confirmation — plane tickets, one adult, two children, one way, leaving soon. Tomorrow morning would be different, but sleeping on the couch was normal. I ended up on the ground next to the stairs. She kicked my head into the solid wood base. I blacked out, came to, stood up, bleeding. My daughter was screaming, “Stop hurting daddy!”

Kerr made the mistake of going to the police after the assault. He was then arrested because all it took was for his wife to claim that he threatened her, and the process kicked in as designed:

“You wife is telling a bit of a different story, as happens a lot in these situations, she says you threatened her.”

“We’re going to take you into custody now.”

“Stand up and put your hands behind your back.”

An hour later I was handcuffed to a hospital bed waiting for CAT scan results to know if my head was bleeding.

After being released from jail with an order to not contact his wife or his children for a year, and with his bank accounts drained, Kerr asked his lawyer what he should have done in this incident. Her response:

“Run. Run and don’t go to the police.”

Kerr tells us this wasn’t his wife’s first assault against him:

She grabbed me and ripped my shirt. Her nails cut my face. I bled. I tried to walk out the door. She blocked the door. I was a gym-every-day, active duty Marine, fearing
someone a fraction of my size. If she had a penis I’d have a dozen ways to put her on the ground. Instead, I was left to sneak out a bedroom window and spend the night in a parking lot.

This is a well known pattern, as Web MD notes in their article Help for Battered Men**:

“We tell men if they have to be in an argument, do it in a room with two doors so they can leave; a lot of times a woman will block the door, the man will try to move her, and that will be enough for him to get arrested.”

In the past our family structure was designed to keep families intact. Our new family structure is designed primarily to break them apart.

4) Dis-empower husbands and fathers in order to empower wives and mothers.

The overarching goal of the new system is to empower women, and in order to do this power must be taken from men and given to women. Fundamentally, the objective is to create a system where women can become mothers without being beholden to a man. The most obvious incarnations of this involve single motherhood. However, the system is also designed achieve the same goal in a more subtle way, by making husbands powerless for those women who wish to remain nominally married. All of the machinery designed to crush the father and remove him from the home can also be used to change the power dynamics within marriage. The mere threat of using this cruel system is as feminist economists Wolfers and Stevens delightedly explain a “potent tool” for wives to use to gain power over their husbands (emphasis mine):

The mechanism examined in this paper is a change in divorce regime and we interpret the evidence collected here as an empirical endorsement of the idea that family law provides a potent tool for affecting outcomes within families.

*Forman says “prove” instead of claim, but then goes on to describe how claims are generally taken as proof.

**Archived here in case the article is edited to remove the advice.

See also Vox Day’s post Child support is modern debt slavery
Dr. Helen kindly linked to my previous post in: Is Imprisoning Men for Child Support a Way for the Government to Destroy Traditional Marriage?

In the discussion of her post I made a point I’m not sure I have made directly here, and either way I feel it is worth repeating. Nearly everyone believes that we have merely modified our marriage based family structure to include an exception for the child support model. The truth is the opposite.

We didn’t modify our marriage based family structure to allow an exception for the child support model, we replaced the marriage model with the child support model and created a very limited exception for marriage.

The child support model is now the rule of the land, our official family structure. Parents are permitted to opt out of the child support structure only so long as both of them wish to continue opting out.
by Dalrock | April 30, 2015 | Link

With the riots in Baltimore one of the issues being discussed is the breakdown of the Black family. Phillip Bump at the Washington Post tackles this very question in Rand Paul cites a ‘lack of fathers’ in Baltimore. Here’s what the data actually show.

In 2013, the Department of Health and Human Services released a study of father-child interactions between 2006 and 2010. It looked at how often black, white and Hispanic fathers lived with and interacted with their children.

The stats he presents are a bit of a let down, and at times don’t make sense. More striking however is how the Health and Human Services report he is getting his data from defines a father. Who’s your daddy? Why any man who is living in the same house while banging your mom!

Not all men are biological fathers and not all fathers have biological children. In addition to fathering a child, men may become fathers through adoption—which confers the same legal status, protections, and responsibilities to the man and the child as fathering a biological child. Men also may become de facto fathers when they marry or cohabit with women who have children from previous relationships, that is, they are raising stepchildren or their cohabiting partner’s children. In this report, men were defined as fathers if they had biological or adopted children or if step- or partner’s children were living in the household.

I understand that the lines can become blurred here with stepfathers, but not only does this government report not distinguish between legal fathers and stepfathers, it expands the definition of stepfather to mean any man currently shacked up with mom.

HHS is not the only US government agency to do this though. As I’ve shared previously, the US Census uses a very similar definition of father:

Children are defined in this report as all individuals under 18 years old. The survey asks respondents to identify the child’s mother and/or father if they are present in the household. A separate question asks respondents to identify the type of relationship between each child and parent, whether biological, step, or adoptive. All living arrangements are as of the time of the interview.

Stepchildren are identified by the survey respondent, and their stepparent may not be currently married to the child’s other coresidential parent.

While HHS says any man currently shacking up with mom counts as the father, the Census says any man currently shacking up with mom counts as the father so long as mom says so. Either way, fathers clearly can’t matter that much to the US government if distinguishing between the actual father and the man currently banging mom isn’t important.
There are other ways we can tell that fathers don’t matter (and therefore Black fathers don’t matter). Under our current family system fathers are a sort of deputy parent. Just like a sheriff’s deputy serves at the pleasure of the sheriff, a father in an intact family serves at the pleasure of the mother. Our entire family court structure is designed to facilitate the removal of the father should the mother decide she no longer wants him to be part of the family unit. How important can fathers really be, when we have a massive and brutal bureaucracy devoted to helping mothers kick them out of the house?

Lastly, a comment on What Do the Ten Most Dangerous Cities in America Have in Common? that I’ve shared previously is highly relevant:

On a side note, this post catalogs the effects of marriage; but not just any kind of marriage. It documents the need for the kind of marriage where parents, especially men, exert a substantial moral influence, and doing so in neighborhoods which maintain that moral influence. It’s not only that we have parents, but that those parents have a job to do, and society depends on them doing it effectively.

As Cane Caldo astutely notes, the Baltimore single mother of 6 being feted by the media as mother of the year for severely disciplining her riotous son would have been seen very differently if she were a father:

...The media and civil authorities would be outraged if there were video of the young man’s father whooping his son’s ass up and down the street; punching him in the face, jerking him around by the hoodie, and pushing him back home. I imagine that cops would take time out fighting for their lives to arrest such a father.
Real men don’t hold purses—unless their wife tells them to.

by Dalrock | May 1, 2015 | Link

Barnabas pointed out a sermon by Pastor Jason Meyer titled Fooled by False Leadership. In the sermon Pastor Meyer offers an example of “Servant Leadership”, a modern Christian term numerous readers have asked for a definition of. I would say this example pretty much sums it up:

Showing his embarrassment is a way to show that this is not what he is comfortable doing. It is a little bit like when your wife asks you to carry her purse. There is no manly way to carry a purse. If you sling it on your shoulder, you show that you are a little too comfortable with it. But you can’t refuse because you really want to serve your wife and help her out. So you carry the purse in a way that shows your discomfort. You hold it by scrunching the handle and holding it out several inches from your body—just far enough away to show you are not about to sling it over your shoulder.

Real men don’t carry purses, unless their wife tells them to, and in that case they must make sure they show they are embarrassed to do so.

I have shared more of my observations on the sermon here, and others have done so in the same thread.
Hey, that’s *our* trick!
by Dalrock | May 2, 2015 | Link

Friday afternoon light reading, courtesy of the Dalrock Research Dept.

Mommyish has a post about Nick Loeb’s Op Ed piece at the NYT. Loeb wants custody of the frozen embryos he and his ex fiancée created, and the ladies at Mommyish smell a rat. First up are Kathryn and Joanne; they think this is a ploy by Loeb to get child support:

Valerie, Roberta, OkieMom, and Liawen have the same suspicion. They think that Loeb is not only greedy, but is trying to use the family courts to punish his ex. OkieMom accuses him of trying to pull off an “oops pregnancy”: 
Valerie > Serena M • a day ago
Exactly! I have no idea. It seems almost like emotional blackmail or he’s doing it expressly to taunt her. What a douche.

Robertta > Valerie • a day ago
A cynical part of me says he may want to get child support from her. After all the embryos are from her and there are cases where’s sperm donors are sued for child support. I hope I am terribly wrong though.

OkieMom > Robertta • a day ago
I think you are right. I find Loeb’s timing suspect in this. Think about it - he & Vergara have been apart for a long time now. A week or so ago a court ruled in the case involving maternity with Sherri Shepherd that she was responsible even though she basically made it clear that she was simply the egg donor. Now Loeb gets his op-ed published? Why wait so long? I’m sure it has been discussed before now, especially if he was that invested in it. I think he wants child support & a way to keep Vergara in his life forever. Jilted ex. And he says she wasn’t invested in it as he was? Last I heard, egg harvesting isn’t a walk in the park & I’m pretty sure one has to be fairly invested to go through it.

Robertta > OkieMom • 20 hours ago
Ok, I looked him up and it actually sounds like he has a fair amount of money. He is the heir to one company and owns his own food company. So either he is not as wealthy as he appears or this is an emotional ploy. Either way, dude sounds gross.

Llaven > Robertta • 17 hours ago
To the greedy, being an heir to a company and owning your own isn’t enough. He might be wealthy on his own, but wants more.

Edit: More. Danielle thinks he is only doing it for the child support payday:

danielle • 18 hours ago
That guy sounds like a complete and utter douche who wants to do this solely for monetary purposes because she is famous and rich.

Catholic faith? Isn’t making a baby outside of marriage against the Catholic faith? Eff that guy.
koolchicken is outraged that a woman could have a child without her consent. Sure this happens to men, but as she explains, that is different:

I have to imagine that's why, but some people do start the process and then sit on the embryos. Given its probably in her contract she can't get pregnant it's a possibility.

I'll agree, it's really pretty freaky to think a woman could have a kid without her consent. Yeah it happens to men, but it's different. I always felt that every time you had consensual sex with someone, you needed to also be consenting to raise a child with that person. So while there may be some sneaky women out there who will ditch the BC if you willingly slept with that woman you knew there was a risk. This is just SO different though. It's like "I know we haven't slept together in three years, but meet your six month old". Uh, no.
Real men don’t just carry purses, they restock them too.
by Dalrock | May 2, 2015 | Link

A teenage boy’s supplicating Instagram post has gone viral, and is upping the ante for servant leaders everywhere.

TO EVERY BOY THAT FOLLOWS ME AND CALLS HIMSELF A MAN OR SIMPLY A GOOD HUMAN BEING. Petition for all of us to start bringing a couple pads or tampons to school to help our girl friends. If you have a girlfriend or are friends with a girl, u should know that they do not always have tampons or pads on them, or that sometimes their period just hits them without notice and have a bit of a problem finding one. We should support them with this, after all, we don’t have to go through all they they do because of menstruation, so it’s just logical that we help them...

The chick rags are of course delighted. Huffington Post exclaims: The Awesome Reason Why This Teen Boy Is Carrying Around Tampons At School. Liz Alterman at The Stir explains in Why This Teen Boy Is Asking Male Students to Bring Tampons to School that she hopes to raise sons like this:

As expected, he’s taken a bit of heat from guys in his class but he’s remaining steadfast in his sympathetic stance and we applaud his effort. Imagine a generation of guys who aren’t embarrassed to go out and buy tampons and maxi-pads for their wives or girlfriends? I’d like to raise sons like that!

Except, maybe her sons shouldn’t be like that:

Still, as a mom of boys, I don’t know if I’d want my son to morph into a human tampon dispenser.

Looking at the picture of the kid holding maxi pads with a please love me look on his face, my hope is that this isn’t real and is instead someone from the manosphere trolling the internet. Either way, if you’ve ever struggled to understand beta creepiness this should help you understand the phenomenon.
They aren’t talking about headship.
by Dalrock | May 3, 2015 | Link

Spike writes:

Dalrock: It’s Sunday in Australia. I just got a sermon about “servant leadership”, plus how there is an obligation for men to be faithful and be “The husband of only one wife”, which is fine. My problem is that no church I know makes it clear what the wife’s obligation to her husband is.

The problem unfortunately is much worse than Spike states. When modern Christians refer to servant leadership they aren’t talking about headship. Servant leader is a term one uses when one wishes to obliterate and deny headship. Individually the words are right, but the term servant leader has no more to do with biblical headship than the term free love has to do with 1 Cor 13. Yes, the Apostle Paul is writing about love, and no, this isn’t something we should be stingy with or charge for. So free is right, and love is right, but free love means something entirely different. Likewise servant is right, and leader is right, but servant leader in our culture means something entirely different than headship.

For those who disagree, show an example of a modern Christian using the term servant leader who isn’t using it in the context of denying or explaining away headship.
As I explained in Black Fathers [Don’t] Matter, the official data on intact families is problematic because both HHS and the US Census are all too eager to count any man mom is shacking up with as the father. Because of this, official data is overstating the percentage of children of all races who are growing up with both their mother and their father. Even when fudging the numbers however, a disturbingly small percentage of Black children live with both parents. I thought I would share what I was able to find with a bit of searching, with the caveat that not all “fathers” counted in the official data are fathers by any reasonable stretch of the term.

The US Census has time series data broken out by race, including this chart:

![Figure CH-2.3.4](image)

Children under 18 living with their mother only


Notes: Direct identification of both parents began in 2007, resulting in the ability to identify children living with two unmarried parents. The collection of race and Hispanic origin has changed over time. Before 2003 respondents had to select a single race. People of Hispanic origin may be of any race.

I’ve also previously shared a snapshot of custody by race for 2012:
However, in addition to counting non-existent fathers, the data above also averages children of all ages. As a result it doesn’t tell us what percent of adolescents still have dad in the home. With a bit more digging I found Census data from 2006 which breaks living arrangement data down by race and age. Since this data also comes from the US Census, the problem of identifying random men passing through mom’s bedroom as “dad” likely impacts this data set as well.
Stepping away for a while.
by Dalrock | May 9, 2015 | Link

I’m going to turn on comment moderation now. I’ll be back in a week or two.
If you can’t feel the current, you have already been swept away.
by Dalrock | May 24, 2015 | Link

Instapundit kindly linked to my post They aren’t talking about headship.

LIFE AMONG THE CHURCHIANS: “My problem is that no church I know makes it clear what the wife’s obligation to her husband is.” In contemporary society, men have obligations. Women have entitlements.

This brought out all of the standard denials in the comment section. We live in an age where feminist rebellion is considered the highest virtue. Modern Christians have bought into feminism but deny this by denying the very rebellion. Feminism doesn't feel like rebellion because it feels normal. Donald Sensing explained that there can't be a problem in modern Christian culture, because he personally has made sure there is no problem:

Well, I have preached on that a number of times!

Maybe the author needs to get out more.

Certainly some pastors do fight our feminist culture, but they more than anyone else understand the amount of effort this takes, and the amount of crying and wailing this creates from the women in the congregation. A few of these pastors have even managed to develop a culture in their congregation contrary to the modern Christian culture surrounding them, and for them the amount of crying and wailing is greatly reduced. But even here, these pastors know the constant effort which is required to keep the modern Christian view that feminist rebellion is virtue from seeping in and taking over. Pastors who are actively fighting our feminist culture don’t minimize the problem because they understand how serious it is. Meanwhile, others like Sensing first deny that feminism has overtaken our culture before explaining that the real problem is that husbands aren’t minding their own business:

The main part of his serious error is that the New Testament spends a lot more time instructing husbands on their duties that wives on theirs. Maybe if he learned and practiced his obligations first he wouldn’t be worrying so much about hers.

His claim that the NT focuses much more time on the duties of husbands than wives is a bizarre one, but aside from that he is also encouraging rebellion by suggesting that there is no problem of feminist rebellion, but instead husbands who aren’t minding their own business.

Commenter Noah D carries on with the same denial; if you only went to Noah’s church it would be obvious that there is no problem at all:

Well, there’s this little organization called the Catholic Church, that a few people belong to, and as been preaching about and thinking about that sort of thing for at least a little while. Might want to check them out – just sayin’.
It is true that formal RCC teaching on headship and the roles of men and women is quite good. However, faithful Catholics understand that just like everyone else they have to fight against the current of modern Christian culture. Because modern Christian culture is thoroughly saturated with feminist thinking, there is a profound difference between RCC teaching and what one is _likely to be taught_ at the local church. Bonald of Throne and Altar recently described the constant vigilance he and other faithful Catholics have to exercise in his post _Youth mentorship in a Catholic parish_:

I’m thinking I’d like to involve myself in the religious education program at whatever parish I end up in. (It seemed silly to bother infiltrating my current one when I don’t have tenure.) I have no relevant expertise to teach, but I can volunteer to make copies and babysit. The point is to be able to follow what’s going on in the program and check material for orthodoxy. My oldest girl will soon be old enough for religion class, which they usually make children take if they want to receive the sacraments (otherwise I wouldn’t even consider accepting the spiritual dangers of a post-Vatican II religion class), and I’ll definitely want to be able to spy on them.

Bonald knows the powerful current exists because he is anchored in the rock, but Noah can’t feel it because he was swept away long ago. Noah is in fact now part of the current.

Men who are part of the current rationalize feminist rebellion without a second thought. There is no malice or calculation here; this is what you do when you are part of the current. Commenter Creative Dude explains that when the Bible tells wives to submit to their husbands even if their husband doesn’t obey the word, this _really_ means his own wife’s submission is contingent upon him obeying the word:

She is to Love, Honor and Obey me to the same extent I Love, Honor and Obey our Lord.

Moreover, when the Bible calls on husbands to wash their wives in the water of the word, this means that husbands should mind their own business:

Our Lord is not a boss. He sets the example, teaches truth and invites us to obey.

He did not tell me to tell others what they should do, he told me what I need to do.

**Note:** Those who have this blog in their reader feed will have received a version of this post which I accidentally published while still editing. Please disregard that incomplete version.
In the comments to my last post TFH pointed out that Donald Sensing has his own blog. From a quick glance it looks as I would expect for a Traditional Conservative, with a focus on his military past, second amendment issues, etc. I was however interested in his background as a preacher since he was so adamant that there is no hesitancy by modern Christians to preach biblical marriage roles to women:

Well, I have preached on that a number of times!

Maybe the author needs to get out more.

According to his Bio, he is a United Methodist pastor:

| I retired in August 1995, answering my call to ordained ministry. I began classes at Vanderbilt Divinity School the same month. I was awarded a Master of Divinity in 1999 and have served full time as a United Methodist pastor since 1997. I was ordained an elder in full membership of the Tennessee Conference of the UMC in June 2002. |

Knowing this helps us understand exactly what Sensing hasn’t noticed as a United Methodist pastor, leading him to dismiss Spike by saying he needs to get out more if he thinks the church is shying away from teaching biblical roles for women. Just what is going on in the United Methodist Church that Pastor Sensing hasn’t noticed? For just one example, see the UMC’s “What We Believe” section of their website, including Every Barrier Down: Toward Full Embrace of All Women in Church and Society. Here the United Methodist Church explains that Christ was a product of His times, and that only modern feminist women could correct His deficiencies:

| As the Church of Jesus Christ enters its third millennium, women continue to heed the call to transform the Church and the world in the name of the One who names us and claims us all for witness, mission and earth-shaking transformation. |

As much as he was a product of his era-one admittedly marked by gender, class, religious, and community exclusion — Jesus Christ brought to us a ministry of transformational invitation. The Living Christ invited — and still invites — to a common table of grace, justice, and power, people who had never before been invited to the religious power tables, including women, cultural and religious minorities, social outcasts, and disreputable community sinners.¹ And women, in claiming their voice in the new faith movement ignited by the Messiah, became leaders in expanding that movement and in pushing further for inclusion of Gentiles in what was then viewed as Jesus’ renewal of Judaism.

Women, in fact, advocated for and sought to protect the inclusive equality of discipleship called forth by Jesus. In this way, they challenged the Jesus movement...
to remain true to the new vision of human relationship that Jesus initiated by extending its table fellowship, sharing the message of the coming Reign of God and inviting Gentiles (non-Jews) to share in that Reign.¹ Jesus treated women with dignity and respect, challenged the conventional sexism of his day, and forever redefined the role of women in the church and society.

As with many expressions of the Christian faith, it took The United Methodist Church and its forebears a while to capture Christ’s vision...

Since that time, however, God’s call to women as preachers, teachers, administrators, mission workers, treasurers, lay leaders, trustees, peace-with-justice advocates, voting rights' workers, Christian educators, and evangelists has blown a fresh breath across the globe and throughout the Church on the wings of the Holy Spirit, despite the rise and fall of our denominational enthusiasm for addressing sexism, gender bias, prejudice, and bad theology. God has done great things with us and, sometimes, in spite of us. Among the victories celebrated throughout our denomination’s history:

Read the whole thing to see their list of feminist victories, along with complaints that the church members aren’t progressing fast enough. Most of this could have easily been penned by your local college’s Women’s Studies department, including:

- a number of United Methodist congregations in 2007 still flatly refuse to accept a woman as senior pastor and are especially opposed to receiving a woman in a cross-racial clergy appointment. In 2006, a racial-ethnic clergywoman assigned to an Anglo church was allegedly menaced by members to dissuade her acceptance of the appointment. In another instance, laity threatened to leave the congregation unless the woman pastor wore a dress instead of slacks to prove she was “a real lady”;
- in a 2007 survey of local United Methodist congregations, 18 percent said they do not have women serving as ushers (an increase over 2004), and local church chairpersons of the Church Council, Finance, and Trustees are still overwhelmingly men and not women;
- United Methodist membership in the US is declining among young women (and men) and people of color, particularly among those in low-income communities. According to a Wesley Theological Seminary survey, women under 35 comprise less than 2 percent of elders in our denomination;
The Other McCain Suspects a Moby was trolling Captain Capitalism’s post on Return of Kings, and I have no question his suspicion is right. I noticed a surge of this same sort of thing after the nutjob omega in Santa Barbara went on his evil murderous rampage.

Check out McCain’s post A Moby in the ‘Manosphere’? for his description of the troll and the definition of the term “moby”.

Anyway, let this be a warning to the grassroots opposition to feminism: Keep your eyes open for similar dirty tricks.
Revisiting the question of a troublesome mother-in-law.

by Dalrock | May 29, 2015 | Link

Top Posts

- Something smells fishy
- What current?
- If you can't feel the current, you have already been swept away.
- Are Women Done With Men After Age 55?
- A wife's best defense against a troublesome mother-in-law.
- More grim news for carousellers hoping to jump at the last minute.
- Why a woman's age at time of marriage matters, and what this tells us about the apex fallacy

One of the most visited posts I’ve written in the five years I’ve been blogging is A wife’s best defense against a troublesome mother-in-law. As I write this it is the fifth most visited page on the blog. This popularity shouldn’t be surprising, as this is sadly a very common problem, and the “normal” methods of trying to address the problem simply don’t work.

Recently commenter Laura has been discussing her own challenges here. From the discussion it sounds like she has made some progress, but she made a comment in reply to another reader which made me want to revisit this topic:

I will not give on this issue for certain reasons that I guarantee any mother that was in my position would be doing the same. Like I said you make think I am not being a supportive loving wife and daughter in law however you really don’t know what I am talking about when I say she did some really horrible things. So stop assuming that its a normal tense relationship between us because it was not.

I can’t speak for the other commenter, but I have no problem believing that Laura’s mother-in-law is doing truly vile and astounding things. Like Laura, I have witnessed things which I
won’t go into out of respect for the privacy of those involved. The question is not should something be done about the problem, but how to best address the problem.

As I explained in the initial post on the topic, the problem is every modern wife’s go-to solution maddeningly stops working when the mother-in-law is involved. Modern wives are masters at manipulating their husbands through nagging, drama, threats of divorce, denying sex, etc. While wives using these tools create a miserable marriage for both husband and wife, the tools themselves are generally speaking extremely effective in manipulating the husband. If a wife wants to spend more money, get her husband to work harder to earn more money, buy a bigger house or a new car, etc, these tools do generally work quite well, and wives know this.

Aside from creating a miserable marriage, the practical problem with this approach is it fails miserably when dealing with mother-in-laws. As I explained in the original post, in this scenario the mother-in-law outranks the wife in the de facto matriarchy the wife has created. It is, however, worse than this devastating fact would suggest. Not only does the mother-in-law outrank the wife, but the wife is playing the mother-in-law’s game. No matter how good at manipulation and drama Laura is, her mother-in-law is going to be far better at this game. It would be less foolish for Laura to challenge LeBron James to a game of 1 on 1 in basketball. And make no mistake, if Laura is trying to pressure her husband to fix the problem with her mother-in-law, she is playing the drama and manipulation game. All of her best moves suddenly fail spectacularly; it is like she is moving in slow motion. Every scheme she concocts to outwit the mother-in-law ends with Laura being knocked down and dunked on. She gets fouled but somehow the mother-in-law makes it look like she was the one in the wrong. It would be hilarious to watch if it weren’t so tragic.

**Why won’t he stand up for himself?**

Like most wives in the same situation, Laura is no doubt extremely frustrated that her husband won’t stand up for himself. Why does he let her manipulate him that way? Yet her chosen tactic is to manipulate her husband even more. She doesn’t really want him to stand up for himself. On the contrary, she wants her puppet to stop taking direction from that other woman and do exactly as she tells him to do.

Part of the problem is that Laura no doubt chose a husband she felt she could keep in line, one who would respond positively to her leadership. She didn’t want to marry a man who was good at standing up to manipulation, and she doesn’t want him to stand up for himself now. What she hadn’t considered is that another woman already trained him in how to be manipulated, and this woman has decades of experience on her. Even worse, every tactic Laura will be tempted to use only weakens her own hand and strengthens the mother-in-law’s. Whether it is threats of divorce, denied sex, or just plain nagging, all of this creates a wedge in her own marriage, pushing her husband away and weakening the very hold she hopes to exploit.

For an example of how wives get knocked down and dunked on, consider one of the more standard plays wives try to run. The mother-in-law does something pernicious, so the wife demands that the husband “Go talk to her about it”. This is of course exactly the sort of drama the mother-in-law is craving. The husband carries out his wife’s orders, and delivers
her message to the mother-in-law. The thing to always keep in mind is that drama, any kind of drama, is like a lit crack pipe to an out of control mother-in-law. That sinister smile you swear just flashed across her face when you sent him over isn’t something you imagined. She is outright delighted that you chose to send this drama her way. How the mother-in-law chooses to play this hand is at her discretion, as she can either paint the wife as a vindictive controlling person who is trying to push the innocent mother out of her son’s (and grandchildren’s) life, or she can play it the other way, by making a huge emotional display explaining how sorry she is that she has “made the wife hate her so much”! What can she ever do to be forgiven of this? For added effect, most troublesome mother-in-laws will also prefer to throw in some sort of health emergency into the mix. This could as easily be real as it is feigned, but the veracity of the emergency doesn’t really matter much.

**She almost caused a divorce!**

When Laura first started commenting she utilized the passive aggressive language of the threat point:

> Letting him guide the situation last time **almost caused a divorce** so this I why I turned to the Internet because Im lost and just don’t know what to do.

The problem with threats of divorce as I mentioned above is that they only strengthen the mother-in-law’s hand by weakening the marriage. Following through and **actually divorcing** does the same thing. The state is at all times delighted to step in and remove a husband and father from the home, but don’t expect that enthusiasm for destroying families to extend to the grandparents. If Laura divorces the father of her children her mother in law’s hand with the children will only be strengthened. Just like divorcing wives, mother in laws understand the power of using children for manipulation.

**What to do when you are tired of getting dunked on.**

For wives who are tired of trying to out manipulate, nag, and drama queen their mothers-in-law, the best option is to allow the husband to do what she keeps complaining he won’t do: learn to stand up for himself. But how to do this, since the normal tools of manipulation by definition won’t teach him to stand up for himself? I’ve given advice on **how a wife can encourage a husband to show more leadership** to a very sweet wife who wasn’t in nearly this bad a situation, and a year later she wrote back to tell me how much her marriage had improved as a result of following the advice.

Realistically wives in Laura’s position have more bad habits for both the husband and wife to learn to break, so it will not be easy. It is however the only viable solution short of divorce and a court order banning the mother-in-law from all contact with the children (the first part is a slam dunk under our system, the second is very unlikely). Even with a court order however, this is a woman who is an expert at manipulation. Breaking apart your family is extremely unlikely to create a better shelter for your children.

What wives in Laura’s situation need to do is what is most against all of their instincts. They need to let go and let their husband stand on his own two feet and lead. Good feminists will of course have picked husbands who are particularly weak at standing up to women, so this
will mean a steeper learning curve for him. Good feminists will also find it very hard not to pretend to allow him to lead while retaining hold of the reins. One thing the son of a manipulative mother understands is manipulation, and while he may not be able to vocalize it, he will sense this manipulation in his gut. His mother will as well.

**The end goal**

The end goal is to get the husband to a situation where he is truly leading, and as a natural result is protective of those he is leading. Ironically what his mother probably needs more than anything is for a strong man to tell her to knock off the antics. As I explained above, men who are acting as a messenger for another woman can't deliver this. Only a man who is acting of his own decision can do this. What wives will find is when their husband decides to do this *of his own volition*, the mother-in-law will almost always become surprisingly calm, happy, and pleasant. However, for difficult cases like Laura’s mother-in-law, this effect is likely to only be temporary. What the husband needs to learn is how to identify manipulation and drama and disarm it. Men in my experience are far better at understanding how to do this than women, as women will almost always choose an option which increases the drama.

**Edit:** Laura has returned with an update.
Shortly after I published my post revisiting the question of troublesome mother-in-laws my wife found a recent edition of Dear Prudence about a difficult mother-in-law. The woman writing to Prudence explains that she and her husband make a habit of bringing the in laws on vacation with the family. On the latest trip the mother-in-law rewrote a children’s book with the daughter, creating a happy ending where the girl’s parents die and the girl gets to live with her grandmother. The letter writer explains that they have confronted the mother-in-law, but this didn’t make an impact. She closes her letter with the question “What should we do?”, which is wife speak for “What should I make my husband do next?”

The book was about a girl who visits her grandmother for the summer every year; my MIL wrote an ending with my daughter that said the girl’s parents died and she got to live with her grandmother forever. It was written like a happy ending! When we confronted her (away from the children) that it was inappropriate, she blamed our 5-year-old saying it was all her idea. I am so upset I can’t even look at this woman; and now she is suggesting we get together again next month to go camping. What should we do?

Prudence understood the coded question and explained that the wife needs to make her husband (wait for it) confront the mother-in-law. This is the drama seeker’s go to response, so even though the letter writer explained this had already been tried and failed, Prudence reiterated that manipulating the husband into yet another drama filled confrontation is the only solution:

It’s time for your husband to explain to his mother that while she obviously loves the kids, and vice versa, she has to do some serious rethinking about her behavior. He needs to explain that she may not be aware of it, but she constantly undermines the two of you as parents. Now she’s gone off the rails entirely with the fantasy book ending that refers to the joys of orphanhood. I think he should tell her that an extended summer get-together is on ice this year. He can say you two are so steamed that you’re going to go away as a family without including the in-laws. He can say that he hopes this hiatus gives her a chance to think about how to be a loving grandmother without being an undermining one.

It always cracks me up when people start by explaining how entirely unreasonable someone is being, and then follow up with a solution which would only apply when dealing with someone who is generally speaking reasonable. As I explained in the previous post, this kind of dramatic confrontation is the troublesome mother-in-law equivalent of crack. There are so many ways for a trouble-making mother-in-law to parry such a clumsy response that all I can say for sure is the mother-in-law couldn’t have asked for a better outcome. It may be that the husband will decide bringing his folks along on future family vacations is a bad idea, but setting this up as a punishment only invites decades of “poor me” performances by the mother-in-law. That in doing this he isn’t acting under his own steam, but instead taking
orders from a gaggle of gossiping women makes the situation all the worse. This is a major victory for the mother-in-law, and decades of high drama will undoubtedly ensue.

There is another point that the letter writer and Prudence are both missing. The most serious issue here is not the harm to the wife’s feelings, but the potential harm to the daughter herself. She is being used as a pawn by her grandmother to stir up trouble, and this has to be at least somewhat harmful. But Prudence and the letter writer are so caught up in the drama, all they see are the letter writer’s hurt feelings. For both the mother-in-law and the wife, the child is merely a pawn.
Someone should have warned them.

by Dalrock | June 1, 2015 | Link

The Daily Mail has a heart rending story* about some recent immigrants to the UK who ended up in prison because they didn’t fully understand the local laws and customs. New to the country and in dire need of money, the immigrants set out to use promises of love and commitment to con local Brits out of half of their stuff.

In the case detailed by the Mail the mark (Mrs. Hardman) had recently acquired nearly 400,000 pounds the old fashioned way, in a divorce. After buying a new home for 200,000 pounds, Hardman still had 190,000 pounds left. The new immigrants were able to con her out of 170,000 pounds with false promises of love and commitment, but failed to follow local law and custom when doing so. As a result, the men are now in prison.

To all new immigrants to the US and the UK, I urge you to learn about our laws and customs. Yes we have a cherished tradition of conning gullible rubes out of half of their stuff using false promises of love and commitment, but there are customs and procedures which must be followed when doing this. Before you start conning anyone with false promises of love and commitment, make sure you contact a local divorce attorney to learn how to do this within the law. You may also want to contact a local Catholic priest or a Protestant organization like Focus on the Family to learn how to do this morally as well.

*H/T TFH

See Also: Hey, that’s *our* trick!
Unhappy? Make your husband put a deposit into Dr. Harley’s Bank.

by Dalrock | June 5, 2015 | Link

Commenter Trust asked if I would give my thoughts on a post by Willard F. Harley, Jr., Ph.D. titled When to call it quits (Part 1). Dr. Harley explains that up to 80% of divorces are caused by what he calls “neglect”. He states this in a gender neutral way, but he makes it clear that he is talking about wives losing attraction for their husbands:

On the subject of neglect, I’ve chosen to feature a marriage that isn’t all that bad from most people’s perspective, but isn’t good either. L.R.’s husband hasn’t abandoned her physically, leaving her to fend for herself. Instead, he’s only abandoned her emotionally. They probably even have a friendship of sorts. It’s cases like these that leave a wife struggling to know what to do.

As it turns out, most of these women divorce their husbands. In fact, research I’ve personally conducted in the archives of government statistics on the causes of divorce lead me to believe that as many as 80% of all divorces are caused by neglect. Women like L.R. suddenly call it quits with little warning, leaving her husband, family and friends scratching their heads wondering what’s wrong with her.

Harley explains here that his fundamental approach is to focus on restoring the wife’s feelings of romantic love and attraction to her husband:

The difference between my approach to saving marriages, and the approach of most other therapists, is that I focus on building romantic love (being “in love”) between spouses, rather than simply focusing on conflict resolution. As it turns out, I also address conflict resolution, but I do it in a way that builds love between spouses.

Aside from his deep hostility to marital commitment (more later), this isn’t a bad secular approach. Feelings of attraction and romantic love are a sort of all purpose lubricant. When the attraction is there it is easy to overlook other issues. When it is gone the smallest issues often seem gigantic.

Correction: This wouldn’t be a bad approach if Harley understood the mechanics of attraction. The foundation of Harley’s work on marriage is a concept he has dubbed the Love Bank. The Love Bank is a sort of ledger of warm fuzzies and cold pricklies. Build up enough warm fuzzies while minimizing cold pricklies in the ledger, and sexual attraction suddenly appears:

We like those with positive Love Bank balances and dislike those with negative balances. But if an account reaches a certain threshold, a very special emotional reaction is triggered — romantic love. We no longer simply like the person — we are in love. It’s a feeling of incredible attraction to someone of the opposite sex.
Since he makes it clear that this is a problem of wives not feeling attraction to their husbands, what this really means is the key to men becoming sexually attractive to their wives is to do more nice things for them. This is what Rollo calls negotiating desire, and not only does the approach not work when men try it, it makes the problem much worse. Harley claims this approach is revolutionary, but it is simply (deeply flawed) modern conventional wisdom. This kind of thinking is everywhere, which is the reason for the uncanny resemblance to the movie Fireproof with it’s accompanying Love Dare.

Getting back to When to call it quits (Part 1), Harley’s advice to wives who don’t feel the tingle anymore is his own special flavor of the wake-up call. He sets this up as a two part system. In part A the wife does everything she thinks the husband wants for 30 days. Before she does this however she secretly prepares for part B, where she ambushes her husband by either kicking him out of the house (if they have children) or moves to a new apartment. Long time readers will see the strong resemblance between Harley’s “Plan B” and what Joel and Kathy Davisson call lowering the boom. The strategy in both cases is to crush the husband with threats to destroy the family, in order to get the husband to buy the authors’ products and start doing what the wife demands. In both schemes once the husband grovels enough the wife will regain her attraction for him.

Harley gives the example of a Christian woman named Ellen who had lost her tingle and found herself tempted to cheat on her husband:

> Her husband, Ken, was not abusive, but didn’t meet her intimate emotional needs. She is a Christian, but told me that she was very tempted to have an affair or divorce her husband.

Harley’s advice on how Ellen should handle her strong temptation to cheat and/or divorce was to bring these temptations much closer. Following his advice, she moved out of the marital home to a secret location:

> Sometimes, especially when an unfaithful spouse refuses to end an affair, I recommend no contact at all for plan B. If he wants to contact her, he must talk through a designated mediator. But in this case, I didn’t feel that a mediator was necessary and that Ellen could talk with Ken by cell phone. He didn’t know her address, however.

Harley also suggested that Ellen offer a reward of sex if her husband went to a counselor and purchased one of Harley’s books:

> I had explained to Ellen how her husband would probably react at first: He would throw a fit. And that’s precisely what happened. He told her that he was filing for divorce, and that she was now on her own. I also predicted what might happen next: After he had a chance to cool off, he’d want to have sex with her. That also happened right on schedule after two weeks had passed. My advice to her was that she should agree to it only after he saw a counselor with her that would take them through “His Needs, Her Needs.” Since her husband hated me after he learned that I was the architect of this plan, I suggested that she find a local counselor who was...
familiar with my books and methods, which she did.

This is how these systems almost always work. The threatpoint of infidelity and the brutal family courts is subtly or not so subtly used to sell the author’s books & workbooks, DVDs, home study courses, coaching services, etc.

But wait, there’s more!

Harley closes by warning wives that they really need to lower the boom Plan B their husband to get him to buy and follow his products. If they don’t they risk being stuck in a loveless marriage or forced to not honor their marriage vows. In fact, by crushing their husband with the threats of the family courts they will be doing their husband a favor:

If you want to be among the 20% that are happily married, you may need to do something drastic-like follow my plan. Or you will become one of the 20% that live together unfulfilled (like you are now), the 20% that stay married, but eventually separate for the rest of their lives together (like you may end up), or the remaining 40% who throw in the towel and divorce.

I strongly encourage you to be among the 20% with a very fulfilling marriage. While your husband may not like my plan at first, especially if you separate from him, if it succeeds, he will be a much happier man. He will come to recognize, as you do, that a great marriage requires a mutual effort. Both spouses must take their marital responsibilities seriously by meeting each other’s intimate emotional needs.

Harley’s claim is that unhappy marriages only get better if wives take over and crush their husbands. He tells us outright that his plan often leads to infidelity and/or divorce, but he positions it as the only viable option (emphasis mine):

There’s the possibility that your husband will not want you to return. He may be happy that you’ve left. Separation is always a dangerous step to take because it often leads to an affair or divorce. But what are the alternatives?

Some people wait and hope for a change of heart. But as I mentioned earlier, time can go by very quickly. Before you know it, 20 more years will have passed without any improvement.

It’s sad to consider how many people put up with a loveless marriage and simply live independently. In fact, about 20% of all married couples die having been separated for many years. And while another 20% continue to live together, they don’t have much of a relationship — it’s like your marriage. Only about 20% have a romantic relationship throughout marriage-they meet each other’s intimate emotional needs.

This won’t help Harley or others like him sell their wares, but the reality is that simply sticking to it and honoring your marriage vows when times are rough is a very effective plan. From Does Divorce Make People Happy? Findings from a Study of Unhappy Marriages:

Two out of three unhappily married adults who avoided divorce or separation ended
up happily married five years later.
One of the more common complaints about Game is that its proponents challenge our modern value structure by equating sexual attractiveness with virtue in men. This is an especially common complaint when it comes to the classification of men into the categories Alpha, Beta, etc. It certainly is true that Heartiste measures the value of a man by the man’s ability to attract and bed women, as he explains in Defining the Alpha Male (link NSFW, emphasis mine):

Many want to believe that getting girls is ancillary to being a true alpha male; that the real measure of an alpha lies in his ability to dominate other men, or his command of his environment, or his thirst for swashbuckling adventure. While these are admirable alpha traits, they are nothing but a means to an end. Make no mistake, at the most fundamental level the CRUX of a man’s worth is measured by his desirability to women, whether he chooses to play the game or not. Pussy is the holy grail. That is why the obese, socially maladroit nerdboy who manages to unlock the gate to the secret garden and bang a 10 regularly is an alpha male. And that is also why the rich, charming entrepreneur who because of an emotional deficiency or mental sickness lives mired in parched celibacy is not an alpha male.

But even here, Heartiste isn’t talking about virtue. He isn’t saying that the ability to generate the tingle is what makes a man good morally. To the contrary, Heartiste regularly reminds his readers that women are attracted to the worst sort of men. From Chicks Dig Jerks: More Scientific Evidence (language warning):

So what is this study telling us? What Heartiste concepts are validated?

- Narcissistic, irrational self-confidence is more attractive to women than modest, rational defeatism. (See: Poon Commandment XI)

- Being a rule breaker (a form of psychopathy) is attractive to women. (Playing by the rules will win you plaudits from polite society, but it won’t help you get pussy.)

- Using people for personal gain is attractive to women.

- The Dark Triad works best for short term sexual hookups (the kinds of mating opportunities most men would jump at if they were easy to get). LTRs require a small but significant infusion of beta provider game to remain healthy and satisfying for any woman.

- Being disagreeable (an asshole, that is) is attractive to women.
- Being power-hungry is attractive to women.
- Never sweating the small stuff is attractive to women.
- In other words, being an aloof, uncaring asshole — an amalgamation of all the above traits — makes you optimally attractive to the greatest number of hot chicks.

This is as he notes a long running theme for Heartiste. See the related posts at the bottom of the page (here, here, and here) if you require more evidence that Heartiste isn't confusing the ability to generate the tingle for virtue.

Ironically, when it comes to the equation of male sexual attractiveness with virtue, Heartiste is directly challenging conventional wisdom. It isn’t pickup artists who are mistaken by thinking that men’s virtue is measured by their ability to generate the tingle; it is everyone else.

This is probably easiest for most to see with feminists and their liberal allies, since they have been very open about replacing biblical sexual morality with a strict focus on romantic love and “consent”. Both of these are really just code words for the tingle however. Romantic love and the tingle are separate conceptually, but for practical purposes they are one and the same. I would also challenge my readers to find a biblical distinction between romantic love and sexual desire. Consent would at first sound like something different, but when feminists say consent they mean the woman is sexually attracted to the man. This is why feminists call sex which the woman later regrets rape, and why a woman who trades sex for food and lodging is also said to have been raped.

But it isn’t just feminists who equate a man’s ability to generate sexual attraction with his virtue. Modern Christians and other conservatives go even further in this direction. Feminists are attempting to toss out what they see as an outdated value structure grounded in superstition, and replace it with a human derived code. Christians have also thrown out biblical teaching on sexual morality. The difference however is that Christians are now teaching that God designed women to only be attracted to good Christian men. This new view is taught without controversy because it is so thoroughly accepted.

**The clitoris as a divining rod for virtue.**

In a post decrying the wickedness of sexual immorality, Dr. R. Albert Mohler Jr. (President of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary), explains that by God’s design a wife’s sexual attraction for her husband is a barometer of the man’s righteousness:

Put most bluntly, I believe that God means for a man to be civilized, directed, and stimulated toward marital faithfulness by the fact that his wife will freely give herself to him sexually only when he presents himself as worthy of her attention and desire.
t is for tingle

And it isn’t just the most conservative modern Christians like the Southern Baptists who now teach that the hallmark of a man’s virtue is his ability to generate the tingle. This view is ubiquitous throughout modern Christian culture. Christians the world over (both Protestants and Catholics) delighted in the message of the movie Fireproof, where the proof that Caleb was finally a changed man came from his wife falling out of love with the doctor she was leaving him for and falling back in love with Caleb. Only through the power of the tingle could Caleb redeem himself, save his marriage, and save his wife’s soul. In this new view the symbol Christians have used as a reminder of Christ’s sacrifice for nearly two thousand years is now transformed into a “t” for “tingle”. By the mysterious power of the tingle, Caleb, his marriage, and his wife were all saved. Christians delighted in this spiritual message, and these thoroughly unbiblical ideas were not even recognized as such let alone debated outside of the manosphere.

It isn’t just at the extremes that we see the worship of the tingle either. It isn’t just radical feminists and conservative Christians. Everyone in between now worships the tingle without a second thought. As I showed recently, secular marriage counsellors also believe that a wife’s loss of attraction for her husband is a symptom of his loss of virtue. Dr Harley’s approach to bored wives is the same as the approach in Fireproof, and is perfectly aligned with our new legal view of the family. Men who can’t generate the tingle deserve to be not only punished, but crushed. Men who can’t keep their wives tingling deserve to have their families destroyed, their children taken from them, and very often even deserve to be imprisoned.

We live in a world where a man who fails to generate tingles is seen as contemptible by both feminists and conservatives, by seculars and Christians alike. Aside from a tiny minority, Christians range from outright rejecting biblical teaching on men and women to feeling ambivalent about what the Bible teaches. In this world Heartiste’s greatest challenge to modern moral sensibilities isn’t his celebration of the tingle, but instead his (modern Christian and secular) heretical assertion that generating the tingle isn’t the ultimate sign of virtue in a man.

Cross graphic released to the public domain by Boris23.
F. Roger Devlin contacted me and offered me a copy of his new book *Sexual Utopia in Power: The Feminist Revolt Against Civilization*. Since it is only $3.49 for the Kindle version I’ll buy the ebook instead, but I appreciate his kind offer. Either way I look forward to reading more of his work, having only read parts of *Rotating Polyandry and Its Enforcers* what seems like a lifetime ago.

Here is the Table of Contents from the Amazon page:

- Introduction: The Facts of Life
  1. Sexual Utopia in Power
  2. Rotating Polyandry—& its Enforcers
  3. The Female Sexual Counter-Revolution and its Limitations
  4. Home Economics
  5. The Family Way
  6. Back to Africa: Sexual Atavism in the Modern West
  7. The Question of Female Masochism
Father’s Day predictably brings out diverse sentiments in our post marriage world. For Christian leaders it brings out contempt for husbands and fathers, including the now traditional (if not obligatory) sermon tearing down men in front of their families. Christians who need more contempt for fathers can of course always supplement the Father’s Day sermon by watching Christian movies like Courageous and Mom’s Night Out.

For women who either chose to have children without marrying, or chose to expel their children’s father from the home, Father’s Day brings out attempts to rationalize why children don’t really need fathers anyway. As a sign of the times, Disney’s Babble brings us two pieces of rationalization by women who chose to be single mothers. My Daughter Has a Father, but I Wish She Had a Daddy is standard for the single mother rationalization genre (albeit with an adoption twist).

More unusual is an article by Dresden Shumaker titled My Son Doesn't Have a Dad, But We Still Celebrate Father's Day. Shumaker explains that she is a single mom by choice who was raised by a single mom, and refers to her son’s father as his donor.

His donor is not his parent. He knows this, I know this, and some days I need to remind others of this.

She explains that she and her fatherless son celebrate Father’s Day by pretending her son’s cat gave him Father’s Day presents.

In the past, W has been gifted small trinkets on Father’s Day from his stuffed animals. This year, his new kitty will be the gift-giver. W has been an amazing pet parent to his cat and I have been so proud watching him learn and embrace new responsibilities. Being honored on Father’s Day is a small way to remind W of this.

This is a family tradition that her grandmother started doing with Shumaker when she herself grew up without a father. It is also, incredibly, a family tradition that she believes sets the stage for her son to one day celebrate Father’s Day with his own children:

...I can bet those of us raising sons hope that one day they will be fathers with a bookcase full of “Happy Father’s Day” gifts.

This year, my son is one step closer to filling up that shelf.

See Also: The normalization of the trashy single mother.
Slumlord argues that prior to modern feminism what we had was affirmative action for men:

The thing is when you take the shackles away from some women they actually outperform men (in certain areas) and many of you simply can’t accept this fact blaming it on Feminist mind control, whatever. The cognitive neuroscientist have a name for this type of error; Magical thinking.

The traditional way of dealing with this natural superiority was to put disabilities on women while privileging men. When my parents came to Australia, my mother worked in a Tannery for half the wages of the man working next to her. (Brad A. Natural justice? Wondering why the feminists get an ear amongst otherwise normal women.) Turning the clock back will simply reset things to the preconditions that allowed feminism to thrive. So it’s not gonna work.

I’ve addressed a similar argument of his about feminism “unshackling women” previously, but his specific claim around legal discrimination by sex in wages had me curious what I could find on this. Slumlord is referring to Australia with regard to his mother’s experience, but since I’m in the US and we are discussing the West in general I looked for information on the US. Infoplease explains that until 1963 it was legal in the US to discriminate based on sex when it came to job positions and wages:

**Help wanted—Separate and Unequal**

Until the early 1960s, newspapers published separate job listings for men and women. Jobs were categorized according to sex, with the higher level jobs listed almost exclusively under “Help Wanted—Male.” In some cases the ads ran identical jobs under male and female listings—but with separate pay scales. Separate, of course, meant unequal: between 1950 and 1960, women with full time jobs earned on average between 59-64 cents for every dollar their male counterparts earned in the same job.

It wasn’t until the passage of the Equal Pay Act on June 10, 1963 (effective June 11, 1964) that it became illegal to pay women lower rates for the same job strictly on the basis of their sex. Demonstrable differences in seniority, merit, the quality or quantity of work, or other considerations might merit different pay, but gender could no longer be viewed as a drawback on one’s resumé.

This change in the law was then followed up by further actions by the legislature and the courts:
The Courts Nix the “Going Market Rate” for Women

The act was gradually expanded over the next decade to include a larger segment of the workforce, and between June 1964 and Jan. 1971 back wages totaling more than $26 million were paid to 71,000 women.

This explains the source of the belief that women were systematically paid less for the same value of work as men under the evil patriarchy, or as Slumlord likes to say, before we “unshackled women”. But as we know, even today after decades of social engineering and ever expanding affirmative action programs for women (including it would seem in the near future the Army Rangers), women still earn less than men. This raises the question; how much of the previous difference was due to legal discrimination against women, and how much was due to women being paid less because of their different choices and productivity?

Infoplease tells us in The Wage Gap that in 1963 women earned 58 cents for every dollar earned by men. What effect did the Equal Pay Act have on women’s wages after the law went into effect in 1964 and the and the courts took aggressive action through 1971? Infoplease provides a timeline in The Wage Gap, by Gender and Race

Note that in 1975 after infoplease tells us that legal discrimination by sex was entirely abolished, the ratio of women’s earnings compared to men actually declined by half a penny to 57.5. By 1980, a full 16 years after the law took effect and more than ten years after the courts had taken aggressive action, White women still earned only 58.9 cents for every dollar earned by men. 16 years after the law passed, White women’s relative wages were less than a penny greater than under the bad old days of legal wage discrimination. Granted these aren’t apples to apples numbers, because the 1963 figure is for all women compared to all men. However, there is no reason to believe that White women were more discriminated against because of their sex than women of other races were. We can double check this as well by comparing the all races figure Infoplease gives for 2013 with the one for White women:

At the time of the EPA’s passage, women earned just 58 cents for every dollar
earned by men. By 2013, that rate had increased to 78 cents.

Note that the 2013 ratio for all races (78) is the same ratio for White women in the chart above.

This early period after the change in the law matters because we know that aside from employers potentially helping men at the expense of women, women’s choices play a huge role in the differences in earnings. Women choose easier lower paying majors in school, and they tend to choose lower paying lower stress and less dangerous jobs than men. They also tend to take time off to have and raise children, lowering their peak earnings compared to men. If women were truly “shackled” under the old system, we would expect an improvement to closely follow the change in the law and actions by the courts. Likewise, changes due to affirmative action for women and changing priorities of women as feminists have radically reordered our culture would be expected to show up later. As you can see, the big changes in women’s earnings relative to men came not immediately following the change in the law, and not even in the 16 years following the change. The big changes we have seen have occurred after 1980.

Australians may well have shackled their women, and if so I would welcome Slumlord or anyone else to present data on this. But for the US at least, the idea that prior to the law changing in 1964 men received affirmative action in wages is to borrow a phrase, magical thinking.

**Edit:** Fixed the chart to reflect the uneven time intervals of the data set.
Better data/chart on the history of the wage gap.

by Dalrock | June 23, 2015 | Link

As I noted in the discussion of the last post, the data I presented is from feminists. Specifically, Infoplease states that the source of the data I used for the chart on the previous page is from The National Committee on Pay Equity (NCPE):


What is the NCPE? From their about page:

| The National Committee on Pay Equity (NCPE), founded in 1979, is a coalition of women’s and civil rights organizations; labor unions; religious, professional, legal, and educational associations, commissions on women, state and local pay equity coalitions and individuals working to eliminate sex- and race-based wage discrimination and to achieve pay equity. NCPE’s purpose is to close the wage gap that still exists between women, as well as people of color, and men. |

Since the data I presented had the problem of comparing the “wage gap” for all women in 1963 with later figures for White women, I decided to see if the NCPE had a time-line for all races going back to the period prior to the passage of the Equal Pay Act. They do. Here is the full time series they present in chart form:

17 year period between the implementation of the Equal Pay Act outlawing wage discrimination by sex and the beginning of the increase in women’s earnings relative to the earnings of men. Feminists are telling us that after this law went into effect nothing changed,
and I’m inclined to believe them. Here is a chart showing just 1960 to 1980 for more detail (the Equal Pay Act went into effect in 1964):

![US Women's Earnings as a Percentage of Men's Earnings, 1960-1980](https://dailrock.wordpress.com/)
The cheating hearts of the patriarchal cartel.
by Dalrock | June 24, 2015 | Link

Following up on yesterday’s post, it is entirely possible that the employers of the patriarchy:

1. Were legally permitted to discriminate against women.
2. Were socially encouraged to do so.
3. Stated that they were paying men more than they paid women for the same work.
4. Intended to discriminate against women (believing this to be good for society).
5. Believed they were paying women less than men for the same work.
6. Were not actually paying women less than men for the same work.

How can 1-5 be true, and #6 also be true? To understand this, you need to consider the mechanism an aspiring woman-shackling patriarch has to use in order to create a society where men are systemically paid more than women for the same value of work. This is very similar to a cartel of producers which agrees to collude to limit production to increase prices. In this case however, the cartel is of consumers (of labor) who agree to collude to overpay for the labor of men for the good of society.

The problem every cartel faces is while the members collectively agree that the plans of the cartel are for the good of the group, individually there is always a temptation to cheat. OPEC’s members may come to agreement on a quota to restrict supply, but individual countries have an incentive to produce more than their agreed quota in order to maximize their own revenue and profit.

In order to overcome the problem of cheating, cartels need to be able to easily spot cheating and they need an effective mechanism to punish it. Without the ability to effectively detect and punish cheating, cartels tend to drift into irrelevancy as each member loudly extols the virtues of the pact while quietly acting in their own best interests. This explains how 1-3, and even #4 could be true while item 6 was also true. Each employer has the incentive to claim they are following the agreement of the cartel, and when they came to the agreement they may have originally intended to honor it.

Bullet 5 (they believed they were paying women less) requires a bit of explanation about labor as an input into production. It is very difficult to pin down exactly what any given person’s labor is worth. Years of schooling or experience don’t always predict productivity and quality. Additionally in order to determine the value of a person’s labor often it isn’t a simple matter of how much an employee will produce and the quality of their product in the next period. Other factors come into play like how the employee influences the team, their hours of availability, and how long they stick around after the employer experiences the sunk cost of hiring and training them. We would expect an individual employer to struggle quite a bit to get this exactly right with each individual employee. However, in the absence of an effective cartel we would expect employers in general to get this at least fairly close to right with the available labor pool over the longer term.

Note that once discrimination was outlawed it became illegal for employers to publicly
demonstrate to their fellow cartel members that they were holding the line. Any proof that they were choosing to pay men more would be grounds for legal action. Additionally, any previous forms of social pressure applied to cheating firms were now impossible. The change in the law made it impossible to both detect cheating and to punish it. Any traction the cartel had previously gained would now be impossible.

Based on the fact that in the 17 years following the change in labor laws women’s relative earnings remained flat, it appears that the labor market in general was already extremely close to what was in the best interest of the employers. It wasn’t until feminists could make longer term changes to our culture (and therefore the choices of women) and implement muscular affirmative action that we started to see a real move in the relative earnings of women. From the feminist perspective changing the law may have been a prerequisite for the other changes they eventually made, but by itself it did nothing to close the wage gap.

This had to have been incredibly frustrating for feminists at the time, and as it turns out they had the cheating men of the patriarchy to blame. The woman-shackling patriarchs may well have thought they were keeping the wages of men artificially high, but their actions after the legislature and the courts broke any possible cohesion of the cartel strongly suggests they were in fact failing to do so.

See also: Sex Cartel!
The Daily Mail has a story up about a new (in development) app called HeroBoyfriend. The app is born from the developer’s experience of being blindsided by a breakup with a woman who clearly wasn’t into him from the very beginning:

We met on the beach in Philip Island, New Years Eve 2002. She told me she was from Zimbabwe and I believed her. She spoke with this funny accent which I later learned was an in-joke between girlfriends. It was a way to tease would-be suitors like myself. She was captivating. Tall, dark with amazing brown eyes. I could tell she was creative and probably complex. I fell for her straight away.

It took 6 weeks before she agreed to go on a date with me.

The most surprising part of the story is that she stayed with him for twelve years.

In early 2014 I quit my job as a successful lawyer and launched a startup. Within 3 months my 12 year relationship with the girl of my dreams was dead. The girl I thought I would grow old with was now “my ex”, and I was left trying to make sense of the broken pieces. This my story of how it happened, what I learned and why I started HeroBoyfriend.com

Not surprisingly the app is designed to build a better beta. From the press section of the app’s website:

HeroBoyfriend, you don’t have to treat her mean to keep her keen.

Mobile application begins enlisting applicants for the private beta of its boyfriend improvement (girlfriend retention) service.

Ouch.

Not all of the advice is bad, as it does recommend exercising regularly and dressing well. But most of it is as cringeworthy as you would expect from an app born of beta confusion and desperation.

I suspect the app will do well as it is selling conventional wisdom. They can also count on a good deal of free advertising both from papers like the Mail and via social media.

Related: Romance 101: How to stop frustrating your wife.
Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right. 2 “Honor your father and mother,” which is the first commandment with promise: 3 “that it may be well with you and you may live long on the earth.”

4 And you, fathers, do not provoke your children to wrath, but bring them up in the training and admonition of the Lord.

— Eph 6:1-4 (NKJV)

Sunshine Thiry was skeptical of my statement in a recent post that tearing down fathers is a modern Christian Father’s Day tradition. Specifically, she was skeptical of my statement:

For Christian leaders [Father’s Day] brings out contempt for husbands and fathers, including the now traditional (if not obligatory) sermon tearing down men in front of their families.

She hadn’t noticed such a tradition, so when she went to church on Father’s Day she wanted to see how her pastor would handle it. Her pastor confirmed the tradition, taking time to explain to the congregation why he was deviating from it. Thiry quoted her pastor’s explanation in her post Do pastors tear down men on Father’s Day?

I have to tell you, it’s our goal on this Father’s Day weekend to lift you up and encourage you. And I have to tell you from history I’ve learned that often Father’s Day is one of the worst days that dads can ever choose to go to church. Because often it’s the only time churches feel like they’re going to have the ears of dads and so what they do is they plan to beat them up royally for all they’re not doing right. Ever been to one of those Father’s Day services? Oh man, I have. In fact, here in the early days of my ministry here, you know what we’d do? Oh man, we planned. We planned for you guys. And then what we did is we’d sing “Cats in the Cradle and the Silver Spoon”. And we’d talk about how you have so royally blown it, the world has gone to hell in a hand basket, and then we’d try and help you recover. And we wondered why dads didn’t like Fathers Day at our church. We don’t do that anymore. What we want this to be is an encouragement to you, we want this to lift you up, and I can’t think of a better story than Abraham’s because he’s like us – far from perfect. And yet he was used significantly from God.”

This tradition shouldn’t be surprising. Father’s Day is a day set aside to honor fathers. This doesn’t translate into modern Christian culture because honoring fathers is a truly alien idea. What would that even look like? Note that Thiry’s pastor doesn’t say that he will honor fathers, he says he will try to encourage them.
Keep in mind that this isn’t about one sermon, or just sermons on Father’s Day, or even about pastors. This is about modern Christians feeling profound discomfort with the idea of honoring fathers. This isn’t a biblical tradition, because the Bible is clear on the importance of honoring fathers. This is about modern Christian culture. Even when modern Christians set out to honor fathers, what they end up doing is tearing fathers down in front of their wives and children. Even worse, this is so deeply ingrained that no one notices. It doesn’t seem out of place because tearing down fathers in front of their families is what we always do. In the post Thiry is responding to I mentioned the movie *Courageous*. Note how well her pastor’s description of his previous Father’s Day sermons summarizes the plot of the movie:

> We planned for you guys. And then what we did is we’d sing “Cats in the Cradle and the Silver Spoon”. And we’d talk about how you have so royally blown it, the world has gone to hell in a hand basket, and then we’d try and help you recover.

If you haven’t seen the movie, or if it has been a while, take a moment to watch the trailer for *Courageous* to see what I mean*. Despite the uncanny resemblance, Thiry’s pastor wasn’t ripping off the Kendrick brothers in his Father’s Day sermons, and they weren’t ripping him off either. This is the formula for approaching the topic of Christian fathers; tear the fathers down in front of their wives and children, and then try to inspire them to do better. As I noted above, this is the pattern even when modern Christians set out to buck the trend of tearing fathers down. This may be hard to believe, but the Kendrick brothers intended for *Courageous* to be the antidote to the secular denigration of fathers. They explained this during the production of the film in an interview with Past The Popcorn:

**Interviewer:** As Stephen [Kendrick] was saying this morning, you can start holding up *Courageous* as the antidote to the popular culture, which now denigrates the role of the male—which rarely prevents viable, positive role models. As a critic, I can point to that as a very unique and special thing that comes out of your work. Do you feel that’s something that’s naturally come out of your work as something God-given, or is that something you’ve really focused on—honed and developed?

**Alex Kendrick:** I would say that we’re driven to do that. That’s the heartbeat behind what we’re doing, other than the general desire to please the Lord. When I turn on the TV—and we don’t watch TV much any more at all—every other character, every other commercial, demeans and devalues the role of the man. It’s terrible. Just take note of the commercials that you see when you’re watching TV. How many of them make the woman look like, “Well, I’m the smart one. The man can’t figure this out, but I can.” And while there’s plenty of demeaning behavior spread around to both sexes, it does seem heavily biased to be anti-father, anti-man. And in movies, when parents are having problems with their children, things get resolved by the parents saying to the children, “Oh, I’m sorry. I was wrong all along. You were right.” I mean, even look at *Finding Nemo*. I love the movie! It’s very well done. But at the end, the father says, “I’m sorry, Nemo. You were right—I was too hard on you.” That seems to be a running theme.

Watch the trailer again, and note that even the trailer has all of the elements the Kendrick brothers are complaining about in secular entertainment. It has all of the elements they
wanted *Courageous* to be the “antidote” for when they were making it. The fathers are failures and the wives are alternating between telling them what they are doing wrong and telling them the *right* way to do what they decide to do. The main character needs to learn to follow his son’s lead instead of the other way around (running vs building a shed), and in the end he apologizes to his teenage son for not being a good father and pledges to do better.

In a separate interview with [CBN](updated link) Alex leveled the same criticism against secular entertainment:

> **Alex:** Look at how media is portraying fathers today. You look at almost any commercial, and the father figure is the idiot, the goober, the guy who doesn’t get it. The wife or mother is the one who really knows what’s going on, the smarter one. And you can’t name one TV show right now that has a really good, honorable father. This generation is growing up with anti-heroes rather than heroes. Rather than *Superman*, truth, justice, and the American way, it’s now Bart Simpson and his dad, Homer.

Yet after *Courageous*, Alex went on to help a friend by appearing in the Christian movie *Mom’s Night Out*. If you aren’t familiar with the movie, it is so full of exactly these themes that it even shocked the [feminists at Dame]**:

> And that’s the biggest problem with Moms’ Night Out: The moral of the story isn’t that the women are supposed to stay home and not have fun, but that the men are totally hapless morons without them around—and that this lesson is still being drilled into our heads in 2014. We’re supposed to feel better about this “men are total idiots, the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world” philosophy (and that latter piece of wisdom was actually uttered in the movie in case you missed the point). But this story of the helpless manchild is a disservice to men—and families—everywhere.

The feminists have it right in this case. Tearing down fathers is incredibly harmful to families. Why is it that even feminists can see what Christians cannot? *Mom’s Night Out* was a huge hit with Christian audiences, as was *Courageous*. These anti father themes didn’t stand out to Christians because Christian culture is even more anti father than secular culture is!

**A Problem With Authority**

At the root of the antipathy for fathers is a revulsion for husbands and fathers having authority. This is true for both secular and Christian culture. For modern Christians the reaction to biblical headship ranges from outright hostility to vocal ambivalence. This poses a serious challenge for those who want to tell Christian husbands and fathers to man up. How can they implore men to follow their God given obligation to lead their families without crossing this bright line and reminding everyone that men have authority which comes with this responsibility? In *Fireproof* the Kendrick brothers negotiated this by inverting the biblical roles of husband and wife, and teaching that a husband’s job is to win the heart of his wife. If a wife rebels against her husband or takes up with another man, this means her husband didn’t love her well enough. They followed this same non-threatening and non biblical pattern in *Courageous* with fathers and their children. They avoided the question of authority...
and instead focused on fathers winning the hearts of their children. Alex explains this in the CBN interview:

Alex: Here’s a principle that we say very clearly in the movie. If I have great conservative rules and regulations, and values in my home, but if I don’t have the heart of my children, they’re not going to listen to me. They will listen to the people that they think really care about them. And most of the time, if a dad is not engaged, it doesn’t matter what his views are. They’re going to listen to their friends. But if a dad captures the heart of his children, then he can speak into their lives, and they will listen, and value what he teaches them.

**Harming the most vulnerable out of fear.**

Thiry’s pastor mentioned that the tradition of tearing down men in front of their families caused fathers not to want to attend church. However, the discomfort of fathers is insignificant compared to the harm this is doing to the families of these fathers. We live in a culture where the family is under assault and wives and children are taught that rebellion is a virtue. The children most harmed by this are the ones having the most trouble honoring their fathers. This could be because the father has serious flaws, or it could be because the child is particularly rebellious. It could even be both. For good fathers with healthy families contempt for fathers from Christian culture merely introduces sand into the gears. Everything is harder than it needs to be, but they are able to power through despite the harm Christian culture causes. This isn’t the case for families who are struggling however. Nearly half of all marriages end in divorce, and large numbers of children aren’t even born to married parents to begin with. For families that are on the edge, for families who are suffering greatly, heaping contempt on the father only makes all of their existing problems worse.

Ironically the common defense of tearing fathers down in front of their wives and children is that it is an act of courage to fix struggling families. However, going with the flow and following the secular culture’s attack on fathers takes no courage, and injecting strife into fragile families doesn’t make them better.

*You can also see my review of the movie here.*

**The still from Mom’s Night Out at the top of the Dame review captures this perfectly.**
Commenter Laura returned to describe how her changed attitude transformed her family dynamic and resolved the problems she was having with her mother-in-law (see here for previous post):

just an update and maybe this might help some others. Since I have last wrote things have been absolutely wonderful in our marriage!

I knew having his mother back in our lives would be horrible and unbearable but I also knew being the barrier between my husband and his mother trying to come back into our lives would also end in the same result. I decided to start sending her pictures trying to show her I was accepting her arrival back into our lives. She never responded not even one time but when my husband used my phone he seen the messages called her to ask why she never responded and she told him she had nothing to say or she would have. This continued with me offering to drive an hour away so she could see the baby and some other nice gestures but the more I accept the situation the more it ticks her off and now she no longer wants to come over or put her two cents in on anything negative.

So its been nice! Haven’t heard from her and my husband told her on the phone in front of me to not say anything negative about his wife to him or don’t bother calling. (this would never have happened in the past)

So nice gestures and letting my husband lead the situation fully, with no side comments on my part has helped greatly. Although yes this is exactly what I tried in the past and it didn’t help at all but this time around I guess bc now he doesn’t take small gestures like that for granted anymore.

Three quick observations:

1. Laura starving her mother-in-law of drama by containing her own reactions caused her mother-in-law to lose interest in stirring up trouble. Drama is like crack to a troublesome mother-in-law. By withholding the drama, the incentive to stir up trouble was greatly reduced.

2. Once her husband was no longer trying to manage being manipulated by women on both sides, he quite naturally became protective of his wife.

3. Laura doesn’t say this outright, but her husband telling his mother to knock it off under his own authority caused his mother to settle down. This isn’t always a given, but often mothers in this type of situation will demonstrate a sense of relief.

While Laura is obviously tempted to rationalize that letting her husband lead wasn’t what delivered the different results, clearly she was able to let him lead enough to get those different results. Especially when something is counter intuitive, often we have to learn a
particular lesson multiple times before we stop fighting reality and accept it. I suspect this isn’t the end of Laura’s mother-in-law troubles, but even so she does have peace now, as well as a template she can go back to if she succumbs to temptation and starts trying to out manipulate her mother-in-law.

Well done Laura.
Republican leadership preparing to roll over on the issue of transgenders in the military.

by Dalrock | July 7, 2015 | Link

Shortly after the Supreme Court made gay marriage the law of the land, Drudge linked to an article at The Hill on the push to lift the ban on transgender troops: Momentum grows to scrap Pentagon’s ban on transgender troops

What stood out to me in the article was the Republican leadership in Congress very obviously preparing to roll over on the issue. The Hill article claims that lifting the ban would face “stiff opposition” from the GOP controlled congress. However, then it quotes House Armed Services Committee Chairman Mac Thornberry (R-Texas) as being astonishingly open to the idea:

The department “needs to look at a variety of policies. As long as they look at it objectively, based on what’s best for the security interests of the country, then we’ll oversee or review what they do,” he told The Hill.

“When there’s a sense that there’s some extraneous social or political agenda ... people get concerned,” Thornberry added.

Representative Thornberry is telegraphing the make-believe argument that he is prepared to go along with when the Pentagon decides that troops have the right to declare they are whatever sex they feel that they are. He is all but pleading with the Pentagon to frame this in such a way that he doesn’t have to pretend to put up a fight. The alternative, that Thornberry is so naive that he doesn’t understand that this is entirely about a social/political agenda, is too absurd to contemplate.

So much for the leadership in the House. Next, on to the Senate:

Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman John McCain (R-Ariz.) struck a similar chord.

“The administration policy should always be a basis for our discussion,” he said.

Senator McCain like Rep Thornberry is looking to the administration for leadership on the topic. Not coincidentally, so are the transgender activists:

“Everyone in advocacy believes this needs to be a Pentagon thing,” said Mara Keisling, executive director of the National Center for Transgender Equality. She added that the legislative push could wind up being an “education and advocacy tool.”

The article notes that Defense Secretary Ashton Carter has been signaling his support for the policy change ever since he took office in February:
“I don’t think anything but their suitability for service should preclude them,” he said.

The White House quickly endorsed Carter’s remarks.

As a hunting buddy of mine likes to say, “It’s all over but the crying”.

What will be interesting is to see how the military tries to manage the inherent contradictions between feminist affirmative action and allowing men to declare they are women. If a man declares that he is a woman, does he still have to pass the much more demanding physical requirements for men? If so, why? Feminists have been telling us for decades that the lower standards for women don’t produce a less capable soldier/airman/sailor/Marine, so it can’t be due to anything related to the job. Since passing the more difficult physical test isn’t required for a trans woman to do the job, then making them take an arbitrarily difficult test must be a form of discrimination against the transgendered. By the same token, shouldn’t a woman who declares that she identifies as a man (and therefore is a man) be required to qualify as a man? Otherwise the military would be saying she isn’t a real man.

Moreover, as I understand the left’s argument gender can be fluid. A man might one day decide he is a woman, and another day decide he is once again a man. All that matters is how the man/woman identifies today. Will the Pentagon be so bigoted as to require that service members pick a gender identity and stick with it? If not, what would prevent at least some service members from switching their identity as it gave them an advantage, then switching back after the test or promotion?

Even more interesting is how this will confuse highly anticipated breakthrough moments for feminists. Feminists are on the cusp of lowering the requirements for women to become Army Rangers, yet CNN has declared that we already have our first female SEAL:

After years spent fighting in some of the world’s worst wars, former U.S. Navy SEAL Kristin Beck says she knows what she wants.
Bonald called it.
by Dalrock | July 9, 2015 | Link

On June 27th Bonald joked in Don't want to be the first one to stop clapping:

A second day of the mandatory rainbow flag on my WordPress editor. At first, the status signaling was mildly amusing; the longer it lasts, the more awkward and funny it will get. Lots of companies are showing their gay pride, and no doubt feeling warmly sanctimonious about it. But life goes on. Still, you know the old joke about nobody wanting to be the first one to stop applauding at the end of one of Stalin’s speeches?

Listen up, WordPress. If you really care about gay rights, I’d better see that rainbow flag tomorrow. I mean, of course everybody expected it yesterday. If you’d just had it for one day, people might have thought you were just doing the bare minimum to keep the SJWs off your back...

...Most important of all, though, you’d better keep an eye on other companies’ websites and keep rainbowing at least as long as they do, because if you don’t, we’ll know that you don’t really care about gay rights as much as those other companies do, and you’ll be scheduled to be eaten.

Two days later, Wired wrote more seriously about this same problem in How Long Should Brands Keep Their Rainbow Logos?

“There’s a danger of jumping on the bandwagon,” says Allen Adamson, North American chairman of the brand consulting agency Landor. Removing the rainbow too soon might seem insensitive to the long fight leading to this moment.

Shortly thereafter Sam Biddle* at Gawker picked up on this and started keeping track of which companies were the gayest, and who stopped clapping first:

To help consumers educate themselves about their choices, we’ll be keeping tabs on the following brave brands as they see out a game of solidarity chicken. Who will be crowned champion of human dignity? What we have here is nothing less than an objective ranking of Who Cares Most.

*When I googled Biddle the first article I found is from Mike Cernovich of Danger and Play: How I Played the Pathetic Gawker Bully Sam Biddle
Disrespecting respectability, dishonoring the honorable.

by Dalrock | July 10, 2015 | Link

In *The Revenge of The Lost Boys* Tom Nichols begins with a familiar question:

What’s going on with young American men?

Nichols focuses primarily on examples of men that Vox Day categorizes as gammas:

Beyond this, they seem to share little beyond a stubborn immaturity wedded to a towering narcissism.

... 

Stuck in perpetual adolescence, they see only their own imagined virtue amidst irredeemable corruption.

...the combination of immaturity and grandiosity among these young males is jaw-dropping in its scale even when it is not expressed through the barrel of a gun.

... 

These young losers live through heroic fantasies and constructed identities rather than through work and human relationships.

...these man-boys are confused about their sexuality and frustrated by their own social awkwardness, and seek to compensate for it. They turn into what German writer Hans Enzensberger called “the radicalized losers,” the unsuccessful males who channel their blunted male social impulses toward destruction.

Yet as the title and opening question both suggest, Nichols isn’t just concerned about a handful of destructive gammas in the news. Nichols is concerned about the overall loss of masculine virtue. He also has a basic understanding of what has gone wrong:

What we don’t really want to think about, because it challenges our cherished political narratives, is why modern society creates such destructive outcasts...

We, the adults, have made this generation of young men by allowing, over the course of some 40 years, the eventual construction of a hyper-sexualized, publicity-obsessed, winner-take-all twenty-first-century culture in which success means money, sex, and fame at any cost. Young males no longer live in a world where there’s a Jack for every Jill, or where social institutions like schools, the police, churches, or the military—all decimated by repeated social attack since the 1960s—provide some kind of equalizing effect among men, protecting and building
up the weaker boys while disciplining and maturing the stronger ones.

This is true, but there is more to it than this. As Novaseeker points out, there is also the problem of perverse incentives. Men are motivated by sex. When society was ordered around lifetime marriage, the way for a young man to pursue sex was to focus on becoming an attractive potential husband. With our embrace of female promiscuity and disdain for traditional marriage, we have created a system where from a practical perspective men are foolish to seek marriage as their path to sex.

The links between men, marriage and civilization.

As a society we benefit enormously from men who are channeling their energy towards first becoming and then being productive husbands and fathers. However, like so many others Nichols misunderstands the relationship between men, marriage, and civilization:

The traditional venues for male socialization (including marriage) have mostly vanished...

Marriage isn’t what socializes and civilizes men. Marriage is the incentive for men to first work to civilize themselves, and then to lead and protect civilization. But the incentive of marriage isn’t limited just to sex. In a healthy society marriage offers an even more powerful reward for men than sex. In a healthy society, marriage and fatherhood confer something even more precious to men, respect.

Respect is a more powerful motivator for men than sex.

This may at first glance seem unlikely. Sex is an incredibly powerful motivator, especially for young men. There is also the problem of overlap, as for men gaining respect is generally a path to sexual success. However, we can both untangle the two and behold the incredible power of respect as an incentive for men by looking at what respect will motivate men to do that promises of sex cannot.

While men will take great risks in part out of a desire for sex, the desire for respect goes even further. The men who willingly gave their lives at Thermopylae did not do so with the expectation of being rewarded with sex. There were no 72 virgins promised to these men. Nor did they entertain the fantasy that they would somehow route the Persian horde and return in triumph. Their motivation, their goal at the Hot Gates was to die an honorable death and thereby earn the profound respect of their society. Likewise the nearly 4,000 Kamikaze pilots in WWII didn’t expect to return home and be lavished with sex. Honor was the only reward for their act of sacrifice.

Withholding respect from the respectable.

As a society we have become incredibly miserly when it comes to respect for men. In addition, the respect we do offer tends to be for men who are working against and not for civilization. Men who work to become husbands and fathers are viewed with either contempt or deep suspicion.
This disdain for respectable men isn’t only coming out of secular Hollywood or the radical feminists leading Women’s Studies departments. This same disdain for husbands and fathers is held with surprising fervor by conservatives, especially conservative Christians. It has become a tradition for pastors to use Father’s Day, a day set aside to honor fathers, as a day to tear husbands and fathers down in front of their families. Christian media is no better. Just like secular movies, Christian movies portray husbands and fathers as villains, failures, and buffoons. Respect is offered to the wise and sexy tattoo artist biker, while respectable husbands and fathers are trashed.

Even when we talk about the family courts, the issue of respect is front and center. Family courts put into concrete action the disdain our society has for fathers. In response to our society’s disdain and contempt for fathers, they have made their primary mission the removal of husbands and fathers from the household. When we talk about the problems of the family courts, we need to consider not just the punishments the courts stand ever ready to mete out against husbands and fathers, but the profound disrespect these punishments represent.

What is most surprising about young men today is not that a handful are acting out in cowardly and destructive ways, nor that a larger but still small number are less conspicuously opting out of the respectable path as we treat respectability with contempt. What is most surprising is that most men still pursue marriage and fatherhood despite how hard we have been working as a society to discourage them from doing so. What should frighten us isn’t that decades of trashing marriage and fatherhood have produced a small number of men who eschew these responsibilities, but that eventually a generation of young men will arrive which fully internalizes what we are quite loudly telling them:

- Only chumps get married, and only a fool would become a father.

*HT Hugh Mann

**It is surprisingly difficult to find good data on the “Peter Pan” manboy phenomenon so often discussed in the media. While there does seem to be something going on, nearly all white women are still able to marry, and to the extent that men are coasting economically, this appears to be about unmarried men choosing to work like women.
As expected
by Dalrock | July 14, 2015 | Link

Pentagon moves to allow transgender troops to serve openly

And there likely won’t be much opposition on Capitol Hill, with Senate Armed Services Chairman John McCain (R-Ariz.) saying he has no major objections.

This is the day after the announcement and I can’t find any press accounts of a reaction by House Armed Services Committee Chairman Mac Thornberry (R-Texas). Neither man’s reaction surprises me, as their previous statements indicated that they were ready to roll over on the issue.
Reality: More young men and women are now living with their parents.

This first item I saw the other day while looking for data on the elusive Peter Pan Manboy. Back in August of 2013 a Pew Research Center study found that 36% of Millennials still live with their parents: A Rising Share of Young Adults Live in Their Parents’ Home. While most Millennial men and women live on their own, young people of both sexes are more likely to live at home now than in the past. Men are a bit more likely to live with their parents (40%) than women (32%). Note that these figures count men and women living in college dorms as living with their parents.

Headline:

Marketwatch picked up the study with the headline: Women leave nest, men stay with parents.

Neither the headline nor the statement quoted above is an accurate description of the data. Most Millennials of both sexes leave home, and the gap between men and women is not new. In fact, the current 8 point gap is smaller than the 11 point gap in 1968.

Reality: Recent spike in heroin use and deaths.

In March of this year the CDC released Data Brief 190: Drug-poisoning Deaths Involving Heroin: United States, 2000-2013. Figure 2 shows that heroin deaths increased for both men and women between 2010 and 2013, with nearly four times as many deaths of men than women:
More men than women died from drug poisoning involving heroin (Figure 2). In 2013, the number of heroin-related drug-poisoning deaths for men (6,525 deaths) was nearly four times that for women (1,732 deaths). From 2010 through 2013, the age-adjusted rate increased from 1.6 to 4.2 per 100,000 for men and from 0.4 to 1.2 per 100,000 for women.

Figure 2. Number of drug-poisoning deaths involving heroin, by sex: United States, 2000–2013

NOTE: Access data table for Figure 2 at: http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/databriefs/db199_table.pdf.

Figure 4 shows that death rates have increased for all races.
However, death rates for 18-44 year old whites have increased so much that they now have the highest rate of death due to heroin:

In 2000, the highest rate for drug-poisoning deaths involving heroin was among non-Hispanic black persons aged 45-64 (2.0 per 100,000) (Figure 4). In contrast, in 2013, the rate was highest among non-Hispanic white persons aged 18-44 (7.0 per 100,000).

Figure 3 shows the breakdown of deaths by age, although it would have been more helpful if they had split out the middle age bracket into two ten year groups:
On July 7th 2015 the CDC followed up with a Vitalsigns article titled Today’s Heroin Epidemic, including the infographic:

Note from the infographic that despite the fact that whites now use (and die from) heroin at greater rates than other races, heroin use is still skewed strongly to people with lower socioeconomic status. Those with low incomes as well as those on Medicaid or with no health insurance have much higher rates of heroin use than those with higher incomes and private
The Boston Globe picked up the *Vitalsigns* article, and their headline reads: **Heroin use spikes among women, higher-income groups**

Study finds new faces of addiction

Women, people age 18 to 25, and those with higher incomes and private insurance have been increasingly falling victim to the drug.

Dr. Sarah E. Wakeman, a specialist in substance abuse treatment at Massachusetts General Hospital, said the report reflects her experience in treating addicts. “It highlights the fact that this has become an equal-opportunity disease,” she said. “Basically, everyone I see is white, they’re equally male and female, they’re younger and affluent — a very different demographic.”
Jessica Valenti complains that not only are men in New York City no longer catcalling her, but our patriarchal culture makes her crave sexual attention from random strangers: *Men rarely catcall me any more. I hate that our culture makes me miss it*

From the time I was 11 or 12 years old – when I began taking the train to school – I’ve been on the receiving end of some of the worst things men say to girls and young women. There was the man in a business suit who told me to “take care of those titties for me”; the man who – when I was in seventh grade – masturbated in front of me on the subway platform near my home; the man who walked by me in the street, leaned in close, and whispered “I want to lick you” so close to my ear that I could feel his hot breath.

It was miserable. But still, as much as I wish it didn’t, the thought of not being worth men’s notice bothers me. To my great shame, I assume I must look particularly good on the rarer days that I do get catcalled.

I think we should be careful not to take anything she tells us about what men in business suits said to her as accurate. As it has been *explained*, when men in business suits catcall women in NYC what they say is always masked by spontaneous sounds of sirens, car horns, jackhammers, etc.

HT *Vox Day*.

*Some time after Vox created the archive link to the page The Guardian changed the headline to: *One perk of older age? Fewer catcalls.*
On Saturday the New York Times warned of the problem of elderly women being conned on dating sites in Swindlers Target Older Women on Dating Websites. They lead with a widow and church secretary in her 70s who fell for such a scammer. Of course, her online dream man was looking for someone just like her, a woman 20-30 years older than him who was “confident” and “outspoken” and wanted to travel to Italy.

[he] described himself as a middle-aged German businessman looking for someone “confident” and “outspoken” to travel with him to places like Italy, his “dream destination.”

While the NYT is doing a service by warning of the scams, it is important to remember that the media itself has been grooming these women their entire lives to believe such scams. It has convinced them that their advanced age is sexy to men in their prime, and that their romantic options are abundant should they only take the plunge and let the desperate studs compete for their attention.

The same media has also taught these women that their cliché feminist personalities are both attractive and rare, something a successful middle aged businessman would be lucky to ever find. The reality is the exact opposite. It wasn’t just the scammers telling these women the lies they wanted to hear. The media has been doing this their whole lives.
I don’t know of a good summary of the small arms ammunition shortage that has accompanied most of Obama’s presidency, but in my own experience ammunition became hard to find shortly after President Obama took office. Things started to get back to normal in the run up to the 2012 election, and then got really bad again after the Sandy Hook shooting in December of 2012.

A January 13, 2013 comment by an irate customer (James) at online ammunition retailer Lucky Gunner captures how high prices went as well as the reason we had something so rare as a shortage in our capitalist economy:

Lucky Gunner customers like myself will remember this when the dust settles, and things are back in stock... 1.05 for .223?

The comment was left on the page for PMC Bronze .223 practice ammunition, which Lucky Gunner is now selling for 38 cents a round. Per the comment, back in January 2013 this same ammunition was selling for $1.05 a round. But even at this price, Lucky Gunner couldn’t keep the ammunition on the shelf. Another customer (Elizabeth) replied the same day:

Just don’t buy it James. In the last hour, they’ve sold 100 units @ $1.05/rnd. All of you people complaining about the price should just go camp out at Walmart where the empty shelves still show $7.86 for 20. At least it’s available here at LG.

Elizabeth followed up less than an hour later:

136 units sold in the last 45 minutes and now they’re sold out again. Supply and demand says their price is TOO LOW! Lot’s of people cheer for capitalism over communism, but get shocked when they see it up close and personal. Why don’t all of you quit buying gas, milk, and bread? That way I wouldn’t have to pay as much for those items.

As Elizabeth pointed out, at the same time stores like Walmart had empty shelves with theoretically much lower prices. As soon as supply would come in it would be immediately sold. You had to either be very lucky or know someone at the gun counter to be able to buy ammunition for the stated price.

I haven’t found a formal statement on this by any of the brick and mortar retailers, but there was a very good reason for them to be hesitant to raise prices enough to let the market clear. The shortage was associated with a perceived push by the Obama administration to go after gun owners. Shooters have long memories and are very passionate about anything they feel is an attack on their constitutional rights. Being seen as profiting from Obama going after gun owners would generate a huge amount of enduring ill will. Ironically had the brick and mortar retailers immediately raised prices enough to let the market clear they could have greatly shortened the panic by soaking up the available reserves of the people doing the most
hoarding. Pretty much all shooters started hoarding to some degree starting around early 2009, but some were buying up thousands of rounds while others bought an extra box or two here and there. Raising prices enough to keep ammunition on the shelf would have also removed the psychological impact of shooters seeing empty shelves.

But again, I don’t think the retailers were wrong. Any brick and mortar retailer which did this would have risked being seen as profiting from Obama going after guns. Online retailers that specialized in ammunition had more freedom to adjust prices, but even here they had to be careful to avoid any perception that they were profiting from the pain of their customers.

After it became clear that Sandy Hook wasn’t going to result in new laws on guns or ammunition, ammunition slowly started becoming more available. I think it was in the fall of 2014 that one of our local sporting goods stores had a big stack of 100 round Winchester White Box (WWB, cheap and cheerful practice ammo) in .40 and .45. I don’t recall the price of the .40 but the .45 was selling for $35 a box so I picked a few up. When I came back the next day there was still a big stack there, so while this was a special sale it wasn’t instantly sold out. Things looked to be settling down.

Then in February of this year the ATF suddenly banned M855 “green tip” .223 5.56mm ammunition. For a while ammunition was harder to find again, but fairly quickly the ATF backed down. Since then ammunition has once again been settling down, and I noticed the other day a local Walmart had 200 round boxes of WWB .45 ammunition for $73. This is 36.5 cents per round, and it isn’t a special sale. They also have 100 round WWB in 9mm for $25.

One thing that makes this situation interesting is that we have had shortages of ammunition under Obama for over six years now. I think many shooters don’t feel that prices have come back to pre Obama levels because we don’t generally think about inflation. Based on the CPI Inflation Calculator, my local Walmart’s price of 36.5 cents per round of .45 in 2015 is the equivalent to 33 cents per round in 2008. This is pretty much in the range of what participants in this thread said was a fair price for .45 in November of 2008. Some in the 2008 thread did report buying ammunition cheaper, especially when buying in bulk online:

| Ammo To Go also has several flavors of 45 hardball at around 300 bucks a thousand. |
| So yeah, 300 bucks a thousand sounds like the going rate these days. |

I checked Ammo To Go, and today they are selling 1,000 rounds of Magtech .45 for $319 ($287.81 in 2008 dollars).

I won’t go through every caliber, but I will note that for some reason .22 LR ammunition still is hard to find locally and expensive online*. I’m sure many of my readers have records on the prices they paid in the run-up to Obama taking office. It would be interesting to see what these past prices look like when compared to similar types of ammunition sold at similar stores today, adjusted for inflation. There will no doubt be differences when looking at not just specific calibers but also specific types of rounds. But overall ammunition strikes me now as not only plentiful but reasonably priced. This doesn’t mean it won’t possibly get cheaper, but if you find yourself running low it might not be a bad idea to pick up a few boxes in the run up to the 2016 election. Likewise if you have been avoiding the range out of fear that you
won’t be able to buy ammunition, you may want to pick some up and go have some fun at the range.

Happy shooting.

*Strangely bricks of .22 ammunition were still available when I first noticed the shortage in April of 2009. I picked up a few bricks at the time, but I’m still shooting through some .22 ammunition I bought over 20 years ago so I haven’t touched it yet. I suspect the reason .22 hasn’t yet recovered is it is seen by many preppers, including those who don’t own a gun, as an alternative SHTF barter currency.
Feminist self loathing
by Dalrock | July 25, 2015 | Link

Feminists have long struggled to define their driving sense of discontentment. Understanding this sense of discontentment is critical to understanding feminism itself. If you don’t know what feminists are devoting their lives in reaction against, you won’t understand what feminism is really for. But as I mentioned above, even feminists struggle greatly to define exactly what they are rebelling against. Betty Friedan famously dubbed the burning sense of feminist discontentment “The problem that has no name” in her much cherished book.

Feminism at its core is about a feeling of envy for men. Feminists don’t deny this, but they claim they are merely envious of men’s position in society. Freud was closer when he coined the term penis envy, but even this only captures a part of the feminist dysfunction. It isn’t so much that feminists wish they had penises, it is that they deeply resent the fact that God made them women. It isn’t just about penis envy, but vagina revulsion.

Feminist icon Germaine Greer made headlines earlier this year when she rejected trans women as real women. Her wording in this rejection was incredibly telling; she didn’t object to trans women on the basis that they had been born with penises, but that they didn’t know what it was like to “have a big hairy smelly vagina”.

You’ve come a long way, baby.

At first glance this is a very peculiar way for a feminist to make this argument, but feminists have been surprisingly open about their struggle with self loathing for a very long time. They have long blamed the patriarchy for making them hate themselves as women and claimed that their goal as feminists was to overcome this self loathing. This comes out in a variety of ugly ways, but very often this involves feminists doing disgusting things with menstrual blood. In 1970 Germain Greer famously tried to mask her own self loathing in her book The Female Eunuch with the statement:

if you think you are emancipated, you might consider the idea of tasting your own menstrual blood – if it makes you sick, you’ve a long way to go, baby

Whether it is claiming a penchant for the taste of menstrual blood, wearing it as lipstick, or painting with it, feminists give themselves away in their try-hard attempts to deny their self loathing.

Drippy vulnerable femaleness

Butch feminist A.K. Summers wrote a comic for Mutha Magazine titled Nursing While Butch. She writes about her fear that breastfeeding would make her feel like a “brood sow”. Her fear was that breastfeeding would be like pregnancy (emphasis hers):

That it was going to keep my drippy, vulnerable femaleness front and center.
Summers explains that much to her relief breastfeeding actually made her feel like a *man*. Being able to breastfeed gave her a super power, like Superman.

One might be tempted to write this mindset off as only applying to butch lesbian feminists*, but as I showed above a sense of disgust at having a vagina and *drippy, vulnerable femaleness* is a universal part of the feminist experience. Moreover, you will find the same kind of revulsion towards motherhood expressed by straight feminists. A different Mutha magazine article, this one by Suzanne Cope, describes a very similar feminist loathing at the biological reality of motherhood. In *Confessions of an Unsentimental Mother*, Cope describes feeling relieved when told she had miscarried:

I began mourning my changing social life, home life, and let’s face it, body, to have this child.

Which is why when the doctor told me I had a miscarriage a few weeks later, I did not cry, or feel anything other than relief.

It turns out she hadn’t miscarried after all, and this brought up Cope’s own feelings of fear and resentment of the thought of being seen as a woman, as a mother:

I swore I would not be defined by my pregnancy. I was not a vessel. I cringed when my belly stared showing, and when colleagues, who once asked about my research and teaching, began inquiring after my health. I felt my identity start to slip through my fingers as my child grew more and more apparent to the outside world.

Similar to Summers seeing breastfeeding as turning her into a brood sow, Cope describes pregnancy as turning her into a vessel, and at times feeling like she was “host to an alien”. And again, there was that drippy vulnerable femaleness (emphasis mine):

And then, at almost 32 weeks pregnant, my water broke. At first I figured this new leakage was one more unfortunate symptom of a growing, and increasingly inconvenient, pregnancy.

But this particular form of drippy vulnerable femaleness was a sign of mortal danger to her child. Cope carried the same feeling of resentment and self loathing even into the hospital as the doctors and nurses worked desperately to save her unborn child:

In a moment, my life was redefined. I could no longer resist being seen as a vessel, for that was all that I was inside the hospital walls. I was no longer called by my name, but referred to as “Mama” by the rotating shifts of nurses who woke me every few hours to check my vital signs, and those of the baby. My new reality, forced upon me weeks before I thought I had to be ready, was rife with compromise.

*Your cavities fight harder to stay in place.*

Last year feminist Amanda Marcotte cemented her position in the Ugly Feminist Hall of Fame with her infamous rant against babies and motherhood.
You can give me gold-plated day care and an awesome public school right on the street corner and start paying me 15% more at work, and I still do not want a baby. I don’t particularly like babies. They are loud and smelly and, above all other things, demanding. No matter how much free day care you throw at women, babies are still time-sucking monsters with their constant neediness.

...

I like drinking alcohol and eating soft cheese. I like not having a giant growth protruding out of my stomach.

...

This is why, if my birth control fails, I am totally having an abortion. Given the choice between living my life how I please and having my body within my control and the fate of a lentil-sized, brainless embryo that has half a chance of dying on its own anyway, I choose me.

...[what a woman] wants trumps the non-existent desires of a mindless pre-person that is so small it can be removed in about two minutes during an outpatient procedure. Your cavities fight harder to stay in place.

When feminists like Gregoire and Valenti tell us their resentment is merely against what they see as the humiliating role of women, they aren’t being fully honest. They aren’t just objecting to serving others by making sandwiches and wrapping presents, they are objecting to what they see as the humiliating fact of being a woman.

**Beauty is in the eye of the Beholder**

Feminist rebellion is at its core a rebellion against beauty. The common expression is that "beauty is in the eye of the beholder”, meaning that there is no such thing as beauty. But this implies that there is no God, and that fallen men are the only beholders who can perceive beauty. If we understand that there is in fact a Beholder (with a capital B), we can understand that beauty is in fact very real and immutable. With this in mind, we also know that the very thing feminists rail against the most is beautiful to God:

Wives, likewise, be submissive to your own husbands, that even if some do not obey the word, they, without a word, may be won by the conduct of their wives, 2 when they observe your chaste conduct accompanied by fear. 3 Do not let your adornment be merely outward—arranging the hair, wearing gold, or putting on fine apparel— 4 rather let it be the hidden person of the heart, with the incorruptible beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is very precious in the sight of God. 5 For in this manner, in former times, the holy women who trusted in God also adorned themselves, being submissive to their own husbands, 6 as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord, whose daughters you are if you do good and are not afraid with any terror.
It is important to note that feminist self loathing doesn’t just apply to women who consider themselves feminists, and it isn’t even limited to women. Modern Christian men and women both loathe what God finds beautiful, in a profound rejection of God Himself. We can see the fruits of this loathing in the theological cross-dressing which is so delightful to modern Christians.

**Feminist self loathing; men’s auxiliary brigade**

While men like Jenner clearly lead the men’s auxiliary brigade, they are not alone. We can see the same self loathing in Christian men seeking out pastors who will figuratively castrate them, just as other men seek out a leader who does so physically. We also see this in the modern Christian loathing of husbands and fathers.

Whatever the expression of rebelling against God’s order and creation, and whether done by man or woman, it is all ugly and will always only bring pain and discord.

*While not all feminists are lesbians, The Other McCain explains that the two are more connected than many would expect.*
How long does IVF allow a woman to delay having children?

by Dalrock | July 30, 2015 | Link

The New Scientist has a new article up titled: When should you get pregnant? Computer knows age to start trying.

Happy with just one? The model recommends you get started by age 32 to have a 90 per cent chance of realising your dream without IVF. A brood of three would mean starting by age 23 to have the same chance of success. Wait until 35 and the odds are 50:50 (see “When to get started”).

The age a woman needs to start trying goes down significantly based on the woman’s unwillingness to accept the possibility of failure. Here is the data they present in table form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chance of realization</th>
<th>1 Child</th>
<th>2 Children</th>
<th>3 Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without IVF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With IVF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note how little IVF helps in this analysis. A woman willing to accept a 50% risk of failing to have at least one child only gains one extra year she can delay starting to try to get pregnant (42 vs 41). The same is true for a woman willing to take a 50% risk of failing to achieve a desired family size of 2 or three children (39 vs 38 and 36 vs 35). IVF helps more for women who are more risk averse, but even here it only buys a few years. A woman who is only willing to accept a 10% risk of failing to have at least one child has to start by age 32 without IVF, vs age 35 with IVF. IVF helps the most for women who are most risk averse and want to have at least three children, raising the maximum age they should start trying from 23 to 27.

See the full article for more detail, but note that this model is regarding fertility and doesn’t take into account the risks of birth defects which are associated with older mothers. The following chart presents data (archive) on this from Ask.com:
Also note that the ages in the table aren’t the age a woman should start looking for a husband; these are the age she should start trying to conceive. When considering when to start looking for a husband, these ages should be reduced based on the woman’s estimates of:

1. How long it will take her to find Mr. right once she starts seriously looking for husband material.
2. How long she plans on dating before becoming engaged.
3. How long she plans on being engaged before getting married.
4. How long she wants to be married before starting to try to get pregnant.

For example, assume a woman is confident that she can find Mr. Right just one year after she starts looking, plans on dating for one year before getting engaged, plans on being engaged for a year before getting married, and wants to wait a year after marriage before starting to try to get pregnant. She should then subtract four years from the ages in the table to find the very oldest age she should start looking for a husband. Using this example, if a woman wants to be highly confident (90%) that she will be able to have two children she should be looking for a husband by the time she turns 23. With IVF she would have a few extra years, but should still be looking for a husband by the time she is 27.

There is however a confounding factor, because the longer a woman waits to start looking for a husband, the harder the husband search tends to be. IVF can help a bit with delayed fertility but it can’t help an older woman find a husband. A woman who is looking for a husband at 23 has a much larger pool of available men, and will find it much easier to fall in love than a 27 year old. Since other women will have already picked first, the pool of available men will also be of lower quality (overall) for a 27 year old woman as well.

See Also:

- Charts on delayed motherhood
- How young should a woman marry?
The ugly feminist secret weapon.
by Dalrock | August 1, 2015 | Link

Feminist Allison Hope reveals her secret weapon at XO Jane (archive):

...I had cracked the code on women’s dominance. It was invisible but had been there all along. **Ladies, we can stink men into submission.**

Thank goodness New York City is so loud. I fart everywhere now. I fart in the grocery store to get the men behind me in line to back up a notch. I fart on the ferry to get men to take their goddamned arm off the back of my seat. I fart at the gym to get the sweaty men to move on over and not take the machine right next to mine. I fart on the street to get men to slow their roll and keep a respectful distance behind me and not encroach on my personal space.

Humid days are the best because the fart hangs around longer...

Hope will no doubt be disappointed to learn that she isn’t the first to discover this particular ugly feminist weapon. See also:

- **Friday afternoon ugly feminists: Hot farts edition.**
- **She’s saving her farts for you.**
The problem isn’t knowledge, but attitude.

by Dalrock | August 1, 2015 | Link

In the discussion of a recent post, Dragonfly asked what things a young woman can do to be more attractive to potential husbands:

...from a man’s point of view, what would that 22 year old woman need to be like to snag a man out of her league? Please list physical/relational/educational/vocational I think some of the women here (in denial) need to see it spelled out from a man.

This is a fair question, and prompted a good discussion. However, as Dragonfly hints the fundamental problem isn’t that most young women don’t know how to attract a man, it is that being sweet and attentive is on nearly all young women’s must not do list.

For a cultural point of reference, Glamour magazine caused an uproar a few days ago by creating a list of things a woman could do to make a man fall in love with her. The Daily Mail describes the squeals of outrage that Glamour would suggest that women be sweet and attentive to a man:

A. Elizabeth West wrote: ‘The 1950s called; they want their advice back.’

Moody Sunflower agreed when they added: ‘It’s 2015, not 1950. WTF??!’

Many argued that the article was encouraging a women to stop being themselves and take on a new persona.

After the ugly feminist meltdown, Glamour pulled the article and replaced it with an apology.

If you are looking for 13 Little Things That Can Make a Man Fall Hard for You, it is no longer available. For a quick explanation of why, here’s our response, posted Monday.

We’ve been taking some heat for a post on man-pleasing tips that ran here a few days ago—and honestly, we kinda asked for it. (That’s the consensus across the Internet and even within our own ranks). We hear you, tweeters—and we agree.

For those who want to see the original list, the Daily Mail article has a copy of it. Note that Glamour wasn’t offering advice to Christian women looking to marry, and that some of the advice is otherwise nonsensical (especially 3 and 13). But the list didn’t cause an uproar over suggesting sex out of wedlock, nor for assuming men will like what women like. The list caused an uproar because it suggested that women be sweet and attentive. Sweet and attentive is now unacceptable.
The good news here is that the young woman who is willing to buck the trend and actually become sweet and attentive will have the advantage of very little competition. The bad news is that nearly all young women who are advised to cast off the feminist miserliness will find such a suggestion unacceptable.

**Should a young woman broadcast her virginity?**

In the discussion following Dragonfly’s question the topic of how to communicate virginity came up. Some suggested a young woman should proactively get the message out that she is a virgin. Others, including Spacetraveller, disagreed:

I don’t advocate that women disclose their ‘status’ to a prospective husband ESPECIALLY if she IS a virgin.
I didn’t understand this at the time I was dating, but I think I understand things better now.
It seems a bit ‘try hard’ if you are trying to convince someone you are a virgin. They will naturally, get suspicious about you.

I never disclosed. When my husband (then boyfriend) directly asked (because of ‘no action’ 3 months or so into our relationship), I actually didn’t answer. He says I blushed and looked away, which is probably true, because I am sensitive about this subject.

I never discussed virginity with anyone who I was interested in or who was interested in me because I thought it was too much of an intimate discussion to have with someone who is not yet ‘established’ as a husband-potential. Even having this discussion with a man was, in itself ‘slutty’, in my view.

Spacetraveller raises an excellent point. There can be a vulgarity about a woman discussing something private in a casual manner, even if the topic is her sexual purity. Note that her reluctance to reply didn’t take on the usual form of “how dare you ask about my sexual past”, but of bashfulness. She read her (now) husband right and he read her right as well. As a result, this worked for her. Other men might be more insistent on getting a clear answer, and I don’t see a problem with that either.

One other problem with a young woman broadcasting her virginity to her social circle is this nearly always is done as a way to set the stage for a celibate boyfriend relationship. The problem for a young woman looking to marry isn’t just that her virginity won’t be believed, but that she will risk being mistaken for wanting a celibate boyfriend instead of a husband.

**See also:** What a setup looks like.
Vice has a post up* on the hashtag #giveyourmoneytowomen. At first glance I thought it was a parody, but Poe’s Law notwithstanding, it seems to be serious (emphasis mine).

Women were banding together to demand payment for all the emotional work we do that goes completely unpaid—the exhausting work of being a tolerant, gentle, nurturing, listening woman in our relationships with men, at all times.

Women put up with a lot of bullshit, and we have a science-backed term for it: Emotional labor. And as with any kind of labor, women are now ready and eager to get paid.

To understand this requires an understanding of the mindset of the miser. To the miser, even the smallest gift is unbearably extravagant. Feminists are misers with love, so while they only give the absolute bare minimum, to them it feels like an unbearable sacrifice.

*H/T Steve Heller
Robolove

by Dalrock | August 4, 2015 | Link

Drudge has a link up today to a Daily Mirror article: Sex with robots to be ‘the norm’ in 50 years, expert claims. What is interesting is the moral argument the expert (Dr Helen Driscoll) lays out:

We tend to think about issues such as virtual reality and robotic sex within the context of current norms.

But if we think back to the social norms about sex that existed just 100 years ago, it is obvious that they have changed rapidly and radically.

Robophilia may be alien now, but could be normal in the near future as attitudes evolve with technology.

She then ties this into our new definition of sexual morality, the existence of romantic love:

People may also begin to fall in love with their virtual reality partners.

... This may seem shocking and unusual now, but we should not automatically assume that virtual relationships have less value than real relationships. The fact is, people already fall in love with fictional characters though there is no chance to meet and interact with them.

Since everyone, including modern Christians, has embraced the view that romantic love is what defines sexual morality this will be an interesting discussion. My guess is the rebuttal will be that since robots can’t love back it isn’t really true love, and therefore isn’t Christian. However, if we could program robotic women to give Christian men the wakeup call and thereby force them to submit to their robo wives, I strongly suspect the lack of reciprocation would no longer be a concern.
Punch harder on abortion.
by Dalrock | August 7, 2015 | Link

This is the way of an adulterous woman: She eats and wipes her mouth and says, ‘I’ve done nothing wrong.’

—Proverbs 30:20

Last month Latest.com ran a story defending abortion with the headline Study: 95 Percent Of Women Feel Relief, Not Sad, After Having Abortions

One of the many arguments against abortion, especially abortions that take place after the first trimester, is that there are lasting, negative psychological effects for the women who have them. Some anti-abortion groups have gone so far as to say that women who regret terminating their pregnancies are actively being “censored.”

However a new study, published in Plos ONE, followed almost 700 women who had abortions as well as a group that were denied abortions for three years. The primary focus of the study was to compare the outcomes of women who had early abortions and those who had them later.

“In crude data, approximately 95% of women completing each follow-up interview reported that having the abortion was the right decision for them...

This is an astounding defense of abortion, and demonstrates an opportunity to punch back much harder. The argument that abortion is a problem because it makes women sad is foolish. What we should instead be pointing out is that our embrace of abortion has turned our women into monsters.

95% of women who murder their unborn children (and have them sold for parts) feel good about having done so! This is what we should be calling out far and wide. Not only does this call out the profound ugliness of abortion, it will pierce the heretofore shameless. Women very often appear impervious to shame, but in reality they are terrified of being called out.

Calling this ugliness out will polarize what would otherwise be team woman into two camps:

1. The larger camp will be the women who wish to distance themselves from something so ugly.
2. The smaller camp will be the women who try to justify feeling good about killing an unborn child and selling it off for parts.*

Both groups will ultimately make the case against abortion, the first will do so intentionally, and the second will do so unintentionally.

www.TheRedArchive.com
This will also split men into groups, but this grouping will be more dispersed. However, two groups are worth pointing out:

1. Pro life white knights will find themselves trying to explain why so many women exercise their “right to choose” against their will.
2. Pro abortion white knights (along with feminist women in camp 2 above) will feel the need to respond to this argument, setting the record straight that women demand this right and are quite pleased when exercising it.

Both groups will leave themselves open to the observation that they are more concerned with the feelings of the adult who decides to do the killing and selling than the unborn child being killed and sold off for parts.

The resulting dogfight will bewilder most observers, leaving them only remembering the profound ugliness of the image of millions of women delighted with their abortion experience. Happy customers, unhappy customers, it doesn’t matter; this is a profoundly ugly business.

*See Amanda Marcotte’s unfavorable comparison of an unborn child to tooth decay for an example of what this will look like.

**Edit:** Pukeko has analyzed the study in question and gives his thoughts on the methodology here.
Laura Lifshitz is back, asking Do the Men Move on First Before the Women, After Divorce?

Every time I have told someone about the divorce, all I hear is, “He will move on before you. The men always do.” Or, “Oh the men need someone so he’ll marry again before you do.” Or, “Well you know...men get over these things quickly. The women stay alone.”

I felt rattled by these words because based on every stranger, coworker and friend, women suffer through loneliness and men find happiness instantaneously. It was the fiftieth time in my life that I wished for a penis.

The answer to her question is it depends on the age of the couple. If the couple is young (say in their mid 20s), it is the ex-wife who almost certainly will find herself with a wealth of dating prospects. It is only later in life, as the SMV fortunes of men and women change, that men find it easier than women. It only seems like men always have it easier because most women now delay marriage so long that by the time they get around to step 5 in the having it all plan the SMV power positions have reversed.

However, I’m not sure it will cheer Lifshitz up knowing that it would have gone much better for her if she had divorced in her 20s instead of her late 30s. At any rate, she has moved from writing about all of the pain her divorce has caused her young daughter to writing about her own pain now that her ex husband has a new girlfriend:

The words. When I knew, I felt as if someone had put a shotgun to my gut. That night I cried for most of the night. In fact, I am pretty sure I have just been random waterworks as if I were a pregnant lady ever since. If you aren’t sure if it’s me, see if the woman is crying. If yes, chances are it’s me.

Lifshitz rationalizes that men fare better in the post divorce dating market because women care more about the children, while men prioritize dating over obligations to family:

“Oh the women always have a tough time. It’s so hard. They focus on the kids. Men don’t want women with kids. Women don’t mind a man with kids.”

So basically, it sucks to be a woman and have a vagina, yet again.

But this is exactly the opposite of what is really happening. We can see this by the relationship between the age of the wife and the risk of divorce. When wives perceive their chances in the dating world and of remarriage are best, divorce rates are at their highest. As the couple ages and the wife’s options outside the marriage dwindle, the risk of divorce steadily decreases. Put another way, the lower mommy’s opportunity to bang other men, the less risk a child has of having their family blown up.
Note the lack of an increase in divorce later in life as the relative SMV prospects of the husband increase. As the AARP survey found, even later in life when the man’s remarriage prospects are better, divorce continues to be driven by women.
Susan Smith eats, wipes her mouth, and says, “I have done no wickedness.”

by Dalrock | August 12, 2015 | Link

This made the rounds a few weeks ago, but I didn’t take the time to look at Susan Smith’s letter to the media until recently. 20 years after she strapped her helpless sons into their car seats and rolled them into a lake, Smith still sees herself as the victim. She also explains that she only tried to cover up her crime out of an abundance of selflessness:

> It has been hard to listen to lie after lie and not be able to defend myself. It’s frustrating to say the least. Mr. Cahill, I am not the monster society thinks I am. I am far from it. Something went very wrong that night. I was not myself. I was a good mother and I loved my boys. The thing that hurts me the most is that people think I hurt my children in order to be with a man. That is so far from the truth. There was no motive as it was not even a planned event. I was not in my right mind. The only reason I lied is because I didn’t know how to tell the people who loved Michael & Alex that they would never see them again. I didn’t want to hurt them. I knew the truth would come out, but I had planned to kill myself first and leave a note behind telling what had happened. I didn’t believe I could face my family when the truth was revealed.

It would be difficult to find a woman with a harder heart than Susan Smith. She is absolutely shameless. Yet note how consumed she is with the knowledge that people on the outside see her as a monster. Never be fooled by the shrieks that your judgment doesn’t affect a rebellious woman.
**Insanity at the races.**

by Dalrock | August 13, 2015 | Link

---

I have previously **explained** why it is much easier and more satisfying for a man to call out a man versus a woman. Calling out men is the path of least resistance, and allows a man to position himself as heroic. Calling out women feels wrong, and tends to be the prelude to a day at the races.

This can be true even when it comes to criticizing an unrepentant child killer like Susan Smith. Nearly all women will be repulsed by the extreme ugliness of a mother who murdered her own children and two decades later is **still** trying to cover up and justify her crime. But a handful will instead **identify with the unrepentant child murderer** and run the rationalization race on her behalf:

Susan Smith was a mentally ill 21 year old girl with a father who committed suicide, a stepfather who molested her, and a husband who cheated on her, abandoned with two small children. She broke. Women do that sometimes, we break, especially when all the men in our lives fail us, **yes fail us** Dalrock. Women do not just spontaneously combust.

---

Hamster pic from Love hamster, Checkered flag from Ewan ar Born. I combined the last two to create the hamster 500 pic. You are free to use this new picture so long as you are in compliance with the original two image licenses.
Funny because it is true.
by Dalrock | August 14, 2015 | Link

On the topic of the denied impact of judgment on women, The Onion presents: Single Woman With 3 Young Children Unaware She Subject Of 984 Judgments Today

...single mother Karen Nichols, 29, was reportedly completely unaware that she was the focus of 984 separate judgments by strangers this afternoon.

...she was the subject of nearly a thousand negative assumptions about her financial situation, relative parenting capabilities, and general promiscuity.

While the bulk of the humor in the piece is in the exaggeration of the judgments people make about single mothers, the satirical premise is not that she is being judged as a single mother, but that she is unaware that this is happening.

Friday Bonus: Couple Brought Together Through Mutual Desperation

Related: The normalization of the trashy single mother.
Why won’t he hurry up and die already?
by Dalrock | August 25, 2015 | Link

New commenter Tab Spangler linked to a blog post by Glenn Greenwald on a woman who fears being outed for her infidelity because of the Ashley Madison hack.

I am female, hold a job with a lot of responsibility, have three kids, one with special needs, and a husband with whom I have not been intimate for several years due to his cancer treatments.

I also used to write about marriage law policy, encouraging traditional marriage for the good of children. My institution has a morality clause in all contracts.

Mine is a loveless, sexless, parenting marriage. I will care for my husband if his cancer spreads, we manage good will for the sake of the children, but we cannot talk about my emotional or sexual needs without him fixating on his death and crying.

Greenwald chose this woman’s example in order to argue for sympathy for the people who are being exposed by the hackers:

As I argued last week, even for the most simplistic, worst-case-scenario, cartoon-villain depictions of the Ashley Madison user — a spouse who selfishly seeks hedonistic pleasure with indifference toward his or her own marital vows and by deceiving the spouse — that’s nobody’s business other than those who are parties to that marriage or, perhaps, their family members and close friends. But as the fallout begins from this leak, as people’s careers and reputations begin to be ruined, as unconfirmed reports emerge that some users have committed suicide, it’s worth remembering that the reality is often far more complex than the smug moralizers suggest.

Certainly anyone with a dying spouse is in an incredibly difficult situation, and by focusing on a woman Greenwald made a sympathetic reaction much more likely by his readers. However, the woman’s profound lack of repentance for her infidelity and empathy for her dying husband are astounding. Her only repentance is for previously holding marriage vows as sacred:

My experiences have led me to soften my views of marriage as my own marriage is a deeply humbling, painful longterm commitment.

I expect to be ridiculed by colleagues, to lose my job, and to be publicly shamed, especially as a hypocrite...

When my outing happens, I suppose I might as well take a stand for those who are trapped in bad marriages. Many of us are doing the best we can, trying in our own imperfect way to cope with alienation, lovelessness, and physical deprivation.
She and Greenwald are on the same page here; the only sin is calling out sin (unless you are calling out the sin of calling out sin, which is of course righteous).

She is also very open about seeing her husband as a villain for not offering her a free pass to whore around while he is sick (and she suggests dying). For what else could she mean when she complains that she can’t “talk about my emotional or sexual needs without him fixating on his death and crying”? If he is unable to perform sexually, no amount of discussion will change that. What she clearly wants is his blessing to do what she did, but he is too selfish to give her this.

Greenwald frames his post as fighting for kindness for the cheating wife, but what he has done to her is anything but kindness. This woman is so self centered she can’t see her own wickedness; Greenwald fails her* by taking the easy path of coddling her and encouraging her to see herself as the victim. Greenwald gets to feel good for protecting a woman, even though he is in reality only harming her. Nothing Greenwald writes will change whether this woman is ultimately outed and loses her job (she has a morals clause in her contract), but he has encouraged her to see her wickedness as not wicked at all. Even worse, she claims she is making a martyr of herself (by remaining married and cheating) “for the children”, but by encouraging her view of herself as the victim it is very likely the children will have the burden of not just a dying father, but of a moral message that their father was cruel for not giving their mother license to cheat while he was dying.

*Greenwald is writing from a secular perspective, but fails her in the same way Christian men are failing Christian women.
New commenter Rachel attempted in several comments to redirect the topic in the discussion of Why won’t he hurry up and die already? beginning with:

Hi, I know this blog is about the destructive and weak behavior of women in their relationships with men. However, I was wondering if you can think of any comparable examples of behavior exhibited by men in their relationships with women. I know that’s not the focus of this blog, though.

There are several problems with the framing of her question. The first is that the post she was responding to was in fact an explanation of how men are failing women, and part of an extended series I’ve done on the topic. Men are failing women terribly by refusing to speak the truth about bad behavior of women. Calling out bad behavior of women is difficult and feels uncomfortable, and men are taking the easy feel good path. This hurts the very women men are refusing to speak the truth about.

But there is another way that men’s failure here is hurting women. Not all women are protective of a push to debauch the culture. While all women (just like all men) face temptation to sin, some women are actively trying to push for better standards of behavior by women. In a properly functioning society, much if not most of the day to day policing of female behavior is done by women, and this is a biblical role.

Likewise, teach the older women to be reverent in the way they live, not to be slanderers or addicted to much wine, but to teach what is good. Then they can urge the younger women to love their husbands and children, to be self-controlled and pure, to be busy at home, to be kind, and to be subject to their husbands, so that no one will malign the word of God.

The woman in the previous post* was not only unrepentant in her adultery and terrible treatment of her cancer stricken husband, she was announcing her intent to fight against the sanctity of marriage:

When my outing happens, I suppose I might as well take a stand for those who are trapped in bad marriages. Many of us are doing the best we can, trying in our own imperfect way to cope with alienation, lovelessness, and physical deprivation.

Some women read the quote above in the original post and didn’t feel a desire to protect the woman who wanted to destroy marriage; they felt under attack by her. For these women, my post wasn’t an assault, but protection. What I would ask the women reading is to go back and consider your own reaction to my last post. Which way did my criticism of the unrepentant adulteress strike you? Did you feel that I was attacking you or being unkind when I called the unrepentant adulteress out, or did you perceive the adulteress as the threat and my calling her out as protection? Which side did you identify with? Likewise, I would ask the men reading how they perceived my criticism of the unrepentant adulteress. Did you perceive it
as an attack against women, or *protection* of women?

*The woman may be real, or a literary device the blogger is using to try to debauch the culture. Either way, the purpose of “her” words are the same.*
It has long been obvious to me that whenever the topic of the sexual double standard is raised the end result is a rush towards female sexual immorality. The correlation here is perfect, but the mechanism had until just recently eluded me.

The reason for the perfect correlation is that when women raise the topic of the sexual double standard they are not expressing a revulsion for sexual sin, they are expressing envy for men. Envy of men is at the core of feminist rebellion, and envy is an exceptionally powerful temptation for women. This goes back to Genesis and Eve’s curse, and even further with Eve being tempted to envy God for His knowledge of good and evil.

Take for example the recent Ashley Madison hack, and what at least appears to be (and very likely is) an extremely large skew when it comes to memberships. A woman who is repulsed by sexual immorality will of course be repulsed by the revelation of rampant sexual immorality. But she won’t think that it isn’t fair that women aren’t getting their share of sexual sin via the site. The fairness question is really a mask for envy, for coveting the sin the woman perceives men as naturally enjoying.

With this, I present Dalrock’s Law of the Double Standard:

Whenever a woman* complains about the sexual double standard, the woman is demanding a license to sin.

*Or a man acting as a proxy for a woman or women.
Robert Stacy McCain gets close, but misses the fact that women’s sexual impulses are no more naturally “pure” than men’s sexual impulses.

What feminist ideology tells young women they should do — being sexually “empowered” and expecting this empowerment to lead to “equality” in their relationships — is the exact opposite of what common sense based on an actual knowledge of human nature would advise them to do.

The accumulated wisdom of centuries still holds true. If you want to be loved, be lovable, and if you want to be respected, be respectable. As I tell young women, don’t just “play hard to get,” be hard to get. A girl who acts like trash thereby forfeits the right to complain that guys treat her like trash. One of the worst things feminism has done is to attack the sexual “double standard” by encouraging women to lower their standards, to screw around heedlessly and to view short-term “relationships” as an acceptable substitute for actual commitment.

The problem isn’t that feminists are tricking women into debauchery they don’t want with the lure of the double standard. The problem is that feminists are tempting women into the debauchery the women want with the lure of the double standard.

More directly, the solution isn’t for women to “be hard to get”. The right advice is:

If you want commitment, commit!

As astute as McCain is, he is overlooking the fact that women have driven the move away from true marriage and commitment, and instead sought out a lifetime of courtship.
Several of the commenters on Don’t play hard to get argued that Robert Stacy McCain and I aren’t really in disagreement regarding the post that I responded to. While we are in agreement on many points*, there is an important difference in our perspective.

I’ll start with our agreement. McCain quotes the Vanity Fair article Tinder and the Dawn of the “Dating Apocalypse” where a player named Marty describes his own hookup strategy:

Marty, who prefers Hinge to Tinder (“Hinge is my thing“), is no slouch at “racking up girls.” He says he’s slept with 30 to 40 women in the last year: “I sort of play that I could be a boyfriend kind of guy,” in order to win them over, “but then they start wanting me to care more ... and I just don’t.”

McCain points out that Marty is playing the promiscuity game to his own best advantage, and that women are foolish to play this man’s game:

See? Marty understands the game he’s playing. Pretend that you’re emotionally available — “a boyfriend kind of guy” — and “racking up girls” via online hook-up sites is not difficult nowadays for any reasonably attractive young man. The more a guy succeeds at that cynical game, however, the lower his estimation of women in general, because each “win” for him just proves how easily girls can be deceived. No amount of feminist “consciousness raising” can change the fundamental reality of human nature. Casual sex is a game in which guys have a decisive advantage, and therefore any girl who plays that game is a fool.

McCain is absolutely right; men and women have different preferred strategies for promiscuity. Marty is doing what he can to tilt the outcome in his own favor, and feminists are foolish when they teach women to be promiscuous according to men’s rules.

Women are much better suited to a different form of promiscuity, which is serial monogamy. With serial monogamy women retain the freedom which comes from sex without commitment, but gain the status which comes from a man publicly declaring his investment in her. This missing status is the part of the modern dating environment the women in the Vanity Fair article are complaining about the most:

“New York guys, from our experience, they’re not really looking for girlfriends,” says the blonde named Reese. “They’re just looking for hit-it-and-quit-it on Tinder.”...

“There is no dating. There’s no relationships,” says Amanda, the tall elegant one. “They’re rare. You can have a fling that could last like seven, eight months and you could never actually call someone your ‘boyfriend.’

The women complain that they feel pressured by feminists to approach promiscuity from the perspective which favors the man, instead of the perspective that favors women:
“Sex should stem from emotional intimacy, and it’s the opposite with us right now, and I think it really is kind of destroying females’ self-images,” says Fallon. “It’s body first, personality second,” says Stephanie. “Honestly, I feel like the body doesn’t even matter to them as long as you’re willing,” says Reese. “It’s that bad.” “But if you say any of this out loud, it’s like you’re weak, you’re not independent, you somehow missed the whole memo about third-wave feminism,” says Amanda.

McCain points out that following feminists in this regard is foolish:

No, ma’am. You got the memo. It’s just that you seem to be smart enough to realize that the memo was completely wrong. What feminist ideology tells young women they should do — being sexually “empowered” and expecting this empowerment to lead to “equality” in their relationships — is the exact opposite of what common sense based on an actual knowledge of human nature would advise them to do.

The accumulated wisdom of centuries still holds true. If you want to be loved, be lovable, and if you want to be respected, be respectable. As I tell young women, don’t just “play hard to get,” be hard to get. A girl who acts like trash thereby forfeits the right to complain that guys treat her like trash.

But the very next sentence is where McCain gets it wrong. He frames women’s preferred form of promiscuity as more moral than men’s preferred form of promiscuity, confusing serial monogamy with commitment:

One of the worst things feminism has done is to attack the sexual “double standard” by encouraging women to lower their standards, to screw around heedlessly and to view short-term “relationships” as an acceptable substitute for actual commitment.

Serial monogamy has no moral advantage over “hit it and quit it”. There is also no commitment involved, only public displays of investment and perhaps romantic love. There is an inescapable logic to the idea that when playing a destructive game, one where someone is going to get hurt, playing by rules which maximize your own chances of coming out on top makes sense. But this doesn’t confer morality, it is purely practical advice on how to behave immorally. Yet very few in our society understand this.

Mixed in with this is the lie that women are wired to “commit”. Nothing could be further from the truth. Our divorce revolution is driven almost exclusively by women feeling “trapped in marriage”. Likewise, the push to delay marriage is coming from young women far more than young men. Young women are the rock-stars of the sexual marketplace, and as such they are the ones who (collectively) determine the rules of the road. McCain understands this, which is why he is coaching them to not listen to the feminists who want them to play the promiscuity game in a way that puts them in a disadvantage.

The problem is the lie that McCain is telling women (the same lie our society at large is telling them) is even more harmful than the one feminists are telling women. Women are extremely vulnerable to believing that promiscuity on their terms is inherently moral. Reinforcing this
delusion is cruel, and we have an obligation to speak the truth here. Sexual morality requires true lifetime commitment. Everything else is (pick your word) fornication or promiscuity. Misusing sex and love is not more moral than misusing sex alone.

In McCain’s defense, this is the lie we have all been told, and very few would question it. But this is also why it needs to be called out.

**See Also:** Women’s sacred path to marriage is in danger.

*Robert Stacy McCain is a thoughtful writer on the topic of feminism, and I enjoy reading his blog. I encourage my readers to click on the link to his blog from my blogroll to see for themselves.*
Glorious Feminist Progress!
by Dalrock | September 4, 2015 | Link

Cane Caldo argues in *The War Conservatives Never Knew They Lost*:

It would be more true to say that those we call Liberals were fighting to occupy Conservatism, and that’s what they won. They didn’t take over the whole culture, but rather took over what is considered Conservative. This is discombobulating because Conservatives have been told that they are fighting for The Culture overall, and so there’s a lot of effort to win external victories; victories “out there”. Meanwhile; the base was sapped...infiltrated...hacked.

Jonah Goldberg, Senior Editor of the National Review, would no doubt disagree were he not already occupied praising the great leap forward the US armed forces are making:

There’s an added irony here. Around the time little Laura’s school was cracking down on Wonder Woman lunchboxes, two women, Kristen Griest and Shaye Haver, passed the Army Ranger training course for the first time. The news was hailed across the country as a huge step forward for women.

Are these women role models or not? Are they heroes? Or should they be condemned for their willingness to use violence when necessary? Maybe Laura should get a Griest and Haver lunchbox and find out.

Hat Tip Instapundit
She’s keeping her vow
by Dalrock | September 5, 2015 | Link

Not her marriage vow, but the vow she made to God when she asked Him to help her break her vow to God. Since He helped her break her vow to Him, she is keeping her vow to Him by helping other women break their vows to Him. Christian homeschooling mother of six Jill explains how this works in 7 Things to Expect During a Divorce:

I made a vow to God that if He would get me through this difficult time, I would use my tribulations to minister to others. He took me at my word. He is using my broken marriage, my heartache, and my mistakes to help carry other women going through a divorce.

So have faith married women, not in God, but in divorce:

I’m now thriving financially, emotionally, and spiritually. I completely give all the glory to God. I still have some sad days where I’m feeling blue, but I definitely have more good days than bad.

And so will you.

...

Before I share with you, I want you to know you are loved, and you will come out a stronger woman than you ever imagined. You might not see the light at the end of the tunnel now, but, sweet one, mark my word, you will survive this storm.

Trust me! You will amaze yourself.

Remember the message of Fireproof:

Hat Tip: RobJ

See also:

- Put your faith in divorce.
- Intermediate guide to selling divorce: overcoming women’s better judgment.
Dominos image licensed as creative commons by aussiegall.
Fahrenheit 451: The dystopia Social Justice Warriors are working to create.

by Dalrock | September 7, 2015 | Link

With Vox Day releasing SJWs Always Lie: Taking Down the Thought Police I dusted off our copy of Ray Bradbury’s Fahrenheit 451 to reread his 1979 essay Coda. Coda is a protest against everyone who would censor or edit his work, including those who would edit for brevity and those who would edit out “offensive” content. But Bradbury reminds us that the censorship in Fahrenheit 451 came from those who would censor content which offended them:

The point is obvious. There is more than one way to burn a book. And the world is full of people running about with lit matches. Every minority, be it Baptist / Unitarian, Irish / Italian / Octogenarian / Zen Buddhist, Zionist/Seventh-day Adventist, Women’s Lib/ Republican, Mattachine/ Four Square Gospel feels it has the will, the right, the duty to douse the kerosene, light the fuse. Every dimwit editor who sees himself as the source of all dreary blanc-mange plain porridge unleavened literature, licks his guillotine and eyes the neck of any author who dares to speak above a whisper or write above a nursery rhyme.

Fire-Captain Beatty, in my novel Fahrenheit 451, described how the books were burned first by minorities, each ripping a page or a paragraph from this book, then that, until the day came when the books were empty and the minds shut and the libraries closed forever.

Ironically, his book about lilliputian censorship was itself censored by editors who couldn’t see the irony of their actions:

Only six weeks ago, I discovered that, over the years, some cubby-hole editors at Ballantine Books, fearful of contaminating the young, had, bit by bit, censored some 75 separate sections from the novel. Students, reading the novel which, after all, deals with censorship and book-burning in the future, wrote to tell me of this exquisite irony.

As Bradbury explains the impulse to censor the offensive exists to some degree with all groups, and he seems to be making an effort to be even handed in his indictment. Yet as we can see all around us, it is the Social Justice Warriors (SJWs) who are truly committed to censoring anything which they find offensive or disturbing. Bradbury’s account of his own experience lines up with this:

In my story, I had described a lighthouse as having, late at night, an illumination coming from it that was a “God-Light.” Looking up at it from the view-point of any sea-creature one would have felt that one was in “the Presence.”

The editors had deleted “God-Light” and “in the Presence.”
A final test for old Job II here: I sent a play, *Leviathan 99*, off to a university theater a month ago...

But, for now, the university wrote back that they hardly dared do my play—it had no women in it! And the ERA ladies on campus would descend with ball-bats if the drama department even tried!

In the real world the firemen don’t show up with kerosene and matches; they show up with trigger warnings and political correctness codes.
Moral progress
by Dalrock | September 9, 2015 | Link

James Bond is being introduced to our new morality. Now he has a girlfriend. The Telegraph explains in New James Bond gets a live-in girlfriend and ‘outspoken’ gay friend (emphasis mine):

For decades he has swaggered through life conquering women, chain smoking and saving the world, untroubled by the sensitivities of the 21st century.

In a new book, however, James Bond will be getting a dose of modern morality...

Among the surprises for fans includes the return of Pussy Galore, who has moved in with Bond in London and spend the mornings squabbling in quite the opposite of domestic bliss.

Hat Tip Vox

Related: Broken Premisses
The topic of sexbots is making the rounds again, and once again the question is how they fit with our new sexual morality. The last time this went around the argument by Dr Helen Driscoll was that using sexbots would become accepted as moral because their users would fall in love with them. This sets up the angry feminist backlash by Dr Kathleen Richardson, who explained to the Daily Express that the problem with robosex is a lack of purifying emotion:

Dr Richardson believes humanoid sex robots reinforce traditional and damaging stereotypes of women.

It also perpetuates the view that a relationship does not need to be more than simply physical.

Drs. Richardson and Driscoll aren’t alone in their modern idea that sexual morality is determined by the amount of emotion involved. Dr. Albert Mohler, President of the The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, uses a very similar argument to explain why men viewing pornography is immoral. Dr. Mohler warns that pornography weakens the power of denial of sex as a tool for wives to control their husbands. As a result of this loss of power by wives, husbands will fail to mix in the purifying emotion which makes sex moral:

...Since the male sex drive is largely directed towards genital pleasure, men often assume that women are just the same...

The emotional aspect of sex cannot be divorced from the physical dimension of the sex act. Though men are often tempted to forget this, women possess more and less gentle means of making that need clear.

Consider the fact that a woman has every right to expect that her husband will earn access to the marriage bed...

...when I say that a husband must regularly “earn” privileged access to the marital bed, I mean that a husband owes his wife the confidence, affection, and emotional support that would lead her to freely give herself to her husband in the act of sex.

It shouldn’t come as a surprise that Drs. Driscoll, Richardson, and Mohler are all using the same yardstick to determine sexual morality. This is the modern way of thinking, and it is a direct consequence of our replacing traditional marriage with serial monogamy. Under the new view, headship is inverted and sex is purified by romantic love.

All three are looking at this through the wrong lens, but in the narrow disagreement between Drs. Driscoll and Richardson I can only agree with Dr. Driscoll. Dr. Richardson argues that robosex is immoral because it lacks purifying emotion. However, to the extent that robosex is worse than other masturbation tools the problem is the opposite. With vibrators and
pornography the misuse is almost entirely physical. With sexbots there will be a much higher risk that romantic love would be misused as well:

“The physical act of sex will only be a small part of the time you spend with a sex robot – the majority of time will be spent socialising and interacting,” Roxxxy’s creator believes.

The biggest problem we have is that having jettisoned real sexual morality, we aren’t able to process the dangers that sexbots will pose in any meaningful way. If romantic love makes sex moral, the proponents of sexbots will always have a seemingly undefeatable argument in their favor. To argue that emotions don’t purify sex would undermine our entire modern edifice of sexual morality. This leaves us arguing over whether having sex with an artificial person involves emotion. If this is the discussion, those in favor of sexbots have the far stronger position.

Aside from the purely moral question, there is another risk regarding sexbots. Our economy is built on the expectation that men will be motivated by marriage to produce in excess of their own needs. As we continue to degrade marriage, sexbots will be there to fill the gaps.

Sexbots don’t even need to become a direct replacement for marriage to have a profound effect on our economy. Our current system relies on young men continuing to prepare to be providers while marriage continues to be further and further delayed. Sexbots will in this context be yet another distraction tempting young men to coast instead of working diligently in anticipation of their future wives tiring of having sex with other men. As each successive cohort of women tires of the carousel and starts looking for husbands, they will increasingly find that the cohort of men they hoped to marry are still willing to marry but fewer and fewer are in a position to play the role of provider. Additionally, sexbots could also accelerate the decline in men’s willingness to remarry after being punished in divorce court.
The thing that struck me the most about Texas politics after moving to the state is that Democrats focus the bulk of their efforts on convincing Texas voters that they are the real conservative, and their Republican opponent is the fake. For just one example of this, in our recent election for Governor Democrat Wendy Davis tried to get to the right of Republican Greg Abbott on the issue of gun rights by supporting open carry. It was of course a ruse, and she has since come out and stated that it was.

Republicans (not just in Texas but nationwide) use a similar strategy regarding feminism. “We’re the real feminists” is the standard Republican claim. You can see this with Jonah Goldberg celebrating Glorious Feminist Progress, and with Gavin McInnes here*. In fact, this formula is so common that very few would even notice it. Republicans claiming to be more feminist than feminists is SOP. If you are a Republican, it is what you do.

There is however an important difference between Democrats in Texas claiming to be the real conservative, and Republicans everywhere claiming to be the real feminists; the Democrats (and pretty much everyone else) know this is a ruse to get elected. Republicans are serious when they claim to be the real feminists.

See Carly Fiorina’s recent campaign video (H/T Cane Caldo):

Ladies, look at this face! And look at all of your faces. The face of leadership. The face of leadership in our party, the party of women’s suffrage. The face of leadership in your communities, in your businesses, in your places of work and worship. Ladies, note to Democrat party: We are not a special interest group, we are the majority of the nation. This is the face of a sixty one year old woman– I am proud of every year and every wrinkle.

*H/T anonymous_ng
You can thank political correctness and feminism for this; both seek to tame male passion and aggression by declaring it brute and dangerous. These cultural forces are abetted by writers like Breslaw who insist that men should be more passive and feminine but then turn around and mock them as manic pixies when they do just that.

Feminists have long argued that women should pursue careers just like men do. Now that many women have successfully done so, however, they are beginning to resent the fact that while they are toiling away at the office, there are free-spirited dudes watching Bravo TV while eating artisanal snacks back at their apartments.

The lure to blame weak men for the failures of feminism is enormous, so seeing writers resist this temptation is a very positive sign. However, even better than the post itself is the comment left by Eric Johnson, at least when it comes to comedic value (intentional or otherwise):

Women! Stop this delusion and marry the The Dork!
The Dork will actually put up with your mother!
The Dork will go to the PTA Meetings!
The Dork is willing to put up with your bullshit!

Don’t worry dorks of the world, sooner or later your future wife will tire of having sex with men like the Manic Pixie Dream Boy and will suddenly realize that you have a duty to marry her. There is no point in trying to rush the process, as she needs to tire of sex with other men before she can recognize that you need to support her and put up with her bullshit. Have patience dorks, assured in the knowledge that while she is giving herself sexually to every man who draws her fancy, she is saving something special for you.
Instapundit linked today to an article in the Guardian about Danish women using sperm banks to become single mothers: ‘There’s no stigma’: why so many Danish women are opting to become single mothers. The article quotes one single mother who explained how she chose among the myriad of approved paths to single motherhood, ultimately deciding to use a sperm bank:

I saw lots of friends choose to become pregnant with boyfriends they knew wouldn’t last – purely because the desire to have a child took over. I also saw ‘traditional’ families breaking up all around me, so I thought, ‘Maybe I should just make this happen on my own.’ Fjord asked herself, “all the tough questions”: “Does the world need more people? Couldn’t I adopt?” And I looked into it, but adoption is practically impossible in Denmark as a single woman, and it’s very expensive. Plus I had this primal urge to have my own child. I thought about having a baby with a friend, but realised this could get complicated. I considered a one-night stand – not a big deal in Denmark – but felt this would be somehow dishonest, stealing sperm from someone. This left donor conception.

Despite accurately defining the issue in the title, the Guardian investigates further and finds that it is actually men who are to blame for not getting with the program once a thirty something career woman decides to become pregnant:

“The majority say that becoming a solomor was Plan B,” says Lone Schmidt, associate professor at the University of Copenhagen Department of Public Health: “Two thirds had been in a relationship and wanted to become pregnant but their partners weren't ready.” The average age of couples seeking help for fertility problems in Denmark is 33, and the average age of single women is 36. “In other words,” says Schmidt, “women are waiting it out, and when it becomes clear that there isn’t going to be a man in the picture, they’re taking action themselves.”

Like the Guardian, Instapundit commenter Amphipolis fears the idea of women facing stigma for choosing single motherhood. Surely we can find a solution which focuses the responsibility on men and not women:

For every single mother there is a donor man who is willing to engender a fatherless child.

Men are also responsible for this, and their anonymity is just a bit of paperwork.

This is the standard refrain from Gilligans everywhere, who live in terror of the thought of unhappy sluts. But our little buddy’s understanding of biology is flawed. It only takes a handful of willing donors to create all of the bastards the single mothers wish to create.

Note also that Amphipolis’ fundamental objection is to the new family model being
circumvented. This new family model of course is not marriage, but child support. He doesn’t propose shutting down sperm banks altogether, or only allowing married couples to use their services. His focus is on identifying the donors so they can be forced to pay child support.

The sperm donors are exactly who I am talking about. They made this happen. They are partly responsible.
Likewise, teach the older women to be reverent in the way they live, not to be slanderers or addicted to much wine, but to teach what is good. Then they can urge the younger women to love their husbands and children, to be self-controlled and pure, to be busy at home, to be kind, and to be subject to their husbands, so that no one will malign the word of God.

–Titus 2:3-5, NIV

One thing my wife has often noted is how intensely critical Christian wives are of their husbands whenever they gather, far more so than women in secular culture. The difference is so stark that she can identify groups of Christian wives just by their intense disrespect for their husbands. Recently we took the kids to a local festival. While I supervised the kids at an activity my wife was in line behind a group of women who loudly complained about their husbands for over twenty minutes. My wife finally asked:

You ladies must be with a church group.

The ladies were delighted. Yes, indeed they were! Had she noticed that they were all wearing crosses? My wife explained that no, she couldn’t see their crosses because she was behind them, but that their extended discussion tearing down their husbands with a litany of petty grievances gave them away. She urged them to repent of this pernicious habit and instead try to focus on how blessed they are to have their husbands. They were as you can imagine dumfounded. However, they eventually recovered and after talking with my wife about the importance of respecting their husbands they seemed genuinely happier.

In partial defense of these ladies and the many millions of Christian wives doing the same thing, while they are indulging in a very common female temptation (as Titus 2 recognizes), they are also being taught contempt for their husbands by pretty much all modern Christian leaders. This is deeply entrenched in modern Christian culture, which is why it doesn’t stand out.

The Kendrick Brothers Strike Again

Not long after the movie War Room was released my wife was at a social event for Christian mothers. One of the wives explained at length how she had forced her husband to see the movie, and that all husbands needed to be forced to see it. While my wife normally pushes back when other wives speak in this way, in this context she chose to bite her tongue*. The bossy wife made her way around the group, asking each Christian wife if they had forced their husband to watch this movie. Each of the other women indicated that they had already either forced their husbands to watch the movie or intended to do so soon. When she made it to my wife, my wife explained that we have not seen the movie, and have no immediate plans to do so. The woman was taken aback at first, but then tried a different approach:
Bossy Disrespectful Christian Wife: Has your husband watched the movie Fireproof?

Mrs. D: Yes.

Bossy Disrespectful Christian Wife: Did he take notes?

Mrs. D: Yes.

Bossy Disrespectful Christian Wife: Did he refer to those notes later?

Mrs. D: Yes.

Bossy Disrespectful Christian Wife: Good for you!

My wife in fact told the truth. I did watch the movie and I did take notes. I also referred to these notes when I wrote my posts on the topic.

Given how elated the bossy disrespectful Christian wife was with the movie, I wanted to see how good my guess was about War Room back in February after viewing only the trailer:

It is possible that the Kendrick brothers will make a U-turn and actually teach biblical roles in marriage. However, based on the preview, their past presentations, and the strong preferences of modern Christians I’m not optimistic. My guess instead is that the advice to the wife is a headfake towards submission while teaching her that her job is not to cultivate a quiet gentle spirit, but to become a warrior praying for her no good husband to get his act together.

For those who enjoyed seeing husbands and fathers put down in Fireproof, Courageous, and Mom’s Night Out, you will want to stop reading if you haven’t already seen War Room. The following plot summary from Wikipedia naturally contains spoilers:

Tony (T.C. Stallings) and Elizabeth Jordan (Priscilla Shirer) have a big house, two nice cars, a beautiful daughter, and plenty of money. Despite their apparent success, they face a strained marriage. Tony, a pharmaceutical salesman, is almost never there for his daughter, Danielle (Alena Pitts). He has been abusive verbally with Elizabeth and doesn’t appreciate anything she does. He also looks lustfully at other women and has thought about cheating on her.

Elizabeth, a realtor, goes to work with the elderly Miss Clara (Karen Abercrombie) to sell her house. Miss Clara senses the stress Elizabeth is under, and suggests that Elizabeth fight for their marriage by praying for Tony. Miss Clara shows Elizabeth a special closet she has dedicated to praying, and calls it her “War Room” because as she puts it, “In order to stand on your feet and fight the enemy, you need to get on your knees and pray”. As Elizabeth starts to seriously pray for her husband, Tony is away on a business trip but is having dinner at a fine restaurant with a beautiful woman who invites him back to her apartment. Just as he is on the verge of going to
the woman’s apartment and cheating on his wife with her, he suddenly gets an attack of nausea at the last moment and goes to a bathroom in the restaurant to throw up.

Shortly afterward, Tony is fired for inflating his sales figures. Realizing he has hit rock bottom, he rededicates his life to God. Unknown to Elizabeth and Danielle, he has been keeping several samples for himself. He now realizes that he has to return them, even though it could potentially send him to prison. However, Tony’s former boss is moved by his willingness to admit his wrongdoing and make amends, and decides not to press charges. Tony begins to show an interest in his daughter’s jump roping skills and offers to participate with her and her friends in the upcoming double dutch competition at the local community center. The competition goes great and Tony’s team takes second place. Elizabeth successfully sells Miss Clara’s house to a retired pastor who notices the knee indentations in the closet floor and realizes that someone was praying in the closet. Shortly afterwards, Tony is offered a job as the director of the community center. Although the pay isn’t nearly what he was making as a pharmaceutical salesman, he realizes that with the income from this new job combined with Elizabeth picking up extra work, the family can make a budget and survive.

The film ends with Tony giving Elizabeth her favorite dessert while he gives her a foot massage, something she loves, and Miss Clara, now living with her son, praying a powerful prayer in the still of the night.

**See Also:** Disrespecting respectability, dishonoring the honorable.

*I won’t go into the details of why this was the right choice in that setting, but I agree with her that biting her tongue here was the right call.*
The Kendrick brothers are masters of the head fake. In Fireproof they ended the film with the surprise revelation that the original Love Dare was done by a woman! We learn that Caleb’s mother submitted to her husband, and that Caleb’s father was won over without a word by his wife’s respectful and pure conduct. This plot twist is pointed to by defenders of the film as proof that the moral of the movie (saving your marriage through submission) is gender neutral. In theory, they explain, submission in marriage could apply to wives as well. What the defenders miss is that this surprise plot twist is the Kendrick brothers being astonishingly open that they have inverted Scripture.

I have not yet seen the movie War Room, but the defenders of the latest Kendrick brothers movie are pointing to a similar headfake. War room they argue is really the Kendrick brothers finally teaching submission to wives instead of husbands. One of the catchphrases of the film is:

Submission is ducking so God can hit your husband.

Girlfriend! Hand that rolling pin to God so that He can hit your husband with it even harder! This is the Christian feminist re-purposing of submission (just as feminists are busy re-purposing the military*), and is delivered in the movie by one of the women “ministers” at LifeWay, Beth Moore. Moore isn’t the only female LifeWay minister in the movie. The protagonist of the movie is played by Priscilla Shirer who is also a LifeWay minister.

Shirer explains in an interview that she took the role because the movie taught the same messages she already teaches in her ministry (emphasis mine):

At first my answer was ‘Heck no! There are real actors who do this sort of thing,’ but they just said Priscilla, just read the script first and lets pray about it and just see if God might have this in mind for all of us. After reading the script, I realized that it isn’t a departure from what I usually do, it’s a different way though of just saying the same message that I would want to say anyway. It’s another medium for ministry and I’m glad that I kind of stepped out in faith and pushed past any fear or intimidation that was saying you can’t do this, you’re not an actress or an accomplished actress. I’m glad that I took the adventure. It’s been fun.

Shirer is a perfect fit for the Kendrick brothers because she too is a master of the headfake. Back in 2011 she was interviewed for an article on submission titled Reclaiming the S-Word. In parts of the interview she seems like she might actually be teaching biblical submission (or at least heading in that direction). However, periodically the mask slips.

The interviewer asked Shirer if submission means “subservience” by the wife (the sin invented by the CBMW):

For many people, the term submit carries with it the stigma of subservience.
In reply, Shirer explains contra to Genesis that women aren’t inclined to rebel against their husbands unless their husbands are doing something wrong:

It is unfortunate that submission has really been given a bad rap. There is nothing that is supposed to be subservient, “doormat-ish” so to speak, or abusive about this word and its meaning. In Ephesians when the Lord began to describe submission in the family dynamic, the majority of the chapter was used to tell husbands how they were supposed to lead, not to tell women how they were to submit. If men do it the right way, if they are the kind of leaders described by God, then it will be the joy of the wife to submit to a husband like that.

Picking up on Shirer’s feminist framing, the interviewer asks:

What about the husband who has the wrong view of submission and is, in essence, a tyrant?

Shirer responds by lumping together husbands who command their wives to sin with physical abuse and the Christian feminist wildcard, “emotional abuse”. If a wife tries her husband and finds him guilty of any of the above, she is not to submit to him:

It is never the woman’s role to submit to a man who is leading her to sin, or if he is in any way being abusive to her whether emotionally or physically. In those cases, she should get away to safety. Submission has long been a ploy to get vulnerable women to stay with a guy who is not treating them appropriately. In its purest meaning, it is a gift given to a woman who does have a man that is seeking to lead in the way the Bible describes.

The interviewer follows up, asking if wives should submit to men who don’t seem to be leading. Shirer offers a qualified yes, but only if their husband has shown leadership in the past:

I would encourage a wife to ask herself, *When we were dating, did he take the backseat?* If the answer is no and he showed initiative and drive and leadership when you were dating, then the reality probably is that you have, over time, usurped his authority. And in those cases, I want you to know that what has been done can be undone. Prayerfully give him back the reigns.

When asked why Christian women bristle at the idea of submission, Shirer overlooks the reason the Bible has told us women will bristle at it, and explains that this is one of the rare bad things to come out of feminism (emphasis mine):

I think that deep down most women would love to be in a relationship with a great man — they might not call it submission, but when you think about the dynamics of it we love to be in a relationship when a man has taken charge. When you water down submission to the bare parts, most women desire that. But there is a fear that has been instilled in us predominantly by the feminist movement. **The feminist movement has given us many things, but one thing it has stolen from us is the right not to feel like we’ve lost our dignity when we choose to submit**
to the leading of a good guy.

See the full interview, as there is too much to quote (including a variant of duck so God can hit your husband). Note also that not only does Shirer tell us that she took the role because the movie teaches the same message she teaches, but that she wrote the companion book for women which was released with War Room (just as she did for Courageous). The title alone will make every Christian Xena’s heart swell. This isn’t a book for quiet, submissive doormats. This is a book for kick-ass Christian gals everywhere: Fervent: A Woman’s Battle Plan to Serious, Specific and Strategic Prayer

A quick search with Amazon’s “look inside” tool indicates that the words “submit” and “submission” are not included in the book:

Given what Shirer has to teach on the topic of submission, I would say it is a good thing it never comes up. However, this is one more nail in the coffin of the claim that War Room isn’t just another in a long line of Kendrick brothers movies tearing down husbands and fathers, but a movie about the power of wives practicing biblical submission.

*That this movie featuring women as warriors was released during the height of the push to fully integrate women in combat is no coincidence. Christian feminists very often take their cues from secular feminists, and War Room is perfectly tuned to the modern Christian preference to see women as fierce warriors rather than the “doormats” with quiet gentle spirits of the bad old days.
Their very first movie Flywheel has an eerily similar plot to War Room. Like War Room, Flywheel is about a dastardly Christian husband and father who lies, cheats, and steals, much to the consternation of his godly wife and child.
Commenter Hank Flanders responded to He’s begging you; don’t forget the beta bucks! with a description of a friend with a similar thought pattern:

I’m currently trying to figure out how to get a Traditional Conservative to understand RP concepts. One of my best friends whom I’ve known for almost 20 years is someone who believes it’s always a man’s fault if his wife cheats, and he also thinks it doesn’t mean anything if a woman’s had sex before marriage. He and I are the only ones in that group of friends who isn’t married, and I’d like to help him understand certain truths before he finally does get married, but he’s the kind of person to whom you can’t tell anything.

Changing strongly held beliefs is extremely difficult because they are closely associated with a person’s identity. This is in itself not a bad thing, as it wouldn’t be an improvement if Hank’s friend changed his views each time the wind blew in a different direction.

From Hank’s description his friend’s paradigm fits closely with what I’ve dubbed Women’s sacred path to marriage. More importantly, this paradigm is almost certainly crucial to his friend’s view of himself as a man with a high Sexual Market Value (SMV) and especially Marriage Market Value (MMV). The twisted thinking goes like this:

1. Women are attracted to good and noble men.
2. I am better and more noble than other men.
3. Therefore I am more attractive than other men.

There is of course one small problem with this line of reasoning, which is that the women around Hank’s friend aren’t acting in a way that would suggest that they find him attractive. At the same time, the women around Hank’s friend are demonstrating attraction for unworthy men. This must mean that less worthy men than Hank’s friend are tricking women, essentially impersonating him. These fakers are getting in the way of women realizing how attractive he really is.

All of the observable data can be made to fit in this theory. Women riding the carousel for many years before suddenly marrying a beta provider is proof that eventually women see through the fake versions of himself and find the real deal. Once women find the real deal they of course remain committed for life as faithful loving wives. If they subsequently cheat and or divorce, this is only proof of another faker, a man who claimed to be as noble and good as Hank’s friend but was really like all of those other unworthy men. These fraudsters are even worse than the men on the carousel, because they took the deception even farther by tricking the woman into marriage.

When you tell a man like Hank’s friend that virtue isn’t what drives women’s sexual attraction, you are telling him he isn’t really at the top of the SMV pile and instead is towards
the bottom. He has no doubt already contemplated this terrifying possibility, and doubling down on denial is his preferred strategy. This won’t be easy to break through.

There is another related aspect to the psychology of men like this, and this is viewing themselves as the noble rescuer of the weak. Under this delusion, his goodness and nobility are not only confirmed, but they will ultimately lead to him having a lifetime of sex with a very attractive woman. The woman who cheats on her husband is the innocent victim of two men who are beneath our hero’s status. Our hero swoops in to rescue her, saving her from the man who tricked her into marriage as well as the man who lured her to cheat when she was vulnerable (having been trapped in an unhappy marriage).

This fantasy won’t be easy to dispel, and in most cases it probably isn’t possible. To the extent that it is possible, my focus would be on discussing what it really means to be a good and noble man, and what it really means to protect the innocent. One way to approach this is to change the focus of protection from sexy sluts to innocent and vulnerable children.

What duty does Hank’s friend have to his future children, to ensure that they don’t have the pain of growing up in a broken home and/or a mother who behaves in ways that bring great shame to them? Surely he has failed his children if he fails to protect them from this. Challenge him to promise that he will do everything in his power to protect his future children in this way.

Once he has agreed that he has this obligation to his future children, focus on how he should go about keeping this promise. Start by asking him if he takes marriage vows seriously. Would he divorce or cheat if he fell out of love or he became unhappy, or would he keep his solemn vow? This one is easy because it fits with his view of himself as more noble than the average man. Then switch to how he would choose a wife, and what he would expect of her regarding her own vows. His assumption is of course that women almost always divorce and cheat because their husband was a fake version of himself. Yet just by being the real deal he hasn’t eradicated the entire threat to his children. Even a small chance of harming innocent children should be enough to motivate a man as good and noble as he is. While for other men the risk is that they won’t be the real deal, in his case the risk is that the woman fails to keep her marriage vows even though her husband is good and noble.

Assuming he agrees that he has a duty to protect his own future children from divorce and/or infidelity by carefully vetting a future wife, the next obvious question is would he do everything in his power to protect other innocent children as well? Is his role as protector of the weak in general, or does he only care enough to protect his own kids? Since other men aren’t the real deal (him), this means that he needs to insist that even unhappy wives of men lower than himself need to honor their marriage vows (at least if they have children). It isn’t just his own children who deserve an honorable mother; all children do.

As you work your way through this you will be forcing him to choose between two views he holds dear. Will he rescue the slut and be rewarded for this nobility with a lifetime of hot sex? Or will he choose instead to protect innocent children? Which does he choose, sex, or protecting the innocent? Does he choose sex with hot sluts, or true sexual morality?

Realistically he is extremely unlikely to abandon his current view of sexual morality, because
the pain of admitting that he isn’t above other men in SMV is too much to accept. The response in most cases will be irrational anger and comical attempts at rationalization. Be patient, gentle, and respectful. All you can do is try to help him move towards true sexual morality; you can’t force him to adopt it. To the extent that you are able to help him in this journey, it will most likely be a slow process as he sorts it over in his mind. As Cane Caldo noted in a discussion some time ago, don’t be surprised if he ultimately comes back to you with an epiphany about sexual morality that he came to all by himself. Don’t worry about credit if that happens, just take the win.

Related: A simple test.
Lesson number 37:

**Husbands Either Serve Their Wives Or Serve Themselves** - You cannot do both. Spoiler Alert – This involves a basin of water and ice cream.

Husbands of course should serve their wives, but he isn’t talking about headship. Also, Someone appears to be missing in this equation.

Or perhaps this isn’t an oversight. Bonus quote, from the Q&A at the end of the film:

“We want someone (Priscilla Shirer) who will represent God after the film’s opening.”
– Kendrick

I can only hope this is a typo or out of context.
Leadership means telling her she is pretty
by Dalrock | October 1, 2015 | Link

Brian Dodd (the same blogger I linked to on my last post) explains that wives cheat because their husbands fail to show leadership.

I’m convinced women do not want to cheat. I read many articles about the incredible guilt and grief they experience because of their actions. Satan knew that when he tempted Eve that more than just one life would be destroyed.

Men, sometimes you can do everything right and there will still be women who simply make selfish, bad decisions. However, most of the time if we practice proactive, loving leadership that is not passive, we can address these 6 reasons while protecting our wives and saving our marriages from the widespread and generational damage that results from infidelity.

If you are a worthy enough man, your wife is almost guaranteed not to stray. And of course, the key is leadership. Keep in mind that he isn’t talking about headship. This is the kind of non threatening “leadership” modern Christians love. Most of the “leadership” Dodd urges husbands to practice boils down to not letting their wives lose the tingle. Key to that is leading by telling her she is pretty:

5. Her ego needs a boost. She needs to feel pretty again or get her groove back. Husbands, if you don’t tell your wife that she is pretty, your passivity will open the door for someone else to fill that void.

Dodd offers a specific warning in this area; if a husband loses his job and his wife goes to work, other men will tell her she is pretty instead of her husband. In this case leadership means not telling her she needs to stay at home, but allowing* her to stay at home (emphasis mine):

If you are a husband who has lost his job or you stay home with the kids because your wife earns more money, be very careful. She puts on a suit and goes to work every day where she interacts with high-achieving alpha males. She gets complimented frequently because she looks good and is accomplishing much. Then she may think she comes home to an under-achieving husband who takes her for granted. Many times, this woman can think she deserves better than you and will act on that thought. An office romance ensues. If it comes down to it, husbands go to work. Let her stay home regardless of the financial implications.

*Dodd tells us that he is a huge fan of Fireproof and War Room, and both movies feature wives who are career women.

See Also: Don’t blame Heartiste for the equation of Alpha with virtue.
Having made my readers suffer four posts on the saccharine sweetness of modern Christian culture, I feel obligated to cleanse your palate with the salty wisdom of the Bible.

In the discussion of a recent post the topic of what to tell young men about loose women came up. Proverbs 7 immediately came to mind, and if you aren’t familiar with it or if it has been a while since you have read it I highly recommend reading the whole thing (it is short). The frame is strikingly anti-feminist, and therefore strikingly anti modern Christian culture. The proverb describes the crafty harlot, who lies in wait for an unsuspecting victim.

| She was loud and rebellious,       |
| Her feet would not stay at home.  |

Her prey is a young man *devoid of understanding*. She catches the young man and kisses him. She tells him she has prepared her bed with fine linens and perfumes, and that her husband is away.

| With her enticing speech she caused him to yield, |
| With her flattering lips she seduced him.      |
| 22 Immediately he went after her, as an ox goes to the slaughter, |

The proverb is a warning to all men to not be caught in the snare of such a woman. It closes with:

| Her house *is* the way to hell,               |
| Descending to the chambers of death.         |

Scripture taken from the New King James Version®. Copyright © 1982 by Thomas Nelson
Disney’s Babble is big on teaching girls to be bossy. In March of last year they jumped on the “ban bossy” bandwagon with Let’s all join Beyoncé and Jennifer Garner in banning the word bossy:

The two superstars are asking us to stop using the word “bossy” when referring to girls and women. And as for me, a bossy lady who is a mother of a bossy girl, I can not agree with this movement more.

Since then they have run multiple posts in praise of bossy girls, including The case for raising bossy daughters and Advice to My 4-Year-Old Daughter: If Anyone Ever Calls You “Bossy,” Just Say “Thank You”. Last week however, one of the moms at Babble wrote about her struggle to curb her daughter’s bossiness while banning the very concept in My Daughter’s “Bossy” Behavior Almost Cost Her a Best Friend.

“Well, she said that if she tells June she doesn’t want to play a particular game, June gets really upset and threatens to end the play date. So Emma keeps playing to keep June happy.”

Ouch. Do the mind games begin this early?

I like that my daughter is comfortable expressing what I’ll call “strong leadership qualities,” which in a pre-Lean In era, would have been called “bossy.”

Of course, the story has a happy ending where her four year old learns to avoid being bossy while simultaneously avoids thinking very word bossy.

…I didn’t want to tell June to curb her authority, which would only reinforce those old gender stereotypes. Rather, I used it as an opportunity to talk about friendship: what it means to be a great friend and how to cultivate friendships that endure. Part of that, I said, is letting others take the lead once in a while simply because it makes friends feel good. Equally important is not making friends feel bad if they don’t want to do something you would like to do. It lets people know their decisions and opinions are valued and important.

In feminist fantasy land, one can embrace ugliness and still expect a beautiful outcome. In reality she is teaching her daughter that vice is virtue, and her daughter is only just getting started putting that philosophy into practice.
She was loud and rebellious,
Her feet would not stay at home.

— Proverbs 7:11 NKJV

Some time back DeNihilist linked to a blog post titled: 21 Signs You’re A Rebellious Woman (language warning). The post begins by explaining that a rebellious woman doesn’t conform to cliché standards:

1. You adamantly refuse to be the kind of woman the world wants you to be. You shun the status quo and loathe outdated clichés of what it means to be a woman, knowing these antiquated views are holding us all back from expressing ourselves fully.

The rest of the list is of course a list of cliché standards, since feminism is no longer at all counter-cultural. Number four however caught my eye:

4. You will never be small or less-than or weak. Your presence is a roar, never a whisper.

This one stood out because it reminded me of a question Pastor Driscoll received at the end of his sermon on 1 Pet 3:1-6. 1 Pet 3:4 instructs wives to submit to their husbands and cultivate “a gentle and quiet spirit, which is very precious in the sight of God.” A woman in the congregation was concerned that this spirit was meant to bear fruit. Driscoll invited his wife Grace up to answer the questions from the women in the congregation because:

if I answered all of the women’s questions it would go really bad.

The specific question was (emphasis mine):

Can an outgoing/boisterous wife also have a quiet spirit?

Mrs. Driscoll explains:

I would say yes. Also a quiet woman can have an unsubmitive heart and actions. So it doesn’t have to do with the personality of the person. I have many friends that are more passionate and outgoing but they are fully submissive and respectful of their husbands.

Proverbs 9:13 says: “The woman Folly is loud; she is undisciplined and without knowledge.” I think the question you need to ask yourself is are you without knowledge in your boisterousness? Are you undisciplined? Are you seeking the Lord? Are you prayerful when you are with your husband and even if you are energetic or
boisterous are you praying before you speak words to him? And also consider asking your husband if your boisterousness is disrespectful at all at times to him and be willing to repent if that is the case. But just because you are outgoing or boisterous doesn’t necessarily mean that you are unsubmitive. It doesn’t necessarily go hand in hand.

The best part of her response is when she defers to the woman’s husband to answer. In fact, had she limited her answer to this suggestion, it would have been an outstanding answer. However, it would have been even better had Mark given this answer directly. Moreover, given that Grace is answering the question because Mark feared rebellion from the wives, I don’t think the woman’s husband is in a good position to answer with any real leadership. If Pastor Driscoll fears this man’s wife, no doubt her husband fears her even more.

But more interesting than Grace’s answer, and perhaps more interesting than Mark’s fear of answering, is the question itself. In our feminist era the idea of a woman being quiet and gentle is heresy. “I am woman, hear me roar!” is the anthem inspired by second wave feminism, with ban bossy being just the latest incarnation of the mindset. Even conservative Christians are now terrified that wives will lack moxie. That the Bible would call on women to suppress this central aspect of feminism is horrifying, and this leads to much rationalization. Of course it can’t actually mean cultivating a quiet, gentle spirit. That is flat out unimaginable.

And yet, not only does it say this, but the reflexive reaction by feminist Christian women against actually being gentle and quiet should only reinforce the importance of it.
The secret to staying married
by Dalrock | October 9, 2015 | Link

Back in July the New York Times ran a surprisingly good piece on marriage titled: The Wedding Toast I’ll Never Give. It isn’t a great piece, but it is far better than what usually comes out of either Christian or secular media.

“The way to stay married,” my mother says, “is not to get divorced.”

“My parents were too poor to get divorced,” a friend told me that very day in Minneapolis as we walked through the book fair. “And so they stayed married and then it seemed too late, and now they’re glad.”

Those are the things I think about when yet another person I used to think of as being part of a happily married couple messages a friend of mine on Tinder.

The conventional wisdom on marriage is that intensive counseling accompanied by large doses of groveling by the husband is required for a marriage to stay together. But the advice from the author’s mother is a far better perspective, and is backed up by science. From Does Divorce Make People Happy? Findings from a Study of Unhappy Marriages:

- **Two out of three unhappily married adults who avoided divorce or separation ended up happily married five years later.** Just one out of five of unhappy spouses who divorced or separated had happily remarried in the same time period...

- **Many currently happily married spouses have had extended periods of marital unhappiness, often for quite serious reasons, including alcoholism, infidelity, verbal abuse, emotional neglect, depression, illness, and work reversals.** Why did these marriages survive where other marriages did not? The marital endurance ethic appears to play a big role. Many spouses said that their marriages got happier, not because they and their partner resolved problems but because they stubbornly outlasted them. With time, they told us, many sources of conflict and distress eased. Spouses in this group also generally had a low opinion of the benefits of divorce, as well as friends and family members who supported the importance of staying married.

- **Spouses who turned their marriages around seldom reported that counseling played a key role.**
In my last post I described the surprising wisdom included in a New York Times piece on marriage:

| “The way to stay married,” my mother says, “is not to get divorced.” |

This is in line with both the Bible and science, but is contrary to modern Christian thought. In the modern Christian view unhappy wives are an opportunity to invert biblical headship via the *wakeup call*.

Focus on the Family offers a striking example of this new and unbiblical view of marriage in their radio program *Moving From Loneliness to Intimacy in Your Marriage*. The program is an interview with Christian relationship expert Dr. David Clarke by Focus on the Family president *Jim Daly*.

The show opens with three clips of women with petty grievances about their marriages. Dr. Clarke sums the complaints up:

| Well, these little stories we heard just a few minutes ago from these ladies, I have heard a million times at my seminars, in my therapy office, oh, just one after the other, good solid Christian women. I am so lonely. I love my husband. He’s a good guy. He’s not in a serious sin and ... and he loves me, but ... and then they go into what these ladies just said. We’re not together a lot. There’s no real intimacy. I’m dying inside. And the key is, they’re not letting the husband know that. The guy has no clue. He’s perfectly happy. So, when that woman hits the wall and leaves him, he is the most stunned guy on earth. |

Clarke’s focus is “catching” these women before they are compelled to divorce, by teaching them how to threaten their husbands into better communication. He explains that the solution is for the wives to take charge, and for the husbands to let them take charge, which he claims is God’s plan:

| This is what God has done to us (Laughing). Now He’s got a master plan, because if we work together and let the woman actually teach us, ‘cause she has many more skills interpersonally that we will ... ever will have. She’s got a Ph.D. in emotional intimacy and spiritual intimacy very often. We have like a third-grade education. So, we have to let the woman kind of guide us, teach us. And then we come together, we get it. |

The premise here is that women are better at marriage *because they are unhappy being married*. Since men tend to be for the most part content in honoring their vows, and women tend to be unhappy doing so, this is proof that women are better at marriage than men. It isn’t just headship that Dr. Clarke is turning upside down; virtue has become vice, and vice has become virtue. Being discontent is a *virtue* according to Clarke, and being content is a
sign of foolishness and inferiority. Also note that Daly is right on board with this, and Daly is the president of Focus of the Family.

To solve the problem of “communication”, Dr. Clarke explains that husbands need to carry a notepad with them at all times and take notes so they will have things to talk about with their wives.

Even if it’s, “I bought batteries at the store for” you know, on sale for 5 bucks (Laughing). Okay, it’s a start. But I ... she knows I care about her. But I’ve gotten better with this. I know what she wants. She wants personal things, emotions, anger, frustration, memories that come into my mind. Guys, this happens to guys during the day, but it’s just whoo! It’s gone if you don’t jot it down.

The problem, Dr. Clarke explains, is that wives aren’t nagging their husbands enough to get them to communicate, and this is exacerbated by pastors and others teaching wives to love their husbands (emphasis mine):

If you just love your husband, uh ... treat him well, meet his needs, then he’s gonna turn around and just love you back the way you really need to be loved. Absolutely false. He’s a guy. He doesn’t know how anyway. He doesn’t know there’s a problem. And if you keep loving him, he’ll think everything’s fine. He will never get it. You have to get the man’s attention. You gotta sit down and say, “Honey, I’m not happy in our marriage. Here’s why. Let’s change it.”

Dr. Clarke explains that following the advice in the Bible in 1 Pet 3 won’t work. Instead, wives need to threaten their husbands:

You gotta get a man with a shovel to the head, metaphorically speaking, of course.

He explains in detail how they should do this:

The woman’s got to tell the man, “Look, Honey, I want to have a meeting with you in three days. It’s about our marriage. It’s gonna be very serious. In fact, it’s extremely serious and I want the kids aren’t gonna be in the house when we have this meeting.” And you set a time and that will get his attention. A decent guy, it’s like, wow! This is serious.

Men need to be threatened because when it comes to marriage they are idiots (emphasis mine).

You see a movie. You don’t see a movie to see a mov ... a guy thinks ... he thinks .... sees a movie just to see the movie. No, no, no, dummy, moron. I’m the same way. You see the movie to talk with your wife about the movie afterward. That’s the whole point. And if finally when the mov ... of what it reminds you of. Boy, that couple, that one scene reminded me of when we were dating, you know, back and we were at the Del Coronado in San Diego and we were on the beach and we snuck in and used their Jacuzzi.
Later however he acknowledges that both the husband and wife are to blame. The husband is to blame for being an idiot, and the wife is to blame for not nagging and threatening him enough:

```
We've gotta teach this man skills. First, we have to get his attention. I’m not happy. And the woman will admit, I’m part of the problem. I’ve not shared my needs. And so, we go through a series of steps where she shares her needs very clearly.
```

Daly and Clarke tie this back to Proverbs 21:9, explaining that the lesson of the proverb is that stupid husbands make their wives be insufferable by not communicating (emphasis mine):

```
All the resentments make a woman who’s cold, who’s mean, who’s sarcastic, who will pay you back. (Laughing) Oh, it’s terr ... and she doesn't want to; she's just going to.
```

Daly jumps on to the stupid husband bandwagon with:

```
Let's give a little clue here. You talk about uh ... a man’s density (Laughing), you know, but that we’re dense generally.
```

Dr. Clarke reiterates that while divorce is technically a sin, women can’t be expected to honor their vows if their husbands don’t “communicate” the way wives demand:

```
Christians now, they have no biblical reason. “I’m unhappy; you haven’t met my needs,” is not a biblical reason to get divorced.

But women especially, are walking away. And so, I’m trying to stop that. They don’t have to if the man would really change. But a lady will love a man with every ounce of her heart until she’s finally ... and not having honest ... being honest about her needs or “I’m very unhappy,” until the last day. And then when that last (Sound of snap) ounce is gone, boom! I call it hitting the wall. She’s done. And you literally cannot ... other than an act of God, get that woman back. She’s through.
```

The solution of course, is to buy Dr. Clarke’s book. As luck would have it, if you donated to Focus on the Family immediately after the program ran, you would have received a copy for free. However, this isn’t merely about money. Focus on the Family believes strongly that biblical headship has it backward, and that wives are supposed to be in charge.

**See Also:**

- Disrespecting respectability, dishonoring the honorable.
- Unhappy? Make your husband put a deposit into Dr. Harley’s Bank.
- The Whispers

*H/T Oscar.*
Scott is back.
by Dalrock | October 14, 2015 | Link

I’m very pleased to see that Scott and his wife are back, at their new blogging home Morally Contextualized Romance. I’ve added them to the blogroll, and you might want to stop by their new site and check it out.
Punishing with her presence
by Dalrock  |  October 16, 2015  |  Link

Better to dwell in a corner of a housetop,
Than in a house shared with a contentious woman.

— Proverbs 21:9  NKJV

In the Focus on the Family radio program I referenced the other day, Dr. Clarke explains that the wives he is talking about are just like the contentious woman described in the proverb above:

All the resentments make a woman who’s cold, who’s mean, who’s sarcastic, who will pay you back. (Laughing) Oh, it’s terr ... and she doesn’t want to; she’s just going to.

I have no doubt these women are every bit as unpleasant to be around as Clarke says they are. What is ironic however is that all three of the women offered as examples complained that their husbands didn’t want to spend time with them*:

**Woman #1:** My husband, Ben is into everything. He has a ball game or a meeting nearly every single night of the week. And then if he’s home, he’s on the phone talking over strategies for the next game or meeting. It ... it’s like he has time for everyone except for me.

**Woman #2:** If friends were enough, I wouldn’t have gotten married. I want my husband. I want him to be with me, to share my life on a daily basis.

**Woman #3:** I was in the grocery store checkout line and the man in front of me, all he did was just glance back and smile. He looked so kind. I don’t know what happened, but when I got back to my car, I burst into tears. I guess I finally had to admit how lonely I felt.

What we see here is a surprisingly common pattern for wives; they go out of their way to be unpleasant to their husbands and then complain that their husbands don’t want to spend time with them. This mode of thinking makes perfect sense to the women involved, but is truly puzzling to men.

I’ve written in the past about a time in our marriage roughly 20 years ago where my wife would at times go out of her way to make me not want to be around. When she did this I’d go hunting or fishing, or do something else rather than choose to stick around and be treated that way. She would go from desperately wanting to drive me away to feeling terribly alone after having done so. To my wife’s great credit she eventually figured out how to stop doing what she was doing. The most difficult part for her was whenever she talked to other women about this impulse she was feeling they acted like she was crazy. All of them denied ever having experienced or even hearing about this impulse, even though in some cases she had
watched them do the exact same thing. Eventually she figured out that if she just resisted the immediate urge and focused on something else for a while, the impulse would quickly go away.

Recently we were talking about this and she reminded me of the term I used at the time for how she was acting:

| Punishing me with her presence.

Despite near universal denial this impulse is extremely common. When women complain to my wife that their husbands never want to spend time with them she gently asks them if when they are around their husband they are pleasant and nice to be around. The response she receives varies from viewing my wife as a traitor to women, to shock that they had never considered this themselves.

*Clarke attributes their loneliness to a lack of feeling “emotional intimacy” towards their husbands (what I would call romantic love/sexual attraction). I don’t think he is wrong in this basic assessment, but I also don’t think this contradicts the fact that the women are also very unhappy that their husbands don’t want to be around them (they are separate things, and both are true). More importantly Clarke’s advice is not only in direct contradiction to the Bible, but on a practical level teaching these women to nag their husbands *harder* will make the physical separation worse, and his advice to husbands to fawn and grovel is going to further *frustrate the wives.*
She lost her best friend.
by Dalrock | October 19, 2015 | Link

On Saturday new commenter Constance left a heartbreaking comment on a post I wrote back in 2010:

My ex husband and I had a mutual divorce 5 years ago and I’m still not over it. It hurts every single day. There was no cheating, just a long period of separation and drifting apart. I suffer from depression, so that also contributed. Now, he has moved on, but I can’t and don’t know if I ever will. I still love and miss him. Always will. I deeply regret the divorce and I feel like I had amnesia and trying to find my life back. But, the wall is thick and tall. Feels like a living nightmare that is inescapable. I dream of trying to find him, but he can’t be reached. I can’t find any peace in my life. Drowning with sorrow and anger. Angry at my depression. Angry at the demise of a marriage to the only man I will ever love.

The title of the five year old post is Her husband was her best friend. The old post included multiple examples of wives who divorced or nearly divorced the best friend they ever had. One of the examples was from a now deleted blog (frivolousdivorce.wordpress.com). While the blog is gone, the Internet Archive has a copy of it and I captured some of the blog in my old post as well. In My husband was the best friend I ever had she wrote:

His faults were many: sleeping too much, clowning around too much, being too interested in sports, not knowing how to cook, not remembering the names of his childrens’ teachers, not getting home before 6 pm because of his 2-hour commute, not liking poetry and art, and other heinous offenses. All deserving of divorce, right?

The truth is that he endured years and years of my contempt, grinding criticism, big mouth, and deep character defects and he loved me in spite of it.

You see, he didn’t demand perfection like I did. He was just there for me through the good and the bad, doing what a real husband does. Too bad he didn’t have a real wife.

I didn’t have the strength of character to make it through the demanding years of our childrens’ teenage and college years. If I had endured those tough years, I would now have a companion to come home to, to eat dinner with, to go to a movie, travel, and grow old with. I do all of those things alone now. Seven years after the divorce, I still miss him.

Another woman has him as a husband and best friend now and he has forgotten me. Good for him.

Constance, the former blogger referenced above, and millions of other divorced women with similar heartbreaking stories show the absolute cruelty of those who either directly sell
divorce or sell the benefit of threats of divorce to unhappy wives.

Back in June I wrote about Dr. Harley selling threats of divorce to wives in his post When to Call It Quits (Part 1)*

On the subject of neglect, I’ve chosen to feature a marriage that isn’t all that bad from most people’s perspective, but isn’t good either. L.R.’s husband hasn’t abandoned her physically, leaving her to fend for herself. Instead, he’s only abandoned her emotionally. They probably even have a friendship of sorts. It’s cases like these that leave a wife struggling to know what to do.

As it turns out, most of these women divorce their husbands. In fact, research I’ve personally conducted in the archives of government statistics on the causes of divorce lead me to believe that as many as 80% of all divorces are caused by neglect. Women like L.R. suddenly call it quits with little warning, leaving her husband, family and friends scratching their heads wondering what’s wrong with her.

In this Q&A column, I describe what spouses usually do when faced with neglect, and then I explain what spouses should do. My approach is radical, and very controversial. But keep in mind the point I’ve just made-80% of divorces are caused by neglect. There’s a much higher risk of divorce in marriages where spouses are not meeting each other’s emotional needs than there is in all the marriages that suffer from physical and verbal abuse, chemical dependency, unemployment, and all other causes combined.

The secular Dr Harley’s approach to wives who have lost the tingle for their good husbands is you will note nearly identical to the modern Christian approach advocated by Dr. Clarke and Focus on the Family in the same situation (see here and here). If you put the writing of Dr’s Bank and Harley side by side (omitting Dr. Clarke’s biblical rationalizations for rebellion) it would be very difficult to tell the two apart. But either way, whether these evil whispers are spoken by secular or “Christian” counselors, or by the secular or modern Christian media, the end result of selling this sin to already tempted women is a massive trail of destruction. While the destruction is theoretically aimed at the husband, in practice innocent children and the foolish wives themselves end up paying terribly for this as well.

Related:

- The secret to staying married.
- Intermediate guide to selling divorce; overcoming women’s better judgment.
- Women’s morphing need for male investment.

*Here is an archive of the link.
False witness
by Dalrock | October 20, 2015 | Link

There are a number of bloggers who exist either mostly or entirely to troll the manosphere. Manboobz is probably the best known, and for a while we also had Bodycrimes tagging along. More recently Insanitybytes has come to my attention.

All of these sites share a common MO, which is a combination of snark, pointing and shrieking, and misrepresenting what is written on manosphere blogs. Of the three Insanitybytes has the most potential to deceive because she does her trolling under the guise of being a Christian antifeminist. While very few of my readers would be taken in by this ruse, sometimes it is worth pointing out the obvious.

For an example of how this works, on Sunday Vox Day put up a post at Alpha Game titled Girls are psychologically soft. Later that same day Insanitybytes responded with “Girls Are Psychologically Soft?” Insanity’s reply doesn’t quote, name, or link to Vox, but she references his blog post by title:

...imagine my surprise when I was rather rudely interrupted by a blog post that suggests, “Girls are Psychologically Soft.”

Next come the passive aggressive accusations (emphasis mine):

If I thought for one moment that girls being smaller, weaker, and psychologically softer, would somehow translate into the idea that life (and men) should show us even greater kindness and charity, you have no idea how often I would play the girl-card. Sadly, it is seldom true however. Something always seems to get lost in translation. In some odd quirk of human nature, “small, soft and weak” tends to just register as, “oh look, perfectly legitimate and morally acceptable……prey.”

Don’t ask me to explain it, human behavior just is what it is, and as this blogger so clearly implied, “girls are psychologically soft,” therefore…..feel free to exploit the crap out of them. He’s a charming specimen, let me tell you, as in some people have a screw loose, but this one done lost two bolts and Teh Stupid has come spilling out.

I am torn between a desire to mercifully try to scoop it up before anyone sees it….and the urge to look away politely, like one might do when someone’s zipper is down. You may not be embarrassed. I however, am embarrassed for you.

If you’ve read Vox’s original post you already know how delusional this claim is. Aside from quoting an opinion piece at CNN by feminists Carol Dweck and Rachel Simmons, Vox’s entire post is:

And it’s really not their fault. It’s the fault of those who have overpraised them since
they were in kindergarten:

[Quote of CNN feminist opinion piece.]

Of course, this also explains why women so often try to turn everything into grade-school, complete with an all-controlling authority figure; it’s the one environment in which they feel reasonably confident of succeeding by means of blind obedience and effort.

As you can see, only someone who is unhinged would misinterpret Vox’s post as an exhortation to exploit or harm women. But to a feminist (even one in denial), any challenge to feminism is a personal attack on herself, which explains Insanity’s bizarre mischaracterization of Vox’s post.
"I have always depended on the sexual kindness of strangers."

by Dalrock | October 21, 2015 | Link

Tracy “Hot Farts” Moore at Jezebel asks How Can We Make Casual Sex Better For Women? (language warning)

Anyone who has embarked on a first-time hookup with a man knows the following: it can be terrible, just OK, or great, but it’s highly unlikely you will get off. Is this a fixed truth of casual sex, or is there something we can do to change it?

Moore and other feminists are coveting something they can’t get. Their first problem is a lack of ownership. This is the tragedy of the slutty commons. Even worse, the kind of men Moore and others want to hook up with are the least likely to care about her satisfaction; their lack of caring is precisely what she finds so attractive.

Futility aside, Moore (like all feminists) puts her faith in the patriarchy to solve all of her problems:

Like everything that involves giving women pleasure or true equality—the wage gap, the domestic labor gap—we need men to pick up the slack.

If you take a step back, feminism is about nagging men to do what feminists want them to do. While it won’t work in this specific application, their faith in men’s ever enduring goodwill is generally speaking quite well placed. Feminism is the assertion that men are evil and naturally want to harm women, followed by pleas to men to solve all of women’s problems. Feminism has been so successful not because men by their nature want to harm women, but because appeals to men for assistance can be so reliably depended upon.

Hat Tip nooneofanyimport

Related: Intrasexual Competition and the Strong Independent Woman.
Open thread: Happy wife, happy life.
by Dalrock | October 21, 2015 | Link

Wibbins asks:

Dal, I have a question, when I hear the phrase “happy wife, happy life” it’s like hearing nails on a chalk board, it usually comes from men that let their wives make all decisions and just let her do everything, is there any way to push back on this concept?

I have some thoughts but they aren’t as pithy as I would like. This seems like a good topic for an open thread, so I’ll share my less than ideal responses as a seed for better replies by others.

One thought would be to reply with a question: “What makes a wife happy?” This is an opening for a conversation that may happen immediately or may happen at a later date.

Another thought comes to mind, and this is that the offending phrase is actually a reframing of Proverbs 21:9. Offering the proverb back would be a reframe in kind:

Better to dwell in a corner of a housetop,
Than in a house shared with a contentious woman.

However, this is also more of a conversation opener than the kind of retort I think Wibbins is asking for. It also would only be effective for a limited audience.

One last submission to get the ball rolling:

Wimpy husband, miserable wife.

But I’m sure there will be much better suggestions forthcoming in the comments.
All men’s fault
by Dalrock | October 22, 2015 | Link

The Daily Mail has a new piece titled The women who haven’t had sex for more than a decade: What it’s like to be celibate and why it’s all men’s fault. The article features three women who ended marriages or relationships between the ages of 38 and 50, and have not been able to find new relationships since.

Their experience isn’t surprising given the rapidly declining marriage and dating opportunities for women as they get older. Long time readers already know of the AARP study on late life divorce which found that women who divorced later in life (over 70% of those interviewed divorced in their 40s) very often ended up terribly alone:

- Almost 9 in 10 men (87%) dated after their divorce, compared to 8 in 10 women (79%)... Among those who dated after the divorce, more than half of men (54%) but fewer women remarried (39%). (Page 39)

- Many women, especially those who have not remarried (69%), do not touch or hug at all sexually. An even larger majority of women who have not remarried do not engage in sexual intercourse (77% saying not at all), in comparison with about half of men (49%) who have not remarried. (Page 6)

Over 60% of the divorcées the AARP surveyed hadn’t remarried at the time of the interview, and given the dramatic drop in women’s remarriage options as they age very few of them are likely to remarry in the future.
Even worse, sixty nine percent of the women who didn’t remarry said they don’t even get hugs. Ouch! The difficulty of even getting this small amount of affection from men came up twice in the Daily Mail piece. Susan told the Mail:

"When friends complain about their husbands pestering them for sex when they’re not in the mood I can’t help but think: ‘You don’t know how lucky you are to have someone who loves you and wants to show it.’"

‘My desire to feel a man’s arms around me and be loved, even briefly, is so deep that I’ve even contemplated offering just to have sex with one.’

There must be plenty out there who would like a no-strings relationship...

Note that she says she contemplates *propositioning men for no strings sex*, and that *there must be plenty* of men out there who would be interested in having no-strings sex with her, not that she contemplates taking any up on recent expressions of interest.*

Suzie (a different woman) explains that while she still very much wishes she could have sex, she has at least found a way to arrange for a man to give her hugs:

‘My passions are still going strong, so I do look at men and think ‘Cor!’ but I’ve not
met the right one to settle down with.’

Instead, Suzie, from Cambridge, has a happily platonic relationship with a younger man. She says she gets to experience the joy of having comforting man-hugs and even walking hand-in-hand with him on the many holidays they have had in places such as Crete, Italy and France.

This is brutal stuff, despite the Mail trying to put a happy face on the issue. Once again it reiterates the profound cruelty of the message that groups like Focus on the Family and secular marriage counselors are selling unhappy wives. Shirley in the article divorced her third husband because she “felt emotionally unsupported”, only to collapse on the street shortly thereafter due to a uterine fibroid tumor caused by her “promiscuous youth”. She survived the health crisis, but after fifteen years of celibacy she doubts she will ever find another man.

*Elsewhere in the article they explain that over the last 17 years Susan has been propositioned “a couple of” times for no strings sex but turned them down due to her high moral standards.

**Correction**: The women ended their marriages between the ages of 38 and 50, not 36 and 41.
This blog has been from the beginning a male space. At the same time, I have welcomed female commenters from the beginning. There is an obvious contradiction here, and I have managed this to the best of my ability. However:

1. We live in a world where male spaces are vanishingly rare. This means protecting the few we have is especially important.
2. When women enter a male space, they inevitably change that space by their presence.

Cane Caldo has limited comments on his blog to male commenters (see also here and here), and Scott has defined a policy of generally separating the commenting of women and men on his blog. Both Cane and Scott make strong arguments for their changes, and after considering the issue I have decided to modify my own comment policy regarding women.

While this is a male space, one of my objectives is to help ease the suffering of both women and men by helping people make better choices. I also have found that while women always change a male space by entering it, there are some women who are able to greatly reduce their footprint in this respect. With this in mind, I’ve decided to continue to allow women to comment, but to have a bias towards removing women who tend to be more disruptive by their presence. This way the discussion isn’t repeatedly derailed by emotional reactions, endless rounds of reframing, etc. And of course, even if you aren’t able to comment you will still be able to read.

I would offer advice to women who wish to comment here on how to minimize the amount that they change the space by participating, but my observation is the women who know how to do this know it in their gut, and the women who struggle with this aren’t likely to either understand or follow the advice I would offer.

I’ll also note that this is just one small place on the internet. If you feel your voice isn’t being heard, I would encourage you to start your own blog for free.

Lastly, I’ll define some general rules for commenting on the blog which apply to men and women. The first three rules below have always been in place, and the fourth is new:

1. Don’t violate copyright law. If there is a question, I’m inclined to err on the side of caution. A link and a paraphrase is ideal.
2. Don’t advocate violence.
3. Avoid changing the topic from the original post, especially early in the comment thread (the first few days or 100 comments after a post is published). After a few days and or 100 comments I’m fairly lenient here so long as the topic change isn’t egregious.
4. Don’t brag about or advocate adultery.

In addition to the above, avoid the following topics unless I specifically make an exception in a post:
1. Age of consent laws. This is a guaranteed thread derailer. It is ok to reference the existence of these laws provided it is on topic, but don’t do this in such a way that would invite a discussion on what should be the proper age of legal consent.
2. Marital corporal punishment.

I’ll place a link to this post on the top of the blog and update the comment policy as required.
Screaming abuse is a brilliant feminist tool to keep husbands compliant because while there are some abusive men who mistreat women, feminists know they can appeal to men as a group to do pretty much anything to try to help or protect women. Ironically calling good men abusers only makes the falsely accused men even more willing to do feminists’ bidding. By expanding the definition of abuse to absurdity feminists can henpeck men into doing exactly as the feminists bid, since anything other than what the feminists say to do becomes by definition “abuse”. Feminists tyrannize good men by accusing good men of being tyrants. It is sheer evil brilliance.

It isn’t just secular feminists who have figured this out. Christian feminists have seen how incredibly effective this is and followed suit. Joel and Kathy Davisson label anything husbands do that wives don’t like “abuse”. Accusing the husband of abuse (for the crime of making his wife unhappy) then sets the stage for the wife to lower the boom on her husband, in order to force him to buy the Davisson’s products as well as those of their mentor Dr. Paul Hegstrom (emphasis mine):

She must demand that he get into counseling and begin a journey of discovery, BEFORE the marriage is restored.

Our books are perfect for this man. Paul Hegstrom’s books are perfect for this man. Ken Nair’s books are perfect for this man.

Our Intensive Marriage Weekend is a required necessity for this couple, BEFORE the marriage is restored.

This should by now be a familiar pattern for my readers. What the Davissons call “abuse”, Dr Harley calls “neglect” and Dr. Clarke and Focus on the Family imply is abandonment. The solution in all three cases is to put the wife in charge so she can make the husband purchase their products. All three advise the same basic strategy of causing terror in the husband that he is going to lose his family. While the specifics of how to accomplish this vary somewhat, the basic plan is the same. What Joel and Kathy call “Lowering the Boom”, Dr. Harley calls “Plan B” and Dr. Clarke and FotF calls “Hitting him over the head with a shovel”.

But Focus on the Family doesn’t stop with implying that husbands are abandoning wives (and thereby causing them to lose the tingle). FotF has a dedicated series on their website explaining “emotional abuse”. They declare that Christian husbands emotionally abusing their wives is a rampant problem in Emotional Abuse in the Local Church:

Emotional abuse is rampant in our culture, and Christians are not immune.

They also explain that it isn’t just women who suffer, men suffer too. Women suffer from being emotionally abused by men, and men suffer from emotionally abusing women:
Dr. Margaret Rinck, a clinical psychologist and author, dissects what happens in emotionally abusive relationships and offers sound and compassionate advice in her book, *Christian Men Who Hate Women* (Zondervan).

She writes, “We need to set women—and men—free from the terrible bondage that entraps them.” It might seem that a husband is the “bad guy” in the relationship, but “in reality he is in no less pain than the woman, but he usually does not know it.”

If you are a man, you are likely abusing your wife and don’t even know it. But what is emotional abuse? Pretty much anything and everything, including a husband who instructs his wife on Scripture and submission. Focus on the Family asks if the reader knows any emotionally abusive Christian men, men like Mark:

Mark instructed Janet not to speak during the Bible study, telling her “women are to keep silent in the churches” (1 Cor. 14:34).

Although Janet had questions, she remained silent in order to “submit” to her husband. Like many abusers, Mark distorted Scripture to manipulate his wife’s behavior.

There is some misdirection here because some will be tempted to assume this is merely FotF disagreeing with the husband’s interpretation of “church” in 1 Cor 14:33b-35. But this would be a disagreement on a difficult question, not abuse. What the article is saying is that it is abuse for a husband to instruct his wife on Scripture (contrary to 1 Cor 14:35 and Eph 5:26). FotF reinforces this same point in *My Spouse Is Verbally and Emotionally Abusive*:

...it isn’t up to a man to see to it that his wife “submits.” The apostle has given tasks to each partner in the relationship. Each partner is responsible only for his or her own assignment. To put it bluntly, men need to forget about “submission.” Their job is to learn what it means to love their spouses “as Christ loved the church.”

The *Abuse in the Local Church* article quotes the Davissons’ mentor Dr. Paul Hegstrom, explaining that Scripture is used to condone abuse (emphasis mine):

It is a sad state of affairs in the church that when a woman has been abused, it seems that the congregation, her friends, and her clergy shy away from dealing with the situation...

Many times in a Church world, submission is held over the heads of women by men who are emotionally manipulative or abusive in order to get their way and maintain power and control.

Power and control. That phrase should ring a bell, because it is the language of the radical feminist domestic violence paradigm. Specifically, it comes from the Duluth Model, and the Duluth Power and Control Wheel. One of the spokes of the Duluth wheel is the feminist term “Male Privilege”:

Treating her like a servant: making all the big decisions, acting like the “master of
the castle,” being the one to define men’s and women’s roles.

Hegstrom uses the language of radical feminism, a paradigm entirely hostile to biblical headship and submission. As the Duluth Model website explains, the community which subscribes to the Duluth Model (emphasis mine):

Believes that battering is a pattern of actions used to intentionally control or dominate an intimate partner and **actively works to change societal conditions that support men’s use of tactics of power and control over women.**

This isn’t about abuse, this is about changing the power dynamic between men and women. This is about obliterating headship. This is Hegstrom’s field, so he wouldn’t accidentally adopt the language of a paradigm he didn’t agree with, and his framing of the issue is the same as the Duluth framing. He is concerned that the church uses submission to give husbands “power and control” in marriage. This is important. Hegstrom isn’t objecting to how husbands are exercising headship, he is objecting to headship itself. True to the Duluth model, he is working to change societal conditions that support men having power and control. And here is Focus on the Family citing Hegstrom as the expert in Christian “emotional abuse”. FotF’s endorsement of the Duluth model can also be seen in the Spouse article where they implore readers to (emphasis mine):

Make sure that the therapist you choose understands the dynamics of abuse, **power, and control**, and that he or she is well trained in the highly specialized field of marital conflict.

If you ask for a therapist using the language above, you are asking for a therapist trained in the Duluth Model.

After a great deal more straight out of the feminist playbook, the Local Church article advises pastors to send husbands accused of emotional abuse to Dr. Hegstrom’s program Life Skills International for treatment:

Along with loving confrontation, **pastors should encourage the abuser to join a treatment program.** An organization that can help is Life Skills International, found online at [http://www.lifeskillsintl.org/](http://www.lifeskillsintl.org/). Founded by Paul Hegstrom, a former abuser, the program addresses abuse from a biblical perspective.

The website for Hegstrom’s Life Skills International will obliterate any remaining doubt you might have that Focus on the Family is selling the radical feminist paradigm of domestic violence. Among other things, the Life Skills website contains a **Power and Control Wheel**, including Male Privilege and Religious Abuse. See the full wheel and click on each item, as there is too much radical feminist insanity to quote. See also the Signs of Abuse page where **any** of the bulleted items indicates abuse, including a husband not sharing equally in the housework:

- Household responsibilities are not shared.

As I mentioned above, not only is Hegstrom the Christian authority Focus on the Family turns
to in order to define how using Scripture on submission, etc. constitutes “abuse”, he is also
the mentor of Joel and Kathy Davisson. Joel Davisson is a proud graduate of Life Skills
International and credits Hegstrom for teaching him the proper interpretation of Scripture
regarding husbands and wives. For his part, Hegstrom is so proud of Joel and Kathy’s work
that he wrote the preface to their book The Man of Her Dreams The Woman of His!. Check
out the book on Amazon to see Hegstrom’s name right there on the cover. Use the “search
inside” feature to see the preface and to see how Joel and Kathy credit Hegstrom and Life
Skills for their theology of marriage, including their doctrine of “women as responders”.

*In the Spouse article FotF also endorses Hegstrom’s Life Skills International.

See also:

- No room for headship here.
- Blowing the Whistle on the Domestic Violence Research Paradigm
Commenters pacguy and Jonadab-the-Rechabite both point out that by the definitions of abuse from Life Skills International and FotF wives are regularly abusing their husbands, and they are very often doing so at the direction of Life Skills, FotF, the Davissons, and Drs. Hegstrom, Clarke, and Harley. Each of the following is defined as abuse on the Life Skills Power and Control wheel:

- Affection is conditional (denying sex would certainly count here)
- Threatens to end the relationship
- Threatens to take the children.
- Uses partner’s money and/or credit with or without their knowledge.
- Accuses.
- Manipulates.
- Commits mental blackmail.

This is a very short sample, but it gives an idea of the problem feminists have here. Feminists are using accusations of abuse to bully and abuse good men. There is no way around this. It works because good men want to help and protect women. It is as I mentioned, sheer evil brilliance.

Moreover, they know exactly what they are doing, which is why they created a special definition of abuse called knowledge abuse. If you point out that by their definition of abuse that you are in fact the one being abused, this is proof that you are an abuser.

- Receives a limited amount of counseling and uses it against partner; uses knowledge of partner’s past against them...
- Reads and listens to self-help books and tapes then uses the information to blame the partner for problems in the relationship.

So when your wife listens to FotF and learns that you are the source of the relationship’s problems and threatens to leave you, take your children away from you, and/or denies sex unless you do what she wants, you can’t defend yourself by pointing out that these are all abuse. As the man you are the abuser, period, and arguing otherwise is just more proof that you are an abuser.

Even worse, if your wife is diagnosed as Borderline, Bipolar, etc. and you point out that she is abusing you in ways that fit with this diagnosis, this is also knowledge abuse:

- uses medical professional’s comments or advice to blame partner for the problems in the relationship

These folks know exactly what they are doing, and they have spent decades perfecting their methodology to do so. Don’t fall for the same mistake so many other men have made of
assuming they are actually acting in (perhaps misguided) good faith, or that this is actually about abuse. It is not, it is about destroying headship by taking power away from husbands and giving it to their wives. They come right out and tell us this by explaining that you can’t use their own definitions against them, just like the Duluth Model website tells us this more directly (emphasis mine):

Making the Power and Control Wheel gender neutral would hide the power imbalances in relationships between men and women that reflect power imbalances in society. By naming the power differences, we can more clearly provide advocacy and support for victims, accountability and opportunities for change for offenders, and system and societal changes that end violence against women.

As they state plainly, the goal of the Duluth Model is to:

...change societal conditions that support men’s use of tactics of power and control over women.

This isn’t about methods or tactics of using power, which is why they are fine when women use the same methods against men. This is about the power dynamic itself. This isn’t about how power is used, but about who has the power.

Related: The crazy dictator.
God’s secret plan for every married man’s life.
by Dalrock | October 28, 2015 | Link

Magnus asks

I wonder what Dr. Hegstrom and the Davissons would say to a genuinely abused man: A man who has been denied sex for years, has been emotionally manipulated and threatened with divorce and financial ruin, and has had his children taken away to be raised by the mother and a replacement father on the other side of the country. Would they care? Would they have even an ounce of sympathy? Are are they so blinded with ideology that they are incapable of empathy and reason?

No need to wonder. They would say that since women are “responders”, everything she did was ultimately his fault and proof that he wasn’t following the instructions God wrote for him. If he weren’t doing something terribly wrong, she would not have done those things. He needs to admit his abuse and beg for her forgiveness. They would at the same time counsel her to forgive him when he repents.

I know this from Joel and Kathy’s book The Man of Her Dreams The Woman of His! See page 31 where Joel explains what Dr. Hegstrom taught him about women’s misbehavior when Joel attended Life Way International. This moment was Joel’s epiphany (all emphasis in quotes below is from the original):

A few more hours into the training, I repeated the question in another manner. “Can’t the woman be the problem? The man is not always the problem in marriage.“ Of course I gestured toward my problem wife! This continued into the second day until Dr. Hegstrom finally had enough. He told me point blank that I was the problem in my marriage. He told me that Kathy was desperate to have a great marriage relationship for that is how God made her.

He continued saying that my issues had caused the problems in our marriage and that if I would get healed and change that I would have a most incredible wife. He emphatically stated that she might have some very minor issues that needed to be addressed but that she will deal with those on her own after I have dealt with mine.

Paul told me that God made Kathy a responder and that her problems were a reflection of her responding to my treatment of her. He said that when I grow up and lay my life down for my wife as Christ did for the church that I would be amazed at how wonderful a wife I have.

This was the beginning. A seed was planted...

This is very similar to the theology FotF and Dr. Clarke teach, where the wife is made by God to know what should be going on in the marriage and the husband needs only to put her in charge. In fact, Joel and Kathy spell this out more directly in their book. On page 36 in a frame box it says:
Men, here it is. Your wife wants a fabulous relationship with you. God made her that way.

On the same page Joel explains that this is the meaning of Genesis 3:16:

Your wife wants a fabulous and happy relationship with you. God made her that way. In Genesis God spoke to your wife concerning this desire that she would have for you.

Your desire shall be for your husband.
-Genesis 3:16

She wants you baby, she wants you! However, what God created your wife to desire is a deep, meaningful, bonded, successful relationship with you.

On page 86 they explain in another framed box that the wife’s feelings are a marriage manual from God:

God has equipped every woman with a marriage manual in her heart, designed to instruct her husband in how to meet her unique needs.

On page 90 they explain that God has written His instructions for men in their wife’s hearts, and that only by doing what their wife feels is right can they know God’s will not just for the marriage, but God’s plan for the man himself:

It is very simple. When your wife’s marriage manual points out that you have violated her in some way, your job is to hear her heart and accept what it is that your personal marriage manual is saying to you. Your wife may not have a clue as to how to handle the household checkbook. She may not have a clue as how to run a lawnmower. What she does have is that unique marriage manual in her heart for your marriage which is given to her from God. The way that a man becomes the man that God has called him to be is to become the husband his wife needs him to be. The only way to become the husband our wife needs us to be is to read our personal marriage manual. How do read that marriage manual? We listen to her heart.

The logic is as plain as it is absurd: If you wish to serve God, submit to your wife’s emotions in all things.

I realize that this stuff is so flat out ridiculous that some will suspect I’m making this up. I urge you to check the book out for yourself using Google Books or the Amazon “look inside” feature to see that this is accurate (barring possible typographical errors). Keep in mind that Joel and Kathy are writing about what they learned in Life Way International from Dr. Hegstrom, and that FotF urges your pastor to send men accused of abuse to this same place to learn Life Way International’s theology of marriage.

Prior to researching for this series of posts I thought that Joel and Kathy were on the fringe, expressing a theology outside the modern Christian mainstream. In researching these posts
I’ve been surprised to learn that they are:

1. Even more absurd in their theology than I had previously understood. They take wife worship to a whole new level, far worse than I had ever seen before.
2. Teaching a theology that is well within the modern Christian mainstream. This isn’t as far as I can tell taught as overtly as Joel and Kathy do (yet). However it is taught in a less obvious form on venues like the FotF radio program, as well in full strength behind closed doors at “marriage counseling” sessions endorsed by mainstream Christian organizations.
Repenting of sexual morality.
by Dalrock | November 2, 2015 | Link

A month ago Liška at XO Jane wrote Marriage Shouldn’t Be an Endurance Sport. Liška repents of her sin of trying to tempt a friend into honoring her marriage vows (emphasis mine):

There was no abuse. No one had been caught in flagrante delicto. Their kids weren’t acting out. They didn’t even argue. Her marriage to Lee* had simply run its course...

While Ann was crunching numbers, figuring out how to make it as a single mom, I was like Mephistopheles tempting Faustus. She and the kids wouldn’t have to worry about the money if she and Lee stuck together, I reminded her. Was she really sure?

She tells us she was guilty of divorce shaming, something she did despite knowing better:

I’d divorced-shamed my best friend.

Funny, but Ann’s reasons were the same I used when people asked why me and my husband of eight years got divorced. This meant that not only was I a hypocrite, I was the one with issues.

This is the upside down world we live in, where encouraging people to remain married is tempting them to do evil, and Christians celebrate the awesome power of threats to destroy the family in their scheme to invert headship.

Most social commentators wonder why roughly half of first marriages end in divorce. However, the more relevant question is how can marriage stripped of all legal force survive in a culture where it is more moral to encourage divorce, or at least threats of divorce, than to encourage honoring marriage vows. How is it possible for so many marriages to survive when everyone agrees that divorce (and not marriage) is sacred, and the family courts back up this new morality with offers of cash and prizes to any woman who does the right thing and blows up her family? What is the “evil” that threatens our sacred institution of divorce?

Liška understands, at least in her gut, what the most dangerous remaining threat to divorce is. This threat is the status women gain from marriage (or something like marriage). This is what her post is really about, decrying the one force which is standing in the way of moral progress. Liška read the NYT article I referenced here, and was disturbed that women in the comments section were bragging that they had the status of remaining married, a status that Liška and her friend no longer have. This must stop:

The comments section, however, was disturbingly duration focused: “I want to kill him a lot the time, but we’ve made it 20-35-50 years, ha-ha!”
Is quantity of time a measure of its quality? Exactly how many “and yet”s does a person have to take?

If law offers an out to marriage, society continues to act as its enforcer. We continue to promote marriage longevity like it’s an endurance event. We reward and acknowledge it by milestone with anniversary parties and bragging rights...

Related:

- Put your faith in divorce.
- Intrasexual Competition and the Strong Independent Woman.
- Women’s morphing need for male investment.
Commitment issues
by Dalrock | November 6, 2015 | Link

Dr. Harley explains in *Why Women Leave Men* that women have commitment issues:

Why do women seem so dissatisfied with marriage? What do they want from their husbands? What bothers them so much about marriage that most are willing to risk their families’ future to escape it?

What is interesting is that what Dr. Harley is saying is (depending on the context) conventional wisdom. *Everyone knows* that traditional marriage is a cruel institution that “traps” women in commitment, depriving them of the romantic love their noble hearts desire. *Everyone knows* that no fault divorce is required to liberate women from being trapped in commitment.

Modern women’s enthusiasm for divorce is hardly a well kept secret. If you are looking at media aimed to women, divorce empowerment is a staple. This is quite literally a shameless obsession. As new commenter Anna mentioned recently:

It’s crazy that every time that I find an article about marriage, it’s either about the actual wedding or divorce. As a 26 year old woman that has been married for 6 years, I’m well aware of the pressure for divorcing. There’s always a “5 ways to know that your marriage is over”. This is how I found your website and it all makes so much sense, even though I’m not a christian. I have no idea why society is leaning towards destroying its foundations.

Yet change the context to the cost of broken families, and suddenly *everyone knows* that men are running away from commitment. This is especially important when it comes to conservative backing for child support. In 2005 Phyllis Schlafly laid out what should be the standard conservative position on a government program designed to destroy families in *Federal Incentives Make Children Fatherless*:

The federal incentives drive the system. The more divorces, and the higher the child-support guidelines are set and enforced (no matter how unreasonable), the more money the state bureaucracy collects from the feds.

Follow the money. The less time that non-custodial parents (usually fathers) are permitted to be with their children, the more child support they must pay into the state fund, and the higher the federal bonus to the states for collecting the money.

The states have powerful incentives to separate fathers from their children, to give near-total custody to mothers, to maintain the fathers’ high-level support obligations even if their income is drastically reduced, and to hang onto the father’s payments as long as possible before paying them out to the mothers...

We can no longer ignore how taxpayers’ money is incentivizing divorce and creating...
fatherless children. Nor can we ignore the government’s complicity in the predictable social costs that result from more than 17 million children growing up without their fathers.

Yet Schlafly is an extreme outlier among conservatives on this topic. Conservatives are the strongest backers of the child support system, and this is due to a deeply held belief that broken families are caused by men who aren’t willing to stick around and raise their kids. This belief is so strong that conservatives end up taking very unconservative positions on the family. Instead of opposing a law that creates perverse incentives to break up families, they enthusiastically support it. Instead of supporting marriage, they support the system designed to replace marriage. Instead of supporting an incentive based structure for production, they are wedded to a crushing soviet style quota system that discourages hard work.

Most recently this dynamic came up in an opinion piece at the Washington Post. President Obama is pushing to stop accruing child support to men who are in prison, since child support is in theory based on a man’s potential earnings. As Instapundit noted, even feminists can see the absurdity of piling on crushing debt to men who aren’t in a position to pay. Yet conservatives love child support, and will fight any changes that don’t make the system stronger:

Congressional Republicans oppose the new policy. They argue that it would undercut the 1996 welfare reform act, which pressed states to locate missing fathers and bill them for child support so taxpayers wouldn’t bear the full burden of their children’s welfare.

“I am fundamentally opposed to policies that allow parents to abdicate their responsibilities, which, in turn, results in more families having to go on welfare,” Senate Finance Committee Chairman Orrin G. Hatch (R-Utah) said in a speech in June on the Senate floor. Obama’s new regulations, he said, “would undermine a key feature of welfare reform, which is that single mothers can avoid welfare if fathers comply with child-support orders.”

It is important to note that this is not about recouping money from convicts who can afford to support their children. This is about maintaining a credible threat to other men, as a reminder that they must do everything in their power to earn the amount the courts have assigned as their production quota. Billing these incarcerated men costs far more than any amount actually collected, and by making it harder for them to succeed after release it also makes them more likely to end up back in prison.

See Also:

- Debtors prisons are an essential tool of our new public policy.
- How we came to embrace illegitimacy.

*HT Pedat Ebediyah

**Not all modern women view divorce as empowerment, but a large enough majority does feel this way, which is why divorce empowerment is ubiquitous in entertainment aimed at
women.
As I explained in my [last post], there is a form of doublethink involved with the topic of how families get broken up. When the discussion is how to hold marriages together, *everyone knows* the solution is for men to do whatever it takes to stop their wives from getting bored and nuking the family. Marriage counselor Dr. Harley puts it this way (emphasis mine):

> Why do women seem so dissatisfied with marriage? What do they want from their husbands? **What bothers [women] so much about marriage that most are willing to risk their families’ future to escape it?**

Yet whenever the topic is the terrible cost of broken families, *everyone knows* the problem is men abandoning their children and not honoring their marriage vows.

But each day the amnesia returns again, and as soon as the discussion is about how to hold families together, everyone once again knows that broken homes are caused by women ejecting the father of their children from the family. As Justice Schanfarber explains today in *Why Women Leave Men They Love: What Every Man Needs to Know* (emphasis mine):

> As a marriage counsellor working with men and women in relationship crisis, I help clients navigate numerous issues. While many situations are complex, there’s one profoundly simple truth that men need to know: Women leave men they love.

> They feel terrible about it. It tears their heart out of them. But they do it. They rally their courage and their resources and they leave. **Women leave men with whom they have children, homes and lives.**

Of course when we talk about women leaving what we are almost always talking about is the woman staying put and expelling the man from the house, as an attorney explains in *Five Ways to Get a Spouse Out of the House*. As one divorcée brilliantly put it, divorce is a *neutron bomb for men*.

Either way, as Schanfarber explains, women’s commitment in marriage is notoriously fickle; it could give out at any moment should a woman no longer feel the spark. Every child in an intact family could have their lives turned upside down at *any moment* should their mother become bored of being married.

> Your wife is not your property. She does not owe you her soul. You earn it. Day by day, moment after moment.

*H/T enrique*
Our slow drift away from marriage.

by Dalrock | November 10, 2015 | Link

Johnycomelately asks:

I’m just wondering what will happen when the clock chimes and men collectively realise the game has changed and that ‘marriage’ really is just a temporary enterprise.

Will that ever happen or will the fem collective continue to maintain the wool over the eyes of men?

What will marriage 3.0 look like?

I don’t think it will happen that way. What I think we will see, and what we can already see, is a slow drift of the culture away from marriage. All of these people I’m quoting, from FotF to the new age marriage counselor are very loudly explaining that marriage has no moral meaning. This isn’t a new message, although the volume and intensity does seem to have increased over the last few decades. This along with the corresponding message that married men and fathers are at best buffoons not to be respected, and at worst more despicable than murders and rapists is having a natural impact. Add to this an ever increasing age at which women start to marry. All of this together, the church, the law, the culture, etc are teaching young men that marriage and fatherhood is for fools and knaves, or at the very least irrelevant and not worth preparing for.

Over time this has and will continue to erode young men’s perceptions of marriage as well as their desire to signal provider status. We already see this in the surveys of Millennials where marriage is less important, as is having children. For Millennial women this change is happening due to feminist messages of empowerment, but for men it is happening for the reasons we are discussing. The part that should frighten policy makers is the very inertia that made it seem like we could gut marriage and still have it work is going to work against us on the other side. You won’t be negotiating with an individual man or even a band of men “on strike”, but with a culture. And even worse, by the time women want to marry at 30ish, a large portion of the men they are looking to as husbands and providers will have coasted for a decade or more. These “Peter Pan” men can’t go back and dedicate their teens and twenties to education and career advancement any more than their would be brides can go back and undo the ravages of time, their student loan/cc debt, and a decade and a half of slutting around before looking for a husband.
What about the fathers?
by Dalrock | November 13, 2015 | Link

Last year Kathryn Edin wrote in The Shriver Report about low income single fathers, in a piece titled What About the Fathers? She thought she knew all about these men, having spent years speaking to single mothers. But talking to the fathers themselves was a shocking revelation (emphasis mine):

...I had spent years living and talking with black, white, and Hispanic single mothers in some of the nation’s toughest urban neighborhoods in Philadelphia, Chicago, the deep South, and the West Coast—10 cities in all. I thought I had learned everything there was to know about these men from the moms. Besides, didn’t everyone know the guys were irresponsible? That they really didn’t care about the kids they conceived? In 2008, even presidential candidate Barack Obama was calling them out, saying they had better stop acting like boys and have the courage to raise a child not just create one.

Finally, fellow researcher Tim Nelson and I began actually talking to these men—more than 100 low-income noncustodial dads living in poor neighborhoods in the Philadelphia area. As it turns out, “everyone” wasn’t right. We were all dead wrong—me, the country, and even Barack Obama.

Edin explains that the pregnancies she studied very often were due to the decision by the mother to forgo birth control without the knowledge of the father, because motherhood will gain her status:

Pretty soon, the women are skipping doses of the pill or letting the patch or other forms of contraception lapse. Why? In these communities, motherhood often exerts a strong pull on young women’s hearts and minds and weakens their motivation to avoid pregnancy. Being a mom serves as the chief source of meaning and identity in neighborhoods where significant upward mobility is rare.

Then once the baby is born, the mothers have strong incentives to eject the father from the family, replacing him with what ultimately turns into a parade of men:

When a single mom in the inner city feels her kid’s father has failed to provide, there is an enormous temptation to “swap daddies,” pushing the child’s dad aside while allowing a new man—perhaps one with a little more going for him economically—to claim the title of father. These moms are often desperate to find a man who can help with the bills so they can keep a roof over their kid’s head. The problem is that these new relationships may be no more stable than the old ones.

When a mom moves from one relationship to another—playing gatekeeper with the biological father while putting her new boyfriend into the dad’s role—she puts her kids on a “father-go-round.”
Edin is describing the very double think I’ve been discussing here and here. It is overall a surprisingly good article, especially coming from a feminist organization. Edin recognizes that it is the mothers who are the ones who decide the structure of the family and if the father is to be involved beyond just a paycheck.

If they want to stop the father-go-round, moms will have to do what they can to keep the biological dad involved with his child and not push him aside. It’s up to them, because currently, mothers have most of the power de facto, if not de jure.

While the mothers eject the fathers to invite in a parade of new men, the rejected fathers end up repeatedly trying to create new families with other women, hoping they eventually will be permitted to stay:

Meanwhile, the biological fathers themselves end up on a family-go-round, having kids by other women in a quest to try to get what they long for—the whole father experience. Each new child with a different mom offers another chance—a clean slate. With eagerness, they once again invest every resource they can muster in service of that new fragile family.

However, Edin fails to realize the need for true commitment if we are going to stop the immense suffering of so many poor (not to mention middle class) children. Our elites have created a new family structure which is a disaster for all but the top quarter of the socioeconomic scale, but the UMC refuses to recognize the immense pain this selfish change is wreaking. Her suggestion to poor men is to make sure they have a high income and their relationship with the mother is “on a solid footing” before having children, in order to reduce the likelihood that she will become unhappy and expel him from the family:

Here is my message to young disadvantaged men: If you really want to be a good dad, wait until you are financially ready to have a child, preferably your mid-to-late 20s, if not beyond. Make sure your relationship with the child’s mother is on a solid footing first.

See Also:

- Fathers [sometimes] matter!
- Black fathers [don’t] matter.
Instapundit is reminding readers that today is National Ammo Day. Instapundit also noted yesterday that Obama is suggesting that he will spend his last year in office focused on gun control.

Should you feel the desire to celebrate National Ammo Day by purchasing ammunition (in compliance with all applicable laws of course), you might be interested in the special offer SG Ammo has for Blazer Brass ammunition. If you buy 1000 rounds of .45 ACP it is only 26 cents a round, and if you buy boxes of 50 (same ammo) it is only 28 cents a round. Still a good deal but closer to common pricing is the Blazer Brass 9mm at the same site. A 1000 round case is 19 cents a round, and a 50 round box is 20 cents a round.

Either prices are about to drop quite a bit across the board, or SG Ammo picked up the Blazer Brass on a special buy because the .45 especially is quite a bit cheaper than everything else. This is American made FMJ brass selling for less than Russian steel cased* ammunition or even most reloads. As a single point of reference, Lucky Gunner has the same Blazer Brass .45 for an extra $60 a case, and even then it is the third cheapest .45 Lucky Gunner has available.

Related: OT: Ammunition is (mostly) cheap and plentiful again.

*With potentially a bimetal jacket which isn’t permitted in many indoor ranges.
The temptation for wives to claim abuse.

by Dalrock | November 21, 2015 | Link

In our age claiming abuse is a powerful tool for wives to punish their husbands. This creates a profound temptation for wives to betray their husbands for any or no reason. Everything is abuse, and for a husband to be accused of abuse is to be considered guilty of abuse. This temptation is most powerful when families are already under strain.

We can see a disturbing example of this in the recent article from Christianity Today: Pastor Saeed Abedini’s Wife Halts Public Advocacy, Citing Marital Woes and Abuse. Pastor Abedini is serving an eight year prison sentence in Iran for spreading the gospel. In a Washington Post op-ed piece on October 23rd, Pastor Abedini’s wife Naghmeh wrote of the abuse her husband faces in the Iranian prison:

Since the nuclear deal in the summer, it is not only more difficult to maintain hope, but the reality of my husband’s situation has grown worse. He remains in grave danger and in need of medical treatment.

Even as President Rouhani was preparing to address the United Nations in New York last month, Saeed was being beaten and interrogated by Iranian guards in prison.

But as the Christianity Today article explains, shortly after writing the op-ed piece Naghmeh sent a series of messages to a mailing list of Pastor Abedini’s supporters accusing him of abusing her and announcing that she was halting her public efforts to have him released from prison (emphasis mine):

In two emails to supporters, [Naghmeh] revealed details of her troubled marriage to Saeed Abedini, an American citizen and pastor imprisoned in Iran since September 2012.

**Those troubles include “physical, emotional, psychological, and sexual abuse (through Saeed’s addiction to pornography),” she wrote. The abuse started early in their marriage and has worsened during Saeed’s imprisonment, she said.** The two are able to speak by phone and Skype.

Touring the country to advocate for Saeed’s release while coping with marital conflict proved too much, she wrote.

Christianity Today reported Naghmeh’s accusations against Pastor Abedini without challenge; to be accused is to be guilty in the eyes of most. Moreover, everything is abuse. Naghmeh’s claim that her husband sexually abused her by looking at pornography is in line with modern Christian thought. Focus on the Family endorsed Life Skills International defines “looks at
However, even if you accept that looking at pornography is sexual abuse, surely Pastor Abedini isn’t being provided with pornography in the Iranian prison. Yet Naghmeh made this accusation to his supporters after he had already been in prison for over three years, and claimed that the abuse had gotten worse after he was imprisoned. Likewise, his only contact with Naghmeh has been through phone and skype, so he can’t possibly be physically abusing her from prison either. This leaves the one possible remaining charge, that he has been emotionally and psychologically abusive since he has been in prison. While it is certainly possible that he has said unkind things to his wife while enduring prison and torture, surely Pastor Abedini can’t pose a threat to his wife from an Iranian jail cell. Any way you look at it, it is clear that this isn’t about protecting herself or her children, but about humiliating her husband. Naghmeh’s claim is that her reason for broadcasting these things is “to be real”, and to help her husband (emphasis mine):

It is very serious stuff and I cannot live a lie anymore...

But that does not mean he has not been battling with his own demons which I am believing that he can be freed of...

I wanted to be real and ask you to pray for real things (I have opened myself up to you), but without judgment and without losing your love for your brother Saeed who is fighting for his life in the dark prison. This is what the Lord has been showing me, to love unconditionally the way He loves us. To see the sin, but love the sinner and to intercede for freedom from the sin. And not to give up. Not to ever give up on your loved one. To persevere and to endure.

None of the obvious problems with Naghmeh’s public accusations against her husband are brought up by Christianity Today. They present the allegations without challenge, even though he can’t possibly be sexually or physically abusing her from prison. The article opens with:

For the past three years Naghmeh Abedini has publicly battled her husband’s captors, advocating for his release from an Iranian jail.

Behind the scenes, she also struggled with his inner demons.

No matter how absurd the claim, the husband is presumed guilty merely by being accused. This is true even in an extraordinary situation like Pastor Abedini is in.

Pastor Abedini isn’t in a position to defend himself, and the woman he trusted to fight on his behalf is the one who has publicly attacked him. Along with his faith in God, knowing that his family and other Christians were supporting him has to have given him a source of strength while his captors have tormented him over the years. Knowing that he has been betrayed in this way must now make the torment all the more difficult to bear.

However, as bad as the situation is there is still a chance for Naghmeh to repent. She appears to at least partially understand the magnitude of what she did:
In a statement to *Christianity Today*, Abedini said she regretted sending the emails, which were written in a time of emotional distress.

This is a first step, but repentance would require truly turning away from this ugliness. Clearly she was in a position of emotional weakness, and the ever present temptation to punish her husband by claiming abuse was something she was not able to resist. If she confesses this, she can not only begin to right the wrong she has done to her husband, but she can also help modern Christians understand the cruelty of offering this temptation in the first place. There is no kindness in encouraging wives who are in pain to lash out to punish their husbands the way we do.
As I noted in my last post, for a husband to be accused of abuse, even with far fetched charges, is to be considered guilty of those charges. The Christian media’s reaction to Pastor Abedini’s wife accusing him of (among other things) sexually abusing her by looking at pornography and abusing her from inside an Iranian prison cell demonstrate this truth.

Religion News Network’s headline reads: Why imprisoned pastor’s wife kept her marital abuse a secret — until now. Having convicted Pastor Abedini in the headline, the RNN article presents Episcopal priest Justin Holcomb as an expert on the subject of Christian abuse. Holcomb explains that women rarely make false charges of abuse (emphasis mine):

[Holcomb] cites research that indicates one in four women will experience abuse in an “intimate partner relationship.” Holcomb advises pastors to talk more openly about domestic abuse, be accessible to abuse survivors, and collaborate with social agencies and law enforcement.

Abuse is one of the most under-reported crimes, he said. “It is extremely unusual for someone to lie about these kinds of claims.”

This would of course be startling news to anyone involved with the family courts, where it is an open secret that women use domestic violence accusations to give them a powerful strategic advantage. As divorce attorney Gregory S. Forman explains in Five Ways to Get a Spouse Out of the House:

Since Domestic Abuse orders are quick and efficient methods for getting a spouse out of the house, they are subject to abuse. Spouses will often attempt to prompt or instigate fights in order to call the police and set up domestic abuse proceedings. Since much domestic abuse becomes a “he said/she said” swearing contest, it is important to protect a client from false allegations of domestic abuse.

Charismanews writes in Naghmeh Abedini Claims Abuse, Halts Public Support for Imprisoned Husband Saeed (emphasis original):

So, many of us are involved here in a way that perhaps we often are not. So it’s worth our consideration about how we respond.

Second, we have to ask, what do we do now?

I think that there are five things we need to do in this situation.

1. We need to care about the accusations and the situation. It matters that a wife has spoken up. We should take seriously any accusations from those who speak up about abuse. Therefore, we are hurting with Naghmeh in this moment.
However, even though he is presumed guilty, we should of course still want to see him released:

2. **We still need to care about religious liberty, and Pastor Saeed still needs to be freed.** Yes, regardless of what happens going forward, his image is now “tarnished.” He, like all of us, has always been flawed. And no person, regardless of his or her flaws, should be imprisoned for sharing his or her faith.

Shattered Magazine picks up the same theme in *Pastor Saeed Abedini Isn’t Perfect, Naghmeh Says, But We Still Pray* (emphasis original):

Now, though Naghmeh asks supporters to continue praying for Saeed and his release, she will take time away from the public eye to heal from abuse and marital conflict.

**Should We Still Pray For Saeed?**

It’s a question that brings Christians to a “What now?” stand off. Saeed Abedini, a pastor we’ve highly regarded for his bravery and unswerving faith in the face of intense persecution, isn’t as perfect as we once thought. Do we reject Saeed because of his moral failure? Or do we continue to support Saeed, a Christian imprisoned for his faith, through prayer and advocacy?

In our disappointment in Saeed and sadness for Naghmeh, it would be easy (and tempting) to forget about Pastor Saeed because of his indiscretions, deeming him unworthy of our support. But we would be forgetting one important thing: Nobody is perfect.

All of this is a harbinger of what we can expect moving forward. Pastor Saeed is presumed guilty of absurd charges, even though he isn’t able to effectively respond to the charges. Further advocacy for his release will therefore mostly be “private” (following Naghmeh’s lead), and those media articles which do discuss his imprisonment will need to focus at least 25% of their copy on the importance of always believing women and the need for pastors to preach on the imminent threat every Christian husband poses to his helpless wife. Another 25% or more of the copy will need to be dedicated to questioning if/why we should advocate for such a man to be freed, with the obligatory final decision that yes, we should, because even though he is a wife abuser we still love him.
The piling on against Pastor Saeed Abedini continues, with an article published yesterday by Christian Today*: Why did Naghmeh Abedini keep her spousal abuse a secret for years? Behavioural experts offer explanation

Since her husband Pastor Saeed Abedini was first imprisoned in Iran back in September 2012, Naghmeh showed no signs of trauma from spousal abuse as she put on a brave face in her effort to secure her husband’s release.

Over three years later, she finally cracked and admitted to supporters through e-mail that her husband had abused her physically, emotionally and sexually.

A husband who is accused is guilty, no matter how absurd the accusation.

...Naghmeh revealed only recently that her husband’s porn addiction and abuse continued despite their limited contacts (Skype and phone calls).

What is fascinating is how quickly the Christian domestic violence movement went completely insane. Modern Christian culture has swallowed this aspect of radical feminism whole, and there is no one I can see who is currently in a position to moderate it. Here we have a persecuted pastor being lynched in the Christian media and everyone is terrified of calling it out. The Christian feminists no longer even try to hide their alignment with radical secular feminists; the Christian Today article directly quotes secular feminist Lenore Walker, instead of relying on a Christian feminist to repackage the same ideology**.

Lenore Walker, a professor at Nova Southeastern University and founder of the Domestic Violence Institute, also agreed with Holcomb. She even suspects that throughout their marriage, Naghmeh felt that the abuse she experienced at the hands of her husband is acceptable, and it is only now that she realises otherwise.

“Women with strong religious backgrounds often are less likely to believe that violence against them is wrong,” said Walker.

This is not unlike the insanity we are seeing on university campuses where the radicals are in firm control. Christian domestic violence advocates are to the modern Church what the Red Guards were to Mao’s China. Something this destructive can’t last forever, but in the meantime it will do immense damage to Christian families around the West.

*Not to be confused with Christianity Today, which broke the original story.
**Christian Today is in turn drawing these quotes from the article by Religion News Service.
In response to Christian Red Guards, BradA wrote:

I agree with the principles you are posting on Dalrock, but Christianity Today has had a leftward tilt at least since I was in college in the 1980s. I am not sure it is accurate to even call it Christian, in spite of its name.

This is a fair question, but the issue isn’t just about which Christian media outlets are busy lynching Pastor Abedini in response to absurd accusations that he is abusing his wife in the US from an Iranian prison. This isn’t just about what Christianity Today, Christian Today, Religion News Service, Charisma News, Shattered Magazine, and others are writing about the persecuted Pastor. This is also about the silence from other Christian media organizations and Christian leaders while Pastor Abedini is being lynched in Christian media.

Outside of this small corner of the blogosphere, who will call out the injustice? Who will point out the absurdity of defining looking at pornography not just as sexual sin, but as domestic violence, as sexual abuse? Who will point out the absurdity of accusing a husband of abusing his wife from inside an Iranian prison seven thousand miles away? Who will point out the obvious violation of 1 Tim 5:19?

The problem isn’t that the Christian Red Guards are running amok, the problem is that everyone else is too terrified to stand up to them. The most likely Christian leaders to fight against this insanity are the complementarians, but they are terrified of being accused of supporting the abuse of women.

This is their greatest fear.

To understand the mortal terror complementarians have of being accused of supporting the abuse of women, you have to understand their frame of mind. They believe that the existence of feminism is proof of grievous abuses by Christian men. They believe that if men are godly enough, women will happily submit to their husbands and thrive. Under this view Adam’s sin wasn’t just that he followed Eve’s lead in the Garden, but that he allowed her to sin (or created the conditions required for her to sin) in the first place.

You can see this in the founding statement of the Council of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood. The CBMW is by far the most predominant complementarian group, and their 1988 Danvers Statement declares that they are formed (among other things) as a response to:

6. the upsurge of physical and emotional abuse in the family;

From the beginning they haven’t been able to see that feminists were generating hysteria around domestic violence and using this hysteria as a tool to attack headship. They believe, and they have believed from their inception, that the feminist claims of rampant wife abuse
was an honest response to a sudden and mysterious surge in domestic violence.

In the Spring of 2003 the CBMW published *A Corrective to Distortions and Abuses of Male Headship* in their *Journal of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*. In this corrective Steven Tracy writes:

> It is often asserted that patriarchy, broadly defined as the legitimation of male authority over females, is the basis for most, if not all social pathologies. For instance, Russ Funk states

Tracy then quotes Funk’s feminist rant on the patriarchy:

> Patriarchy is a terrible, violent, vile system that destroys huge pieces of all of us—our individual humanness and humanness in general. Patriarchy creates men who choose to act oppressively and violently, who create huge systems of destruction… Patriarchy is a death system. It is a system based on destruction, violence, and degradation.

Tracy quotes this to remind his readers that biblical patriarchy is a frightening thing. Tracy disagrees with Funk’s indictment of the patriarchy, but only slightly. His main concern is that we not dismiss what radical feminists like Funk have to say about patriarchy (emphasis mine):

> It might be tempting to casually dismiss such criticisms, especially given the theological and ethical views of many radical feminists who deny for example, the substitutionary atonement (calling it “divine child abuse”), reject historic Christian orthodoxy in favor of neo-paganism and goddess worship, and stridently promote lesbianism and abortion. At the same time, we must never soften our commitment to the truth, wherever it may lead us. **If feminists have identified legitimate concerns, they must be fiercely addressed.** Sadly, while biblical complementarians oppose the abuse of male leadership, they have been extremely slow to address specific issues of male abuse in a detailed fashion.

Tracy continues:

> While patriarchy is not the cause of all the world’s social ills, a corruption of patriarchy very often is a major cause of many ills. Given the nature of human depravity with its tendency to corrupt divine gifts, it should not surprise us to find that male headship is often twisted to generate horrible evil. Donald Bloesch astutely observes: “In opposing militant feminism, however, we must not make the mistake of enthroning patriarchal values that have often held women and children in bondage and oppression.” Similarly, in the context of noting the harmful results of egalitarianism, which he says are anarchy or matriarchy, he issues a sober warning: “a very real danger in the patriarchal family is tyranny in which the husband uses his power to hold his wife and children in servile dependence and submission.”
Widespread abuse of male power is anticipated and condemned in Scripture.

If the term “servile dependence and submission” rings a bell, it is because this is a nod to another point in the CBMW’s founding document. In the Danvers Statement, the CBMW invented a new sin for wives, the feminist sin of servility:

4. The Fall introduced distortions into the relationships between men and women (Genesis 3:1-7, 12, 16). In the home, the husband’s loving, humble headship tends to be replaced by domination or passivity; the wife’s intelligent, willing submission tends to be replaced by usurpation or servility.

Keep in mind that the CBMW is the vanguard of the modern Christian fight against feminism, and they are at best ambivalent towards the idea of biblical gender roles. When feminists started expanding the definition of abuse to include any husband a wife wanted to gain power over, they responded by asserting that feminists were right in their hysteria. Turning this back now will be even harder than it would have been decades ago, and on top of that this case involves allegations of a man viewing pornography.

If we do see a complementarian speaking out against the Christian media lynching Pastor Abedini, this will no doubt create a fracture in the complementarian movement. Speaking out on this topic involves the risk of being seen as supporting the abuse of wives and supporting the use of pornography; for any lone leader who tries to take a stand, even a wishy washy stand, others will be eager to renounce them in order distance themselves from these terrifying charges as much as possible.
Fatherless doublethink
by Dalrock | November 30, 2015 | Link

As everyone knows, women struggle greatly with commitment. This is why the Christian blogger at Uplifting Love has offered a list of ten things Christian husbands can do to stave off the ever present threat of their wives becoming unhappy and blowing up the family:

What I do believe this statistic demonstrates is that there are more women unsatisfied with their marriages, at least to the point of ending them, than there are men. There are certainly many reasons for the dissatisfaction that exists but I posit that the husband and his actions (or lack of actions) plays a significant role in causing and sustaining the dissatisfaction.

I’ve reflected on this. I’ve done some more reading and research on marriage and divorce rates. I’ve discussed this with my wife. I’ve prayed about it. I’ve talked to and observed couples who have been married for a long time. Why?

To help us husbands do a better job keeping our wives happy.

Here’s what I’ve come up:

He closes with:

Keeping our wives happy can be daunting at times but if we remember that we love them and make sure that they hear it, see it, and know it we’ll be successful.

Good luck men!

What else does everyone know?

As everyone knows, fatherlessness is caused by men leaving their families. Christian Today explains that men won’t commit in International Men’s Day: In a world stacked against women, here’s why we still need to talk about men:

The so-called crisis in fatherhood is something precipitated by men leaving. We must begin to talk about why so many men now don’t live with their children and the impact that can have in society as a whole. A man’s decision not to commit to his his child and the child’s mother is a life-changing one – and one that it seems not enough men are taking seriously. There are, of course, no easy answers to this issue - relationships break down. But men must be confronted with the consequences of their actions.
Vanessa Friedman of the New York Times is ecstatic, convinced that the new Pirelli calendar featuring 12 months of feminists is a sign that we are finally creating a New Feminist Man (LSFW, and Not Safe For Your Lunch): The 2016 Pirelli Calendar May Signal a Cultural Shift

Along with Playboy’s decision in October to end nudity in its pages, the Pirelli pivot seems to give real substance to the theory that we are at a flexion point in the public objectification of female sexuality.

Friedman’s fantasy is that since the Pirelli calendar is given to an exclusive group of opinion leaders, this will usher in a new era where women’s achievements are what will make them sexy.

[This is] the first time the attraction of the subjects is in their résumés, not their measurements.

This isn’t just stock feminist delusion, it is also an excellent example of Sailer’s Law of Female Journalism:

The most heartfelt articles by female journalists tend to be demands that social values be overturned in order that, Come the Revolution, the journalist herself will be considered hotter-looking.

This is also about feminist territory marking. Tire shops are a male space, and changing the calendar is about marking these spaces as female:

And as Ms. Zimmerman said: “Women have a disproportionately loud voice compared to their male counterparts. And for those women it is no longer socially acceptable to walk into a high-end garage that sells Pirelli tires and see a calendar with naked girls on the wall. You’d drive right out again in that Mercedes you came in with.”
Defense Secretary Ashton Carter announced today that all combat roles will be opened to women, with no exceptions. This has lead to a reply from many conservatives that women should have been careful what they wished for, as now there is no longer any reason to exclude them from the draft.

I pointed out the delusion of the idea in the comments at Instapundit. The idea that women will ever be drafted into combat against their will is pure fantasy. All women who want to avoid being drafted need to do is fail the physical test. When they do, everyone will point out that women and men are different after all. Men in theory could also fail the physical tests, but in practice this will come with a stigma for men that women will never face.

Two other commenters at Instapundit described how this worked for men in the past. Comanche Voter explained:

Dalrock points out that all the woman has to do is fail the physical test. I have a friend whose granddaughter was in basic training at Ft. Sill. Came the end of basic, she failed the physical test. And was promptly given an honorable discharge. And she had volunteered and wanted to be a soldier.

Back in my basic training days (1969—I want to be an airborne ranger and live a life of danger in Viet Nam and all that) if you flunked the physical, they put you in a special training company until you could pass the physical. For guys who were seriously out of shape that might take some time—and in some cases the only way out was to get a truly disabling injury.

These days with an all volunteer army (sorry libtards but the current military’s education achievements and intellectual level is above the national average) if you can’t cut the physical requirements/PT test at the end of basic, they simply discharge you. I suspect a lot of women are going to get discharged—unless they lower the standards.

MTByrne followed up with a more recent example of the mechanism used to ensure that men had strong incentives to not fail out:

When I went through Marine Corps Recruit Training in 1998, they weren’t discharging physically unfit recruits if they failed the PFT (which was about 8 weeks into boot camp.) Those recruits were recycled into a platoon just starting the training cycle. Same with the “unks” on the rifle range. It was a good incentive to make sure you passed or hey guess what, you get to do it all over again.

We may see selective service changed to include women as well as men. We may even see a situation where women are drafted alongside of men. What we won’t see, ever, is a situation where women have high or even significant pressure applied to motivate them to pass
physical requirements if they don’t personally want to be there.

What this is about, and what this always has been about, is envy of men. It is about eradicating the idea of masculine virtues, and more importantly, erasing all sentiment of gratitude for what the men in the military do. To a feminist feeling gratitude to men is unbearable. This is why every unit, especially elite forces and combat infantry, must include women. When Seal Team Six took out Bin Ladin feminists were forced to bear the unbearable; public officials expressed gratitude for the “men who risked their lives to accomplish the mission”, and feminists couldn’t chime in with “and women too!”

Never again.

Since the goal is to erase the concept of masculine virtues, the new bargain the introduction of women into combat represents isn’t to have women join equally or even seriously in the fighting and dying. The new bargain is that men will continue to be the ones who fight and die, but they must not feel a sense of masculine pride in either doing this or having this obligation. Registering women for selective service alongside men serves this goal, as does drafting women and letting those who don’t want to be there fail out. The imagined downside for feminists is only a fantasy.

**March 2019 Update:** Revisiting the subject of women and the draft.
I was curious if the CBMW had a response to the decision to open all combat roles to women. I was curious given their great ambivalence regarding biblical gender roles if they would oppose the inclusion of women in combat, and if they opposed it, if they would call out the very obvious rebellion by women in this regard. Like Eve in Eden, women are envious of a position they don’t have, and are grasping for that which they should not grasp.

I don’t see a response to yesterday’s announcement, but I did find an article in response to the announcement back in 2013 that started this process. The piece was written by CBMW Executive Director Owen Strachan, titled Women in combat: A complementarian perspective.

The piece doesn’t acknowledge that women are grasping for the roles of men. Instead it astonishingly presents this as a problem of men being unwilling to serve in combat, thereby forcing women to serve in men’s place. The piece twists the message of Genesis to remove Eve’s rebellion, implying that Eve only sinned because Adam failed to protect her from the possibility of sinning (emphasis mine):

Scripture teaches that woman was made from man, a truth that grounds her dependence on him (Gen. 2:21-22). It details how Adam failed to own this responsibility and protect his wife. For this reason, God addressed him first after the forbidden fruit was eaten: “Where are you?” (Gen. 3:9). Adam was a self-crippled man.

This is the common complementarian dodge of the issue of women’s rebellion, but it is still striking to see the claim made so shamelessly. Clearly if Adam failed to protect Eve from the possibility of sin, God did as well. But this wasn’t Adam’s sin in the garden. Adam’s sin was going along with his wife when he witnessed her rebellion, because confronting the rebellion would have been uncomfortable.

Modern Christian men are failing Christian women in the exact same way Adam failed Eve. We aren’t willing to call out their rebellion, and instead are taking the easy feel good path. This is ironically exactly what the CBMW is doing on the subject of women in the military. Out of fear of confronting the rebellion, they have constructed a fantasy world where women aren’t grasping for the position of men, but instead men are begging women to serve in their place.

This is a fantasy no-one but the complementarians believes, as feminists are quite clear as to their intent. The push to integrate women into all combat roles is also part of a wider “progressive” push with the military, including the repeal of the bans on transvestites and open homosexuality. Men are no more to blame for women wanting to take on the roles of men than women are to blame for men like Jenner wanting to have vaginas.

The piece closes with:
If men will not own this responsibility, then women will be forced to take it on as did biblical women such as Deborah and Jael (and the extrabiblical figure Judith). Many modern men fail to mirror Christ in leading, providing, and protecting. In the cries of fatherless children, the strained voice of working mothers desperately seeking “work-life balance,” and the Marine Corps Gazette, we hear echoes of the Bible’s first question, addressed to a self-crippled man: “Where are you?”

As Christian men we aren’t responsible for women’s temptation to rebel, but we do have a responsibility to try to guide them away from this sin. It is true that doing this is at times very uncomfortable, and in our feminist age for many the idea of it is quite terrifying. Yet we can’t allow our fears to overwhelm us as the CBMW is doing. Women need us to do our duty, and we must not allow ourselves to flee this duty in fear.
Fantasy Land
by Dalrock | December 7, 2015 | Link

As I wrote on Friday, the CBMW’s response to the generations long push by feminists to insert women into all parts of our armed forces is to pretend that something else entirely is going on. To avoid confronting the very open feminist rebellion, the CBMW pretends that men are insisting that women be forced into combat in their place. No one else believes this, and I have to believe that deep down even the complementarians themselves know this is a farce. However, confronting a generation of women demanding to usurp men’s roles is difficult, and to a complementarian downright terrifying. Changing the subject from reality to a fantasy world allows complementarians to avoid what is difficult and instead focus on posturing.

Look at how much tougher and braver I am than other men! Look how much more I care about women!

But make no mistake, this is only posturing. The Bible teaches us that women are more easily deceived. As Christian men we have a responsibility to Christian women to try to protect them from temptation of feminist rebellion. Pretending that no rebellion is occurring is worse than remaining silent, and it is the opposite of brave. In pretending that feminist envy and usurpation is really about men insisting that women take their roles, complementarians are actively encouraging women to be deceived into sin.

The compulsion to change the subject from reality to fantasy land is so great that CBMW member writing on the topic reads like articles from the Onion. Here is a quick review of articles by CBMW members on the subject over the last ten years. Note how the women who want to usurp men’s roles are praised as courageous, smart, and noble, while the real villains (the men who are making them usurp men’s roles) are castigated instead. All emphasis mine:

John Piper: Co-ed Combat and Cultural Cowardice

If I were the last man on the planet to think so, I would want the honor of saying no woman should go before me into combat to defend my country. A man who endorses women in combat is not pro-woman; he’s a wimp. He should be ashamed. For most of history, in most cultures, he would have been utterly scorned as a coward to promote such an idea...

Piper followed up with: More on women in combat

...Women may be more courageous than men in any given situation. They may have nobler vision. They may be smarter. That is not the issue. What God has written on our hearts and designed for our survival and our joy is the issue. Manhood puts itself forward between the women and the enemy. That is part of what manhood means. That is who we are by God’s design. The courage of women will show itself in a hundred ways. But when a man is around, he will not exploit that courage to fight the battle where he belongs.
Joe Carter in *Women in Combat: A good idea?*

Unfortunately, many men will be more than willing to allow women in combat if it will lessen their chances of having to defend their country in wartime. **One of the harsh realities we face is that American society is filled with men who are anti-woman cowards.**

Denny Burk: *Women in Combat and the Undoing of Civilization*

Perhaps some people believe that women ought to be able to volunteer for whatever job they are qualified to do. But what if the draft were reinstated? Under the right conditions, the draft would be a very real possibility, and that specter of a draft is really clarifying. **It’s one thing for women to volunteer for combat service. It’s an entirely different matter for them to be drafted into it.** I have a hard time believing that the women of America would want to be forced into such conditions. Any man that would countenance for one second his 18-year old daughter being pressed into this kind of service is abdicating his responsibility. **Are we really going to be the kind of people who press our wives and daughters and mothers to fight in combat?**

Owen Strachan closes *Women Should Not Be in Combat (Says a Female Marine Captain)* with:

Complementarian Christians, like the Lord himself, are not anti-woman. In humility and full recognition of our sin, we are the most pro-woman group there is. We love women, and want them to thrive, both in natural terms and in their walk with Christ.

Any other path is unwise; **the call by men for women to fight in their place is the height of cowardice, and worthy of the strongest possible rebuke.**

Strachan again in *Women in combat: A complementarian perspective*

**If men will not own this responsibility, then women will be forced to take it on as did biblical women such as Deborah and Jael (and the extrabiblical figure Judith).**

**See Also:** *Turning a blind eye.*
I shouldn’t have been surprised to learn that there is a Women’s Studies professor on the CBMW Council:

Mary Kassian, M.C.A.O.T.
Homemaker, Author, Women’s Ministry Consultant
Edmonton, AB, Canada
Distinguished Professor of Women’s Studies, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
Louisville, KY

For an idea of just what a complementarian Women’s Studies professor is like, here is a video of Professor Kassian discussing the importance of escaping the repression of the 1950s, as well as her feminist past. Kassian features this video in a blog post titled Kissing Traditionalism Good-bye. You can watch the video below or from her blog, but either way I suggest clicking on her blog to see the girlpower image she prefaced this with. Kassian is the one in red on the left:

The unspoken premise of the discussion is that Christians got it all wrong for nineteen and a half centuries, and then the 1960s (and NOW) came along and enlightened Christianity regarding the problem that has no name. I’m guessing they intended for the title “women’s studies” to be ironic, but it is clear that what they are selling is at best feminism light.

Kassian isn’t the only close connection between the CBMW leadership and Baptist women’s studies programs. CBMW founders Paige and Dorothy Paterson drove the creation of women’s studies programs at two other Baptist seminaries:

[Dorothy] Patterson, along with her husband, were instrumental in establishing women’s studies programs at Southwestern and at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, where Paige Patterson was president until his election at Southwestern in 2003.

Dorothy Patterson was the only woman in the founding of the Council for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood
Just before Naghmeh Sabedini reiterated her charges of abuse against her persecuted husband, Christian Today published: *Why evangelicals pray for persecuted pastors rather than battered women.*

Ed Cyzewski explains that God only hates divorce when it doesn’t come with cash and prizes:

It won’t serve us well to simply drop the teachings of Jesus on divorce into today’s context. At the time of Jesus, women had few rights, and Jewish men were permitted to divorce their wives for the slightest infraction, simply stating in public that they are now divorced. Women were then left destitute with few options to support themselves.

Where would these women live? How would they earn money? How would they arrange to have another marriage?

These concerns, that are quite foreign to us, were at the forefront of Jesus’ teaching (see Matthew 19:1-9). When he limited divorce to marital unfaithfulness, he was intending to primarily limit the men, not the women. Jesus didn’t provide a timeless template. He was providing a culturally recognisable protection for women. The clear implications of Jesus’ teaching on marriage in his context are that the safety and well-being of women is a top priority because a divorced woman in his day was highly vulnerable.

**See Also:**

- Don’t forget your 30 pieces of silver.
- Put your faith in divorce.
- Blinded by the times.

*H/T David Wiley*
Servant leaders mind their own business.
by Dalrock | December 21, 2015 | Link

Complementarian/CBMW Women’s Studies professor Mary Kassian explains that an essential quality of a servant leader is to mind his own business in 7 Misconceptions about Submission (archive):

A husband does not have the right to demand or extract submission from his wife. Submission is HER choice—her responsibility... it is NOT his right!! Not ever. She is to “submit herself”—deciding when and how to submit is her call. In a Christian marriage, the focus is never on rights, but on personal responsibility. It’s his responsibility to be affectionate. It’s her responsibility to be agreeable. The husband’s responsibility is to sacrificially love as Christ loved the Church—not to make his wife submit.

Note that she is describing the new family model created by Complementarians after being enlightened by the 1960s; it is not to be mistaken for biblical headship and submission. Under headship and submission the wife is to win a sinning husband without a word, and a husband is to wash his wife in the water of the word.

In the new model of servant leadership it is the exact opposite. Husbands are forbidden to call out the sin of their wives, and wives have the obligation to wash their husbands in the water of the word and avoid the newly defined feminist sin of lacking moxie. While husbands are forbidden from attempting to even encourage their wives to follow the instruction of the Bible, wives must closely monitor their husbands for any and all possible error and punish them if they transgress (emphasis mine):

No brain-dead doormats or spineless bowls of Jello here! Submission is neither mindless nor formulaic nor simplistic. Submitting to the Lord sometimes involves drawing clear boundaries and enacting consequences when a husband sins.

Again, only wives are to take on this new cross dressing version of headship in the Complementarian view (this is what distinguishes Complementarians from Egalitarians). Husbands must not try to encourage or coerce their wives in any way into following the instructions of the Bible. Most importantly, husbands must never encourage their wives to honor their roles as wives and submit to their husbands. This is core to the Complementarian new theology of marriage, as Kathy Keller explained at FamilyLife:

If there are husbands out there that are saying, “Yes, I’m the head. This is good teaching. I like this head stuff.” It’s respectful submission between equals. Submission is something that a wife gives. It’s not something that a husband can demand. Christ emptied Himself. He didn’t grasp equality with God. It was a voluntary submission. This proves that headship does not imply superiority, nor does submission imply inferiority.

One of the commenters on Kassian’s blog pointed out the problem with Kassian’s insistence
that submission is optional on the part of the wife:

Regarding the answer to so-called myth #4: (“Submission is HER choice—her responsibility... it is NOT his right!!”):

Immature screaming caps and exclamations aside, this is patently unbiblical. The Bible does not say that “For a husband is the head of his wife if he asks and she gives her consent to lead.” Biblically, she consents to submit, and he consents to lead, when they consent to marriage. So yes, submission is “granted” but at the alter, but it is not revokable (except by death or divorce) and is not situational.

This enraged Kassian, who replied with an emotional rant that otherwise husbands will force their wives to watch porn!

The fact that you are even questioning this misconception indicates to me how emphatically it must be stated. The Bible says that a wife is to “submit herself.” Furthermore, the relationship between husband and wife is correlated to the relationship between God the Father and Son. The fact that the Son willingly submitted himself to the Father is paradigmatic and highly important. It was Christ’s perogative to refuse; the Father did not force Him to obey. Christ willingly submitted Himself. I have counselled with far too many women whose husbands demanded submission as their right, and forced their wives to watch porn, or participate in other ungodliness. Women need to know that according to the Bible, submission is their choice and responsibility, and NOT their husband’s right.

This is as Cane Caldo explains the problem with nearly all women teaching submission today. Instead of teaching submission, they focus on teaching caveats (not submitting). The irony is that obedience to husbands is one of the few things women are instructed to teach, and instead of teaching it women like Kassian and Keller teach everything but obedience.
3 Wives, likewise, be submissive to your own husbands, that even if some do not obey the word, they, without a word, may be won by the conduct of their wives, 2 when they observe your chaste conduct accompanied by fear. 3 Do not let your adornment be merely outward—arranging the hair, wearing gold, or putting on fine apparel—4 rather let it be the hidden person of the heart, with the incorruptible beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is very precious in the sight of God.

— 1 Pet 3:1-4 NKJV

Reading Kathy Keller’s teaching on Headship and Submission at Family Life, it is striking how poor a job she does at hiding her rage at what the Bible instructs husbands and wives. She rationalizes that if she is tempted to rebel against submission, this must mean that “the culture” has misunderstood submission:

Long ago, when I was struggling with this teaching, and I did struggle with it, I had to ask myself this question, “If it’s not an assault on the dignity, and value, and equality of Jesus to take the subordinate role to His Father in order to accomplish our salvation, how on earth can I be hurt or devalued when asked to play the Jesus role of subordination in my marriage?” The answer is, “I can’t be. It’s not going to hurt me if it’s defined by Jesus rather than by a cultural understanding.”

This is the foundation for all of the rest of her rationalizations, and as rationalizations go it is especially weak. By “the culture”, she must mean both our current culture (the one which caused her to rebel), as well as all cultures from the time of Christ until now. Only now, two thousand years later with the benefit of Kathy’s emotional state, can the clear instructions of the Apostles Peter and Paul finally be understood.

Kathy explains that “helpmeet” is comparable to the role of God (emphasis mine):

Genesis 2 then—there’s this thing like, “Adam first, then Eve; and she’s the helper?” Like, “What happened to the equality?” The word “helper” in the Bible, azer,—I’m not sure, you Hebrew scholars, if I’m pronouncing that right—it is more frequently used of God. You may have heard this; but in the Bible, the word azer—the helpmate word that is used of Eve in Genesis—is most often used of God—God, our help.

A helper can only help out of strength. The helper helps because he or she has qualities that are needed by the person who doesn’t have those qualities. It is a position of strength. It’s not like “assistant”—you know, “God’s my assistant.” “My wife is my assistant.” It’s a helper who helps out of complementary strengths that the husband doesn’t have. Okay, that’s a tangent; but we needed to do it.

Later she thinks out loud that while husbands and wives are totally equal, wives might
secretly be more exalted by God. She does this while simultaneously denying that the thought came from her:

You could actually make the case that, in asking women to be submissive, that they are actually being given a greater calling than the men and will be exalted more highly for it.
I’m just saying, “You could make the case”; I’m not making the case.

The whole piece is riddled with these kinds of painful rationalizations, and reading it gave me great sympathy for the torment Kathy is clearly experiencing due to her rebellious state. This torment has gone on for many decades, and instead of trying to help her escape from this state of constant torment, her husband Tim Keller (a famous pastor) has encouraged it by placing her in a teaching position over both men and women. This not only increases the torment, it makes it visible to the entire world.

It isn’t just her husband who has failed Kathy in this way. Dennis Rainey of FamilyLife is the man giving her the radio platform to teach headship and submission, and Owen Strachan offers her and her husband great praise in his article: Giving Thanks to God for Complementarians Tim & Kathy Keller. Not surprisingly all of this ties back to the CBMW, as Strachan is the Executive Director of CBMW and Rainey is on the CBMW Board of Reference.

Kathy’s highly agitated rebellious state of mind is surprisingly well known within the complementarian world, where it is seen not as a problem but is instead celebrated. It is seen as something for all complementarian wives to emulate. The most famous example of this is what Kathy proudly calls her “godly tantrum”, where she smashed their wedding china in order to get her own way. Tim and Kathy are both so proud of this moment that they feature it in their book The Meaning of Marriage.

In the section titled The Godly Tantrum, Tim explains that Kathy wanted Tim to work fewer hours, but he was focused on the goals of his ministry. Tim offers this story as encouragement to readers “not to shrink from really telling the truth to one another.”

One day I came home from work. It was a nice day outside and I noticed that the door to our apartment’s balcony was open. Just as I was taking off my jacket I heard a smashing noise coming from the balcony. In another couple of seconds I heard another one. I walked out on to the balcony and to my surprise saw Kathy sitting on the floor. She had a hammer, and next to her was a stack of our wedding china. On the ground were the shards of two smashed saucers.

“What are you doing? I asked.”

She looked up and said, “You aren’t listening to me. You don’t realize that if you keep working these hours you are going to destroy this family. I don’t know how to get through to you. You aren’t seeing how serious this is. This is what you are doing.” And she brought the hammer down on the third saucer. It splintered into pieces.
Tim explains that this was the **wakeup call** that he needed to decide to work fewer hours. Hilariously, he also explains that his wife wasn’t emotionally out of control while she very clearly was:

> I sat down trembling. I thought she had snapped. “I’m listening. I’m listening,” I said. As we talked it became clear that she was intense and laser focused, but she was not in a rage or out of control emotionally.

In the preface to the story he makes the same absurd claim:

> Kathy talks of what she calls the “godly tantrum.” By this she means not an emotional loss of temper but an unrelenting insistence on being heard.

Tim’s denial here is breathtaking, but it is essential to understand that it is at the foundation of the complementarian perspective. For all of their lectures about believing that men and women are different, their whole edifice is founded on the feminist denial of the nature of women. Complementarians **must** deny bad behavior of women no matter the cost. No matter how many children grow up without fathers, and no matter the cruelty of parading Kathy out in this highly disturbed mental state for decades, the first priority is and always has been to maintain the denial.

**See also:**

- Fantasy Land
- Untethered
Merry Christmas
by Dalrock | December 25, 2015 | Link

I do not think I can top Vox's message so I will copy it here:

A Merry Christmas Eve to you all. The night is dark and we find ourselves in a time of war. And yet, we remain joyful and thankful.

I love Christmas Eve, the midnight masses, the candlelight services, the cheerful Christmas greetings, and the certain knowledge that all around the world, the vast network of believers reaches into every darkness and shadow.

But whether the season’s greeting is said openly with a smile or whispered surreptitiously under threat of death and torture, the Christmas message of hope in a fallen world remains the same.

With this I will only add that I will be praying for Pastor Abedini and his family tonight and tomorrow, as well as the rest of the persecuted church. I also pray for God to bless each and every one of you who have taken the time to read this humble blog.

Merry Christmas!
She only acted crazy to get her own way.
by Dalrock | December 26, 2015 | Link

Over the course of two comments on Unhinged, Brand complained that I failed to point out how calculating Kathy Keller was in her “godly tantrum”:

For what it’s worth, the pieces she broke were already damaged.

...

It’s in the book that contains that story. Don’t assume the paraphrased story is complete. I think it is inappropriate as well, but I think the detail is important. We also don’t know her usual day to day behavior, which may or may not be flattering, and this one instance could be overwhelmingly out of character for her.

This isn’t strictly speaking correct. It is true that according to the book the emotional outburst is presented as contrived. However, the explanation is not that the three pieces of their wedding china that she destroyed were already broken, but that they no longer had matching cups. As Tim Keller explains in the book, once he had submitted to her will she was suddenly calm:

Finally I inquired, “When I first came out here I thought you were having an emotional meltdown. How did you get control of yourself so fast?”

With a grin she answered, “It was no meltdown. Do you see these three broken saucers I smashed?” I nodded. “I have no cups for them. The cups have broken over the years. I had three saucers to spare. I’m glad you sat down before I had to break any more!”

But contrived as it was, Kathy was still very clearly out of control emotionally. She was in the opposite of the state that the Apostle Peter urges wives to cultivate in 1 Pet 3. She was the opposite of a gentle and quiet spirit.

It is also essential to remember that Tim and Kathy are using this episode of Kathy’s rebellion as an example for Christian wives to emulate. They are teaching Kathy’s “godly” rebellion as submission, and the message is getting through as intended. Their theology of the godly tantrum is a message modern Christians are thirsty for in this feminist age.

Rev. Sam Brown of Grace Presbyterian Church cites Tim and Kathy’s teaching in his sermon 1 Peter 3:1-7 – Wives, Husbands, and the Curse Undone (emphasis mine):

But for every marriage in which the man is a sinner, the hope here is that God may use His daughter to open the eyes of her husband. She may not even need to speak a word because the Spirit inside her will speak louder than she ever could.
Tim Keller, a pastor in New York, wrote a book with his wife, Kathy, which I’d commend to you. It’s called The Meaning of Marriage and in it Kathy tells a story from their early years of church planting in the city when he was working long hours and was neglecting his family. So, she says, she threw a “godly tantrum.”

“I took the china, and took them out to our balcony and when he came in I was smashing them with the hammer. I had to do some dramatic thing to get his attention to show he was breaking things.”

That image doesn’t exactly fit the stereotypical image of a “submissive” wife, does it? And yet it was a godly woman respectfully and violently showing her husband what she needed from him.

Similarly, Brittany Smith at the Christian Post cites Kathy’s rebellion as an example of submission in Kathy Keller: Submission Doesn’t Mean You Do Everything the Husband Says

The Kellers also made it clear that being submissive does not mean the wife can’t push back or confront her spouse.

Kathy Keller used an example from her own life when she went to extremes to get her husband’s attention. She said they moved to New York to start Redeemer, where Tim is lead pastor, and in the first four years he was working all the time.

Kathy Keller feared that he was neglecting his duties as a father and a husband, and was not freeing up any time for other pursuits. So she said she had a “godly tantrum.”

“I took the china, and took them out to our balcony and when he came in I was smashing them with the hammer. I had to do some dramatic thing to get his attention to show he was breaking things,” she said.

They said that this can work in marriages where spouses are having trouble communicating, or if they don’t have the same view of submission.

There is another point worth bringing up in this episode, and that is the meaning of the complementarian expression “listen to your wife”. This is another case where the complementarian expression means something quite different than what the words would suggest on their face. Just like “servant leader” doesn’t mean headship, and “submission” means rebellion, “listen to your wife” doesn’t mean simply listen to her. When spoken by a complementarian, “listen to your wife” means do as she says (emphasis mine):

I sat down trembling. I thought she had snapped. “I’m listening. I’m listening,” I said. As we talked it became clear that she was intense and laser focused, but she was not in a rage or out of control emotionally. She spoke calmly but forcefully. Her arguments were the same as they had been for months, but I realized how
deluded I had been. There would never be a convenient time to cut back. I was addicted to the level of productivity I had achieved. I had to do something. She saw me listening for the first time and we hugged.

Note that they had been discussing this for months. He had heard her arguments but didn’t agree with her on the correct decision. This is what complementarians call “not listening”. “Listening” means agreeing with her.

See also: The crazy dictator.
**Weak men screwing Star Wars feminism up.**

by Dalrock | January 1, 2016 | [Link](#)

**Spoiler Alert:** Don’t read any further if you want to avoid plot spoilers for the new Star Wars movie.

Mark Judge complains that weak men are screwing his Star Wars feminism up in ‘Star Wars’ and the Crisis of Masculinity (H/T Instapundit). Judge postulates that the problem both in the movie and in real life is a lack of a male initiation ritual. There may be something to this, but there is a much more obvious problem in both Star Wars and the western world which Judge trips over while making his case for meaningful initiation rituals of manhood (emphasis mine):

> Yet young men who are not properly initiated can suffer from psychic dissonance, depression, rage, and a lifelong inability to handle relationships. In other words, they become like Kylo Ren. This is why the questions about Ren’s parentage are so fascinating. **His parents, Han Solo and General Leia, are both strong warriors**, yet their son seeks to test himself against a grandfather he never met. What went wrong?

*Of course* his mother and father are both strong warriors. This is western fiction; all princesses are now warriors. It is mandatory. Women have coveted the status of men, including their status as protectors. For the most part women don’t actually want to take on the role, but they want to deny men of any sense of manly pride which might come with having such a defined obligation. This is why *all* parts of our military need to be open to women, even the most elite and physically demanding roles.

The fundamental problem is not that we don’t have initiation rituals for men, but the reason *why we can’t have them*. Initiation rituals are about defining manhood, especially the noble qualities of manhood. This is something women en mass in the western world have demanded that we no longer do, because defining noble manhood confers the very manly pride women covet.

Judge gets tantalizingly close to recognizing the problem via a quote he offers from James Hollis:

> What the modern man suffers from, then, is the wounding without the transformation . . . He is asked to be a man when no on can define it except in the most trivial of terms.

The real problem is not in the fictional universe of Star Wars, but in our own modern societies. When we encourage young men to imagine themselves fighting to protect a woman, he must imagine that once he arrives to save the day he will be met with feminist snark “What took you so long?”
What sane young man is going to dream of fighting to be yet another punchline in our feminist society? Good men who do heroic things are suckers and buffoons in our culture.

The problem isn’t just that feminists have managed to destroy our ability to even imagine noble masculinity, but that our conservatives are stuck living in a fantasy world where feminist rebellion isn’t happening. As a result of this crippling conservative delusion, our most conservative institutions are focused not on encouraging a vision of respectable manhood but on destroying the idea of respectable manhood. Who needs feminists to destroy our sense of manhood when we have Christian conservatives?

In this sense Judge’s near miss analysis is emblematic of the very masculine malaise he is analyzing. Judge cheers on Leia’s transformation from a princess to a bad ass general while seeking to find the explanation for the loss of the concept of noble manhood. All he can see is the possibility that individual fathers are failing by not providing a ritual which would embody a forbidden concept:

*The Force Awakens* is a weakly written script so we never find out what precisely motivates Ren, but judging by his behavior, his hostility and confusion might stem from the lack of male initiation. That is to say, Han Solo may have been hyper driving around the galaxy when he should have been raising his son.

Go girlpower! Why are weak men screwing feminism up?

**Edit:** Welcome Instapundit readers.
Is “The Force Awakens” too feminist?
by Dalrock | January 4, 2016 | Link

It is often quite telling to compare the opinions of feminists and traditional conservatives on current issues. This is certainly the case in comparing the views of feminists with the president of the Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (Owen Strachan) regarding the latest Star Wars movie.

**Warning:** Plot spoilers below.

For feminists the controversy revolves around whether the feminist heroine of the movie (Rey) is too perfect or not. They love that she is a badass warrior, but worry that maybe her feminist perfection has gone _too far_. As Caroline Franke at Vox.com explains:

> Is Rey, the new movie’s protagonist, too perfect to be a good hero? Is she, in fandom speak, a “Mary Sue”?

Franke disagrees:

> In _The Force Awakens_, Rey, a young scavenger with mysterious origins, becomes entangled with the Rebellion, flies the Millennium Falcon without prior experience, discovers that she can tap into The Force, and uses it to her advantage to best a more experienced Jedi. Any additional skills Rey has — mechanical work, hand-to-hand combat, climbing — are explained when we first meet her. She’s been fending for herself on Jakku for _years_. If she hadn’t picked up those skills, she’d probably be dead.

Feminist Donna Dickens at Hitfix.com argues that asking the question itself is sexist:

> So if you have a problem with Rey’s skill set, ask yourself this question: would you even have noticed her ascent to badassery if she’d been a dude named Ray?

One thing is perfectly clear; The Force Awakens is the movie about women in combat that feminists have been dreaming of. Lesbian feminist Patricia Karvelas at The Guardian explains why this is the case in _Star Wars is a game-changer, awakening the feminist force in little girls everywhere_

> Finally we have our female Luke Skywalker – an orphaned scavenger girl alone on the desert of Jakku.

> ... 

> As she prepare to fight scores of Storm Troopers Han hands her a weapon. “You might need this,” he says. She replies: “I think I can handle myself,” and he answers: “That’s why I’m giving it to you.” It really sets the tone of the film.
Clearly feminists loved the movie, and their only concern is if it went too far in the area of feminist propaganda. But what about Christian conservatives, the ones focused (albeit ambivalently) on gender roles? How did the president of the CBMW react to the movie?

Not surprisingly, Owen Strachan quite liked the movie*, and doesn’t note or object to the over the top feminist message. In fact, he especially liked the scene featuring a woman in combat, listing it as one of the four best in the film:

| The forest battle between Ren and Rey (Ren’s lightsaber was very cool)

Elsewhere Strachan tells us:

| I liked how Rey showed steel as she discovered the power to use the force.

Notably absent from Strachan’s review is a criticism of the movie presenting women as warriors. This is especially noteworthy since the Guardian feminist was so delighted to see a man hand a woman a weapon so she could go fight.

This however isn’t surprising, since Strachan and others at the CBMW are in denial of the feminist goal to erase gender roles (the roles the CBMW exists to defend) when it comes to women in combat. Back in 2013 Strachan wrote:

| The decision by Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta to place women in the front lines of military combat is an anti-woman decision. It seems “pro-woman,” but it’s not. It will put women in situations that are not suited to them.

Strachan closed that piece with the bizarre claim that what we are witnessing isn’t an envy driven feminist usurpation of men’s roles, but men forcing women to usurp their roles:

| ...the call by men for women to fight in their place is the height of cowardice, and worthy of the strongest possible rebuke.

He echoed the same bizarre denial of reality in a separate article that same year:

| If men will not own this responsibility, then women will be forced to take it on as did biblical women such as Deborah and Jael (and the extrabiblical figure Judith). Many modern men fail to mirror Christ in leading, providing, and protecting.

Strachan isn’t alone in this delusion driven by a willful blindness to feminist rebellion. This is a laughably common denial for the CBMW. So it isn’t a surprise that Strachan, who can’t spot the most obvious feminism in the real world, can’t spot the most obvious feminism in the movies. This is true even when the movie matches his own fantasy of a man handing a woman a weapon and telling her to go fight.

*H/T jonakc1
Regular readers of the blog are aware of the tragic situation with Pastor Saeed Abedini (see the tag with his name at the bottom of the post or start here, here, here and here). One aspect of this tragedy that I haven't fully discussed is the truly profound change in the narrative which occurred starting in late October of 2015.

The original focus.

Until October 24, 2015 the focus was on the persecution of Pastor Saeed for his faith in Christ, as well as the messages he had to teach. Two years ago the ACLJ published a deeply moving letter he sent to his wife Naghmeh. The ACLJ explains that the letter was “written on the margins of scraps of newspaper”. Pastor Seed opens the letter describing how he wasn’t able to recognize his own face after all of the beatings he had endured. He described the pain and anguish of being persecuted, and how even here he found joy through his faith (emphasis mine):

I could not fall sleep one night due to the pain when all of a sudden I could hear the sound of dirty sewer rats with their loud noises and screeches. It was around 4 in the morning. It sounded like laughter in a way.

...but I knew that in the eyes of Jesus Christ, and in the eyes of my brothers and sisters, I am like the sewer rat, beautiful and loveable - not disgusting and unclean - and like the rats I can scream with joy within those prison walls and worship my Lord in joy and strength.

His focus in the letter was on forgiveness, and he described how he was teaching this to his cell-mate. He explained how he is practicing this as well:

I forgave the prison doctor who did not listen to me and did not give me the medication that I needed. I forgave the interrogator who beat me. Every day when I would see the interrogator and for the last time when I saw him, I forgave him. I smiled at him and with respect shook his hand and I said my goodbye. The minute I forgave them and loved them, that second I was filled with unspeakable joy. I saw in the eyes of the interrogator that he had come to respect me and as he was leaving, he could not look behind him. Love is as strong as death.

Even though he is confined in a prison thousands of miles away, Pastor Saeed still found a way to wash his wife in the water of the word:

Surely you have someone in your family, city, work or environment that have become like poisonous snake who have bitten you and tried to make you poisonous. So, forgive them and use the antidote of love and be Victorious!

The entire letter is very much worth reading, although I will warn you that it is very painful to
On June 30th 2015 the ACLJ published a beautiful letter from Naghmeh to Saeed. In the letter she describes how much she misses him, and how she wishes she could care for him. She closes the letter with a promise that just six months later is bitterly ironic:

Saeed, your wife wants you to know that you are NOT forgotten. You are covered in prayer. Your wife and the body of Christ are standing with you. We are giving you what prison walls cannot take away. We are giving you our prayers.

Your loving wife,

Naghmeh

In early September 2015, the ACLJ published an update from Naghmeh to Pastor Saeed’s supporters. The update reminded readers of Pastor Saeed’s suffering and how important it is for someone suffering like he is to know he has not been forgotten:

I made sure that he was told that I had not given up the fight. That we had not given up the fight for his release. That despite government shortcomings, none of us were giving up. That we were getting on our knees and praying and fasting for him each day leading up to the prayer vigil. I knew that during the short prison visits he needed to know that he was not forgotten.

“Remember the prisoners as if chained with them—those who are mistreated—since you yourselves are in the body also.” Hebrews 13:3 (NKJV)

Saeed spoke of a cellmate who died this week in the prison because of lack of medical treatment. Saeed and other prisoners worry about their own medical conditions that continue to go untreated. Saeed has held onto hope that he would be released before his medical condition became too critical.

For several more months the focus continued on Pastor Saeed’s suffering, the lessons he had to teach, and the need to bring him home. During this time Naghmeh clearly continued to work tirelessly to keep him in the minds of Christians and everyone else in the West (as she had for years). As just two examples: In September she announced that she would be fasting for Saeed and the persecuted church. On October 2nd 2015 she retweeted a series of tweets from the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, which themselves were quotes from their interview of her:
The beginning of the change.

Her efforts continued throughout the month of October, including her October 23rd Op Ed in the Washington Post. However, the very next day marked a turning point. On October 24th she tweeted about a “great article” in Christian Today titled: Like her husband Pastor Saeed Abedini, Naghmeh also under fire for her strong Christian faith. The article opens with:

In a new twist to the saga of American pastor Saeed Abedini who is languishing in Iranian prison, it turns out he is not the only one in his family who is on trial for his Christian faith.

Sharing a similar fate as her husband, Naghmeh Abedini said she is also under fire, not from Iranian authorities, but from radical Muslims and even Christians who question her faith...

This all started with a facebook post by Naghmeh where she wrote about criticism she had received:

I have been told many things of which some have been that I am not a good mom for traveling so much...that how could I possibly share about Christ when I have not even been to a Bible School. I have been criticized from what I wear to what I say to
the way I parent...

Taking a page from her husband’s letter to her two years ago, she encouraged her followers to learn from her and forgive their tormentors. However, she doesn’t present this as a lesson she learned from Pastor Saeed, but as something recently revealed to her in the Old Testament:

I used to break to pieces after each attack and criticism, but recently the Lord has been speaking to me through the life of Moses. That I should use the attacks to keep me humble. That I should respond as Moses responded. To intercede and ask the Lord to forgive them and to not hold it against them. To have a heart of compassion for them (instead of a heart of bitterness) and to truly know that they do not know what they are doing....We see here that Moses’ response to attacks on himself was to intercede for those attacking him. Because of his response and humility we see the Lord stepping in and defending him.

Today, can you cry out to God for those attacking you? Can you intercede for them and ask that the Lord would not hold it against them? Can you free your heart from bitterness and unforgiveness? Can you let go and leave it to God and believe that God is your defense? There is so much freedom in letting go and not defending yourself, but instead praying for and interceding for those who are attacking you and criticizing you.

Compare the second paragraph above to Pastor Saeed’s exhortation to Naghmeh two years ago:

Surely you have someone in your family, city, work or environment that have become like poisonous snake who have bitten you and tried to make you poisonous. So, forgive them and use the antidote of love and be Victorious!

As I understand it, there is strong tendency for families of hostages to place themselves in the shoes of the hostage, to feel that they personally are the hostage. This makes sense, and I can’t imagine the pain that Naghmeh and the rest of Pastor Saeed’s family have endured. However, this marked a turning point, and shortly after the article came out Naghmeh sent out the email message accusing Saeed of abusing her from prison and announcing that she would take time off from advocating for him.

She has followed through on this announcement, and following her Oct 24th tweet of the Christian Today article comparing her with Saeed she has been almost entirely silent on Twitter. As I write this (January 5th) the Oct 24 tweet is only the third newest tweet in her twitter feed:

The change progresses.

She has in the meantime written two additional Facebook posts which turned into news stories*. On Dec 7th she wrote a post explaining that her new form of advocacy for Saeed would take the form of praying for him (emphasis mine):
The truth is that I still love my husband more than ever and my advocacy for him has taken a new form of interceding on my knees. The truth is I can not deny Saeed’s love and passion for Jesus and that he continues to suffer in the Iranian prison because of his genuine love for Jesus and his refusal to deny Him. I can not deny the amazing dad he has been to our kids and the spiritual truths he poured into their life until the moment he was arrested. But at the same time I can not deny the very dark parts of our marriage and serious issues Saeed continues to struggle with.

She urged followers to pray for Saeed, including a prayer that God will use his persecution to free him of his wife abusing ways:

So I open myself up once again and become real and raw in asking you to join me in praying for Saeed. This time not only for his physical chains, but the spiritual chains that have bound him for so many years. Those chains that have stuck to him from the culture he was raised in (Middle East) and from his former religion (Islam). I believe that God will use Saeed’s imprisonment to break Saeed of these chains and to refine him and use him as a vessel for the work that He has prepared for him.

Saeed was at least still a topic of discussion on Dec 7th, even if much of this revolved around her accusations that he is abusing her from inside an Iranian prison. But the overall focus was very much about Naghmeh and her suffering. She was especially bitter that religious leaders didn’t come to her aid when she was criticized for making bizarre accusations against her husband (emphasis mine):

I had to turn off every voice including my own and only care about what Jesus was saying to me. It was hard. With the news that came out recently (an email I had sent to prayer partners was leaked to media), stones were being thrown at me left and right and many religious leaders who saw me wounded and bleeding passed on by afraid to touch me or this whole mess/situation. It was hard, but Jesus kept telling me to be silent and to look to Him.

It isn’t clear which religious leaders she is upset with for not coming to her aid (Franklin Graham?), nor who was criticizing her. Aside from myself, I’m not aware of anyone challenging what she has done outside of discussion comboxes here, on news stories, and on Facebook. At any rate, there is clearly also a shift to her new focus which will be sharing the important things she personally has to teach her followers as God reveals Himself to her. She closed the Dec 7 post with:

I am not sure how often I will be providing updates, but I will share as the Lord leads. Starting January 5, I am going to start another 21 days of prayer and fasting. It will be a time of drawing closer to the Lord and sharing what He lays on my heart. I hope they will be a source of blessing and encouragement to you as well.

I praise God for all of the ups and downs, excitements and disappointments, and for the many pains and tears. They have been good for me. They are a great tool to refine us and keep our eyes on Jesus.

With much Love in Jesus
Saeed erased, now the focus is entirely on Naghmeh.

Today she followed up with another Facebook post, and in this one the transformation that she began in late October is complete. There is no reference whatsoever to Saeed or his suffering. The focus is on the persecution Naghmeh has suffered for her faith, and the lessons she has to preach as God reveals Himself to her:

Tomorrow I will be starting a three week fast. The focus of the fast is to spend more time in the presence of the Lord and to draw closer to the heart of God. I will be sharing scripture and what the Lord lays on my heart for each day.

...

When I became a follower of Jesus at the age of 9 I had to let go of all I had been taught as a Muslim despite the cost and the rejection and persecution that came from my own family.

As I wrote in my very first post on the topic, there is enormous cruelty in the Christian media encouraging Naghmeh in the way that it is. From reading Pastor Saeed’s moving letter I have no question that he will forgive her for radically changing the way he is seen back home when he was without a voice, when he trusted her to act as his voice. If Pastor Saeed can forgive his tormentors, I can surely forgive them too. But I do pray that the media and Christian leaders will stop feeding the temptation she is feeling, and I pray that she will repent of the dark path she is on. At the same time I pray for Pastor Saeed to be released from prison, and for restoration in his marriage and family.

*For news stories on her Dec 7th Facebook post see the Gospel Herald, the Baptist Press, Charisma News, the Christian Post, and Christian Today. So far I only see one news story regarding her Facebook post today on the Christian Post. However, other online papers are very likely to follow the Post’s lead here.*
The erasure of Pastor Saeed occurred sooner than I thought.

by Dalrock | January 6, 2016 | Link

In my last post I noted that there was no reference to Pastor Saeed in his wife Naghmeh’s Facebook post yesterday. However, I now see that Christian Today wrote an article in December about a Dec 16th Facebook post by Naghmeh where she also made no reference to him*: Pastor Saeed Abedini’s wife Naghmeh back on social media, says people musn’t confuse Jesus’ righteousness as their own

I was also surprised to see that she didn’t mention him in her Twitter/Instagram Christmas message:

Merry Christmas from our family to your! I am so thankful to be home with my babies celebrating our Savior’s birth. ❤Love you all! Isaiah 9:6

I also found some more background on the story which makes this all even more bizarre and disturbing. On Oct 21 she tweeted an Instagram update explaining that she would not have any way to communicate with Saeed during the months of November, December, and January because his parents were going to be out of Iran and therefore not able to visit him. It isn’t clear the exact date she sent the email claiming Saeed was abusing her from prison, but early November seems like the best guess. Certainly all of these ugly allegations have been made public, and his wife’s astonishing move to erase him from the narrative, occurred during a time where Saeed is fully cut off from communicating with the outside world. All of this has also occurred during a time that his physical health is deteriorating quickly. On Oct 14th Naghmeh tweeted:

I spoke with Saeed’s parents today after their prison vistation with Saeed. They continue to be worried about Saeed’s health. They say it is deteriorating quickly. Saeed’s mom reminded me of my testimony in front of the congress (in June of this year) when I said that I did not know in what condition I would receive my husband and [sic] that father of my kids. It is hard hearing of Saeed’s health deteriorating, but today as I prayed I felt calm and peace knowing that God is in control.

*In both cases when the press wrote stories about Naghmeh’s facebook posts that excluded all reference to Saeed, the press stories still made at least some reference to him. I strongly suspect that Naghmeh will find her press coverage drops off dramatically if she continues to post updates that don’t involve Saeed in one way or another. She could probably revive their interest in the short term by offering more salacious accusations against her imprisoned husband, but eventually that angle will either become too absurd for even the press to continue covering or simply no longer interesting. Returning to writing about his suffering and imprisonment would be another way for her to return to the media spotlight, but interest in her husband’s persecution will be hard to revive after accusing him of sexual abuse. Naghmeh may very well have cut open the golden goose in her quest for attention.
A fresh start for Naghmeh
by Dalrock | January 6, 2016 | Link

Today Naghmeh tweeted a link to a Charisma News article about her latest Saeed-free Facebook post: Why Saeed Abedini’s Wife Is Calling for 3-Week Fast The article explains that Naghmeh is moving on after having publicly advocated for years for her husband’s release:

The fast is a fresh start for Naghmeh, who shocked the world last year with claims of spousal abuse.

Naghmeh, who was a tireless advocate for Saeed, halted her public support for her husband’s release from Iranian prison, citing “physical, emotional, psychological and sexual abuse.”
Nagmeh warns Christians not to be seduced by the desire for attention.

by Dalrock | January 14, 2016 | Link

I had planned on changing the subject, but haven’t had time to write the next post I plan on writing. In the meantime, the Christian press continues to feed Naghmeh Abedini’s cravings for attention. Ironically this latest round involves Naghmeh teaching her social media followers that they need to fight the urge to seek fame and attention, especially in the form of social media followers:

A main theme during my time of prayer and fasting seems to be becoming aware of our (my) friendship with the world as followers of Christ. I am being made more and more aware of how we (including me) are allowing its subtle ways get to us and it is putting the body of Christ to sleep. My travels over the last 3 years have opened my eyes to the condition that the body of Christ is in. Pursuing fame, wealth and “followers/numbers” has become normal in the Christian world. We are becoming like the world and we are totally Ok with that. Yet the scripture has serious warnings even calling us ENEMIES OF GOD.

See the recent articles from Charisma News, Christian Today, and the Christian Post. All of these stories are based on recent Facebook posts by Naghmeh which don’t reference Saeed in any way (here and here). All of the news stories however still do mention Pastor Saeed, since he is the only reason Naghmeh’s Facebook writings are in any way newsworthy. Strangely, the Christian Post article makes it sound like Naghmeh is still advocating for her husband’s release, and isn’t launching a new solo act:

The Boise mother of two has spent a good portion of the last three years traveling around the country raising awareness for Christian persecution and the imprisonment of her husband in Iran.

Pastor Abedini has spent over three years in an Iranian prison despite international pressure for his release. Groups such as the American Center for Law and Justice have said that the American citizen is being punished by the Iranian regime for his Christian faith.

Naghmeh Abedini has pleaded before Congress to do more to expedite her husband’s release, and has also spoken out about the many other Christians held in Iranian prisons.

The Post knows she has stopped advocating for Saeed after bizarrely accusing him of abusing her from prison, because they reported it in their November 14 article Naghmeh Abedini Halts Public Advocacy, Citing Marital Abuse, Stress (emphasis mine):

Naghmeh Abedini, the wife of imprisoned U.S. Pastor Saeed in Iran, has said she is suspending her public advocacy for her husband, which she has kept up for more
than three years, citing continued psychological and sexual abuse in her marriage among other reasons.

Even the photo for the article makes it look like she is still advocating for Saeed, as it shows a picture of her at a vigil for her husband with Rev Franklin Graham. Given her blatant desire to turn sympathy for her husband into a Christian leadership role for herself, this photo she prominently includes on her twitter page would be much more appropriate.

Clearly the papers know that Naghmeh’s Facebook posts about her spiritual insight as she temporarily abstains from coffee, chocolate, soda, and chips are not noteworthy unless they can be framed as part of the larger story of the persecution of Saeed. The longer Naghmeh goes without advocating for Saeed, the less interested the press will be in her social media posts. This will happen more quickly if posts about Naghmeh have this disconnect politely and consistently called out by readers. In the meantime, they continue write articles on her facebook posts while playing up the Saeed angle. Not surprisingly, Naghmeh has continued her efforts to morph herself into the role of persecuted Christian leader (replacing her husband):

This is why I went to Iran as a missionary a month after September 11, 2001 when everyone was avoiding airplanes and the Middle East. This is why I refused to deny Christ when in the summer of 2004 (in Iran) I had guns pointed to my head and told to deny Jesus and return to Islam if I wanted to live.
I’ve written a fair amount about the similarity between Traditional Conservatives and Feminists. However, one defining characteristic of the Trad Con is their stone cold humorlessness when it comes to delivering the “weak men are screwing feminism up” message. To Trad Cons there is absolutely no irony in this message, just a sense of disgust and outrage that weak men are standing in the way of achieving glorious feminist progress. This humorlessness is a byproduct of their great skill at denying reality. On the other end of the spectrum we have the Daily Mail, which makes a sport out of trolling its readers on the topic.

Most recently the Daily Mail asked: Are reluctant men to blame for so many women being childless? Throughout the article the Mail author juxtaposes claims that men are to blame with statements by childless women explaining that they were too picky, too feminist, or dumped/drove away their best prospects. After explaining the increase in almost entirely unwanted childlessness in women, the Mail article gets down to the hilarious business of trolling their readers (emphasis mine):

Melanie Whitehouse is certainly one of these women. And she is clear about the cause of her childlessness: men.

Or rather, the lack of men who were willing to settle down and start a family with her. The heartbreaking realisation that she was never going to have a baby struck late – in her 50s, while at a reunion lunch with her first boyfriend, whom she had dumped on a whim.

‘I hadn’t grieved for the children who might have been until then. I realised with painful clarity what I’d lost,’ she says. ‘Tom had been happily married for 25 years and had three kids, while I had nobody.’

After dumping the boring loyal dude, Melanie spent her most fertile years having sex with cads. Just before she turned 30, she started an affair with a married man named Duncan. This affair would become the defining milestone of her sexual career:

‘I always thinks of my life as BD and AD – Before Duncan and After Duncan. He changed everything.

After ten more years of the alpha carousel, Melanie decided that at 39 it was finally time to switch to beta bucks:

As her desperation increased, and the chances of her having a child began to tumble, Melanie took drastic action.
'Aged 39, I went out with a tall, bald accountant. He was younger than me and obviously uncommitted, but I was determined to somehow make it work.

But she failed to stick the landing in the AF/BB strategy, by driving her beta bucks man away before she could pull off an “oops” pregnancy:

‘I’d shelved my dream of the perfect marriage by now and I took risks with contraception. I was quite prepared to bring a baby up alone if I had to. I remember getting so angry at his lack of regard for me that I had a huge row with him – and he dumped me.’

Other women blame men for not making their own unrealistic feminist expectations come true. Genevieve hilariously complains:

It was as if the men’s thinking hadn’t caught up with what women were told to expect from life. And I wasn’t prepared to accept this.

The comments to the article are quite interesting, as most of the recent comments could well have come from the manosphere. Yet one of the commenters is a 34 year old woman who explains that Not All Childless Women Are Like That. She is disturbed by the callous unfairness of a system which would make her marry and have children with a man she has contempt for before pulling the divorce/child support ripcord:

I’m 34, single and childless and its unfair to put myself and others in a similar situation in the same light based on the stories and views of just 3 women. Society has changed but simple bad luck has to be taken into account. The chances of meeting the right guy, at the right age and being financially secure to have a family are slim. Who wants to settle for someone who isn't quite right, have a child then split up a few years later? I’d rather be alone than in a miserable marriage that inevitably ends leaving two divorced parents and a child from a broken marriage.

*H/T Anon
Saeed is free!
by Dalrock | January 16, 2016 | Link

Rejoice! The ACLJ has confirmed that Pastor Saeed Abedini has been let out of prison!

We can now officially confirm that Pastor Saeed has been freed. In addition there are reports that 3 other Americans imprisoned in Iran have also been released.

News broke late last night that Pastor Saeed had been taken from his prison cell to Iran’s Central Intelligence agency. While the details are still coming in, we can confirm that this morning he was released.

This is a major victory. We are incredibly grateful to the more than 1.1 million people who have joined us in fighting across the globe for Pastor Saeed’s freedom.

They even include a supportive response from Naghmeh:

“This has been an answer to prayer. This is a critical time for me and my family. We look forward to Saeed’s return and want to thank the millions of people who have stood with us in prayer during this most difficult time.”

With Saeed’s release we should continue to pray for healing, both physical healing as well as reconciliation in his family. God-speed Saeed.

H/T Robert
I hear he is a real bastard.
by Dalrock | January 18, 2016 | Link

With Pastor Abedini’s release, Heavy.com chose him as a topic for one of their 5 Fast Facts posts. Fast fact number three is:

3. His Wife Naghmeh Campaigned Relentlessly for His Release, But Then Quit After Saying He Had Abused Her

Unlike the Christian media, the Heavy.com author noted how strange this accusation really is (emphasis mine):

She said the abuse started early in their relationship and somehow worsened while he was in prison, when they communicated by phone and Skype.

Just before relaying the accusation that Saeed somehow abused his wife via phone and skype, the piece noted that the couple’s daughter had gone so long without hearing her father’s voice she was forgetting what he sounds like:

My daughter said she is forgetting Daddy’s voice and she asked me, ‘Do you think he has a beard now?’ I didn’t even think of that. She keeps playing the home videos over and over.

There are currently only two comments on the Heavy.com piece, the first is:

I hear he is a real bastard.

The second comment is a reply to the first one. It is not a reminder that all we have are bizarre whispers of accusations against a man incapable of defending himself, but a reminder that we are all sinners.

The Heavy.com article’s note of the strange accusations against Saeed contrasts with the Washington Post,* which received the modern Christian angle from Russell Moore of the Southern Baptist Convention. Moore’s statement presumes the bizarre whispered accusations are true:

Details of her abuse will eventually have to be addressed within the evangelical community, where she has been a prominent spokesperson for international religious freedom, said Russell Moore, president of the Southern Baptist Convention’s Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission.

“I don’t think today is the day to address that,” he said. “I was stunned and surprised by Naghmeh’s statement. I did not know any of that. It was and is very troubling.”

*H/T Dave
Back in 2010 an unnamed pastor* at the Council for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (CBMW) explained how the complementarian model for marriage works in: Breaking the Marital Impasse: How Authority and Submission Work When Spouses Disagree

Breaking the impasse is critical to the complementarian model because having a “tiebreaker” is, along with the husband having sole responsibility for all failures of the marriage and most of the responsibility for failures by the wife, what distinguishes complementarian marriage from egalitarian marriage. Often times complementarians will present the husband as the tie breaker, but this can’t really be. In the complementarian model the husband’s responsibility is total, but should his wife feel on any issue that he isn’t “listening” to her, she has not only the right but the obligation to throw a godly tantrum. Since the godly tantrum trumps the tiebreaking role, obviously someone else needs to be the tiebreaker.

Enter the CBMW, which explains that the tiebreaker in all decisions within the marriage is neither the husband nor the wife but the third person in the complementarian threesome, the couple’s pastor. To illustrate how the complementarian model of marriage works, the CBMW pastor offers the example of a couple which has been discussing an issue for several weeks before the husband finally decides that the time for further discussion has passed and makes a decision:

...the problem concerned Elizabeth’s leadership of our church’s preschool ministry. Elizabeth loved the work, but life in their home was crazy. Ted was forced to work longer hours at work, their family was growing, and another ministry they shared in the church was quickly multiplying. Ted did not believe it was wise for Elizabeth to continue to supervise the preschoolers. They had been discussing this issue for weeks, but could not agree on a course of action. Finally, Ted “put his foot down” and made the final decision. Elizabeth would have to resign from the ministry.

Since the couple was at an impasse Elizabeth invoked the complementarian model of decision making, appealing to the couple’s pastor for a ruling:

Elizabeth was stunned, angry, and hurt. In her anger she told him she would never quit. After 24 hours of conflict, Elizabeth called me for help.

The CBMW pastor explains that this model is required not just for cases where a husband is sinning, but where a wife feels uncomfortable about her husband’s decision (emphasis mine).

What would wise, biblical counsel sound like in real-life situations where conservative Christian spouses disagree about the nature of submission and the parameters of marital authority? **What is a wife to do when she feels uncomfortable submitting to her husband in an area**, but cannot quote
“chapter and verse” that it is a sin.

The pastor explains that Elizabeth was right to come to him, because even though her husband discussed the issue with her for weeks before making a final decision, she felt like her husband was committing the sin of not listening to her (emphasis mine):

...Elizabeth began to sense that Ted was not really listening to her. She was aware that he had made up his mind before they talked. She discussed this issue with him, but he never really engaged the matter before making the decision that she must quit. Ted and Elizabeth thus made a fleeting and failed attempt at guidelines #2 and #3.

That is when guideline #4 kicked in and Elizabeth sought help from her pastor. She was right to do this because as a believer she is under pastoral authority as well as husbandly authority. She also had grounds because she believed she needed help in engaging a sin issue with her husband.

Therefore the CBMW pastor agreed to preside over the case of Elizabeth’s role in the children’s ministry. After deliberating over the case, the pastor issued a split verdict. Ted had the right to make the decision that he did, but although he discussed the issue with his wife for weeks, he was sinning because she didn’t feel like he was listening to her. Ted also sinned by making the decision since making a decision his wife disagreed with was unloving and constituted demanding his own way. Elizabeth on the other hand was right to refuse to do as Ted said and appeal to the third person in the marriage (because Ted was in sin), but she was wrong to not submit to her husband and appeal to the pastor (because this is rebellion). In the end, two thirds of the marriage were found by the CBMW pastor to be in sin (everyone but the pastor himself), and the pastor ruled that Elizabeth was to quit her work in the children’s ministry (emphasis mine):

As I spoke with Ted and Elizabeth it became clear that they were both right, and they were both wrong. Ted was correct that he had authority to make a decision regarding Elizabeth’s ministry commitments that were doing damage to her and her family and needed to be streamlined. He was incorrect in the way he executed his leadership. In fact, Ted had not listened to his wife. He did not shepherd her well. Repentance for Ted meant confessing that he had been quick to speak and slow to listen, and that he had been unloving in demanding his own way, thus violating the law of love.

on the other hand, Elizabeth was correct that her husband had treated her in an unloving way, but was wrong in that she used his sin as a legal loophole to squirm out of submission. She approached the decision about her ministry as an exercise in personal autonomy, rather than glad-hearted submission to authority.

In Summary:

Ted:

- Was right to make the decision.
• Sinned by making the decision.
• Listened to his wife for weeks before making the decision.
• Sinned by not listening to his wife before making the decision.

Elizabeth:

• Was right to not submit to her husband and instead appeal to the pastor to overrule her husband.
• Sinned by not submitting to her husband and instead appealing to the pastor to overrule her husband.

The pastor:

• Has final authority in all decisions in the marriage.
• Has no responsibility for the outcomes of the marriage, as assuming this responsibility would be usurping the role of the husband.

Hopefully this clears up any confusion as to how complementarian marriage works. For those interested in practicing this alternative lifestyle, I would suggest buying a bigger bed, as things are about to get awfully crowded.

*Update:* Commenter David J pointed out that the name of the author/pastor is Heath Lambert, based on footnote #4 in the article.
We need to focus on respect instead of fairness.
by Dalrock | January 20, 2016 | Link

Instapundit has a link to an article on his wife’s book Men On Strike in a paper in Bermuda. Together Instapundit and Dr. Helen are doing an incredible job of promoting conversations neither conservatives nor liberals want to have*. However, as I’ve mentioned before I disagree with Dr. Helen on her characterization of men’s response to feminism. She describes it as a strike, and I see the response as something more ominous. I don’t think men are making purely logical cost/benefit calculations and deciding not to marry; this would make sense if it were happening, but I don’t think it is what we are witnessing. I think what we are starting to see is a culture changing in a delayed response to the message we have spent decades sending men.

Something else struck me when reading the article from Bermuda along with the comments; framing the problem as one of “fairness” is an ineffective argument to conservatives and men in general, and it also sets us up to move in the wrong direction to find a solution.

Why the fairness argument fails with conservatives and men in general.

We don’t tend to have much sympathy for men who complain about unfair treatment. Whether you think we should have more sympathy or not is a separate question. The reality is this is true. Dr. Helen is quite extraordinary in her ability to empathize with men, but most of the audience we need to sway isn’t like her in this regard. This is especially true for conservatives, who strongly believe that noble masculinity involves sacrifice, and that fairness is for women, not men. You can see this with Tucker Carlson’s flippant response to Dr. Helen when she explains that men have no rights in marriage, and that marriage has been turned into a legal mechanism for women to steal from men**:

Well that’s all true, I mean I agree with that completely. But it still doesn’t absolve men of the responsibility to stop complaining about how the cards are against them and man up and become men– because you don’t become a man until you assume responsibility.

Dr. Helen appears truly astounded by Carlson’s lack of empathy in the video, but while Carlson is extreme in his flippancy his basic gut reaction isn’t unusual for either men or conservatives. I don’t know that Carlson is in a position to be convinced away from his stance that the problem is weak men screwing feminism up, but at least some conservatives will be willing to listen.

For the conservatives who will listen, a much more effective argument is to point out that men are motivated by respect. The reason we see men moving away from marriage is the role of husband, especially the role of married father, has gone from an honored role to one seen with great contempt. This contempt isn’t limited to the feminists who envied men’s status. This would be bad enough, but the contempt is actually worse among conservatives. We don’t notice this because disrespecting honorable men is now so commonplace that it feels normal. But if you look for it, you can see it all around you. Father’s Day is a day set
aside to honor fathers, but pastors have instead turned it into a day to tear down fathers in front of their wives and children. Christian movies are now more contemptuous of married men, especially married fathers, than secular movies are. This same contempt for husbands is at the root of the rush to discredit Saeed Abedini while he languished in an Iranian prison, as well as the move by pastors to usurp the role of headship from the husbands in their congregation.

For those conservatives who will listen, the most effective response is to point out that we are getting the kind of men we demonstrate that we want. We withhold honor from honorable men yet at the same time whine that men are hearing the unmistakable message we are sending. Undermining, ridiculing, and casting aside husbands and fathers isn’t unfair, it is a sign of profound disrespect. The men we respect instead are the sexy bad boys who can best navigate our post marriage sexual marketplace. Conservatives, especially conservative men, who don’t like the change this has wrought in our culture need to man up and stop complaining, and get about the hard work of showing respect to the respectable and honoring the honorable. This isn’t as pleasant and easy as posturing as the only real man in the room, nor is it as gratifying for most as supplicating to women. But as men we often need to do difficult, risky, and unpleasant things, and for our time especially we need to find the courage and conviction to do this.

The wrong definition of the problem leads to the wrong solution.

The other problem with framing this as a matter of fairness is this naturally leads to an attempt to fix the family structure we have selected to replace marriage. Fairness means more egalitarian divorce, child support laws, and custody arrangements. It means replacing marriage with something more fair than the system we have already replaced marriage with. This isn’t what we need to do. What we need to do is restore marriage, not come up with a more palatable way to destroy families.

*Dr. Helen’s framing does seem to be the most effective way to start the conversation in the media. It would be difficult to overstate what she has accomplished in this regard, and either way she is making the case as she sees it. With this said, even for those who fundamentally see this as an issue of fairness, I think they will find it more effective when specifically addressing conservatives to focus on what we honor and respect as a society and the logical results we should expect from these messages.

**H/T innocentbystanderboston
Commenter yac-yac asks why a young man would want respect from a man who would tell him to man up and marry those sluts:

That, I think, is the epiphany, the moment of change: the awareness on the part of the young man, that the opinion of a Cuckservative has less value than a bucket of warm ratsshit, as at least you could use the ratsshit as fertilizer in the tomato patch.

“Man Up and Marry Those Sluts!”

“Why?”

“To earn My Respect[tm].”

“Why should I care about whether or not some random @$hole ‘respects’ me?”

How much the respect of such a conservative is valued by a young man is a good question, but we should be clear that in the example given (Tucker Carlson), respect isn’t on offer for a man who marries.

We can see this by how flippant Carlson is about a system designed to disrespect the respectable. He doesn’t care. This was clear in the video I quoted in the previous post, based on his exasperated disinterest in the fact that honorable men are held in contempt by society. If he respected men who marry, he wouldn’t have been so eager to shrug off the issues that Dr. Helen presented.

This is also clear in another video on the topic where Carlson reacted to a quote from Dr. Helen:

Dr. Helen: [The] new world order is a place where men are discriminated against, forced into a hostile environment in school and later in college, and held in contempt by society. Maybe there is no incentive to grow up anymore. It used to be that being a grown-up, responsible man was rewarded with respect, power and deference. Now, not so much.

Tucker Carlson: Every word of that is true, and let me say who cares? If you’re a man, stop whining and reclaim your birthright which is masculinity, and masculinity and male power derive from responsibility. You don’t embrace responsibility, you have no power

If Carlson respected honorable men, he would be disturbed to see them treated with contempt, especially in a such a coordinated way. I imagine that unlike married men Carlson does have at least some respect for wounded veterans. Assuming that is true, would Carlson answer “Who Cares?” if someone pointed out that wounded veterans were being systemically
treated with contempt by our government, and that this in turn was harming enlistment rates?

Never.

This may sound to some about fairness, but it is not. This is about respect, and how men react to seeing men they respect being treated with contempt. There is a natural revulsion to this, not unlike the natural revulsion to a man complaining that life isn’t “fair”.
Don’t fear marriage and fatherhood, but beware those who are working to destroy your family.

by Dalrock | January 22, 2016 | Link

Matt Walsh has a new post up at the Blaze*: Dear Millennial Men, Don’t Be Afraid of Marriage And Fatherhood. Walsh makes some good points. He notes that marriage isn’t the only way a man can embrace responsibility while pointing out that very few of the men avoiding marriage are practicing celibacy. He also notes the toxic impact of feminism on women, and that large numbers of women are delaying marriage. This last part is understated, but even acknowledging it is a massive improvement over the way (for example) complementarians pretend that men are insisting that women usurp men’s roles.

However, there is a huge piece missing from Walsh’s analysis. Men don’t just fear the responsibilities of marriage and fatherhood, they fear the way these institutions have been corrupted and assaulted by our laws, courts, Christian leaders and entertainment, and even attacked by Walsh himself. Marriage has been legally and socially replaced by a new family model. While some men only fear taking on responsibility, wise men rightly are weary of the evil of this new form of family. Under God’s family structure, marriage is for life and husbands are head of the household. Under our new culture and legal structure, marriage lasts precisely as long as your wife says it will, and married fathers are either a punchline or a serious threat to the family and must be aggressively restrained. It isn’t the responsibility that many men fear, but the contempt of society (including conservative Christians) that being a married father earns, and the loss of their family on a whim that best demonstrates this contempt.

It isn’t just that the law and the courts stand forever ready to reward your wife with cash and prizes if she decides to destroy your family. The culture, including Christian culture, will constantly be working to undermine you and destabilize your family. Christian movies about husbands and fathers reliably degrade the role of married men. Fireproof was the Christian entry into the genre of divorce fantasy, and Courageous went to unbelievable lengths to tear down good husbands and fathers so it could ostensibly build them back up. More recently War Room followed in this well worn anti husband and father path. But these are just the more serious expression of the dark modern Christian contempt for husbands and fathers. There are also Christian comedies like Mom’s Night Out which portray Christian husbands and fathers as buffoons. It is true that Christian movies are following the lead of secular movies in this regard, but this is a deeply troubling defense. Moreover, Christian films aren’t just following, they take the secular contempt for married fathers to the next level. Modern Christians haven’t noticed this because the movies reflect how modern Christians collectively feel about married fathers.

Yet while modern Christians can’t spot the contempt for married fathers in Christian movies, secular critics very often do. In his review of War Room on rogerebert.com, Matt Fagerholm complains that the movie portrays the Christian husband and father as lacking any redeeming qualities (emphasis mine):
The film’s centerpiece sequence occurs early on, as Elizabeth sits weeping in her closet while pleading, “God, help him love me again.” This moment is heartbreaking for all the wrong reasons. Since the Kendricks have mistaken one-dimensional caricatures for people who exist in the real world, they forgot to provide Tony with any redeeming qualities that would make us want to root for his marriage. As for the film’s advice to women who are beaten by their husbands, one of Elizabeth’s co-workers advises, “Learn to duck so God can hit him.”

Likewise the feminists at Dame were astonished by the anti-father message of Mom’s Night Out, as they explained in Manchildren Are Not Sexy. Neither Are Helpless Dads. This is a movie that Christians adored, yet feminists were made deeply uncomfortable by the anti father and anti family message it carried:

And that’s the biggest problem with Moms’ Night Out: The moral of the story isn’t that the women are supposed to stay home and not have fun, but that the men are totally hapless morons without them around—and that this lesson is still being drilled into our heads in 2014. We’re supposed to feel better about this “men are total idiots, the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world” philosophy (and that latter piece of wisdom was actually uttered in the movie in case you missed the point). But this story of the helpless manchild is a disservice to men—and families—everywhere.

There is of course a good, strong, competent man in the movie, but he isn’t a married father. He is a sexy badboy biker. Christians say that marriage and fatherhood is the path to respectable manhood, but the man we really (collectively) respect is the man who doesn’t listen to what we say about respectability and marriage.

Walsh rightly wants men to man up. Yet if they do, how will Walsh respond? Does his support for marriage go deeper than posing as the only real man in the room? Too often the answer is no. If your wife writes to him complaining about you, Walsh won’t hesitate to join the gossip and denigrate you to your wife and the rest of his audience:

She told me about her own prize catch; he wakes up at around 11 AM to play video games, meanwhile she brings their two sons to church. Something tells me this is the sort of guy who would call his wife “the boss.”

…I don’t know this woman. But I’m guessing she’d be overjoyed if hubby dropped the video game controller and picked up the Cross of Leadership.

This hopefully won’t be fatal to the family in question, assuming Walsh has it all wrong; if Walsh is merely unfairly maligning a good husband and father, the man can probably push through the discord Walsh is sowing in his home. But what if Walsh is right, and this wife who lacks discretion also has a failing husband? Is the ego boost Walsh received by denigrating another husband and father worth the risk that two young boys will grow up without their father in the home? And what about the other women (besides this man’s wife) that Walsh is posing for when he whispers that their life would be so much better if they were married to a real man like himself? Are their husbands good enough to survive Walsh’s clumsy attempt to AMOG them? We should pray that they are.
Even worse, at the same time Walsh mocks other Christian husbands for not being the kind of big strong Christian leader that he is, he is careful to avoid upsetting the feminist sensibilities of the women in his audience:

I believe that men have a duty to lead, and I believe that there are many, many women who agree with me.

Notice: I’m not saying that the man should be the boss. Being a leader doesn’t mean being a “boss.” But I don’t need to spend time dispelling the notion that men ought to be the boss, because, as we’ve covered, that notion doesn’t really exist.

For most marriages the sand Walsh throws into the gears will only create low level strife; we can’t blame the nearly 50% divorce rate on acts of grandstanding by Walsh. But his inclination to malign good men and destabilize fragile families is a dangerous game with no upside except to Walsh himself.

Likewise the Christian husband and father Jenny Erikson divorced almost certainly can’t single Walsh out as instrumental in encouraging his wife to blow up their family. Nor can their two daughters blame Walsh for the fact that they will grow up without their father in the home. However, Walsh undeniably provided Jenny Erikson comfort by aiding her in rationalizing her treachery. We know this because shortly after Jenny Erikson announced that she was tired of honoring her marriage vows, she tweeted:

Married men: your porn habit is an adultery habit
http://themattwalshblog.com/2013/11/25/married-men-your-porn-habit-is-an-adultery-habit/ ... (I love this guy)

But again, Walsh is only a bit player in the cacophony of voices whispering marital strife and destruction. Men who take Walsh’s advice to marry and have children aren’t safe if they merely keep their wives from reading bad influences like Walsh himself. They also need to overcome the discord being sown by a legion of Christian leaders. Modern Christian culture’s contempt for married fathers is so great that it has become customary to tear down fathers from the pulpit on the very day set aside to honor fathers. And while Father’s Day is a special day set aside to tear down Christian fathers, the threats aren’t limited to just one day. Christian wives are now being taught that submission means throwing godly tantrums, and many pastors now want to turn your marriage into a threesome.

But just because Walsh has a disturbing habit of sowing discord into other men’s homes, doesn’t mean he is wrong when he says men should man up. We all should. For some men this will mean carefully selecting a wife and doing everything possible to protect their family from what Walsh, secular culture, and Christian leaders throw against their home. For others it will mean finding purpose and responsibility while foregoing the profound benefits of marriage, including sex, romantic love, and children. For all of us manning up should also mean respecting the respectable, and doing what we can to fight against our society’s relentless attack on the family structure God created.

*H/T The Question
While Pastor Saeed Abedini was flying home to see his wife and children yesterday after being imprisoned for his faith for nearly four years, his wife Naghmeh was preparing a special surprise for him. According to a local news station, this surprise resembles the one Jenny Erikson had for her husband:

…a case filed Tuesday in court that shows Naghmeh Panahi vs. Saeed Abedini with Judge Jill Jurries for domestic relations. Legal experts say that could mean a couple of different things, from separation to support to divorce.

A surprise ruined.

Earlier Naghmeh had complained to the Baptist Press that someone had ruined another surprise she had in store for him when he was first released. She explained that someone had told Pastor Abedini about her accusations that he was abusing her from prison:

“It’s unfortunate that your family is going through so much pain and people try to profit off of it and put it out there,” she said. “Because Saeed was made aware of it, it will make it that much harder for us to pursue healing and reconciliation. So I was very heartbroken.”

After that she decided not to take their children to meet him in Germany. Naghmeh told the Idaho Statesman that the new plan was for her to fly out with the kids on Monday of this week (Jan 25) to begin “going through counseling” with Saeed at a retreat in North Carolina:

He will be at a retreat center with his parents for a few days and then the kids and I will join him on Monday and will be taking weeks or months healing as a family and going through counseling

It would seem that Pastor Abedini changed those plans and decided instead to fly home Tuesday to finally be reunited with his wife and children.

Pastor Abedini, have you stopped beating your wife?

Not all of the surprise is ruined, however, as Naghmeh told the Baptist Press that now that she has whispered accusations against her husband she will not elaborate further and instead will expect Saeed to tell the world about how he abused her:

“I think when it’s time,” she told BP, “I think it’s a story that needs to be told by Saeed, not me. I think it had better not be anything that I focus on anymore.”

This fits her pattern from the very beginning. After she sent the email saying she was living a lie and would stop her advocacy for Saeed’s release, she has been careful to passively aggressively make statements in support of the charges repeated by the press while never actually going on record making the allegations*.
Pray for repentance and reconciliation.

This is seriously ugly business, but we should remember that marriage is sacred and that there are children at risk of growing up in a broken home. I pray for repentance and reconciliation in their family and a return to the biblical roles of husband and wife. I ask those reading to do the same.

If Pastor Abedini doesn’t deserve better from Christian leaders and the press, no Christian husband does.

Over the years many men have commented on this blog that they were abandoned by their churches once their wives decided to blow up their families. While this will be small comfort, they should at least realize that this wasn’t due to any defect in themselves. In this case we had a persecuted pastor being accused of abusing his wife from his Iranian prison cell, and the best response he received was silence as his wife publicly erased him from the picture.

*Update* (H/T Coloradomtnman): Naghmeh has finally made a specific claim against Saeed outside of the whispering campaign she has lead for months. See this local news article for a full reproduction of her post on Facebook (emphasis mine):

I do deeply regret that I hid from the public the abuse that I have lived with for most of our marriage and I ask your forgiveness. I sincerely had hoped that this horrible situation Saeed has had to go through would bring about the spiritual change needed in both of us to bring healing to our marriage.

Tragically, the opposite has occurred. **Three months ago Saeed told me things he demanded I must do to promote him in the eyes of the public that I simply could not do any longer. He threatened that if I did not the results would be the end of our marriage and the resulting pain this would bring to our children.**

Naghmeh also explains that she went to the family courts to “establish boundaries” with Saeed.

**Update 2:** Commenter Craig looked up the filing:

She filed for separation, a pair of TROs, and counseling for divorcing parents. See for yourself:

https://www.idcourts.us/repository/mainpublic_id.do?forward=mainpublic_id

Case: CV-DR-2016-01483 Magistrate Filed: 01/26/2016 Subtype: Domestic Relations
Judge: Jill S. Jurries Status: Pending

(CERTAIN DOCUMENTS MAY BE ACCESSIBLE UNDER I.C.A.R 32)
Defendants: Abedini, Saeed
Plaintiffs: Panahi, Naghmeh
Register of actions: Date
01/26/2016 New Case Filed – Domestic Relations
01/26/2016 Petition for Legal Separation
01/26/2016 Summons Filed
01/26/2016 Joint Tro Property
01/26/2016 Joint Tro Children
01/26/2016 Order To Attend Focus On Children (2/24/16)
Boundary

by Dalrock | January 28, 2016 | Link

Naghmeh used a modern Christian buzzword when explaining why she went to the family courts:

In very difficult situations sometimes you have to establish boundaries while you work toward healing. I have taken temporary legal action to make sure our children will stay in Idaho until this situation has been resolved. I love my husband, but as some might understand, there are times when love must stop enabling something that has become a growing cancer.

You may recall the CBMW’s Women’s Studies professor using the same term:

Submitting to the Lord sometimes involves drawing clear boundaries and enacting consequences when a husband sins.

Pastor Driscoll made a similar plea to the women in his congregation when preaching on the Book of Esther. Pastor Driscoll explained that Christian wives need to emulate Vashti as a strong independent woman, not the doormat Esther:

And ladies, sometimes the godliest thing is to say no. I believe what Vashti did was noble, it was brave, it was good, it was right. And some of you ladies, you’ve mastered the art of saying no. Like, you’re—you could, like, teach a grad school class on how to jam up a man. Right? I mean, you landed the dismount. Boom, nailed it again. You’re really good at it. Okay?

Now, some of you ladies have never even tried. You’re always like, “Yes, okay. Whatever you say. Whatever you want.” No, pick your chin up. Look him in the eye. “No! No.” I’ve seen this repeatedly, where there’s a foolish man with a wise woman and her not speaking is not helping. Ladies, use a loving voice, use a respectful voice, use a godly voice, but don’t lose your voice. And sometimes, a woman has to prayerfully, carefully just say no. Vashti says what? No.

This also ties in with the godly tantrum wives are instructed to throw if their husband “isn’t listening to them” (doing as the wife instructs).

What you won’t see is husbands being exhorted to set boundaries for their wives, enact consequences for their wives, learn to say no to their wives, etc. This is the inversion of the roles of headship and submission that nearly everyone hasn’t noticed, because cross-dressing theology is what our feminist culture is thirsty for. Submission now means saying no, enacting consequences, and establishing boundaries. Submission means washing your husband in the water of the word, just as headship now means winning your wife over without a word.
A few readers have challenged my observation that when complementarians say husbands are guilty of “not listening” to their wives what they mean is husbands aren’t doing what the wife says. I’ve recently offered multiple examples where complementarians do this (here and here), and so far no one has offered any counter examples. I’ll offer some more examples in a followup post, but we should also consider the different meanings of the expression itself and the context in which complementarians are using it. We should also consider the practical implications in real life marriages of what is at best a terribly vague charge.

Saying someone “isn’t listening” very commonly does mean the person isn’t doing what you told them to do. The distinction comes with the position of the person using it in relation to the person they are talking about. If a boss complains that his employees aren’t listening to him, he isn’t saying they won’t hear him out; he is complaining that they aren’t doing as instructed. The same is true for a parent who complains that their children aren’t listening to them. Outside of feminised Christianity there really is no controversy here. The term does mean not doing as they were told if the person doing the telling is considered to be in a position of authority.

Moreover, while they like to be coy about this fact, modern Christians do see the wife as being in a natural position of authority over the husband. This is why we frequently have Christian wives exhorted to tell their husbands no, set boundaries, and enforce consequences. If a husband were to “set boundaries” and enforce consequences on his wife, the term for this is abuse. Even pointing out that this would be abuse if the sexes were switched is itself a form of abuse. This is the complementarian position.

I have shared a long list of examples where wives are taught to give their husbands the wakeup call when the husband isn’t doing what the wife wants him to do. Joel and Kathy call this lowering the boom. Kathy Keller “submitted” to her husband Tim by throwing a “godly tantrum” and breaking their wedding china. Dr. Mohler explains that it is God’s plan for wives to deny sex if their husbands aren’t doing what they should be doing. In Fireproof the wife brings about God’s will to fix her husband by filing for divorce and starting an affair. In the advertisement for ReEngaged the wakeup-call came in the form of the wife having an affair.

In the case of Bill and Vonette Bright, Vonette gave Bill a wake-up call by threatening to leave him and take the kids. FotF’s Glenn Stanton explains that civilization exists because wives make their husbands do the right thing. FotF’s president and Dr. David Clarke explain that God’s plan is for wives to teach and lead their less astute and less virtuous husbands. I could go on further because the examples are everywhere, but will stop at this point.

Having established both:

1. The term does mean “doing as I say” when used by someone in authority.
2. Complementarians present wives as being in authority over their husbands.

There really can’t be a question as to how complementarians are using the term except for
the cloak of deception complementarians use to deny #2. “Listen to your wife” is the perfect expression here, because complementarians can play Motte and Bailey with the two established meanings until everyone tires of the game.

But there is another advantage for complementarians in stealthily selling female headship with this term. When wives disagree with what their husband is doing, their natural inclination is to demand to continue to discuss the question forever. Children do this too, and the effect (even if not done consciously) can be to wear out the decision maker with objections until they relent. In the case of the Kellers, Tim and Kathy tell us that they had discussed the issue of his workload for months before Kathy threw her “godly tantrum”. Tim listened to her concerns about his workload for months, he just didn’t agree to work less. It wasn’t until he agreed with her that he was finally listening. Likewise in the complementarian threesome the couple had discussed the issue for weeks before the husband finally made a decision. For making a decision his wife disagreed with he was deemed unloving and guilty of the sin of not listening.

Even if “not listening” didn’t have the commonly accepted meaning of not doing as told by a superior, this would still be a deviously clever way to enact feminist headship while pretending to honor biblical marriage roles. Wives would be free to continue objecting to every decision they disagreed with forever, and husbands would be in sin if they didn’t continue to listen. The husband would retain full responsibility for all decisions, but the wife is the one who is really in charge. This is the very definition of complementarianism.
Solomon challenged my definition of the word *complementarian* in the last post:

> Dalrock, you said “This is the very definition of complementarianism.”

> I think maybe you meant this is the definition of today’s upside-down, backwards, unholy complementarianism currently touted.

> Normal complementarianism is God’s actual order. Man is authority, woman complements/helps

This isn’t true. Complementarianism is a term coined a little over twenty five years ago by Christians who wanted to preserve what they saw as feminist progress while avoiding what they saw as feminist excess. John Piper and Wayne Grudem explained this back in 1991 in the preface to their seminal book *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*. Piper and Grudem explain that their purpose is to push back against the evangelical feminists arguing that there should be no difference between the roles of men and women. However, they are largely sympathetic to the feminist position, seeing it not as rebellion but as the understandable pushback from thousands of years of Christian error (emphasis mine):

> …these authors differ from secular feminists because they do not reject the Bible’s authority or truthfulness, but rather give new interpretations of the Bible to support their claims. We may call them “evangelical feminists” because by personal commitment to Jesus Christ and by profession of belief in the total truthfulness of Scripture they still identify themselves very clearly with evangelicalism. Their arguments have been detailed, earnest, and persuasive to many Christians.

> What has been the result? Great uncertainty among evangelicals. Men and women simply are not sure what their roles should be. **Traditional positions have not been totally satisfactory, because they have not fully answered the recent evangelical feminist arguments.** Moreover, most Christians will admit that selfishness, irresponsibility, passivity, and abuse have often contaminated “traditional” patterns of how men and women relate to each other.

Note their adoption of the feminist frame via the claim that traditional marriage is *contaminated* by passivity and abuse. Here they are referencing their creation of the new feminist sin for wives (the sin of servility to husbands), as well as the feminist claim that traditional marriage is characterized by abuse of wives. They explain that their primary purpose is convince Christian feminists that complementarians have banished the errors of the patriarchal past. Complementarianism is a **new vision** that incorporates the best parts of feminism while retaining separate gender roles (emphasis mine):
But our primary purpose is broader than that: We want to help Christians recover a noble vision of manhood and womanhood as God created them to be—hence the main title, Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood. Our vision is not entirely the same as “a traditional view.” We affirm that the evangelical feminist movement has pointed out many selfish and hurtful practices that have previously gone unchallenged. But we hope that this new vision—a vision of Biblical “complementarity”—will both correct the previous mistakes and avoid the opposite mistakes that come from the feminist blurring of God-given sexual distinctions.

We hope that thousands of Christian women who read this book will come away feeling affirmed and encouraged to participate much more actively in many ministries, and to contribute their wisdom and insight to the family and the church. We hope they will feel fully equal to men in status before God, and in importance to the family and the church. We pray that, at the same time, this vision of equality and complementarity will enable Christian women to give wholehearted affirmation to Biblically balanced male leadership in the home and in the church.

This is not a call to end feminist rebellion, because they are largely sympathetic to feminism. When complementarians encounter the most overt feminist rebellion they go to laughable extremes to deny feminism and blame men and men alone. This is a plea to Christian women in rebellion to come back without fear of having their feminist sensibilities challenged. You can almost hear the music playing in the background as Piper and Grudem wrote the preface:

Baby come back! You can blame it all on me!
I was wrong, and I just can’t live without you!

A bit further down they reiterate that they have coined a new term in order to avoid what they see as the stigma of traditionalism:

A brief note about terms: If one word must be used to describe our position, we prefer the term complementarian, since it suggests both equality and beneficial differences between men and women. We are uncomfortable with the term “traditionalist” because it implies an unwillingness to let Scripture challenge traditional patterns of behavior, and we certainly reject the term “hierarchicalist” because it overemphasizes structured authority while giving no suggestion of equality or the beauty of mutual interdependence.

This is the origin of the term from the founders of the CBMW, one of the two flagships of the complementarian movement*. The other flagship of the movement is The Gospel Coalition (TGC), founded by D.A. Carson and Tim Keller. Here is women’s studies professor Mary Kassian explaining the origin of the term at TGC:

Though the concept of male-female complementarity can be seen from Genesis through Revelation, the label “complementarian” has only been in use for about 25 years. It was coined by a group of scholars who got together to try and come up with a word to describe someone who ascribes to the historic, biblical idea that male and
female are equal, but different. The need for such a label arose in response to the proposition that equality means role-interchangeability (egalitarianism)—a concept first forwarded and popularized in evangelical circles in the 1970s and 1980s by "Biblical Feminists." I've read several articles lately from people who misunderstand and/or misrepresent the complementarian view. I was at the meeting 25 years ago where the word "complementarian" was chosen. So I think I have a pretty good grasp on the word's definition.

Kassian emphasizes that the term is designed to conserve the progress of the 1960s:

2. June Cleaver is so 1950s and so not the definition of complementarity.

In our name-the-concept meeting, someone mentioned the word "traditionalism," since our position is what Christians have traditionally believed. But that was quickly nixed. The word "traditionalism" smacks of "tradition." Complementarians believe that the Bible's principles supersede tradition. They can be applied in every time and culture. June Cleaver is a traditional, American, TV stereotype. She is not the complementarian ideal. Period. (And exclamation mark!) Culture has changed. What complementarity looks like now is different than what it looked like 60 or 70 years ago. So throw out the cookie-cutter stereotype. It does not apply.

*These two groups aren't entirely separate, as there is much overlap among the major movers of these organizations. John Piper is featured in the TGC overview video, and Mary Kassian is a member of the CBMW Council.
Christian sex experts Pastor Dave and Ann Wilson inadvertently explain how to kill your wife’s attraction in The Art of Marriage:

**Dave:** On May 24, 1990, it was our ten-year anniversary—I sort of surprised Ann with a ten-year anniversary date. We dressed up and went to a really nice restaurant. I sort of set it up with the waiter, while we were having dinner / when I would queue him—sort of give him a look—he was supposed to bring a rose over. So, I queued him early in the dinner—he brought over a rose and laid it on the table. We talked about year one.

**Ann:** He was like a little boy that night—like waiting for the next thing to happen.

**Dave:** Then I looked over later, and he brought another rose. So, anyway, every rose was a year; and we would talk about that year.

**Ann:** He was so sweet—he even planned what he was going to say when each rose arrived.

Little boys are indeed sweet, but they aren’t sexy. Later that night Dave tried to kiss his wife, and she explained that she no longer had feelings for him.

**Dave:** So, I leaned over to kiss Ann. As I leaned over to kiss her in the passenger seat, she sort of pulls away.

**Ann:** “Uggghhh!” I was just like, “Honey, I can’t even!” In my head, I was thinking, “I cannot even go there.”

**Dave:** So I pulled back, and look at her, and said, “Is something wrong?” She looks at me—and I’ll never forget this—she goes, “Well, yes, there is something wrong.” I am like, “What’s wrong?” And she says, “Well, to be honest with you, I’ve lost my feelings for you.”

Pastor Wilson was an All-American quarterback at Ball State and a leader of men, but by supplicating to his wife he took on the form of a little boy and killed his wife’s attraction for him.

Hat Tip Sunshinethiry (followup post pending)
Related:

- Romance 101: How to stop frustrating your wife.
- What is closeness?
Sunshine Thiry decided to test to see if it is true that when complementarians say “listen to your wife” what they mean is “do what she says”.

Is it true that what complementarians mean by “listening to your wife” is agreeing with your wife and doing what she says? This is actually a very serious accusation, and therefore all of us who take biblical marriage seriously should be concerned about this charge because if it is true, what complementarians are teaching is directly counter to what the Bible says about the marital hierarchy of headship and submission.

This caused Sunshine to think back to the video series The Art of Marriage, and specifically the message from Pastor Dave Wilson and his wife Ann (clip 1, clip 2). In the video segments we learn about the time Ann gave Dave a wake-up call in order to get him to spend more time with the family. In modern Christian theology wives are closer to God than husbands are, and therefore need to periodically do or say things to threaten and/or hurt their husbands in order to bring them to heel. In this case the wake-up call was Ann telling Dave she didn’t love him anymore:

**Dave:** So, I leaned over to kiss Ann. As I leaned over to kiss her in the passenger seat, she sort of pulls away.

**Ann:** “Ugggghh!” I was just like, “Honey, I can’t even!” In my head, I was thinking, “I cannot even go there.”

**Dave:** So I pulled back, and look at her, and said, “Is something wrong?” She looks at me—and I’ll never forget this—she goes, “Well, yes, there is something wrong.” I am like, “What’s wrong?” And she says, “Well, to be honest with you, I’ve lost my feelings for you.”

In the second clip Dave explains that God spoke to him then and there, telling him to “shut up and listen” to his wife. Dave followed this command and started working less and spending more time with his wife and family. As Sunshine Thiry points out, this is yet another example of complementarians meaning do as your wife says when they say “listen to your wife”:

Looking at their story now, two years later, it clearly seems to support Dalrock’s charge. The Wilsons’ story is eerily similar to the Kellers’ except that Mrs. Wilson doesn’t violently smash anything. But there is still a veiled threat implicit in telling your husband that you no longer love him on your tenth anniversary date night. Pastor Wilson even talks about getting the sense that he was supposed to “just shut up and listen” to his wife, as Pastor Keller had with Mrs. Keller, while she told him what she had told him repeatedly before.
From wake-up call to divine tingle.

The Wilsons take this a step further in a two part series* they did for FamilyLife. They use this same story to teach that a wife's attraction to her husband is determined by how godly he is. Here is how FamilyLife explains the message when selling the series (all further emphasis mine):

Pastor Dave Wilson and his wife, Ann, explore the complex and wonderful dance of marital intimacy as they share their own unique dance experience. According to Pastor Dave Wilson and his wife, Ann, a man’s relationship with God is key to unlocking the mystery of marital intimacy.

In the FamilyLife series the Wilsons explain that Ann’s wake-up call to Dave that night was even harsher than presented in the Art of Marriage clips.

Ann: I basically said, “I have been so angry, and you haven’t heard me.” And even when I thought I was going to bring this up, I thought he would get angry again because he would say, “I am home!”

Dave: Yes, I usually fought loud.

Ann: Yes. So, I told him that: “I was angry, and then my anger turned to bitterness, and then my bitterness turned to numbness, and now I don’t even care. I’m not even mad at you anymore because I’m not going to divorce you, but I feel like I don’t have anything for you.”

They explain that when she said this, God was speaking to Dave through Ann:

Dave: Yes. Here’s all you need to know about that night—the thing that changed our marriage is when Ann was sharing with me what she felt—I had a pretty unique encounter with God. I sensed God was speaking to me, through Ann;

This is when he realized that a wife’s attraction toward her husband (or lack thereof) is a barometer of the man’s godliness:

and the word I heard from God was only one word: “Repent.” I knew, when I heard that word, what it meant—it wasn’t “Repent of being a bad husband,” or “…being gone too much.” It was: “Repent of your relationship with Me,”—God / vertical. See, I had been so busy that my walk with God was sort of on the fly—I wasn’t sitting with Him / I wasn’t studying His Word. I got into His Word—why? So I would have something to preach. I hadn’t been intimate with God in months.

At that moment, Dave started praying and dedicated himself to God. This is what turned around Ann’s long time revulsion at the thought of having sex with Dave:

Ann: I think God was saying: “When we are okay, I can get you through anything. I will catch you.” And I knew it, too, because our sex was terrible. I was so resentful when he touched me—it didn’t take a crockpot / it took for
eternity. I could never, ever get used to Dave’s touch. It was a red signal going off, like: “We need help! We need counseling. Something needs to happen.”

So, for me, I got down on my knees too. Dave and I grabbed hands together, and we both repented and re-surrendered our lives to Jesus and our marriage to Jesus.

Dave: I’m telling you—it changed. I’m not saying we’re perfect and the last 25 years haven’t been without difficulty...

If you want a better sex life—and that’s just one part of your marriage—you’re not going to get it by taking three points from us. The only thing that’s going to change your marriage or your sex life is bringing God into your bedroom /bringing God into your marriage.

Part of their message is good; surrendering to God, repenting, and praying are extremely important. But this is only part of their message, and it conceals a very harmful theology. They aren’t just advising to pray for improved sex/marriage, and this isn’t even just a sort of sexual prosperity Gospel. They are teaching that women are designed to respond sexually to godly husbands. This is unfortunately a fairly common modern teaching, but even here they are taking the error to the next level:

1. Ann knew Dave wasn’t right with God because she was repulsed by the idea of having sex with him.
2. God spoke to Dave about his lack of Christian obedience through Ann’s lack of desire to have sex with him.

Moreover, a generic focus on prayer is being used to avoid complying with the clear instructions in the Bible to husbands and wives. The most relevant instruction is in 1 Cor 7, which tells husbands and wives not to deprive one another of sex. They cover this in part one of the series, but the stress is on rationalizing Ann’s failure to follow this command. They turn it into a yuk yuk moment where Ann chastises Dave for having “used this against her” in the past:

Ann: Here’s what it says in 1 Corinthians 7: “The husband should fulfill his marital duty to his wife and likewise the wife to her husband. The wife’s body does not belong to her alone but also to her husband.” You used to use that against me a little bit too: “It’s not just your body; it’s mine.” Do you remember that?

Dave: I never did that.

Ann: Yes, you did.

Dave: Hey, you’re supposed to just read the Word of God. [Laughter]

Then together they gloss over the command by focusing solely on the unifying properties of sex in marriage:

Ann: “In the same way the husband’s body does not belong to him alone but also to
his wife. Do not deprive each other except by mutual consent and for a time so that you may devote yourselves to prayer and then come together again so that Satan will not tempt you because of your lack of self-control.”

You know, I read that and here’s what I think: “Before we’re married, Satan will do everything in his power to try to get us to have sex; and after we’re married, Satan—who wants to destroy our marriages—tries to do everything in his power for us not to have sex. Isn’t that true? Yes! Here’s what the promise is—that I think that God is saying for us to come together—it unites us, spiritually/emotionally. It’s what makes it so special and, yet, it’s so hard; but I love that the Scripture talks about this.

Dave: Yes; and the Scripture isn’t giving you a number of how many times a week that you’ve got to make love—it doesn’t do that—but it does give us a pattern that says it should be somewhat regular.

Scripture isn’t giving a number because it is saying to have sex whenever either of you wants. This is very clear, but it is extremely unpalatable in our feminist age. In tossing aside this very clear instruction and instead focusing on the wife’s arousal, Dave and Ann are effectively arguing that couples should only have sex when the wife is in the mood. This then is connected to their claim that wives will want to have sex if their husbands are godly. Where Scripture tells us Ann was sinning by defrauding her husband, Dave and Ann turn this around so that Dave was sinning (even in a yuk yuk way) by washing his wife in the water of the word. Then they explain that the reason Ann wasn’t aroused was because Dave wasn’t godly enough. Pointing out sin becomes the real sin, and what the Bible tells us is the sin of the wife (in the case of a defrauding wife) is turned around to indicate a sin of the husband. This is especially toxic because the target audience of the series is married couples where the wife is either denying sex or strongly tempted to do so.

The other relevant instructions in Scripture are the repeated command to wives to submit to their husbands (Eph 5:22:24, 1 Pet 3:1&5, Col 3:18, 1 Tim 2:11 & Tit 2:5). Dave and Ann have turned this relationship around, and their cross-dressing theology is at least part of the reason Ann was repulsed by the thought of having sex with Dave. They present it as being the opposite, that Ann is turned on by Dave doing as she says (which ends up being God’s will since He speaks to Dave through her). Yet this is both of them following her rationalizations.

*I have quoted from the transcripts, but if you listen to the audio you will find that at times the transcript left small parts out. Here are the detailed links: Part 1 mp3, part 1 transcript, Part 2 mp3, part 2 transcript.
Drudge has a news story up today about a woman the local Tennessee media celebrated back in July of 2015 for showing that women can be in combat just like men. At the time Erika Lopez was the first woman in the state to enlist in the Army as a combat engineer. The story is in the national media because Lopez is now considered a deserter.

Lopez was in basic training at Fort Leonard Wood in Missouri. An Army spokesperson tells Local 8 News that Private Lopez was scheduled to return from convalescent leave on January 4th. She was reported absent without leave (AWOL) on January 5th after she failed to return.

Spokesperson Tiffany Wood issued a statement saying, “After 30 days in an AWOL status, a Soldier is considered a deserter and a federal warrant is issued for his or her arrest.”

This story and others like it are bad for the narrative, but they won’t change the political decision to open all combat roles to women. In the end it really isn’t all that bad for the narrative either, because for nearly all feminists this isn’t about actually having women perform at the level of men, but about disgracing the institutions that they see as conferring status on men. Nearly all women understand at a deep level that they can’t actually perform the same roles; feminists know they can’t attain the honor and respect that they are so envious of, so instead they set out to mark the space as feminine to ensure that men can’t either. From this perspective Lopez is accomplishing the feminist mission whether she sticks around long enough to join a unit or makes a laughingstock of the whole process.

On the other side we have conservatives, who tend to fall into two camps*. The first conservative camp is dedicated to showing that they embrace opening all roles to women so long as the military holds women to the “same high standards as men” and pretends this is about finding the best talent for every job. This isn’t really serious though. This is a plea to feminists to maintain the fiction conservatives see as their tacit bargain with feminists. We saw the same nonsense last summer when the Republican leadership telegraphed their willingness to open the military to transgendered. As House Armed Services Committee Chairman Mac Thornberry (R-Texas) put it at the time:

The department “needs to look at a variety of policies. As long as they look at it objectively, based on what’s best for the security interests of the country, then we’ll oversee or review what they do,” he told The Hill.

“When there’s a sense that there’s some extraneous social or political agenda ... people get concerned,” Thornberry added.

This wasn’t a new argument, as it was the same rationalization Republicans have been using to first accept women in the military and then later women in combat.
The second conservative camp relies on a different fantasy to get them through the day. They start with the same lie the first camp of conservatives uses to rationalize the process, and then pretend it is the other conservatives who have driven the feminist process all along. This is an extra level of psychosis, but is their only way of claiming to support biblical sex roles while avoiding confronting the feminist rebellion that surrounds them.

Both groups are in full denial of what feminists have been entirely open about all along. This is about envy of men. The Lopez story of women’s empowerment is the same story feminists have been selling all along. Her desertion wouldn’t be of any interest to Drudge if she hadn’t been sold as a feminist hero from day 1. While both camps of conservatives have been denying that pushing women into the military is about feminism, we were all being bombarded with messages of feminist empowerment like the original local Tennessee news story:

A Knoxville woman has signed up for a job that could lead her straight into battle, and she is the first in Tennessee to do it. She hopes her journey will inspire her children and women around the world.

... 

After delivering her first son at 16 and staying home to raise the next one that came along, Erica still found a way to follow her dreams. She stepped out of her role as a housewife and enlisted in the Army as a combat engineer. But Erica had no idea that her choice would be so unique.

Yet in the same piece her decision to leave her husband and two sons in order to “follow her dreams” is presented not as selfishness, but as a sacrifice she is making for them. No one notices the contradiction because feminism is now one of our highest values as a society. Promoting it even at the expense of her family is seen as a sacrifice she is making for her family:

She left her husband and two children in September of 2015 for basic training where she was learning to build bridges, detonate artillery, and detect roadside bombs under combat conditions. She said, “You make sacrifices your whole life for your children and for your family, this will be a sacrifice... Women can do anything they set their mind to just as well as men I don’t really see any difference at all. I hope women will want to join.”

Here is the video of the original news story from Youtube. Some of the audio cuts out on the youtube version but the version on the Local8 page has the audio intact:

*Drudge and the WND story he links to are of course proof of a remnant of conservatives still pointing out that putting women into combat is a game of politically correct theater.

**Update:** Private Lopez has turned herself in.
During the Super Bowl tomorrow the NFL will be running the following PSA on domestic violence:

Last year’s PSA featured a woman dialing 911 but not being able to tell the 911 operator why she called. She couldn’t speak freely because her abuser was in the room with her to prevent her from communicating in ways he didn’t approve of. This year’s PSA is more ambiguous, but it suggests that the woman being abused during the Super Bowl is the victim of a boyfriend or husband who is “in a mood” and therefore she declines an invitation to a Super Bowl party. At the very least it is implied that the woman in the PSA doesn’t want to provoke an argument with her controlling boyfriend/husband. It might also be that as with the previous year’s PSA, the boyfriend/husband is monitoring her communication and perhaps even physically blocking the abused woman from communicating with her friend (or family) in ways he doesn’t approve of. Her abuser might be physically stopping her from communicating by taking her phone away or pressing cancel before she can hit send.

If we didn’t know that only men are domestic abusers, we might be tempted to point out that the scenario in this year’s PSA is far more likely with the sexes switched. It is far more likely that a man would decline an invitation to a Super Bowl party because his wife or girlfriend was “in a mood”. It is also more likely that a wife/girlfriend would physically stop her husband/boyfriend from communicating with friends or family.

The domestic violence industry tells us repeatedly that domestic violence really isn’t about violence, but about power. This is only partially true. To domestic violence activists, it isn’t about the methods one partner uses to achieve power of the other, but about which partner is in power. This is why being “in a mood” is lumped in with physical violence, and why looking at pornography is considered “sexual abuse”. This is also why there are careful safeguards to prevent women from inadvertently being caught up in the domestic violence machinery. Police are trained to see the man as the abuser, since abuse comes from “male privilege”. They are further trained to see denials of abuse by accused men as proof that they are abusers. Dr. Don Dutton, head of the University of British Columbia Forensic Psychology lab explains how domestic violence activists have trained police and other officers of the court to identify the man as the abuser:

Jaffe et al. then go on to define abuse, using the “Duluth Power and Control Wheel” that includes “Using Male Privilege” as a part of an octant of abusive strategies used against women. Jaffe et al. then list, under “whom to assess”: Victimized mothers (p.44), Battering fathers (p.46) and “war torn children” (p. 49). Jaffe et al suggest using an Abuse Observation Checklist (Dutton 1992) and asking the victimized woman to describe the “first, worst and last” incident, followed by allowing the “alleged perpetrator an opportunity to respond”. It is not clear what response, apart from denial might be expected from an accused male. Indeed, the authors warn an assessor that (p. 42) the male perpetrator may “minimize their abusive behavior by..."
blaming their victims or proclaiming that the abuse was uncharacteristic”. It seems that, once accused, the male can only use responses that the evaluator is already primed to see as disingenuous.

The most commonly used model of defining abuse, the Duluth Model, is very specific that it is men who are the abusers. They make it a point not to create a gender neutral standard for defining abuse, because their primary focus is on who benefits from the way abuse is defined (emphasis mine):

Making the Power and Control Wheel gender neutral would hide the power imbalances in relationships between men and women that reflect power imbalances in society. By naming the power differences, we can more clearly provide advocacy and support for victims, accountability and opportunities for change for offenders, and system and societal changes that end violence against women.

Their fundamental goal is to effect feminist change, not to stop violence or controlling behavior in general:

...change societal conditions that support men’s use of tactics of power and control over women.

As a final safety against having charges of domestic abuse used against women instead of men, domestic violence advocates have created a special category of abuse to apply to men who try to point out that what their wife/girlfriend did to them is abuse. A man using the language of the domestic violence industry is guilty of knowledge abuse.

For an example of how the Kafkaesque rules of domestic violence are applied in real life, we can look at the Idaho Statesman report of Saeed Abedini’s 2007 conviction of domestic violence. Part of the story of course is a he said, she said. But part of the story appears to be agreed to by both Naghmeh and Saeed. According to the Statesman:

The argument came while Saeed, then 27, was speaking with family members. Naghmeh, then 30, got upset at something he told his family and tried to close the laptop computer he was using to talk with them, Saeed told police.

If we take this at face value, Naghmeh did what the Super Bowl PSAs and the whole industry warns us abusers do. She prevented Saeed from communicating with others. She even physically took over his communication device to force him to stop. If the sexes had been reversed, this would have been domestic violence according to the DV advocates.

According to the Statesman report, after she closed his laptop Saeed tried to get Naghmeh out of the room so he could communicate without her monitoring him. The area of dispute is what Saeed did in order to stop her from preventing him from communicating with family. He says he verbally told her to leave the room. She says he pushed her out of the room.

Naghmeh — who was holding her daughter, Rebekka, then 10 months old — told police that her husband “pushed her several times” and forced her out of the room.
Naghmeh said Saeed pushed her in the neck and upper chest, and the officer, Erik Tiner, now a sergeant, reported seeing a “slight amount of redness” in that area, according to his report.

“He told me that he told her to get out of the room and made hand gestures indicating that he pushed her,” Tiner wrote. “I asked him if he pushed her and he denied doing so.”

Even if we assume Naghmeh’s account is the accurate one, switch the sexes and Naghmeh would be the abuser. If a husband was physically preventing his wife from talking with her family by closing her laptop and hovering around to make sure she didn’t re-establish communication, and the wife responded by pushing her controlling husband out of the room, the husband would still be the abuser. This is, again, by design.

The domestic violence industry has created a paradigm where women can physically block, shove, and even hit their partners and still not be considered the abusers. Web MD warns men to make sure they don’t end up in a room with only one exit when their wife gets in a mood, because it is very common for wives to physically block their husbands in a room and then cry domestic assault if the husband tries to escape. From the WebMD article Help for Battered Men:

> “Never allow yourself to be provoked into any kind of retaliation,” says Brown. “We tell men if they have to be in an argument, do it in a room with two doors so they can leave; a lot of times a woman will block the door, the man will try to move her, and that will be enough for him to get arrested.”

Understand that if a husband were to physically trap his wife in a room, this would make him the abuser, even if she tried to escape. Turn the sexes around, and the man is still the abuser.

This same pattern persists even when a wife violently assaults her husband and he doesn’t fight back; the husband is still the abuser. Iraq war vet Joseph Kerr explained how this works in his post “What Do You Do When A Girl Hits You?”

Women assaulting their partners, and specifically women initiating violence against their partners, is accepted as normal and not domestic violence by domestic violence activists. Not surprisingly, stopping women from attacking their partners would be extremely effective in preventing the women themselves from becoming injured:

How can we prevent Intimate Partner Violence and injury to women? IPV researcher Deborah Capaldi, Ph.D., a social scientist at the Oregon Social Learning Center, finds that the best way for women to be safe is to not initiate violence against their male partners. According to Dr. Capaldi, “The question of initiation of violence is a crucial one... much IPV is mutual, and initiations — even that seem minor — may lead to escalation.”

The problem is, stopping women from being assaulted isn’t the primary objective of the DV industry, and taking away the power for women to assault their partners would take a tool
away from women to control their relationships. The issue is, after all, not about violence, but about power and control.

*H/T anonymous_ng
National Review has a new editorial complaining about the answers from Jeb Bush, Chris Christie, and Marco Rubio on Selective Service registration during the Republican debate on Saturday. They frame this as men cowering behind women for protection in Only a Barbaric Nation Drafts Its Mothers and Daughters into Combat (H/T PokeSalad)

Men should protect women. They should not shelter behind mothers and daughters.

This is all part of the fantasy which has brought us to the situation we find ourselves in. The problem isn’t that men are cowering behind women. The problem is that men are cowering in front of women. The idea that sending women into combat will lower the number of casualties for men is pure fantasy. Adding women to combat roles will increase, not decrease the number of men wounded, captured, and killed in future battles. The National Review touches on this fact in their editorial, but still pretend that this is about men wanting women to protect them. It is not. This is about women demanding to usurp men’s roles, and men being too terrified to say no. You can see this by the way the three Republican candidates framed their answers. The focus is on empowering women and not restricting their feminist rights. You can see the full transcript here (do a word search for selective service), but here are the highlights.

The question:

I want to move on to the military. Senator Rubio, all restrictions on women in combat as long as they qualify. Positions including special operations forces, like Navy Seals. Just this week military leaders of the Army and Marine Corps said that they believed young women, just as young men are required to do, should sign up for Selective Service in case the Draft is reinstated.

Many of you have young daughters. Senator Rubio, should young women be required to sign up for Selective Service in case of a national emergency?

Rubio:

First, let me say there are already women today serving in roles that are like combat. That, in fact, whose lives are in very serious danger, and so I have no problem whatsoever with people of either gender serving in combat so long as the minimum requirements necessary to do the job are not compromised. But, I support that, and obviously now that that is the case I do believe that Selective Service should be opened up for both men and women in case a Draft is ever instituted.

Next Bush:

RADDATZ: Do you believe young women should sign up for Selective Service, be required to sign up...
BUSH: ... I do, and I do think that we should not impose any kind of political agenda on the military. There should be — if women can meet the requirements, the minimum requirements for combat service they ought to have the right to do it. For sure. It ought to be focused on the morale as well. We got to make sure that we have readiness much higher than we do today. We need to eliminate the sequester which is devastating our military.

We can’t be focusing on the political side of this, we need to realize that our military force is how we project our word in the world. When we’re weak militarily it doesn’t matter what we say. We can talk about red lines, and ISIS being the J.V. team, and reset buttons and all this. If we don’t have a strong military than no one fears us, and they take actions that are against our national interest.

[Moderator repeatedly redirects Bush to the fact that Selective Service would determine who was drafted if a draft were implemented.]

BUSH: ... we don’t have a draft. I’m not suggesting we have a draft. What I’m suggesting is that we ought to have readiness being the first priority of our military, and secondly, that we make sure that the morale is high. And right now, neither one of those are acceptable because we’ve been gutting the military budget.

Finally Christie goes full feminist:

CHRISTIE: Can I — can I be really — can I be really clear on this, because I am the father of two daughters. One of them is here tonight. What my wife and I have taught our daughters right from the beginning, that their sense of self-worth, their sense of value, their sense of what they want to do with their life comes not from the outside, but comes from within. And if a young woman in this country wants to go and fight to defend their country, she should be permitted to do so.

Part of that also needs to be part of a greater effort in this country, and so there’s no reason why one — young women should be discriminated against from registering for the selective service. The fact is, we need to be a party and a people that makes sure that our women in this country understand anything they can dream, anything that they want to aspire to, they can do. That’s the way we raised our daughters and that’s what we should aspire to as president for all of the women in our country.

Rubio says Selective Service should be “opened up” for women. Bush says women have a “right” to be in combat, and argues that by allowing women into combat we are allowing the best qualified to be selected and thereby avoiding playing politics with the military. Christie says women should not “be discriminated against” by denying them the right to register for the draft. The pandering to women by the candidates is undeniable.

What very few have noticed though is it isn’t just Bush, Christie, and Rubio who are afraid to say no to women. The authors of the National Review piece are just as afraid to say no to women on this issue as the candidates are. The candidates framed this as a women’s rights issue, and National Review framed this as a women’s safety/privilege issue. Both are avoiding
saying no to women, they are just using different methods of avoidance. The former assures women their desire to usurp men’s roles won’t be hindered. The latter complains that men are forcing women into usurping men’s roles. This is the real cowardice.

Men aren’t cowering *behind* women, men are cowering *in front* of them.

**See Also:**

- [The fantasy of drafting women](#)
- [Fantasy Land](#)
He was for it before he was against it.

by Dalrock | February 10, 2016 | Link

Before the editors of National Review discovered that women as warriors was against natural law, National Review Senior Editor Jonah Goldberg* was delighted with the message of feminist empowerment that it sends. Just four months ago Goldberg was enthralled by the girlpower message of his real life Wonder Women “passing” Army Ranger training (emphasis mine):

Around the time little Laura’s school was cracking down on Wonder Woman lunchboxes, two women, Kristen Griest and Shaye Haver, passed the Army Ranger training course for the first time. The news was hailed across the country as a huge step forward for women.

Are these women role models or not? Are they heroes? Or should they be condemned for their willingness to use violence when necessary? Maybe Laura should get a Griest and Haver lunchbox and find out.

*In my original version of the post I incorrectly attributed the Wonder Woman article to Senior Editor Rich Lowry. Goldberg wrote the Wonder Woman article. Rich Lowry is the editor of National Review, and Goldberg is a senior editor.
The CBMW has responded in a predictable way to the discussion of drafting women. While the Republican candidates are pandering to women by arguing that women should have the right to register for selective service, the CBMW continues to pretend that the push to put women in combat is not driven by mass feminist rebellion, but by men wanting women to protect them.

This isn’t about protecting women though, this is about false bravado. It is about avoiding saying “no” to women in rebellion while pretending to be courageous. The make believe in the CBMW article starts in the very title: **We Will Never Let Our Daughters Die for Us** However, even while pretending this is about men forcing women to usurp men’s roles, the authors (including the president of the CBMW) are careful to avoid offending the feminist Christian women who dominate their audience:

**We are Holistically Pro-Woman and Cannot Support This**

At CBMW, we are completely pro-woman. Unlike a secular, gender-blurring culture, we honor women and view them in the highest regard. As complementarians, we are committed to the biblical truths that men and women are completely equal in dignity, value, worth, and honor; however, men and women are different in role and function.

In their desire to appease the feminists in the audience they stress that women are very good at killing, and when they do kill it is of course a good thing. They are so eager to appease the feminists that they hold up Jael killing Sisera with a tent peg after luring him to sleep as an example of *self defense*.

This–warfare–is a key arena in which we see differences between the sexes, both in terms of calling and design.

We are not saying that women cannot defend themselves if threatened. Godly women don’t fear Satan and know no limits in their willingness to oppose evil. We know the story of Deborah, and we have heard of Jael’s dexterity with a tent peg.

Having begged the Christian feminists for some room to operate, they get back to blaming cowardly men for wanting their wives and daughters to fight so they don’t have to:

*If men do not answer the call, women will have no choice but to fight. This should not be, though. Women shouldn’t have to be in combat, because men should step up and lead the way.*
The real cowardice of course is not a movement by men to get women to fight in their place, but a fear by men of saying “no” to women in rebellion. This very fear is what motivates so many Christian conservative men to play a passionate game of make believe whenever the issue of women in the military comes up. This is not only true for the CBMW, but it is also true for Matt Walsh** as it was for Vision Forum.

*H/T Taciturn

**H/T The Question
We live in an age obsessed with women's self esteem. Feminists assure us that all (or nearly all) of our problems would be solved if only women held themselves in higher regard. This is closely tied to the idea that women being “true to themselves” is a central virtue. According to our modern thought process women are innately good, so if they have the confidence to be true to themselves they will point men towards virtue. Instead of looking to God for our moral compass, women are to follow their hearts and men are to follow women. These ideas are contrary to the Bible, yet they have been widely adopted by modern Christians.

In Matt Walsh’s letter to his daughter, his greatest fear is that she will grow up to lack self esteem because our society will tell her she isn’t good enough:

That’s why I wrote this letter. For the times when the pressures of the world — the constant, deafening din, screaming “you’re not pretty enough, you’re not good enough” — become a little too heavy to shoulder. Whether it’s 7 years from now, or 17, or 70 — whenever you need a reminder, here it is:

You’re beautiful.

Similarly, Glenn Stanton teaches parents that unlike their sons, their daughters will naturally develop virtue, so long as society doesn’t get in the way:

What are the essential qualities that transform our daughters into mature, secure women?

As you read through the qualities described below, please keep in mind that much of this is innate, but because our culture seems to fight so hard to suppress certain natural tendencies, it’s our privilege and responsibility as parents to watch out for opportunities to nurture and guide in these areas.

Christian women are of course hearing the message, as the blogger at Drurywriting discovered when teaching college students about sin. In Do Women sin? he explains that while his students have no trouble identifying a list of sins men are tempted by, they are reliably stumped when he asks them to list sins women tend to be tempted by. After he sets only the women in the class to come up with a female sin, they eventually find one:

Lack of self esteem

Part of the problem is that we have redefined women’s sins as virtue. A wife who smashes the couple’s wedding china in order to get her own way is now said to be “submitting” to her husband by throwing a godly tantrum. A wife with a frigid and incredibly unkind attitude towards her husband is said to be channeling God’s will through her vagina. Discontent is yet another newly minted virtue. Along with sins recast as virtues, there is also virtue recast as sin. The CBMW’s founding document created a new sin for wives which fits perfectly in our
feminist age, the sin of **servility**.

Another part of the problem is that when women do sin, modern Christians simply pretend it isn’t happening. This is easiest to see with the game of make believe complementarians play whenever considering the question of women in the military. Women aren’t demanding to usurp men’s roles, they tell us, men are refusing to fight and thereby **forcing women to stand in their place**.

**The Christian cult of women’s self esteem.**

But denying the obvious isn’t enough. To truly follow the wisdom of the world Christians need to cast women’s self esteem as the highest virtue. In this regard there is a slight disagreement as to whether a woman lacking self esteem is in itself a sin (as the college women decided), or if a woman lacking self esteem is merely the root of women’s sins. But this is a minor disagreement that I will leave modern theologians to sort out. What is widely agreed is that women need to be constantly told they are awesome. Pastor Matt Chandler explains the importance of telling Christian women they are awesome in his sermon **A Beautiful Design (Part 3) Man’s Purpose***:

> When women go to women’s retreats, they just get encouraged. “You guys are awesome. You can do it! All right!” Men get blown up. You go to a man thing. You’re just going to hear how much you’ve failed and how bad you stink and why the whole world is broken because you’re so worthless. That’s kind of how we do it, and it’s the right way to do it.

Pastor Chandler explains that a father’s highest calling with his daughter is to make sure she has high self esteem, since a woman sinning is evidence of low self esteem, and high self esteem leads to virtue in women:

> We don’t neglect spiritual direction and sacrificial love because we provide. I say this all the time. I’m telling you, I did college ministry for 10-15 years before I became a pastor. I have met many a young women with BMWs and fashionable clothes who hated their Daddy and treated themselves cheaply because what they didn’t have is Daddy in their life. I have met many a young woman in just an old ghetto, beat-up, backfiring hooptie and just whatever Mom and Dad could afford to get her who had a glad confidence about her and a high expectation of how she was treated because Daddy would kiss her and crawl in bed with her and ask her about her heart and encourage her and cheer her on.

Chandler explains to the women in the congregation that if they have enough self esteem, their natural virtue will serve as a beacon for men to follow. All women need to do is know they deserve better than the men who are around them, and men will learn to be godly:

> Single ladies, if you’re like, “Do you know what? I like the look of you, but the way you act, the way you carry yourself, the way you live your life, no thank you,” that will send a brother off to maturation school. You can giggle all you want, but I’m telling you, ladies, you have a profound amount of power when it comes to an expectation of males being men. You put the bar on pre-pubescent ridiculousness, I
promise you, you’ll find a herd of morons who will come trampling toward your door.

But if you’ll put the bar up and go, “No, thank you. Get out of my face. No, I’m not signing up for that,” if you raise your expectations, we raise the bar on what we expect out of men, I think by and large by the grace of God, they’ll rise to it. You keep it low; they’ll stay low. I promise you. I promise you sin has bent us in that direction. That’s why this is important for women, that you might encourage and that you might expect.

In one sense he is right; men do respond to what women demonstrate by their actions that they want. There is also a certain twisted logic here that fits with the non biblical claim that women are naturally attracted to virtuous men. If a woman finds herself chasing after bad boys, she must not have the self confidence to go after the men she is really attracted to.

However, by pretending that women who chase bad boys merely lack enough self esteem to demand what they really want, Pastor Chandler is doing these women a terrible disservice. We know that left to follow their hearts, women will seek out badboys while telling themselves that the men they are selecting are really good men. By telling women that they are naturally virtuous and blaming their choice of men on men in general, we are all but driving them into the arms of the badboy. This is not only unloving to tempted women and good men, but unloving to the badboy himself. We are creating a stumbling block for the bad boy by sending our daughters out to follow their hearts and sending temptation directly in the path of every badboy out there.

H/T Darwinian American
One of the more striking aspects of complementarianism is the over the top cartoonish chivalry. This in turn derives from a caricature of masculinity which is hyper violent (to men) but simultaneously non threatening to feminist sensibilities. It is a chivalry devoid of male leadership with a kind of vicarious blood lust for men and even little boys to be killed or injured in the service of women. In this cartoonish chivalry it is better for a man to be killed in the service of women than for him to successfully guide a woman to safety. There is also an over the top feigned bravado.

As an example I’ll offer a segment from the same Pastor Chandler sermon I referenced in my last post. In the sermon Chandler is defining manhood, and he is careful to clarify that leadership isn’t a defining quality of manhood:

When I was trying to draw up a sentence on the unique responsibility of men, I wanted to, as best I could, stay away from the word lead. I’ll tell you why. I think men do lead, and they do lead in a unique way. I also know women who can lead and who do lead. In fact, I’ve come across some women who are bosses. Do you know what I’m saying? I mean, they get stuff done. They lead. They put together teams. They help those teams function rightly, and they lead out. So saying that a man leads as a kind of attribute of manhood that is not true about women would be incorrect. I want to introduce the word and maybe redeem the word headship.

In doing this Chandler is taking complementarianism full circle, because complementarians originally moved away from the term headship to servant leader because the latter was less offensive to feminists. Chandler objects to the word leader and therefore is trying to redefine, to redeem headship as a non threatening servant/protector who minds his own business. He ties this back to Genesis, explaining that Adam’s sin was not that he listened to his wife when he should have rebuked her, but that he didn’t protect her from the influence of the serpent:

What happens is the Serpent deceives Eve with Adam standing right there. Eve takes the apple, believing the lie of the Serpent, takes a bite of the fruit, and then hands it to her passive idiot husband, who also takes a bite.

Do you know who God blames for sin introducing itself into the cosmos? Adam. Because he had the role of spiritual headship, of covering and protection. He didn’t step up. He did the spiritual equivalency of, “Go check it out, baby.” He did the spiritual equivalency of, “You head to the front line and get dismembered, raped, and slaughtered, and I’ll be back here.” The boy goes down, and the girl goes free.

Chandler then switches to address unmarried men in the congregation and their obligation to protect and serve (but never lead) Christian women:

What if you are a single man? How are we to think about this as single men? If
you’re a single man, you’re going, “Well, I don’t have a wife. Well, I’m not an elder, so how would I practice your definition of manhood if I don’t have a wife and aren’t an elder at the church?” Okay. A single man images headship. He doesn’t have it as much as he images headship with a borrowed authority. Single men have no authority over any woman in this congregation unless they are your young daughter or you are an elder in this church.

To illustrate men’s generic obligation to protect and serve women without corresponding authority, Chandler offers an odd anecdote from his childhood:

Let me unpack that. I have an older sister and a younger sister. Here was a frequent conversation my daddy had with me. “Buddy, at school, you look out for your sisters. If some other guy is messing with your sisters, I want you to tell a teacher. If that teacher will not listen, I want you to punch them in their face and keep punching and keep punching and keep punching until an adult drags you off of that little boy. When they drag you off, what I want you to do is be like, ‘Get off me! Get off me!’ You go back at them until they... There needs to be a healthy kind of fear of you when it comes to your sisters. You protect them.”

Let me say this. I had zero authority over my sisters. Zero! I could not come home and go, “Stephanie, clean my room.”

He uses a straw man here, because the authority which would naturally go with an obligation of protection would be to direct his sisters on how to behave so they didn’t create risks to their safety. But aside from the obvious straw man, I find the story as presented very hard to believe.

I can imagine a school environment so rough that a young boy’s father might repeatedly remind him to be prepared to protect his sisters, but the specifics of the story are off. I felt it was off just reading the transcript, but seeing the sermon made it all the more incongruent. Someone like Pastor Driscoll could sell this kind of hyper-violent-yet-non-threatening (to women) masculinity. But coming from Pastor Chandler it seems like a pure boyhood fantasy. It isn’t just his inflection, but the way he swishes his hips while he tells the story:

This is the oddest only real man in the room sermon I’ve ever seen. He is saying the right words, calling the men in the congregation boys who can shave, etc, but his voice and gestures don’t match the tough guy message. At the same time he is telling men to be men like him, he is also telling them to marry a woman who can teach them how to be men, just like he did.

It’s like logs that continually get thrown on a fire as you watch your wife love and serve the Lord, as you watch her mature, as you watch her grow, as she becomes the type of iron that sharpens your life. This is where we should be pushing into. Single men, you should be pursuing godly... I grieve for some of our godly single women here, just ferociously godly women stuck around a bunch of boys.

Here is the same sermon, but starting further back (you can also drag the cursor to the
beginning). If you let it play through you will see the cartoonish chivalry story of the boy in the wagon (the boy goes down so the girl goes free):

**See Also:** Sunday Morning Cartoons
Piper's debilitating fear of saying "no" to women.

by Dalrock | February 18, 2016 | Link

John Piper wrote in Co-ed Combat and Cultural Cowardice:

If I were the last man on the planet to think so, I would want the honor of saying no woman should go before me into combat to defend my country. A man who endorses women in combat is not pro-woman; he's a wimp. He should be ashamed. For most of history, in most cultures, he would have been utterly scorned as a coward to promote such an idea. Part of the meaning of manhood as God created us is the sense of responsibility for the safety and welfare of our women.

Piper is very clear in the above linked article, as he is here and here, that it is cowardly for men to allow women to protect them.

But combat isn't the only place we arm women and give them the job of protecting us. In fact, most combat (while hopefully focused on advancing our national interests) is not about directly protecting our borders or our civilians. To protect civilians we have police, not the military. Surely if it is cowardly for a man to allow a woman who wants to be like men to go into combat, it is at least as cowardly for a man to give a woman a gun and a badge with the obligation to come and protect him should he face danger.

Women as police should in fact bother Piper all the more because he rejects the idea of using force to protect himself and his family from criminals. In Should Christians Be Encouraged to Arm Themselves? Piper asks if as a Christian man he is permitted to shoot someone who is attacking his wife. As Steven Wedgeworth at The Calvinist International explains, Piper dances around the issue, but the thrust of his argument is that a man should not defend his wife with violence in such a situation.

The most shocking part of Pr. Piper's essay is, as we have said, his 8th point. He offers up a common situational dilemma faced by Christians looking into the question of the appropriate use of force. He says, "A natural instinct is to boil this issue down to the question, 'Can I shoot my wife's assailant?'" He then goes on to give 7 aspects to an answer which amounts to an unclear and qualified negative. We won't quote these answers in full (you should read them for yourself), but they amount to an argument that bearing witness to Jesus precludes the use of deadly force.

Wedgeworth reinforces this later in his article:

Piper is answering a question about how a man should care for his wife, and by extension his children, by pointing the man towards self-sacrifice and martyrdom. But self-sacrifice is not the issue in question, and the man is not actually justified in sacrificing other people in the name of his own love for Christ. One does not love their neighbor by imposing martyrdom upon their neighbor during times of crisis.
This is not hyperbole from Wedgeworth. While Piper is circumspect in his *Arm Themselves* article linked above, he is much more open in his article *Guns and Martyrdom*. There Piper explains that one of the many reasons he does not own a gun is because this would interfere with his plan of allowing a man who breaks into his home to kill him. Piper’s reasoning is that he is ready for heaven, but a man who would murder him (and his family) is not.

In *Arm Themselves* however Piper does leave open the possibility of calling the police should someone attack himself or his wife. Piper believes a husband shouldn’t defend his family with violence, but he isn’t above calling upon someone else to do so. This brings us back to women as police. If Piper won’t defend himself and his family, and instead will call someone else to do so, what if that someone else is a woman? Surely this is the very cowardice Piper and other complementarians complain so loudly about. This raises the question, would Piper tell women they should not become police officers?

Clearly this creates a complementarian dilemma. He can either accept a scenario where he would call a woman to defend himself and his family (something by his own criteria which would make him a terrible coward), or he can say *no* to a woman who wants to usurp a man’s role. It is hard to imagine which would be more terrifying to a complementarian, but in Piper’s case at least we know the answer. In *Should Women Be Police Officers?* Piper responds to a woman who asks if this is an appropriate role for a complementarian woman.

Beth writes in, “Hi Pastor John! I’m a woman who enjoys being a woman. I have no desire to be a man, or to compete to be better than men at being masculine. For a couple of years now, I have felt drawn to police work as a vocation. I am unmarried and, should I become married and my husband object, I would discontinue work as a police officer. At this point my question is a question of principle: Can a single Christian woman, who is a complementarian, become a police officer?”

Piper opens by explaining that his goal is *not* to tell her what she should do, and then reinforces this by claiming that he is unwilling to tell a woman that any particular job should be out of bounds:

I love Beth’s spirit and I hope I can be of help without telling her what she should do.

...?

Now in the home, the Bible makes plain that these definitions imply a leadership role for men that bear the burden of loving and leading the wife like Christ, and that in the church that men bear the responsibility to lead the church as elders. But what about outside the church in thousands of possible roles that men and women may fill in society? My sense is that it is unwise to make a list of women’s jobs and men’s jobs. There is simply too much diversity and too much flexibility in how many jobs there are and how the jobs are done and what the very relationships with men or women are in all the various jobs. It just won’t work to try to make a list like that.

Keep in mind that if telling a woman no wasn’t terrifying to a complementarian, this would be an extremely easy question. Piper is deeply convicted that:
1. The police have the unique role in our society of applying violence in the protection of men like himself and his family.

2. Women should not be placed into roles where they would in the ordinary performance of their duties be expected to protect others, especially men, through violence.

It is only the deep rooted fear of saying no to a woman that makes this in any way hard, especially since in this case of the woman clearly is open to a “no” answer. When complementarian heavyweights like Piper punt on the incredibly easy questions, it demonstrates that we can’t expect them to be capable of handling even moderately difficult questions without likewise caving in to fear.
 Pastor Doug Wilson makes a biblical case against women in combat in Is Your God Scary?

“The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman’s garment: for all that do so are abomination unto the Lord thy God” (Dt. 22:5).

This verse is a prohibition for cross-dressing when it comes to men. But the restriction placed on women here is not simply the reverse of that. When a man is getting kinky in the way described here, it is a straightforward transvestite problem. But going the other way, we should notice a different problem. Notice the odd construction — “that which pertains to a man.” The Hebrew underneath is keli geber, and should be read as the “gear of a warrior.” Whether we are talking about a man in fishnet stockings, or a woman decked out in full battle regalia, we need to recognize that God finds it loathsome. So should we.

This is a simple, straightforward biblical case, and I can find no fault with it. I can, however, understand why this wouldn't be popular with the CBMW, since it has the problem of calling out bad behavior by women. More recently in Carve Outs and Ghettos, Pastor Wilson explains that the prohibition can be read more broadly:

Women are told not to wear keli geber, the gear of a soldier. The phrase can be understood as the panoply of a warrior, but it could also perhaps be extended to include something like a telephone lineman’s tool belt. So, no. A Christian complementarian woman should not become a cop, especially when it involves riot gear. No.

In the last quote he not only answers the question Dr. Piper punted on, but he comes through with a clear “no” (twice). The difference between the biblical argument against women in combat and the CBMW argument that “The boy goes down so the girl goes free” is night and day. There is no reason to bother fashioning a palatable chivalric response in lieu of a biblical answer unless the desire is to avoid the Truth of the Bible while still sounding traditional.

I do however differ slightly with Pastor Wilson in that I think a woman wanting to put on a military uniform and go into combat is not that different than a man wanting to wear a dress. Both are literal and figurative forms of cross-dressing. Both also are expressions of envy, and they are equally twisted. It also raises an interesting parallel for those modern Christians who are far more animated in their concern at the potential for women being drafted into combat than they are about a mass desire of women to have the right to to usurp men’s roles. If we had the mass of Christian men so devoted to the idea of wearing women’s clothing that even the most conservative pastors were terrified of pointing out that men shouldn’t wear women’s panties, etc, a sudden outrage by these otherwise silent pastors at the idea of men potentially being forced to wear women’s clothing would be as ridiculous as what we have today. Which is more troubling? A Christian culture devoted to cross dressing? Or a secular
government which might in theory (but not in practice) force some of the very small minority of Christians who don’t relish the thought of a little cross dressing to do so against their will?

Interestingly Pastor Wilson is a part of The Gospel Coalition, although he does not prefer the term complementarian:

I began by saying that I am on the same team with Gospel Coalition complementarianism. I say that even though I don’t generally use the terminology of complementarianism because it seems to me too much of another -ism. As a friend said to me recently, why can’t we just call it common sense? When men are men, faithful women like it, and when women are women, faithful men like that. Anyhow .

In the same post he makes a similar point to one that Vox Day often makes (emphasis mine):

In our corner of the Reformed interwebs, one of the points that has been made more than once is that I draw the animus of the egalitarian intoleristas because of the exuberance of my writing. If I would only tone it down, it would become evident that complementarians are thoughtful, engaging people, and that they do not use flamethrowers in debate. But please note. I have been making the point repeatedly that the thing that makes us the enemy is any kind of principled resistance to the sexual revolution. If you do anything other than offer full-throated support, you will be demonized. You can write with as many pastel adjectives as you like, and you will still find yourself in the same cattle car with me, being bundled off to the sensitivity camps. Now I do not mind different styles of opposition to the sexual revolution, and in fact welcome it. But never make the mistake of thinking that our enemies do nuance. In this post that RHE draws her inspiration from, no distinction whatever is made between those who are soft-spoken in their opposition to What Must Come to Pass and those who are flamboyant. What matters to them is simply this — are you effectively in the way? If you are in the way, they will try to take you out of the way, by whatever means necessary.

More recently Wilson even pointed out that SJWs always lie (emphasis mine):

But what if someone responds by agreeing that military standards must never be lowered, but argues that any woman who can meet those standards should be allowed in? There are a basic problem. It is that social justice warriors, of the kind that are driving this whole business, lie all of the time. They do not submit to the way God made the world, so why would they submit to accurate descriptions of the way God made the world? They are at war with the science as much as with Scripture, and their response to any obstacle is always the same. They lie about it. If you refuse to see the difference between a man and woman, why on earth would you be willing to see the difference between accurate data and politically-fudged data? Everything is always all the same except for the difference between “the agenda” and that which is “not the agenda.”

He also points out the fundamental problem with conservatism:
Once you have signed off on the nation/state conscripting your daughters to go serve in combat roles, whatever it was you thought you were conserving — thus allowing you to call yourself a conservative — has had a fork stuck in it and is done. Nothing really to conserve any more.

Where some of the quotes above sound much like Vox Day, this next one sounds like something Cane Caldo would write:

The standard looks like a simple application of the biblical requirement of “equal weights and measures.” But once you have affirmed the “same standard” approach, good luck applying it. The same measuring rod will get you a first rate man but a third rate woman, or a first rate woman and a third rate man. Why? Because a defensive lineman is not a quarterback, a china vase is not a backhoe, and a crescent wrench is not a hammer.

And this brings us to our evangelical sophisticates who, unlike John Piper, believe that crescent wrenches are only “not hammers” in the church and family. Outside in the world, where complementarianism is thought to be the height of SILLINESS, feel free to pound in the brads with the crescent wrench, which actually can be done, come to think of it. You might run up against the limits of your theory when you try to get the lug nuts off your tire with a hammer though.

One last quote from Wilson on the topic of women in combat:

And last, let me make one quick appeal to the light of nature. The egalitarians who are pushing for this are not true egalitarians — they want the same access to the same positions for men and women, but they don’t want the same qualifying requirements. A true egalitarian would insist that all positions should be open to both sexes, provided they both were able to meet the same standards. But this whole (very rigged) joke depends on running two entirely different sets of standards simultaneously, and shouting down anybody who notices. So then, o ye treat-everybody-the-samers! When do you think you will start doing that? It’s your religion. Why won’t you practice it? It’s your temple. Why won’t you go in? Is your god scary?

If we eliminated the double-standard here, we would still have the theoretical problem, but we sure wouldn’t have a practical problem at all.
Via Vox Day and Instapundit, the social justice warriors at Twitter have suspended Robert Stacy McCain’s account without explanation.

Related, and also via Vox:

Mike Cernovich has launched the Kickstarter for his documentary Silenced: Our War on Free Speech:
In a previous post I introduced the term cartoonish chivalry. Today I want to explain it a bit further, and at the same time explain why we see so much of it. There are three primary roots of cartoonish chivalry, and they are all intertwined.

1. Feminism, with a side of romantic gesture.

Cartoonish chivalry comes in two main forms. In my previous post I offered an example from Pastor Chandler of what you might call a “Hulk Smash!” form of chivalry. In that example one young boy repeatedly punches another young boy in the face until adults eventually take notice and are able to restrain the boy from further violence. This is however the less common of the two forms. The much more common form more closely resembles Wile E Coyote holding a sign that reads “Yikes!”

In the first form of cartoonish chivalry a man or boy metes out ruthless punishment on another man or boy who has somehow offended a woman. In the second form instead of focusing on meting out violence on behalf of women, the focus is on the man absorbing punishment on behalf of women. As different as this would seem to make them, both forms of chivalry are focused on gestures in service of women over prudent and practical actions in defense of others. In this way both focus on maximizing romantic appeal while minimizing offense to feminist sensibilities.

In Co-ed Combat and Cultural Cowardice Pastor John Piper offers a beloved hypothetical scenario where a young man and woman are suddenly threatened by a man with a knife:

Suppose, I said, a couple of you students, Jason and Sarah, were walking to McDonald’s after dark. And suppose a man with a knife jumped out of the bushes and threatened you. And suppose Jason knows that Sarah has a black belt in karate and could probably disarm the assailant better than he could. Should he step back and tell her to do it? No. He should step in front of her and be ready to lay down his life to protect her, irrespective of competency. It is written on his soul. That is what manhood does.

In another telling by Piper of the same hypothetical, Jason heroically declares “Over my dead body!” Then (presumably after the knife wielding man accommodates Jason’s romantic declaration) Sarah repeatedly karate kicks the assailant and wins the day!

Note the absurd feminist character of Sarah the black belt; in cartoon land women are very often braver and tougher than men. Also note that in cartoon land men have an obligation to step into the knife so that Sarah can have both her feminist empowerment and her romantic gesture. The focus is on Jason laying down his life, not ordering Sarah to run while he distracts the assailant, or even on using force to stop the attack. The former would certainly cramp Sarah’s feminist style. The latter would stoke her feminist envy. There really is no choice; Jason must die. In the event that we must settle for second best, he must at least be
seriously wounded in his romantic gesture.

Some would no doubt suspect I’m reading too much into a (repeatedly) poorly framed hypothetical, but Piper is clear that the focus on martyrdom in this hypothetical is not a fluke. Moreover, this pattern is very common when it comes to complementarian chivalry.

2. Overcompensation.

If you are building a stone Church or home, you need to carefully shape the stones to the specification of the Architect. A bit of mortar (chivalry) can not only be pleasing to the eye, it can also help bind the stones together and even help smooth out minor imperfections. However, instead of using a thin layer of chivalry to level out minor imperfections, it is being used to permit modern Christians to go entirely off script with regard to shaping the stones (men and women). Once you create a mental model where women are perfect (except for their flaw of not seeing themselves as perfect), you create a mismatch that has to be filled by something. You are going to need more mortar. Likewise when you declare that rebellion is submission and leading means following, you may as well dispense with the wheelbarrow and back up a truck filled with mortar. This is what complementarians are doing. After you finish cheering for Hollywood’s latest incarnation of Xena: Warrior Princess, how do you recover and try to sound traditional? You follow up with a loud declaration that while women are surely wise, valiant, and just as good as men at combat, you are eager to die to prevent one of these delicate-yet-tough-as-nails champions from having to step foot on the field of battle.

3. Arrested development.

Cartoons are for children, and cartoonish chivalry is for young boys. Young boys are prone to romanticize combat and have a tendency to foolishly watch a scene in a movie full of death, gore, and suffering, and wish they could be there:

Think of the movies we like to watch. We want the fight. We want our lives to matter. We want to lay it down. We love Saving Private Ryan, everybody getting shot up on the beach. We want to run up on that beach with them. It’s in us.

Brothers, you’ve been called to this. Anything less than this is outside of design and purpose.

This is childishness, but it is expected for a child. As a boy grows up the men around him will teach him that we don’t relish the pain and sacrifice of other men. The men who had their guts shot out on Normandy, and their buddies who watched them die didn’t want to be there. They weren’t there to cut a heroic picture; they were there to get a dangerous, difficult, and necessary job done. There is also the problem of using another man’s sacrifice to puff yourself up. All of this has the effect of minimizing the noble sacrifice other men have made. Lastly, cartoonish chivalry is the result of childishly seeking women’s approval.

I would have gotten away with it too if it weren’t for you meddling kids!

Every cartoon needs a catchphrase, and cartoonish chivalry is no exception. As you might expect, the catchphrase for cartoonish chivalry captures all three of the elements explained.
above. It offers a side of non threatening chivalry to complement a main course of feminism. It compensates for going off script, and is used in lieu of biblical teaching which would offend the feminists in the pews. Lastly, it offers a boy’s view of chivalry, with the accompanying vulgar diminishment of the sacrifice of other men. The catchphrase for cartoonish chivalry comes courtesy of former CBMW President Randy Stinson, and is well loved by current CBMW President Owen Strachan. It is also a favorite of Pastor Matt Chandler (catchphrase in bold):

All three of these young men under the age of 30 grabbed their girlfriends (not wives and mothers), threw them down on the floor, and threw their bodies on top of their girlfriends. All three were shot and killed. All three of the girlfriends were wounded. They were wounded when bullets passed through their boyfriends and struck their bodies. Throughout the world, these men were heralded as heroes.

...

Why does it matter? Do you want me to tell you why it matters? Because we all know this sentence in our gut: the boy goes down, and the girl goes free.

*H/T Darwinian American. Alternate link here.
The Atlantic has a new piece up titled *The Scourge of the Female Chore Burden*:

All over the world, women are doing work they’re not getting paid for. In rich countries, it might be folding the laundry or staying home to take care of a sick child. In developing countries, unpaid labor tends to be more physically arduous, like hauling water and chopping wood. Wherever you are, it’s considered women’s work.

This is standard fare, and part of the constant bombardment women receive encouraging them to be discontent. It is also part of a very long tradition, going back to the Serpent and Eve in the garden of Eden. This particular piece is noteworthy however because the stand in for the Serpent is billionaire Melinda Gates complaining about the patriarchal oppression of being married to Bill Gates:

For those who think it can’t be done, Gates offers an example from her personal life. Though Bill and the couples’ children would always help with after-dinner cleanup, she nevertheless was always the last person left in the kitchen, “doing those last few little things.”

Finally, she issued an edict: No one leaves the kitchen until mom does.

The Atlantic piece whispers that if only men worked more around the house and slept less, women would finally be content. This is a lie even the Serpent would be proud of.

**Gates is a feminist; what about complementarians?**

But the whispering doesn’t stop when women enter the modern church. Complementarian pastor Matt Chandler explains in his sermon *Women’s Hurdles* that feminist resentment isn’t a hurdle for women; it is a sign that men are oppressing them. If men work hard enough, do enough of the housework, and are loving enough, the temptation of feminist rebellion and resentment will not occur (emphasis mine):

Where this happens, where men exercise biblical headship, where they are sacrificially loving, they are creating environments that honor and uplift the name of Jesus Christ, they’re establishing a place where the Word of God is seen and honored, and we understand God as he has revealed himself, and where they provide for, where that happens, and where women come underneath that, the idea of male headship might be attacked as a philosophy, but if they came into our homes, our wives would not want to be freed from anything.

Really, men, here is a great way to gauge how you’re serving, loving, and
practicing your headship. If the most secularized feminist in the world showed up in your home and began to kind of coach your wife toward freedom and liberation from your tyranny, our wives should be so well cared for, so nourished, so sowed into and loved, they would say, “What you’re describing is actually tyranny. I love where I am. I am honored. I am encouraged. My man sacrifices so that I might grow in my gifts. He will oftentimes lay down his own desires in order to serve me more. My husband goes to bed tired at night. He pours into our children. He encourages me. All that comes out of his mouth, sans a couple of little times here and there, is him building me up in love.”

Chandler immediately follows by telling men they need to repent if their wife feels the temptation of feminist rebellion.

| Men, here is a good opportunity. If you’re like, “Well, gosh, I don’t think she would say that at all,” then, men, I think on the way home, you should probably repent and confess before the Lord to your wife. Quit asking me about you, though. We’ve already covered you. We’re here to talk about the ladies. |

In the last “Quit asking me about you” bit, Chandler is making light of the fact that this is supposed to be a sermon about women’s temptation to sin. Even the Serpent would high five Chandler for the brilliant tactic of setting the couple up for a fight on the drive home from church. I don’t see how this could have been accomplished any better.

Leaving aside what this does to the husbands in the congregation, marriage as an institution, and the children who will grow up in a home filled with strife because of what Chandler is teaching, consider how cruel this is to the wives themselves. All of the constant whispering to women (from all angles) is a source of great torment. No doubt some of the women watching the sermon have figured out how to fight this temptation. For such a woman, here is her pastor explaining that her efforts to combat this sin aren’t real; her husband can take the credit for her ability to overcome this temptation. It is even worse for a woman who struggles more with this temptation, as her pastor is telling her that her temptation to feel resentment has been her husband’s fault all along!

Aside from the Serpent and Pastor Chandler, who profits from this message?
I’ll take this as confirmation that Trump is alpha.

by Dalrock | February 25, 2016 | Link

From the Daily Mail: Woman who accused Donald Trump of trying to rape her and turn her into his ‘sex slave’ says she would now vote for him

Ms Harth told Law Newz, which obtained the dropped 12-page lawsuit against Trump, that voting for the man she once accused of raping her was simply ‘supporting a friend’.

‘I saw him recently, and he said I looked good,’ she said. ‘I have nothing but good things to say about Donald.’

Also from the Daily Mail, a reminder that (contrary to modern Christian theology) alpha does not mean virtue:

Why women are attracted to bad boys: Brooding looks reveal Dark Triad traits that suggest the men will be strong fathers
Cane Caldo pointed out the SJW convergence at Acts 29:

The SJW-convergence aware crowd might be interested in Matt Chandler’s vision for the Acts29 Network since he took control. Here are the values:

1. Plant Churches that Plant Churches
2. Be Known for Holiness and Humility
3. **Become a Radically Diverse Crowd**
4. Be Serious about Evangelism and Conversions

It’s not an irony that Chandler stands and moves like a woman. It coincides.

I wasn’t aware of this, but this is indeed Chandler’s **Hope #3** for Acts 29:

My third hope for Acts 29 is that we might boldly and unapologetically become a radically diverse crowd over the next few years.

Why? Ethnic harmony/diversity is core to being explicitly Christian.

This is of course what SJW entryists always do; they re-purpose the organization towards “diversity” and claim this is essential to achieving the organization’s original mission. In this case, *harmony* becomes *diversity*, and university ethnic studies values predictably start supplanting the original mission.

Make no mistake, this isn’t about *harmony*, it is about the racial grievance industry and *white privilege*. During the Ferguson riots in November 2014, Acts 29 Vice President and The Gospel Coalition (TGC) Council Member Darrin Patrick* published an article at TGC titled **How Should You Respond to Ferguson**. The article opens with:

We learned last night that Darren Wilson, the police officer who shot Michael Brown, was not indicted by the grand jury. Multiple businesses have been looted and burned, and our city—St. Louis—is trying to figure out how to pick up the pieces and move forward. Leading up to the grand jury decision, we wanted to prepare our church, regardless of the verdict, to rightly respond to the issues this case has unearthed.

Over the last few months, the elders and other leaders at The Journey have been encouraging our church and the wider community to let their guard down and step into hard conversations about justice, privilege, and race.

What follows is a standard issue SJW discussion about racist police and white privilege. The language and frame of mind are *exactly* what you would find in the African American Studies department at your local university, and this is no accident. One of the experts on the panel...
is introduced as:

Sabrine:

- multi racial background
- majored in African American Studies at Wash Univ.
- speaks and leads workshops on diversity training

You can see Sabrine’s introduction in the video embedded below. Drag the cursor to the beginning if you want to see the whole thing:

Pastor Chandler isn’t just pushing SJW racial theory as core to being a Christian. He is also slightly more subtly doing the same with feminist theory as well. In his sermon Man’s Purpose Chandler quotes 1 Tim 3 on the qualifications of elders, and then explains what this means (emphasis mine):

Two sentences. Where an all-male eldership practices authority in the church that is harsh and uncaring, then they are outside the bounds of the beautiful design of God and outside the boundaries of Scripture. Where an all-male eldership does not create and nurture lanes for the flourishing of women in their gifts, they are outside the bounds of God’s beautiful design and outside the bounds of Scripture.

Once again, male headship is the unique leadership of the man in the work of establishing order for human flourishing, and Christ is our model. That’s work. We are to cultivate in the home. We are to cultivate in the church.

This is not what 1 Tim 3 says, and moreover the far more relevant Scripture for women’s roles in the Church is the instruction immediately prior to 1 Tim 3 (1 Tim 2:8-15):

8 I desire therefore that the men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting; 9 in like manner also, that the women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with propriety and moderation, not with braided hair or gold or pearls or costly clothing, 10 but, which is proper for women professing godliness, with good works. 11 Let a woman learn in silence with all submission. 12 And I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in silence. 13 For Adam was formed first, then Eve. 14 And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression. 15 Nevertheless she will be saved in childbearing if they continue in faith, love, and holiness, with self-control.

The Apostle Paul reiterated his point from 1 Tim 2 in 1 Cor 14:34-35:

34 Let your[d] women keep silent in the churches, for they are not permitted to speak; but they are to be submissive, as the law also says. 35 And if they want to learn something, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for women to speak in church.
Pastor Chandler seems to be directly mocking this Scripture when he says:

Let me just share my heart for all women, married or single here at The Village Church. I don’t desire, and the elders do not desire, that you would be the type of “pat your head, bless her heart, be quiet, ask when we get home” women.

Complementarian affirmative action.

Pastor Chandler practices what he preaches. He not only has women leading in The Village Church, he has women in leadership who instruct pastors. Jen Wilkin is identified as a Minister on the church website, and wrote the article Counsel for a Complementarian Pastor explaining the need for affirmative action for women in church leadership:

3. Help them lead.

If Deborah or Huldah were a member of your church, would she have a place to exercise her gifts? We complementarians have some work to do to reclaim and celebrate the notion of women as leaders. Regrettably, many of our churches hold simultaneously a pure theology and a broken practice: We may affirm equal value and dignity with our lips, but our ministry structures tend to be far from it. And women are taking note. Seeing few or no places to serve, women with untapped gifts often conclude they must change their theology to be able to serve meaningfully in the church. We don’t want our female leaders to leave. We want them to find their places in leadership with us, but how?

We must actively help them. Leaders rarely develop in a vacuum; most can point to a senior leader who advocated for them. Pastor, what gifted and able women in your church need your guidance and advocacy? Be proactive about identifying and empowering women to lead. Pursue them to serve, and then lends them credibility by publicly celebrating their gifts. Evaluate and, if necessary, adapt your ministry structures and hiring practices to ensure they reflect your belief in the vital contributions of women.

Wilkin explains that complementarian affirmative action means meeting women more than half way:

4. Set them up to win.

Because women are typically primary caregivers, ministry to women is a “ministry of more-than-halfway.” It requires us to think not just in terms of, “What discipleship opportunities can we make available?” but to meet women more than halfway by asking, “How can we remove as many participation barriers as possible?”

*You can see Pastor Patrick discussing chivalry with fellow TGC Council Member John Piper here.*

www.TheRedArchive.com
Christian feminists are shameless liars when it comes to Scripture. They claim to have secret knowledge of the meaning of Scripture, meanings no one could discern for 2,000 years. In the hands of a Christian feminist Paul is no longer warning that those who would corrupt the Church will take a page out of the Serpent’s playbook in Eden and focus on deceiving women as the entry point. Instead, the passage above suddenly becomes a feminist message exhorting Christian women to be kickass tough girls.

The Christian feminist in the video below starts by bragging about the time she put up her dukes in defense of feminism. Then she goes on to turn the Scripture above upside down, claiming Paul meant something no sane person would expect Timothy or the early congregations of the church to have interpreted from his words. Moreover, Paul’s words in his previous letter to Timothy offer the same warning:

11 Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. 12 But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. 13 For Adam was first formed, then Eve. 14 And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. 15 Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.

Here is a woman teaching the meaning of Paul’s second letter to Timothy, contrary to Paul’s explanation in his first letter that women are not to teach. In doing so, she provides a perfect example of why this is prohibited.

However, Christian feminists are a dime a dozen. What makes this video noteworthy is that this particular Christian feminist is a Women’s Studies professor at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Also, she is not only a council member of the CBMW, she was involved with its founding. In other words, this is Christian feminism with a CBMW and Southern Baptist Theological Seminary stamp of approval.
See Also my follow up post: Tame or be tamed.

Update: bkilbour found the transcript of Kassian’s sermon.
In response to my last post several readers and one kind blogger challenged my characterization of Mary Kassian’s sermon Don’t Be a Wimp: Kicking the Habits That Make Women Weak. I was very brief in my last post, so I’m doing this follow up with more detail. The sermon is just under an hour so I’ll break it down into four sections. For brevity I’ll keep the quotes to a minimum and instead will reference sections of the sermon by their beginning and ending times in the video. From there you can find the same section in the transcript if you prefer to read her words rather than listen.

1) Introduction (Them’s fightin’ words!) 0 to 2:14

The first two minutes are dedicated to whipping up feelings of feminist envy and resentment in the audience. Kassian talks about being a tomboy who could do everything the boys could do, and her deep resentment when one of her brothers told her she was a “weak girl”.

2) Identifying the topic of the sermon (Taming Scripture) 2:15-6:37

This feminist resentment has a purpose, because this is a very standard Christian feminist sermon where the feminist identifies an initially offensive passage in Scripture before explaining that it isn’t offensive if you know what it really means. If Scripture offends your feminist sensibilities ladies, you clearly don’t understand it correctly. What then follows is an outlandish yarn about the “true meaning” of this widely misunderstood Scripture. If you look you will find Christian feminists doing this all of the time. For just a few examples, see Jen Wilkin doing it with 1 Pet 3 here, and Sheila Gregoire doing this with Eph 5:22 here.

In this particular Scripture taming sermon, the topic is 2 Timothy 3:6-7

> For among them are those who creep into households and capture weak women, burdened with sins and led astray by various passions, always learning and never able to arrive at a knowledge of the truth.

Kassian describes her initial offense at the words of the Apostle Paul:

> My brother had called me a weak girl. There is no way anyone was ever going to call me weak. And here was Scripture talking about weak women.

> You can turn there to 2 Timothy 3:6-7. That’s the passage we’re going to park on this morning, and I’m going to unpack it for you.

Kassian then follows the pattern, explaining the true meaning of 2 Timothy 3:6-7. Of course it isn’t offensive to feminists at all! It turns out there is a feminist backstory that explains everything.

> ...one of the problems that was facing the church there was that false teachers were
impacting the church, influencing the church from the inside. And they were finding a disproportionate amount of success amongst the women, because the women were weak.

Here is Paul-the-women’s-studies-major identifying an area of disproportionate results between men and women, and Paul wants to level things up by teaching the women to be as strong as the men. Kassian tells us that Paul’s point in the passage is to empower Christian women so they will be equal with men in their ability to avoid being deceived (emphasis mine):

These women were childish and frivolous and silly and immature and wimpy. They deserved the triple W label: weak, wimpy woman. [laughter]

The point is, they ought not to have been. They ought not to have been that.

The only problem is that isn’t Paul’s point at all. Moreover, while the backstory she offers may well have happened, it doesn’t accurately describe the context of the Scripture. In the verses leading up to 2 Timothy 3:6-7, Paul explains that perilous times are coming. Paul isn’t writing to tell Timothy how to fix his problem of unempowered women, he is warning Timothy of danger to come in the future:

3 This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. 2 For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, 3 Without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, 4 Traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; 5 Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.

Paul isn’t commenting on a baffling recent lack of moxie, he is warning of an inherent vector of attack that will be exploited in the future. As Paul explained in his previous letter to Timothy women are more easily deceived, and this goes all the way back to the fall:

11 Let a woman learn in silence with all submission. 12 And I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in silence. 13 For Adam was formed first, then Eve. 14 And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression.

Yet Kassian has twisted this passage around to where instead Paul is somehow surprised that women are more easily deceived than men and offering a recipe for making this equal.

3) How to be strong empowered women. 6:37-44:30

Kassian then uses the specific wording of the passage to identify seven habits women can adopt to become as hard to deceive as men. Much of what she proposes is good, except for
the fact that even while doing this she is teaching the opposite of what Paul was getting at. For example, it is good that she is teaching women to learn Scripture. But in doing this she is claiming women can solve the problem of being more easily deceived than men by studying their Bibles.

Lies, lies, lies. Satan is the father of lies. He is a good liar.

And our foremother Eve fell for a lie, and the propensity to fall for them has plagued women ever since.

Do you know how the FBI trains secret service agents to identify counterfeit money? They put them in a room with real money. And for hours and hours and hours, they study the details of the real thing, and they feel it, and they smell it. And they become so familiar with real money that when they come across counterfeit money, they just know, “Hmm, something’s off, not quite right. It’s not quite the right texture.” And they can pick it out, what’s wrong. They don’t pick out what’s wrong by studying the bad stuff. They pick it out by becoming familiar with the good stuff.

And it’s the same way with us; it’s the same way with us. In order to combat falsehood, we need to become intimately familiar with truth. We need the Word.

This is truth. This is truth, and if we aren’t getting it into our systems, if we aren’t feeling it and handling it and reading it and studying it and becoming a familiar with the texture and the feel of it, we’re not going to know when something else is kind of off.

But if we’re familiar with truth, when Satan comes along with a lie . . . and those lies always have some truth to them, otherwise we wouldn’t fall for them. They’re just off a little bit. And when Satan comes along with a lie, we’ll be able to know, “Hmm, something’s not quite right here. Something’s not quite right.”

So a woman of strength equips her mind, and she also protects it.

Truth will set you free, ladies, but you will have a tough time discerning what’s true if you spend all your time being exposed to garbage.

... 

Don’t be a wimp, ladies. Don’t be a wimp. A weak woman is captivated by lies. A woman of strength takes her thoughts captive to truth.

While studying Scripture is very important, it isn’t the solution Paul provides to this specific problem. The solution is for women to learn in silence in all submission. But this has the original problem of offending feminist sensibilities. When Scripture faces off against feminist sensibilities, something has to give; either Scripture will tame the feminist, or the feminist will tame Scripture. Here as we see so often, the choice of the feminist is to tame Scripture.
Finally, we get to the twist. The twist is designed to seem like repentance of the feminist rebellion stoked in the beginning and nurtured throughout the rest of the sermon, but this is only a distraction. If you read carefully you will find that no such repentance occurs.

The twist is that once she started actually fighting her brother (who is 3 years her senior), she started getting hurt. The outrage of “He called me a weak girl!” is traded for the outrage of “He hit a girl!”

I started swinging and hitting and punching and kicking. And I think he was amused. He pushed me off a little bit, but then I must have smacked him in the face, and he got angry. And he started hitting me for real, and it didn’t feel so good. And I started crying, and I was getting hit, and I was losing the fight, and he was pinning me down.

And it must have been this massive commotion, because my older brother heard it from downstairs and he came up. He pulled us apart, took my brother to the floor, pinned him down, and told him off and said, “How dare you! How dare you do that! How dare you hit her!”

This isn’t about logic, it is about emotion, and the emotion remains unchanged. This isn’t a capitulation; it isn’t a recognition that she resented being a woman and envied men. It is a shift from overt feminism to non-threatening chivalry.

My older brother looked at me, and he said, “You are a girl. And if you get into fights with him, you’re going to get beat up. And next time you have an issue, you come call me, and I’ll deal with it.”

I like that brother. That was a good brother. [laughter]

Like, “Yeah, I can get into trouble. He’ll come deal with it.

This would be an obvious opening to remind the women that they need to lean on, to submit to, the man who should be leading them and protecting them. But again, this would offend the feminist sensibility, and Kassian has made it clear elsewhere that no man is going to tell her to submit.

What follows instead is a speech nearly all Christian men have received multiple times, usually from a Christian man who is a current or former athlete. The only difference is Kassian has changed the sexes to make this about being a strong woman instead of being a strong man.

But here is the irony: A weak woman tries to act strong, and culture tells us to act all strong and in control and in charge and bossy as women. But a woman of strength recognizes that she is weak, and that she needs a Savior—that she’s in a lifelong wrestling match with sin, and she’s not going to win unless that Savior comes in and takes care of it for her.
Our own strength is inadequate. I loved listening to Joni last night and listening to her talk about her weakness, because that’s what we are.

And in order to become a woman who clothes myself in strength, I need to identify my weakness and press into the strength of Jesus.

Ephesians 6:10: “Be strong”—what? “in the Lord and in the strength of His might.”

It’s His might. It’s His strength. It’s Him. And if you don’t hold onto that, you can act as big and tough and mean as you want, but you are just going to get beat up because we’re weak. We are weak, and without Christ as our strength, we’re going to take the hits.

Seek the Lord and His strength. Seek His presence. Seek His strength continually.
The cause of feminist resentment.
by Dalrock | March 3, 2016 | Link

The complementarian movement has long implied that the reason women feel the temptation for feminist envy and rebellion is that men aren’t loving enough. Feminist rebellion is seen not as a sin of women, but as proof of sin by men. In the past few years complementarians have gone from implying this to stating it outright. Acts 29 President Matt Chandler goes all in with this idea when teaching about women’s sins. You can also see the same argument by Mary Kassian in a video on a page explaining complementarianism at The Gospel Coalition. The video comes with the Editor’s Note:

Learn more from Mary Kassian in this interview with Jennie Allen as they discuss the freedom of boundaries and the difficulty of submitting to sinful men.

In the video Kassian compares men’s leadership in the Church to a husband’s leadership in marriage. She says if men’s leadership is functioning well you will see unity in both a church and a marriage. Allen counters that the problem is that it rarely functions well, and because of this women are frightened and feel that men being in authority “steals something from them”:

And I think that the problem is that it rarely functions well. Just really honestly. And I think that is where it feels scary is women feel like that authority that often gets put upon men steals something from them. And so what would you say to those women that maybe have been hurt by either men or the church and feel like it is just really difficult, even if biblically they can see that view, to regard that as something they would ever live out.

Kassian confirms that she has experienced the same resentment as a “strong woman who has leadership giftings”, and the cause of this feeling is sinful men who aren’t loving enough*:

Well I don’t think there is any woman who hasn’t bumped up against it, and particularly if you have a strong woman who has a leadership giftings and teaching giftings-as I do- and so I have bumped up against that. I have been hurt by it. I have encountered men who are sinful men and who do not interact with me in a godly loving way.

It is of course true that men are sinful, and also true that unloving men can increase a woman’s temptation for feminist rebellion. But the temptation exists either way; they are both denying this by framing it as strictly a reaction to sinful men, and overlooking the fact that it is rebellion either way. In fact, Christian men (and women) are far more likely to encourage rebellion today by pretending it doesn’t exist than by being harsh and authoritarian. The love we are failing to show is overwhelmingly the failure to rebuke women for a sin our culture teaches is a virtue.

This blind spot for complementarians, the inability to recognize the temptation driving
feminist rebellion, is astounding given that we live in an age defined by feminist rebellion. Women’s envy for the role of men is causing us to dramatically reshape our entire society with disastrous results, and the group of Christians who are ostensibly trying to counter feminism can’t even identify what is going on. From the complementarian perspective, all that has happened over the last forty or so years is men suddenly and mysteriously became more authoritarian.

As one more example of this profound blind spot, in August of 2012 TGC founders D.A. Carson and Tim Keller discussed the importance of complementarianism with CBMW co-founder John Piper. Piper explained that complementarianism is important because:

“We live in a culture where for the last 30 or 40 years, the collapse of the meaning of biblical masculinity has not produced a beautiful egalitarian society,” Piper observes. “It has produced a brutal masculine society.”

*Kassian goes on to explain that even when authority is sinful her attitude to authority should reflect her heart towards the Lord:

But how do you deal with it when you’ve been hurt by it, when you’re feeling the sting of that and not experiencing it as something good. I think that for me its important to remember that the way I live my life out, and the way the decisions I make, how I choose to live, how I choose to approach relationships, how I choose to approach my relationships with those in authority, all is a reflection of my heart towards the Lord.

This part of her answer is quite good, but it doesn’t change the fact that she is claiming the reason she feels feminist resentment and rebellion is because men are sinful. You can watch the video below for the entire exchange.
The new face of complementarian feminism

by Dalrock | March 5, 2016 | Link

I’ve been writing this week about complementarian (covert) feminist Mary Kassian, a Women’s Studies professor at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Kassian is a council member of the CBMW and was involved with its founding. She also contributes fairly regularly to The Gospel Coalition (TGC), another flagship complementarian organization. But Kassian is the old guard of complementarian feminists. I don’t say this to minimize her work in bringing feminism to Christianity. She has worked tirelessly for decades in this regard, and she has had great success. I suspect we can even give her at least partial credit for convincing the CBMW to invent the feminist sin of servility in their founding document. But Kassian’s work has been mostly about consolidating the gains overt Christian feminists made in the 60s, 70s, and 80s, and nurturing these ideas in complementarianism. She has also of course trained up the new guard of complementarian feminists in her role as a Women’s Studies professor.

But the old guard paves the way for the new guard, and the new guard of complementarian feminists are women like Jen Wilkin. While Kassian periodically contributes to TGC, Wilkin is a formal contributor at TGC and also publishes books under their banner. Wilkin is also a minister working for Pastor Matt Chandler, President of the Acts 29 network.

As a member of the old guard, Kassian is careful to distance herself from the label feminist and focuses on undermining headship and stoking feminist resentment. But because of the progress women like Kassian have made over the decades, a new guard of complementarian women like Wilkin can afford to be quite open in their feminism (even if they avoid outright calling themselves feminist) and focus on the same issues as secular feminists. As the old guard stomps out the last embers of complementarian headship and submission, the new guard can focus on agitating for affirmative action for women in leadership roles.

For example, in let not the men keep silent* Wilkin repurposes a viral feminist letter by a white knight complaining about supposed barriers to women in engineering. She very openly applies secular feminist activism in her role as a complementarian (emphasis mine):

Jared understands what I wish more men in ministry understood. In the ongoing discussion about whether women in complementarian churches are actually treated with the equal value that Genesis 1 bestows on them, it is time for men to speak up on behalf of their sisters. We women can tell our shared stories to whomever may listen, but our concerns won’t likely draw notice until our brothers perceive their validity, take them to heart, and speak them as their own. As long as women are the ones speaking them, we are easy to dismiss as complainers or (gasp) feminists.

Jared Mauldin had eyes to see the stereotypes and gender bias that plague women who venture into fields where “they don’t belong”. What he observed plays out in its own ways in churches, as well. Church staffs, like most male-heavy environments, often unwittingly perpetuate boy’s club mentalities, harmful gender stereotypes and
tokenism. I and other women have occasionally donned protective gear and written on it.

In More Pressing than Women Preachers, Wilkin explains that she isn’t focused on convincing fellow complementarians to accept women preachers because she is too busy pushing for more women into every other leadership role in the church:

Once again the internet has been abuzz with discussions of whether women should preach in the local church gathering. Whenever the issue is raised, those who oppose it are quick to explain that the role is not withheld from women because they are less valuable than men. And that “equal value” assertion always shifts my eyes from the pulpit to a more pressing concern. As some continue to debate the presence of women in the pulpit, we must not miss this immediate problem: the marked absence of women in areas of church leadership that are open to them.

The women e-mailing me regularly are not worried about winning the pulpit. They’re still facing opposition over teaching the Bible to other women. They are fighting to be seen as necessary beyond children’s ministry and women’s ministry. They are fighting to contribute more than hospitality or a soft voice on the praise team. They are looking for leadership trajectories for women in the local church and finding virtually nothing. They watch their brothers receive advocacy and wonder who will invite them and equip them to lead well. If the contributions of women are equally valued in the church, shouldn’t we see some indication in the way we staff?...

...The sisters among us are wondering when we’ll be able to tangibly demonstrate equal value in the local church, not just affirm this value with our words.

Elsewhere Wilkin explains the need for complementarian pastors to not permit women to take on leadership roles, but to pursue them for leadership roles. In The Complementarian Woman: Permitted or Pursued? Wilkin explains that the Apostle Paul set a disturbing tone among Christians that needs to be corrected:

I am not certain when it became common to speak of permitting rather than pursuing women to serve, but I admit that it grieves me. Yes, there is that well-worn verse in 1 Timothy, but it seems a shame to let one occurrence of a term dominate our language and practice. It may be that permission vocabulary persists because of the unfortunate woman-as-usurper stereotype that sometimes underlies complementarian thought.

She suggests that if there was more affirmative action for women in leadership, Christian feminists might stop rebelling:

I have to think that egalitarians would grow quieter in their critiques if we could point to more women within our ranks who convincingly demonstrate equal, complementary value in our churches.

Feminist progress is after all a reflection of men having the courage to lead:
Do you desire to leverage the equal complementary value of women in your church? Don’t give us a chance to ask permission. Get out ahead of us. You approach us with what you intend to empower us to do. End the culture of permission and you will dispel the stigma of submission. We are not usurpers, we are the possessors of every capacity you lack and the celebrators of every capacity you possess.

Brothers, don’t permit us. Pursue us.

*The title is an obvious jab at 1 Cor 14:34 “Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience as also saith the law.” –KJV
The biblical case for women teaching women.

by Dalrock | March 7, 2016 | Link

11 Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. 12 But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. 13 For Adam was first formed, then Eve. 14 And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. 15 Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.

— 1 Tim 2:11-15 KJV

A number of commenters have argued that Mary Kassian’s preaching is biblical because she is only preaching to other women. This does seem to be a widely accepted (modern) view, and is the complementarian/CBMW view as well. Yet while this is widely accepted, it is surprisingly difficult to find clear exegetical arguments for this claim.

Note: For the purpose of this post, the kind of teaching I am interested in is preaching and explaining Scripture. Titus 2 encourages older women to teach younger women to be good wives, mothers, and homemakers, and this is not the kind of teaching I am focused on in this post.

My initial guess was that this was based on an assumption that “over the man” in 1 Tim 2:13 above applied both to authority and to teaching. By this reading, the Apostle Paul wasn’t restricting women from teaching in general, but restricting women from teaching men. Yet the way all translations I’ve seen render this verse it seems the more plain reading would be that women are not to teach and they are also not to have authority over men. More importantly, the verses immediately prior and following strongly point in this same direction. Prior to 1 Tim 2:12 Paul is saying women are to be silent and in subjection/submission. After the verse he offers two reasons women are not allowed to teach or have authority over men. The first reason is that Adam was created first; this explains why Adam is the leader and not Eve, and why women are not to have authority over men. The second reason offered is that Eve was the one who was deceived, not Adam; this explains why women are not to teach. If the reason women aren’t to teach is that they are more easily deceived, there is no reason to believe it is less dangerous to have women teaching women than having women teaching men. Indeed, it would only be more dangerous to have the easily deceived teaching the easily deceived.

In search of the source of the argument.

But it could be that there is a better argument than the one I’m assuming, so I went to the 1991 book edited by Drs. John Piper and Wayne Grudem of the CBMW: Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism. The link is to a PDF file on the CBMW site, so I urge you to check it out and make sure I haven’t missed something. Alternately, for those who want the short version, you can skip to the summary and conclusion at the bottom of this post.
In Chapter 2 Grudem and Piper offer a sort of FAQ, and question 28 on page 66 touches on the topic. They explain that contrary to the historical reading of 1 Timothy 2:14, they don’t think Paul was saying Eve was more easily deceived. They instead have a new theory that they are “attracted to”. In this new theory, Paul is merely reiterating again to the creation order, reiterating what he just said in 1 Timothy 2:13:

28. Do you think women are more gullible than men?

First Timothy 2:14 says, “Adam was not the one deceived; it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner.” Paul gives this as one of the reasons why he does not permit women “to teach or have authority over a man.” Historically this has usually been taken to mean that women are more gullible or deceivable than men and therefore less fit for the doctrinal oversight of the church. This may be true (see question 29). However, we are attracted to another understanding of Paul’s argument. We think that Satan’s main target was not Eve’s peculiar gullibility (if she had one), but rather Adam’s headship as the one ordained by God to be responsible for the life of the garden. Satan’s subtlety is that he knew the created order God had ordained for the good of the family, and he deliberately defied it by ignoring the man and taking up his dealings with the woman. Satan put her in the position of spokesman, leader, and defender. At that moment both the man and the woman slipped from their innocence and let themselves be drawn into a pattern of relating that to this day has proved destructive.

If this is the proper understanding, then what Paul meant in 1 Timothy 2:14 was this: “Adam was not deceived (that is, Adam was not approached by the deceiver and did not carry on direct dealings with the deceiver), but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor (that is, she was the one who took up dealings with the deceiver and was led through her direct interaction with him into deception and transgression).”

In this case, the main point is not that the man is undeceivable or that the woman is more deceivable; the point is that when God’s order of leadership is repudiated it brings damage and ruin. Men and women are both more vulnerable to error and sin when they forsake the order that God has intended.

By their logic when Paul says “And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression” what he means is that Adam should have been the one who was deceived, but Eve took this honor from him. This is a very strange, I would argue tortured, reading of the verse. While they admit that this is not the traditional reading, their only argument in its favor is that they find it attractive. They don’t explain why they find it attractive, but it should be obvious why this new interpretation is attractive in our feminist age. But this points to another glaring flaw in their argument. If what they are saying is true, Paul was wording his message in a way that was extremely likely to be misunderstood in the ancient world. As feminists like to remind us, when the Paul sent the letter to Timothy the culture wasn’t as “enlightened” as it is now regarding women. Clearly Paul would have expected contemporary readers to have understood him as saying women were more easily
deceived. This of course explains why this was the traditional reading. But why would Paul word his letter to Timothy in such a way that the “real meaning” wouldn’t be apparent until 2000 years later, following the women’s liberation movement?

All of this is at the core of the matter, because as I will show their assumption of what Paul meant here is the foundation of the CBMW view that women are permitted to preach to women. If you don’t accept their argument that Paul meant Adam was created first when he wrote Eve was the one who was deceived, you have to reject their conclusion that Paul was only forbidding women from teaching men.

Enter Dr. Douglass Moo

There is a full chapter in the book devoted to 1 Timothy 2:11-15 written by Dr. Douglass Moo: “What does it mean not to teach or have authority over men?” Dr. Moo breaks the verses down in great detail, and on page 181 he addresses the question of what kind of teaching this Scripture is talking about. He concludes that the kind of teaching Paul is referring to is preaching, as well as some Bible studies:

In light of these considerations, we argue that the teaching prohibited to women here includes what we would call preaching (note 2 Timothy 4:2: “Preach the word . . . with careful instruction” [teaching, didache]), and the teaching of Bible and doctrine in the church, in colleges, and in seminaries. Other activities-leading Bible studies, for instance-may be included, depending on how they are done. Still others—evangelistic witnessing, counseling, teaching subjects other than Bible or doctrine—are not, in our opinion, teaching in the sense Paul intends here.

This is exactly the type of teaching Kassian is doing, and it fits with my reading of the text; I wouldn’t read it as being in contradiction to the kind of teaching Paul urges women to do in Titus 2:3-5:

3 The aged women likewise, that they be in behaviour as becometh holiness, not false accusers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things; 4 That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, 5 To be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed.

There is an obvious difference between urging younger women to live as submissive wives and homemakers, and preaching or otherwise explaining the meaning of Scripture.

Next Moo tackles the core question; does this prohibit women from preaching to other women, or just prohibit them from preaching to men? Moo makes an astonishingly weak argument. All he argues is that you can read the verse either way, and then claims that Titus 2:3-4 indicates that Paul must have intended to allow women to preach to women:

C. Is Every Kind of Teaching Prohibited, Or Only Teaching of Men?

Is Paul prohibiting women from all teaching? We do not think so. The word man (andros), which is plainly the object of the verb have authority (authentein), should
be construed as the object of the verb teach also. **This construction is grammatically unobjectionable**, 16 and it alone suits the context, in which Paul bases the prohibitions of verse 12 on the created differences between men and women (verse 13). Indeed, as we have argued, this male/female differentiation pervades this passage and comes to direct expression in the word that immediately precedes verse 12, submission. **Paul’s position in the pastoral epistles is, then, consistent: he allows women to teach other women (Titus 2:3-4), 17 but prohibits them to teach men.**

His claim that this is required to make the verse consistent with Titus 2 doesn’t make sense, because he already stated that this is about preaching and teaching doctrine, not about urging other women to be good mothers and wives. This leaves us with the endnotes 16 and 17 (in red above), but here he merely reiterates the same uncompelling arguments:

16. Despite Payne’s objections (“Surrejoinder,” pp. 107-108), Acts 8:21 is a valid illustration of the point at issue: that two words, connected by oudé (“nor”), can both depend on an object that follows the second only. The nature of the relationship of the two words and the fact that the object takes the case demanded by the second word only is immaterial. On the latter point, see Herbert Weir Smyth, Greek Grammar (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920), who notes specifically that in such cases the object will take the case demanded by the nearer verb (p. 1634). Payne objects further that the word order with teach separated from man by six words militates against construing them together. But not only is Greek word order notoriously flexible in such areas, but Paul has probably thrust teach forward in the sentence for the sake of an emphatic contrast with learn in verse 11: “Let the women learn, but, as for teaching. . . . “

17. The purpose clause in Titus 2:4, “in order that they might train young women to love their husbands . . .,” shows that the “teaching” of verse 3 is restricted to teaching young women.

This ends Moo’s formal argument in the chapter on the specific question of women being allowed to preach to women. However, later in the chapter (P 185) he addresses some feminist arguments that the verses are specific to a small group of women in Ephesus who were teaching false doctrines, and don’t apply in general. In the course of arguing against this feminist position, Moo addresses the reading that Piper and Grudem explained had until our feminist age been the standard reading (emphasis mine):

If the issue, then, is deception, it may be that Paul wants to imply that all women are, like Eve, more susceptible to being deceived than are men, and that this is why they should not be teaching men! While this interpretation is not impossible, we think it unlikely. For one thing, there is nothing in the Genesis accounts or in Scripture elsewhere to suggest that Eve’s deception is representative of women in general. But second, and more important, this interpretation does not mesh with the context. Paul, as we have seen, is concerned to prohibit women from teaching men; the focus is on the role relationship of men and women. But a statement about the nature of women per se would move the discussion away from this central issue, and
it would have a serious and strange implication. **After all, does Paul care only that the women not teach men false doctrines? Does he not care that they not teach them to other women?** More likely, then, verse 14, in conjunction with verse 13, is intended to remind the women at Ephesus that Eve was deceived by the serpent in the Garden (Genesis 3:13) precisely in taking the initiative over the man whom God had given to be with her and to care for her.

It is strange that Moo only addresses this off hand as he does, since it is central to the question of whether Paul meant women should not preach at all, or women should not preach to men. By omitting this above, he failed to address what Piper and Grudem explain is the traditional reading. Moreover, his dismissal is even weaker than the rest of his assertions. He says that nowhere in Genesis or the NT is it implied that women are in general more easily deceived than men, but this isn’t true. Paul is after all stating this in the very verse in question! Moo offers his denial of this traditional reading as proof that it isn’t so. In addition, Paul warns of the same susceptibility for deception in 2 Tim 3:6-7. Moo’s second (circular) argument is that it can’t be that Paul is saying women are more easily deceived, because we already know that Paul wasn’t restricting women from preaching to women. How do we know Paul wasn’t prohibiting women from preaching to women? Because Paul was not saying women are more easily deceived. He is offering his conclusion as evidence for his argument.

However, note that Moo does agree with me on one point; if Paul really does mean in 1 Tim 2:14 that women are more susceptible to being deceived, this means that Paul is forbidding women from preaching to both men and women in 1 Tim 2:12.

**In Summary:**

1. Piper and Grudem acknowledge that the traditional reading of 1 Tim 2:14 is that women are more easily deceived.
2. Piper and Grudem offer no real argument against the traditional reading, but explain that they are “attracted to” a new more feminist friendly reading of the passage which assumes Paul was merely talking about creation order when he explained that Adam was not deceived but Eve was.
3. The expert Piper and Grudem selected to explain the CBMW reading of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 acknowledges that if the traditional reading of 1 Tim 2:14 is correct, Paul means to prohibit women from teaching both women and men in 1 Tim 2:12.

**Conclusion**

I can only conclude Piper, Grudem, and Moo don’t have a compelling argument for their modern interpretation of Scripture regarding women preaching to women. If they had a compelling argument, I can not see why they refused to share it in this book. What seems to have happened is somewhere along the line conservative Christians caved on this issue without ever really putting up a fight, and now everyone knows this is what the Scripture means without understanding just what they are buying into. Piper, Grudem, and the CBMW are at best moderates in the fight against Christian feminist rebellion, and when they ceded this ground there was no one left who was willing to point out the gaping holes in the feminist reinterpretation of this Scripture.
There is however another issue here aside from conservative Christians caving on the question of whether women are permitted to preach to women. Just as important is the question of what a lack of prohibition in this regard means. Conservative Christians haven’t just rolled over on whether having women to preach to women is prohibited; they have jumped far past that to the claim that women must preach to women. I will cover this second issue in future posts.
As I noted in my last post, complementarians have jumped from deciding that women are not forbidden to preach to women, to believing that women must be taught by other women. While the first change was accepted under very dubious arguments, the second change occurred with no real argument at all. Now complementarians not only believe that Paul didn’t prohibit women from preaching in 1 Tim 2:14, they also believe that it is borderline (if not outright) improper for a man to teach a woman Scripture.

Jen Wilkin makes this very common assertion at The Gospel Coalition (TGC) in Pastors Need Women Teachers (and Vice Versa). Why do pastors need women teachers? Among other reasons, because women in ministry have authority Pastors do not, and can not, have:

**She holds an authority you cannot hold.** A woman can tell other women to stop making idols of their careers or families in a way you can’t. A woman can address other women on vanity, pride, submission, and contentment in a way you can’t. She holds empathetic authority over her female students—the ability to say, “I understand the besetting sins and fears of womanhood, and I commend to you the sufficient counsel of Scripture.” She can lighten your load by confronting sins women might resent you addressing at all. She can say things like “PMS is not an excuse for homicide” and not get a single nasty e-mail the following day.

Wilkin is mixing multiple things here, combining Paul’s wisdom in Titus 2 with a claim that pastors lack authority over women. In the case of the latter, the existence of rebellion is offered as proof that men (and therefore pastors) lack authority to confront women in rebellion. Wilkin also offers the standard “diversity” argument, explaining that men are too testosterone laden to effectively teach women:

**She brings a perspective you cannot bring.** When men teach, they naturally draw on examples that resonate with men. This means women who exclusively hear male teaching will be offered a fair number of testosterone-laden illustrations from action movies and sports. And that’s fine. But a woman teacher might also speak the language of Jane Austen novels and HGTV. And she’ll probably draw a few different observations from the text than a man might. This is not to say she will feminize a text, but that she will likely emphasize those elements of the text that highlight the role of women in redemptive history, or that speak to sin issues women commonly face.

Wilkin is the new guard of feminist complementarians, and as such is constantly agitating for more women in leadership. She is however in the mainstream in challenging the idea of men having the authority and ability to preach to women, especially on the issue of women’s sins. The idea that it is somehow inappropriate for a man to preach to women is baked into the creation of separate ministries and Bible studies run by women, for women. It is similarly baked into the expectation that if a Pastor teaches or writes a book about biblical marriage he needs to bring his wife in to teach at the same time, or at the very least make her the
public face for women.

When Pastor Voddie Baucham preached on Ephesians 5, FamilyLife president and CBMW Board of Reference member Dennis Rainey noted that there was something very discomfiting about the idea of a man preaching to women about what the Bible says wives are to do:

**Dennis:** I’ve got a feeling it’s probably pretty quiet in some cars and, maybe, on some headsets, listening to this broadcast.

**Bob:** Let me just say that we still have Part Two to come. That is where Voddie is going to talk to men about loving their wives as Christ loves the church. This message has some balance to it, but—pretty strong stuff.

**Dennis:** It is strong stuff. As I was sitting there listening to Voddie give that message, I thought, “You know, this would be a tough message for a woman, in this culture, to hear, if it was given by a woman.

**Bob:** Yes.

**Dennis:** But hearing it from a man—it is interesting. I think for some women—that makes it tough to hear. I would just say to the wife or the young lady who is listening to that and says, “I don’t like that!”—you know what? He didn’t write it. He’s just trying to share with you what the Scriptures teach, in terms of how a marriage relationship between a husband and a wife—how they’re to complement each other and not compete with each other. There’s a lot about the Bible that causes the hair on the back of my neck to stand up.

**Bob:** [Laughing] You go, “I don’t like that part either!”

**Dennis:** As a man, absolutely! And yet, in this culture, Bob, I feel like we poisoned the stream about—I don’t know—four decades ago and really made it almost objectionable for a message like this to be preached by a pastor—by a man—to a mixed audience, at this point. I don’t want you to hear me apologizing that we did it—that’s not my point. I want to recognize that, in this culture, we understand that it does go against the grain of what a lot of women are taught.

When Mark Driscoll preached on 1 Peter 3:1-6, he was visibly uncomfortable with the idea of preaching to women. He was so uncomfortable with this that he took the unusual step of bringing his wife up to answer the questions after the sermon. He did this because:

…if I answered all of the women’s questions it would go really bad.

Similarly, when Acts 29 president Matt Chandler preaches on topics related to women, he prefaces his sermons with a self deprecating comment about how dangerous it is for a man to preach to women. In A Beautiful Design part 7: Woman’s Purpose Chandler opens with:

| A man teaching on the purpose of woman. What could go wrong? |
In part 8 *Woman’s Hurdles* he opens with:

| Well, a man talking about the sinfulness of women. Just not dangerous at all, is it? |

Under this new model contrary to *Eph 5:26* and *1 Cor 14:35* husbands are no longer to instruct their wives on Scripture, especially relating to submission. Mary Kassian explains this in *7 Misconceptions about Submission*:

| A husband does not have the right to demand or extract submission from his wife. Submission is HER choice—her responsibility... it is NOT his right!! Not ever. She is to “submit herself”— deciding when and how to submit is her call. In a Christian marriage, the focus is never on rights, but on personal responsibility. It’s his responsibility to be affectionate. It’s her responsibility to be agreeable. The husband’s responsibility is to sacrificially love as Christ loved the Church—not to make his wife submit. |

Kathy Keller explained the same thing at FamilyLife:

| If there are husbands out there that are saying, “Yes, I’m the head. This is good teaching. I like this head stuff.” It’s respectful submission between equals. Submission is something that a wife gives. It’s not something that a husband can demand. |

This new sex segregated model only goes in one direction. In both Kassian and Keller’s cases we have women teaching men (either directly or via their wives) what their proper role is; the instruction is to back off, you aren’t welcome teaching your wife. Likewise Jen Wilkin is teaching pastors how they should run their church. Moreover, both Kassian and Keller agree that wives should teach their husbands. Kathy Keller is famous for teaching that submission means throwing “godly tantrums” if a husband isn’t doing as his wife says. Kassian teaches wives to set clear boundaries for their husbands and enact consequences if he doesn’t follow them:

| No brain-dead doormats or spineless bowls of Jello here! Submission is neither mindless nor formulaic nor simplistic. Submitting to the Lord sometimes involves drawing clear boundaries and enacting consequences when a husband sins. |
Jen Wilkin explains that male pastors need women to preach to women because:

- She holds an authority you cannot hold.
- She brings a perspective you cannot bring.

I wrote about the authority question yesterday, but it is worth reiterating that she says this is especially the case whenever Scripture directly relates to the roles of women. If someone must preach to women on 1 Pet 3, Ephesians 5, or 1 Cor 7, by this logic it should be a woman and not a man.

But what does a woman’s perspective on Scripture look like? What kind of insight springs forth when there isn’t testosterone poisoning the process? We will start with Wilkin explaining 1 Peter 3:17. Wilkin claims that these verses are not general instruction to married Christians, but are specifically to Christian men and women with unbelieving spouses:

Peter’s comments to husbands are a subset of a discussion about how to live among unbelievers in a God-honoring way, urging submission to others as an expression of submission to God. Having just addressed how a believing wife ought to live with an unbelieving husband, Peter addresses believing husbands about how to live with an unbelieving wife, describing her as the “weaker vessel”.

This is obviously not the case, because the Apostle Peter tells us what he is saying to wives is timeless, and is based on what is beautiful to God:

3 Wives, likewise, be submissive to your own husbands, that even if some do not obey the word, they, without a word, may be won by the conduct of their wives, when they observe your chaste conduct accompanied by fear. Do not let your adornment be merely outward—arranging the hair, wearing gold, or putting on fine apparel—rather let it be the hidden person of the heart, with the incorruptible beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is very precious in the sight of God. For in this manner, in former times, the holy women who trusted in God also adorned themselves, being submissive to their own husbands, as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord, whose daughters you are if you do good and are not afraid with any terror.

There can be no dispute that Peter is instructing all wives in this passage. He includes the “even if” instruction to make it clear this also applies to wives with unbelieving husbands, not to exclude wives with believing ones. This is reinforced by Peter’s message that this command is timeless; this goes back to Sarah in Genesis, whose progeny God made the original covenant with. He also tells us a wife submitting to her husband is beautiful to God, and we know that God is the same yesterday, today, and forever.

Similarly, does God only want Christian husbands with unbelieving wives to dwell with them
in understanding?

7 Husbands, likewise, dwell with them with understanding, giving honor to the wife, as to the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life, that your prayers may not be hindered.

If anything, this verse is aimed more at husbands of believing wives, as unbelieving wives would not be “heirs of the grace of life”. But the verse starts with “likewise”, which ties in the previous verses to wives; Peter’s instruction to dwell with them with understanding applies to husbands with believing and unbelieving wives.

Next Wilkin claims that Peter’s instruction was specific to the times. Peter wasn’t telling them what was beautiful to God, he was merely advising Christian wives to take drastic measures to avoid being beaten or killed by their unbelieving husbands. Likewise, he was only urging Christian husbands not to beat or kill their unbelieving wives:

This is where historical context becomes our friend. At the time Peter writes, Roman law had begun to soften towards women. During the first century A.D., laws began to be passed giving women rights of property ownership and protection from domestic abuse, but for hundreds of years before this, the concept of the pater familias had reigned in the lawbooks and in the home.

The pater familias, or “family father” held sway in the home on all decisions regarding property and family. All property remained legally his until his death – should he live to be eighty, none of his adult sons could hold property. Moreover, he held the power of life and death (vitae necisque potestas) over every member of his family. Infants deemed too expensive to be raised could be left on the temple steps at his order, either to die from exposure or to be taken and raised as slaves. Adult children could be executed by fathers who believed them to be rebellious or deceitful. And most relevant to our discussion, wives whose husbands held the legal power to put them to death could hope for little protection from domestic violence.

So, the Rome to which Peter writes, much like the American South in the eighty years following Abolition, is a Rome in which new laws are on the books but practices remain much the same. Peter instructs wives on how to live carefully with an unbelieving husband who could cause them (or their children) physical harm for having converted to a new religion, and then he admonishes husbands of unbelieving wives not to deal harshly with them, even though the culture would allow it.

Note the game of heads I win, tails you lose when it comes to historical context and feminist interpretation. In this case wives were to submit in the ancient world because their husbands were brutes who would beat or kill them if they did not. Since husbands are (as a group) far less violent/dangerous now there is no longer any need for wives to submit. But the other claim from feminists is that wives cannot be expected to follow Peter’s instruction today because modern husbands are too brutal. It would be suicide to submit to a modern man; he would only beat and/or kill them if they did!
If you want more wisdom from Wilkin on 1 Peter, you are in luck. She wrote a book on the topic and published it under The Gospel Coalition.

But it isn’t just Wilkin bringing a unique feminine interpretation to the Bible. I’ve already covered Mary Kassian and Kathy Keller’s testosterone free interpretation of headship and submission, as well as Kassian’s exegesis of 2 Timothy 3:6-7. Several years ago I also shared Sheila Gregoire’s unique interpretation of Ephesians 5 in her signature book To Love, Honor, and Vacuum: When You Feel More Like a Maid Than a Wife and Mother:

Whether we like to be reminded of it or not, the Bible calls for wives to submit to their husbands (Eph 5:22).

... Many biblical commentators think that the meaning of “the husband is the head of the wife” in Ephesians 5:23 implies something similar to “source,” like the head of the river. The wife draws energy and support from her husband, and the husband finds part of his identity in supplying his wife with what she needs.

...take the opportunity to show him he’s needed at home, too. Often men feel superfluous at home, like they don’t even belong, because you manage everything. Make honest requests of him that allow him to help support you and feel involved in building your home.

... If you want your husband to take responsibility for certain chores on his own, without being asked, you need to find a delegation method that conveys to him what needs to be done without threatening him.

... My husband is motivated by lists. If I just tell him I would like him to help clean up after dinner, he doesn’t know what to do. But if there is a list of daily and weekly chores on the fridge, and he can see what is left to be done, he’s like a Tasmanian devil whirling around the house, cleaning.

Gregoire also has a testosterone free interpretation of 1 Cor 7:5, which she offers in What Does 1 Corinthians 7:5–Do Not Deprive Each Other–Really Mean? Gregoire is all over the map, but some of my favorite examples are:

And that’s my point of contention today: too often these verses are used as weapons, which makes sex into simply an obligation...

That is no fun.

...
If her husband’s body belongs to her, then she has the ability to also say, “I do not want you using your body sexually right now with me.”
Ye shall know them by their cartoonish chivalry.

by Dalrock | March 10, 2016 | Link

As complementarian women continue to push the feminist envelope, complementarian men are forced to ramp up their non-threatening imitation masculinity. Ladies, if you want your Christian feminist rebellion to come with a stamp of (sort of) tradition, you are going to have to snuggle up with this:

Pursuing Your Wife: Embracing a War-like Posture

Because dating and pursuing one’s wife is such an incredibly important issue, we are going to begin a multi-part series here at Manual encouraging you, urging you, and coming-off-the-top-rope-with-a-biblical-manhood-elbow-drop into you to challenge you to raise the bar in how you date and pursue your wife.

There is no close second, bro.
Lore Ferguson Wilbert explains The Problem With Our Complementarianism

Bit by the bug of second wave feminism in the 1960s and ‘70s, the term “complementarianism” seemed to offer conservative churches an answer. Here was a word that described how men and women were equal and distinct. Same value, different roles. Same intrinsic worth, different intrinsic expressions. It came across a simple answer to a complex equation—as almost all issues concerning the human heart are.

In the 35 years or so since then, liberal churches grew more liberal and the conservative—heaven help us. McQuinn uses the term androcentrism to describe the shift in neo-reformed environments in particular. It means being dominated by or emphasizing masculine interests or a masculine point of view. It wasn’t that the theology was all wrong, it was that the voices of church leaders were maddeningly male, through the male perspective, with male interests paramount, and evaluated by males.

Imagine with me for a moment a room of chimps all chimping about how to be a better room of chimps and pandas.

McQuinn is Wilbert’s pastor, and a fellow complementarian:

Gary McQuinn, named so many of the issues friends like Jen Wilkin, Wendy Alsup, Hannah Anderson, and others—all complementarians paying particular attention to women’s involvement and leadership—had been talking about for years.

These aren’t SJW outsiders wishing they could gain entry into complementarianism; they have already gained entry. The article is published by the Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary*. McQuinn is the head pastor of an Acts 29 church. Jen Wilkin is a minister for Acts 29 president Matt Chandler. She is also on staff at The Gospel Coalition (TGC). Wendy Alsup and Hannah Anderson also contribute to TGC, (but are not on staff).

Wilbert closes with:

A crowd of chimping chimps sounds ugly and a stampeding herd of mustangs is destructive. If your meeting rooms and lead teams are full of male voices, tread softly with that power. It leads nowhere good and nowhere healthy for the local church or the Church as a whole. Christ did a good thing when he called us all his bride, making plaid wearing, pipe smoking men squirm everywhere.

Squirm on, friends. It’s the squirm that leads to growth.

*H/T Anonymous Reader
Scott Adams speculates on how Trump might rhetorically disarm Hillary. He points out that the sexist card has already been tried and failed. When Hillary called Trump sexist, Trump fired back that she was (in Adams’ words) “an enabler for her husband’s womanizing”. This however still leaves room for Trump to take his own shot:

I wonder if we have seen all of the permutations of gender politics. I doubt we will see Clinton accuse Trump of being anti-male. That wouldn’t stick. But we haven’t seen Trump accuse Clinton of being anti-male. And that would stick like tar. He might be saving that one for later.

Remember that Linguistic Kill Shots such as low-energy, little Marco, and robotic generally have two characteristics that make them work:

1. The label must be a fresh one you have not seen in politics.
2. Voters must be reminded of the label every time they see or hear the subject.

Adams points out that Trump doesn’t need to actually call Hillary anti male in order to get this point across.

Trump could frame Clinton as anti-male without ever saying “anti-male.” The exact words matter less than the concept. But the words do need to be catchy in some way, so everyone wants to repeat them.

Adams calculates that perhaps half of women are anti male enough that such an accusation by Trump would only drive them closer to Hillary, but Trump doesn’t have a chance with such women either way. On the other hand, the remaining half would want to distance themselves from such an identity:

But the hypothetical half of women that do not have a grudge against men would run like the wind to avoid being labelled anti-male. It goes to identity. And identity is always the strongest level of persuasion. The only way to beat it is with dirty tricks or a stronger identity play.

Adams is right, although I think he underestimates how many women will want to distance themselves from such an identity. The reason they will want to avoid the identity is it is ugly, and women at a very deep level want to avoid being seen as ugly. When I started writing about how ugly feminism is, even the most hard boiled feminists fell over themselves to present themselves as loving, traditional homemakers. If I, a lowly beta, can have this effect on hard core feminists imagine what an alpha like Trump could do with ordinary women.

Certainly there are many ways Trump could approach this. The one word that jumped into my own mind when reading Adams’ post was scold. Trump would only need to mention the
term once, in his characteristic offhand way; hard core feminists and Hillary herself would suffer a complete (and unattractive) meltdown. When inevitably pressed on his use of such a non PC term, Trump could either double down or downplay it by switching his language to the word “lecture” without apologizing for using the world scold.

Who wants to hear Hillary lecture us in that scolding schoolmarmish tone of hers for four or eight years?

Not only are scolds ugly, but this charge is a perfect match for Hillary. In her continuing quest to be taken seriously, Hillary is constantly lecturing and scolding her own supporters. This is all the more painful because of Hillary’s huge likability deficit, something even her supporters acknowledge. This is a charge that once uttered would be impossible to eradicate from the discourse. Every time Hillary started into yet another schoolmarm lecture this would be in the back of everyone’s mind, including Hillary’s. Part of Hillary’s unlikability is her obvious distaste for the need to convince people to vote for her. She obviously dislikes campaigning. Being called a scold would make her even more resentful and self conscious, which would only make the label more fitting.

On a related note, Instapundit linked to a new Trump ad about Hillary:

As Instapundit commenter Wellspring put it:

It’s damned effective. It’s a sidelong attack on Hillary’s likability, but also a way of making her appear weak and unserious in the face of the serious dangers our country faces. Or, rather, highlighting the fact that she is weak and unserious.

It’s also a way to knock her off her game. And the beginning of his work to reunify the party after a brutal primary.

I’d rate this one 8/8 well played. I’m a Cruz supporter but in terms of raw political effectiveness, this is excellent work.

EconRob’s comment reinforced this:

HRC comes across as a phony. This is one of her few unscripted moments and it just got shoved up her... The ad will tend to make her more tentative. She already looks bad on TV — the teleprompter is not her friend and she cannot be natural.

Update:

- Related from Slate: Men With Platforms Have Thoughts on Hillary Clinton’s Face and Voice
- Linked from Drudge: Social Media Explodes Over Hillary’s ‘Excruciating’ Voice [VIDEO]
- Also on Drudge: US elections 2016: Hillary Clinton sparks sexism ‘shouting’ row
Does being scolded give him a thrill up his leg?

by Dalrock | March 17, 2016 | Link

I’m not the first to call Hillary a scold. Here is Chris Matthews doing it on MSNBC, although he means it as praise:

Is this something that a white woman presidential candidate can do that an African American president can’t do? I mean why didn’t Obama give this sterling point by point scold—you, you, you—Christie, Rick Perry, calling them out?

If Trump uses the term, he could wait a few days for the feminist outrage machine to get good and worked up and then point to that clip of Dem lackey Matthews using the same term to describe her style. Bonus points because the clip has Hillary doing her characteristic scolding voice.
Doing the job no American man would do.
by Dalrock | March 21, 2016 | Link

When it comes to women pushing their way into the US military, Complementarians adopt the same posture the left does with illegal aliens. Illegal aliens, we are told, aren’t forcing their way into our country and taking American jobs; they are merely undocumented workers forced to cross the border to do the jobs Americans won’t do. Likewise, Complementarians don’t see women clambering to dress up as men, they see women being forced to do what men are unwilling to do.

No doubt the CBMW will be dismayed to learn that men’s cowardly unwillingness to serve in the military goes all the way to the top. Last week we learned that President Obama was forced to select a woman to be the top general in defense of our homeland.

General Robinson would lead the United States Northern Command, which is based in Colorado Springs and was created after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks to coordinate the military’s response to domestic threats.

The CBMW often compares our current situation to Deborah in Judges 4 being forced to accompany Barak as he lead the troops in battle. If the CBMW is right about what is going on, none of the men in the US Military were willing to step up, leaving a reluctant General Lori Robinson no choice but to take command of the defense of our homeland.

In other recent news regarding women in the US military: All Marines Forced To Go Through Training To Erase ‘Unconscious Bias’ As Women Enter Combat Roles (H/T Instapundit).

The reason for the training is mostly because male Marines have by and large been totally opposed to allowing women into combat roles. A survey conducted in 2012 by the Center for Naval Analyses found two-thirds of males Marines disapproved of integrating women, and a third of female Marines also opposed the idea.
Sarah was a doormat by Complementarian standards, as are her daughters.

by Dalrock | March 22, 2016 | Link

At the core of Dr. Wayne Grudem’s theology of marriage is a table he frequently uses to describe the sins of husbands and wives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wayne Grudem on Sins of Husbands and Wives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Errors of passivity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Husband</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wife</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aside from the implicit claim that headship and submission shouldn’t be offensive to our feminist sensibilities, most of the table makes basic sense*. Yet one field stands out like a sore thumb; Grudem has created a new sin for women**, the feminist sin of being a doormat. Grudem explains this new sin in A Balanced Look at Roles:

There is an error of passivity on the wife’s part. Day after day, month after month, year after year in their marriage, “Yes dear, whatever you say . . . yes dear, whatever you say.” She doesn’t contribute at all to the decision making process. She has no preferences, no desires. She’s a doormat. That is an error as well. That’s not the biblical pattern.

In his book Countering the Claims of Evangelical Feminism: Biblical Responses to the Key Questions Grudem offers the same table and explains:

...when a wife chooses not to participate in family decisions, does not express her preferences or opinions, does not speak up when her children or husband are doing wrong, or does not object to her husbands physical or verbal abuse, then she is not being submissive, but instead is acting as a doormat, and out of line with the role God designed for her in the marriage relationship.

Note that abuse is thrown in as an always effective red herring. If you object to this newly manufactured sin, you therefore must be condoning abuse. Note also that Grudem’s doormat theology creates the formal structure for fellow CBMW member and Women’s Studies professor Mary Kassian to teach Christian wives to set and enforce boundaries for their husbands (emphasis mine).

No brain-dead doormats or spineless bowls of Jello here! Submission is neither mindless nor formulaic nor simplistic. Submitting to the Lord sometimes involves...
drawing clear boundaries and enacting consequences when a husband sins.

All of this should raise the obvious question: Why do Christian women in our feminist age need to be constantly warned not to be doormats, but women in the ancient world did not? Did women in the ancient world have more moxie than the women of our feminist age? Why are modern women at risk of committing this new kind of sin, a sin which the Bible fails to warn us of? Why must Grudem, Kassian, etc. constantly remind Christian women not to fall into the sin of being a doormat when Peter and Paul did not? Why does the New Testament repeatedly remind wives to submit to their husbands (Eph 5:22-24, 1 Pet 3:1&5, Col 3:18, Tit 2:5) without offering Grudem’s modern “balanced” warning not to be a doormat? Was the teaching of Peter and Paul really flawed, requiring complementarians like Grudem and Kassian to “fix” it two thousand years later?

*The devil however is in the details. What Grudem is describing as headship/submission is essentially egalitarian marriage with the husband as a figurehead with almost no authority.

**This same new sin is incorporated into the CBMW founding statement, but instead of using the term “doormat” the Danvers Statement uses the word servility.
Complementarian marriage: Egalitarian marriage with a veneer of headship.

by Dalrock | March 22, 2016 | Link

In order to understand complementarian marriage, you have to start by tossing out everything the Bible says about marriage roles and begin with a foundation of egalitarian marriage. Then add back a thin veneer of headship, focusing on headship *sounding* principles which are calculated to least offend modern feminist sensibilities.

I’ll start with the base 95% of complementarian marriage: egalitarian marriage. Dr. Wayne Grudem explains the base of complementarian marriage in *A Balanced Look at Roles* (emphasis mine):

…how does it work? How does it work in practice?”

In our own marriage, Margaret and I talk frequently and at length about many decisions. I can tell you that I wouldn’t be here tonight unless Margaret and I had talked about this and asked the Lord about it, and she had given blessing to it, and said, “Yes, I think that’s right.” Sometimes we make large decisions such as buying a house or a car, and sometimes they are small decisions like where we should go for a walk together. I *often defer to Margaret’s wishes, and she often defers to mine because we love each other.*

In almost every case, each of us has some wisdom and insight that the other does not have. Usually, we reach agreement on the decisions that we make. Very seldom will I do something that she doesn’t think is wise—l didn’t say never.

So far, this is pure egalitarianism, or if you prefer, “mutual submission”. Note the implication that love means they almost never disagree.

In *Countering the Claims of Evangelical Feminism: Biblical Responses to the Key Questions* Grudem explains that complementarian couples nearly always come to mutual agreement because God makes them one flesh:

The biblical ideal is that the husband is to be both loving and humble in his leadership. The wife is to be both joyful and intelligent in her submission. Practically, this means that they will frequently talk about many decisions, both large and small. This also means that both the husband and the wife will listen to the other’s unique wisdom and insight related to the decision. Often one will defer to the other in the decision; rarely will they differ greatly in the decision (for the Lord has made them “one flesh”).

Now that we have defined the base 95% of complementarian marriage (egalitarian marriage), we add in the remaining 5% of non threatening, non offensive headship. But since the word headship is itself too offensive to feminist sensibilities, many prefer the term
servant leader. Whatever you call it, this 5% is calculated to be as non threatening as possible while seeming something like headship, but it is not biblical headship. We can understand what this looks like by Grudem’s description of what is missing when it is absent. When husbands are “wimps”, what exactly is missing?

Opposite the errors of aggression are errors of passivity. They are equally wrong. When a husband abdicates his leadership responsibilities by not disciplining his children, not caring for the family’s physical or spiritual needs, or not defending his wife and children when verbally attacked by a friend or relative (these are just a few examples), then his acting as a wimp does not fit the role God designed for him in marriage.

When Grudem says a husband is being a wimp by being too passive, he doesn’t mean the husband isn’t leading his wife in any meaningful sense of the term. He means the husband isn’t doing a laundry list of things every wife is tempted to nag her husband into doing. None of these things are threatening or offensive to all but the most radical feminist woman. Even better, under this definition anything you want to manipulate husbands into doing can be framed as “leadership”, including dating/wooing their wife and telling her she is pretty.

There is another component to the veneer of headship complementarians place on top of egalitarian marriage, and that is responsibility. While complementarian decisions are made using the same process egalitarians use, the difference is the husband is responsible for every decision made using the egalitarian process. As Grudem explains in Countering:

But in every decision that involves both the husband and wife, whether large or small, and whether they agree or not, the responsibility to make the decision rests with the husband. Therefore, male headship makes a difference every day in the marriage relationship.

This is egalitarian marriage with a female friendly cherry on top. If your husband isn’t giving you your way, he must not really love you. But even when he gives you your way, he is always responsible for any bad outcomes. Only the most hard core feminist woman could find fault with such an arrangement.

Grudem makes the same point in Balanced:

But in every decision that we make that affects us together or affects our family, the responsibility to make the decision rests with me. If there is genuine male headship, I believe there is a quiet acknowledgement that the focus of the decision making process is the husband, not the wife. Even though there will often be much discussion and there should be mutual respect and consideration of each other, ultimately the responsibility to make the decision rests with the husband. And so, in our marriage the responsibility to make the decision rests with me.

In summary:

1. Nearly all decisions are made by coming to consensus. If husbands are making decisions their wives disagree with, someone isn’t loving the other well enough; to
understand who this *someone* might be, consider which spouse Scripture instructs to focus on *submitting*, and which spouse is to focus on *loving*. Alternately, perhaps they aren’t *really* married, since if they were *one flesh* this wouldn’t be happening. In a world of rampant divorce because wives don’t “feel loved” and/or decide they were tricked into marrying the wrong man, this is gasoline on the fire of rebellion and broken homes.

2. Husbands need to defer to the better judgment of their wives on a regular basis.

3. No matter who made the decision, and even though it must be made using the egalitarian process, the husband is responsible.

For comparison, consider a very typical description of egalitarian marriage from a woman who *started out as a complementarian*:

> We make all major decisions together. Since each of us starts out willing to yield to the other, any disagreements are usually resolved in favor of who the issue is more important to. But if we disagree, we have to talk and pray until we find consensus. He doesn’t have an “I make the final decision if we disagree” trump card.

> On the other hand, since back in our complementarian days, he never actually used this trump card, this makes no practical difference. We have always sought consensus. He has never wanted to override me.

The practical decision making process is the same in both models. The difference is the removal of the veneer of headship (emphasis mine):

> In short, our marriage has not changed all that much in its outward appearance. The difference is in our attitudes. **I can no longer coast along, letting the responsibility for everything rest on him.** I have to step up and take responsibility alongside him, shouldering with him the adult load. Any rules that we set for the household and children, we must both be fully willing to enforce. And once we got used to this, we both liked it much better.

Indeed. If you insist on having an egalitarian marriage in structure, it is far better not to *pretend* that it is traditional.
God will provide the Lamb.
by Dalrock | March 25, 2016 | Link

For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

- John 3:16 KJV

In Genesis 22 we learn of God’s test of Abraham:

And he said, Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of.

Since God had already promised to multiply Abraham’s seed through Isaac, Abraham expected God to resurrect his son after he sacrificed him. When Isaac noted that they had no lamb, Abraham assured his son that God would provide the lamb:

And Abraham took the wood of the burnt offering, and laid it upon Isaac his son; and he took the fire in his hand, and a knife; and they went both of them together.

And Isaac spake unto Abraham his father, and said, My father: and he said, Here am I, my son. And he said, Behold the fire and the wood: but where is the lamb for a burnt offering?

And Abraham said, My son, God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt offering: so they went both of them together.

Abraham knew that God would keep His promise, but he was wrong about how He would do so. Alternately, you could say that Abraham was right about the how, but not about whose Son God would resurrect. Either way, it was not God’s will that Abraham kill Isaac, and an angel of the Lord intervened just in time to stop Abraham. Instead, God provided a lamb snared by his horns in a thicket:

And Abraham lifted up his eyes, and looked, and behold behind him a ram caught in a thicket by his horns: and Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him up for a burnt offering in the stead of his son.

Many years later in Exodus the theme of fathers, sons, and the blood of a lamb would return with the original Passover. In Exodus 11 Moses tells the Pharaoh about the plague that is about to transpire:

So Moses said, “This is what the Lord says: ‘About midnight I will go throughout Egypt. Every firstborn son in Egypt will die, from the firstborn son of Pharaoh, who sits on the throne, to the firstborn son of the female slave, who is at her hand
mill, and all the firstborn of the cattle as well. \(^6\) There will be loud wailing throughout Egypt—worse than there has ever been or ever will be again. \(^7\) But among the Israelites not a dog will bark at any person or animal. \(^7\) Then you will know that the Lord makes a distinction between Egypt and Israel. \(^8\)

In Exodus 12 we learn how Israelite fathers are to spare their households from this plague with the blood of a male lamb without blemish:

3 Speak ye unto all the congregation of Israel, saying, In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb, according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for an house.

4 And if the household be too little for the lamb, let him and his neighbour next unto his house take it according to the number of the souls; every man according to his eating shall make your count for the lamb.

5 Your lamb shall be without blemish, a male of the first year...

7 And they shall take of the blood, and strike it on the two side posts and on the upper door post of the houses, wherein they shall eat it...

12 For I will pass through the land of Egypt this night, and will smite all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both man and beast; and against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgment: I am the Lord.

God kept His promise to the Israelites, and they were spared the plague of the firstborn due to the blood of the lambs.

Moving forward many years again and John the Baptist first sees Jesus. He immediately recognizes Jesus as the Lamb of God:

The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.

At the time of Jesus the Jewish people still slaughtered lambs in observance of Passover, with the male lambs slaughtered on the day of preparation. Indeed, the Lamb of God, Christ, was crucified on the day of preparation (John 19:31). Like Isaac in Genesis, Jesus carried the wood for his own sacrifice (John 19:17). Like the ram caught in the thicket, his head was surrounded by thorns (Mat. 27:29, Mark 15:17, John 19:2,5). And like the male lambs in Genesis and Exodus He was without blemish.

It is by the blood of this Lamb that we are saved, and this is why we celebrate Easter. May God bless each of your households.
Why am I so much better than other men?
by Dalrock | March 30, 2016 | Link

I already offered this as a comment at Instapundit, but since I don’t have a new real post to offer I thought I would put this up to at least allow for new discussion. Instapundit’s post is itself a link to Dr. Helen’s post, which is a rebuttal to the Michael* Walsh’s post: Why Are Millennial Men Such Wimps?

Walsh’s post is yet another “Why am I so much better than other men?” rant. It is a natural crowd pleaser, in that women love being told they deserve better men, and many men love the opportunity to pose alongside Walsh as troubled by their own magnificence in comparison to other men. It is therefore a sure bet to draw clicks and allow Walsh and his followers to bask in their own smugness.

What it fails to do however is:

1. Make Walsh and those posing with him more attractive to women. Groveling after all only makes men less attractive to women.
2. Offer any meaningful solution to our societal decay. To the extent that it has an impact, it will make things worse since one of the claims being made is that the more feminist/unfeminine a woman becomes, the more she deserves a strong man “who can handle her”.

Walsh quotes the female newscaster:

So whose fault is it? Is it our fault, ladies? Are we getting too strong? Nah, I don’t buy that. See, a real man knows how to handle a strong woman, so this isn’t our problem...

Please teach your sons to be men, because the women of the world are tired of the boys.

To which Walsh replies:

You go, girl!

*Michael Walsh should not be confused with Matt Walsh who also writes on the same theme.
Aborted morality.
by Dalrock | April 1, 2016 | Link

...[what a woman] wants trumps the non-existent desires of a mindless pre-person that is so small it can be removed in about two minutes during an outpatient procedure. Your cavities fight harder to stay in place.

— Amanda Marcotte

Trump created a mini scandal this week on the topic of abortion. He made the mistake of taking pro life advocates on their word that they considered abortion murder, and in an interview stated that if abortion is made illegal women who illegally abort their children should face some form of punishment. As CNN explains, this unified both the pro and anti abortion groups against Trump:

By suggesting that women who get an abortion should face punishment, Trump managed to unite advocates on both sides of the issue. Abortion opponents have pushed for punishment for doctors who perform abortions, but not women who receive them. That Trump struggled with this issue — a core holding of these advocates — underscored for some that he is new to the conservative fight...

After the interview Trump quickly backtracked his comment, explaining that women who abort their children are victims:

If Congress were to pass legislation making abortion illegal and the federal courts upheld this legislation, or any state were permitted to ban abortion under state and federal law, the doctor or any other person performing this illegal act upon a woman would be held legally responsible, not the woman. The woman is a victim in this case as is the life in her womb. My position has not changed – like Ronald Reagan, I am pro-life with exceptions.

Cruz issued a statement blasting Trump for not understanding the pro life position. He explained that women who abort their children should not be punished for doing so, but instead should be celebrated for their ability to give birth:

Once again Donald Trump has demonstrated that he hasn’t seriously thought through the issues, and he’ll say anything just to get attention. On the important issue of the sanctity of life, what’s far too often neglected is that being pro-life is not simply about the unborn child; it’s also about the mother — and creating a culture that respects her and embraces life. Of course we shouldn’t be talking about punishing women; we should affirm their dignity and the incredible gift they have to bring life into the world.

Both Trump’s second statement and Cruz’s statement above are in line with with the pro life movement, as CNSNews.com explains in Pro-Life Leaders Say Abortionists Should Be Punished, Not Their Women Victims.

www.TheRedArchive.com
Pro-life leaders were vociferous in their rejection of Donald Trump’s statement to MSNBC’s Chris Matthews that pro-lifers believe women should be punished for having an abortion, pointing out that their longstanding position is that women are also victims of abortionists as well as their unborn babies.

In this case even Matt Walsh finds himself in agreement with Trump’s second statement:

In other recent tweets Walsh compares the head of Planned Parenthood to Pol Pot, and refers to abortion as murder.

Trump’s blunder was believing that pro life activists mean these kinds of statements. If they really believed abortion was murder, a woman who put a hit out on her unborn child would merit punishment along with the rest of the murder-for-hire conspiracy. After all, she is entrusted by God to protect this child, and legally she is the only one who can decide to kill it. What Trump didn’t understand until after the interview is these kinds of cartoonish demonstrations are not to be taken seriously. This is what conservatives do, especially Christian conservatives.

It is worth noting here that the source of outrage against Trump’s original statement isn’t that he proposed something that was right morally but ill-advised politically. The pile on from the pro life leaders was a histrionic objection to Trump implying that a woman who kills her unborn child bears some culpability for the child’s death. The official pro life position states that women who have abortions are merely victims. While it is true that women are more easily deceived, this doesn’t absolve women of responsibility for their sins. Moreover, in this case it is the pro life leaders themselves who are assisting in the deception by telling women in advance that they are merely victims if they have an abortion. This is cruel to women, and the cruelty comes from cowardice of speaking the truth about women and sin.
They don’t know any better.

by Dalrock | April 2, 2016 | Link

Doug Wilson explains why the pro life movement objects to passing laws which would punish mothers who abort their children along with the abortionists who assist them in doing so. His claim is that women who get abortions don’t know that abortion involves killing an unborn child, but abortionists do:

We are dealing with millions of cases. It is the view of politically active pro-lifers that the penalties should fall on those who know what they are doing. Medically trained doctors know exactly what they are doing. The ghouls at Planned Parenthood know exactly what they have been selling.

And the view about the mothers, taken as a class, is that they have been fraudulently manipulated into a form of negligent manslaughter. That kind of problem is best answered with information — ultrasounds and more. This is why pro-lifers for decades have offered support, information, care, and medical services to mothers. The laws have been aimed at doctors who were after the blood money. And in the main, this has been a very effective and reasonable distinction.

However, Wilson acknowledges that there may be extreme cases where a woman actually knows that abortion means killing the unborn child. For example, if a woman is a doctor who performs abortions and also elects to abort her own child, this would be the sort of rare corner case where the mother aborting her child understands that this means killing the unborn child:

Now of course you will have some cases where the mothers know just as much as the abortionists do. Say that an abortionist gets pregnant herself, and then procures a late term abortion. It would make no sense to maintain that she was not guilty of anything because “motherhood.” But that kind of rare case is not what the political battle is over.

Keep in mind that this is not about punishing women who have had legal abortions. It is also not about settling for half a loaf. This is about what kind of laws the pro life movement would want if they had free rein. This is about what the pro life movement sees as just. The claim isn’t merely that the pro life movement has utterly failed to explain that abortion is morally wrong for the last 40+ years. The claim is that after abortion is outlawed, 99% of women would seek out illegal abortion providers without understanding that this is wrong.

Stipulating the absurd argument that mothers don’t understand what abortion does, this raises an obvious question; how is it that the pro life movement has for all of these decades failed to explain that a mother who kills her own child is doing something wrong? The obvious answer is the very nonsense we are witnessing. This makes the case for a law that punishes women (in some way) all the more essential. How else could we hope to signal that this is in fact wrong?
Wilson has promised more detail on the subject in the future, but unless he changes his position I can’t imagine a longer argument being less absurd.
It isn’t insincerity, but fear of losing women’s approval.

by Dalrock | April 4, 2016 | Link

Agnostic writes in *The Pro-Life Movement (TM): Just another branch of victimhood feminism*:

Certainly if you believe that abortion is murder, then the pregnant woman is at least an accessory to murder. Perhaps you wouldn’t punish the woman as much as the doctor, but to not only let her off scot-free, to righteously command everyone to look the other way about what she did, is sacrilege.

... But it’s The Current Year, and shaming people hurts their self-esteem and makes them feel excluded, so everyone who does something wrong is actually a victim of circumstances and only needs our compassion, not our attempt to guide their behavior in a better direction.

Christians are not even allowed to appeal to Jesus’ command to “Go and sin no more” — sinners aren’t really sinners, but victims of someone else’s plots. We’re supposed to feel sorry for the pure innocent victims, and try to foil the plots of the truly wicked. That is actually a far more primitive worldview, akin to one where all bad things are due to witchcraft, rather than our own inner sinful nature.

...its central claim, that “abortion is murder,” was flatly contradicted by their total pardon of the pregnant women who seek out abortion.

This assessment is hard to argue with, but Agnostic has the motivation wrong. It isn’t that the leaders of the pro life movement don’t sincerely believe that abortion is murder. This is I should note the obvious conclusion nearly everyone will draw when seeing the pro life outrage to the proposal that women be punished in some way for obtaining illegal abortions. It was in fact my own (initial) gut reaction to the outrage.

The correct explanation however is even uglier and harder to fathom. It isn’t that the pro life movement doesn’t believe that abortion is murder; it is that even when it comes to Christian women murdering their own unborn children the fear of calling out sin in women is simply too much to bear. As outrageous as this would seem, it fits with a well established pattern. Faced with the problem of women coveting men’s role as warriors, conservative Christians created a fantasy world where women have been forced to join the military because men refuse to fight (see here and here). This same fear drives a long list of similar contortions, from cartoonish chivalry and inventing the feminist sin of servility, to claiming women’s sins are actually virtues. A wife denying sex contrary to 1 Cor 7 is therefore presented as channeling God’s will through her vagina, and an unhinged wife is said to be submittting to her husband by throwing a “godly tantrum”.

This fear is pervasive, but it is shrouded in denial backed up by a common misconception that conservative Christians are fervent antifeminists. No one thinks to check to see if
conventional wisdom is true because Christian conservatives as woman hating meanies is too good to check. It is somewhat similar to the way everyone knows Malthus was predicting capitalism would lead to famine, even though he was actually writing about the dangers of the welfare state and the dreams of various leftist utopians. Neither the left nor the right want to confront, let alone process the fact that Malthus was not a Malthusian. This would require changing the way the pejorative Malthusian is applied, and neither side wants to go back and rework all of their arguments. So the misconception endures. Likewise, confronting the fact that conservative Christians are pandering to feminist Christian women would require a rework of the entire debate, and neither side has any motive to undertake such a massive task.

Yet the evidence of conservative Christian terror of upsetting women is all around us. Matt Walsh laughed off the claim that he was carrying feminist water when he argued that women who have abortions are only victims:

Matt Walsh
@MattWalshBlog

Right. Feminist. That's me. Nobody is loved more in feminist circles than me. Just ask them.

Draugluin's Wrath @DraugluinsWrath
@EllenElizabe @MattWalshBlog Because Walsh is a feminist. He doesn't believe women should be held accountable for their actions.

As nonchalant as Walsh pretends to be he knows very well that the women in his audience are in reality extremely feminist, and he fears them punishing him by withholding their approval:

...what disturbed me more than the inevitable Attack of the Trolls, were the literally hundreds of people who told me they agreed with the message, and thought it constructive and urgently necessary, yet I “lost them,” or they “stopped reading,” or they “changed their minds about me,” because of one three word sentence halfway through my rather lengthy post. Here is that decisive phrase: “I’m no feminist.” There goes the whole heartfelt and sincere piece about loving, protecting, and being loyal to women; apparently negated in the minds of many because I didn’t give myself the proper label.

As absurd as it seems, the leaders of the pro life movement really do believe that abortion is murder. They are just too afraid of being scolded by the women in their lives (and audience) to act as if they believe it is murder when a mother kills her own unborn child.
As promised, Pastor Doug Wilson revisits the question of whether women should ever be punished for having an abortion:

So the question is this. Should women who procure abortions be charged with anything? Should there be any penalty? Ever?

Wilson breaks this into two parts. The first part involves the foreseeable future, and for this Wilson maintains his previous answer; no, since even after a law has been passed making abortion illegal we can’t expect women to know better.

But he does allow for the possibility of holding women accountable a thousand years from now, assuming everything lines up just right:

But the second question concerns an ideal biblical republic, and involves the logic of the thing. If abortion is murder, then who is the murderer? And even if the murderer is the abortionist, on what grounds could we possibly say that the mother can never be complicit?

So say that all this postmillennialism stuff is true, and a thousand years from now we have believing magistrates, a faithful people in the main, biblical laws, and all those unfortunate people who were born with a critical spirit have no scope for their blogging talents. Everything in the civil realm is exactly as it ought to be. What would the case be then? Could there be any penalty then? The answer here is of course, but it is an of course that requires very careful exposition.
William Saletan has a devastating article at Slate arguing that the pro life movement can’t really believe abortion is murder. Saletan points to recent cases where women were sentenced to death or long prison terms for hiring hitmen to kill their adult children:

Hiring someone to kill your adult son or daughter is different from hiring a doctor to terminate your pregnancy. But you can also see familiar themes. Sometimes a woman seeks an abortion because she thinks the child would break up her relationship, destroy her marriage, or ruin her life. Sometimes she worries that the father won’t support the child financially and that without his help, she can’t afford to raise the baby. Sometimes she’s in a new relationship with a man who doesn’t want some other guy’s kid in the picture, so she gets rid of it. Pro-lifers often describe these situations as abortions for “convenience.”

Still, pro-lifers say the woman must not be punished.

He points out that all of the excuses pro lifers offer for women who abort their children are made by women who kill their adult children, but in those cases we hold women accountable anyway. He argues that the pro life movement treats abortion differently because they don’t really believe it is murder:

If pro-lifers shrink from this conclusion—if they continue to make excuses for women who procure abortions while rejecting the same excuses for women who procure the deaths of their born children—then there’s only one logical explanation: They don’t really believe abortion is morally equivalent to killing a person. They sense that something about abortion—the fetus’s limited development, or its location inside the woman’s body, or the moral seriousness of weighing parenthood before you’ve actually taken it on—mitigates the gravity of the deed and the culpability of the procurer.

In their rebukes of Trump, you can see signs that pro-lifers share his doubt. Officially, the National Right to Life Committee asserts, “The baby living in her mother is as distinct and unique a separate person/human being as I am from you. This human being, as we all do, has the unalienable right to life and deserves full protection under the law.” But in its reply to Trump, the NRLC stressed that it “has long opposed the imposition of penalties on the woman on whom an abortion is attempted or performed.” The woman on whom an abortion is attempted.

Apparently, the NRLC forgot that abortion, as an act of termination, is aimed at the supposedly distinct baby, not at the woman.

Kasich, Moore, and the Susan B. Anthony List committed the same slip, describing women, not their babies, as the victims who “receive” and “undergo” abortions.
Never mind that the woman pays to have the baby killed and leaves the clinic alive...

That’s how you talk when you know, somewhere in your brain, that abortion is a medical procedure, that the woman is the primary patient, and that the physical and moral relationship between her and her fetus is complicated.

Saletan’s conclusion is an obvious one. Even though this isn’t the real reason for the pro life movement’s bizarre inconsistency on the issue, most people will come to the same conclusion.

This will be as devastating for the pro life movement’s credibility as the recent series of sting videos on Planned Parenthood were to the pro abortion movement. It may ultimately end up being even more damaging. Women and men who are on the fence on abortion will see the pro life movement itself acting in contradiction to what they say they believe, and this fits perfectly with the argument that opposing abortion is really just about restricting the freedoms of women. Moreover, the pro life position that women who seek abortions are merely victims offers women a pre-made rationalization for what they already want to do. The Serpent couldn’t hatch a better plan to comfort women into believing that abortion isn’t that big a deal after all.
The fear of confronting sexual sin by women.

by Dalrock | April 7, 2016 | Link

This last week I’ve been writing about the fear of confronting sin by women in the form of abortion. But the fear of confronting sin by women is pervasive, and therefore twists nearly all modern teaching on women and sin. It doesn’t just show up with regard to abortion, it shows up with women’s discontentment in marriage, women envying and usurping men’s roles, wives denying sex, and wives usurping headship. And of course, it also twists modern teaching on women and sexual sin.

At Dr. John Piper’s Desiring God, Pastor Matt Chandler describes a traumatic experience where he tricked an unrepentant adulteress into attending church, only to have the pastor teach that sexual sin is ugly.

My freshman year of college I randomly sat next to a twenty six year old single mother...

Me and some of my crew would go over to her house and babysit her daughter. She was actually in an extramarital affair at the time with a married man, and so we would talk through that and the wisdom in that. This is the relationship we had, just kind of serving her and trying to explain to her spiritual things...

And so I said a good friend of mine is in a band, he is playing, why don’t you come hear him. And so she agreed, she thought it would be a concert. I knew better, it was shady, it was excellent.

The music was excellent, but during the sermon the pastor preached on the ugliness of fornication and adultery; this made the woman Chandler had tricked into attending uncomfortable.

Clearly this traumatic experience has impacted the way Pastor Chandler teaches about sexual immorality. When discussing sexual sin, Chandler is careful to frame women’s sin as caused by a man. Just like women are victims of the abortionist they pay to kill their unborn child, they are the victim of the men they seek out for illicit sex. In his sermon Women’s Purpose Chandler speaks to single mothers:

...maybe, God help you, you got involved with a boy who could shave, where you got caught up with a guy who looked like a man but ended up not being one, and now you have a child, God is going to enter that space and he’s going to be merciful and gracious. So don’t lose heart.

Notice that there is no repentance required because the fault for the woman’s sexual immorality lies with the man she had sex with. He either wasn’t good enough for her to marry, or refused to marry her after they had sex. This is the complementarian spin on women’s sacred path to marriage.
Similarly, in *Woman’s Hurdles* Chandler prays for the men women didn’t find good enough to marry, or who wouldn’t marry when the woman decided she had found the one who needed to commit to her:

Father, for men in this room who prey on insecure women with wounded hearts, Father, I just pray over these men a type of weight on their souls that would be crushing. Father, I thank you that you do not take lightly wolves hunting down your daughters and that there would be a day that these men, hollow-chested boys in grown up bodies will cry out as you come for mountains to fall and that the mountains will flee before your coming.

I thank you that you are a just judge who will not handle lightly boys who can shave who take advantage of your daughters. I pray that there might be repentance for these men for the salvation of their own soul. Enter these spaces. They’re complex and hard. I pray for my sisters. Help us.

Again, repentance for sexual immorality is only for the men, even though this is a sermon on women’s sins. In fact, if you do a word search in *Hurdles* for the word repent, you will find four instances of the word. On page 4 he tells men they need to repent if their wives feel the temptation of feminist resentment. On page 18 he tells women to repent if they have been trying too hard to be perfect wives and mothers. On page 19 he prays that God will soothe the women in the audience as they repent of their perfectionism. Finally, also on page 19 he tells men to repent for causing women to sin sexually (the quote above).

As just another example of this, Matt Schmucker writes* in *Sex and the Supremacy of Christ* (edited by John Piper and Justin Taylor):

We do not want a brother standing at the altar on his wedding day looking at his beautiful bride only to imagine behind her the boys and men who took advantage of her and robbed her of the trust and confidence that she now needs for her husband. We do not want a sister standing at the altar on her wedding day looking at her handsome groom only to imagine behind him a string of relationships with girls and women he failed to honor, and knowing that images in his head from pornography use and past flings may stick with him for a long time.

*HT Darwinian Armenian
The Daily Mail has a new article on the ten year anniversary of Eat Pray Love (EPL): Eat pray love (and walk out on your husband): It’s the bestseller that inspired a generation to transform their lives. But it left behind a trail of broken relationships

The focus of the article is on the “empowerment” the book and later movie lead to at the cost of broken families. But this is the text. If you look at the pictures the most striking aspect of the story is that all of these women are alone. None of them are pictured with their secret multimillionaire hunky handy man. One of the three women featured managed a short marriage to a retiree before he tragically caught a virus and died. The other two women weren’t actually married when they decided to EPL, and neither of them describes a current man in their life.

Then the article turns to the author of EPL, Elizabeth Gilbert. Unlike the three women who followed her EPL prescription Gilbert is remarried. But like the other women in the article, Gilbert is pictured alone. Why is that? The power of EPL is not that Gilbert managed to dump her loyal husband and travel to Europe and India. Being rewarded with cash and prizes for betraying your marriage vows is something the US and UK offers all wives. The power of EPL is that betraying her marriage vows not only made Gilbert more moral, it also allowed her to trade up to a better husband*. Gilbert appeared to have defied the odds and stuck the landing.

The obvious answer to Gilbert being pictured alone is that her remarriage was no more a trade up than her divorce made her more moral. In real life “Filipe” is 17 years older than Elizabeth, and appears to be shorter than her. Featuring 46 year old Elizabeth with the mid sixties “Filipe” doesn’t fit with the image of the story. The Daily Mail author doesn’t comment on the real Filipe, but she closes the article hinting at the disconnect between the EPL fantasy and reality:

Reading the book again I can’t help question whether Gilbert may have done as much harm as good for those following in her footsteps. There are of course inherent problems in trying to emulate someone’s else’s road to redemption, not least of all the inevitable disappointment when one discovers there aren’t enough Javier Bardems lurking at the end of the rainbow.

*The Kendrick brothers were shrewd enough to sell a similar story of divorce empowerment leading to a new round of courtship, a better husband, and spiritual rebirth in the Christian movie Fireproof.
He didn’t know it was her turn.

by Dalrock | April 15, 2016 | Link

We can get an idea of where feminists want to take converging domestic violence and rape laws from two recent articles about laws in Sweden*. Celia Farber at observer.com explains that a husband “nagging” his wife for sex is now considered rape:

> Sweden has both the most expansive rape laws (which extend all the way to marital bed nagging), as well as the highest number of reported rapes in the world.

This fits with the new concept of rape that feminists are advancing in the US, where the definition of consent now means desire. Even if a woman consents to sex, if she didn’t do it out of sexual desire feminists are calling this rape. Women who trade sex for food and lodging are under this new standard said to have been raped because they felt pressured to offer sex in order to continue receiving benefits from the man.

You can see a similar logic in the Daily Mail article Man is reported to police in Sweden for doing a ‘revenge fart’ after woman denied him sex. The Mail article explains that while the man and woman had “previously discussed having sex”, the woman told the man she didn’t want to have sex right then. This is what lead to the man’s act of criminal flatulence:

> This disappointed the man who farted – and left the flat, writes Hallandsposten. The was allegedly of such a nature that it ‘disturbed the woman’s piece of mind’.
> ‘It smelled very bad in my flat,’ she wrote in her report to police.

This new concept of rape is tied in to our new definition of sexual morality, which in itself is tied to our reordering the moral relationship between sex, romantic love, and marriage. It is also needed to facilitate maximum promiscuity by women by freeing them up to have sex with men they don’t know, men who aren’t invested in them. In order to remove women’s fear of doing risky, foolish, and immoral things, the laws must be changed so that men are perpetually in fear of being brought up on charges by women. Feminist Ezra Klein at Vox explains:

> “No Means No” has created a world where women are afraid. To work, “Yes Means Yes” needs to create a world where men are afraid.

While it is radical feminists who dream up laws like this, ultimately it will be conservatives who pass them. Conservatives have a profound blind spot when it comes to sin by women, and therefore will see laws feminists propose in order to encourage women’s promiscuity as a chance to punish the boorish cads and brutish oafs the promiscuous women are chasing. Then of course, women will finally be free to seek out the nice guy conservatives they have always desired.

*I don’t have any way to confirm the laws in Sweden or how they are applied. However, either way these articles give us an idea of where feminists hope to take them.
A funny thing happened on the way to the matriarchy.
by Dalrock | April 18, 2016 | Link

In The decline of America is not an accident Vox Day quotes Mallory Millet on a communist call and respond chant Millet participated in back in 1969:

“How do we destroy the family?” she came back.  
“How do we destroy the family?” they cried exuberantly.  
“And how do we destroy the American Patriarch?” she replied.  
“And how do we destroy the American Patriarch?”  
“By taking away his power!”  
“How do we do that?”  
“By destroying monogamy!” they shouted.  
“How can we destroy monogamy?”

Their answer left me dumbstruck, breathless, disbelieving my ears. Was I on planet earth? Who were these people?

“By promoting promiscuity, eroticism, prostitution and homosexuality!” they resounded.

What Millet’s co conspirators couldn’t have imagined back in 1969 was how eager Christian conservatives would be to assist them in their destruction of the family. Instead of fighting back, conservative Christians jumped on the anti father bandwagon with a zeal that even makes the liberal elite uncomfortable.

One way subversives have implemented their plan to destroy the patriarchal family is via entertainment. This is why we have so many secular movies and TV shows maligning husbands and fathers. Yet as I’ve pointed out before even secular feminist reviewers are astonished at how anti-father Christian movies are. The feminists at Dame were shocked at the anti-father message in Mom’s Night Out, and worried that this kind of message is destructive to our culture:

And that’s the biggest problem with Moms’ NightOut: The moral of the story isn’t that the women are supposed to stay home and not have fun, but that the men are totally hapless morons without them around—and that this lesson is still being drilled into our heads in 2014. We’re supposed to feel better about this “men are total idiots, the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world” philosophy (and that latter piece of wisdom was actually uttered in the movie in case you missed the point). But this story of the helpless manchild is a disservice to men—and families—everywhere.

Likewise, a reviewer at rogerebert.com was disturbed by the way the latest Kendrick brothers movie portrayed the Christian husband and father:

Since the Kendricks have mistaken one-dimensional caricatures for people who exist in the real world, they forgot to provide Tony with any redeeming qualities that would make us want to root for his marriage.
While secular reviewers point out the problem with the anti father bias in Christian movies, Christian reviewers praise secular movies for having the courage to undermine the patriarchy. CBMW president Owen Strachan didn’t just love the feminist message of the latest Star Wars movie, he also loved the anti-father message the movie included:

4. *Star Wars* continues to explore father-son dynamics with power and pathos. The core of these movies is the tangled relationship between fathers and sons, a remarkably old-fashioned theme in a gender-neutral world...

*TFA* mines this territory in a powerful, if brief, way by putting Han Solo face-to-face with his estranged son, Kylo Ren. Ren is simultaneously drawn to and enraged by his father. We are reminded palpably of the twisted and fascinating dynamics of Darth Vader and Luke Skywalker. Mark Hamill was no auteur of the cinema; his performance was reedy and shrill in many places. But he succeeded admirably in capturing the paradoxical disaffection and father-hunger of the abandoned child. This is where the true power of the original *Star Wars* movies was. Years later, reflecting on the Vader-Skywalker exchanges, one still feels deeply moved by them.

George Lucas takes many hits for his sometimes wooden directing and awful dialogue, but his films—and the *Star Wars* series—offer us vivid portrayals of the complex relationship between fathers and sons. This is a big part of why they are beloved. They give men a vocabulary for what they feel on both sides of the equation, father and son. Though, thankfully, most fathers and sons do not handle their issues with lightsabers in hand.
Clearing the Christian marriage market.

by Dalrock | April 22, 2016 | Link

Pastor Doug Wilson tackles the very real problem of delayed marriage in: 7 Reasons Young Men Should Marry Before Their 23rd Birthday.

We do have a pressing problem. According to The Atlantic, right now the average age for a first marriage is 27 for women, and 29 for men. In 1990, it was 23 for women and 26 for men. In 1960, it was 20 for women and 22 for men. This is a grease fire disaster.

Wilson accurately describes the problem delayed marriage creates with regard to temptation to sin:

1. There is no such thing as gift of singleness. That is not a Bible thing. Paul does teach that there is a gift of celibacy. “For I would that all men were even as I myself. But every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that” (1 Cor. 7:7).

For someone who is gifted with celibacy, marriage would constitute a distraction (1 Cor. 7:33). But for someone without that gift, the absence of marriage would be the distraction. Burning with passion does have a way of distracting.

If someone is single (who very much wants to be married), that condition is only a gift in the sense that every affliction is a gift.

Where Wilson goes terribly wrong however is in understanding the social changes which are driving delayed marriage. Wilson believes that men are driving the change, through a combination of a desire to sow their wild oats and excessive pickiness (emphasis mine):

An unmarried person should have high standards for their future spouse when it comes to Christian commitments, basic responsibility, compatible personalities, and sexual attractiveness. But this needs to be balanced against the temptation (which comes very easily to men) of not having any awareness of what league they are actually in. “For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith” (Rom. 12:3).

In a follow up post Wilson reiterates that the problem is Christian men being unwilling to marry the large number of unmarried Christian women who want nothing more than to be godly wives (emphasis mine):

3. I am a pastor, and this is a pressing pastoral problem. And I have talked to many other pastors who agree that it is a pressing pastoral problem. The nature of the pastoral problem is that of a large and growing population of unmarried
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women who would love to be married, and who would make good and godly wives. In the conservative church, it would not be unusual to find this cohort of women outnumbering the men in the same station of life by a factor of about 5 to 1. Some of this is caused by the church’s hostility to masculinity, resulting in men being made to feel unwelcome in the church, and some of it is caused by the men who remain being encouraged to perpetuate their teen years by a decade or so. Singleness is a gift, the teaching goes.

In short, Wilson has the problem exactly backwards. He overlooks the fact that women are very open about their desire to ride the carousel for as long as possible before marriage. He also clearly doesn’t understand the realities of the sexual marketplace (SMP) and marriage marketplace (MMP). Young women are the rockstars of the SMP, while young men are near the bottom. Since young women have the power, they set the terms. And what women want* is years, if not a decade or more, of sex with a small subset of the most attractive men before settling for a boring loyal dude. It makes no sense that men would prefer to marry just when their SMP stock is on the rise, and just when the SMP stock of their soon to be bride is rapidly declining.

Rollo has done an excellent job of mapping out the respective SMP power positions as men and women age, and of course dating sites like OK Cupid can easily see the same structure. We can also see women’s understanding of their changing SMP/MMP power with age reflected in the dramatic drop in divorce rates as the wife ages. The data is clear, but the problem is calling out women’s sins, including sexual sins, is difficult and extremely uncomfortable. For this reason modern Christians will continue to deny what young women are very open about, just as they deny women’s culpability when they have abortions.

*Obviously not all women choose to ride the carousel prior to seeking a husband, but Wilson is writing about the issue in general, and I am responding in that same frame.
The word which came to Jeremiah from the Lord, saying, 2 Arise, and go down to the potter’s house, and there I will cause thee to hear my words. 3 Then I went down to the potter’s house, and, behold, he wrought a work on the wheels. 4 And the vessel that he made of clay was marred in the hand of the potter: so he made it again another vessel, as seemed good to the potter to make it.

5 Then the word of the Lord came to me, saying, 6 O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold, as the clay is in the potter’s hand, so are ye in mine hand, O house of Israel.

— Jeremiah 18:1-6 KJV

In The Shared Essence Cane Caldo argues that the Pro-Life movement’s horror at the idea of punishing women who seek abortions stems from viewing women as divine:

Pro-Lifers, a multitude of whom are professed Christians, are hiding their belief that, on the issue of babies, women are like God. They believe that the child belongs to the mother as its creator, just as Christians believe we all belong to God as our creator. They believe that because women give birth, women—like God—have power over life. They believe that therefore we must not trespass on a mother’s power to kill their creations.

My theory of their belief is consistent with the Feminist belief that a woman’s body is her temple to herself, and whatever is within is hers to do with as she will...

[There is an] essence shared by both the Feminist and Pro-Life movements. That essence is the desire to worship women.

Cane expands on his observation that modern Christians are worshiping women in follow on posts The Shadows Cast by Goddess Idols and It’s Like an Amen.

While the Pro-Life movement’s terror of holding women accountable can be sufficiently explained in more simple terms, Cane is definitely on to something here (as is Zippy). The Pro-Life movement very openly acts as if women are on a higher spiritual and moral plane, and that men must not interfere with women’s ability to do what would be a crime if done by anyone else. When the Trump abortion scandal first came out, Ted Cruz explained that we shouldn’t concern ourselves with whether a particular woman chooses to kill a particular child or not, and should instead be in awe at the fact that as a woman she holds the power to bring life:

Of course we shouldn’t be talking about punishing women; we should affirm their dignity and the incredible gift they have to bring life into the world.
This kind of woman worship (or at least quasi-worship) is so common now that it goes by entirely unnoticed, and Cruz’s bizarre argument didn’t even cause a minor controversy. Of course we should focus on a woman’s power to bring life into the world and not trouble ourselves with details which are above our spiritual pay grade; does the pot question the pot-maker?

We see the same pattern in what I have termed wife worship, and the worship of women doesn’t just happen after the marriage ceremony. Recently Christianity Today caused an uproar over a classified ad* they ran for a father seeking a husband for his daughter. The controversy surrounded the father noting that his daughter was a virgin; but there was no controversy around the fact that the only stated requirement for the future son-in-law was that he recognize that he was unworthy of marrying such a goddess:

| Her: godly, gorgeous, athletic, educated, careered, humorous, travelled, bilingual, 26-year-old virgin. |
| You: unworthy, though becoming less so daily. |

You can see the same issue with the common terminology we use for Christian women. Christian women call themselves “daughters of the King”, as Mary Kassian does in her sermon on the true meaning of 2 Timothy 3:6-7:

| God doesn’t want His girls to be wimps. A daughter of the King is not wimpy and weak. |

Again, this is something that no one notices because it is normal. There is also a head-fake here, as this is not about setting Christian men and women aside from other men and women as God’s children; it is about setting Christian women aside as divine royalty. It is used to distinguish Christian women from Christian men.

*H/T Darwinian Arminian
Why doesn’t this 28 year old manboy want to become respectable?

by Dalrock | April 28, 2016 | Link

The Daily Mail has a new article about a 28 year old man who doesn’t want to grow up and start a family of his own. Instead, he chooses to live with his mother and go to grad school for a degree in experimental cinema.

This is the kind of case Traditional Conservatives regularly wring their hands over. Why are so many men refusing to man up? The answer is obvious, but not something most want to talk about, or even admit. In the West we have spent the last 50 years tearing down the position of husband and father, and now we are surprised that more and more men (on the margins) don’t aspire to become husbands and fathers.

The 28 year old momma’s boy isn’t named in the article, so I’ll call him “Giovanni”. Why doesn’t Giovanni want to strike out on his own? I don’t have stats for Italy, but my guess is women are delaying marriage there just as they are in the US; this greatly lowers the importance to young men of signaling provider status. Steady Eduardo isn’t sexy, but Giovanni the brooding experimental cinema grad student is another story. Part of the problem no doubt is he is being coddled, funded in his pursuit of worthless degrees. But part of the reason has to also be a (perhaps unconscious) desire to avoid the contempt Western culture reserves for husbands and fathers. The reason Giovanni’s is in the news is his divorced father was just ordered by the court to continue paying child support for his 28 year old son:

The middle-aged man was at a civil court in Modena, northern Italy to challenge a condition of his divorce settlement which stated he should pay for his grown-up child’s education.

But the judge said the young man’s course should be supported – despite the father’s claim that he ‘does not deserve any further financial support, having made no effort to find work to support himself.’

Your father is a chump Giovanni; let that be a lesson for you!

The Daily Mail frames this as strictly an issue of courts requiring “parents” to support their grown children. Technically this is true, as married parents have been ordered to continue supporting adult children as well. But this isn’t just about the legal requirement of parents, and especially fathers, to financially support adult children. While the obligations of husbands and fathers have expanded, the authority of husbands and fathers has evaporated.

More importantly, these legal changes are merely the formal codification of the changing social attitude towards husbands and fathers. It isn’t just Western courts that have contempt for husbands and fathers, it is the culture at large. This includes what we would call
conservative culture, including conservative Christian culture. The lack of respect is critical, because respect is an even greater motivator for men than sex is. We can fix this, as soon as we stop denying what we have done and repent of it. In the meantime we can continue wondering why Giovanni and countless others like him across the West don’t want to be just like dear old dad.

**Edit:** Welcome Instapundit readers.
The ultimate affront to cartoonish chivalry.

by Dalrock | April 29, 2016 | Link

It is bad enough that we force women to join and even lead our military in the real world, but this has gone too far:
There is a new push under way for women who divorce to be rewarded with even greater amounts of cash and prizes. Dr. Helen tackles this in Elizabeth Warren Wants Men to ‘Share the Pain’. It isn’t just Elizabeth Warren lobbying for an increase in cash and prizes; The Atlantic has a new article out titled The Divorce Gap, painting a picture of men frivolously divorcing and kicking their hapless wives out on the street:

…her husband told her to leave their house, and filed for a divorce she couldn’t afford. “He said he was tired of my medical issues, and unwilling to work on things,” she said, citing her severe rheumatoid arthritis and OCD, both of which she manages with medication. “He kicked me out of my own house, with no job and no home, and then my only recourse was to lawyer up. I’m paying them on credit.”

No doubt The Atlantic found this kind of one in a million case, but it is incredibly dishonest to pretend that this is how the family courts function. All they did was take reality and switch the sexes, and all to generate support for increasing the rewards to women who blow up their families. As every divorce lawyer knows, while there are very rare exceptions the system is designed to eject the husband from the home and replace him with an income stream for the wife. Likewise, both Christian and secular marriage counselors will tell you that it is women, not men, who struggle most with commitment. As Dr. Harley asks in Why Women Leave Men:

Why do women seem so dissatisfied with marriage? What do they want from their husbands? What bothers them so much about marriage that most are willing to risk their families’ future to escape it?

Elsewhere Dr Harley explains that 80% of divorces are initiated by women who become unhappy and divorce with little or no warning.

Even if you don’t talk to divorce lawyers or marriage counselors, and even if you don’t look into the academic research, everyone knows what the score is here. It is women, not men, who not only initiate the vast majority of divorces, but shamelessly fantasize about divorce as “empowerment”. As the very first comment on the Atlantic article notes:

The Atlantic understands the reality of who initiates divorce (and why) better than most, because they are in the entertainment business. If you want to keep the interest of your female audience, part of your offering needs to be stories of women frivolous divorcing so they can imagine doing the same. But this only applies to women; this is why there is no counterpart to Eat Pray Love or Fireproof for men, and why only women can make a living...
writing about the pain they caused by blowing up their families. A man fantasizing about destroying his family would be seen as disgusting, but for women this is not only normal and empowering, but good for business.

And again, The Atlantic knows this because this is the business they are in. When The Atlantic isn’t publishing articles like The Divorce Gap complaining that women don’t get enough cash and prizes for divorcing, they are publishing articles like Let’s Call the Whole Thing Off:

| The author is ending her marriage. Isn’t it time you did the same? |

To make sure their audience knows they aren’t advocating something so gauche as men abandoning their families, the accompanying image features a group of women escaping out of the windows of their homes. Since this isn’t a piece lobbying for more cash and prizes, The Atlantic can afford to be honest about not only the real initiators of divorce, but the real reason as well. The piece opens with:

| SADLY, AND TO my horror, I am divorcing. This was a 20-year partnership. My husband is a good man, though he did travel 20 weeks a year for work. I am a 47-year-old woman whose commitment to monogamy, at the very end, came unglued. |
Married Game in a picture.
by Dalrock | May 4, 2016 | Link

While I don’t think Scott and Mychael would call their blog Morally Contextualized Romance a “Game” blog, their banner image is the very picture of married Game. Click on the link above to see Scott with his shotgun in hand and his smiling woman over his shoulder (no, I don’t have that backwards).

While you are there, you might also check out some of their excellent posts, including:

1. Transcendent things and the long view
2. Why the word “coward” never works on women.
3. How do we politely challenge church leaders?

Related:  If it isn’t fun, you probably aren’t doing it right.
Don’t tell women no.
by Dalrock | May 6, 2016 | Link

Recently Zippy Catholic noted how shocking it was to see how vehemently the pro life movement opposes holding women accountable, or even discussing the idea of holding women accountable:

...just listening to the pro life rhetoric following the Trump gaffe - this was truly, genuinely shocking to me, and I am not easy to surprise - that most of the pro life movement just is pro choice when it comes to the woman who is choosing to abort herself. They may not agree with her choice and they may be against everyone who is facilitating it, but they are against legally punishing her for making it. Heck, they are against even talking about legally punishing her for making it.

I'm with Zippy on this. I'm hard to shock, and yet even I was shocked at the open insistence that women never be held accountable. The sentiment isn't unusual for modern Christians, but usually great care is taken to deny that this is really going on. Prior to the Trump abortion gaffe, the clearest example of this frame of mind was the absurd lengths Complementarians went to in order to pretend that the push to integrate all parts of our armed forces was driven not by envious rebellious women demanding equality, but by cowardly men insisting that women fight in their place.

But even the absurdity around women in the military is more open than usual. Normally modern Christians are much more diligent about covering their tracks. Normally it isn’t so much a conspiracy of commission, but one of omission. Occasionally we are given rationalizations for this pattern, as Jason Allen explains at the CBMW in 5 Key Ways to Cultivating Biblical Manhood in Your Church (emphasis mine):

...we must be clear about what men must do. Biblical complementarity is not fundamentally about what opportunities women must forgo, but what responsibilities men must take up.

At first glance this seems like a good statement. Men after all must lead. However, the way Christian men are failing the most in our era of open feminist rebellion is by refusing to call out that very rebellion. Allen wants men to lead, but the example he sets is to focus not on confronting the very open feminist rebellion, but on some mysterious and spontaneous change in men*. This is especially ironic because his article opens by citing the gloating book by feminist Hanna Rosin The End of Men.

Rosin has a point, and it is an alarming one. While we recognize the challenges such statistics indicate for a society, as Christians our primary concern is not the country or the culture—it is the home and the church. If the latter are healthy, the former will be healthier.

Many churches are bereft of male leadership, and many congregations exist in a settled fog over what biblical manhood should look like.
Biblical manhood is failing precisely because organizations like the CBMW make their living by carefully avoiding challenging the feminist rebellion in their midst, while holding themselves out as the example Christian men must follow. Men like Allen constantly bemoan the lack of good men, while the CBMW supports Women’s Studies professors Mary Kassian and Dorothy Patterson**.

More often though the omission isn’t even discussed. Instead, great care is taken to frame every issue in a way that won’t offend the feminist rebellion. At times this is taken to comical lengths, as is the case where Jeremy Young repents of his ugly feminism in: Ditch Your Delusions of Grandeur and Love Your Child

Down the hallway I stomped and there I stood in front of my kid on his porcelain throne. This must have been the thousandth time I needed to wipe his rear end. And frankly, I didn’t want to! I looked up to heaven, and threw my hands up and yelled (in my head and heart at least), “Surely God, I was made for something greater than this!”

This bit of unintended comedy reminds me of the joke about the drunk looking for his keys:

A policeman sees a drunk man searching for something under a streetlight and asks what the drunk has lost. He says he lost his keys and they both look under the streetlight together. After a few minutes the policeman asks if he is sure he lost them here, and the drunk replies, no, and that he lost them in the park. The policeman asks why he is searching here, and the drunk replies, “this is where the light is.”

Feminists, including Complementarian Feminists, are very open about their deep aversion to caring for their families in any way which is traditionally female. It is women, not men, who are seething with resentment at wiping butts. But women are in open rebellion while men are not, so it is far easier to call out men for women’s rebellion no matter how absurd the premise; it is also as pointless as looking for your keys where the light is good instead of where you lost them. Change the sexes and make the article relevant, and the CBMW would have a riot on its hands. At some level they know this, which is why so much care is taken to avoid calling out feminist rebellion and instead focus on the weak men who are screwing feminism up.

*Allen is a featured speaker at the CBMW 2016 Preconference, speaking on Complementarity and the Disappearance of Men.

**See Kassian and Patterson explaining how Christians got it all wrong until the feminists enlightened us in the 1960s.
...complementarity is not fundamentally about what opportunities women must forgo, but what responsibilities men must take up.

— Dr. Jason K. Allen, President of Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Don’t tell women no I quoted Dr. Jason Allen at the CBMW explaining that our problem today is a lack of male leadership:

Rosin has a point, and it is an alarming one. While we recognize the challenges such statistics indicate for a society, as Christians our primary concern is not the country or the culture—it is the home and the church. If the latter are healthy, the former will be healthier.

Many churches are bereft of male leadership, and many congregations exist in a settled fog over what biblical manhood should look like.

Back in March I highlighted the Midwestern Seminary article by Lore Ferguson Wilbert complaining in The Problem With Our Complementarianism that church leaders are “maddeningly male”:

In the 35 years or so since then, liberal churches grew more liberal and the conservative—heaven help us. McQuinn uses the term androcentrism to describe the shift in neo-reformed environments in particular. It means being dominated by or emphasizing masculine interests or a masculine point of view. It wasn’t that the theology was all wrong, it was that the voices of church leaders were maddeningly male, through the male perspective, with male interests paramount, and evaluated by males.

Imagine with me for a moment a room of chimps all chimping about how to be a better room of chimps and pandas.

However, until today I didn’t realize the full connection between the two:
While Dr. Allen is making his name as a complementarian complaining that the church lacks male voices because men (for some mysterious reason) aren’t stepping up and leading, the seminary he is president of is publishing feminist articles on how to improve complementarian churches by replacing male leaders with female leaders.

This is the same fantasy land template complementarians use when it comes to women in the military. They pretend that women aren’t really coveting and forcing their way into men’s roles; instead, they claim that men are forcing women to usurp men’s roles by being unwilling to lead (or fight). The real lack of leadership of course is complementarian men like Dr. Allen being unwilling to say no to rebellious women. Leading by example (saying no to women) is difficult and feels bad, while telling other men the problem is their fault is easy and feels heroic.

The connections between the CBMW and Midwestern don’t end with Dr. Allen. CBMW President Owen Strachan is a professor at the seminary:

> Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary President Jason Allen announced that Owen Strachan will join the institution’s faculty on July 1, as associate professor of Christian Theology and as director of a forthcoming center for theology and culture.

This also can’t be a case where the leadership simply isn’t aware of the feminists running amok lower down in their organization. President Strachan has clearly gotten the message Wilbert and her complementarian feminist allies are sending, and he is eager to assure them that he has heard them and the CBMW is working diligently to promote diversity and inclusion.

Strachan offers four reasons readers should attend the 2016 CBMW T4G pre-conference. Reason number one is that the conference features both men and women, and they will focus on the “absolute iron-clad” need for more women teaching in the church:

1. **You will see a group of men and women who stand on truth.** The speakers at the CBMW T4G pre-conference are not ashamed of God and his Word. They have staked their lives on it. It can be dispiriting to live in a day and age when the Word of God is reviled, but at our sessions, you’ll be encouraged, edified, and trained by gospel proclamation that touches on every aspect of our lives. You’ll hear about many things, including some that we’ve identified as areas that we need to develop further: singleness, the sexualization of human identity, the fatherhood of God, the absolute iron-clad necessity of training women teachers in the church (see Titus 21), and much more. We’ll cover the majors, in sum, but we’ll also cover less-discussed matters that we’ve heard people asking us to address.

Note the implicit claim that Titus 2 means that women must have formal teaching and
leadership roles, despite the fact that the Scripture referenced focuses on informal teaching while the women in the CBMW are not only preachers in all but name but they teach the opposite of what Titus 2 says women should teach. Once the CBMW founders convinced themselves that 1 Tim 2:11-15 doesn’t mean what Christians thought it meant for 2,000 years, the stage was set for women’s ministries to become mandatory; Strachan wants to assure the feminist complementarians that he heard them and is working to reduce the number of chimps chimping.

Reason #2 is standard boiler plate complementarianism, and reason #3 is SJW boiler plate:

2. You will hear a joyful celebration of God’s design...

3. You will see a diverse movement that stretches all over the world...

The fourth and final reason Strachan offers is (again) that the conference will feature women:

4. You will be blessed by the voices of numerous women...

However, the conference isn’t only about women. Dr. Allen will be giving a lecture about men titled:

- Complementarity and the Disappearance of Men
In 5 Key Ways to Cultivating Biblical Manhood in Your Church Dr. Allen writes:

Fifth, as preachers, we must intentionally enlist, equip, and empower men into leadership roles in our churches. Biblically, theologically, and logically, the indispensable ingredient to complementarianism is biblical manhood. One of the recurring arguments that undermines male leadership in the church is the absence of biblically-qualified male leaders. Let us determine to make the red herring, “What if there is no man to lead or preach?” an extinct species.

This is an interesting statement, because while he calls the argument a red herring, he doesn’t dispute it. In fact, his solution (training more men) suggests that the argument is in fact true*.

This leaves two possibilities. The first (and I believe most charitable) is my assertion from my last post that he is making a similar case regarding church leadership that complementarians make about the military; women are being forced to fill a leadership vacuum in the church because there aren’t enough qualified men willing to lead. This claim is of course absurd, but as I wrote I think this is the more charitable reading of his statement.

A less charitable interpretation would be to assume that he understands that the real problem is that women are in full rebellion and are using claims of men not being available to lead as a cynical smokescreen for their rebellion. This is less charitable because given his insistence that the answer to the problem is not to tell women no, this would mean that he knows what the real problem is but is too fearful to do what is right. The reason for his refusal to act against the rebellion could be fear of the wrath of the women who are rebelling, or fear of acknowledging a key lie underpinning complementarianism. It could also be a combination of fear of backlash from rebellious women and a fear of backlash from other complementarian men.

At any rate, what is without question is that Dr. Allen is focusing his attention on other men’s leadership failures (men who unlike him aren’t even in leadership) while allowing a very open rebellion from women in his own organization. The article his seminary published in January, The Problem With Our Complementarianism, is without question the most unabashedly feminist complementarian piece I have read to date; I was surprised to see a complementarian seminary publish something so overtly hostile to men in leadership. The article is indefensible, and that it not only was published but has not been retracted tells us a great deal about the status quo of his seminary. That this rebellion is going on unchecked in his own backyard is striking in and of itself, but it is all the more astounding given his very public complaints that there aren’t enough men in leadership.

*Labeling an argument a red herring only means that the argument isn’t relevant. In this case, he appears to be arguing that women really are feeling forced to take over leadership roles due to a lack of qualified men, yet the lack of qualified men doesn’t change the fact that
only men should hold those positions.
Why can’t he find men to marry the women he is teaching to have contempt for men?

by Dalrock | May 12, 2016 | Link

The “Friendly Atheist” at Patheos has a new post going viral titled Christian Pastor Says Men Who Play Video Games Are Losers Possessed by a “Retarded Spirit”

Pastor Gene Lingerfelt goes off on men who play Xbox, blaming “that retarded spirit” for why beautiful young women in the church can’t find dates.

The post links to a video which appears to have been deleted, but the post contains a still and excerpts from the original video.

And don’t even get me started on the Xbox. And all of that. If you have callouses on your thumbs, you’re a loser. If you’re more than 18 years old and you’re still jackin’ around with that stuff... [does “L” gesture].

I curse that spirit in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth.

There are young gals in this church. Beautiful, beautiful, beautiful young gals, and you know why they can’t get a date? ‘Cause that retarded spirit got onto young men.

This is all crowd pleasing stuff for modern Christians, and calling other men retarded and losers is how a pastor can set himself up as the only real man in the room. Very few conservative Christians would have objected to the parts of the video transcribed in the post, but the Friendly Atheist found it shocking.

I recently covered the social changes driving the delay in marriage, so I won’t rehash that here. Aside from the larger social changes I can offer another reason non retarded young Christian men might not be lining up to marry the women in Pastor Lingerfelt’s congregation; wise men don’t want to marry a rebellious woman. Not only are the women in Pastor Lingerfelt’s congregation receiving a constant barrage of feminist messages from the culture telling them they are better than men and encouraging them to to rebel against headship, they receive the same corrosive messages from Pastor Lingerfelt himself:

Some of you women, you have my permission — blame me. He come home — I’m talking about your husband come home, and that’s gone. And don’t just throw it in the trash — he’ll go fish it out — you gotta put in the bathtub full of water before you throw it in the trash. Now don’t do that while it’s plugged in... [Laughter]
Earlier this week Vox Day quoted from a recent Daily Mail article:

According to the Office of National Statistics, the number of ‘silver divorces’ has risen by three-quarters in the past 20 years, while the divorce rate among the rest of the population has fallen.

As well as fractured relationships and infidelity, the rise in late-life divorce is also fueled by women fed up with old-before-their-time husbands and a lack of excitement.

Few of these women anticipate that their silver divorce will cost them all the home comforts and financial security they once took for granted.

Dominik Lipnicki, a housing expert for Your Mortgage Decisions, believes this boom in divorce and the financial instability it can cause is a huge problem for older women.

There is quite a bit packed in this quote, especially since the Daily Mail is using their standard tactic of trolling their readers. In this case the trolling consists of whispering that it’s time for older married women to ditch their boring loyal dudes, while simultaneously framing late life divorcées as victims whose cash and prizes run out far too soon. What gets lost in the trolling however is the fact that the Mail and other papers are selling a great misconception; there simply is no “boom” in divorce as couples get older. It is true that divorce rates have been rising in the UK for women over 50*:
However, divorce rates for older age brackets are very small in comparison with younger brackets. In fact, divorce rates decrease dramatically as women age. Here is what it looks like in the US:

http://dalrock.wordpress.com/
Sources: http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/hh-fam/cps2009/tabA1-all.xls

The UK has a very similar pattern, with the exception of women under 25**. Here is a time series animation I put together using the latest ONS data going back thirty five years:
The great misconception you will find in all pieces on late life divorce is a sense that as a generation ages through or past middle age there is a time when their rate of divorce suddenly “booms” or “explodes”. This is the opposite of reality, but newspapers have a strong incentive to give the sense that “everyone is doing it” to both sell feminist divorce empowerment and to sell copy.

If you break the UK data down by cohort you can see that for the last thirty five years around age 27 a woman’s tendency to divorce starts falling and continues to fall; It falls so quickly as she ages that by the time she passes sixty her likelihood of divorcing in any given year drops to around 1.5 per 1,000. The chart below presents data for all four birth cohorts of Baby Boomers (B), along with two cohorts of Silents (S) before them and Gen Xers (X) after them. This tracks each cohort from their early twenties through their late 50s***:
To understand the data represented in the chart above, it might help to see it in table form. Also, keep in mind that the chart above actually understates the way that divorce risk reduces as women age because:

1. The older the age bracket we are looking at, the higher the proportion of second, third, etc marriages in the mix. Remarriages have far higher rates of divorce than first marriages, so this skews the data to make it look like late life divorce is higher (relatively) than it really is.
2. The curves only show data through the late 50s***, because after a woman turns 60 the ONS stops breaking divorce rates out in five year brackets. Divorce rates after 60 are so low (around 1.5 per 1,000 married women per year) that it doesn’t make sense to try to measure it separately for each over 60 bracket.

*The data is from the ONS page here. The most recent data file is for 2013 (tab 3b). Note that for 1981 the data isn’t broken out for the 50-54 and 55-59 age brackets, so I used the averages for the years immediately prior and after 1981 to fill in the gap.

**I won’t speculate on the reason US and UK divorce patterns are different for the under 25 age brackets since this is a post on late(r) life divorce.

***Except for the younger cohorts where there isn’t yet data for the older age brackets.
Is fear of women the beginning of wisdom?
by Dalrock | May 16, 2016 | Link

Christian Economist Dr. Robert P. Murphy explains in An Essay for Single Christian Men* that although what most call red pill** observations are on the whole accurate, knowledge of the truth is highly dangerous. While Dr. Murphy and I no doubt agree that learning from pickup artists carries the risk that a man will lose his fear of God and follow the pickup artist into sexual immorality, Murphy’s primary concern is that Christian men will damn themselves by losing their fear (or if you prefer reverence) of women:

The reason lonely young men end up delving into the ranks of the pickup artists—either from “professionals” or just in their own peer groups by hanging out with guys who are “good with girls”—is that they have eyes. They can see quite clearly that sending flowers to a crush does absolutely nothing while other guys are known as notorious cheaters and have girls randomly showing up at their apartments.

But since I’m directing this essay at you, a Christian, I can tell you frankly that these techniques and advice are literally FROM THE DEVIL. Yes, it is true that if you can actually train yourself to look at women (except your mom and sisters, of course) as less than human, so that you are no longer afraid of their opinion of you, then your long career of striking out will be over. You will go from being terrified of beautiful women to knowing how to spot the ones that are incredibly insecure, who spend hours getting ready because they think they need to in order to deserve attention from men. You will laugh at your old self, who somehow was intimidated by a half-naked 115 pound creature in heels. What was your problem?!

It is the pedestal, not sexual morality, that Murphy most fears will be lost if Christian men learn the truth about women’s sexual nature.

Murphy is far from alone in his pronounced reverence for women. Worshiping women is extremely common in modern Christianity, so much so that it isn’t seen as odd or noteworthy. Moreover, the modern Christian “improvement” on biblical marriage is the introduction of the wakeup call to make husbands fear their wives.

Fearing women, however, is not something that the Bible teaches. Christians are to fear God, and wives are to fear their husbands. As every Christian feminist’s favorite verse in Ephesians 5 explains, Christians in general are to submit to one another in fear (also translated as reverence) of God:

| 21 Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God.

A bit later, in Ephesians 5:33, Paul explains that a wife is to fear (also translated as reverence) her husband (ISV):
33 But each individual man among you must love his wife as he loves himself; and may the wife fear her husband.

Interestingly in some translations fear is used in verse 21 while reverence is used in verse 33***, as is the case with the King James version:

21 Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God.

...33 Nevertheless let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she reverence her husband.

Other times we see it the other way around as is the case with the International Standard Version:

21 and you will submit to one another out of reverence for the Messiah.

...33 But each individual man among you must love his wife as he loves himself; and may the wife fear her husband.

This is not to say that Christian wives are to worship their husbands as Christian men today so often worship women, but clearly there is a healthy reverence wives are instructed to have for their husbands in line with headship and submission. Yet again, we see that modern Christians have come up with a crossdressing theology by inverting the proper relationship between husband and wife****.

*H/T The Question.

**I prefer a different movie metaphor.

***The reason we see alternate translations (fear vs reverence) for both verses is that while the original Greek words for fear/reverence are not identical between the two verses, both words can be translated either way. The word used in Eph 5:21 is phobos (Strongs 5401). The word in Eph 5:33 is phobeó (Strongs 5399).

****Since the fear Dr. Murphy is afraid Christian men will lose is romantic/sexual in nature, and he isn’t proposing that the fear should be lost after marriage, this is very much about marriage.
She doesn’t need a man.
by Dalrock | May 17, 2016 | Link

Christ does not need us. He doesn’t need us to be happy. He doesn’t need us to be fulfilled...

In the same manner, when a fulfilled, self-sufficient woman marries a man, she doesn’t need her man.

–Pastor Wade Burleson

Feminism tells us women are to be strong and independent, and that it is a sin for a woman to need a man. After all:

A woman needs a man like a fish needs a bicycle.

But the Bible tells women to submit to and revere their husbands, and to turn to them for spiritual instruction. What is a Christian feminist to do?

The answer of course is to craft a biblical sounding argument that submitting to husbands is sin and women need to be strong and independent. Egalitarian Pastor Wade Burleson shows how this is done in The Beauty of Loving Your Husband without Needing Him:

Any religion on this earth that refuses to assist women to find their basic needs met in Jesus Christ, any religion that refrains from pointing women to the King of Kings and encourages them to revel in the riches of being “wed to Christ,” and any religion that somehow makes a woman think she needs her husband (spiritually, emotionally, or materially) is a religion that is not based on the infallible Scriptures or the truth of God’s Kingdom. On the other hand, those Christian women who have been set free from the bondage of believing that they need their husbands to meet their basic needs, and then simply love their husbands from the overflow of experientially resting in the love and provisions of Christ, will find a slice of heaven in their homes.

If a wife is contentious, we are told this is not a sign that she is overcome by a rebellious spirit, but that she is submitting too much to, and therefore expecting too much from, her husband:

Angry quarrels, scornful fights, and other efforts to control and manipulate your spouse arise from a desire to have your basic needs met by your mate rather than by your God. God never designed your husband to take His place in your life. Christ alone is your Source of real and lasting love, personal and abiding significance, and unqualified daily security.

A wife who leans on her husband is not being faithful to God:
A woman is to get her significance, security, and love from her union with Jesus Christ, and never a union with any man.

Each of these statements can technically be true. Wives are not to use their husbands as a substitute for God. However, in our feminist age the highest virtue is to not submit, and moreover the spirit of this common feminist argument is not a spirit of submitting to husbands as an act of obedience to God. It is a snare designed to make feminist rebellion seem holy, and biblical submission seem sinful. The insinuation is that sinful wives make their husband or their marriage an idol, and therefore submit to their husbands; godly wives don’t submit, and instead draw boundaries:

To say that a husband’s infidelity does not hurt a wife would be false. To say the wife does not need her husband to be faithful would be true. To say that a husband’s emotional and physical abuse does not hurt a wife would be false. To say that a wife does not need her husband to be kind, loving and gracious would be true. A married woman does not need to be married. She wants to remain married, but she doesn’t need to remain married.

Therefore, if your husband is unfaithful or abusive, confront your husband in love and draw a boundary. Tell your husband that you cannot control his actions, nor is it your desire to control him. Let him know that if he desires another woman, or if he feels the need to abuse you, then you will let him go. You can and will end the marriage because you do not need him.

In many marriages, wives will unintentionally enable their husbands to continue in their addictions or sin because they unintentionally substitute their husbands for Christ. When a wife cannot picture a future without her husband, she has made the picture (marriage) her idol, and lost perspective on the reality that her marriage is intended to represent (her union with Christ).

Pastor Burleson is overt in his egalitarianism, and is very open about his hostility to headship. However, you will see all of the same arguments used with more guile by those who wish to conceal their feminism. Back in January the Baptist Press interviewed Naghmeh Abedini, where she explained that she had to learn not to revere Saeed:

“For most of my marriage, I’d idolized Saeed, and through my fast I was made aware of that and the importance of putting God first, which seems to be Christianity 101 in action,” she said. “This last fast really had me focused on the Lord. It took his imprisonment for me to break that idol and focus on the Lord fully and to see issues that are so hidden.”

The Lord has taught her to forgive and love her husband, she said, while still establishing boundaries in the relationship.

“It was difficult because Saeed was the first person I ever dated, the love of my life, and he still is,” she told BP. “But [I’ve learned] that can’t override my relationship with God and my obedience to God. Obedience to my husband is very important, but
when it's biblical and when it's healthy.... I'm sure many, many Christians know that, but for me, it was a new lesson to learn.”

Note that like Pastor Burleson she ties this in with the Christian feminist virtue of a wife setting boundaries for her husband, something Naghmeh followed through on with the help of the family court. Naghmeh claims this is about trusting God, suggesting that her choice was to be obedient to and love God or to revere her husband. This is a false dilemma, as the Bible instructs wives to fear/revere their husband as an act of obedience and love to God.

If you look closely at the stories women write about supposedly making their husband an idol, it turns out what they really had done is make themselves an idol. They had elevated their own emotions over both God and their husbands. To the extent that they overcome this it is of course a very good thing, but if in the process they tell themselves or (even worse) other women that the key to happiness is to no longer revere their husbands, they are replacing one sin with another. The solution for an out of control wife is to stop pedestaling herself and her own desires, not to stop revering her husband.
After my last post I looked up the origin of the feminist fish/bicycle slogan, and it turns out it has its roots in a rejection of God:

I was paraphrasing from a phrase I read in a philosophical text I was reading for my Honours year in English Literature and Language in 1970. It was ‘A man needs God like a fish needs a bicycle’.
There was an altercation down in Houston over the weekend that was caught on video and ended up as a story at the Daily Mail:

Note that the woman spends the first minute of the video trying to get a fight started between the men, and the three men spend that time trying to avoid taking the bait. Eventually her persistence pays off, but much to her surprise she ends up getting punched by one of the men she worked so hard to antagonize.

*Let’s you and him fight* is an old game, as is *don’t hit me I’m a girl*, yet the Daily Mail can’t spot either game:

Suddenly the woman finds herself in the middle of three men and she gets hit in the face.

However, this could be the Mail trolling its readers by playing dumb. Two of their US based readers certainly could spot what was going on in the video. Bannie from Bakersfield commented:

Woman won’t let it go.

Carl Streator from Brooklyn captured it even better:

she turned into a woman so fast. incredible

Most striking is that the video was taken by a girl with her father, and the father didn’t see what was really going on. You can periodically hear him warning her in the background of the danger of getting too upset over incidents in traffic. He seems entirely oblivious to the sex dynamic that is in play. This is too bad, because it would have been an excellent opportunity to help his daughter understand a temptation she will have to resist, a temptation our culture at large is in denial of. Not only does the culture not warn women about this temptation, very often it rewards this kind of bad behavior by praising the woman for “having balls”.
What Prager and Wilcox are selling.
by Dalrock | May 25, 2016 | Link

Brad Wilcox of the Marriage Project made a video for Prager University that along with a rebuttal by MGTOW Turd Flinging Monkey has been getting a good deal of attention. Be a man. Get married.

From the title alone you should be able to guess what Prager and Wilcox are selling here. They are selling marriage and fatherhood as a rite of passage into manhood, and specifically a vehicle for men to attain respect.

Less obvious at first glance is what they are not selling. They are not encouraging marriage to promote sexual morality. Wilcox is the head of a secular academic organization, and Prager argues that no fault divorce is good for society and has improved marriage:

Most Americans believe that for the past generation, America has been in a moral decline. And whenever conservatives describe this decline, they include the high divorce rate, along with crime and out-of-wedlock births, as a prime example. I believe conservatives are wrong here...

...a truly bad marriage is akin to life imprisonment, and innocent people do not deserve such a punishment. Second, it only takes one person to divorce. Assuming that all divorced people sought their divorce is as untrue as it is unfair. Third, when there are no children involved, a divorce’s social costs to society are minimal and therefore unworthy of our attention. Furthermore, as a rule, it is far better for society to have people marry and divorce than never to marry. When people marry, they begin to grow up, and society needs grownups. Fourth, regarding children and divorce, the effects of divorce usually depend on what happens after a couple divorces.

This is important, because this view of marriage is really just a state certified version of boyfriend and girlfriend, where the only thing remotely resembling sexual morality is a loose ethic of one at a time. One at a time is a strategy to avoid sexual traffic jams, not anything morally meaningful, so it is understandable why neither Wilcox nor Prager want to stress morality as a benefit of marriage.
This leaves them with potential financial benefits of marriage, along with the status of husband and father, which from a marketing perspective boils down to respect. Wisely, Prager and Wilcox zero in on respect, and even when they are discussing financial benefits the implication is that married men, and especially married fathers, are respected. Respect is a primary motivator for men, more powerful than money and sex. This is why the series can sell responsibility and having to work much harder as a benefit:

![Image](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

This works because in a healthy society responsibility is accompanied by both authority and respect. Men understand this in their guts. The only problem with the implication is that as a society we are painstakingly careful not to offer either authority or respect to married men, especially married fathers. Husbands and fathers are at times respected and honored, but this is despite the best efforts of the law and our moral and cultural leaders. This is, incidentally, why this kind of promotional video is needed. To the extent that men are the ones avoiding marriage (which is to say only minimally), the problem is that young men are responding to reality and are less likely to believe that marriage is a path to respect.

In his rebuttal Turd Flinging Monkey points out the cruelty of the family courts, but it is important to remember that the family courts are merely the formal governmental expression of our societal attitude towards married fathers.

But while as a society we see husbands and fathers as at best fools and buffoons, and at worst evil and dangerous, there is still the hope by many men that they will be viewed differently. Either way, this is as I pointed out above the best benefit Wilcox and Prager have to sell, so it makes sense for them to carry on in this direction. The video explains that a man who marries is transformed from a bar crawling single man to a respectable family man and member of the local church. This is ironic because contempt for married fathers isn’t a purely secular phenomenon; in fact modern Christian culture takes contempt for married fathers so far that even secular observers are taken aback. While secular culture begrudgingly accepts Father’s Day as a day to honor fathers, modern Christians can’t abide the idea of a day to honor fathers and have transformed it into a day to tear down fathers.
The video makes the claim marriage is the *only* path to this new and respected status:

And a critical rite of passage:

It gives men a new, respected status in the world:

Why is it that marriage can turn a boy into a man when nothing else can? Marriage comes
with a woman to teach you how to be a man:

This is about as effective as a video promoting modern marriage can be, but it won't have the kind of impact its creators are hoping for. As Wilcox points out, the median age of marriage for men has gone from 23 to 29. If this were due to a movement by men to delay marriage, the video would be an effective response. However, the social change we are seeing around delayed marriage is being driven not by men, but by women. Most of the young men who will watch this video live in a world where very few women their age are interested in marriage, and they don’t see the men a few years older than themselves getting married. Signaling provider status is no longer an effective path to sexual success for young men, as most young women in our hookup culture far prefer exciting bad boys to boring loyal dudes. By the time the women in their generation tire of chasing after bad boys, many of the would be steady eddies have coasted through the better part of their 20s. The problem isn’t so much that young men don’t want to marry, but that once marriage is suddenly on the table many young men won’t have prepared for it as previous generations of men had.

This is a cultural problem that can’t be fixed by having young men watch a video, because the young men aren’t the ones driving the cultural change. Moreover, one lesson that men are slowly learning is the very lesson that Prager has been teaching; marriage doesn’t have any moral meaning. If this is true, and given the deliberate assault on the status of husbands and fathers, then Turd Flinging Monkey’s response is the most rational perspective. Of course it isn’t true, but acknowledging sexual morality would upset the feminist apple cart that conservative elites like Prager and Wilcox are so careful not to upset.
Misers are miserable.
by Dalrock | May 26, 2016 | Link

Perhaps the greatest disappointment for feminists is their failure to make men miserable by getting them to do traditionally female roles. Feminists didn’t understand that their misery came from their own miserly hearts, not from the act of caring for others. Not only has becoming more like men made women less happy, but even more maddening is the fact that men aren’t experiencing the misery feminists hoped to transfer along with women’s roles. Men in fact have the audacity to be downright cheerful when caring for others:

- Expectations also lie behind the curious finding that performing household chores makes men statistically less likely to become depressed but contributes to depression in women. Taking on housework seems to encourage men to judge themselves as generally likeable, fair-minded dudes, kindly reducing their wives’ load. On the other hand, taking on housework seems to make women feel exploited.

See the full article in the Guardian (Gains in women’s rights haven’t made women happier. Why is that?) for much more feminist gnashing of teeth, with the final conclusion that of course feminism makes women miserable, we never promised otherwise:

- Declining happiness among women may seem depressing. But who ever claimed an expanded consciousness brings satisfaction?
I haven’t done this before, but Opus’ comment on the 18th deserves recognition:

Somehow (and as at best a sceptic) I find it very hard to think that Christianity just happens to be a perfect fit for Feminism and that despite this no one these past two thousand years – that is until the last decade or two – even noticed.

This was in response to egalitarian pastor Wade Burleson, but it is equally applicable to pretty much all modern Christians, including the complementarians at TGC and CBMW. The only difference is that while egalitarians explain that headship and submission are vestiges of a barbaric patriarchal age (and therefore either no longer apply or never really had any meaning), complementarians explain that headship and submission are only offensive to our modern feminist sensibilities because we don’t understand what Peter and Paul were trying to get across. According to complementarians, if we only were able to shed our modern age’s barbaric patriarchal views and read the offending Scripture as the egalitarians of the ancient world understood them, we would realize that they don’t really contradict the feminist wisdom of our age.

Of the two, the egalitarian view is at least less internally contradictory.

See Also: Blinded by the times.
Fragile femininity and our masculinity crisis.

by Dalrock | May 31, 2016 | Link

Conservatives frequently complain about a masculinity crisis among younger generations of men, but while feminists probably are succeeding somewhat in their efforts to feminize young men, their primary success has been in making women less feminine (H/T Vox Day):

The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) is one of Sandra Bem’s most notable contributions to feminist psychology, measuring an individual’s identification with traditionally masculine and feminine qualities. In a cross-temporal meta-analysis of U.S. college students’ scores on the BSRI (34 samples, \(N = 8,027\)), we examined changes in ratings on the Bem masculinity (M) and femininity (F) scales since the early 1990s. Additional analyses used data collected in a previous meta-analysis (Twenge 1997) to document changes since the BSRI’s inception in 1974. Our results reveal that women’s femininity scores have decreased significantly \((d = −.26)\) between 1993 and 2012, whereas their masculinity remained stable.

Feminists cry crocodile tears over “fragile masculinity”, but it turns out that masculinity is surprisingly resilient. In their consuming envy of men, feminists have tried to eradicate the very idea of noble manhood. This is an assault on our collective imaginations, and spans everything from our military to entertainment. While men of my generation grew up with tales of a young man on a heroes’ quest in movies like Star Wars, feminists have succeeded in replacing Luke Skywalker with a woman. Where the masculine hero can’t be replaced outright, he must be otherwise neutered by a strong independent woman. I’ve recently shared examples of this with The Battle for Christmas Morning:

And the Ratchet and Clank movie:

This weekend Nickelodeon aired a three part series about two boys saving the day titled Lost in the West:

Best bros Chip and Dave saddle up for a whirlwind adventure when Chip’s latest invention accidentally transports them back in time to the Wild West! Not only will they have to save their hometown, they’ve also got to make it back to the present in time for the Homecoming Dance!

But because feminists are so completely consumed with envy, the hero’s quest must always be modified to soothe their fragile femininity.

Despite all of this being done entirely out in the open, our conservatives can’t bring themselves to see what is going on. When faced with a generation of hyper masculinized young women all they can see is “normal” women surrounded by weak men screwing
feminism up. Calling out the bad behavior of women is hard, so herculean efforts are made to pretend that feminists have not been wildly successful in transforming young women. This is why the men of the CBMW live in a fantasy world where men are forcing women to go into combat in their place, all the while cheering on the moxie of the latest female action hero. While feminists were crowing about their victory in turning Star Wars into a piece of feminist propaganda:

Finally we have our female Luke Skywalker – an orphaned scavenger girl alone on the desert of Jakku.

The president of the CBMW went to the same movie and not only didn’t notice the feminist propaganda, he found the feminist message inspiring:

The forest battle between Ren and Rey (Ren’s lightsaber was very cool)...

I liked how Rey showed steel as she discovered the power to use the force.

We are without a doubt in the grips of a masculinity crisis, but it isn’t in young men. Young men in fact have proven themselves remarkably resilient in the face of mass attempts to demoralize their manhood. The true masculinity crisis is with the older men who stand by while feminists wage war on the masculinity of young men, too afraid to stand up and protect the culture. Let us hope that the resilience today’s young men are showing remains with them as they grow older. If they keep this resilience, hopefully we will one day have a generation of middle age and older men with the courage to stand up to feminism and set an example of courageous masculinity for the young men who follow.
Vox Day has a post today about Forbes revising its net worth estimate for Elizabeth Holmes from $4.5 billion to zero. Yet from this article it is clear that Holmes has all of the attributes to be a kickass tech visionary:

- Lab coat? Check
- Ponytail? Check*
- Fanboys? Check

The only deficiency I can find is related to eye-wear. I can’t find a single image of her wearing either glasses or safety goggles. This is however a purely superficial issue, and given her other accomplishments (see bullets above) it is something I think the business press and venture capitalists should continue to overlook.

*I have given her credit for a ponytail even though no ponytail is verifiable in the photo. It is however possible that like the test results from her company’s signature invention, the ponytail assumption will have to be thrown out.
Elizabeth Holmes is part of a storied tradition of feminist pioneers who were willing to do what it takes to be like trailblazing men. Holmes of course has patterned herself after Steve Jobs:

Like Jobs, Holmes wears a daily “uniform” of a black suit with a black cotton turtleneck.

But long before Holmes proved that she could be a tech pioneer by donning a lab coat and pulling her hair back, Amelia Earhart proved that she could be an aviation pioneer with a different coat and hairstyle combination.

Earhart immersed herself in learning to fly. She read everything she could find on flying, and spent much of her time at the airfield. She cropped her hair short, in the style of other women aviators. Worried what the other, more experienced pilots might think of her, she even slept in her new leather jacket for three nights to give it a more “worn” look.

Some readers no doubt will think this is unfair to Earhart, as she was only dubbed “Lady Lindy” and “Queen of the Air”, thrown a ticker tape parade, and invited to the White House after her ground breaking 1928 transatlantic flight. It was this great achievement that she detailed in her bestselling 1928 book 20 Hours, 40 Min. The book was published by the same publisher as Lindberg’s We, and is still in print nearly 80 years later. Goodreads begins its description of the book with:

Amelia Earhart captured the hearth and imaginations of people around the world when she became the first woman to cross the Atlantic Ocean by airplane. This book, her personal account of the historic flight, sparkles with her high-spirited charm and adventurous determination.

But this flight that made Earhart an aviation pioneer was 100% image, 0% skill and accomplishment. Earhart was in fact a passenger on the flight that made her famous as the female counterpart to Charles Lindbergh. While Earhart was a licensed pilot, she wasn’t qualified to even assist with such a flight.

Since most of the flight was on “instruments” and Earhart had no training for this type of flying, she did not pilot the aircraft. When interviewed after landing, she said, “Stultz did all the flying—had to. I was just baggage, like a sack of potatoes.” She added, “…maybe someday I’ll try it alone.”

Have you come a long way, baby?

Four years later she did in fact try it alone. Fortunately for Earhart aircraft technology advanced greatly during the five years between Lindbergh’s transatlantic flight and her own
attempt. Lindbergh accomplished his 1927 solo flight in a single seat aircraft custom built to his specifications around a 223 hp Wright Whirlwind J-5C engine. Earhart was able to make her 1932 solo flight in a 500 hp 6 passenger airliner. To give herself a further advantage, Earhart decided to shave 30% off the distance by starting her flight to Paris from Harbour Grace Newfoundland instead of New York City. Even with these huge advantages, Earhart didn’t make it to Paris and landed instead in a farmer’s field in Northern Ireland. The farmer asked “Have you flown far?”, to which Earhart famously replied “From America”.

Earhart was a creation of powerful media forces and wealthy benefactors. She was chosen for her role as “Lady Lindy” by Amy Phipps Guest, the wealthy daughter of Henry Phipps, Jr. and wife of Frederick Guest. Guest hired the pilot, purchased the airplane, and secured the services of George Putnam, the publisher of Lindbergh’s autobiographical account of his aviation career. As Sylvia Branzei and Melissa Sweet explain in Rebel in a Dress, Earhart was selected for the role because she fit the desired image:

Amy Guest, wanted the “right sort of girl” and that girl had to be American. The project coordinators interviewed Amelia Earhart. She was attractive, bright, and confident. Also, Earhart looked like a female version of Charles Lindbergh, the first person to fly across the Atlantic Ocean. Amelia fit the bill.
The race to be first.
by Dalrock | June 6, 2016 | Link

This is the story of the brave men who were inspired by Charles Lindbergh’s 1927 transatlantic flight to attempt one of aviation’s greatest triumphs. In 1919 Alcock and Brown were the first to fly across the Atlantic, an amazing feat in an open cockpit WW1 bomber. Then in 1927 Lindbergh had proven that a man could fly from New York City to Paris.

But there remained a question that had dogged aviators from the very beginning; was it possible to fly across the Atlantic with a woman on the plane? Aviators knew from previous men of daring that it was indeed possible to fly an airplane with a woman on board. And of course they knew it was possible to fly across the Atlantic without a woman on board. Given these two facts, shouldn’t it be possible to fly across the Atlantic with a woman in the plane? In theory it seemed feasible, but few aviators of the day were willing to risk their lives on such a theory. No one knew for sure what would happen if a woman were on board over the middle of the Atlantic. Would she have an uncontrollable urge to redecorate the plane in mid flight, damaging the aerodynamics? Would she make so many sandwiches the plane became off balance? Few men were willing to face these risks.

But some men were willing to take the risk for the opportunity to be first. No one remembers the second man to fly from NYC to Paris, and no one would remember the second man to fly a woman across the Atlantic; it is only the man who is first who secures his place in history. Lindbergh’s amazing feat had set the stage for this next aviation breakthrough; the race was on.

George Halderman, October 11 1927

The first to try was flight instructor George Halderman. Halderman decided that a seaplane would be his best bet for such a risky crossing, but he also knew he would need to have a woman on board for the flight to have any meaning. Halderman decided this role would be filled by Ruth Elder, one of his students. In October 11, 1927 Halderman took off from Roosevelt Field with plenty of fuel and of course his essential cargo, Ruth Elder.

For days no one heard from Halderman. The time came and passed when he should have made it to land, but still no word came back. Spectators were left to wonder; had the existence of a woman on the plane caused the disaster they all feared? Soon they had the happy news that engine problems had caused Halderman to land the seaplane next to a Dutch freighter 350 miles off the Azores. The plane was lost, but Halderman and his cargo were retrieved safely aboard the freighter.

Wilmer Stultz, October 17 & 23 1927

Halderman hadn’t made it, but his flight did seem to prove that a woman would not explode once a plane reached the middle of the Atlantic, nor would she doom the flight via an uncontrollable urge to decorate or make sandwiches. Still, this left the nagging question; was there something about having a woman on board that would cause an aircraft’s engine to fail
over the Atlantic?

Wilmer Stultz was willing to bet his life that it was possible to fly a woman across the Atlantic. The machine he would use was a Sikorsky S-36 amphibian named Dawn. He carefully selected his cargo, Frances Grayson, and on October 17th 1927 took off from Roosevelt Field headed for Newfoundland to start the transatlantic flight. Unfortunately Stultz had to return due to fuel system problems. With the fuel problem fixed, Stults loaded Grayson back into his plane and tried again on October 23rd. However, he was again forced to turn back, this time due to engine problems. Stultz then decided that it was now too late in the season for another try.

Frank Koehler, December 23 1927

Frank Koehler saw his opportunity to cross the Atlantic with a woman on board once Stultz decided to hold off for the season. Knowing that Stultz had been turned back twice already in his attempt, he loaded Grayson onto the Dawn and took off for Newfoundland on December 23, 1927. Unfortunately, Koehler, Grayson, and the two others on the plane were never heard from again.

Wilmer Stultz, June 17 1928

Undeterred, Stultz decided to continue to try to prove that this could be done. Koehler and Grayson had gone down in the same plane Stultz had originally tried with, so Stultz now needed both another woman and another plane. In a stroke of luck, both problems seemed to be suddenly solved in the person of Amy Phipps Guest. Guest purchased a plane and indicated that she would be willing to be the cargo, but her family objected to such a wealthy woman taking the risk. Guest agreed to honor her family’s wishes if another, more suitable, cargo could be found. Famous publicist George Putnam was enlisted into the venture and quickly located a cargo which met the approval of Guest. Her name was Amelia Earhart, and she had the look and image Guest was looking for.

A lesser man would have turned back, but Stultz believed it was possible to fly a woman across the Atlantic, and he knew others would be trying. It would only be a matter of time before someone made it across the Atlantic with a woman on board, Stultz reasoned. With a new woman and plane secured, Stultz again tried what he and at least two other men had previously failed to accomplish. On June 17, 1928 Stultz and his copilot/mechanic Louis Gordon secured their cargo and took off from Newfoundland headed to Burry Port, Wales. This time man and machine performed flawlessly, and Stultz proved to the world that it was possible to fly a woman across the Atlantic!
Commenter PM observed that the feminist fiction spun around Amelia Earhart seems harmless enough:

Men are still doing most of jobs that keep civilization going. I don’t see that changing. A few women are being propped up with false accomplishments here and there but it doesn’t have much impact overall.

Most people male or female won’t invent something that changes the world or be the first to do anything. I think that Amelia Earheart’s “success” inspired a lot of women. My sister has her pilot’s license and it seems harmless enough. Doesn’t change the fact that most pilots are men.

This has been the reaction by men to feminist envy from the beginning. Pointing out the outrageous pettiness of feminists feels petty, and men would far prefer to be gracious by playing along with the fiction. Yet indulging envy only feeds the beast and fuels even more envy and discontent. Moreover, the farther along you follow this path, the harder it becomes to stop indulging it.

After Lindbergh’s amazing feat he was an instant hero. What he attempted was so astounding that before he even landed there were huge crowds gathered at the intended landing field outside Paris, waiting to see if this unknown airmail pilot from America could pull it off:

The airfield was not marked on his map and Lindbergh knew only that it was some seven miles northeast of the city. He initially mistook the airfield for some large industrial complex with bright lights spreading out in all directions. The lights were, in fact, the headlights of tens of thousands of cars all driven by eager spectators now caught in “the largest traffic jam in Parisian history.”

A crowd estimated at 150,000 spectators stormed the field, dragged Lindbergh out of the cockpit, and literally carried him around above their heads for “nearly half an hour”.

This was just the crowd that gathered to see if he could pull it off. Lindbergh had no radio on board so all the crowd knew was that he had taken off 33 hours prior and was intending to land at that airfield. After he landed he was an instant worldwide sensation.

The adulation and celebration of Lindbergh that emerged after the solo Atlantic flight were unprecedented. People were “behaving as though Lindbergh had walked on water, not flown over it.”

Within a year of his flight, a quarter of Americans (an estimated 30 million) personally saw Lindbergh and the Spirit of St. Louis.
For feminists the idea of a man receiving this much praise and attention was *unbearable*. All of the attention given to “Lucky Lindy” created a frantic search for a woman who could be named “Lady Lindy”. This was not a race to see which woman would be the first to prove her mettle, it was a race to *change the subject* and mark aviation as a feminine space. This is why all that mattered was that a woman ride in an airplane across the Atlantic, so long as she looked the part.

Earhart was actually fairly late in the game. In 1927 actress **Ruth Elder** set out to be “Lady Lindy”:

> [Elder] was a twenty-three year old, some-time actress when she heard of “Lucky Lindy’s” flight from New York, to Paris.

She made up her mind that she would be the first “Lady Lindy,” the first woman to fly across the Atlantic.

Elder wasn’t the only person to coin the term Lady Lindy before the “accomplishment” was even in progress. The man who interviewed Earhart for the part had the term in mind the day he met her:

> Railey claims to have been struck by a strong resemblance in Amelia’s appearance to Lindbergh and he immediately coined the sobriquet “Lady Lindy” in his mind.

A big part of the problem is that we don’t recognize envy in women because it seems so normal. If a *man* had set out to upstage Lindbergh by hiring someone to chauffeur him across the Atlantic (or anything else short of real achievement), he would be a laughingstock. But when we observe this same kind of pettiness from women we reflexively overlook it; pointing out pettiness in women *feels* petty.

Again, this was not about women setting out to create their own achievements, it was about extinguishing manly pride. The desire wasn’t to inspire little girls so that one day, if they worked hard enough, they too could have a man fly them in an airplane. This wasn’t about inspiring little girls, it was about *not inspiring* little boys. Feminists understand this in their guts, which is why feminists today still love Earhart’s *absurd book* about the time a man flew her across the ocean. Earhart’s ride was triumphant not because she accomplished anything, but because she helped change the subject away from Lindbergh.

This raises the question; what is the cost of extinguishing manly pride? What is the cost of downplaying the importance of manly virtues? At the individual incident level, the costs seem too small to be measurable; manly pride has turned out to be nearly as indefatigable as feminist envy has proven unquenchable. Indeed, our society is ordered on the assumption that men’s graciousness towards women is as inexhaustible as women’s envy of men. So far at least, this has been a winning bet.

But this isn’t just about one incident. Clearly the boys growing up in the 1930s were still inspired to work hard and take incredible risks despite the feminist parasite siphoning off as much recognition as possible; there was no shortage of men who were willing to storm the beaches of Normandy and Iwo Jima. As successful as feminists were at changing the subject,
they weren’t able to stop young boys and men from seeing Lindbergh honored for his achievements. And even if feminists had managed to entirely prevent the recognition of Lindbergh, there were still other role models to inspire young men. This is about a beast that wasn’t satiated with muting the celebration of Lindbergh’s success, a beast which grew more ravenous with each meal. This is about a relentless and ever more effective movement to stamp out all celebration of manly virtues over the last eight decades. Looking the other way when feminists were petty about Lindbergh’s achievement lead to looking the other way when feminists marked our armed forces as a feminine space and snuffed out or neutered the heroes quest.

We live in a bizarre age. We complain that young men lack manly virtues, while claiming that there is no cost to feminists’ envy driven need to denigrate manhood. If manly virtues are important to our society, then we must once again unashamedly celebrate men who display these virtues. We must call out this pettiness so that we can recognize courage, even though we find it uncomfortable.
What started out as a seemingly harmless fiction was merely the early stages of an all out jihad against manly pride. Eighty-eight years after we pretended that Earhart was like Lindbergh because a man flew her across the Atlantic, we now have to pretend that women are part of everything men do. When the blue collar beer brand Busch decided to use Joussaye Marie’s poem *The Honest Working Man* in a commercial, they had no choice but to include a woman as a working man too.

This doesn’t stand out because these are the new rules we live under. Of course we need to include women when we praise the honest working man. They have manly hearts too, don’t they? Yet if this were a commercial featuring Marie’s most famous poem *Only a Working Girl*, there would be no similarly absurd need to praise men as working girls.

Likewise, when Pep Boys runs a commercial, only Jack can still be a man. Manny and Moe must now be women:

Each of these individual incidents are in the big picture small, petty, things. Yet this pettiness is now institutionalized in our culture. All of this is part of the same petty impulse which leads to women needing to be in every role in our armed forces, including submarines, SEALs, and Delta. Women must be in every role or feminists will feel the intolerable burn of envy that somewhere, somehow, there is a man out there who is proud to be a man. Even worse, whenever men make horrific sacrifices for the nation, feminists will endure the unthinkable: gratitude towards men.

It is also the same petty impulse which has lead feminists to march men in high heels, and the attempt to make male Marines wear women’s caps.

With all of this, there are two things we can count on:

1. This envy will only grow stronger the more we feed it.
2. Men will always find ways to seek respect. As feminists shore up their blockade on manly pride for hard work, noble sacrifice, fatherhood, etc. men will find other avenues to pursue manly excellence. Feminists only hold sway over our legal and moral institutions, and this will drive men outside of these institutions. Our religious, secular, and legal institutions have been wildly successful at maligning the married father, but they can’t help but admire the tattooed biker who doesn’t care about their rules.
As feminists have run out of institutions to mark as feminine in their futile effort to abate their driving pangs of envy, they have more and more turned to marking men themselves as feminine. Part of this no doubt is the recognition that it is far easier to convince men to be like women than it is for a woman to convincingly pretend to be like a man. This is made simple because so many men are desperately searching for a socially acceptable concept of noble manhood, following feminists’ successful cultural jihad against the notion.

Chase Bank teaches us that heroic fatherhood means dressing in drag:

Dads can be heroes in many ways — and, according to JP Morgan Chase & Co., that could mean putting on makeup and a wig and donning a tutu to play the fairy princess at a birthday party...

Real Men Wear Pink*, a campaign from the Australian National Breast Cancer Foundation, teaches a similar message:

Heroes change the world, so we’re daring all real men to wear something so outrageous their friends will sponsor them heaps of cash.

The site is filled with pictures of men in pink tutus, feather boas, and onsies, and suggests that men dress up in “mankinis”.

As long as it’s safe and as embarrassing as possible, anything goes!

There is a common theme to all of these messages, and it is that if you are a real man who cares about women, you will gladly feminize yourself. The specific cause will vary, as it could be showing your daughter that you love her (the Chase commercial), driving awareness for violence against women (as with the soldiers marching in red high heels), or breast cancer research (in the US this is primarily men’s sporting teams wearing pink). But the solution to all of these is for men to prove their manhood and show they care about women byemasculating themselves.

Individually, as I’ve pointed out before, these are in the big picture petty things. But pettiness on a grand scale is entirely the point. If feminists can’t experience manly pride, they don’t want men to experience it either.

*H/T Spike.
When seconds counted, the police were only three hours away.

by Dalrock | June 13, 2016 | Link

This is off topic, but there is an aspect of the news reports regarding the terror attack on the gay nightclub in Florida which doesn’t add up. According to the available reports:

1. The terrorist called 911 and pledged allegiance to ISIS just before he began the attack.
2. At 2:02 AM the terrorist engaged in a firefight with an off duty police officer providing security for the club. Two more officers quickly showed up and joined the firefight.
3. The terrorist (re?)entered the club and started shooting. At first the patrons of the club didn’t understand what was happening; they thought the gunfire was part of the music.
4. Three hours later at or around 5:00 AM, the police breached the building and killed the terrorist.

Some time between when the shooting started at 2:02 AM and when the police finally entered the building around 5:00 AM, the terrorist shot 103 people (50 killed, 53 wounded). The news reports are calling this a hostage standoff, but the reports from people inside are that the shooting started right away. Based on the available reports, it appears that the police left an unknown number of shooting victims to bleed out for three hours before entering the building. Beyond that, one of two scenarios must have occurred:

- The police allowed the shooter to continue to shoot the club patrons unchallenged for three hours.
- There was a three hour pause in the shooting.

The first scenario is unimaginable. Given the fact that many people were calling for help on their cell phones, it would mean that the main function of the police was to prevent anyone from going in to protect the patrons while the terrorist shot 103 people.

But the second scenario doesn’t look much better. Given the fact that 103 people where shot, this would mean that the police either

1. Allowed dozens of wounded patrons to bleed out for three hours.
2. Were so slow in moving in once the shooting resumed (after three hours of preparation) that the shooter was able to shoot dozens of people before the police breached the building.

It is possible that the information we have is still incorrect, but so far it looks to me that whoever was in charge failed in a major way. My guess is that he or she became fixated on the idea that this was just another hostage scenario, and ignored all evidence that this was a terror attack for a full three hours. What baffles me however is that I don’t see anyone in the press or a blogger linked from Drudge or Instapundit raising these questions. Something
doesn’t make sense here, and I strongly suspect we are going to learn in the coming days that the police response was terribly botched.

**Update:** I now see that the LA Times is raising this same question. According to the Times, the local PD is referring the question to the FBI, who is referring the question back to the local PD.

**Update 2:** Another news piece is referencing this: ORLANDO MASS SHOOTING: Police veered from modern engagement tactic, expert says
Note: I have no training or expertise in police procedure, and this subject is off topic for this blog. However, after raising questions in a post the other day, I decided to follow up with the additional information I’ve been able to gather. I should also note that we still don’t have all of the information. While what we have looks bad (to me at least), it is possible that the Orlando PD is just doing a very poor job of getting the information out about what transpired.

Following my original post on the topic more detail has come out about how the terror attack was handled. However, there are still significant gaps in the explanation. According to the LA Times, the off duty officer working security at the bar engaged with the terrorist right away:

The shooting was reported at 2:02 a.m. Sunday when an off-duty Orlando police officer at the club initially confronted Mateen near an entrance and the two engaged in a gun battle, Mina said.

This is vague and it isn’t clear whether the original officer broke off the engagement or chose not to pursue the terrorist as he went (back?) into the club. It also isn’t clear when the terrorist shot over 100 people. Did he shoot them before the off duty officer engaged him, or after the officer engaged him but before additional officers arrived? The story is that after additional officers arrived they went into the club and engaged with the killer, and the killer retreated into one of the bathrooms of the club. At that point, Police Chief Mina says that “dozens and dozens of people” were rescued:

At that time we were able to save and rescue dozens and dozens of people and get them out of the club,

Again, this is vague, but reading in between the lines it sounds like it was a hasty effort to get as many people out of the building as possible before hurrying out. They must not have been able to do much of a check for wounded who were unable to either call out for help or walk out on their own power. It also seems that they didn’t sweep beyond a main area, because while the terrorist was holed up in one bathroom with a number of victims, the police left the bar without freeing 15-20 victims trapped in another bathroom.

Mateen holed up with four to five hostages in a bathroom, while 15 to 20 more people were trapped in another bathroom nearby, Mina said. That’s when police backed off.

“Based on statements made by the suspect about explosives and an explosive vest, we did retreat,” Mina said.

After the police left the building, this article states that the wounded inside would have to wait until some time after the building was breached (around 5 AM):

As people lay dying in the club, the shooting developed “into a hostage situation,”
Orlando Police Chief John Mina said.

Orlando Mayor Buddy Dyer said that initially, officers mistakenly thought the gunman had strapped explosives to some of his victims after a bomb robot sent back images of a battery part next to a body. That held paramedics up from entering the club until it was determined the part had fallen out of an exit sign or smoke detector, the mayor said.

The robot was sent in after SWAT team members used explosive charges and an armored vehicle to knock down a wall down in an effort to access the club.

While the original claim was that the police waited out of fear of causing harm to the hostages, the fear of harming the hostages (in the bathroom) doesn’t explain why the police left the bar entirely and didn’t immediately start assisting and (once possible) moving the most seriously wounded people out of the building. In fact, the reason specifically given for not remaining and helping the seriously wounded is fear of explosives. Based on the reported statements by the police department and the mayor, the reason for the roughly three hour delay in rendering aid to the victims they left in the club was not fear of causing harm to the victims, but fear of harm coming to the police and paramedics. Obviously this was a judgment call, and the safety of the first responders matters. But there is an evasiveness in the way the story has been told.

After roughly three hours of victims laying bleeding on the floor with the police and paramedics outside, it was finally deemed safe enough to go and render aid. CNN describes the scene:

When it was all over and the first of the responders made their way through the cavernous nightclub, feet gingerly stepping over the bloody bodies sprawled all around, they called out, “If you’re alive, raise your hand.”

Lastly, there is this bizarre statement from the commander of the SWAT team commending the bravery of his officers for only leaving the building (and not running farther away) after Mateen locked himself and some hostages in the bathroom:

My guess is that most if not all of the SWAT team members wanted very much to go in and take control of the building (except perhaps for the bathroom the terrorist was holed up in) so the paramedics could start caring for the seriously wounded inside. While the framing is bizarre, by making the subject the bravery of his individual officers he is able to deflect attention away from the leadership’s decision to play it safe and wait.
Shooting an AR 15 made him emotional, and then the internet was mean to him.

by Dalrock | June 16, 2016 | Link

Not quite back on topic but moving in that direction...

Yesterday Gersh Kuntzman with the New York Daily News wrote about his emotional reaction to firing an AR 15:

Squeeze lightly on the trigger and the resulting explosion of firepower is humbling and deafening (even with ear protection).

The recoil bruised my shoulder, which can happen if you don’t know what you’re doing. The brass shell casings disoriented me as they flew past my face. The smell of sulfur and destruction made me sick. The explosions — loud like a bomb — gave me a temporary form of PTSD. For at least an hour after firing the gun just a few times, I was anxious and irritable.

This display of journalistic pants wetting predictably lead to much fun being had at Kuntzman’s expense. Today Kuntzman came back for more, hilariously complaining about all of the emails he received calling him a girly man:

...the majority of email senders trained their laser sights on my masculinity — often in graphic terms that would sound more appropriate in a magazine about erectile dysfunction or an ad for Depends.

...Others sent me videos of 7-, 10- and 12-year old girls firing the same weapon I fired — except these kids were smiling.

For those who haven’t fired a semi automatic .223 rifle, I should point out that while the videos he received are no doubt examples of conservatives being enamored with girlpower, they aren’t feminist hyperbole. These rifles are in fact very polite to shoot, and a child can manage the recoil*. I first fired a .223 in grade school. It was my uncle’s varmint rifle, and I loved it because it was so easy to shoot. It had more kick than my Ruger 10/22, but was far more pleasant to shoot than any other rifle I had fired.

The funny thing is that after Kuntzman’s second piece I no longer think he made the whole thing up for propaganda effect. I now believe he was serious when he wrote that firing an AR 15 made him “irritable and jittery for hours”. While shooting a rifle made him weepy, getting made fun of on the internet made him too afraid to write articles about guns. Won’t some big strong man come and save him?

Besides, if masculinity is defined by the power to commit violence on a wide scale, I proudly choose femininity. At one time, “being a man” meant standing up for what you believe in — and against injustice. By that definition, we need more real men in
power taking on bullies like the NRA, which seeks to bolster the Second Amendment by shutting down opponents’ right to the First. We can’t even debate guns in this country, thanks to the gun lobby.

Hat Tip Instapundit.

*The right age to take a child shooting, and what kind of rifle they should first shoot are questions beyond the scope of this post. However, I’m sure opinions on this will be shared in the discussion.
Father’s Day doublethink.
by Dalrock | June 20, 2016 | Link

A few weeks before Father’s Day the Mirror picked up a post by married* mommyblogger Constance Hall: Mum’s heartfelt post reveals 7 ‘facts’ about single mothers which people keep getting wrong. Hall closes with:

7. They don’t want your husbands

They didn’t spend all this time getting rid of theirs and supporting their kids and working their arses off to have to wake up next to your farting, snoring, horny delight. He is all yours.

Hall is basing her argument on something the women reading understand from observing reality; single mothers (as a group) deliberately ejected the father of their children from the home. She then uses this well known fact to try to deny the risk that married women intuitively understand, that such women are on the prowl for a replacement man. The problem of course is not her assertion that single mothers (as a group) ejected the father from the home, but her claim that this indicates the woman is “done with men”. Such women aren’t done with men, they are merely in between steps on the path of serial monogamy.

But while everyone knows single motherhood is caused by mothers ejecting the father from the home, everyone also knows that broken homes are caused by fathers running out on their families. This brings us from the pre Father’s Day defense of single mothers at the Mirror to the Father’s Day Op Ed piece by Rich Cohen at the LA Times**:

With the adoption of no-fault laws, the U.S. divorce rate doubled between 1967 and 1985. In my junior high school years, every father and every mother were fighting in every kitchen. Every road trip was tense. Every kid was being raised by a single parent. No one could go out on Saturday because it was “my father’s weekend,” which meant an awkward stay with the old man and new girlfriend in an apartment downtown — apartments that always smelled like fresh paint.

...[Mick Jagger] personified that greater tide of coupling and uncoupling and begetting and going away. Mick was not my father — he was our father. He stood for all the wayward fathers, all those randy middle-aged men living in a crash pad on Grand Street; for all those who refused to behave like adults or function as parents.

Does Mick Jagger, who, as a great-grandfather, will be celebrated by three generations of descendants, deserve William Jackson Smart’s special day? What about all those other boomer dads who took off because they fell out of love? (“Hey man, it happens.”) How do you honor fathers who refused to behave like fathers? Do
they merit the gift cards, the neckties and spice racks made in shop class?

**See Also:** Fatherless Doublethink.

*Hall’s post is a simultaneous defense of destructive behavior and a subtle reminder to single mothers that as a married mother she outranks them.*

**H/T MrTeebs**
Two years ago Perrie Samotin at Stylecaster complained in Urban Outfitters Offends Again With Sexist Hillary Clinton ‘Nutcracker’:

The supposedly funny toy—a brilliant women with serious political ambition, ha ha—is rocking a pantsuit, and features packaging with some messaging like “Is America ready for this nutcracker?” while informing shoppers the gag gift has “stainless steel thighs” and that it “cracks the toughest nuts.”

Translation: Hillary is a ball-buster who emasculate men—a damaging message to send to the world about the person who may become the first female President of the United States, no?

Fast forward two years, and Hillary has made the pantsuit her campaign icon. Hillary has fully embraced the (visual) image of the ugly feminist. But Hillary’s ugly feminism runs much deeper, which is why the campaign is compelled to dress a man in a pantsuit tee.

Formally connecting Hillary the candidate with:

1. A visual reminder that feminist women are proud to be unattractive.
   and
2. The emasculation of men.

is of course not helpful for the campaign. This isn’t about winning voters, but about an ugly feminist compulsion. But what do I know? I’ve never walked a mile in her pantsuit.

Related: How to be a hero.
Giving us what we love.
by Dalrock | June 25, 2016 | Link

The Country duo Florida Georgia Line has a new worship song* out that raced to number 1 on the Billboard Country chart. The song is titled H.O.L.Y., and is dedicated to praising their savior:

You’re holy, holy, holy, holy
I’m high on loving you, high on loving you
You’re holy, holy, holy, holy
I’m high on loving you, high on loving you

You made the brightest days from the darkest nights
You’re the river bank where I was baptized
Cleansed from the demons
That were killing my freedom

However, the savior they are worshiping in the song is not God but their wives.

That such a song would have instant success should come as no surprise. It feeds ancient temptations in both women and men, temptations which our present age has magnified by declaring them virtues. Going all the way back to the fall, women have been tempted to be like God, and men have been tempted to follow woman instead of God.

Secular reviewers note that the song seems inappropriate in the way that it replaces God with a woman. The Rolling Stone writes:

...Tyler Hubbard kicked off the prayer about a woman so perfect she turns dark into light and reminds him of a baptism they’re together. The mix of Christian imagery and hooking up is most likely a little over-the-line for devoutly religious fans (“Let me lay you down, give it to ya / Get you singing babe, hallelujah”)

Saving Country Music writes:

...but don’t let anybody tell you this song is religious. If anything, it might be sacrilege.

However, I wasn’t able to find any Christian sources calling out the song. Perhaps I wasn’t using the right search terms, or perhaps the song hasn’t yet caught the attention of Christian leaders.

While I wouldn’t be surprised if Christian leaders eventually do denounce the song, it is worth noting that the song is drawing on themes deeply rooted in modern Christian teaching and culture. Worshipping wives is especially common in conservative Christian culture, and a wife’s sexual attraction and feelings of romantic love (or lack thereof) towards her husband are considered a direct signal from God regarding a man’s righteousness. Ultimately this kind of
theology, both in pop culture and from Christian teachers, is provided to us because it is what we love.

*H/T Robert
What causes all of the consternation about housework?

by Dalrock | June 26, 2016 | Link

This week Lori Alexander of Always Learning had a Facebook post go viral with a cacophony of feminist clucking. In the post Lori suggested that wives not focus on the amount of housework their husbands did, but instead:

...do your housework cheerfully, as unto the Lord. Remember, you didn’t marry your husband to help with the household chores. You married him to be your protector and provider. You also should have married him because you deeply loved him, wanted to be a great help meet to him...

This outstanding post predictably drove feminists mad, and the criticism from feminists lead Lori’s husband Ken to write his own post. Ken explained that godly husbands should do housework, but that if a husband is sinning in this way his wife should just do the housework cheerfully anyway. Lori’s focus was on the toxicity of feminist resentment. Ken agrees that wives should fight against the resentment, but also shifted the focus towards the sinful husbands he contends are (generally) the reason wives feel this resentment in the first place (emphasis mine):

The reason it struck such a viral cord is twofold: First because it did not fit with the progressive women’s agenda that a wife married to a husband unwilling to meet her expectations should just take the high road and love him anyway. Second, because this is one of the hottest sources of frustration for most wives in the modern world.

In the discussion Ken reiterated that he does not see the frustration as emanating from a feminist mindset, but as coming from husbands not helping their wives enough:

I am also not referencing the source of the feminist resentment, but the resentment felt by a wife who feels frazzled with a home, with a brood to manage, while feeling her husband is not helping her enough.

In the discussion Ken does leave open the possibility that an individual husband might not be sinning if his wife feels this resentment, but his general thrust in both the post and in the discussion is for the husband to do more of whatever work his wife identifies as the source of her resentment.

What Ken has misunderstood is the true source of the resentment. The resentment does not come from an excess of work or an unfair distribution of work, but envy of men. This is why women who haven’t overcome this envy will complain bitterly no matter how much better they have it than their husbands. He may be doing dirty, backbreaking, dangerous work, but he isn’t stuck being a woman like she is. It isn’t the work, but what the work represents to her. The problem is that the work reminds her that she is a woman.

This is why during the height of World War II Margaret Sanger understood that the women in
her audience would identify with a resentful wife who complained about being “trapped”
caring for a young child while her husband had the good fortune to be fighting in Europe.
Sanger knew that this would resonate with women, because the reality of the respective lots
of the man and woman are entirely irrelevant:

...now the wife.. who was really just a girl.. was feeling trapped and rebellious. She
loved her baby of course, and well she might, because he was a beautiful child,
but she was beginning to feel very bitter toward her husband because she said that
she could tell from his letters that he was actually enjoying the excitement of war! Already he had been to Iceland, England, Africa, and Italy! Oh, she was willing
to admit there were plenty of hardships connected with it... but what had she been
doing all this long while? Just staying home day after day minding the baby! “When
he gets home,” she told me, “he can just sit with the baby for a while and see what
it’s like. I’m going out and have some fun!”

I could see her point of view... what woman couldn’t? You don’t have to be a war
bride to feel trapped... many a house-wife gets that feeling just watching her
husband go off to the office every morning while she stays home facing the same
meals, dishes, and children. How many divorces have their beginnings in just this
very feeling of imprisoned futility?

What Sanger calls “imprisoned futility”, Betty Friedan called “The Problem That Has No
Name”. This is absolutely a feminist feeling, and was the battle cry that launched the modern
feminist movement.

In his post Ken describes a situation from their own marriage many years ago that echoes the
common pattern. Ken was working sixty hour weeks and frequently had to travel for
business. When he was home he helped with some of the housework, but not all of it. Lori
would be generally happy when he was home, but once he went on the road other women
would start whispering discontentment in her ears*:

I was talking to a friend today and she told me that you really should be helping me
more. What I need is more help. My friend’s and sisters’ husbands help their wives
more.

It is important to realize that no matter how much Ken had helped, these women whispering
in Lori’s ear wouldn’t have stopped. No amount of washing dishes would have made them
stop tempting his wife into feminist envy and rebellion. And no amount of vacuuming would
have made the envy go away. When wives feel this way they think they can soothe the
discontent by forcing their husbands to experience the shame they have in being a woman.
They think that by making him vacuum, dust, change diapers, or whatever, they will transfer
the consuming feeling of resentment from themselves to their husbands**. But the source of
the misery is in the woman’s own rejection of being a woman, in her own heart, not in
anything inherent to the work itself. This is why it only makes wives more miserable when
their husbands cheerfully do these very easy tasks. They wanted to make him suffer, to feel
the shame (in their minds) of being a woman, but maddeningly he feels no such thing.

You can test all of this by offering suggestions to the next woman who complains to you that
her husband doesn’t do enough housework. My wife hears this complaint from other Christian wives all of the time. Each time she starts by giving them time to explain why their no good husband isn’t doing enough around the house. Then my wife offers suggestions that don’t involve the wife assuming authority over her husband and making him do work the woman (falsely) believes is humiliating. For women with children old enough to help, she advises having the children do more of the housework. Other times she will identify time consuming work the woman is focusing on which could just as well be left undone. In other cases she will suggest ways to get a “problem” job done that better frees up her day (cooking with a crock pot, etc). The response is always the same, because the issue is not about the woman having too much work. Invariably once the discussion turns toward solutions that don’t involve making the husband do more housework, the women lose all interest in the conversation.

*Note that even though Ken is telling wives not to nurse their resentment, he is at the same time whispering in their ears that a husband who doesn’t meet their expectations is sinning. He says don’t feel resentment, while confirming their suspicions that their husband is the source of the problem. In doing this second part he is inadvertently playing the same role with the women who read his wife’s blog that her friends and sisters played while he was away on business.

**This is very similar to the feminist impulse to dress men as women.
A woman’s prerogative.
by Dalrock | June 29, 2016 | Link

A reader who asked not to be named describes how the military has come to define rape:

One of my fellow company commanders in Afghanistan invited a CID agent to give a lecture on sexual assault. I had my Soldiers attend and I attended as well. The agent told a story about a female Soldier who had sex with a male Soldier, admitted she was on top most of the time, texted her friend while he was in the shower, then had sex with him again. When her boyfriend found out, she cried rape. The accused was convicted.

I asked the CID agent if that meant that if someone regrets having sex, that means it’s rape. He said yes. I was shocked.

The key thing to remember is this is not the new policy on rape having unexpected results. This kind of outcome is entirely intentional. Accusations of rape have become a general purpose weapon for feminists to use against men. Whether a rape has occurred or not does not matter. The goal is to make men live in fear of accusations, as Ezra Klein explained in “Yes Means Yes” is a terrible law, and I completely support it (emphasis mine):

The Yes Means Yes law is a necessarily extreme solution to an extreme problem. Its overreach is precisely its value.

...

If the Yes Means Yes law is taken even remotely seriously it will settle like a cold winter on college campuses, throwing everyday sexual practice into doubt and creating a haze of fear and confusion over what counts as consent. This is the case against it, and also the case for it. Because for one in five women to report an attempted or completed sexual assault means that everyday sexual practices on college campuses need to be upended, and men need to feel a cold spike of fear when they begin a sexual encounter.

...To work, “Yes Means Yes” needs to create a world where men are afraid.

This is why regret equals rape, and why a college student can be expelled for rape even though the ostensible “victim” never claimed to have been assaulted, and in fact has consistently stated otherwise.
As the CBMW has explained, the reason we opened combat roles up to women is because cowardly men were forcing women to serve in their place. Given today’s announcement by Defense Secretary Ash Carter, the only explanation can be that cisgendered people are refusing to serve, and insisting that trans-gendered serve in their place. First men who identify as men wouldn’t fight, so women who wanted to be like men had to join. Now, men who identify as women are forced to fight in the place of...

I’m not sure. I’m fairly certain it is cisgendered married men’s fault though, especially if they are fathers. Perhaps if married men were better at implementing crossdressing theology (marital cross-dressing), we wouldn’t need crossdressing in the military (martial cross-dressing).
Pastor Doug Wilson explains that it is much easier to confront men on their sin than it is to confront women*. Men, even men who have done terrible things, expect to be called on their sins, while women rebel against the very idea:

When a man mistreats a woman, the current climate still allows a pastor to confront him, and to deal with it thoroughly. Even though the world gets conviction of sin all wrong, this climate does mean that the simple message of repent and believe is one that can still be delivered to men. The men usually expect it, which is good, because they deserve it.

But that is not the case anymore with women. Any counselor who actually tries to address feminine shortcomings in a dysfunctional relationship is a brave counselor. One of the things that happens is that any such an attempted address is immediately construed as “taking the side” of the abuser. And to anticipate an objection here, this is not a function of the counselor being male — my wife has seen the same reaction that I have, and sometimes more quickly.

However, even while sharing this, Pastor Wilson explains that he has often observed men to be sinning terribly, but the sins he observes of women tend to be inappropriate reactions to men who are abusing them (emphasis mine):

Taking one thing with another, over the years I have seen many instances of men doing awful things to their wives and daughters. And when I say “awful,” I mean awful. Their abusive treatment has ranged from wicked to blindingly stupid. Not only do I not excuse it or explain it away, I rejoice in the liberty that I still have in such instances to call sin sin...

Now I know that some women have done awful things to men also, and I take it as a given that this can and does happen. I do not assume that the man must be the worst offender. But in the counseling I have done over the years, the thing that usually wrecks the woman’s joy is not the fact that her sin is equivalent to the man’s, or greater than the man’s, or less than the man’s, but rather the fact that her sin is untouchable. We are dealing with a culture-wide insistence that women not be held responsible for what they do. This assumption has crept into the church, even into the conservative wing of the church, and has now been weaponized.

He knows that in theory women do awful things to men, but in practice he has observed men doing awful things to women. That he has observed men doing such things doesn’t surprise me. He has been a pastor for long enough that I would be surprised if he hadn’t seen men sin in the ways he describes. Yet at the same time he suggests that he hasn’t observed similarly outlandish behavior from women against men. This is truly astonishing.

If his observations are accurate, this would mean that the women in Pastor Wilson’s
congregation are generally behaving better than the men, despite the men being far more open to rebuke. I find this unlikely. It also surprises me because while I undoubtedly have less direct experience with the kinds of situations he is describing, I have observed plenty of men and women treating others terribly.

While it is theoretically possible that the women in Pastor Wilson's congregation are better behaved and yet more rebellious against authority, I strongly suspect there is something else in play here. As Wilson explains, it is far harder to hold women accountable. Even men who have sinned greatly tend to not only accept, but expect to be rebuked for their sin. But women tend to be far more resistant to being called out. Moreover, calling other men out comes with a sort of satisfaction, while calling women out feels cruel. Given simple human nature, we tend to follow the path that is easy and satisfying over what is difficult and uncomfortable. As Wilson points out, conservative Christian culture has been infected, but I don't believe he sees the full extent of the rot. It isn't just that we tend to avoid addressing women's sins when we see them, but that we tend to find ways to not see them in the first place.

This is why the leaders of the CBMW have gone to such absurd lengths to deny the feminist rebellion with women in the military, and have created a fantasy land where cowardly men are forcing women to push their way into combat. This would also explain why Pastor Wilson not only hasn't observed truly bad behavior by wives, but why he argues that only after a thousand years, when the stars have aligned, could we consider holding women who have abortions accountable. It would also explain why he can't see the very open feminist push for women to delay marriage.

*H/T Hmm
She’ll cut their balls off.
by Dalrock | July 5, 2016 | Link

There is a rumor going around that Trump is considering Iowa freshman Senator Joni Ernst for the VP slot. People magazine writes: Who is Joni Ernst? 5 Things to Know About the Hog-Castrating Senator Rising in Trump’s V.P. Candidate Ranks

The Daily Mail writes: Pig-castrating Senator Joni Ernst also in the running to be Donald Trump’s veep

For those who aren’t already familiar with her background, conservatives fell in love with Ernst once they found out she had a penchant for castration. In 2014 The Washington Post explained How Joni Ernst’s ad about ‘castrating hogs’ transformed Iowa’s U.S. Senate race:

She was a relative unknown in a crowded field led by a wealthy businessman. Then she started talking about castrating hogs.

Ernst spent just $9,000 to air her first television ad, but her testimonial — “I grew up castrating hogs on an Iowa farm” — and her promise to apply those pork-cutting skills to “make ‘em squeal” in Washington transformed her candidacy.

At a time when voters tune out many political messages, the ad was a vivid reminder of the enduring power of a single image. In the first three days, her 30-second spot was viewed nearly 400,000 times on YouTube and became the talk of cable news, catapulting the state senator from rural Red Oak into the top tier.

Ernst knew conservatives love a ball busting feminist more than anything, and she had everything they were dreaming of. She was more than a tough talking ball slicer with a butch haircut. She was the perfect woman:

Ernst, a lieutenant colonel in the Iowa Army National Guard who says she proudly carries a pistol in her purse, followed up last week with her second ad, in which she steps off her Harley-Davidson and, wearing a black leather jacket, fires multiple shots with expert precision at a shooting-range target.

While she had them at castration, this follow up ad sealed the deal as conservatives everywhere swooned. Finally, a ball buster conservatives could call their very own.
Huffington Post Divorce warns its readers that dating after divorce tends to be a letdown in "The 11 Worst Pick Up Lines Divorcés Have Ever Heard:"

- Thinking of jumping back into the dating scene? Prepare yourself for some godawful pickup lines. (For some reason, the older you get, the worse the lines become.)

All of them are brutal reminders (in one way or another) that the divorced woman’s status in the dating world has dropped, but some are more brutal than others.

- ‘I only date divorcées — you’re all so grateful.’

Ouch. This guy wasn’t alone in seeing divorcées as desperate/easy:

- …my estranged husbands’ friends offering their support in private: ‘Hey, if you ever need to talk…’

Several others communicated that they see divorced women as good for sex, but not for anything serious:

- I guess now that you’ve crossed marriage off of your bucket list you can just relax and let a guy show you a good time?

and

- Are you still married? If you are, we can still keep it on the down-low.

Even worse was the man who didn’t even take the divorcée seriously for sex:

- …a guy on Tinder who started the conversation with, ‘You have a nice head’ then he followed with ‘we should get drinks.’ I ran into him on another date and he saw me and said, ‘Hey! We matched on Tinder! You’re the wellness blogger with a nice head!’ Then he actually patted me on the head.

The article does include one “bad line” received by a man after divorce. Actually it wasn’t a bad line at all, but a case of the divorced man not expecting an attractive woman to proposition him for no strings sex:

- A lovely women I knew walked into a bar I was at. We chatted for a bit and when I told her I was recently divorced, she slid off her stool, came over and gave me a very sensual hug. She looked me in the eyes and said, ‘What you need is a pure and simple rebound. A woman to just take you home and press her body into yours and ask for nothing but pure physical love.’ I don’t think that’s a bad pickup line but back then, as a freshly divorced man, I didn’t get it. I looked deep in her eyes and said, ‘You’re right — I wonder how I am going to meet someone like that?’ She waited for
a few moments to see if I was joking. When she saw I wasn’t and truly had no clue, she gently extracted herself from the mess I was. It was only two days later that I realized what she was suggesting.

See Also: Women’s morphing need for male investment.
Vox Day offers excellent advice in *It won’t be fun, but you must endure*:

What isn’t fun is living in a 4GW world which is an obvious reality in the United States of America today. I believe things will get much worse before they get better too, and it will be awful to watch and dangerous as well. One of the best ways to help those around you outside of knowing some basic self-defense is keeping a level head as society frays apart around you. Most of your friends and family will be in a state of near panic as events like these continue on the news cycle, not because they are cop-lovers, or love the government, but because they subconsciously know that civil order is under attack.

If you find yourself becoming extremely angry and wanting to lash out at everyone around you, or find some specific group or person who is suddenly the ultimate evil in at the moment, step back for a bit. Remember that we are living in dark times and there are plenty of evil people around. Cherish the good around you, especially your family and friends. Endeavor to protect them and plan for difficult times, but do not lose hope, wish for violence for the sake of violence, or lose your cool because of the news. Be the rock that people can depend upon in hard times. Be the foundation of a future society which can be better than the one we are currently living in.

Separately, Michael Yon* explains at *Breitbart* how what Vox describes as 4GW unleashes more than just violence motivated by defined causes:

Amid the chaos of unstructured conflict and war, the always-there lunatic fringe is uncorked. Suddenly the actions of a serial killer look like the work of an insurgent or group. Criminality skyrockets, and what would earlier have been seen as just a bank robbery looks like part of a movement.

... Wars allow criminals and the insane to fulfill their full their vast potential.

Some people just like to fight. Fighting is their cause, and they will latch onto any cause if it helps them get ammo. Young men with guns, no rules, and a sense of divine authority, are the most dangerous animals on earth.

Yon is referencing what he observed in Iraq, and pointing out the risks we could face in the US. We would be arrogant to ignore this risk, but I also think we have a distinct advantage over Iraq, Syria, etc. The Christian concepts of loving our neighbor, respecting authority, and sexual morality/the family are fundamentally different than the Muslim worldview. Even deeply flawed attempts to live out these values produce a far more successful and peaceful society than what we see in the Middle East.
As effective as the left has been at assaulting Christianity, and as effective as Christians (and everyone else) have been at assaulting the family and fatherhood, we still have a core knowledge of these things as a society. It has taken great effort by Christians and others to make respectability disrespected. To a degree, we can start repairing this damage by simply removing the effort currently applied to destabilize families. While it would be ideal to repudiate the anti father messages taught in the last three** Kendrick brothers movies, we could start moving back towards a Christian family structure simply by not making further anti father “Christian” movies (or making them successful). The same goes for the yearly ritual of denouncing fathers from the pulpit on Father’s Day. It would be ideal to repudiate this, but simply by stopping the effort to tear down fathers we would start to move in the right direction.

It would be profoundly foolish to hope or pray for civil breakdown, as this will inevitably unleash all forms of evil as Yon describes. However, more difficult times are likely to lessen our appetite for familial destruction. We do not need difficult times to reduce our zeal for destroying families, but fortunately for us difficult times should tend to reduce the effectiveness of the forces diligently working to destroy our society.

One thing you will find about life is that the events in your own life will far overshadow the impact of global events. Be generally prepared for difficult times (have some food, water, savings, means of personal/family defense, diversify financially, etc) and vote according to your beliefs; but don’t put your life on hold or worse give up on it because of a bad global prognosis. Keep your head as Vox advises, and focus on being a good husband/father/wife/mother/brother/sister/son/daughter to your family, and a good friend and neighbor to everyone else. Doing this out of love and obedience to God will make a difference at the micro level, and as others follow your lead it will make a profound difference at the macro level as well. May God bless you and your household.

*I’ve written previously about Michael Yon in Chivalry only comes from a position of strength.

**Four if you include Mom’s Night Out.
Blue Pill Professor asked:

In short, I think the efforts to destabilize marriage and family are so broad reaching that saying “remove the effort has little meaning.” Remove what? Movies, TV show, magazines, books, social media, our schools, our jobs, DAMMIT! It is everywhere. It is almost like a false reality or something. Like we should all take some pill or something and wake up to the real world.

Only bleeping out the whole damn Matrix will “remove the effort to destabilize the family.” Can you be more specific? What CAN we do? What SHOULD we do? How do we force social change?

The point he was responding to in my interesting times post was my assertion that it takes constant effort to maintain our current level of familial destruction. While we absolutely should nurture families, in our current situation we wouldn’t need to nurture families to make them stronger. If we stop stomping on families, or (more realistically) stomp on them less frequently and/or with less force, the family will start to recover.

Previously I’ve compared modern feminism to a massive pumping operation. There is a tendency to assume that all feminists have done is removed a sort of patriarchal levee and allowed the water to flow to its natural level. This is the feminist narrative, but this conception is deeply flawed. While it is true that feminists have removed patriarchal guides built into previous custom and law, this was actually a very small part of the changes they have wrought. For example, in the US the Equal Pay Act of 1963 outlawed the practice of paying women less than men for the same work. Feminists celebrate this as a momentous achievement, crediting the law with lessening the earnings gap between women and men. But the reality is that even by the feminist’s own metric women’s relative earnings didn’t improve for 17 years after the act went into effect:
Feminists dynamited the patriarchal levee, only to find out that the water was already where it wanted to be. A gender neutral law had no effect. It took decades of massive affirmative action programs at all levels of our society to create the changes feminists have achieved beginning in 1981. These “improvements” aren’t permanent, because they aren’t natural. The moment we lessen the massive effort we are putting into affirmative action programs we will start to see a decay of feminist progress.

There is something similar going on with the destruction of the family. It is true that the first stages of familial destruction merely required destroying the cultural and legal structures that encouraged stable families. Once the churches and the government both agreed that divorce and out of wedlock births weren’t a big deal, the family naturally started falling apart. But in the West in general, and the US in specific* the churches and the courts have gone far beyond removing social and legal protections for the family. While the initial gutting of marriage tremendously weakened the position of husbands and fathers, it wasn’t enough. It took great effort to go to the next level. It wasn’t enough for churches to look the other way regarding divorce and out of wedlock births, and for the government to declare single mother families just as good as nuclear families. Marriage wasn’t merely gutted, it was replaced by a new family structure based on child support, a system which requires much more active government support to maintain than marriage does. Fathers had to be actively denigrated. Pastors had to start preaching that fathers are objects of derision, and the government needed to enact and continuously enforce laws hostile to fathers and families.

While it would take effort to actually preach against the destruction of families, no effort is required to stop preaching against intact families. The same is true for the government. It would take a legislative initiative to rewrite the laws of the family courts, but much could be gained simply by a reduction in the zeal by which the system is used to stamp out fatherhood. A less intensely anti father (or merely less industrious) family court judge could make a real difference by only imprisoning 50% as many fathers for failure to meet income quotas as he or his predecessor did in the past. Likewise, if 50% of pastors decided to skip the annual anti-father sermon on Father’s Day, this would make a real difference. Similarly, the Kendrick brothers could go from making an anti father movie every 2.5 years to one
every 5 years. All that would be required would be for the anti family forces to do less of what they are doing today, and families would be strengthened.

We are at a stage of feminism and the destruction of the family where the pumps need to be kept running at full speed in order to maintain the status quo. For the family it is possible that after enough time has passed under our anti father regime that men’s unilateral commitment to marriage and fatherhood will eventually become less than it is today. Once that happens, preachers, family court judges, and sitcom writers won’t have to work as hard to ensure that families are broken up and fathers are despised. But that isn’t where we are today. Moreover, as feminism and the destruction of the family break down the machinery of our society, it will only become harder to maintain our current levels of anti father diligence.

*The US is far more progressive/effective than Europe is when it comes to destroying families, even though we have more weddings.
The new feminist Ghostbusters can’t catch a break. First the youtube trailer for the movie was widely panned by feminists and normal people alike. Then the movie was released and eviscerated by critics, with reviews like Richard Roeper’s ‘Ghostbusters’ reboot a horrifying mess.

“Ghostbusters” is a horror from start to finish, and that’s not me saying it’s legitimately scary.

More like I was horrified by what was transpiring onscreen.

Seeing their high profile attempt at territory marking going terribly awry, feminists enlisted the media to try to turn the tide. But the defenses of the movie turned out to be far more damaging than the criticism. Wired lead the way by explaining that even if the movie were actually good, it would still suck (emphasis mine):

The new Ghostbusters will suck. That’s not a value judgement, it’s an Internet-predetermined truth—and come Friday, no matter how funny or smart or entertaining director Paul Feig’s reboot is, it’ll become a self-fulfilling prophecy. Put simply, Ghostbusters can’t win.

But Wired’s assertion that it isn’t the movie’s fault that it sucks was probably the least damaging defense. Andrew O’Hehir at Salon lectured moviegoers that right thinking people will find the movie light and funny, and won’t be distracted by the feminist message. But even O’Hehir has a hard time swallowing his own party line. He doesn’t even make it through the title before questioning his own premise: The new “Ghostbusters” delivers: It’s a cheerful exercise in feminist nostalgia — except, wait, is that possible? O’Hehir then tries to recover from his own lack of faith in the opening of the review:

Is Paul Feig’s “Ghostbusters” remake, supposedly shrouded in supposed controversy ever since its supposedly subversive casting was announced, an exercise in feminism or in nostalgia? If this highly entertaining summer retread proves anything, it proves that those things are not incompatible...

O’Hehir then explains that you will find this movie funny unless you are a basement dwelling Gamergater:

...“Ghostbusters” is a goofy, free-floating romp with an anarchic spirit of its own, a fresh set of scares and laughs and a moderate dose of girl power that is unlikely to seem confrontational to anyone beyond the most confirmed basement-dwelling Gamergate troll. (Did I just indiscriminately slime an entire subset of the male Internet population? Oops.) Whatever the bizarre reaction to the “Ghostbusters”
remake in some quarters is really about, it isn’t about the movie, which is relentlessly cheerful, entirely inoffensive and distinctly above the popcorn-movie standard in terms of wit and style. (The screenplay, by Feig and Katie Dippold, has a few unexpected nuggets — the 19th-century mansion with an “anti-Irish security fence” — that will be funnier on repeat viewing.)

O’Hehir reinforces his message that right thinking people will find this movie funny by identifying the other group of movie goers who will fail to laugh when instructed, mouth breathing Donald Trump supporters:

It’s depressing but unavoidable to observe that the “Ghostbusters” cultural divide is like the political divide over Donald Trump, on a dumbed-down and entirely symbolic level. Except, no: Nothing could be stupider or more symbolic than the Trump phenomenon, so maybe “Ghostbusters” is the truly important issue.

This quickly devolves into a rant on how much he despises ordinary Americans:

America in 2016 is like a giant game of hide-and-seek conducted by blindfolded children in a dark room, with broken glass and rattlesnakes on the floor. If we look for the simplest explanation, the one that covers all the available evidence, it might be that Trump has gotten so bored with running for president that he’s spending his time writing hate-blurbs about “Ghostbusters” on the Internet. Sad!

Keep in mind, the point of this SJW lecture is to instruct the faithful that they will find Ghostbusters to be light and funny. Yet this supposedly relentlessly cheerful movie left him brooding about blindfolded children in a dark room with broken glass on the floor.

If you think the praises for the movie can’t get worse, you are mistaken. Jen Yamato with The Daily Beast came to the movie’s aid by explaining that Ghostbusters will be a smash hit with the lesbian feminist demographic: ‘Ghostbusters’ Review: Kate McKinnon’s Probably-Gay Gearhead Steals the Show

In the summer of 1984, crossing the streams was the ultimate male taboo the original Ghostbusters broke to defeat ghoulish evil from another dimension. In 2016, it’s female solidarity among four heroines whom the world has labeled hysterical, defying the odds and historically ingrained sexism...

Yamato explains that it is the quality of the characters that makes the movie so charming. Kristen Wiig’s character “carries the dramatic thrust” of the plot:

Wiig plays Erin Gilbert, a meek physicist up for tenure at Columbia University who wears her unhappiness with the strict patriarchal establishment on her face and in her stodgy, joyless wardrobe.

Yamato wants us to know this isn’t just a movie with solid lesbian feminist chops. This is a comedy so funny it is guaranteed to make even the most dour feminist crack a brief satisfied smile:
...laughs come when the Ghostbusters hire a male secretary named Kevin (Chris Hemsworth), a dim bulb with a pretty face who Erin takes an unsubtle shining to. It’s a role Hemsworth commits to with relish: Thor, God of Thunder, fetching the lady Ghostbusters coffee and answering their phones. He’s terrible at all of it but they keep him around just to have something nice to look at. The joke is broad and obvious, and yet so, so very satisfying.

But the part that will most endear moviegoers according to Yamato is the lesbian part, even though the patriarchy keeps it repressed:

McKinnon’s Holtzmann, meanwhile, is the secret weapon of this Ghostbusters. Aside from spewing rapid-fire technical jargon as the team’s resident eccentric gearhead, McKinnon oozes visceral charisma with the swagger—sans the womanizing douchiness—of Murray’s Venkman. She flirts brazenly with Erin, emanating cocksure confidence even if we learn very little about Holtzmann as a character. Hemsworth might be the beefcake on paper but it’s McKinnon who’ll leave moviegoers crushing.

...[Holtzmann] may or may not be gay but can’t say so because she’s trapped in a PG-13 summer studio blockbuster.

All of this goes to show that feminists can be funny after all, just not in the way they intend to be.
CBMW’s evolving position on spiritual headship.

by Dalrock | July 16, 2016 | Link

From the beginning complementarianism has been an effort to split the difference with Christian feminists (egalitarians). This comes naturally from their belief that feminism isn’t a manifestation of the same discontent that caused Eve to want to be like God in the garden of Eden. Instead, complementarians see feminism as a misguided (but entirely understandable) rebellion caused by the provocation of cruel men*.

Complementarians believe if they are nice enough to women, feminist rebellion will go away as the reason for the rebellion is thereby withdrawn (examples here and here). This requires compromise when Scripture offends feminists, and this has lead complementarians to invent novel interpretations of Scripture. But this compromise is by no means a one time deal. The compromises of yesterday become the starting position for bargaining today, and today’s new compromise will become the starting point for bargaining tomorrow.

We can see this with the complementarian position on spiritual headship. Complementarians had to find an interpretation for Ephesians 5:26-27** that formally set them apart from egalitarians but caused minimal offense to feminists. But no amount of compromise with feminists will actually avoid offending feminists, and this has lead to multiple complementarian stances on the topic of spiritual headship.

In the latest CBMW quarterly journal David Croteau describes the two predominant complementarian compromises on spiritual headship, and then proposes rejecting the concept of spiritual headship altogether.

Croteau describes the first compromise position complementarians created on spiritual headship. This position frames spiritual headship primarily (if not entirely) as a club to beat down husbands with. The focus is on declaring husbands as failures, while avoiding offending the feminists in the pews by pointing out that wives should look to their husbands for spiritual instruction (emphasis mine):

| The first category I’ve called “Sanctification is the Husband’s Responsibility.” The following authors/pastors have been specifically chosen as examples because they are known for being careful expositors and have ministries that I particularly appreciate. The use of these men should not be seen as an indictment against them, but calling into question their particular use of Eph 5:26–27. “The man is responsible for the spiritual well-being of his wife. Her sanctification is his responsibility. There is probably no male task that has been more neglected in our society than this one.” |

But even constraining references to spiritual headship as a club to beat down husbands still will generate envy from feminists. This has lead to a further complementarian compromise position on spiritual headship:

| The second category is a little more fuzzy, where it seems like the husband is
responsible but the connection to Eph 5:26 is more ambiguous: “By Implication, the Husband is Responsible for His Wife’s Sanctification.” For example, “When a husband’s love for his wife is like Christ’s love for His church, he will continually seek to help purify her from any sort of defilement. He will seek to protect her from the world’s contamination and protect her holiness, virtue, and purity in every way. He will never induce her to do that which is wrong or unwise or expose her to that which is less than good.”

Croteau rejects both of these compromises, and argues that we should get rid of the concept of spiritual headship altogether. To get here, he argues that Eph 5:26-27 is a diversion, and that while the Apostle Paul started making an analogy to Christ’s relationship with the Church in Eph 5:25, he has exited that analogy in verses 26 & 27 and is now talking only about Christ and the Church. Croteau’s claim is that verses 26 & 27 are a digression, and while sandwiched in instruction on husbands and wives have nothing to do with husbands and wives (emphasis mine):

The third category clarifies that the husband is to have a sacrificial love for his wife and the example of this sacrificial love is the way that Christ loved the church. All of the discussion about sanctification, presenting the church as glorious and without spot or wrinkle, is primarily about Christ and the church. Thielman says, “The analogy between the love of husbands for their wives and the love of Christ for the church leads to a digression on the relationship between Christ and the church.”[8]

He reiterates this in the conclusion:

Analysis of the structure and context of Eph 5:25–27 demonstrated that a husband is given only one command in the passage: love his wife. The rest of the passage used Christ’s love for the church as a comparison for the sake of explaining the depths of the sacrifice of this love. The sacrificial love of Christ is similar to the kind of sacrificial love a husband should have for his wife...

None of this means that a husband shouldn’t seek for his wife to become more like Christ daily. Since every Christian should desire the progressive sanctification of each other, how much more a husband with his wife. However, the main point of this paper is to say that Eph 5:25–27 does not directly address this issue...

...Attempts to apply the specifics in verses 26 and 27 are misguided as it is specifically talking about the way Christ loved the church. The application of verses 26 and 27 can be seen in what Paul says in 28–29. Therefore, Eph 5:26–27 does not describe as part of a husband’s duty the progressive sanctification of his wife.

This is not (yet) from what I can tell a widely held position by complementarians. Most complementarians still struggle to find a way to nominally support spiritual headship without supporting it in practice. However, the fact that the CBMW is publishing this argument means that abandoning the concept of spiritual headship entirely is a discussion they are quite open to. This is a formal announcement that the complementarian Overton window now includes
the argument that there is no such thing as spiritual headship.

*An alternate rejection of the idea that feminism is women rebelling exactly as the Bible tells us they are most tempted to rebel is the claim that feminism is a scam men have run on gullible women. However, this is not the mainstream complementarian view.

**And related verses such as 1 Corinthians 14:35.
Escoffier posted this quote from Kierkegaard yesterday in the discussion of Vox’s riff on my CBMW post:

The matter is quite simple. The Bible is very easy to understand. But we Christians are a bunch of scheming swindlers. We pretend to be unable to understand it because we know very well that the minute we understand we are obliged to act accordingly. Take any words in the New Testament and forget everything except pledging yourself to act accordingly. My God, you will say, if I do that my whole life will be ruined. How would I ever get on in this world? Herein lies the real place of Christian scholarship. Christian scholarship is the Church’s prodigious invention to defend itself against the Bible, to ensure that we can continue to be good Christians without the Bible coming too close. Oh, priceless scholarship, what would we do without you? Dreadful it is to fall into the hands of the living God. Yes, it is even dreadful to be alone with the New Testament.
In the early 1980s a group of feminists put together a model to approach domestic violence called the Duluth Model. Under this new (feminist) model the focus is not on actual violence, but on fighting the patriarchy and “male privilege”. This is something the Duluth organization is very open about. For example, in Countering Confusion about the Duluth Model they explain (emphasis mine):

The underpinnings of the Duluth curriculum do come from a historical analysis. When Europeans came to this continent, they brought religion, laws, and economic systems that institutionalized the status of women as the property of men through marriage. From the church to the state, there was not only acceptance of male supremacy, but also an expectation that husbands would maintain the family order by controlling their wives. Various indiscretions committed by wives were offenses to be punished by husbands. This system of male dominance (like any social structure where one group oppresses another) was perpetuated by: a) a belief in the primacy of men over women; b) institutional rules requiring the submission of women to men; c) the objectification of women which made violence acceptable; and d) the right of men to use violence to punish with impunity (Dobash and Dobash 1983).

...Do all men who batter want to dominate women? This is a complicated question. Clearly, many men who batter believe that women should be submissive to men and there are others who share a variation of these sexist beliefs—“The man is the head of the household” or “You can’t have two captains of one ship.” However, there are other men who batter that don’t believe that their wives or girlfriends should be subservient because of their gender, but they still batter. These men use violence to control their partners because they can and violence works...

...we do not see men’s violence against women as stemming from individual pathology, but rather from a socially reinforced sense of entitlement...

Opponents of a feminist analysis of domestic violence continue to argue their theory that women are as violent as men and that the level of mutual violence calls out for changing arrest and prosecution policies as well as advocating for marriage counseling to stop the violence. This may be an attractive theory to some in the mental health field and “men’s rights“ activists...

The Duluth curriculum’s central focus is exploring and understanding power relationships and the effects of violence and controlling behavior on domestic partners.
The Duluth curriculum is an educational approach. The philosophical core of the model is the belief that men who batter use physical and sexual violence and other abusive tactics to control their partners...

Back in the 1970s, battered women's advocates were rightly concerned about how the mental health community used psychological explanations to describe wife beating. They correctly worried that battered women would be labeled psychologically and that mental health practitioners would collude with men who batter by treating offenders' personality disorders rather than working to change their beliefs and attitudes about women, men, and marriage...

Under the Duluth model, the idea of headship is not only abuse itself (male privilege), it is the very root of all domestic violence. The focus of the program is to change men’s sexist beliefs (emphasis mine):

[We want men] to genuinely struggle with their beliefs about men, women, relationships, and entitlement.

A central assumption in the Duluth curriculum is that nature and culture are separate. Men are cultural beings who can change the way they use violence in relationships because beliefs about male dominance and the use of violence to control are cultural, not innate. Facilitators engage men who batter in a dialogue about their beliefs. Through curriculum exercises, group participants are immersed in critical thinking and self-reflection. Some of the men in our groups begin to understand the impact that their violence has had on their partners, children, and themselves.

A key teaching tool is the control log that helps group members analyze their abusive actions by recognizing that their behavior is intentional and inextricably tied to their beliefs.

This is critical to understand because when they talk about violence, they really mean power and control, and specifically they are concerned about men having power and control over women. This isn’t really about abuse or violence at all, it is about radical feminism. This is why under the Duluth model domestic violence by women is seen as wholly different than violence by men. Violence by men is a tool of the patriarchy, while violence by women is a tool to fight against the patriarchy (emphasis mine):

When women use violence in an intimate relationship, the context of that violence tends to differ from men. First, men’s use of violence against women is learned and reinforced through many social, cultural and institutional avenues, while women’s use of violence does not have the same kind of societal support. Secondly, many women who do use violence against their male partners are being battered. Their violence is primarily used to respond to and resist the controlling violence being used against them. On the societal level, women’s violence against men has a trivial
effect on men compared to the devastating effect of men’s violence against women.

...

**Making the Power and Control Wheel gender neutral would hide the power imbalances in relationships between men and women that reflect power imbalances in society.** By naming the power differences, we can more clearly provide advocacy and support for victims, accountability and opportunities for change for offenders, and system and societal changes that end violence against women.

Since this is radical feminist theory, *who* and *whom* is paramount. For this reason not only do the Duluth model creators tell us the model should not be used to confront abuse of men by women, but it also should not be applied to women who abuse women or men who abuse men:

Battering in same-sex intimate relationships has many of the same characteristics of battering in heterosexual relationships, but happens within the context of the larger societal oppression of same-sex couples. Resources that describe same-sex domestic violence have been developed by specialists in that field such as The Northwest Network of Bi, Trans, Lesbian and Gay Survivors of Abuse, [www.nwnetwork.org](http://www.nwnetwork.org)

The other key thing to understand about the Duluth model is that its influence isn’t limited to the kooky women’s studies departments that gave birth to this kind of analysis. The Duluth model has been widely accepted as *the* model for understanding domestic violence. Not only has this model been adopted by police departments and courts (criminal and family) across the West, it has saturated both secular and Christian thinking on the topic as well.

**Complementarian Absorption of the Duluth Model**

Very often the impact of the Duluth model isn’t entirely obvious on the surface. For example, according to the CBMW founding document one of the reasons they created the organization was:

1. the upsurge of physical and emotional abuse in the family

This was in 1988, and while there wasn’t an actual upsurge in physical and emotional abuse in the family in the 1980s, feminists had managed to dominate popular thought via the Duluth model earlier in the decade.

A more direct example of the Duluth model influencing complementarian thinking can be seen in the post *Signs of an abusive relationship* by CBMW board member and Women’s Studies Professor Mary Kassian. Kassian doesn’t reference the Duluth model by name, but just as the Duluth model teaches she explains that abuse is about power and control:

An abuser will use a variety of tactics to manipulate and exert power over you...
Power and Control is core to the Duluth model, and chances are at one point or another you have seen an adaptation of the Duluth Power and Control Wheel. In that wheel all of the forms of “abuse” are presented, with violence mixed in with “Using Male Privilege” and “making her feel guilty”. Keep in mind that like the feminists who created the Duluth model she (covertly) presents, Kassian is all about power and control, so long as the wife is the one wielding it. Kassian teaches wives to set boundaries for their husbands and enact consequences if their husband doesn’t do as she tells him to do. If a husband does this Kassian calls it abuse, but if a wife does it Kassian calls it submission (emphasis mine):

Submission is neither mindless nor formulaic nor simplistic. Submitting to the Lord sometimes involves drawing clear boundaries and enacting consequences when a husband sins.

Kassian concludes her post on signs of an abusive relationship with a referral to an organization named Focus Ministries:

Get more information and support at Focus Ministries, a domestic violence and domestic abuse ministry for Christian women.

The Book of Duluth

While Kassian doesn’t name the Duluth model when she presents their paradigm, Focus Ministries is very open in promoting the Duluth model. In Weapons of An Abuser: Power and Control Focus Ministries presents modified versions of the Duluth Power And Control Wheel and the Duluth Equality Wheel, explaining that this slightly modified radical feminist ideology represents God’s teaching on marriage. They go so far as to say that the Equality Wheel represents God’s design for relationships (emphasis mine):

Domestic Violence Help For Women

Adapted from the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project
Duluth, MN

...[The Power and Control] wheel symbolizes the relationship of physical abuse to other forms of abuse. Each spoke represents a manipulative tactic used to gain power or control.

...

[The Equality] wheel represents God’s design for relationships. The eight components are held together by Mutuality, each person submitting and serving the other. The core is Equality for each image bearer of God.

Focus Ministries presents modified versions of the two Duluth wheels in another article titled Healthy vs Abusive Relationships: What’s the Difference? This article identifies “Using Male Privilege” as a form of abuse, and explains that abuse is about power and control (emphasis mine):
In order to have a healthy relationship, both partners must treat each other as equal and independent human beings. The husband must respect his wife more than his need to control her. While the wife should respect her husband’s role as the spiritual leader of the home, the husband should be an example of Christ’s love as he takes the position of a servant leader. Both must submit to the Lord and to each other as they learn how to combine the scriptural principles of Ephesians 5 and 1 Corinthians 13. The relationship becomes abusive when the husband or wife usurps control of the other person’s thoughts, actions, emotions, freedom, and individuality. Abusers believe they have the right to punish their partner when they disobey or fail to measure up, and often use violence to intimidate them, keep them in line, and regain control.

Again, Kassian teaches women to set boundaries and punish their husbands when they transgress, but this isn’t abuse, because abuse is about the patriarchy. Wives fighting against the patriarchy by definition can’t be abusive, only husbands can.

In yet another article, this one titled Power and Control—Weapons of an Abuser, Focus Ministries again presents the Duluth model, explaining that domestic violence is about men wanting power and control over women (emphasis mine):

The Domestic Abuse Intervention Project in Duluth, Minnesota demonstrates through a “Violence Wheel” chart the kind of behavior abusers use to get and keep control over their partners. This chart uses a wheel as a symbol to show the relationship of physical abuse to other forms of abuse. Each spoke represents a tactic used to gain power or control, which is the hub of the wheel. The rim which surrounds and supports the spokes is physical abuse. It holds the system together, and gives the abuser his strength.

And again, everything is presented as men abusing women, not because the target audience is abused women, but because this is fundamental to the Duluth model. This leads to definitions like:

**Using Children**
An abuser who wants to use the children as weapons may take his ex-wife to court when she withholds visitation because the children are sick. An abuser will also feel a great sense of control by keeping the children past the court-appointed time of visitation...

**Complementarians and the Duluth Model; a Marriage not from Heaven**

While feminist activism around the Duluth Model in the 1980s clearly influenced the founders of the CBMW, part of the alignment between the two groups is coincidental. Both groups are deeply hostile to the idea of male headship, and prefer instead to have women in charge. This is why complementarians like Kassian teach that wives should set boundaries for their husbands and enact consequences when they sin, but consider it abuse if a husband even points out that Scripture says a wife should submit to her husband.

Complementarians endorse wives smashing the family china (a “godly tantrum”) or
threatening to leave and take the children, or using denial of sex (here and here), in order to gain power and control in marriage. Wives who do this are presented as being forced to take drastic measures by their disobedient husbands. Yet these very same acts would be considered abuse if a husband were to do them. The difference between abuse and he had it coming comes down to who both the Duluth model creators and complementarians think should rightly be in charge. The fundamental difference between the two groups in this respect is the Duluth model creators are honest about their feminist objectives, while complementarians claim to support biblical headship.
Who is she teaching?
by Dalrock | July 23, 2016 | Link

A few days ago CBMW Women’s Studies professor Mary Kassian published a new post titled Does a Husband have the Authority?* The post follows the Duluth model framing headship as abuse, and the main image conveys the sentiment of the post quite well: Christian husbands are dangerous brutes.

The first question that came to mind when reading this post is who is Kassian teaching here? The possible options are:

1. She is teaching other Christian women.
2. She is teaching Christian men (directly).
3. She is teaching Christian men via their wives.

When Kassian says that a husband has no authority, identifying the audience is critical to understand precisely what she is instructing. If the audience is Christian women, the instruction is to not feel pressured to submit to your husband. It is in fact a message to rebel against a husband that doesn’t meet Kassian’s standard of headship.

If the audience is Christian men, then Kassian is instructing Christian men in the proper way to exercise headship. Lastly, the third option is that Kassian is teaching Christian wives how they should instruct their own husbands in the proper way to exercise headship.

Clearly, Kassian is doing all three with this post. More importantly, the Bible makes it clear that she isn’t to be doing any of these three things. Titus 2:3-5 says that older godly women are to teach younger women to be obedient to their own husbands.

> The aged women likewise, that they be in behaviour as becometh holiness, not false accusers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things;  
> That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children,  
> To be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed.

Kassian is teaching the opposite of this. The other relevant Scripture to consider regarding Kassian’s post is 1 Tim 2:11-15:

> Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.  
> For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.

The traditional reading of this section of 1 Tim is that women are not to teach Scripture. Dr. Moo defines the kind of teaching the CBMW founders believed are restricted by Paul’s words above:
...we argue that the teaching prohibited to women here includes what we would call preaching (note 2 Timothy 4:2: “Preach the word . . . with careful instruction” [teaching, didache]), and the teaching of Bible and doctrine in the church, in colleges, and in seminaries. Other activities-leading Bible studies, for instance-may be included, depending on how they are done. Still others-evangelistic witnessing, counseling, teaching subjects other than Bible or doctrine-are not, in our opinion, teaching in the sense Paul intends here.

Clearly Kasian is teaching Scripture authoritatively here, as she is setting herself as the authority on how headship can and cannot be practiced. However, the CBMW has a novel interpretation of who Kassian would be prohibited from teaching in this way, arguing that women are only prohibited from teaching men. This is based on the CBMW founders’ assumption that when Paul wrote in verse 14 that Adam was not deceived but Eve was, that he wasn’t talking about Eve being deceived but instead was making an oblique reference to the creation order, cryptically reiterating what he had stated clearly in verse 13 (emphasis mine):

...what Paul meant in 1 Timothy 2:14 was this: “Adam was not deceived (that is, Adam was not approached by the deceiver) and did not carry on direct dealings with the deceiver, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor (that is, she was the one who took up dealings with the deceiver and was led through her direct interaction with him into deception and transgression).”

In this case, the main point is not that the man is undeceivable or that the woman is more deceivable; the point is that when God’s order of leadership is repudiated it brings damage and ruin. Men and women are both more vulnerable to error and sin when they forsake the order that God has intended.

...Paul’s position in the pastoral epistles is, then, consistent: he allows women to teach other women (Titus 2:3-4), 17 but prohibits them to teach men.

But even indulging the CBMW’s creative loophole for 1 Tim 2:12, Kassian is still clearly prohibited from doing what she did in that post. According to Dr Moo and the CBMW founders, Kassian is not to teach men, and this would include teaching men the proper way to exercise headship. Even worse, since Kassian’s site is primarily targeted at women, Kassian is inviting wives to teach their own husbands on the proper way to exercise headship. No matter how you look at Kassian’s article, she had no business writing such a thing under even the most libertine complementarian interpretations of Scripture. Only an egalitarian would argue that it is appropriate for Kassian to teach what she is teaching.

Putting all of this aside, there is also the massive problem of the message itself. Kassian is teaching the Duluth model of abuse, a model that was developed by feminists to eradicate the idea of Christian headship. Unlike Focus Ministries (the domestic violence ministry Kassian endorses), she doesn’t call it the Duluth model, but this is exactly what she is teaching in her recent post (emphasis original):

... this truth deserves to be stated and restated with clarity: It is not the
husband’s right to force or coerce his wife to submit. Submission is voluntary on a wife’s part, and her choice entirely.

...

The misuse/abuse of authority is an abomination to God...

According to the Bible, a wife’s submission is her choice alone. A husband does not have the right to force or coerce her to do things against her will. He does not have the right to domineer. He does not have the right to pull rank and use strong-arm tactics.

According to Kassian, a husband “pulling rank” is guilty of abuse. If a husband makes what complementarians would call the final decision in cases where the two can’t come to agreement, or the “tiebreaker”, this is abuse. While the Duluth model calls this “using male privilege”, and Kassian uses the term “pulling rank”, we are talking about the very same thing. Moreover, like the Duluth model, Kassian is just fine with coercion to lead a spouse away from sin, so long as it is the wife coercing her husband. In that case it isn’t abuse at all; Kassian calls it submission (emphasis mine):

Submission is neither mindless nor formulaic nor simplistic. Submitting to the Lord sometimes involves drawing clear boundaries and enacting consequences when a husband sins.

It would be thrice wrong for Kassian to teach as she is teaching even if she wasn’t promoting the radical feminist view of marriage and headship (the Duluth model). And it would be wrong for her to teach the feminist view of marriage and headship even if she weren’t going against both Titus 2 and 1 Tim 2 in doing so.

This is all the worse because Kassian is both a Women’s Studies Professor and one of the original people involved with the founding of the CBMW in the late 1980s. This is her area of expertise, something she has positioned herself as an expert on for thirty years.

But realistically while complementarians claim to take the Bible’s instruction seriously (albeit with novel interpretations), what Kassian is doing here doesn’t put her out of the mainstream of CBMW and complementarian thought. While in theory it is clear that even the complementarian interpretation of Scripture prohibits what she is doing, in practice she is actually on the conservative side of current complementarian thought. Kassian is merely attacking headship and submission, she isn’t denying the authority of male clergy or attacking male pastors as androcentric chimps chimping like the new guard of complementarian women are doing.

*HT Hmm
I stumbled across an old CBMW newsletter from 1995 (the year after VAWA was passed), and like the founding statement the influence of the Duluth model on complementarian thinking is obvious:

OFTEN, THE RELATIONAL TENSIONS BETWEEN MEN
and women are described in terms of power or control. This semantic slant on the discussion often wrongly leads egalitarians to the conclusion that headship includes the forceful use of power by a man, resulting in domination if not outright abuse of his wife. Because of this, egalitarian efforts to level the distinctions between men and women in the home and the church are easily focused on the woman’s reclamation or assertion of power or control in the relationship.

Power and Control is the foundation of the Duluth model that has saturated our thinking on domestic violence. Since complementarians believe that feminist envy and rebellion is caused by men, they of course identify the root of problem not as radical feminists obsessed with usurping power, but men who aren’t loving their wives* (emphasis mine):

A glimpse at some Biblical injunctions should correct this false assumption and its conclusion. Jesus’ reminded the disciples in Luke 22:25-26. “The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them; and those who exercise authority over them call themselves Benefactors. But you are not to be like that. Instead, the greatest among you should be like the youngest, and the one who rules like the one who serves.”

Along these lines, Diane Knippers of the Institute on Religion and Democracy declared in Beijing, “I am likewise skeptical of the use of the concept of power in the family.... What a sterile and bankrupt view of the most private and intimate human relationship!...The root problem is husbands who do not love their wives. Our goal should be to change their minds and hearts, not merely to restrict their behavior.”

The very next article in the newsletter is from Mary Kassian, and reinforces the message that when women are tempted to feminist rebellion, it is men who are to blame.

A battle is raging across the nations. It is a spiritual battle. And although the battle is not isolated to role relationships between men and women, much of it does take place on that front. Those of us who have experienced the goodness of God’s plan for male- female relationships must be careful not minimize or trivialize its severity. Countless women experience extreme pain and suffering from the hands of the very men who ought to guard and protect them. It is real. It is damaging. And from my perspective, it is increasing in violence and intensity.

My personal experience
I have been extremely fortunate to have had good men in my life. My grandfather, father, brothers, husband, and male friends have all blessed me in both action and word. But consider the woman who has been molested by her grandfather, ignored by her father, sexually derided by her brother, slapped by her husband and ridiculed by her male friends. She reacts to the wounding by adopting a feminist and/or egalitarian philosophy which assures her of her worth and value as a woman. And no wonder!

To be sure, such a woman needs truth. But most often, she needs healing of her pain before she is able to respond to truth.

Kassian describes a feminist woman she knew in College:

When I met her, she was contemplating becoming a Christian, but was struggling with how to reconcile Christianity with her feminist world-view. Sandra did give her life to Christ, but continued to hold on to feminist beliefs.

Kassian doesn’t directly say what type of abuse Sandra suffered that drove her to become a feminist, but she explains that it took a good man to undo all of the bad things men had done before Sandra could abandon her feminism. Fortunately, Sandra found a Christian husband who was willing to “sign a contract agreeing to stay home half-time should they have children.” Through the love of this good man, Kassian explains that Sandra’s desire for feminism eventually went away.

This is terrible theology, as there is no biblical backing for the claim that women are only tempted to rebel because men drive them to it. It is true that men and women are both sinful, and therefore there is no man who has not sinned (aside from Christ). But this theology declares that women are only tempted to sin because men sin first, and this desire to sin will go away if men are nice enough.

Not only is this terrible theology, it is also bad logic. If the root of feminist rebellion is men who aren’t nice enough, then why is it in the modern age that we suddenly have so much more feminist rebellion? Were the men in the ancient world, the middle ages, etc. more egalitarian and nice than modern men? Of course not. Feminist rebellion is growing because we are unwilling to say no to women, not because we have suddenly started saying no to them.

One other interesting note about Kassian’s article. Kassian uses the massacre of women by Mark Lepine to paint men in general, including many complementarian men, as brutish woman haters. If you aren’t familiar with the background on this, Mark Steyn explained it back in 2007:

Every December 6th, my own unmanned Dominion lowers its flags to half-mast and tries to saddle Canadian manhood in general with the blame for the “Montreal massacre,” the 14 female students of the Ecole Polytechnique murdered by Marc Lepine (born Gamil Gharbi, the son of an Algerian Muslim wife-beater, though you’d never know that from the press coverage).
*Technically it is true that men are failing to be loving leaders, but not in the way the article is claiming. The article is arguing that if men were *nicer* women would stop rebelling. Modern Christian men are failing women, but we are failing them by not confronting the rebellion.
Guarding her equality.
by Dalrock | July 26, 2016 | Link

As I’ve demonstrated (here and here), an underpinning belief of complementarianism is that the source of feminist resentment is sinful men, men who are not sufficiently nice and accommodating. As Pastor Chandler explains, if men are good enough women can’t even be tempted to rebel:

...where men exercise biblical headship, where they are sacrificially loving, they are creating environments that honor and uplift the name of Jesus Christ, they’re establishing a place where the Word of God is seen and honored, and we understand God as he has revealed himself, and where they provide for, where that happens, and where women come underneath that, the idea of male headship might be attacked as a philosophy, but if they came into our homes, our wives would not want to be freed from anything.

In Cherishing Your Marriage: Part 1, the CBMW asks:

In practical ways in your marriage relationship, how do you balance gender equality with male headship?

Mary Kassian provides the answer. Kassian explains that she doesn’t feel the feminist urge because her husband “guards her equality” (emphasis mine).

Brent and I have been married for almost thirteen years. In that time, he has always honored, blessed and encouraged me. He has never, ever said or done anything that would give me the impression that I am lesser than he. He trusts me completely, and gives up much on my account. When he fails, he is quick to seek forgiveness. I am left with the impression that he regards my desires and interests as more important than his own, and I feel cherished.

Therefore, the question of male-female equality has not been an issue in my mind. I am secure and confident in who God has made me as a woman. Brent upholds and guards my “equality” so I do not feel the need to do so.
Drudge has a link to a story about a Texas man on vacation in Tennessee who called 911 after his wife was squirted with water by a Hibachi chef (as part of the show):

I’m not from Tennessee so I don’t know Tennessee laws, but in Texas that is sexual assault.

The restaurant manager thinks this was about the customer wanting a free meal, but while the man asked for a refund I think the motivation has more to do with a misguided attempt to demonstrate that he is protective of his wife.

This kind of cartoonish chivalry goes over quite well from the pulpit, but in practice this man only lowered his own value in his wife’s eyes. This isn’t to say that a husband shouldn’t protect his wife from real danger, but husbands should be very careful about getting drawn into this kind of drama.

Contrast the Texas man in Tennessee’s obsequious attempt to impress his wife with another Texas husband my wife observed the other day. The couple was out shopping and the wife asked her husband if he would protect her if they were attacked by a bear:

Wife: Would you protect me from a bear?

Husband: How big is the bear?

Wife (laughing): What if it is really big?

Husband: Oh no, you are on your own then!

Wife (still laughing): What if it is just a small bear?

Husband: If it is just a small bear, then you should be able to protect yourself.

Wife: So you wouldn’t protect me at all?

Husband: Well, it depends. What did you make for dinner that night?

Wife: What if it was tuna casserole?

Husband: Tuna casserole! No way. But you could throw the casserole at the bear.

In this case the wife was delighted by the whole exchange.
The mysterious male marriage premium.

by Dalrock | August 1, 2016 | Link

Glenn Reynolds at Instapundit explains why he left big law:

...I looked at the partners and their lives and thought, “this is what it looks like when you win?”

But one thing I noticed about a lot of the partners was that they worked hard and pushed for more compensation because they were married to women who spent a lot of money. Perhaps the older women lawyers don’t have that incentive to stick around.

A commenter echoed Glenn’s description of the pressure involved for those who stay in big law:

Chasing partnership in Big Law has been described, properly, as “a pie-eating contest where the prize is more pie.” Best thing that ever happened to me was getting sacked from a Big Law firm in October ’08, when the legal market (and the economy at large) collapsed. I’ve done a bit of solo work, which has been grand, and am now outside general counsel to two companies and having a grand time of life.

I would rather sell everything I own and take up bartending than go back to life in a big firm — even if it were possible at this stage, which it pretty much isn’t. Sorry I spent 10 years trying to make that crap work.

As you may recall, the pressure married men feel to seek out and remain in more stressful and difficult jobs is a key benefit Prager and Wilcox claim men get from marriage. While obviously not all married men seek out and remain in jobs as stressful as big law, as Glenn suggests marriage does push men to make career choices they otherwise would prefer to avoid. This isn’t bad in itself, but the lengths we go to in order to minimize the sacrifices married men are making is a problem. This kind of foolishness prevents us from understanding the true cost of feminist policies to destroy traditional marriage. Being forced to work much harder to support others is not a benefit of marriage to men, just as the benefit of buying a home isn’t the need to work harder to pay the mortgage.

While Prager and Wilcox sell pressure to work more difficult jobs as a benefit to men, at least they understand that for men marriage comes with pressure to earn more. That men take on obligations as bread winners in marriage that women don’t would come as a terrible shock to many, probably most, economists. In fact, this is something economists go to great lengths to avoid seeing.

One of the favorite theories is that marriage frees men up to focus more on paid work. By this theory, single men dream of working a more dangerous job with more stress, a longer commute, and working more hours, but are prevented from chasing this lifestyle by the constant demands of housework. These poor single men are stuck putting dishes in the...
dishwasher when they could be sitting in traffic, traveling for business, or working late into
the night. This absurd feminist theory simply won’t die, even though the data shows that
marriage increases men’s focus on paid work while not reducing their focus on housework. As
the St Louis Fed explains in *For Love or Money: Why Married Men Make More*

...If a man spends less time on housework after he is married, then it makes sense
that he would see an increase in his wages because the extra time and effort spent
at work would increase his productivity and promotion chances.

...while marriage does seem to make men more productive in the market (i.e., men
begin making higher wages after marriage), household specialization does not seem
to be the cause. They find little difference between married and unmarried men in
the time they spend on home production.

If the productivity from marriage itself is not the result of decreased hours spent on
housework, as Hersche and Stratton suggest, then where does that improved
productivity come from? Because the earnings of divorced or separated men are
higher than those of never-married men, the added productivity that accompanies
marriage must be of two kinds: (1) productivity from the marriage itself and/or (2)
advantages that remain even after the marriage is dissolved. Korenman and David
Neumark argue in a 1991 study that the wage premium earned by divorced or
separated men is attributable to the advantages gained while married. Their
evidence is that wages grow more slowly in the years of divorce or separation.

Economic papers are filled with this kind of willful misunderstanding of what is going on. Why
do men earn more after marrying, and then after divorce tend to stop growing their
earnings? The answer is quite simple, and boils down to incentives. Men who want to marry
know they need to earn more to signal provider status. After marriage men have greater
responsibilities, and therefore have to earn even more. *Threats of divorce* ratchet this
pressure up further, as men understand that the family courts are designed to separate
fathers from their children while financially rewarding the mother at the father’s expense.
Divorce for women means ejecting the man and keeping both the kids and a large part of his
paycheck. Divorce for men means losing the kids and paying a steep monthly fee to finance
the operation.

But since divorce removes the incentive married men naturally feel to earn more money,
family court judges know they need to replace the natural incentive with something else. This
is why the family courts assign men earnings quotas (imputed income) based on their
previous income. The man might earn less than his quota, but he will be billed for child
support and/or alimony based on this quota. This quota system is enforced with the *threat of
imprisonment*, and is not surprisingly despised by the men who find themselves forced into it.
This explains why divorced men earn more than never married men; they have a quota to
meet based on their income at the end of the marriage. If they don’t maintain their married
level of earnings, they will be sent to prison. It also explains why divorced men’s earnings
tend not to grow like they would have were they still married; quota systems are effective in
the short term at coercing hard work, but they create a disincentive for increasing
productivity. Under a quota system earning more only increases your quota. Most men under
our new quota system will work hard enough to stay out of prison, but they aren’t going to take risks and/or work harder for the privilege of increasing their quota.

Note that while Prager and Wilcox claim the pressure married men feel to work harder is a benefit to men, the St. Louis Fed likewise implies that being forced by a court to pay alimony and/or child support is an advantage divorced men have which never married men lack (emphasis mine):

...the added productivity that accompanies marriage must be of two kinds: (1) productivity from the marriage itself and/or (2) **advantages that remain even after the marriage is dissolved**.

We won the cold war because an incentive based system leads to a kind of dynamic productivity that a quota based system can’t ever hope to create. Yet we have dramatically reworked our family structure in ways only the Soviets could truly appreciate. This new system is hurting us in ways we refuse to accept, because accepting the cost would force us to rethink our family model. Part of the problem is that the costs associated with replacing marriage with a child support system weren’t immediately obvious. Since we pretended we still had a fundamentally marriage based family structure, initially men carried on as if that was the case. In fact, most men today still do so. However, over time the reality of the new system has caused not a marriage strike, but **something more ominous**. Just like with the Soviet system, this will continue until we decide the ideology behind the quota system isn’t worth the economic pain it inevitably causes. In the meantime, economists will remain baffled as to why married earn more than divorced men, and why both earn more than never married men.
The Atlantic has a love-hate relationship with men’s economic contributions. The magazine alternates between gloating that feminism has destroyed men’s economic status once and for all, and worrying that men are no longer fulfilling their traditional roles as bread winners.

In 2008 The Atlantic published Lori Gottlieb’s now famous piece Marry Him! warning of a shortage of eligible men for marriage delaying women:

...despite growing up in an era when the centuries-old mantra to get married young was finally (and, it seemed, refreshingly) replaced by encouragement to postpone that milestone in pursuit of high ideals (education! career! but also true love!), every woman I know—no matter how successful and ambitious, how financially and emotionally secure—feels panic, occasionally coupled with desperation, if she hits 30 and finds herself unmarried.

...if you say you’re not worried, either you’re in denial or you’re lying. In fact, take a good look in the mirror and try to convince yourself that you’re not worried, because you’ll see how silly your face looks when you’re being disingenuous.

Whether you acknowledge it or not, there’s good reason to worry.

Then in 2010 Atlantic senior editor Hanna Rosin switched the sentiment from fear to greed with her own now famous piece The End of Men, gloating at the ostensible crushing of men once and for all:

Earlier this year, women became the majority of the workforce for the first time in U.S. history. Most managers are now women too. And for every two men who get a college degree this year, three women will do the same. For years, women’s progress has been cast as a struggle for equality. But what if equality isn’t the end point? What if modern, postindustrial society is simply better suited to women? A report on the unprecedented role reversal now under way— and its vast cultural consequences.

But the end of men means the end of feminists having it all, since having it all depends on men continuing to fulfill their traditional roles as feminists radically rewrite the rules of marriage and the family. In 2011 The Atlantic switched back to fear, publishing Kate Bolick’s All the Single Ladies:

Recent years have seen an explosion of male joblessness and a steep decline in men’s life prospects that have disrupted the “romantic market” in ways that narrow a marriage-minded woman’s options...

Rosin and Gottlieb went on to write books by the same title as their Atlantic articles. Bolick has since embraced her new status as a spinsters, first with an Atlantic article and then with a
book by the same title.

In 2014 instead of Hanna Rosin’s open gloating, Derek Thompson wrote a less triumphant Atlantic piece titled The Mysterious Rise of the Non-Working Man. Thompson quoted the New York Times, noting that a combination of new technology, the destruction of marriage, and the welfare state was changing men’s incentives:

Many men, in particular, have decided that low-wage work will not improve their lives, in part because deep changes in American society have made it easier for them to live without working. These changes include the availability of federal disability benefits; the decline of marriage, which means fewer men provide for children; and the rise of the Internet, which has reduced the isolation of unemployment.

Thompson concluded his 2014 piece with a much more muted declaration of feminist victory than Rosin’s 2010 piece:

...some economists think identity plays a starring role in the economy. “Some of the decline in work among young men is a mismatch between aspirations and identity,” said Lawrence Katz, a professor of economics at Harvard University. “Taking a job as a health technician has the connotation as a feminized job. The growth has been in jobs that have been considered women’s jobs—education, health, government.”

The economy is not simply leaving men behind. It is leaving manliness behind. Machines are replacing the brawn that powered the 20th century economy, clearing way for work that requires a softer human touch.

In April of this year Derek Thomson was back, this time with a feminist complaint about American men titled Too Many Elite American Men Are Obsessed With Work and Wealth.

...it’s making the pay gap worse.

Like most economists, Thompson minimizes the obvious difference between men and women’s roles in marriage and the profound impact this has on how the sexes approach work (emphasis mine):

It’s hard to identify the root causes of the values gap. Are women averse to high-risk, high-reward professions because they expect, from an early age, that these career paths are barricaded by discrimination? Maybe. Are women less interested in working more hours because pay disparities mean that the marginal hour worked earns them less money? Maybe. Are subtle and hard-to-measure cultural expectations nudging young women toward jobs that would offer flexibility (to care for kids they don’t yet have) while pushing men toward high-paying jobs (to provide for that family they don’t yet have)? Maybe. Are part-time female workers in the U.S. happier at work because their husbands are the primary breadwinners, and they don’t feel a similar burden at the office? Maybe. In addition to these cultural factors, are there biological factors that, for better and worse, make men more likely to seek out risks? Maybe.
Thompson then closes his April Atlantic piece with an indictment of (some) American men for selfishly working too hard:

But something else is clear: There is a workaholic mania among educated wealth-seeking American men, who seem uniquely devoted to working any number of hours to get rich. Remember the lesson of the Stanford study: Sometimes, the winners of a tournament are the ones who choose not to enter it.

But while Thompson and the Atlantic worry that elite men are selfishly working too hard, they also worry that young men are not preparing to be bread winners for aging feminist career women. This brings us to Thompson’s July Atlantic piece on Why America Should Be Worried About Its Young Men. In this piece the feminist Thompson frames his angst as a concern for the wellbeing of layabout young men who aren’t preparing for the joy of marrying aging feminist career women:

…they are having fun, Hurst emphasized. “Happiness surveys actually indicate that they [are] quite content compared to their peers,” he told UChicago. In the short run, not working doesn’t seem to make men miserable at all.

Cheap and abundant entertainment anesthetizes less-skilled and less-educated young men in the present. But in the long run, it cuts them off from the same things that provide meaning in middle age, according to psychological and longitudinal studies—a career, a family, and a sense of accomplishment. The problem is that these 20-year-olds will eventually be 30-year-olds and 40-year-olds, and although young men who don’t go to college might appear happy now, those same satisfaction studies suggest that they will be much less happy in their 30s and 40s—less likely to get married, and more likely to be in poverty.

There is of course some truth to this concern. A life on the dole is soul crushing. However, this sudden claim of concern for men coming from The Atlantic is hard to take seriously. This is doubly true given Thompson’s Atlantic article two days ago praising the Scandinavian welfare state.

At any rate, we should expect to see an increasing frequency and intensity of articles worrying about how men are reacting to the radical redefinition of the family, as men’s choices slowly catch up with reality. These articles will come both from conservatives looking to conserve feminist progress, as well as feminists who find themselves suddenly conservative when it comes to men as (selfish) breadwinners. There is after all one thing conservatives and feminists can agree on whole heartedly, and that is that weak men are screwing feminism up.
Feminists longing for the good old days.

by Dalrock | August 9, 2016 | Link

Camille Paglia has famously argued that “If civilization had been left in female hands, we would still be living in grass huts.” Yet even this is likely too optimistic. As the New York Times explains, the patriarchy can be traced back to the mastery of fire:

- Negative cultural consequences came with fire, too — and continue to leave an imprint. Anthropologists have speculated that inhaling smoke led to the discovery of smoking. Humans have long used fire to modify their environment and burn carbon, practices that now have us in the throes of climate change. Fire is even tied to the rise of patriarchy — by allowing men to go out hunting while women stayed behind to cook by the fire, it spawned gender norms that still exist today.

Even literacy is patriarchal, as Leonard Shlain argues in his book The Alphabet Versus the Goddess: The Conflict Between Word and Image

- Literacy has promoted the subjugation of women by men throughout all but the very recent history of the West. Misogyny and patriarchy rise and fall with the fortunes of the alphabetic written word.

The Booknews editorial review of the book explains that literacy leads to logical thought, and logical thought is patriarchal (emphasis mine):

- [Shlain] Proposes, rather than argues closely, that the shift from apprehending the world from images to writing—especially alphabetic—contributed largely to the suppression of goddess worship and the decline in the status of women in societyting. Shlain is a neurosurgeon, and begins by explaining how reading and looking at pictures or listening to speech use different parts of the brain and indeed can influence the development of children’s brains. Then, rejecting the linear, sequentialist, reductionist thinking he associates with both writing and masculine values, he offers a long series of essentially independent essays, each evoking an example of his thesis.

H/T DeNihilist

Update: Instapundit links to another blog making the same observations.
The peasants are revolting.

by Dalrock | August 10, 2016 | Link

Love him or hate him, Trump has managed to bring the Republican elite’s seething contempt for the working class to the surface. Back in March, Kevin D. Williamson at National Review wrote that white working class communities deserve to die:

If you spend time in hardscrabble, white upstate New York, or eastern Kentucky, or my own native West Texas, and you take an honest look at the welfare dependency, the drug and alcohol addiction, the family anarchy—which is to say, the whelping of human children with all the respect and wisdom of a stray dog—you will come to an awful realization. It wasn’t Beijing. It wasn’t even Washington, as bad as Washington can be. It wasn’t immigrants from Mexico, excessive and problematic as our current immigration levels are. It wasn’t any of that...

The truth about these dysfunctional, downscale communities is that they deserve to die. Economically, they are negative assets. Morally, they are indefensible...

Trump’s focus has been on the elite’s policy of driving down the wages of the working class through lopsided trade deals and flooding our economy with cheap foreign labor. Williamson ironically disregards the economic crisis faced by the working class by accurately noting that our elites have done even more damage by creating a new family model that only works for the upper middle class.

The callousness on display here is breathtaking, yet it is commonplace amongst Republican elites. Much of the contempt for Trump stems from the contempt the elite have for the segment of society that he is reaching out to, a segment the Republican elites have done their best to ignore for decades. This shines through even when members of the elite try to learn from Trump’s example.

Yesterday John Daniel Davidson placed this contempt on full display in his Federalist article Like Trump, Right Should Speak To America’s Forgotten Fishtowns. Unlike Williamson, Davidson argues that we can’t just expect these undesirables to die.

And sure, maybe they’re a nasty bunch of old drunks, like the rural white folks we meet in J.D. Vance’s gripping new memoir, “Hillbilly Elegy,” who can’t seem to get out of their own way long enough to get ahead. But they’re here nonetheless, in our towns and cities, and they’ve been stirred up by Trump...

But even when arguing that conservatives should change course and reach out to this forgotten group, Davidson wears his contempt for the working class on his sleeve (emphasis mine):

If conservatives want a political future, if they want to take back the GOP and lead the country, they’ll need to figure out a way to speak to these people. They will need to persuade them that their best chance for a better life doesn’t rest with the empty
promises of a demagogue like Trump—or with Hillary Clinton and the tired old liberal policies that Democrats have imposed on our cities for generations.

They will have to go to the Fishtowns of America, to the forgotten and shuttered places, and by word and deed show the people there, however backward they might be, that they can rebuild their lives and their communities, and that they aren’t alone anymore.

This attempt by the Republican elites to minimize the plight of the white working class is not only foolish politically, but is also built on moral quicksand. It is true that the dysfunction we observe typically involves poor choices by all involved. But it is also true that these same elites have reworked marriage to a model that only works for the elite. After gutting marriage, our elites strut around thumping their chests bragging about their ability to make this new corrupt family model work in their own lives. If those poor slobs who work with their hands were more like the elite, moving from a marriage based family structure to a child support based system would work for them too.

Since the only legally meaningful part of our new marriage model is the wedding, our elites could sum up their advice to the working class with a handy slogan:

Let them eat wedding cake.

H/T Instapundit.
The real problem with the Ghostbusters reboot.
by Dalrock | August 15, 2016 | Link

I left the following paragraph as a comment over on Instapundit the other day, and I think it is worth sharing here and expanding on:

The real problem with the reboot is that it was the stereotypical dreary feminist message. Feminism sells just fine, but the new Ghostbusters was straight from the ministry of feminist entertainment. It was the movie version of the soviet fashion show Wendy’s parodied in their famous commercial. Very few women (and fewer men) want to watch a group of dumpy women in ill fitting ugly jumpsuits and combat boots. It is that simple. Hollywood can sell feminism all day long, and has been doing so with no problem for decades. But even Hollywood can’t sell the dumpy lesbian feminism that Ghostbusters was selling.

For those who aren’t familiar with the Wendy’s commercial I referenced above:

For an example of Hollywood successfully selling feminist characters, see the far more successful Suicide Squad. Suicide Squad proves that you can sell feminism to both men and women at the movies, so long as the women are sexy. In fact, crazy is fine so long as it is hot and crazy.

But to the party faithful feminism must be dreary or they won’t be happy. It isn’t enough to have a group of kick ass women, they have to be wearing sensible shoes.

Male feminist Scott Hansen at Sheboygan Press explains in ‘Suicide Squad’ perpetuates Hollywood sexism:

As portrayed by Margot Robbie, Harley Quinn is physically strong and able to outwit most of the “Suicide Squad” male characters, but unfortunately has to do so in a glorified bikini while being leered at by most of the male cast.

Hansen describes three other kick ass women in the movie, but all of them suffer the same fate of being sexually desired.

What Hansen doesn’t understand is that it is even more important to the women in the audience that the women on the screen be hot than it is to the men. A good rule of thumb for women is would they want to dress up like the character for Halloween? Even with a slightly sexed up version of the Ghostbusters costume, I don’t think they will have trouble keeping up with demand. Even the ugliest feminist doesn’t want to be seen as ugly. Costume vendors understand this, which is why they have created “sexy” versions (here and here) that look nothing like the outfits in the movie. Those will surely sell far better than the more accurate reproduction, but I still suspect they won’t be top sellers. On the other hand, there is a whole page full of options for Harley Quinn costumes, and if you want one I would suggest that you
order well in advance.
Why can’t women do pull ups? It’s a culture thing.
by Dalrock | August 16, 2016 | Link

With the news coming out today that the sole remaining female Marine has dropped out of the Infantry Officer’s Course (CNN, Marine Corps Times*) it seems like a good time to look into why women in the military are having so much trouble meeting physical fitness requirements. According to the CNN video below from January of 2014, the reason women lack upper body strength is women aren’t taught how to do pull ups. Here is the relevant exchange between CNN Anchor Don Lemon and CNN Pentagon correspondent Chris Lawrence:

**Chris Lawrence:** What they’re gonna do now, is... looking at better ways to train women to do these push-ups [sic]. There is a feeling that from the time they are girls, girls don’t do push-ups, even women who workout religiously and are very physically fit are not working those kind of muscles and trying to build up that bigger upper body by doing pull-ups. So, what they want to do is go in and really teach women better ways to train to do this particular exercise.

**Don Lemon:** Yeah, working the upper body that’s a guy thing, right? And I mean, guys you see at the gym with skinny legs, big upper bodies.

**Chris Lawrence:** It’s the beach muscles. It’s the beach workout.

Here is the video, starting with the exchange between Lemon and Lawrence:

All of this is of course a smokescreen in an effort to pretend that standards aren’t being lowered in the process of further integrating the armed forces. Something has to give, and even if we have a Republican in the white house next year the Obama administration’s decision to open all combat roles to women won’t be rolled back. Part of being conservative means conserving feminist progress, so the only question now is how fast and how far the standards will be lowered in order to finally complete the construction of our new feminist military.

*H/T The Question*
Every submarine, every SEAL team.

by Dalrock | August 18, 2016 | Link

Oscar commented:

I’ve served in all-male units and I’ve served in mixed sex units, and the all-male units simply worked more smoothly...

This of course was what the Marine Corps found when they compared teams with all men and mixed sex teams. The Marine Corps study was promptly dismissed because it doesn’t fit the narrative. The only solution here is to make it impossible to compare mixed sex and all male units. This is one of the reasons that all units, every single one, must include women. If there are any units without women, the men will be able to identify the difference. Every submarine, every SEAL team, etc. must include a woman or it will be possible to point out that all male teams perform better. This won’t happen overnight, but it is the fundamental goal and we should expect that it will eventually be accomplished.

The other reason this has to happen is women’s envy of gratitude and respect. Our nation must never again be grateful for the sacrifice of men without in the same breath stating that we are equally grateful for the sacrifice of the women who were present. At all costs. Never again. To feminists it is better to lose a battle, or even a war, than to suffer that unbearable indignity. Our political and military leaders have heard this order, and are fully committed to carrying it out.

The new bargain here is identical to the new bargain on marriage. Men will retain sole responsibility for the success or failure of the mission, but women will be declared fully equal partners while having a long list of special rights. This is why the fact that failure is much more likely doesn’t really bother most (conservatives or liberals). All we need is for the men to stop complaining, man up, and somehow make it all work. Then we can get on with the business of thanking the men and women who protected us.
Broadcasting what they bring to the table.

by Dalrock | August 19, 2016 | Link

After a successful hunt (or fishing trip), men like to show off with a picture of what they are bringing to the table. The appeal for men to demonstrate their ability to provide in such a primal way is obvious. But for women, hunting or fishing and then posing with their kill has lacked this appeal for equally obvious reasons; provision isn’t what women bring to the table.

Women are however skilled at finding ways to re-purpose activities to meet their own needs, and have finally found a way to make fishing as fun and meaningful for women as it is for men (LSFW).
Scientists and the popular media are claiming that women are fallen, and therefore tempted to sin. But Christian theologians know that women are innately good, and if they are ever tempted to sin it is because they don’t have enough self esteem.

H/T Vox
Scott is back.
by Dalrock | August 31, 2016 | Link

Scott is back with a new blog, American Dad. As Scott explains:

The basic concept is, as the tag line suggests, “to honor fathers.”

The fatherhood crisis is not going to go away until fathers are honored, for just being fathers. Some of the dads featured are single. Some are raising step children. Some are separated from their own kids because of their ex-wives blowing up their marriages. There are poor ones, middle class ones, etc. The only criterion is “dads who love their kids.”

That may seem like a low bar. But in this culture, the simple of statement “dads should be honored” is countercultural.

Check it out from the link above, or from my blogroll.
Are real men attracted to boisterous, opinionated women?

by Dalrock | September 8, 2016 | Link

In *Real Men Love Strong Women*, a feminist laments the fact that weak men are screwing feminism up:

> I’ve heard it too many times: “A man likes a quiet woman.” “Guys don’t respond well to smart girls.” “Educated women are too intimidating to attract good men.”

> …we feel very clever when we get to diagnose the cause and cure of singleness. “You’re too opinionated.” “You’re too boisterous.” “A woman should be small, quiet, and delicate.”

Yet, it’s easy to forget in the midst of all our diagnosing: whether a woman is “intimidating” is a factor of male perception, not female personality. Do we want women to be less intimidating? That’s a question to be put to men who experience them as such, and we can only wait for such men to grow.

This basic complaint is standard issue for feminists, and you will regularly see the same lament on Jezebel or Gawker. However, what sets this particular *ban bossy* article apart is that it appears on John Piper’s Desiring God website. Piper you will recall is (along with Grudem) one of the two main founders of the CBMW and the complementarian movement. Piper is also a council member of the other big complementarian group, The Gospel Coalition. John Piper is at the core of the complementarian movement, and he published this piece on his personal website.

As a complementarian argument for feminism, the author (Paul Maxwell) frames *ban bossy* as a matter of being good Christians:

> We live in a time when women are outperforming men in many areas of professional and personal competency. And men have two choices: to find female strength captivatingly attractive, or to be insecure and intimidated. Real men love strong women, because God’s glory is beautiful, and “woman is the glory of man” (1 Corinthians 11:7).

> Jesus, give men the grace to see the beauty of glorious female strength. Give women the resilience to remain strong long enough for the right men to find them beautiful for the right reasons. And help men and women to fall in love with proven, genuine faith, which is “more precious than gold that perishes though it is tested by fire” (1 Peter 1:7).

Maxwell offers the example of Jael in Judges 4 in making his case that Christianity discourages women from being meek and submissive:
...often, godly femininity requires being strong, even intimidating. Consider Jael in Judges 4. Jael’s husband Heber “had separated from the Kenites,” and “had pitched his tent as far away as the oak in Zaanannim, which is near Kedesh” (Judges 4:11).

So, when Sisera, a Canaanite military general under Jabin the King of Hazor — the enemy of the people of God — tried to seek refuge, he went to Heber’s tent, “for there was peace between Jabin the King of Hazor and the house of Heber the Kenite” (Judges 4:17). But Sisera found Jael at the tent and started barking orders at her: “Give me a little water.” “Stand at the opening of the tent.” In response, “she went softly to him and drove the peg into his temple until it went down into the ground” (Judges 4:21). Deborah later sang of Jael, “Most blessed of women be Jael . . . She sent her hand to the tent peg and her right hand to the workmen’s mallet” (Judges 5:24, 26).

Thank God Jael wasn’t meek and submissive and respectful toward this friend of her wayward husband. She wasn’t one to be trampled on. Strong women reject the requests of evil men.

A far more relevant (and less obscure) Old Testament example would be Sarah in Genesis. As the Apostle Peter explains in 1 Pet 3, Sarah is the example Christian wives are to emulate:

3 Wives, in the same way submit yourselves to your own husbands so that, if any of them do not believe the word, they may be won over without words by the behavior of their wives, 2 when they see the purity and reverence of your lives. Your beauty should not come from outward adornment, such as elaborate hairstyles and the wearing of gold jewelry or fine clothes. 4 Rather, it should be that of your inner self, the unfading beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is of great worth in God’s sight. 5 For this is the way the holy women of the past who put their hope in God used to adorn themselves. They submitted themselves to their own husbands, like Sarah, who obeyed Abraham and called him her lord. You are her daughters if you do what is right and do not give way to fear.

Note that Peter tells us that wives who submit to their husbands, who cultivate a gentle and quiet spirit, are beautiful to God. Maxwell, on the other hand, tells us that men who are attracted to what God finds beautiful are not real men, and not good Christians. Is God insecure and intimidated because He finds quiet, gentle, and submissive women beautiful? Of course not. Moreover, what is beautiful to God is what is beautiful (period). God does not have faulty “male perception”, He is perfect, and so is His perception.

Not only has Maxwell chosen a relatively obscure OT story while ignoring much more relevant NT direct instruction, but he has managed to miss entirely the point of Judges 4. The moral of Judges 4 is not that men need strong women to lead them. The moral is that it was shameful for Barak to insist that Deborah accompany him to the battle. Because of this, God ensured that Barak would have no glory in the battle by delivering his enemy into the hands of a woman (Jael).
Then she sent and called for Barak the son of Abinoam from Kedesh in Naphtali, and said to him, “Has not the Lord God of Israel commanded, ‘Go and deploy troops at Mount Tabor; take with you ten thousand men of the sons of Naphtali and of the sons of Zebulun; and against you I will deploy Sisera, the commander of Jabin’s army, with his chariots and his multitude at the River Kishon; and I will deliver him into your hand’?”

And Barak said to her, “If you will go with me, then I will go; but if you will not go with me, I will not go!”

So she said, “I will surely go with you; nevertheless there will be no glory for you in the journey you are taking, for the Lord will sell Sisera into the hand of a woman.”

Every other man in the enemy’s army was slaughtered that day by Barak and his men, except for Sisera, whom God reserved for a woman to kill (as punishment to Barak).

But Barak pursued the chariots and the army as far as Harosheth Hagoyim, and all the army of Sisera fell by the edge of the sword; not a man was left.

However, Sisera had fled away on foot to the tent of Jael.

Instead of badly misinterpreting Judges 4, Maxwell could have turned to the book immediately following Judges, the Book of Ruth. While Jael is praised in the Song of Deborah for her role in shaming Barak, she is a foreigner who isn’t chronicled in the Bible as converting to become a Hebrew, and if she had any children they aren’t noted in the Bible. On the other hand, while also a foreigner, Ruth follows God, has a book of the Bible named after her**, and has the honor of being the great grandmother of King David, from whose line Christ was born.

Maxwell could also have gone further to Proverbs 7:11, where a rebellious woman is described as (depending on the translation) loud or boisterous, traits Maxwell is arguing are encouraged by God. He could likewise have turned to Isaiah 3:12:

As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them. O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths.

*HT Woodchipper

**If you haven’t read the book of Ruth, or haven’t read it recently, I highly recommend taking a few minutes to read it. The story is moving, sweet, short, and every page is guaranteed to make a feminist want to tear out the hair on her legs.
And yet she feels compelled to frame this as a **courageous stand against the patriarchy**.

She’s going to fix men, so that women (like her) who want to be like men will be **satisfied** being like men.
Age of cross-dressing
by Dalrock | September 18, 2016 | Link

The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman’s garment: for all that do so are abomination unto the Lord thy God.

— Deut 22:5, KJV

Yesterday Drudge linked to an article in the Sun about Britain’s first woman to fight on the front line.

GUARDSMAN Chloe Allen has become the British Army’s first female frontline soldier — after being born a boy called Ben.
The 24-year-old joined up four years ago as a man, but changed her name officially last month.

I tried to describe the full absurdity of the story to my wife and daughter last night, with a tattooed man speaking in a deep voice about how honored he is to be the first woman to break through this barrier.

Sporting long polished nails and with silver studs in her ears, she said: “It’s a great honour to make history.

“I’m just looked at as a normal person.”

I finally decided to show them the video embedded in the article, since I really can’t do it justice. After watching the video my wife was sure it had to be satire, and that I was pulling her leg.

But this is the age we live in, the age of cross-dressing. It is entirely fitting that the “first woman” to fill this role is a man in the earliest stages of disguising himself as a woman, because putting women in combat has always been about cross-dressing. When feminists first pitched the idea in earnest, surely nearly everyone had cross dressing in mind, albeit from the other direction. Who among them would have realized that the culmination of their work would be a man pretending to be a woman pretending to be a man? The desire was for women to pretend to be men, to wear the garb of men and take on the role of men. This kind of cross dressing is now entirely normal in our society, just as Ben hopes his apparent change into Chloe will also be accepted as normal.

This morning my wife showed me the cover of the Fall 2016 USAA Magazine. It features a closeup of a butch woman (Star Cazador) in a Sheriff Department uniform with the caption:

PROTECT AND SERVE

Marine training helped define this law enforcement officer’s mission.
I can't find the cover image on the web to link to, but it is the top photo here cropped to only show Cazador. If your browser permits you to blow it up until she takes up the entire frame, you will get a pretty good idea of the cover of the magazine.

Most who see the photo will see nothing wrong with Cazador donning the dress and posture of a man, because this is perfectly normal in our society; it is seen as a *virtue* for a woman to do this in our age. This is even true for most of the people who can still spot the absurdity in Britain’s first female front line soldier.

But now that we have as a society come to not just accept but *celebrate* Cazador’s cross-dressing, we are also being taught to both accept and celebrate Ben Allen’s cross-dressing. Just as it was crucial for feminists to teach adults to encourage girls to want to grow up to be men at a young age, Social Justice Warriors are now busy teaching us that boys should be taught to want to grow up to be women at a young age. This is all around us, but for just one example see the NY Times article Drudge linked to on Friday: *From He to She in First Grade*

When our son turned 6, my husband and I bought him a puppet theater and a chest of dress-up clothes because he liked to put on plays. We filled the chest with 20 items from Goodwill, mostly grown-man attire: ties, button-down shirts, a gray pageboy cap and a suit vest.

But we didn’t want his or his castmates’ creative output to be curtailed by a lack of costume choices, so we also included high heels, a pink straw hat, a dazzling fairy skirt and a sparkly green halter dress.

With this as only the beginning of her and her husband’s passive aggressive prodding, they are proud to announce that their son now considers himself a girl. This life altering change of identity was pushed on him at such a young age he could not have hoped to understand what his parents were softly coaxing him towards. After his first three days in first grade his parents had worked their magic, as his mother proudly explains:

“*I already decided about that,“* he said. “*I never think about that anymore.‘”

It had been three days.

But it was also true. He had already decided. He didn’t think about that anymore. And he — she — never looked back. She grew out her hair. She stopped telling people she was a boy in a skirt and started being a girl in a skirt instead.

We are much farther down this path than nearly everyone is aware. Even those who are fighting against this latest SJW crusade are almost entirely unequipped to perceive the true insanity of it. As Cane Caldo *brilliantly observes:*

The tailspin of America has only accelerated, and it is accelerating at a quadratic rate. Whatever our ethnicities or religions, we now have two groups of people in America: Those who think men who dress as women should disrobe with little girls, and those who think they should disrobe with little boys. (There is no debate about the wrongness of trans-sexualism. There is no concern for the boys.) How did we
come to this?

Crossdressing is the spirit of our age, with even modern (conservative) Christians fully caught in its thrall. The instructions to husbands and wives in the Bible make modern Christians deeply uncomfortable, but all of this is solved by the simple act of embracing cross dressing. Switch the roles of husband and wife, and modern Christians absolutely adore headship and submission.
Hierarchy equals abuse.

by Dalrock | September 21, 2016 | Link

As I’ve explained most recently in All roads lead to Duluth, the Duluth model has become by far the dominant paradigm for viewing domestic violence. This is essential to understand because Duluth isn’t really about domestic violence, but about legislating feminist theory. The focus of Duluth is to end what feminists call male privilege, or male entitlement. While the flag of domestic violence and abuse is waved in front of the crowd, the Duluth creators go out of their way to make it clear that their focus is not on violence or abuse, but on the idea that a husband is head of the household. In the Duluth model the idea of headship is both the root of abuse, and it is in itself abuse.

This paradigm is so widely accepted that very often it isn’t named Duluth when it is presented. For example, in the article Domestic violence: Male entitlement mentality a factor, the word Duluth is never used. However, the model is clearly the Duluth model, as it is about power and control and ending male entitlement (emphasis mine):

The real problem is a belief system rooted in male entitlement.

“The underlying belief system is, ‘Because I’m the man in this relationship, I’m in charge,’” Steffy said.

The goal is to help men change the way they think and live, Steffy said. The counselors help them to view relationships as egalitarian, not a hierarchy.

“Our ultimate goal would be for each client to make an absolute commitment to be noncontrolling, nonviolent,” Steffy said.

In the case above the advocate (Roger Steffy with Lutheran Social Services of South Central Pennsylvania) is very open about pushing a feminist/egalitarian model. But in other cases the same feminist model is delivered by Christian leaders presenting themselves as traditional. These leaders teach the same feminist concepts, and very often adopt the same feminist terminology, but they present the Duluth paradigm as a (traditional) biblical paradigm and not a radical feminist creation. This is far more dangerous than the overt teaching of feminism.

I’ve offered examples of this before, but for another example see Pastor Sam Powell’s Headship is not Hierarchy* and his related post Genesis 3:16. Like Steffy, Powell explains that a hierarchical marriage is by it’s very nature abusive, but he goes a step further and claims the very idea of hierarchy in marriage is of the devil:

The goal of marriage is the one flesh relationship, rather than the antagonistic and abusive relationship that characterized the kingdom of the devil. It isn’t about who makes the coffee, changes the diapers, or does the dishes.
Note how he weaves in feminist resentment to poison the very concept of headship. Modern wives are constantly encouraged to simmer in feminist resentment over who does the dishes, and Powell makes brilliant use of this to poison the very idea of biblical headship in his reader’s minds. Part of the ruse here is a very effective distraction. Powell wants the reader to focus on what he presents as men abusing headship, but his real argument is against headship itself. In *Headship* he writes:

> I think it is reading to much into the text to say that this means that Adam ruled over his wife. Did Adam sit on the couch and say “Woman, beer me and shut those kids up!” I think not. He did not rule his wife. They both served God and one another perfectly, being without sin.

These are feminist nuclear emotional triggers, designed to terrify the men who are reading and make the women reading furious. They are stink bombs of marital strife. But his real point, the one he is sneaking in while lobbing stink bombs, is that husbands are not to *lead*, even in a loving way. He explains this in his *Genesis* post:

> Let’s take it with the second part of the phrase, “But he shall rule over thee”, which is set in contrast to the first phrase. It’s a disjunctive clause. The word “rule” (mashal) can be good rule, benevolent rule, tyrannical rule or any other kind of rule...

> Now that Christ has come, we as men are called, not to rule over our wives (whether benevolently or not) but to love our wives, and thus reflect to the world the love of our great savior, who gave himself for us.

This is also clear in the title “Headship is not hierarchy”; Powell is against *any* idea of headship other than one which redefines it as purely submission.

> So in answer to the question, “Do I believe that the husband has authority in the home?” My answer is “Yes. Certainly. There is no way around it. He is to wash his wife’s feet, serve her, do good to her, love her – even, as Paul says, give himself for her.

This new definition of headship is really a thinly disguised form of the wife’s role of submission**. Except in this crossdressing form of headship and submission, husbands are accountable for the outcome while winning their wives without a word:

> ...the husband is to take the lead in taking the lowest place in the home. That’s not me saying this. That’s Jesus Christ.

> It is the husband ultimately responsible for the peace of the home. It is the husband that God will hold accountable for what has been entrusted to him.

Then he switches to Duluth language of abuse, power and control, and male entitlement (emphasis mine):

> ...he does not rule the home by **power and control**. He governs his home by
service and love. You can see a woman **controlled by power**. She is downcast and the light is gone in her eyes. And you can see a woman who is loved by her husband. She is alive, fully human, confident, and joyfully doing whatever work God has called her to with spirit and life. Why do so many who claim the name of Christ believe that women are to be **controlled by entitlement and power**?

The husband isn’t the boss, the commander, the chief, the king. All of that belongs to Christ.

Hierarchy, leading, believing you are the head of the household (in any non feminist sense), is abuse and *satanic* according to Powell. Instead, Powell teaches husbands to take on the role of homemaker:

So for you husbands insisting that you are the head of your home, take it seriously. Go home, cook dinner, draw her a bath, do the dishes, put the kids to bed.

As Powell explains, in Christian marriage “It isn’t about who makes the coffee, changes the diapers, or does the dishes”, so long as it is the *husband* who does these things.

*HT The Question

**The problem is not Powell saying a husband is to serve his wife; the problem is him using a husband’s obligation to serve his wife to deny headship and entirely recast it as submission.

See Also: Relishing sin
No crisis here.
by Dalrock | September 23, 2016 | Link

Instapundit host Glenn Reynolds has a great line:

I’ll believe it’s a crisis when the people who tell me it’s a crisis act like it’s a crisis.

I would apply this same line to Stephen Green’s recent Instapundit entry:

THE PRICE OF WAR, NEGLECT, DOWNSIZING, AND A BROKEN PROCUREMENT SYSTEM: House Panel says $1 Trillion Needed to Reboot Military.

It was just over a year ago that the Republican lead House Armed Services Committee telegraphed its readiness to pretend that trans-gendered soldiers, airmen, sailors, and marines would make our military stronger. The Senate Republicans and the Admirals and Generals fell in line as well. We saw the same with women in combat. All of our civilian and military leadership is telling us that we have no significant military threats, and therefore we can stop focusing on fielding warriors and get on with the business of fielding Social Justice Warriors. I’m inclined to take them at their word.

Besides, we just completed a massively expensive SJW reboot; surely that should hold us over for a few years.
She didn’t stick the landing, and she won’t leave the floor.

by Dalrock | September 29, 2016 | Link

When Eat Pray Love came out, it appeared that Elizabeth Gilbert had successfully navigated her way through steps 1-8 of having it all. But to succeed in this game of serial monogamy a woman needs to stick the landing. In truth this detail was missing from the beginning as the hunky Latin stud Gilbert claimed to have traded her boring loyal dude for turned out to be a short bald elderly man who married her for a visa*. But so long as Gilbert was willing to keep up the charade, so were most women in the west. They wanted to believe the lie because they desperately wanted to have it all as well.

But now it has all unraveled very publicly, first with Gilbert announcing that she is divorcing her second husband, and then with her announcing that she has become a lesbian**.

Now I’ve just left another marriage, it’s starting to look irresponsible and people are saying I’m having a midlife crisis, and ‘What is she doing?’

The truth is Gilbert’s romantic life has always been a disaster, but so long as it appeared that she had stuck the landing her tale could be spun as one of triumph, as a sort of sexual rags to riches story. Gilbert’s best move here would be to keep a low profile and allow the women who want to follow her path pretend it didn’t really morph into dark comedy. But more than anything Gilbert craves attention, so even though this would be the pragmatic approach, she simply can’t help herself.

I need to live my life in truth and transparency, even more than I need privacy, or good publicity, or prudence, or other people’s approval or understanding, or just about anything else.

Related: Women’s morphing need for male investment.

*It could be worse. He could also have been gay.
**H/T Reason
At least they haven’t turned the ships pink yet.
by Dalrock | September 30, 2016 | Link

Yesterday the US Navy announced what it is calling a “large cultural change”, with the elimination of 91 enlisted ratings titles. Navy Times explains in Navy scuttles sailors’ enlisted rating titles in huge career shake-up

Sailors will no longer be identified by their job title, say, Fire Controlman 1st Class Joe Sailor, effective immediately. Instead, that would be Petty Officer 1st Class Joe Sailor.

... 

Sailors past and present have longstanding and deep love of the titles that have defined their Navy lives. All of these now belong to the history books.

Two thirds of the way into the article the Navy Times finally explains that this is all about making the Navy more gender neutral:

It began by a directive from Mabus to find gender-neutral rating titles that stripped them of the word “man,” in an effort to be more inclusive to women sailors who make up an increasing size of the force.

Secretary Mabus, you may recall, tried to have male Marines wear female caps three years ago.

All of this is entirely to be expected, and this is only the beginning. Women pushing to enter male spaces fall into two categories. A small number of women sincerely want to experience manly pride, and these women are very protective of the masculine nature of the institutions they enter. A much larger number recognizes that they can’t experience manly pride, and therefore sets out to ensure that men can’t either.

The second group is the one that inevitably takes control, and will forever agitate to mark the space as feminine. The best way to conceptualize this compulsion is an overwhelming desire to put a pink bow on everything associated with the space (men, machines, uniforms, etc). We can see this symbolically with the elimination of masculine job titles used for hundreds of years, and we can see it more literally in the placement of a giant pink bow on the flight deck of the amphibious assault ship USS Bonhomme Richard:
Information on pink ribbon image [here](#) and [here](#).
Reworking Malachi 2:16 for our feminist era (part 1).

by Dalrock | October 5, 2016 | Link

I’ve written previously about the modern Christian cross-dressing view of marriage, where wives are in absolute headship and regularly need to give their husbands wakeup calls to establish their authority. While wives punishing disobedient husbands is a universal modern Christian fetish, there is a divergence of opinion on which method wives should use to make their husbands submit. Some favor smashing household items in an insane rage. Others favor denial of sex to control husbands, and some even go so far as to teach that God speaks to husbands through their wives vaginas.

While the above methods are (modern) Christian favorites, secular culture tends to instead prefer threats of divorce, or actual divorce, so that the family courts become the method of punishment. Economists Stevenson and Wolfers explain how the new marriage model facilitates the feminist agenda in their paper Bargaining in the Shadow of the Law: Divorce Laws and Family Distress (emphasis mine):

In the literature on the economics of the family there has been growing consensus on the need to take bargaining and distribution within marriage seriously. Such models of the family rely on a threat point to determine distribution within the household. The switch to a unilateral divorce regime redistributes power in a marriage, giving power to the person who wants out, and reducing the power previously held by the partner interested in preserving the marriage.

Modern Christians of course love this method as well; if you’ve seen the cherished movie Fireproof, you will recall that the wife brings her husband to heel (and to God) by filing for divorce and taking up with a new man. But there is a problem, and that problem is that the Bible tells us in Malachi 2:16 that God hates divorce*. Realistically, most get around this by pretending to detest divorce themselves; all modern Christians really need to do to facilitate the threatpoint is to remain silent on the issue, to wash their hands of it. But for some modern Christians, this isn’t enough. So long as Christian leaders aren’t actively encouraging wives to divorce or threaten to divorce, some wives will be unwilling to use this tool to bring their husbands to submission.

Fully embracing the modern view of marriage, as a semi-permanent pairing where the wife retains the option to nuke the family should she become displeased, requires reworking Malachi 2:16 to a meaning that provides God’s blessing, if not his outright encouragement, for unhappy wives to divorce their husbands.

Joel and Kathy Davisson explain to their readers that Malachi 2:16 has been twisted by evil men who would deprive wives of the power of the threatpoint:

Yes, God hates divorce. That is obvious. God hates anything that destroys. BUT, this is NOT the central message of Malachi 2.
Years ago, Kathy experienced a rage. It lasted one day. She was totally confused as to where this rage came from and what it was all about. That evening, while we were ministering, (this was in our early years, when the marriage was rough) God spoke to Kathy and said, “The anger that you feel is what I feel about divorce. I hate divorce.” The word-picture was perfect for the message that we were sharing that night (even though our marriage was having severe troubles!) Instantly, the anger lifted and Kathy shared the experience with those in attendance.

Yes, God hates divorce. But that is NOT the central message of Malachi 2.

The REAL message of Malachi 2 has been totally ignored.

A bit further down they reveal what that real meaning is:

The real message is this:

“Men, quit all of your praying, crying and giving offerings. I am not receiving them from you. Why? Because you have dealt treacherously with your wife. You deal treacherously with your wife and then you end up divorced. This is bad. Why? Because I, God hate divorce. So, quit dealing treacherously with your wives.”

As Joel and Kathy explain, everything a husband does that displeases his Christian wife is treacherous and abusive. This is by definition, because wives are according to Joel and Kathy, responders. If a wife is treating her husband badly, or is even just unhappy, this is a sign from God that the man needs to change.

God has equipped every woman with a marriage manual in her heart, designed to instruct her husband in how to meet her unique needs.

What is so diabolically brilliant about this new feminist meaning of Malachi 2:16 is they have twisted the passage from a condemnation of (male) divorce theft to a blessing of (female) divorce theft. At the time Malachi was written, the more common problem of divorce was men pretending to commit to their wives for life, but once the beauty and fertility of her youth was gone they would cast the wife out. The wife was duped into thinking her marriage was for life, but once it was to her husband’s advantage, she was cast out (put away), ending up destitute and separated from her children. This is the treachery the passage refers to men committing against the wives of their youth (emphasis mine):

14 Yet ye say, Wherefore? Because the Lord hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously: yet is she thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant.

15 And did not he make one? Yet had he the residue of the spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a godly seed. Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth.

16 For the Lord, the God of Israel, saith that he hateth putting away: for one covereth violence with his garment, saith the Lord of hosts: therefore take heed to your spirit,
that ye deal not treacherously.

17 Ye have wearied the Lord with your words. Yet ye say, Wherein have we wearied him? When ye say, Every one that doeth evil is good in the sight of the Lord, and he delighteth in them; or, Where is the God of judgment?

In our modern era we are still very aware of just how treacherous this (male) form of divorce theft is. We call it “trading her in for a younger model”, and it is widely (and rightly) condemned. However, the male form of divorce theft is no longer what is driving the vast majority of divorces. In fact, divorce rates are highest when women are young, beautiful, and fertile:

![Divorces per 1,000 married women by age](http://delrock.wordpress.com/)  
Sources: http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/hh-fam/cps2009/tabA1-all.xls  

The reason divorce rates drop to next to nothing when we would expect a surge of “trading her in for a younger model” divorce is that men aren’t the ones driving the modern divorce racket. A woman’s strategy for divorce treachery requires that she divorce her husband while she still has her beauty and fertility, so that she can still hope to attract another man. This is no less treacherous than the male form of divorce theft, as it also involves conning a spouse into an ostensible lifelong marriage, only to cast them out and rob them of their wealth and children.

It is this new form of divorce theft/treachery that modern Christians want to condone, and this is why Malachi 2:16 must be twisted to condone divorce theft so long as the wife is the one committing it. Joel and Kathy explain that the point of Malachi 2:16 is misapplied when it is used to tell unhappy wives they should honor their marriage vows, because the real message of the passage is that men need to keep their wives happy or the wife will be justified in casting the husband out (emphasis mine):

We have wrongly lifted three words out of context and as a result, the entire EMPHASIS of the passage has changed. As we have already pointed out, the
pressure often goes on suffering women to “buck up” instead of being placed upon men to treat their wives right the way that God intended.

...

The message of Malachi 2 is this:

“Men, obey the Word: Quit dealing treacherously with your wives. Why? Because if you don’t, **you are going to end up divorced and God hates divorce. We are not going to applaud you as a great man of God anymore if you cannot keep one little wife happy.**”

*This is of course not the only place in Scripture where Christians are told that marriage is for life, but the twisting of this specific Scripture is the topic of this post.

** I’ll provide another example in part two.
Reworking Malachi 2:16 for our feminist era (part 2).

by Dalrock | October 7, 2016 | Link

In part one of this series I explained how Malachi 2:16 is being reworked from a condemnation of divorce theft to justification for divorce theft. Thus Joel and Kathy Davisson have changed the meaning of “God hates divorce” to God hates men who can’t keep their wives happy (all emphasis in this post is mine):

Men, obey the Word: Quit dealing treacherously with your wives. Why? Because if you don’t, you are going to end up divorced and God hates divorce. We are not going to applaud you as a great man of God anymore if you cannot keep one little wife happy.

Treachery is expansively defined here to mean anything that displeases a wife. A husband’s role in this new definition of Christian marriage is to follow the instruction of his wife on how to be married, since God has provided wives with all of the knowledge when it comes to marriage. Joel and Kathy explain this in their book The Man of Her Dreams The Woman of His!

God has equipped every woman with a marriage manual in her heart, designed to instruct her husband in how to meet her unique needs.

... It is very simple. When your wife’s marriage manual points out that you have violated her in some way, your job is to hear her heart and accept what it is that your personal marriage manual is saying to you. Your wife may not have a clue as to how to handle the household checkbook. She may not have a clue as how to run a lawnmower. What she does have is that unique marriage manual in her heart for your marriage which is given to her from God. The way that a man becomes the man that God has called him to be is to become the husband his wife needs him to be. The only way to become the husband our wife needs us to be is to read our personal marriage manual. How do read that marriage manual? We listen to her heart.

While Joel and Kathy are probably the most over the top in how they present this new view of Christian marriage, what they are teaching is the mainstream conservative Christian view of marriage. I promised in the first post to include another example of this in part two, and the example I’ll share is from Pastor Sam Powell in his post God Hates Divorce, part two (see part one here).

Pastor Powell is a bit more circumspect, but he is selling the same message as Joel and Kathy. If a wife is unhappy in her marriage, it is evidence that her husband is hateful and treacherous to her. Powell explains that God created Adam and Eve to have a perfect marriage, but because men are sinful they hate their wives and treat them treacherously. Powell claims that instead of hating divorce, God is saying men need to make their wives happy or they deserve to end up divorced:
...sin entered the world and men became treacherous, violating that harmony, hating their wives and oppressing them, rather than loving them. This should not be, especially among God’s people.

And now we get to verse 16 and see that it makes perfect sense. If you hate her that much, set her free! Be open with it. You put on one front but behind closed doors you are something else entirely. Clothe yourself with the violence that defines your life and set your wife free!

So is God condoning divorce? No. That isn’t really the point of the passage. The point is the last part of the verse: “therefore take heed to your spirit, that ye deal not treacherously.”

...He hates lying and deceit. He hates the proud, treacherous heart. He hates the entitlement mentality that says “I am; and there is none like me!” God hates the hatred that a man has for his wife, causing him to rail at her, to oppress her, to take a mistress or another wife. He hates the disharmony that wicked men cause in their home.

If you insist on treating your wife like this, set her free. It will be the only decent thing you’ve ever done.

What would be far better, though, is if you took heed to your spirit and quit treating her this way. If you refuse to do that, don’t think that God doesn’t hear the voice of your wife pouring out her tears on the altar. God hears that, and will not allow those tears to go unanswered.

Why isn’t God hearing your prayers? Why doesn’t he accept your sacrifices? Because of how you treat your wife.

If you hate her that much, set her free.

Pastor Powell then anticipates the objection to his claim that marriage vows are conditional on the wife’s happiness:

But then, you say, how will we keep our wives from leaving us? First, I have to say to you that if force and intimidation are the only tools in your arsenal to keep your marriage, then you need to reevaluate your existence as a human being.

Instead of asking that question, ask instead, “How can I make my wife WANT to stay married to me?”

Paul answers this in Ephesians 5. Love your wives, as Christ loved the church.

This is the same message as the one I quoted at the top of the post from Joel and Kathy. Make your wife happy or God says you will deserve it when she divorces you. This is likewise built on the claim that a wife will be happy if her husband loves her. Powell repeats this claim.
that a wife who is loved will be happy frequently in his writings on marriage. In *Headship is not Hierarchy* Powell writes:

…you can see a woman who is loved by her husband. She is alive, fully human, confident, and joyfully doing whatever work God has called her to with spirit and life.

Note that you could easily reword this into the language that Joel and Kathy use; the wife is a responder.

Powell explains this in more detail in his post *To the Newly Married*. The key to a Christian marriage, he tells us, is for the husband to learn how to make his wife happy:

This is where it gets endlessly wonderful. Women are fascinating creatures; each one created just a little different. They are almost like a puzzle to be solved… If you want a blessed and beneficial marriage, learn how to make your wife exult. What makes her tick? What does she fear? What does she dream of?

…Guys, do away with the jokes about not understanding women. You are commanded to do just that. But to do that you have to put off your own self-absorption, and figure out how to listen. Listen with your ears, with your eyes, even with your finger-tips. She’ll let you know what causes her to exult, but you have to tune in.

…Don’t try to learn about your wife from stereotypes, books (especially of the “women’s place is in the home” variety) or locker room gossip. This is your wife you are learning about and she is the only one who can show you what causes her to exult. You are on a wonderful journey of discovery together.

As Joel and Kathy say, every wife has a marriage manual written in her heart, from God.

Powell closes his advice to newly married couples by explaining that if their marriage ever becomes “stagnant”, this is a sign that the husband isn’t loving his wife enough and isn’t listening to the marriage manual in her heart. He needs to repent and learn to make her happy before she decides to divorce him:

If you have been married for a while and find your love growing stagnant, it is probably because you didn’t heed God’s command. Repent and ask your wife’s forgiveness for failing to understand her. Then start your year now. Turn the TV off. Give up boys’ nights out, and **learn how to cause your wife to rejoice. It may not be too late.**

See Also:

- Reframing Christian Marriage
- Lowering the boom.
Do as you please with their wives, so long as you respect her in the morning.

by Dalrock | October 9, 2016 | Link

It has been telling that Republican outrage over the audio of Trump describing his attempt to cuckold other men is almost entirely focused on the fact that Trump spoke crudely in describing the way women threw themselves at him. Cuckoldry they don't mind, but describing slutty women with disrespectful language is unacceptable!

Trump had **claimed he pushed a married woman to have sex with him** and said he could grab women “by the p*****” because he was a celebrity. A recording of his conversation with then-“Access Hollywood” host Billy Bush was published by NBC News and The Washington Post on Friday.

“No woman should ever be described in these terms or talked about in this manner. Ever,” Priebus said in a statement released that night.
In *God hates divorce?* Pastor Sam Powell worries that some readers may suspect he is soft on divorce:

This article is a little more technical than I usually write. There is a reason for it. I am fully aware that the views expressed here will leave me open to accusations of being “soft on divorce”. I assure you that is not the case. My only concern is to rightly discern God’s word and go where it leads.

But Powell should not worry that he will be accused of being soft on divorce, because this is clearly not the case. Powell is a hardliner on divorce, a true believer, a zealot. Powell believes so strongly in divorce that he says it is a sin to encourage unhappy wives to stay married with the hope that things will improve. He explains in *The Secret Things of God* (emphasis mine):

> When she reports that she is filing for divorce, the answer of her elders is often something like this: “God can change hearts. Stay in the marriage. What will you do if he repents? What if he changes?”

> It seems to me that this puts an unendurable burden on the heart of the wife (or husband, as the case may be). The church is asking her to make a life-altering decision based upon what God may or may not do in the future. But **how can we ask our sheep to sin in this regard?**

I encourage my readers to read his full post; Powell really is claiming that encouraging a wife to remain married is a sin. Powell’s biblical rationalization for his divorce zealotry is a bizarre comparison to Satan tempting Christ in the Gospels. In Powell’s rationalization:

- A wife who wants to divorce is like Christ.
- A pastor or elder who encourages a wife to remain married is like Satan tempting Christ.
- Remaining married is foolhardy and sinful, like jumping off of a tall building to test God.
- Divorcing is an act of obedience to God.

His reasoning is that staying married with the hope that things will improve is a form of witchcraft:

> But our text in Deuteronomy forbids doing just that. We cannot make our decision based upon the “secret things of God”. We are required only to make wise decisions based upon what we know today.

If encouraging Christians to stay married with hope that it will change the spouse is a sin, clearly the Apostle Paul sinned in 1 Cor 7:16:
14 For the unbelieving husband has been sanctified through his wife, and the unbelieving wife has been sanctified through her believing husband. Otherwise your children would be unclean, but as it is, they are holy.

15 But if the unbeliever leaves, let it be so. The brother or the sister is not bound in such circumstances; God has called us to live in peace. 16 How do you know, wife, whether you will save your husband? Or, how do you know, husband, whether you will save your wife?

Moreover, in 1 Pet 3 wives are told to submit to their husbands with the hope that they might win them over. Divorce is the polar opposite of submission:

3 Likewise, wives, be subject to your own husbands, so that even if some do not obey the word, they may be won without a word by the conduct of their wives, 2 when they see your respectful and pure conduct.

Lastly, setting aside Powell’s abysmal theology, staying married really does tend to ultimately create happy marriages (emphasis mine).

Many currently happily married spouses have had extended periods of marital unhappiness, often for quite serious reasons, including alcoholism, infidelity, verbal abuse, emotional neglect, depression, illness, and work reversals. Why did these marriages survive where other marriages did not? The marital endurance ethic appears to play a big role. Many spouses said that their marriages got happier, not because they and their partner resolved problems but because they stubbornly outlasted them. With time, they told us, many sources of conflict and distress eased. Spouses in this group also generally had a low opinion of the benefits of divorce, as well as friends and family members who supported the importance of staying married.
Deepwater Horizon is a pleasant surprise.
by Dalrock | October 13, 2016 | Link

In our discussion back in 2014 of Mom’s Night Out, Cane Caldo astutely commented:

Our movies really hate married fathers. “Taken” is acceptable as a movie premise because Liam Neeson’s father character is divorced. “Homeland” is also fine because Jason Statham’s character doesn’t have a wife in the way while he sexily protects his daughter.

I have found this observation to be spot on, which is why I was so surprised that Deepwater Horizon doesn’t follow Hollywood’s rule on married fathers. Mark Wahlberg’s character doesn’t go to his difficult and dangerous job knowing that he is failing as a husband and father. He isn’t shown missing his daughter’s recital or presentation. Nor do we learn that she resents him for being away from the family for long stretches of time due to his job. On the contrary, his daughter loves him and looks up to him, and is proud of what he does to support the family. Likewise, his wife is not unhappy, and does not provide the audience with a list of his shortcomings.

Secular movies are far better regarding married fathers than Christian movies are, but even for a secular movie this is vanishingly uncommon. It is refreshing to see a movie which so thoroughly bucks the trend here.
Vox Day has lead the creation of a fork of Wikipedia called Infogalactic. Creating an alternative to the SJW converged Wikipedia is a massive undertaking, but starting with a fork is a great way to approach this. For more information see Vox’s recent posts Project Big Fork: Infogalactic and Wikipedia: where information goes to die.

Edit: I’ve placed a link to Infogalactic on the blogroll.
Slate XX has a [piece up](#) explaining that women like Beth Moore are much more of a force in driving conservative evangelical opinion on politics than outsiders would likely suspect. Slate quotes CBMW co-founder John Piper explaining that it is fine for men to listen to Beth Moore’s sermons, so long as they don’t “become dependent on her”:

> But these women are often underestimated as influencers, both from within the evangelical world and outside it. In conservative corners of evangelicalism, the question of whether and how women can properly serve as spiritual teachers is a sensitive topic. “I’m a guy,” a questioner asked the influential pastor and author John Piper in 2010. “Is it wrong for me to listen to Beth Moore?” It’s OK to listen, but be careful not to “become dependent on her as your shepherd,” Piper answered. “There is a certain dynamic between maleness and femaleness that when a woman begins to assume an authoritative teaching role in your life the manhood of a man and the womanhood of a woman is compromised.”

Readers who have viewed the movie War Room will recall Beth Moore delivering her signature line:

> Submission is ducking so God can hit your husband.

Slate links to the [full transcript](#) of Piper’s answer to the question, and their summary and quote is accurate. This answer from Piper in July of 2010 is an evolution from the original answer Piper and Grudem put forth when they created the CBMW. In their inaugural book, Piper and Grudem explained that they believed the traditional reading of 1 Tim 2:14 is incorrect:

> First Timothy 2:14 says, “Adam was not the one deceived; it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner.” Paul gives this as one of the reasons why he does not permit women “to teach or have authority over a man.” Historically this has usually been taken to mean that women are more gullible or deceivable than men and therefore less fit for the doctrinal oversight of the church. This may be true (see question 29). However, we are attracted to another understanding of Paul’s argument.

As a result of their innovative interpretation of 1 Tim 2:14, Grudem and Piper had Dr. Moo explain that 1 Timothy 2:11-15 only prohibits women from preaching to men:

> …we argue that the teaching prohibited to women here includes what we would call preaching (note 2 Timothy 4:2: “Preach the word . . . with careful instruction” [teaching, didache]), and the teaching of Bible and doctrine in the church, in colleges, and in seminaries...

> …Paul’s position in the pastoral epistles is, then, consistent: he allows women to
teach other women (Titus 2:3-4), 17 but prohibits them to teach men.

But this was back in 1991. By 2010, Piper explains that 1 Timothy 2:11-15 permits women to formally teach/preach to men, so long as the man doesn’t start to see her as his pastor.

I want to learn from my wife and I am happy to learn from Beth Moore. But I don’t want to get into a relationship of listening or attending a church where a woman is becoming my pastor, my shepherd or my authority. I think that would be an unhealthy thing for a man to do. I could give reasons for that biblically, experientially and psychologically, but I have given the gist of it.

So the answer is, no it is not wrong for you to listen to Beth Moore, but it could become wrong. I think Beth Moore would be happy with that answer. I’ve talked to her about this, and I think she would be OK with what I’ve said. Our paths cross at the Passion Conference every now and then, and we talk.

To see the full complementarian progression on the topic we have to add in Jenn Wilkin at The Gospel Coalition. This gives us the full progression to date, although certainly not the final complementarian word on the evolving meaning of 1 Timothy 2:11-15:
Progression of 1 Timothy 2:11-15

Women are not to teach (preach). Women are not to be in authority over men.

Became

Women are permitted to preach to women.

Became

Only women are permitted to preach to women.

Became

Only women are permitted to preach to women. Women are permitted to preach to men.

https://delrock.wordpress.com/
One thing to always remember is that feminism requires constant effort just to avoid moving backward. We aren’t in a steady state regarding feminism, and despite the myth of progress there is nothing natural about how we have organized our society. Feminists know this and therefore never stop working, refining and reinforcing their efforts. For nearly everyone else most of these efforts have become a sort of background noise. If you’ve ever tried out a good pair of noise canceling headphones on an airplane you know that background noise, even if quite loud, is impossible to really hear after a very short period unless you have the ability to at least temporarily filter it out.

The same thing happens with feminism, where we often can hear the loud clanging as a new piece of machinery comes online. What we don’t tend to hear anymore is the cacophony of all of the existing machinery in the background.

The conservative position is to conserve the roar of background noise while complaining about the clanging. Thus when feminist efforts start to bear fruit conservatives inevitably complain about weak men screwing feminism up. This is of course a great boost to feminism, but ultimately having an “opposition” group that forever stands ready to make your every innovation permanent after a brief period of complaining isn’t enough. Conservatives have their place in conserving feminism, but by themselves they aren’t enough. Feminists need to excite and motivate younger generations to constantly push for more. If they don’t entropy will have its way, despite the best efforts of conservatives. This is where the background hum effect ultimately starts to hurt feminists as well. Each new generation of would be feminists takes feminists and conservatives at their word, that we have reached (or nearly reached) the natural state of humanity. Where is the excitement, where is the glory, in “blazing” an established trail?

Young girls will watch commercials like the one above and will grow up to be bossy women. They will even congratulate themselves on how extraordinary they are for being a woman who is pushy and controlling. But feminism is being presented to them as a largely completed project. Sure they will constantly complain that the whole world is stacked against them, even while basking in their personal triumph over the patriarchy. But more and more they will ask what is the point of showing that women can do what other women have already shown women can do, especially as the inevitable costs of decades of previous feminism show up.
Going through the motions.
by Dalrock | October 21, 2016 | Link

The narrative for feminist STEM poster child Elizabeth Holmes and her company Theranos continues to unravel. Last week the WSJ published an article titled Agony, Alarm and Anger for People Hurt by Theranos’s Botched Blood Tests (paywall warning). As the title suggests, the article shares examples of the anguish caused by inaccurate Theranos test results. And the inaccurate test results were themselves due to a focus on image over substance and rigor. One expert the Journal discussed the situation with explained:

| They were just going through the motions. |

This shouldn’t come as a surprise. Feminism is in many ways a cargo cult, with the pervasive belief that if women just ape the dress, language, and mannerisms of men, the accomplishments they see men achieving will magically follow. Indeed, play acting the role of a famous man is all it takes to become a true feminist hero. This is why all it took for Amelia Earhart to be nicknamed Lady Lindy and Queen of the Air and be thrown a ticker tape parade was to cut her hair short, don a flight jacket, and ride as a passenger on a transatlantic flight.

The same could be said for Holmes and Theranos. What exactly did Holmes accomplish besides mimicking the dress and mannerisms of Steve Jobs and declaring that she was going to change the world? In both cases, all it took was a coat and a hairstyle, and feminists around the world swooned.

Just a few days before the WSJ piece, Jonathan Gottschall published his own devastating Theranos piece at Harvard Business Review titled Theranos and the Dark Side of Storytelling (emphasis mine):

| Holmes constructed an inspiring hero narrative starring herself—a precocious girl-genius who, at nineteen years of age, began pioneering medical technologies that could potentially save millions of lives around the world. Despite abundant warning signs, and despite the Silicon Valley company’s refusal to provide real evidence that their technology worked, journalists didn’t skeptically evaluate Holmes’s story—they simply repeated it. They told and re-told Holmes’s story until she began to seem less like an actual person, and more like a living symbol—of progress, of innovation, of female empowerment. The problem, as The Wall Street Journal’s John Carreyrou has reported in more than a score of articles, was that there was little to Theranos beyond its story—and that story was mainly fictional. |

Gottschall blames this on a general willingness of venture capitalists and the media to fall for a good story. This certainly is a human weakness, but in this case the bolded part above is quite important. This was the story they desperately wanted to believe, and it is a story feminism has primed all of us to believe from a young age. Holmes was the messiah feminists had foretold for many decades. Here she finally was, the pretty young woman who one day decided to pull back her hair, don a lab coat and some glasses, and poof! A miracle occurs. As Oppenheimer Funds puts it:
So there!

The same story of Earhart and Holmes has repeated countless times, and we can be assured of falling for it in the future. Just because Holmes is turning out to not be the feminist messiah, it doesn’t mean feminists are giving up on the narrative. One day soon, a young pretty girl will pull her hair back, put on a lab coat and some glasses*, and change the world!

*Either glasses or fashionable safety goggles.
When I saw that Ecuador cut off Assange’s Internet access I decided to try my hand at satirically scripting this famous scene. Language warning.
I noted the creation of Infogalactic, a wikipedia fork a little over a week ago. I'm not aware of a more promising venture to take on the SJW thought police than Infogalactic. It is quite simply huge. Infogalactic starts off as good as Wikipedia, and is rapidly becoming markedly better than Wikipedia.

I’d love to take on the SJWs! How can I help?

The Infogalactic home page lists several ways you can help:

**How to Support**

Infogalactic is a private corporation supported by donations and advertising revenue. For information on how to support Infogalactic, please see the relevant page. Please note that Infogalactic is neither a charity nor a foundation, and donations are not tax-deductible.

- Donations and Merchandise
- Advertising
- Pro Admin Seats

But there is another way you can help, and this is simply by using the superior Infogalactic instead of the inferior Wikipedia. Mindshare is crucial when it comes to forks. This is why I’ve added Infogalactic to my blogroll.

But most of us don’t go first to Wikipedia and then search for information. Most of us go to a search engine and the search engine points us to the information we want. Because Wikipedia has more mindshare, today Google, Bing, etc will point you to a page on Wikipedia instead of Infogalactic. But there is an easy fix for this. There are now browser extensions for Chrome and Firefox which will auto forward you to the equivalent page on Wikipedia:

Thanks to Blake Roussel, you can now make sure that you’re always using Infogalactic instead of Wikipedia, no matter what links Google feeds you.

INFOSEXTANT is the browser extension to automatically change Wikipedia links to Infogalactic.

Chrome (updated version): https://chrome.google.com/webstore/detail/infosextant/plieanmckkckfcdfao
bonnaaibonmmbeninaige


Help yourself and help a good cause, by taking a minute now to ensure that you get better information in the future. I’m using the Chrome extension and it is pretty cool to watch a Wikipedia link automatically redirect to Infogalactic.

**Edit:** There is now an extension for Safari:

Safari users now have an extension that will redirect Wikipedia links to Infogalactic. **Download it here.** I am also informed that extensions adding Infogalactic as a default search engine option will be available next week.
Hillary’s nasty woman brigade.

by Dalrock | October 25, 2016 | Link

Trump struck a cord in the final debate last week when he called Hillary a “nasty woman”. Business Insider’s Linette Lopez is convinced that ordinary women will rush to self identify as nasty:

Clinton and her female supporters officially have a name they can be proud of.

This is a huge problem for Trump. Clinton’s “deplorable” comments rallied Trump’s base. But they already despised Clinton anyway. “Nasty woman,” however, is a rallying cry for any woman who works, any woman who is in charge of her home, any woman who decides her own future.

And these are voters that the Trump campaign has needed to woo in order to win the election. But he won’t — not if they’re “nasty.”

Indeed, there are already a slew of T shirts women can order and proudly wear to announce how nasty they are. Lopez even claims the Clinton campaign has formally adopted the term:

Clinton’s campaign took over nastywomengetthingsdone.com, which directed anyone headed there to her campaign.

I suspect she is mistaken on this last part, and that the domain was instead picked up by supporters and not by the campaign itself. At any rate, Elizabeth Warren stirred the nasty woman pot in a speech she gave today with Hillary:

For CNBC the money quote was:

Nasty women are tough. Nasty women are smart. And nasty women vote. … We nasty women are going to march our nasty feet to cast our nasty votes to get you out of our lives forever,

Clearly this is a phrase feminists want to use to motivate their base, and in the short term at least I believe it could work. But I don’t see most women wanting to identify as nasty, something ugly. Feminists could avoid the obvious ugly implication by going with the sexual connotation, framing Hillary supporters as nasty sexual freaks instead of nasty ball busting feminists. But then they would have to change the term from nasty woman (ghostbusters feminists) to nasty girl (sex positive feminists) to really capture the different meaning. Even this would be limited in scope. In the right setting many women might flirt with such a term, but few would want to fully identify with it due to the risk of slut shaming that goes with adopting such a brazen label. Both kinds of feminism are ugly, and there is no way to escape this fact.

Given how little time there is left before the election, my guess is that this strategy will help
Hillary energize the harpy brigade without the image seeping through enough to make the average woman excessively uncomfortable. Six months of Warren and other surrogates shouting that Hillary supporters are nasty women would take its toll, but two weeks doesn’t seem likely to be much of a problem. The only thing I could see that might change this dynamic is if there were a big social media push by women who decided to signal their sweetness in contrast to Hillary’s (and her supporters’) nastiness. But time is fleeting, and Trump’s comments about grabbing women by the p**** and trying to seduce married women would make such a counter movement harder to ignite.
That’s quite a nasty woman problem you have there.

by Dalrock | October 27, 2016 | Link

Emma Lord at Bustle doesn’t want women to suffer in silence, so she is challenging women to speak up about their nasty woman problems.

So, fellow women of the internet: wanna let Trump know exactly what you think of his words, while also helping out other women? Then take the #NastyWomanChallenge by posting what makes you a ~nasty woman~, either by sharing a picture of yourself with the words written on a piece of paper, or sharing a video of yourself saying it out loud. Don’t forget to add the hashtag when you put it on your social media.

Much like the Ice Bucket Challenge of yore, once you post you can challenge three friends to do the same within 24 hours.

In order to get the ball rolling, the women at the Bustle office are sharing their own stories. First is Frances, who has blood coming from her wherever. As you can imagine, this took some courage to publicly state.

Another confession comes from Emma, who has a particularly nasty woman problem; She sits on strange men on public transit.

We’ve gotten to the point when men are straight up ignoring transit ads campaigning against manspreading — the time to nastily plant ourselves in space we deserve is NOW.

Fortunately Emma isn’t one of the heavier women featured in the challenge. If some of the others were to sit on men it could cause serious injury.

Let no one accuse feminists of all being alike. While Emma has nasty woman problems that cause her to invade the personal space of strange men on public transit, Gaby’s nasty woman problem involves a hypersensitivity to men on public transit whom she perceives as invading her personal space.

Personal space is just that, yo — PERSONAL. So whether you’re getting inappropriately crowded on public transport or weirdly hovered over by a six-foot-something orange man in a live, television 90-minute debate, you are more than entitled to assert your right to your physical space, loud and proud (and, of course, #nasty).

See Also: The ugly feminist secret weapon.
I’ll be turning moderation on.

by Dalrock | October 28, 2016 | Link

I have a lot on my plate right now, so I’ll be turning on comment moderation tomorrow morning and will leave it on at least over the weekend. Feel free to drop links here before I turn on moderation if you want to host the conversation on your own blog.

Edit: Moderation is back off.
As I explained back in August, the real problem with the Ghostbusters reboot was not that it was too feminist for audience sensibilities. The real problem was that the women in ghostbusters didn’t look hot while they were playing the roles of men. Four women in dumpy jumpsuits and combat boots isn’t something most women or men want to watch, even in our thoroughly feminist age.

On the other hand, Suicide Squad was a hit partly because the feminist heroine was hot. I offered a practical test for understanding what kinds of female characters women want to identify with:

A good rule of thumb for women is would they want to dress up like the character for Halloween?

At the time I predicted that Harley Quinn costumes would be far more popular than women’s Ghostbusters costumes this Halloween*. Now that Halloween is upon us, I decided to check Google Frightgeist. Harley Quinn is the number one Halloween costume in the US this year, while Ghostbusters is number 21. This list is not just for women, so any men interested in dressing up as old school Ghostbusters would also contribute to making Ghostbusters number 21.

*More specifically, I predicted that Ghostbusters costumes would remain available while Harley Quinn costumes would sell out. While I was right on the general point, it appears that costume marketers predicted demand well enough to stock up on what would be popular and greatly restrict stock on the niche costume. It turns out that the Ghostbusters costumes are sold out, while nearly all of the Harley Quinn ones are still in stock as I write this.
Pride of ownership.
by Dalrock | October 31, 2016 | Link

According to Spirit Halloween, the top selling Harley Quinn costume item is a choker with the word Puddin on it (Harley’s pet name for the Joker). Popular culture tells us that women don’t want to be owned, yet a collar with the name of her owner is the most popular part of the most popular woman’s Halloween costume this year.

A quick google search of “harley quinn puddin” brought up the following video, which demonstrates the appeal:

See Also: Even strong independent women want to be possessed.
Why there is a controversy about women teaching/preaching Scripture and doctrine.

by Dalrock | November 1, 2016 | Link

Commenter Amy Wilson asked in response to Four legs good, two legs better:

I am also very concerned about the slippery slope we see of feminist redefining of the plain words of Scripture. However, I’m still not clear on how “Women may teach other women” is a feminist compromise, given that Titus explicitly tells the older women to teach the younger, and no limiting contexts are given, only the required content.

This is a common question. The answer is there is no conflict between 1 Tim 2 and Titus 2, because the kinds of teaching referred to in the two passages are very different. 1 Tim 2 is talking about teaching Scripture and doctrine. As Dr. Moo explains in the CBMW founding book (emphasis mine):

In light of these considerations, we argue that the teaching prohibited to women here includes what we would call preaching (note 2 Timothy 4:2: “Preach the word . . . with careful instruction” [teaching, didache`]), and the teaching of Bible and doctrine in the church, in colleges, and in seminaries. Other activities-leading Bible studies, for instance-may be included, depending on how they are done. Still others-evangelistic witnessing, counseling, teaching subjects other than Bible or doctrine-are not, in our opinion, teaching in the sense Paul intends here.

So far, so good. However, Moo then claims that since Paul instructs older women to teach younger women how to behave in Titus 2, that women must be permitted to preach to other women:

Paul’s position in the pastoral epistles is, then, consistent: he allows women to teach other women (Titus 2:3-4), 17 but prohibits them to teach men.

This doesn’t follow, because Titus 2 is about older women teaching younger women how to conduct themselves. Submit to your husband. Love your husband and children. Be self controlled and pure. Don’t be a drunk. Take care of the home. In Titus 2 Paul is saying to teach the older women (and men) to live in such a way that their lives are “appropriate to sound doctrine”. It is about setting an example with their lives so that no one will malign the word of God. This isn’t about the older women teaching sound doctrine, it is about them living in a way that is congruent with having been taught sound doctrine, and teaching younger women to live this way as well.

All of these things could be taught by atheist older women to younger women with no need to reference (or even know of the existence of) the Bible, if they wanted to teach this behavior. The reason this is hard, and the reason there is a controversy, is women really
really want to teach doctrine*, in a way that the average man simply doesn’t and can’t understand. Men aren’t consumed by this burning envy. We don’t sit in church festering “Why can’t it be me up there teaching everyone? Why does it have to be him!”

This is why the women who set themselves up to teach doctrine so often receive requests on how other women can do the same thing. It is a burning interest for their target audience.

Priscilla Shirer is the well known women’s preacher who played Elizabeth Jordan in the movie War Room. In her FAQ for her ministry Going Beyond Ministries, the fourth question is:

How do I pursue a full-time career in women’s ministry?

Shirer isn’t offering to teach other women to become a preacher like she is, but she gets the question so often she put it in the FAQ anyway. The answer starts with (emphasis mine):

We want to congratulate you on accepting God’s assignment for you. There are so many of us who run from what God wants us to do because it isn’t what we had in mind for ourselves. Priscilla has certainly tried to, but she has found that true contentment and peace comes only when we surrender to His will for us.

There are so many women who ask Priscilla about how to pursue ministry. Her response is always the same—give back to God the gift that He has given you. Let God continue to be in control. In other words, if you believe that God has called you into ministry, you can be sure that He will be faithful to open the doors and make a way for you to serve Him. He will continue to give you clear guidance as you walk in obedience to Him. All He asks you to do is obey His instructions that He gives you moment-by-moment and day-by-day. As you continue to follow, He will continue to lead.

Shirer explains a bit further down that other women need to not focus on being the one on stage preaching sermons like she does:

One more word: Remember the Lord has a specific ministry in mind for you. Don’t allow what you think the ministry should look like to replace His desire. For example, there are so many women who desire to be a speaker and seek opportunities to minister at large events. They spend money, time and energy trying to “create” opportunities and in doing so they are missing out on the ministry God has for them in their own back yard...

Likewise, the preacher Beth Moore (Mandy in War Room) in her Living Proof Ministries FAQ has:

Do you have a mentoring or internship program?

During this season at Living Proof, we do not have any type of mentoring or internship program. Beth feels that God has called her to mentor corporately through her Bible Studies
*The other reason this is so hard is the idea of wives turning to their husbands for instruction (1 Cor 14:35, Eph 5:25-28) is anathema to our modern Christian feminist sensibilities. Setting up separate women's ministries is the answer to anything but that!
As Instapundit noted the Kindle version of Dr. Helen’s book is on sale for only $3.29. It doesn’t say how long this price will last, but I believe it is only a short time offer. I had been hoping for such an opportunity and have taken advantage of this special price. If you are interested in reading her book, this would be the time to buy it.
Conservative Christians are facing a masculinity crisis. The traditional/biblical roles of men are no longer palatable in our feminist era. Yet part of being conservative/complementarian means stressing the difference between men and women. The challenge is, how to take on the appearance of being traditional without upsetting feminist sensibilities?

At the same time, we’ve been so successful in stamping out biblical masculinity that we very often lack real life masculine role models. Because Christians enabled the divorce revolution in the 1970s, large numbers of Christian men and women grew up without fathers in the home. Making this worse, for those fathers who weren’t ejected from the home, the constant threat of ejection very often worked as designed. As a result, modern Christians are left vehemently rejecting masculine leadership while at the same time starving for it.

I’ve written separately about this phenomenon with respect to cartoonish chivalry, which is a modern Christian caricature of masculinity based on secular entertainment. Another closely related phenomenon is pastors as drill instructors. Since biblical instruction on masculinity is taboo and many in the church (including perhaps even the pastor) themselves grew up without a strong father, the temptation to mimic popular caricatures of masculinity and declare them as the Christian model is extremely powerful. This is why we so often find pastors addressing the men in the congregation by mimicking (with slight alterations) R. Lee Ermey’s character in Full Metal Jacket:

...you are pukes! You are the lowest form of life on Earth! You are not even human fucking beings! You are nothing but unorganized grabastic pieces of amphibian shit! Because I am hard, you will not like me. But the more you hate me, the more you will learn. I am hard but I am fair. There is no racial bigotry here. I do not look down on niggers, kikes, wops or greasers. Here you are all equally worthless.

The poster child for pastors-as-drill-instructors is former Mars Hill Pastor Mark Driscoll, with his famous “How Dare You!” tirade:

This famous clip is actually the climax of an hour plus sermon Driscoll preached, and his abuse of the men in the congregation began in his opening prayer:

Father God, I pray that our time would be pleasing to you, that it would be profitable to us, Lord God, as well. I pray for those men who are here that are cowards, they’re silent, passive, impish, worthless men...

The focus of the sermon is one verse of Scripture, 1 Peter 3:7:

Likewise, husbands, live with your wives in an understanding way, showing honor to the woman as the weaker vessel, since they are heirs with you...
life, so that your prayers may not be hindered.

Driscoll is using this one verse to teach the men of his congregation about godly masculinity.

...most of you men don’t know what masculinity truly is.

The irony here is profound, since Driscoll clearly has a massive hole in his life in this respect. It was Driscoll’s complete inability to model godly masculinity and his corresponding unwillingness to submit to authority which ultimately destroyed Mars Hill. According to Infogalactic:

He described a difficult family history of abuse and crime, writing: “The men on my father’s side include uneducated alcoholics, mental patients, and women beaters.... One of the main reasons my parents moved from North Dakota to Seattle was to get away from some family members when I was a very young boy.”

Very often in the sermon Driscoll’s words cause me to think he is merely repeating to the congregation the emotional tirades he received as a child, claiming they come from the Holy Spirit:

Some of you right now, you guys will get all- “Oh, how dare he yell at me.” That’s the Holy Spirit telling you, it’s you. I didn’t name you, he did. You change now, little boy. You change right now. You shut up. You put your pants on. You get a job. You grow up and maybe one day, you can love a woman. It’s for men, not for boys.

This would help explain how Driscoll came to the conclusion that the way to teach men understanding and patience was to scream at them for over an hour. This is something a good father would have modeled for him, but clearly this either didn’t happen in Driscoll’s case or it didn’t take. Driscoll goes so far as to claim the drill instructor model of masculine leadership and instruction is what the Bible requires:

Now my tone is for the men. We speak to men differently than women. Part of this is theological. Peter will say it in 1 Peter 3:7, that women are the weaker vessel. Think of a goblet and men are like a thermos. You could drop a thermos, bang a thermos, you could dent a thermos, it’ll be fine. You treat a thermos differently than you do a goblet. Were this a women’s conference, I would not call you all idiots and imbeciles and fools, that you’re a joke, okay? But you men, this is where it needs to go.

While Pastor Driscoll is the most famous and over the top example of this, the basic pattern is very common in a less extreme form. As Sunshine Thiry’s pastor explained, this is most common on the day set aside to honor fathers:

...I have to tell you from history I’ve learned that often Father’s Day is one of the worst days that dads can ever choose to go to church. Because often it’s the only time churches feel like they’re going to have the ears of dads and so what they do is they plan to beat them up royally for all they’re not doing right. Ever been to one of those Father’s Day services? Oh man, I have. In fact, here in the early days
of my ministry here, you know what we’d do? Oh man, we planned. We planned for you guys. And then what we did is we’d sing “Cats in the Cradle and the Silver Spoon”. And we’d talk about how you have so royally blown it, the world has gone to hell in a hand basket, and then we’d try and help you recover.

While less obvious, this is still clearly the drill instructor (or if you prefer sports training camp) theology Driscoll practiced. In saccharine Christian culture WWJD? has morphed into WWED? (What Would Ermey Do?) And thus, a sermon on 1 Cor 13 morphs into something like:

Listen up maggots! Love is patient!

Didn’t your mama teach you worthless fucktards that love is kiiiiind?

You are the most miserable excuse for Christian husbands and fathers on the planet!

I feel sorry for your wives and children for having to put up with such worthless nancy boys!

Fast Food Fatherhood

The boot camp/sports training model itself is not the problem. In the right context it can be a very effective way to mold a group of men into a team. But it is being used in the wrong context, to teach what it cannot teach. Fathers do at times need to strongly discipline their sons, but the vast majority of the time their instruction is far more subtle. There is no shortcut to teaching patience. You can’t scream love and kindness into a man. You won’t teach courage by taking the easy path. And you won’t teach that love does not boast by declaring yourself the only real man in the room.

In a very real sense modern Christians have become the Saddest Boy Ever, craving strong fatherhood so much we seek out pastors who will abuse us.

The big difference however, is the drill instructor in the video quickly realized that the boy craving a father didn’t need to be publicly humiliated. He hugged the boy, and took him away from the cameras.

Sorry son, mommy had to cut daddy from the team.

There is yet another problem with the drill instructor model, and that is that the model is not just about tearing men down so the instructor can build them back up as a unit over time (something the pastors can’t do in a sermon). The boot camp/sports training model is also about weeding out the weaklings. There is no way around this when adopting this model. The quote from Full Metal Jacket that I referenced above is bracketed by this fact:

If you ladies leave my island, if you survive recruit training, you will be a weapon. You will be a minister of death praying for war. But until that day you are pukes. You are the lowest form of life on Earth. You are not even human fucking beings. You are nothing but unorganized grabastic pieces of amphibian shit!
Because I am hard, you will not like me. But the more you hate me, the more you will learn. I am hard but I am fair. There is no racial bigotry here. I do not look down on niggers, kikes, wops or greasers. Here you are all equally worthless. And my orders are to weed out all non-hackers who do not pack the gear to serve in my beloved Corps. Do you maggots understand that?

Not only do pastors never get around to building the men in the congregation back up after demolishing them in front of their families, the whole model invites more of the very rebellion that started our masculinity crisis. The message is that the men in the congregation are worthless pukes, but those who survive the divorce revolution the pastor is enabling will be an elite team of whipped husbands.

Even more sick is the fact that the very husbands and fathers this method is ostensibly intended to help are the ones most harmed by it. More accurately, it is the wives and children of these men who are most harmed by the pastor-as-drill-instructor routine. The wife and children of a failing man aren’t helped in their already difficult situation by having him abused and undermined in front of the congregation. A strong family will survive the pastor’s onslaughts with just a few more bruises, just as they survive the onslaughts from the rest of the culture. But the weak families, the suffering ones, are the families the pastor’s drill instructor strategy will most likely “weed out”. This is after all the intent of the model the pastors are thoughtlessly adopting, but in the new context pastors are using it in it is truly evil. The only person in the congregation who benefits from this model is the pastor himself, who is able to promote himself as the only real man in the room, the man the other wives should wish they married, and the man the other children should wish they had as a father.
At least this story has a happy ending.
by Dalrock | November 7, 2016 | Link

This man dodged a bullet. Some additional thoughts.

1. Abuse is defined as anything and everything that makes a woman unhappy.
2. Just because a woman is sweating you to get married, doesn’t mean she wants to be your wife. Very few men understand this. You have to carefully test to see if she really wants to be your wife, and even this isn’t perfect.
3. She was willing to try anything, anything, to fix their relationship. Anything except for being sweet and loving to the man she wanted to marry.
4. Somewhere out there is the man desperate enough to marry Lauren. He isn’t, however, a man with good options.
Open election thread.
by Dalrock | November 8, 2016 | Link

For those who want to discuss today’s election.
In the past I’ve shared Joel and Kathy Davisson’s theology of women as responders. Joel explains in their book:

“Can’t the woman be the problem? The man is not always the problem in marriage.” Of course I gestured toward my problem wife! This continued into the second day until Dr. Hegstrom finally had enough. He told me point blank that I was the problem in my marriage. He told me that Kathy was desperate to have a great marriage relationship for that is how God made her.

... 

Paul told me that God made Kathy a responder and that her problems were a reflection of her responding to my treatment of her. He said that when I grow up and lay my life down for my wife as Christ did for the church that I would be amazed at how wonderful a wife I have.

The first edition of the book is from 2004, but Joel learned this theology from Dr. Paul Hegstrom (the man FofF sends readers to for Christian counseling). For some time I’ve been curious where this theology came from and when it first cropped up. I doubt I’ll ever find the definitive answer, but I recently stumbled on more of the back-story of this disastrous theology.

It turns out that Dr. Richard L. Strauss preached this terrible theology way back in 1972, when second wave feminism was rampaging through both secular and Christian culture. The sermon is titled What Every Husband Needs to Know, and you can see the sermon in article form here or here, and download the audio here*. 1972 is an interesting year because by then the nation was in the full throes of feminist rebellion. Divorce rates wouldn’t level off for another ten years, but they had already exploded to over 150% of the rate from 1960**. This left pastors understandably in fear of provoking the wrath of the by now well established and very open rebellion***, while wanting to find a biblical solution to the skyrocketing divorce rate. Strauss opens the sermon by suggesting that an important cause of the divorce revolution is men not understanding their wives (all emphasis in quotes below is mine):

God tells men to dwell with their wives according to knowledge—an understanding of their basic nature and needs—but most men know very little about the makeup and mechanism of the female of the species. Could this be one of the reasons why so many marriages are floundering?

This of course is no idle question, and Strauss goes on to explain how men are causing the divorce revolution by not sufficiently loving their wives.

The God who created these tremendous emotional needs in women intends that husbands should meet them...
How does the husband do it? How can any man satisfy a woman’s basic needs? This may sound like a gross oversimplification, but one little four-letter word is actually the complete answer to this entire complex problem. The husband’s primary responsibility in a Christian marriage is to love his wife... All of these verses require agape, that highest level of love that keeps on giving even when it gets nothing in return and seeks only good for the one loved regardless of the personal cost or sacrifice.

Surely Strauss was not the first to make this argument, and he would not be the last to try to explain away the modern feminist rebellion against marriage and headship as stemming from a lack of love on men’s part****. He explains that women will not be tempted to feminist rebellion, and will want to submit if only their husbands love them:

This gives an entirely new meaning to the misunderstood doctrine of male headship. Headship is not some masculine doctrine cleverly designed to bolster the husband’s sagging ego. Headship involves the husband’s solemn obligation to establish an atmosphere of love in which the basic needs of his wife are fulfilled—an environment in which she is free to grow and develop into all that God wants her to be. Her submission will then be the voluntary response to his loving leadership.

It is at this point that Strauss introduces the theology of women as responders:

The key word here is response. The woman is a responder. This is the obvious role of someone who depends on another person. Flowers depend on sunshine and rain; when they get it, they respond by blossoming into gorgeous beauty. This is how God made a woman too. She responds to what she receives. If she receives irritability, criticism, disapproval, unkindness, indifference, lack of appreciation, or lack of affection, she will respond with a defense mechanism, such as bitterness, coolness, defiance, or nagging. Some women turn to drinking or submerge themselves in social activities.

But if the woman receives love she will respond with love, and will blossom into the most beautiful creature under God’s heaven. When a man claims that his wife doesn’t love him anymore he is unwittingly admitting that he hasn’t loved her as he should have. If he had, she would most likely have responded with love in return. A man gets from his wife what he invests in her. He cannot force her to love him, but he can show love to her and enjoy her loving response. Thus the responsibility for a successful marriage rests initially with the husband. He makes the first move—that of loving his wife with the totally unselfish love of Jesus Christ.

Strauss goes on to explain that when the Apostles Peter and Paul tell husbands to have Agape love, they meant the kinds of acts of beta comfort that modern marriage counselors teach men. If you want to understand Epistles from ancient Rome and Greece, you need to watch Oprah. If a husband practices enough beta game, his wife will love him and want to submit. This boils down to an all too familiar list:

1. Buy her gifts:
   “…love gives. It will involve giving the material things a wife needs as finances permit.
and perhaps even a little gift now and then that says, I really care. I think about you when we’re apart.”

2. Do the housework:
   “If the wife is really the weaker vessel, then wiping the dishes, sweeping the floor, supervising the children, cleaning the windows, or dozens of other little helpful acts are just other ways of saying, I love you.”

3. Complete your wife’s Honey Do list:
   “Some husbands are too busy to run an errand, fix a gadget, or devote an evening to their wives alone. They are saying in subtle little ways, You’re really not worth very much personal sacrifice, and this is like spraying weed killer on a beautiful flower.”

4. Show her that she is appreciated:
   “She needs to know that he cares—that he appreciates the things she does to please him, like maintaining his home and cooking his meals. She needs to know that he comes home because she is there—not just for meals and a bed! One of the most prevalent complaints of wives is that their husbands take them for granted, treating them as if they were maids. Here is what one woman said she needed most from her husband: I need to feel needed, that what I am doing for him and for our children is important to him. Then, I want to be appreciated for the things I do.” Most wives try hard to please, and they need to know that their husbands approve of their efforts and appreciate them.”

5. Stop having so much fun at work:
   “Giving ourselves may not demand dying for our wives, but it certainly demands living for them, and that is the very thing many husbands are unwilling to do. They exclude their wives from their lives. They think working hard and providing an abundance of material things will make their wives happy. And while they are at work getting rich, their wives are at home with aching hearts, yearning to share their husbands’ lives as God intended them to do, yearning for the appreciation, approval, attention, and affection which God intended them to have, yearning for the sympathetic understanding their God-given natures demand.”

6. Be a sensitive new age guy:
   “One woman wrote, My husband needs to let me know that he is aware of my problems and understands them. I need to feel that we are working together toward a common goal. The one word that occurs most frequently when wives are discussing what they need from their husbands is understanding. No amount of material things can take the place of a husband who listens to his wife with undivided attention when she unfolds her heart, who tries to understand even her most complicated moods, and who lets her know that he loves her even during her most illogical and unreasonable moments.”

The problem is not that husbands should never buy their wives gifts, or fix things around the house, or tell their wives they love them. The problem is that:

- Modern Christians have substituted pop culture in place of the instructions in the Bible, and as the Strauss sermon shows this dates back to the heydays of second wave feminism.
- Responding to feminist rebellion and discontentment with more beta comfort is a prescription for frustrating your wife. The reason wives are in rebellion (in general) is not because Christian men aren’t being nice enough to Christian women, but because
Christian men are terrified of saying no to rebellious women. Ironically, if husbands were to do the truly loving thing and stand up to the rebellion their wives would be far more likely to feel loved.

See Also: Why Christians need Game.

*The article form has been edited some for brevity, but the lesson is not fundamentally changed. Since the recording is from 1972 and has a large amount of noise, I suggest running it through a noise reduction filter using Audacity or a similar tool.

**See “Figure 5. Number of Divorces per 1,000 Married Women Age 15 and Older, by Year, United States” from The State of Our Unions 2010.

***On the other hand Strauss’ companion sermon What Every Wife Needs to Know is very strong in teaching submission, although he adopts what has become the standard posture that husbands are not to instruct their wives regarding their role as a Christian wife, and says that husbands must not call wives out when they are being moody or childish.

****Without a doubt all husbands across the ages have fallen short of loving their wives as commanded in the Bible, but this by itself should prove the absurdity of asserting that our modern feminist rebellion is due to men suddenly not being sensitive new age guys.
by Dalrock | November 10, 2016 | Link

This joke made the rounds a few years ago, and seems worthy of dusting off now:

One sunny day in January 2017, an old man approaches the White House from across Pennsylvania Avenue where he’d been sitting on a park bench. He speaks to the U.S. Marine standing guard and says, “I would like to go in and meet with President Obama.”

The Marine looks at the man and says, “Sir, Mr. Obama is no longer President and no longer resides here.” The old man says, “Okay,” and walks away.

The following day the same man approaches the White House and says to the same Marine, “I would like to go in and meet with President Obama.”

The Marine again tells the man, “Sir, as I said yesterday, Mr. Obama is no longer President and no longer resides here.” The man thanks him and again just walks away.

The third day the same man approaches the White House and speaks to the very same U.S. Marine, saying, “I would like to go in and meet with President Obama.”

The Marine, understandably agitated at this point, looks at the man and says, “Sir, this is the third day in a row you have been here asking to speak to Mr. Obama. I’ve told you already that Mr. Obama is no longer the President and no longer resides here. Don’t you understand?”

The old man looks at the Marine and says, “Oh, I understand. I just love hearing it.”

The Marine snaps to attention, salutes, and says, “See you tomorrow, Sir!”
Nasty Gal’s nasty woman problem.
by Dalrock | November 10, 2016 | Link

In Hillary’s nasty woman brigade I quoted from an opinion piece in Business Insider about ugly feminists embracing the term “nasty woman”.

Since Trump made that statement, women around the country have taken up “nasty woman” as a rallying cry against Trump, and a moniker, the same way Trump’s supporters took up deplorables.

The difference here is that for Trump, his naming mistake could be fatal.

The author offered up the company Nasty Gal as an example of women embracing feminist ugliness:

Sophia Amoruso, the founder of a clothing company, Nasty Gal, changed the name of her website to Nasty Woman.

Amoruso is a modern feminist icon, with a bestselling book titled #GIRLBOSS.

Just two weeks later, Nasty Gal and Amoruso are the subject of a new Business Insider article:

Hot clothing company Nasty Gal is reportedly filing for bankruptcy, Re/code reports.

Founder Sophia Amoruso, who founded the company as an eBay shop in 2006 when she was 22, will also step down as executive chairwoman.

Among other problems, Nasty Gal is being sued for allegedly being nasty to the gals who work there. Racked wrote in November of 2015: Nasty Gal Sued by Former Employee Who Was Fired After Undergoing a Heart Transplant

Nasty Gal’s alleged discriminatory practices aren’t leaving many #GirlBosses left at the company. The company, which is already being sued by four women who claim they were fired because they became pregnant, is now being accused of firing a woman for falling seriously ill, according to The Fashion Law.

The plaintiff, Farah Saberi, is suing Nasty Gal for letting her go after she underwent surgery to receive a heart transplant. Despite maintaining a 40-hour work week upon returning to work, Saberi received a demotion and then her walking papers.

Nasty.

As recode notes in their article on the bankruptcy, this is a blow to nasty women everywhere:

…it goes without saying that while it’s a bad day for Nasty Gal, it is also one for Nasty Women all over.
Pocket pouting
by Dalrock | November 11, 2016 | Link

One of the greater misconceptions about feminism is that men can fix the problems feminists are complaining about. What isn’t understood is the base impulse, envy of men and the associated resentment, is unfix-able and doesn’t spring from injustice. Christians should understand this, because we know that Eve was dissatisfied in Eden! Why did God get to keep the knowledge of good and evil all to Himself? Why couldn’t she have it too? The best that can be done is women can learn to recognize this temptation and manage it. Helping women recognize and manage this temptation is something loving we men can do for women. But we tend to fail in exactly the same way Adam failed; we see the pouty face and go along with it.

As just one example of the omnipresent temptation to feel that someone is unjustly keeping something from them, see the feminist carping about the lack of pockets in women’s clothing. Racked.com created a video complaining about the men of the patriarchy mysteriously keeping women from having pockets.

Hillary Clinton wore a deceptively simple suit when she took the stage at the Democratic National Convention to accept the party’s nomination for president. Its impeccable tailoring announced Clinton’s authority; its snowy whiteness connected her to the suffragette movement; and, with no designer claiming it, the suit seems to transcend fashion — unnamed, it belonged to every woman. All of these points make Hillary’s white suit a significant garment, but the suit did more than make Clinton look powerful. One omission in Clinton’s suit whispered a long, questionable history, and that is this: It has no pockets.

The silliness of this is hard to fathom. The reason Hillary Clinton didn’t have pockets in her multi thousand dollar custom pantsuit (assuming this is true) is because Clinton didn’t want pockets. This isn’t just true for powerful women wearing custom made clothing, it is true for women’s fashion across the board. Women don’t want pockets because if they put something in their pocket it makes the outfit less flattering. If women were really clambering for pockets, someone could make a mint filling this mysteriously untapped demand. The women at Racked know this, because they work in fashion. But this doesn’t stop them from continuing to complain about how men are keeping women down in a sinister pocket conspiracy, because this is what the feminist impulse is all about. See the pained body language and pouting expression on Entertainment Editor Elana Fishman’s face at the 50 second mark as she sighs longingly for the equality of the Middle Ages.

This is flat out nuts, and it is feminism in a nutshell.
Pocket Envy
by Dalrock | November 13, 2016 | Link

As I noted in Pocket Pouting, feminists accuse men of forcing women to buy clothes without pockets, or with insufficient pockets in size and/or number. This isn’t a new complaint, nor is it just Racked making the accusation. In September of 2014, Tanya Basu at The Atlantic published The Gender Politics of Pockets. Basu claims that women are demanding clothes with more and larger pockets, but the men who design women’s clothes have different priorities and refuse to meet this demand (emphasis mine):

So how can an industry that focuses on women—whether it be models or products created primarily for a female demographic—consistently dodge the very people it markets to? Camilla Olson, creative director of an eponymous high tech fashion firm, points to inherent sexism within the industry. Mid-range fashion is a male dominated business, driven not by form and function, but by design and how fabric best drapes the body.

“I honestly believe the fashion industry is not helping women advance,” Olson said...

This is laughable, because it is women and not men who are demanding clothes with form over function. As the case of Nasty Gal proves, if a designer is meeting a niche they can easily find their target market. Designers who refuse to design what women want to buy will be swiftly punished by the marketplace, just as designers who make the clothes women want will be equally rewarded.

Since designers are clearly responding to the demands of their market, the only other way to blame this on men is to assume men are bullying the women in their lives into forgoing the pockets they crave. But this is equally absurd given our feminist culture. Men aren’t bullying women out of wearing the functional clothing they want to wear. We don’t have husbands mocking their wives for having and using functional pockets, obsessed with the lump a useful and used pocket creates. Nor are husbands sneaking into their wives’ wardrobes and getting rid of clothing they deem having too large, and/or too many pockets. If men were doing this, it would be considered abuse according to the Duluth model.

No, the issue is that women judge their clothing by different standards than men do. This in and of itself isn’t a problem. It is in fact quite natural given the differences between men and women. The problem is when women fester in envy and resentment of men for not being like women. This unbridled resentment is the very foundation of feminism, and it is unquenchable.

One of the ways this festering envy and resentment manifests itself is through a desire to keep men from having what women can’t have. We see this expressed in a myriad of different ways, including with something as petty as pockets. In August Nicole Hong at the Wall Street Journal wrote about this petty obsession by many women in Nice Cargo Shorts! You’re Sleeping on the Sofa (archive). Hong opens with the pettiness of Ashleigh Hansen, who goes through her husband’s wardrobe and gets rid of items of clothing with pockets she
doesn’t approve of.

Mr. Hansen’s wife, Ashleigh Hansen, said she sneaks her husband’s cargo shorts off to Goodwill when he’s not around. Mrs. Hansen, 30, no longer throws them out at home because her husband has found them in the trash and fished them out.

“I despise them,” she said. “There were so many good things about the ’90s. Cargo shorts were not one of them.”

As the title suggests, Hong’s article explains that Ashleigh Hanson is just one out of a wave of petty tyrant wives. Another is Jen Anderson, who objects to her husband wearing cargo shorts because the pockets cause the fabric to not drape over her husband’s body the way she wants it to (emphasis mine):

Through what Ms. Anderson described as “strong mocking,” she convinced him to return the shorts. She said she doesn’t like the idea of being seen in public with her husband when he’s wearing cargo shorts, which make him look like “a misshapen lump.”

Yet another envious petty tyrant in Hong’s article is Lyndsay Peters:

…Mr. Lommel, who often works from home, seizes opportunities when his wife is away at work to wear his cargo shorts.

“Every time I put them on, I am conscious of the fact that I am now being disobedient in my marriage,” he said.

Mr. Lommel’s wife, Lyndsay Peters, disputes the idea that he tries to wear cargo shorts only when she’s not around. “I wish that were the truth,” she said. “If he was only wearing them when I could not look at him, that would be perfect.”

Yet while the Wall Street Journal tells us how offended wives are that their husbands wear clothes with large usable pockets, The Atlantic is convinced that it is women who crave big useful pockets, and men who object to the aesthetics of them. According to Basu at the Atlantic, modern women crave pockets big enough to carry all of their technical gadgets:

Our skinny jeans have pockets, but there is no way an object bigger than a standard issue ID card fits in the front, and everyone knows that slipping a phone in your back pocket is an invitation for a treacherous dive into a toilet, or a backflip resulting in heartbreaking shatters...

“More women are expecting and demanding pockets,” Olson said of trends in the industry. “I was hearing more about pockets on the runway in recent shows. Pockets are becoming more interesting, but they aren’t the size to carry around an iPhone, much less an iPhone [6] Plus.”
...most designers don’t consider pockets as part of the functionality of women’s clothes just yet—they’re still looking at purses as the way for women to carry their smartphones and other technological devices.

Drake Baer at NY Mag may have stumbled onto a piece of clothing that is ready made to hold all of the technology Basu tells us women desperately want to hold in pockets. Baer explains in *Anthropologists Analyze the Cargo Short Boom* that the desire to carry technical gadgets is what drives their popularity.

The practicality and preparedness that made cargo pockets a military staple inform their popular persistence, she says. Having lots of pockets to put things in and thereby not having to lug around a bag is incredibly convenient.

...don some cargo shorts, throw a charger in the side pocket. And some earbuds, too. Go crazy, there’s plenty of room.

Unfortunately, while Basu explains that women are interested in function over form, and demand clothing with multiple large pockets to carry all of their tech gear, there is one type of clothing she tells us women don’t want:

Cargo pants, however, have been unanimously dissed by the fashion savvy as the solution of choice for the smartphone dilemma women face.

Baer even quotes from Basu’s Atlantic piece, noting that while cargo shorts/pants are the epitome of what Basu says women want, women clearly don’t want them.

This isn’t about women really wanting functional pockets to carry their technology, it is about women resenting the fact that men are perfectly comfortable with functional pockets, even at the expense of how the fabric drapes. Baer inadvertently captures this reality with his closing sentence:

If only, by some working of fashion karma, the excess pockets of men’s non-fashion shorts could migrate to women’s fashion.
The thesis of the Atlantic piece on The Gender Politics of Pockets is that the patriarchy keeping women from being able to buy the clothing they want:

So how can an industry that focuses on women—whether it be models or products created primarily for a female demographic—consistently dodge the very people it markets to? Camilla Olson, creative director of an eponymous high tech fashion firm, points to inherent sexism within the industry. Mid-range fashion is a male dominated business, driven not by form and function, but by design and how fabric best drapes the body.

“I honestly believe the fashion industry is not helping women advance,” Olson said. And the lack of functional designs for women is one example. “We [women] know clearly we need pockets to carry technology and I think it’s expected we are going to carry a purse. When we’re working we don’t carry purses around. A pocket is a reasonable thing.”

“I find it discouraging,” Olson said. “Fashion looks selectively at who they let in and keeps women at a certain place. It’s not helping women move forward in the workplace.” Olson says that some designers have deemed pockets “too ugly” for clothing, while others simply don’t think women need them. And these decisions, she says, have created a chasm in women’s fashion, and hold women back.

The premise is that what women want is understood and achievable, but that stubborn designers refuse to provide it. But as you read further, it becomes clear that what Olson and other women want doesn’t exist, and so far no one has figured out what exactly would satisfy women. What women want is purely theoretical.

Cargo pants (something which exists) are out since they are not stylish enough. Then the article suggests holsters or fanny packs are the answer:

“It’s got to be an accessories solution,” she theorized. “Chanel just came out with a holster type of thing that is really, really pretty. Or a fanny pack that was stylish. Or a shape to wear about [the body]. But not belts. Something that’s comfortable, that’s important.”

There is no link to fanny packs, but this is the holster the article links to! From the product’s description:
Made from MIL-SPEC webbing and seatbelt. Handcrafted on industrial sewing machines with outdoor-rated thread.

Other solutions offered in the article with a straight face include bras with pockets, high waisted pants, and belts wide enough to disguise a large smartphone:

It’s not as if this thought process is revolutionary with regards to moving the pocket to another location: There are shirts that cleverly disguise your phone, belts that double as hiding places for your beloved device, and even a bra that takes the term ‘bosom friend’ to a whole new level. (Cargo pants, however, have been unanimously dissed by the fashion savvy as the solution of choice for the smartphone dilemma women face.)

The article she links to ostensibly as support is focused instead on lambasting all of Ms. Olson’s wacky theories. It opens with:

Are you ready to sport a man purse? How about high-waisted pants or a chunky bag with your cocktail frock? These are just some of the potentially unfashionable fashion trends that a larger iPhone, and various other larger-screen phones, might bring about.

The article even mocks Olson by name:

1950 called — and it wants its pants back. [So. Much. Yes.] You might be hearing statements like this more often thanks to larger screen phones, some experts say. Camilla Olson, the creative director of high-tech fashion firm Camilla Olson LLC, says the larger phone could lead to higher waistbands on pants and/or deeper pockets.

It also quotes Olson as saying what she wants doesn’t exist, but she hopes that someone will make something she likes:

Many fashion houses have sent models down the runways of recent fashion shows in dresses cinched with wide belts. Soon, says Olson, these kinds of belts might hide an iPhone. “There were some horrible attempts at a new age fanny pack,” she says. But “a wide belt that can hold a phone — that would be more fashionable.”

Make no mistake; this isn’t about allowing good ideas to see the light of day, it is about nagging men to create something entirely new. Olson has no idea how to solve the problem at hand, but she is confident someone with a penis can find a solution she will like. As I’ve pointed out before, Feminism is the assertion that men are evil and naturally want to harm
women, followed by pleas to *men* to solve all of women’s problems.

**See Also:** #poutyface
Not good for the narrative.
by Dalrock | November 15, 2016 | Link

From Robert Stacy McCain in Lessons of a ‘Sex Object:’ What can we really learn from Jessica Valenti’s memoir?

Compare this description to what Ms. Valenti says about her ‘lovely’ husband, who is forced to keep the house immaculate merely to avoid her wrath, and then ask whether you’d rather be (a) the muscle man who banged her at 16, or (b) the poor fool who ended up marrying her when she was 30.

H/T Instapundit

Related:

- Losing control of the narrative
- Where have all of the bad men gone?
Note: Minor plot spoilers to follow. You may want to watch the movie before reading this post.

I had the chance to catch Hacksaw Ridge the other day, and it is an extremely powerful movie. I was a bit leery after reading the very positive reviews because they highlighted the presence of the bad husband/father trope in the movie. From: Mel Gibson’s ‘Hacksaw Ridge’ Is the Best War Film Since ‘Saving Private Ryan’

...incidents in early sections of the film showing Desmond’s challenging family life with a loving, overly religious mother who was often savagely beaten by his drunken, abusive father...

I went anyway, and am glad that I did. The trope is certainly in the movie, but the father is not shown as a one dimensional drunken abuser. After watching the movie I checked out History Vs Hollywood, and it appears that Gibson used more than a little creative license in this regard:

The Great Depression left their father, a carpenter, despondent and turning to alcohol at times (though the movie greatly exaggerates this and makes him abusive).

But even with this in mind, Gibson doesn’t display the abject contempt for fathers that the Kendrick brothers do. As I noted the father is shown as a real (but deeply flawed) human being who is suffering and loves his family.

With the failing father trope out of the way, it is astounding that Hacksaw Ridge is the first non documentary movie to tell the incredible story of Desmond Doss. Doss after all was heroic in WWII, the only war in which Hollywood is truly comfortable portraying American fighting men as as heroes. It is also not coincidentally the only war where the US was allied with the Soviet Union. But while Doss was fighting on the right side of the war from Hollywood’s perspective, his story can’t be told without honoring his incredible faith. Gibson deserves great credit for fighting the Hollywood current and making a major production about this truly extraordinary man.

I mentioned above that Doss’ story is incredible, and in a way it may be too incredible. Aside from exaggerating the failures of his father, the movie also in many ways understated how extraordinary he was. For example, in one scene it shows Doss and his unit as having to climb up a cargo net to enter their first battle. Given the timing of the battle where this took place (Okinawa), it struck me as unlikely that this would be their first action. Hollywood Vs History confirmed that not only was Okinawa not their first action, but that Doss was one of three men who climbed the cliff to place the net there in the first place:

...medic Desmond Doss was one of the three men who volunteered to go up the
ridge and hang the cargo nets (something not shown in the movie). They were the same cargo nets that the men had used to climb down from the army personnel carriers into the landing crafts that took them ashore. In the photo below, Desmond is seen standing on top of the ridge. The photo doesn’t convey the sheer danger he was in up there. The photographer refused to get any closer for fear he would be hit by Japanese fire. -The Conscientious Objector Documentary

The same article notes there was another incident that Gibson changed because he felt the true story was too difficult for the audience to believe:

Director Mel Gibson decided to leave this out of the movie because he felt audiences would find the heroic circumstances under which it happened too hard to believe...

It also mentions yet another incident which Gibson left out:

...the Japanese had a clear shot at Desmond Doss. Though it’s not depicted in the movie, one Japanese soldier recalled having Desmond in his sights, but every time he went to fire, his gun jammed. -The Conscientious Objector Documentary

After reading about the real story, as is so often the case I find the real story to be more compelling than the dramatized version. Still, Gibson has made a fantastic film and I highly recommend it.
It has been interesting to watch the tabloids switching from cheerleading Angelina Jolie for her empowering decision to divorce Brad Pitt, to seeing her as destroying the lives of her children. There are a number of factors which explain this, but one critical factor is that Jolie has a track record of not only breaking up marriages, but being unable to remain married. Feminists have been wildly successful at teaching us to react in horror at concepts like “she can’t keep a man”, but since reality can’t be brainwashed the risk of this concept creeping back is ever present. This kind of badthink is ironically more of a risk for women than for men, because while Team Woman is real, women also are in fierce intra sexual competition.

Back in September Drake Baer at NY Mag tried to stop the bleeding with an article titled Angelina’s Divorce Shows How ‘Failed Marriages’ Are Failing Us. Baer’s thesis is that divorce and broken homes only cause harm because we misperceive them as failure. Baer argues for a new morality, where staying married is immoral and divorce is heroic:

The dissolution of Brangelina is a “union’s failure” to the The Atlantic, a “failed marriage” to Newsweek and Us Weekly. Trend stories continue to speak of a “divorce epidemic,” one that’s contagious from couple to couple and needs to be “vaccinated” against...

It would be more generous to everybody involved to allow that divorce could be a courageous, positive act. To quote Louis C.K., “No good marriage has ever ended in divorce.” Like Vicki Larson, author of The New I Do: Reshaping Marriage for Skeptics, Realists and Rebels, argues, it would be absurd to think that sticking it out in a sexless, alcoholic, and abusive relationship until somebody dies is success, while sharing a respectful, loving bond for 5, 10, or 50 years and then realizing that you’ve grown apart is failure.

... 

While we can’t know the full circumstances of Jolie and Pitt’s dynamic, we do know that, in some cases, staying married shows an incapacity to do what’s in the best interest of yourself, your partner, and your kids.

This of course is a very common argument today. Baer pairs this with an equally common rationalization, that while lifetime marriage once was feasible, longer modern lifetimes make lifetime marriage no longer reasonable:

To put the grand institution of marriage into context, it’s useful to note that “till death do us part” used to be a lot more immediate...

Zooming into the United States, the colonial era saw American marriages lasting under 12 years on average: Between childbirth, communicable disease, and natural
disaster, people had a habit of dying way younger. One of the great miracles of the 20th century was the increase in lifespan, shooting up over 25 years, on average, in the U.S...

Thanks to increases in medicine and decreases in war, you can't count on death to dissolve a marriage; it comes through divorce.

I haven't been able to locate the original source of the claimed 12 year average for marriages in the colonial era*, but even stipulating that for the sake of argument, Jolie hasn't been married for a total of 12 years even if you add up all three of her failed marriages. Given her past average, even a fourth marriage wouldn't put her over the combined 12 year mark.

Even worse for the claim that longevity is the reason for the divorce revolution is the fact that divorce rates are by far the highest in the younger age brackets. No matter how hard men like Baer and his peers in the media try to sell the idea of grey divorce, the reality is divorce is rare in the very age groups which this argument assumes is driving the divorce revolution. Divorce is considered empowering for women in their 20s and 30s, when their chances of remarriage are still fairly good. Once women reach their 40s as Jolie has, their chances of both divorce and remarriage have dropped dramatically and continue to do so.

http://dalrock.wordpress.com/
Sources:
But the biggest threat to Baer’s argument is the fact that no matter how hard we try to pretend that divorce doesn’t represent a failure, it always will. If we really believed that breaking up families isn’t harmful, we wouldn’t bother with the idea of marriage in the first place. No matter how much feminists try to convince us that children don’t need a father in the home, we all know better. Even worse for Baer, those women who didn’t fail to keep their families intact will always be at risk of pointing this quite obvious fact out. And even when other women remain silent, the women who failed will always know that other women are secretly thinking these thoughts feminists have tried so hard to banish.

*The link provided points to an article identifying Stephanie Coontz as the source of the statistic, but does not name her data source or state where she made this claim.
America is destroying the Hispanic family.
by Dalrock | November 19, 2016 | Link

Usually when you see divorce rates broken out by race and ethnicity, the results look like the chart below, created with data from an NCFMR report on 2010 divorce rates:

Hispanic divorce rates look slightly higher than white divorce rates, and far lower than black divorce rates, where marriage has all but collapsed. But this presentation overlooks the fact that something terrible is happening to the Hispanic family following the first generation. When the NCFMR revisited the same subject with data from 2012 they broke out Hispanics into two separate groups, foreign born and native born:
When they broke the data out in this way, they found that in 2012 foreign born Hispanics had a lower divorce rate than whites, and native born Hispanics had the highest divorce rate of all races, even higher than the divorce rate for blacks!

One thing that stands out between the two charts is the fact that while white and Asian divorce rates remained nearly unchanged between 2010 and 2012, the 2012 data showed black divorce rates as having dropped substantially, from 30.4 to 25.4. Since the NCFMR was crunching American Community Survey (ACS) data to calculate these statistics, there is reason to suspect that the change in black divorce rates was due not to an actual change, but variation due to small sample sizes.

Fortunately earlier this year the NCFMR crunched the ACS data for 2014:
In this latest data set it looks like native born Hispanics have a slightly lower divorce rate than blacks. Also note that the black divorce rate came in at almost exactly the same figure in 2014 as it was for 2012 (25.8 vs 25.4). Based on this I would assume the 2010 value of 30.4 overstated the real black divorce rate, and that over the last six years black divorce rates have been somewhere around 25.

In the same report they show that overall US divorce rates dropped slightly between 2012 and 2014, which fits with the drops observed for Asians, whites, and foreign born Hispanics during the same period:
Given the variation we are seeing in the native born Hispanic divorce rate between 2012 and 2014 I think the best guess is that native born Hispanics have roughly the same divorce rates as blacks, at something around 25 divorces per 1,000 married women. Whether native born Hispanics have a slightly higher or lower divorce rate than American blacks, either way it is clear that we are witnessing something truly tragic occurring when Hispanic families come into contact with American family values and the legal expression of these values via the family courts.

No one sees this because usually all Hispanics are lumped together, hiding the demographic time bomb quietly ticking away. Moreover, all of our elites are highly invested in the current no fault + cash and prizes system. Liberals are busy telling us that the only problem with divorce is that we see it as failure. Instead we should embrace divorce as a heroic act of feminist empowerment, and if we do so families will be just fine. Conservatives on the other hand are telling us that while broken homes really are bad, our current system is working just fine, and the problem is that people mistakenly believe it leads to high levels of divorce. Those conservatives who do see high divorce rates as a problem merely shrug their shoulders and suggest that since our new system seems to work fine for our elites, all we need is for everyone to become like the elite. On the surface it appears that liberals and conservatives have very different takes on divorce, but both are focused on explaining away the very real suffering and devastation our new family model is causing.
A cold calculation.
by Dalrock | November 21, 2016 | Link

Child support is the answer to the question “How shall we replace the nuclear family”? This much is axiomatic, with the only question being how many nuclear families we want to replace. Radical feminists want to destroy all marriages, or at least eliminate the need for all women to remain married. Conservatives want to replace a smaller percentage of marriages with the new family model, and based on conservative arguments that destroying 30-40% of marriages is not excessive, this is a fair estimate of how many marriages conservatives (in general) wish to destroy.

The difference of course is not just in the number of marriages each group wants to destroy, but the rationale each group uses to determine when a marriage should be destroyed. Feminists see marriage in general as a threat to women’s autonomy, and therefore it is no surprise they fall on the side of mass replacement. Conservatives on the other hand are more conservative in their goals for replacing marriage. Usually conservatives argue that marriages need to be destroyed if the husband is unable or unwilling to sufficiently provide for his family, or if he is abusive or unfaithful. But even here the terms are open to broad interpretation, as there is no defined amount of provision husbands must provide to be safe in this model, and abuse and infidelity have been stretched beyond all reason so that a husband viewing pornography is now often accused of both abuse and infidelity.

Feminists astutely recognize that conservatives have given them carte blanche to destroy families, so long as the feminists pretend they are only destroying marriages for the most serious reasons. As a result, we have answered both the question of how to replace marriage (with child support and other cash and prizes) as well as how many marriages should be replaced (as many as women desire). This has been codified into law, and perfectly describes our family courts. Women who want to divorce know they are assured of receiving custody, and custody determines who gets (vs pays) the cash and prizes.

Since there is by design no attempt in our system to determine if the man being punished actually deserves to be punished, the only conservative defense of this system is a claim that no sane woman would do this unless pushed to the limits by a truly bad man. Although the system is designed to provide a strong incentive for wives to eject husbands from the family, conservatives vehemently argue that following this route creates so much hardship for a wife that no formal protections against abusing the system are required.

But feminists long ago were able to craft this new legal model with the full support of conservatives. Feminists have also been largely successful at removing the social stigma against wives who destroy their families, with the great help of conservatives (especially Christian conservatives). Now that the new regime is in place and supported by nearly everyone, the need for divorcing mothers to keep up the facade that conservatives rely on is fading away. Now women who discard the father of their children have less incentive to pretend that they did anything but make the obvious cost/benefit calculation our family model invites them to make. Is it easier to stay married and raise children with less than
100% autonomy, or is it easier to eject the father from the home while retaining the bulk of his spendable earnings?

Yesterday Salon published an article by single mother Dena Landon that breaks this taboo. In *All the single mamas: Raising kids isn’t always easier with a partner* Landon explains how she made the cold calculation that it was easier to eject her disabled husband from the home than to honor her marriage vows (emphasis mine):

> When I tell people that I’m a single mom, with 60 percent custody, the typical response is a combination of pity and comments like, “you’re so strong” or “what a tough job.” If I’m not in the mood to engage with the person commenting, I’ll just smile and say, “thanks.” But sometimes I’ll respond with the truth: “Actually, it’s easier than being married.”

There’s a narrative that has taken root in society of the hardworking, tired and overwhelmed single mom. And I am all of those things — often. **But this narrative is sometimes subtly used to support the retro notion that a two-parent family is still best**, with its implication that it would be easier if I had someone to help me...

Note the contemptuous mocking of the conservatives who created our new family structure with the belief that women would pretend the system wasn’t a formula for cold, calculating women like Landon to destroy their families. This lie is no longer required, and therefore Salon and Landon are eager to correct the record.

The father of Landon’s children has MS, and either way would not do the housework as he was told. This made ejecting him from the home and collecting cash and prizes the obvious logical choice:

> “Sure, Dena, ask your handicapped husband, who spent all day at work, to clean the house.” He’d snap his laptop close and get up in a huff, legs buckling twice, before stalking into his study and leaving me to watch our son.

But Landon goes a step farther, and explains that even when husbands do the chores their wives demand, it can still be easier to seize 100% of the power by taking the family courts up on their standing offer:

> Other single moms have noted that even if their exes had cooked or helped out with the kids, it’s still easier for these women to go it alone now than to deal with the constant negotiating, tension and passive aggressive behavior around household chores that they experienced during their marriages.

> …There are no internal struggles: Should I leave the mess and see if he cleans it up? Do I have the energy for another argument about housework? If there’s a mess, it’s hers.

While Landon’s cold calculation is commonplace among single mothers, her **candor** is still fairly rare. What she is admitting to is after all quite ugly. Not only did she casually break her
sacred vow, but she is admitting to forcing her son to grow up without his father in the home because mommy wanted to flex her feminist muscles. The response in the comments to this incredible ugliness is unsurprising. Jerseyguy999 wrote:

Wow ! Salon is desperate for feminist heroines. Because this woman, Landon, sounds like a b**ch. Her husband is working – which is tough enough with Multiple Sclerosis. But then he divorces him because he doesn’t clean the dishes ? THIS is the problem in our society. Don’t you get it liberals ? My mother and father were married for over 30 years until my Mom died. Not all of it was great. But they worked through the tough times because they understood the importance of preserving the family. But here is a woman who figures divorce is a good option because her husband doesn’t’ pick up his socks. Sure, the guy maybe should be more considerate. But getting a divorce shouldn’t be like deciding the jeans you got don’t fit exactly right … and you’ll just return them. Geez !

Pointing out this ugliness reflexively lead to the standard motte and bailey game when it comes to no fault divorce. While the article was about the incentives wives have to toss out good husbands out of convenience, once the ugliness was pointed out commenter tinwoman replied explaining that the real reason women divorce is because men are abusive:

...you have NO idea how many women are divorced because they were abused. You seem to think it is rare? Women file for most divorces, and guess what honey bunches, they cite abuse as a reason almost half the time– and many more abused women don’t cite abuse as a reason because they were badly advised in the divorce process or because all they want is out.

Oh wait, women are always lying when they say they’re abused, right?

While there will always be an incentive to play the motte and bailey game regarding no fault divorce and child support, we should also expect to see more of this kind of honesty moving forward. For the near and medium term at least feminists know that conservatives aren’t in a position to admit what an evil system they have created. As a result conservatives will instead try to ignore or deny the very open taunting by feminists and double down on the argument that weak men are screwing feminism up. Over time however as marriage continues to crumble and the economic benefits of the system are forgone, eventually we will start to see a push by our elites to reign in the worst abuses of the family courts. The problem is, by the time the pain is great enough to no longer ignore, much of the massive goodwill of men towards marriage that sustains this new model will have been squandered.
A big win for Grudem.
by Dalrock | November 22, 2016 | Link

The Atlantic has a new article out on a change the ESV is making in their translation of Gen 3:16. From Rewriting the Biblical ‘Curse’ on Womankind:

Whereas the first half of that sentence formerly read “Your desire shall be for your husband,” it now reads, “Your desire shall be contrary to your husband.” It appears to suggest that women naturally oppose their husbands’ desires, and thus are responsible for marital conflict.

It turns out that Dr. Wayne Grudem, cofounder of the CBMW was a major driver of this change:

The ESV translators are known to mostly affirm complementarianism, the view that men and women should have different roles in the family and church. They include Christian leaders such as the prolific theologian and writer J.I. Packer; the publisher Lane Dennis; and the theologian Wayne Grudem...

I've only read a little on the argument for the change here, so I did some digging. Grudem argued for this reading of Gen 3:16 in a chapter he wrote for Biblical Foundations for Manhood and Womanhood*

The word translated “desire” is an unusual Hebrew word, teshûqåh. What is the meaning of this word? In this context and in this construction, it probably implies an aggressive desire, perhaps a desire to conquer or rule over, or else an urge or impulse to oppose her husband, an impulse to act “against” him. This sense is seen in the only other occurrence of teshûqåh in all the books of Moses (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy), and the only other occurrence of teshûqåh plus the preposition ‘el in the whole Bible. That occurrence of the word is in the very next chapter of Genesis, in 4:7. God says to Cain, “Sin is crouching at the door, and its desire is for you, but you must master it” (NASB). Here the sense is very clear. God pictures sin as a wild animal waiting outside Cain’s door, waiting to attack him, even to pounce on him and overpower him. In that sense, sin’s “desire” or “instinctive urge” is “against” him. 20

The striking thing about that sentence is what a remarkable parallel it is with Genesis 3:16. In the Hebrew text, six words are the same and are found in the same order in both verses. It is almost as if this other usage is put here by the author so that we would know how to understand the meaning of the term in Genesis 3:16. The expression in 4:7 has the sense, “desire, urge, impulse against” (or perhaps “desire to conquer, desire to rule over”). And that sense fits very well in Genesis 3:16 also. 21

Grudem further argues that to characterize this as sexual desire would be incorrect:
Some have assumed that “desire” in Genesis 3:16 refers to sexual desire. But that is highly unlikely because (1) the entire Bible views sexual desire within marriage as something positive, not as something evil or something that God imposed as a judgment; and (2) surely Adam and Eve had sexual desire for one another prior to their sin, for God had told them to “be fruitful and multiply” (Gen. 1:28), and certainly in an unfallen world, along with the command, God would have given the desire that corresponded to it. So “your desire shall be for your husband” cannot refer to sexual desire. It is much more appropriate to the context of a curse to understand this as an aggressive desire against her husband, one that would bring her into conflict with him.

Grudem offers the following in the notes for the chapter:

The understanding of Genesis 3:16 as a hostile desire, or even a desire to rule over, has gained significant support among Old Testament commentators. It was first suggested by Susan T. Foh, “What Is the Woman’s Desire?” in Westminster Theological Journal 37 (1975), 376-383. David Talley says the word is attested in Samaritan and Mishnaic Hebrew “with the meaning urge, craving, impulse” and says of Foh, “Her contention that the desire is a contention for leadership, a negative usage, seems probable for Gen. 3:16” (New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis, 5 vols., ed., Willem Van Gemeren, Vol. 4 [Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1991], 341, with reference to various commentators).

*Not to be confused with the similarly titled book Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, which Piper and Grudem put together when they first created the CBMW. Also note that the excerpts I quoted are only pieces of what he wrote on the topic in the chapter. The link is to a pdf version of the book, and you can read the full section starting at the bottom of page 33 of the pdf file.
The rational response to high divorce rates.
by Dalrock | November 23, 2016 | Link

Note: Most of the data presented in this post is from family profiles produced by the National Center for Family and Marriage Research (NCFMR) at Bowling Green State University (BGSU). For brevity when referencing a family profile from the NCFMR I will use the NCFMR short name of the profile (eg FP-16-19), with a link to the profile.

Recently first divorce rates have gone down (FP-16-19), and first marriage rates have gone up (FP-16-18):

Also, while the US overall (not just first) divorce rate remained flat between 1990 and 2010, according to FP-16-21 the overall divorce rate since the US peak in 1980 (22.8) has gone down by 25%, to 16.9.
These figures are encouraging on the surface, but they leave out something catastrophic that is going on beneath the surface. Our new model of marriage simply doesn’t work for the majority of the nation, and as a result large parts of our population are increasingly avoiding it. This avoidance can take the form of delaying marriage, avoiding remarriage, or avoiding marrying altogether. The aggregate result of this avoidance means that the percentage of the adult population that is married is dramatically decreasing:

From the chart above you can see that the results are different for men verses women, as well as by race. A more detailed picture by race can be seen by comparing the rate of first divorce (FP-16-19) and the rate of first marriage (FP-16-18) by race:
As you can see above, the women who divorce the most are also in the least demand for marriage, and this pattern is consistent across all racial and ethnic groups measured. The logic of this is intuitive, but seeing it so clearly mapped out is striking.

We can see a less clear example of this when we look at first divorce rates (FP-16-19) and first marriage rates (FP-16-18) by education:
As we would expect, the least likely group of women to divorce (college graduates) is the most in demand for marriage. However, the women with the highest divorce rates (some college) are the second most in demand for marriage. Clearly men haven’t recognized the real risk of marrying a woman with some college, and are instead assuming the risk is slightly higher than marrying a college grad. But aside from “some college” women being out of place in the marriage chart (they should be to the far right), there is another anomaly; women without a high school diploma or GED have the second lowest divorce rates, but are the least in demand for marriage. However, this represents an odd corner case, and much of what we are measuring in this category represents first generation Hispanics.

While there are some exceptions, overall the more likely a woman is to divorce the less likely she is to marry. This much is clear from the data. This leaves us with the question of what is the mechanism that is creating this pattern. It is always possible that I have the wrong end of the causal arrow, but I think the most logical answer is that men have over time become less interested in marriage where the risk of divorce is high. But even here, there is the question of the specific mechanism in play. One very popular theory is that men are individually making a cost-benefit evaluation of marriage and more and more deciding not to marry. While I think there are certainly some men who are approaching the question in such a clear headed way, I think the much more powerful mechanism has been a slow cultural shift in response to the changing risks of marriage for men.
A proposed mechanism.

Instead of men carefully researching the statistics and coming to individual conclusions, I think what is happening is each subculture is slowly responding to the new realities of marriage. Part of this is cultural knowledge, like the warning to middle class and upper middle class men that it is foolhardy to marry a working class woman, and the warning to men in general to avoid marrying a woman who already has a track record of divorce. Part of this is also about the changing sense of what is “normal”. When the divorce revolution first exploded, the men who found themselves ejected from their homes, and the sons of those men, already had formed their opinion on the nature of marriage based on a previous era. Even though the rules and risk had clearly changed, these men were slow to change their ingrained attitudes on marriage. Marriage was simply something respectable men did.

But over time, each new generation was raised with a different starting assumption on both the normalcy of marriage and its risk. This happened fastest where the change in risk was highest. In working class neighborhoods, divorce rates well over 50% meant that divorce theft, and not lifetime marriage, was the new norm. Moreover, as women continued to delay marriage, and men became less willing to marry divorced women (or even try marriage again after being ejected from their first marriage), a smaller and smaller percentage of the subculture was married at any given time. In addition, the family courts are merely the formal/legal expression of our attitudes towards married men. In the past married men were generally seen as respectable, but both the family courts and popular media make it clear that men who marry are despicable (either for being cruel to women and children or worthless fools).

In 1960 70% of white men were married, and in 1970 this had only dropped to 68%. Even in 1980, with divorce rates peaking, 65% of white men were still married. If you were white and in the middle or upper middle class, these rates were even higher. Marriage was still very much the norm, although this was becoming less and less so as each year passed. Compare this to black men, who saw the percentage of men who were married drop from 61% in 1960, to 57% in 1970, and 49% in 1980. By 1980 being unmarried was more normal for black men than being married. This continued to fall, and by 2010 only 36% of black men were married. This translates into increasing out of wedlock birth rates, and this added to the continuation of high divorce rates means that fewer and fewer children will grow up with married parents. Over time, the expectation of each generation regarding marriage has changed, but the change has been slow enough to fool many into a sense that our new marriage model isn’t failing after all.

Much of the apathy is that our elites still feel like marriage is working for them; if the changes they made to marriage have been a catastrophe for everyone else, then everyone else simply needs to become like the elites. This is a profoundly arrogant and selfish attitude, but since the elites are the ones who frame the debate about marriage there are few voices prepared to challenge this narrative.

The sexual revolution isn’t over.

But even our elites will eventually be forced to recognize the cost of redefining our family. There is a common belief that the sexual revolution started in the 1960s and ended
sometime in the 1980s. While it may well have begun in the 1960s, the sexual revolution never ended. Marriage has continued to recede as each cohort marries in smaller numbers, and those who do marry wait until ever later in life to do so. While divorce rates have dropped some as marriage has become a luxury of the higher socio economic classes, each new cohort is less likely to remarry after divorce. The real sexual revolution has always been about destroying marriage, and it won’t be over until marriage is defunct as a social institution. Even if divorce rates continue to either level off or decline, marriage will continue to be something that is relevant to an ever shrinking part of the population.
The roots of modern Christian wife worship.
by Dalrock | November 25, 2016 | Link

In the discussion of Women as responders, commenter Neguy pointed out that the idea that women are naturally good (so long as their husband is loving) goes much further back than 1972:

I think you’ll find that the core of the men bad/women good theology goes back quite a long way. British scholar Callum Brown dates the big shift to somewhere around the year 1800. He surveys the evangelical literature of the 19th and 20th centuries and writings from the 1800s are almost identical to Glenn Stanton. His book The Death of Christian Britain is about secularization in the UK, but basically argues that this feminization of faith (or more precisely, the merger of Christian and feminine identity), is what ultimately caused the collapse of Christianity in the west.

This comment and some excerpts he shared in follow-on comments convinced me to pick up a copy of The Death of Christian Britain. I haven’t made it all the way through the book, so I may well write a follow up post later. But as Neguy notes above, the narrative that Brown found starting around 1800 is the standard narrative we see from conservative Christians today.

Brown’s thesis is that conventional wisdom on the decline of Christianity in Britain is incorrect. Conventional wisdom is that Christianity has been in steady decline in Britain since 1800. Brown asserts that this is not the case, and instead argues that the real decline was abrupt and began in 1963. As Brown explains in the introduction:

...this book re-brands Britain of 1800 to 1963 as a highly religious nation, and the period as the nation’s last puritan age. The Britain of our nearest forefathers is re-branded as a deeply Christian country of unprecedented churchgoing levels and the most strict religious rules of personal conduct.

...The book focuses considerable attention on how piety was conceived as an overwhelmingly feminine trait which challenged masculinity and left men demonized and constantly anxious. It was modern evangelicalism that raised the piety of woman, the ‘angel in the house’, to reign over the moral weakness and innate temptations of masculinity.

...women, rather than cities or social class, emerge as the principal source of explanation for the patterns of religiosity that were observable in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Most importantly, two other things will emerge. First, women were the bulwark to popular support for organized Christianity between 1800 and 1963, and second it was they who broke their relationship to Christian piety in the 1960s and thereby caused secularization.

Chapter four covers what Brown calls the feminization of piety.
One of the great mythic transformations of the early nineteenth century was the feminization of angels. Until the 1790s, British art and prose portrayed the angel as masculine or, at most, bisexual — characteristically muscular, strong, and even displaying male genitalia, and a free divine spirit inhabiting the chasms of the sky and space. But by the early Victorian period, angels were virtuously feminine in form and increasingly shown in domestic confinement, no longer free to fly. Woman had become divine, but an angel now confined to the house.

But it is Brown’s analysis of the common narrative during this period that I find most interesting.

...women’s spiritual destiny was virtually never portrayed as a battle with temptation or real sin; fallen women did not appear as central characters, and none of the usual temptations like drink or gambling ever seemed to be an issue with them. The problem is the man, sometimes the father, but more commonly the boyfriend, fiancé, or husband, who is a drinker, a gambler, keeps the ‘bad company’ of ‘rough lads’ and is commonly a womanizer. The man is the agency of the virtuous woman’s downfall; he does not make her bad, but does make her suffer and poor. She is not always portrayed as having undergone a major conversion experience, but to have emerged from childhood into a disciplined and natural ‘goodness.’

As Neguy points out, you can see this same concept of women having “natural goodness” in Glenn Stanton’s writings (among many others). Brown explains how this concept dominated the Christian romance stories of the time. Just as Christians are taught today, if a woman has a godly husband she will be a very happy wife:

Finding the right Christian husband was the uppermost consideration rather than the age of engagement. The ending, as in all evangelical stories, was always happy — as in Love’s Healing in the 1920s which concludes with the heroine marrying ‘a splendid Christian man. She is fortunate indeed and will be a happy wife.’ By the 1930s and 1940s, scores of paperback religious novels appeared, aimed almost exclusively at teenage girls and young women. Love was the dominant theme, following a format familiar to Mills & Boon readers, but with a Christian ‘spin’, ending with lines like: ‘What are you thinking of, darling?’ whispered her husband. ‘I was thinking how good God is. I’ve never been so happy in my life.’ Romance was set within a tough system of moral values, but it was invariably the man’s moral values that were the criteria, making the women’s issue the arrival at the right judgment on the man’s worthiness.

Men, on the other hand, are presented as naturally sinful and in need of a woman to reform them (emphasis mine):

In evangelical stories about piety, women appeared throughout as good but not always converted; men, by contrast, almost always appeared as in a perilous sinful state until near the end. Men were the problem, given manifold temptations: drink (nearly always), gambling (increasingly after 1890), and ‘rough’ in overall cultural terms. They lived dissipated lives which caused suffering and ruination to mothers, wives, and children. Nowhere did evangelical literature have such a powerful
influence in the public domain, including in ‘secular’ fiction, as in its
demonization of men.

Brown explains that narratives about men fit one of two structures:

The male centered evangelical narrative had important characteristics. There were
two structures in use between the 1850s and 1930s; the ‘son structure’ and the
‘husband structure’:

Of the two, the Husband Structure is the one we most commonly see today, albeit generally
omitting item E or replacing it (and often D) with the wakeup call.

A. Husband lives with virtuous wife
B. Husband is a drunkard/gambler/wife-beater
C. Wife and children suffer in poverty
D. Chance event (often an accident to husband)
E. Wife nurses husband in Christian way.
F. Husband converts
G. Family happier, if not richer

If this seems familiar, it is because it is the plot of every Kendrick brothers movie with the
possible exception of Facing the Giants. I’ve already written about Fireproof, where the
chance event (D) is the wife filing for divorce and taking up with another man. I’ve also
written about Courageous, and War Room. But you can even see this same pattern in the
more obscure Kendrick brother movie Flywheel. From the plot summary at InfoGalactic:

Jay Austin (Alex Kendrick) is a car salesman who consistently cheats his customers,
even to the point of overcharging his own pastor. He teaches his rotund salesmen,
Bernie Meyers (Tracy Goode) and Vince Berkeley (Treavor Lokey), to do likewise. Jay
occasionally attends church, but only because his wife Judy (Janet Lee Dapper) wants
him to go. He also fakes giving a donation to the church. His relationships with his
wife and son (Richie Hunnewell), who both disapprove of his dishonesty, deteriorate.
In addition he is facing foreclosure on his lot by the bank. Jay becomes troubled in
his conscience, and one day while flipping television channels, he sees a pastor
preaching that “you’re in the shape you’re in today because of the choices you’ve
made”. Jay becomes personally convicted and becomes a born-again Christian,
prompting him to change his business practices.

Jay apologizes to his pregnant wife and his son and decides to sell cars honestly from
that point on...

This covers A-D, omits E, and covers F. All that is left for the Husband Structure is the final
item, G:

The next day Jay comes to the lot and sees many people there to buy his cars. Jay
even has to call his wife to help sell all the cars on the lot that day. The total of the
sales above the cost of the cars is enough to cover what the banker demanded, who
comes later that day and wonders where all the cars have gone...
Jay exits the lot and rushes home to bring his wife to the hospital. She gives birth to a girl named Faith, to stand as a living reminder of Jay’s newfound faith in God. At the end of the film, Jay drives away with his son in his 1958 Triumph TR3, an acquisition at the beginning of the film, which Max (Walter Burnett), his mechanic, had repaired with a newly installed flywheel (thus the film’s title).
7 For a man ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God, but woman is the glory of man. 8 For man was not made from woman, but woman from man. 9 Neither was man created for woman, but woman for man. 10 That is why a wife ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels.[d] 11 Nevertheless, in the Lord woman is not independent of man nor man of woman; 12 for as woman was made from man, so man is now born of woman. And all things are from God.

— 1 Cor 11:7-12, ESV

In the discussion of a recent post the conversation turned to the different temptations faced by men and women. That the two sexes would face different temptations is only natural. However, there is at least one temptation that men and women share; both are strongly tempted to worship women, to put women in the place of God. You can see this outside of Christianity with the prevalence of mother goddess religions. You can also see it in Genesis 3, in the way that the serpent tempted Eve (emphasis mine):

4 But the serpent said to the woman, “You will not surely die. 5 For God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.” 6 So when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise,[b] she took of its fruit and ate, and she also gave some to her husband who was with her, and he ate.

Eve was tempted by telling her she would be like God. Adam's temptation was to listen to his wife instead of God:

17 And to Adam he said,

“Because you have listened to the voice of your wife
and have eaten of the tree
of which I commanded you,
‘You shall not eat of it,’
cursed is the ground because of you...

Modern Christians have succumbed to this same temptation. Thus despite us living in an age where female rebellion is considered a virtue, conservative Christians constantly warn men that they need to be wary of the sin of not listening to their wives.
Others, like FotF’s Glenn Stanton, come right out and teach* that men require their wives to take on the role of headship, so the wife with her natural goodness can instruct her husband on issues of morality.

Man and woman are not equal. He owes what he is to her. That is hardly her only power, but it is among her most formidable. Christianity has always known this....

Woman is the most powerful living force on the globe. She creates, shapes, and sustains human civilization.

Most women, of course, love this message. But if we are honest, so do most men.

*HT Smithborough
I think he has earned a puppy party.
by Dalrock | November 28, 2016 | Link

In Why Man and Woman Are Not Equal Glenn Stanton writes:

The New York Times’s Gail Collins told NPR unequivocally that the most important primary finding of her brilliant book America’s Women (which faithfully sits to the left behind Leslie Knope’s desk in every Parks and Recreation episode), is that the most powerful and important influence women have had on our nation’s founding, growth, and success is this: They make men behave. All their other important contributions are secondary.

I was unfamiliar with Leslie Knope or the show Parks and Recreation, but given how important she is to Stanton I knew she and the show had to be hilariously feminist. I did a bit of googling and found this fitting clip.

I am a goddess, a glorious female warrior. Queen of all that I survey. Enemies of fairness and equality, hear my womanly roar. Yeah!

Related: Solipsism as a religious experience.
Carrying on like teenagers.
by Dalrock | December 3, 2016 | Link

Scott shares a tip on diffusing spousal friction in: When in doubt, grab her by her waist, put her on the kitchen counter and kiss her neck.

Added to the fun was the fact that my daughter, who loves this stuff grabbed my phone and snapped the shot.

This picture looks like something two high-schoolers would do. Remember?

And Mychael has many times referenced back to the fact that these moments make her feel like she is in high school again. It’s kind of the point.

It works, every time. And even if she knows I am doing it, it doesn’t change the fact that it worked. What “works” about it is still a bit of a mystery to me. But usually the look on her face changes rapidly from whatever scowl she has to slight resistance, to indignation to resignation and then relief. It takes about 4 seconds for her to go through every one of those emotions.

See his full post for the picture as well as the required disclaimer in our age of Duluth.

See Also:

- Headship Game
- If it isn’t fun, you probably aren’t doing it right.
Dr. Russell Moore explains at FamilyLife the key to avoiding infidelity in marriage*:

It’s been said that the best defense is a good offense. Russell Moore says that when it comes to maintaining marital fidelity, a wife’s best defense may well be to move into her husband’s life with hard questions and a loving presence to open up the dialogue about marital fidelity – before the affair happens.

Note that in the FamilyLife summary above, the temptation to sin only affects husbands. In the beginning of the segment Moore does briefly reference premarital counseling where he has both the husband and wife write out how they would be tempted to cheat, but for the rest of the program the presumption is that only husbands are tempted by sexual sin.

Dr. Moore describes a situation where his wife’s radar went up:

Early on, in ministry—serving a church—we had a young woman, who would come up after every sermon. She would say, “Ah, Brother Moore—that was just amazing! I’ve got some questions to ask you, from Habakkuk.” Then, she would stand and ask questions. Maria said to me, in the car, on the way home, “She’s after you!” I said, “You’re crazy! You are crazy! I look like a cricket. [Laughter] She’s not after me. Secondly, she’s just this godly, truth-seeking woman. She’s just intensely passionate about Habakkuk.” [Laughter] Maria said: “Well, I don’t know about all that, but I know women. I know how women act, and she is after you.” She was not threatened by that. She didn’t nag or berate me about that. She just made sure that, every time that woman approached, she was right there with me.

Moore can’t see sin/temptation in women, so he couldn’t see it in the woman who was moving in on him. His takeaway from this story is not to recognize his own blind spot, but to declare his wife to be a Christian version of Xena, Warrior Princess:

That woman came and sat down one time—next to me, on the pew, before service started—to ask me a Habakkuk question. Next thing I know, here comes Maria. She just squeezes herself right down between us, reaches up and kisses me on the cheek, and just starts rubbing my back, while I explain the eschatology of Habakkuk. [Clapping] What that is—is a 

warrior princess for Christ—in her marriage.

His wife’s mate guarding strikes me as wise, but Christ’s words in Mat 5:47 seem to apply:

Do not even pagans do that?

Moore then reinforces the concept that only husbands are tempted to cheat:

If you wives are going to work, with your husbands, toward godliness, you cannot be threatened by the idea that your husband is going to feel some attraction for some
other woman. If your husband tells you that he has never had any attraction to anybody else but you, he is a liar! Don’t be threatened, wives, when your husband sits down and says to you: “I believe that I may be vulnerable. I find myself noticing So-and-so when she walks in the room,” or, “I find myself just spiritually dry, and joyless, and bored right now. I’m afraid that’s an inroad to Satan. Help me to crucify the flesh.” That’s a blessing from God!

Next Moore changes the subject to fornication. He points out the problem with the euphemism *premarital sex*, because it creates a sense of marriage retroactively covering fornication:

Paul says, “If you cannot handle yourself and keep yourself under control, marry. It is better to marry than to burn with passion.” Why is that the case? It is not simply because fornication will do bad things to you later on—although, it will. It is because God has revealed, “Fornicators will not inherit the Kingdom of God.”

Now, one of the problems that we have in our church, and possibly even in your marriage, is that we do not really believe that. We do not really see the spiritual war that is going on, at this point, because we assume: “It’s premarital sex. So, once the marriage takes place, the issue is now resolved.”

The term premarital sex is deceptive not just because it hides the sin of a couple fornicating with each other before marriage, but because it also expands to cover all of the other acts of fornication the two members of the couple engaged in with a parade of other people. While Moore can see the smaller problem, he doesn’t seem to be able to see the larger one.

Moore ironically then uses the same frame of mind of premarital-sex/retroactive-marriage to frame fornication as strictly a sin by husbands, who prey on their future wives (emphasis mine):

Some of you—in your marriages, right now—are experiencing deadness, and mistrust, and conflict because you, husbands, led that woman into fornication. You have never gotten to the point of repentance before God for evil. Every act of hiddenness that you took to manage your own image and to cover over your sin, you will be able to do, just as easily, again, with some other woman. “She’s the love of my life!” You’ll feel that way about somebody else, one day. “We were just so carried away!” You’ll be carried away again, one day.

Until you get to the point—specifically, men—where you, as a former fornicator, get on your knees with your wife and say: “I am guilty of not protecting you, of not exercising godly headship over you, of not loving you as Christ loved the Church. I repent before God, and I repent to you,” you will never understand what the Scripture is talking about when it says: “You were washed. You were freed.” The problem is—we assume that, because the issue is in the past, that the issue is over; but as Alice von Hildebrand put it so poignantly one time, “Nothing drives two people further apart than sinning together.”
Your wife, men, may not trust you right now because she knows her parents couldn’t trust you then. Until that is dealt with—with the kind of heart that cries out, “Lord, have mercy, and free me, and wash me,” you will never find the kind of spiritual power and freedom in your marriage that you so desperately need.

Note that he claims the husband’s sin is not exercising godly headship over a woman he wasn’t married to. Yet he wasn't her head, because she hadn’t (yet) chosen him to be her head! She only chose him as a fornication partner. Once he was her head, it wasn’t fornication anymore. Moreover, for the vast majority of the couples listening, the (now) husband wasn’t the first, or even second, and probably not even the third man she fornicated with before marriage. Did all of those other men also have headship over her? Is the last man in the chain that she fornicated with, the man who married her, more guilty than the other men because he married her instead of moving on? If the husband hadn’t later married her, would his fornication with her really be less sinful?

Note that the problem is not that Moore is calling men to repent of their sexual sins, nor that he is warning them of the temptations they face. This is loving. The problem is that he isn’t showing this same love to the women in the audience, and is in fact helping them deceive themselves into denying their sins and their temptations. Even worse, he is withholding this love from the more easily deceived spouse, at a time when the culture is teaching her that sin and rebellion are virtues.

See Also: Dr. Russell Moore: Wives don’t sin (part 2)

*Broadcast February 12, 2013. Also published here.*
There is another aspect to the Dr. Russell Moore sermon I wrote about in my previous post. It contains something astoundingly common for modern Christian leaders, and that is a provocation to marital strife:

Some of you—in your marriages, right now—are experiencing deadness, and mistrust, and conflict because you, husbands, led that woman into fornication.

Feminism has weaponized female discontentment and sown marital strife. Pastors and other Christian leaders have responded to this not by countering it with relevant Scripture like 1 Peter 3:1-6, but by joining in. The reasons for feminists to encourage female discontentment and marital strife are fairly obvious, but for Christian leaders the reason for their perverse delight in sowing marital strife is more puzzling.

While the reasons are puzzling, the pattern is crystal clear. I'll share just a few examples in this post, but you will see it everywhere. Pastor Caleb Suko opens his post How to Make Your Wife Submit to Your Authority -6 Tips with:

Alright men here’s another post for you! Let’s not beat around the bush, the Bible commands our wives to submit to us!

This is of course carefully calculated to stir up feminist resentment in the wives who are reading. Suko knows that the modern Christian men reading aren’t clamoring to force their wives into submission, they are cowering in fear of contentiousness from their feminist wives. The whole point of the opening line was to fan the smouldering feminist resentment right off the bat. The same is true for:

Don’t think for second that you need to lay down the law and “show her who’s boss”!

Likewise, Pastor Sam Powell writes in Headship is not Hierarchy:

Did Adam sit on the couch and say “Woman, beer me and shut those kids up!” I think not.

Dr. Richard L. Strauss preached in What Every Husband Needs to Know (background) that if wives are unhappy, their husband is to blame:
This gives an entirely new meaning to the misunderstood doctrine of male headship. **Headship is not some masculine doctrine cleverly designed to bolster the husband’s sagging ego.** Headship involves the husband’s solemn obligation to establish an atmosphere of love in which the basic needs of his wife are fulfilled—an environment in which she is free to grow and develop into all that God wants her to be. Her submission will then be the voluntary response to his loving leadership.

...

She responds to what she receives. If she receives irritability, criticism, disapproval, unkindness, indifference, lack of appreciation, or lack of affection, she will respond with a defense mechanism, such as bitterness, coolness, defiance, or nagging. Some women turn to drinking or submerge themselves in social activities.

But if the woman receives love she will respond with love, and will blossom into the most beautiful creature under God’s heaven. **When a man claims that his wife doesn’t love him anymore he is unwittingly admitting that he hasn’t loved her as he should have.**

Dr. David Clarke at Focus on the Family explains that women being discontented in marriage and men being happy is a sign that God made women better at marriage than men. A wife’s discontentment isn’t something she needs to overcome, it is a **virtue**, and proof that she is better at marriage than her fool of a husband:

Well, these little stories we heard just a few minutes ago from these ladies, I have heard a million times at my seminars, in my therapy office, oh, just one after the other, good solid Christian women... There’s no real intimacy. I’m dying inside. And the key is, they’re not letting the husband know that. The guy has no clue. He’s perfectly happy. So, when that woman hits the wall and leaves him, he is the most stunned guy on earth.

...

Now He’s got a master plan, because if we work together and let the woman actually teach us, ‘cause she has many more skills interpersonally that we will ... ever will have. She’s got a Ph.D. in emotional intimacy and spiritual intimacy very often. We have like a third-grade education.

Clarke is so concerned that wives might follow the instructions in 1 Pet 3:1-6 and try to **win their husbands without a word** that he insists that wives schedule time for strife:

...many Christians and pastors, the Christian community are on board with this problem in trying to get their attention, ‘cause the wife is told ... I see this in books *all the time* and from pastors from the pulpit. If you just love your husband, uh ... treat him well, meet his needs, then he’s gonna turn around and just love you back the way you really need to be loved. Absolutely false. He’s a guy. He doesn’t know how anyway. He doesn’t know there’s a problem. And if you keep loving him, he’ll
think everything’s fine. He will never get it. You have to get the man’s attention. You gotta sit down and say, “Honey, I’m not happy in our marriage. Here’s why. Let’s change it.”

...

The woman’s got to tell the man, “Look, Honey, I want to have a meeting with you in three days. It’s about our marriage. It’s gonna be very serious. In fact, it’s extremely serious and I want the kids aren’t gonna be in the house when we have this meeting.” And you set a time and that will get his attention...

You gotta get a man with a shovel to the head, metaphorically speaking, of course.

Some pastors don’t trust the wife to schedule the strife, so they schedule it for her. Former Acts 29 president Pastor Mark Driscoll suggested in Marriage and Men (“How dare you!”) that the strife begin during his sermon and continue on the ride home:

...some of you guys have already given her that look, “Don’t cry, don’t let ’em know they’re talking about me. Just hold it together.” You’ve already intimidating her right here. Some of you guys have already whispered in her ear, “I don’t want to hear it. We’re not talking about this in the car on the way home.” Some of you have already whispered in her ear, “I’m sorry. I’ll do better. Trust me. Let’s just move on real quickly.”

How dare you! Who in the hell do you think you are?! Abusing a woman, neglecting a woman, being a coward, a fool, being like your father, Adam! Who do you think you are?! You’re not God! You’re just a man! You’re not an impressive man! You’re not a responsible man! You’re not a noble man! You’re not a respectable man! You’re not a responsible man in any regard!

Likewise, in his sermon Women’s Hurdles current Acts 29 president Pastor Matt Chandler explains that if the wife is in any way tempted to feminist discontentment it is the husband’s fault, and schedules the strife for the ride home:

Really, men, here is a great way to gauge how you’re serving, loving, and practicing your headship. If the most secularized feminist in the world showed up in your home and began to kind of coach your wife toward freedom and liberation from your tyranny, our wives should be so well cared for, so nourished, so sowed into and loved, they would say, “What you’re describing is actually tyranny. I love where I am...

Men, here is a good opportunity. If you’re like, “Well, gosh, I don’t think she would say that at all,” then, men, I think on the way home, you should probably repent and confess before the Lord to your wife.

As disturbing as it is that Christian leaders are deliberately sowing strife in Christian marriages, it is even more disturbing that this has become so commonplace that it now feels
normal. No one notices this, because this is what we have come to expect from Christian leaders, especially complementarian leaders, in our feminist age. But this evil compulsion (for it truly is evil) is anything but normal for Christian leaders to practice. It only feels normal because we have become numb to this profound wickedness.
Are you sure you aren’t unhappy?
by Dalrock | December 8, 2016 | Link

From today’s Daily Mail, Are you subconsciously unhappy in your relationship? Expert reveals the 10 signs that prove it’s finally time to call it quits

You may be coasting along in your current relationship but have you ever stopped to ask yourself if you’re really that happy?

According to one expert, there’s ten tell-tale signs that prove you’re subconsciously unhappy with your partner and may need to break things off.

This kind of thing is of course ever present, a cacophony of whispers telling women they should be discontented. But it is worth pointing out the secular deluge that Christian leaders are responding to when they work to create strife in marriages and tempt wives to resent their husbands. Christian leaders didn’t invent this particular wicked practice, but instead of fighting widespread evil the response from modern Christian leaders has been to join the effort.
Dr. Russell Moore: Wives don’t sin (part 2)

by Dalrock | December 9, 2016 | Link

2 But because of the temptation to sexual immorality, each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband. 3 The husband should give to his wife her conjugal rights, and likewise the wife to her husband. 4 For the wife does not have authority over her own body, but the husband does. Likewise the husband does not have authority over his own body, but the wife does. 5 Do not deprive one another, except perhaps by agreement for a limited time, that you may devote yourselves to prayer; but then come together again, so that Satan may not tempt you because of your lack of self-control.

–1 Cor 7:2-5, ESV

In the Daily Mail piece I linked to yesterday many of the ten signs it is time to dump your man are actually bad behavior on a wife’s part. Sign number two is the wife becomes contentious:

You find yourself constantly rolling your eyes and tutting at the most insignificant things your partner does.

Sign number four is the wife finds herself refusing sex with her husband, and sign five is she stops wanting to make him happy. Sign ten is the wife belittles her husband in front of others.

This idea that any time a wife sins it is really a condemnation of her husband is well loved by modern Christians. Of the ten signs in the Mail article, sign number four is arguably the modern Christian favorite. If a wife denies sex to her husband, it is not a sin to address with the wife, but an indication that her husband is sinning. Pastor Dave Wilson teaches at FamilyLife that a wife not feeling attracted to her husband is a message from God that something is wrong with the man. When Dave’s wife Ann rejected him telling him she didn’t have feelings for him anymore, Dave recognized that this was a message from God:

Here’s all you need to know about that night—the thing that changed our marriage is when Ann was sharing with me what she felt—I had a pretty unique encounter with God. I sensed God was speaking to me, through Ann;

Likewise, Dr. R. Albert Mohler Jr. explains:

Put most bluntly, I believe that God means for a man to be civilized, directed, and stimulated toward marital faithfulness by the fact that his wife will freely give herself to him sexually only when he presents himself as worthy of her attention and desire.

Dr. Russell Moore offers his own take on this theme at FamilyLife in Pornography: Poisoning Marital Intimacy. Whenever a husband complains that his wife is withholding sex, Moore changes the subject:

Now, when a couple comes in to see me and they say to me: “We just don’t know
what’s wrong in our marriage. We just don’t have any intimacy. We don’t have sex with each other anymore. We just feel cold.” I immediately say, “How long has the porn been going on?”

Husband, typically, looks at me, like I’m an Old Testament prophet or a New Age psychic. “How did you know? Are you working for the cable/internet company or something?” It’s because it happens so often and with such regularity, and it always has the same satanic results.

Just to clarify, Moore isn’t saying he deals with both sins together, he is saying if the issue of a wife* withholding sex is brought up, he changes the subject entirely to pornography.

Also, following the standard complementarian script that wives should set and enforce boundaries for their husbands, Moore tells wives:

Ladies, if your husband is entrapped in pornography, confront him in his sin. If he refuses to repent and to show you how he is repenting, take it to the pastors of the church. You are not being un-submissive. You are saying to the authorities that God has put in your life—“Our marriage is in crisis. I love him. I want you to help me to help him.” You, as a joint heir with your husband—following after, going according to his authority—when Satan has gotten him, fight for your man.

Ironically Moore references 1 Cor 7, but not to call out the sin of denial of sex, but to explain why the wife should set and enforce boundaries for her husband:

The answer to all of that is—number one, for the wives in this room—or in the case when it’s the other, the husbands in this room—to recognize the truth of what Paul is saying here when he says, “A husband’s body does not belong to himself. A wife’s body does not belong to herself.” Some of you wives, in this room, are suffering silently alone while your husbands are enslaved to porn. You believe you are doing so because you are being a submissive wife. No, no, no, no. The Bible says, “Wives, submit yourselves....” The Bible never tells women to submit to men, generally. It says for a wife to submit herself to her own husband. But the Scripture also says that what a husband is doing sexually with his body is a violation of his wife; and she, the Scripture says, has ownership over his body.

On the other hand, if the wife is using pornography, Moore explains that the husband should first ask himself why she feels tempted to do so. Then he should bring in someone to deal with the crisis in the marriage that is causing her to feel tempted:

Husbands, if your wife is entrapped with some form of sexual fantasy—whether it’s Fifty Shades of Grey or whatever the Christian version of that is these days—if she is pursuing a romantic fantasy or a sexual fantasy—first of all, ask, “What in our marriage is causing her to seek this out elsewhere?” and, then, bring in those who can come into your marriage and deal with the crisis. Why?—because this is not just a relationship issue. This is a spiritual warfare issue, and there are beings who want to work with your passions to destroy you.
In Summary:

1. If a husband is using pornography, the wife needs to take charge of her husband and seek church discipline.
2. If the wife is using pornography, the husband needs to bring in a marriage counselor to bring back the romance.

And all of this occurs after changing the subject from a wife defrauding her husband of his conjugal rights*.

See Also: Dr. Russell Moore: Wives don’t sin (part 1)

*It could in theory be a husband defrauding his wife, but there is an undeniable pattern here of finding ways to ignore/deny/redirect the sins of wives, and denial of sex is a primary complaint by Christian husbands. If a husband is defrauding his wife I don’t think Moore or the vast majority of Christian leaders would hesitate to tell the husband he is sinning by doing so. In that case pornography could still be a related sin, but the impulse to change the subject entirely would not be there.
Rubbing body parts together.

by Dalrock | December 9, 2016 | Link

Deti noted in the comments of the last post that there is a deep aversion in modern Christians to the idea that both spouses (not just husbands) owe sex to each other, as outlined in 1 Cor 7.

Pastors and theologians are among the most uncomfortable with the idea that husbands are entitled to sex in marriage.

This is true, and it is tangled up with the modern elevation of romance/emotion out of all proportion. The belief is that marital sex needs to be purified by romance, or it is unseemly. You can see this in the wording of both Mohler’s and Moore’s pieces.

Mohler writes:

Many individuals—especially young men—hold a false expectation of what sex represents within the marriage relationship. Since the male sex drive is largely directed towards genital pleasure, men often assume that women are just the same. While physical pleasure is certainly an essential part of the female experience of sex, it is not as focused on the solitary goal of genital fulfillment as is the case with many men.

By definition, sex within marriage is not merely the accomplishment of sexual fulfillment on the part of two individuals who happen to share the same bed. Rather, it is the mutual self-giving that reaches pleasures both physical and spiritual. The emotional aspect of sex cannot be divorced from the physical dimension of the sex act. Though men are often tempted to forget this, women possess more and less gentle means of making that need clear.

Therefore, when I say that a husband must regularly “earn” privileged access to the marital bed, I mean that a husband owes his wife the confidence, affection, and emotional support that would lead her to freely give herself to her husband in the act of sex.

Romance/emotion is needed to make married sex “spiritual”. Otherwise it is dirty. A priestess is needed to bless the marriage bed to make it holy and pure, and this priestess is the person in the marriage who is the expert in marriage/emotion (the wife). Telling her to stop the nonsense and have sex with her husband when she isn’t channeling this emotional holiness is horrifying. That would just be rubbing body parts together!

And rubbing body parts together is what Mohler explains is the real problem with porn. Not (fundamentally) that it is channeling sexual desire outside of marriage, but that it is channeling sexual desire outside of emotion. The problem is (as Mohler explains it) that when
men can view porn their wives’ ability to control them via denial of sex is weakened, and this means the priestess/wife can’t enforce the need to bless sex with romantic love.

Likewise, Moore explains that porn is satanic not because it is focusing sexual desire outside of marriage, but because it lacks romance and emotional intimacy:

Pornography is uniquely satanic because it drives you further, and further, and further from intimacy. Why? Because there is an occult pull upon you that is driving you toward the kind of mystery and the kind of intimacy that you are designed to find in the one-flesh union. It severs that away from real life—covenant, flesh and blood love—in such a way that you become numbed over to the joy of sexual intimacy itself.

Pornography lures you in with sexiness; and then, totally eviscerates your capacity for sexual intimacy. Pornography will move in and destroy you because it will start to create you into the kind of person for whom intimacy is simply body parts rubbing together—not one flesh.
The unexpected challenge to modern Christian orthodoxy.

by Dalrock | December 12, 2016 | Link

There is very often an honesty in secular media that is striking when compared with modern Christian teaching. Rare News reports on the ladies at the view discussing wives withholding sex to punish their husbands for disagreeing with them:

“Well, you shouldn’t have voted for Trump, okay?” she said. Behar cited one therapist who said her clients have “lost their sex drive since Trump won.” The therapist called it “Trump bedroom backlash.”

... 

“You voted for that? I’m not sleeping with you,” Behar said.

“That’s what’s happening,” Sunny Hostin agreed.

This kind of story is sadly commonplace, as modern wives are given constant encouragement to use sex as a way to punish their husbands. Yet while secular culture is very open about this, Christian leaders, especially conservative Christian leaders, are anxious to deny what the ladies in The View are speaking openly about.

It isn’t just that conservative Christian leaders are denying what is happening, but that at the same time they reinforce the feminist message of The View. The Christian wife who watches The View and wonders if she should resist the temptation to use sex to punish her husband will most likely receive abominable counsel should she turn to conservative Christian leaders. Pastor Dave Wilson will teach her that when she denies her husband sex, she is expressing God’s will. Dr. Mohler will teach her the same basic message. Dr. Moore will teach her that if she is tempted to do this it must be because her husband is secretly viewing pornography.

Where could such a wife turn to for wise Christian counsel? If she reads Pastor Doug Wilson’s post The Suitor and His Porn she will receive a message that could easily come from Behar at The View; if they argue and she withholds sex, it is her husband’s fault:

Entitlement: if the young man in question has a sense of entitlement about things generally — grades, employment, standard of living, and so on — it should not be surprising that he is the kind of person who will just “expect” what is his due. If for some reason that drifts away from him, he will still feel entitled. The most common way this happens in marriage is that a man does not treat his wife right, they start to quarrel and drift apart, and this naturally includes their sex life, and he feels just as entitled as he ever did. And the computer is right there. If she is going to take away x, then I will compensate with y — and she can’t complain, because its really her fault. Like laziness, the root problem is abdication of responsibility. Identifying this as a possible problem beforehand should take the
form of looking for a young man who seeks out and accepts responsibility, and who
doesn’t make excuses.

Contrast Pastor Wilson’s statement above with Dr. Helen’s secular **reaction** to the women at
The View:

If this is a girlfriend or fiance, get rid of her now. A person who would treat you this
way and use sex as a weapon against you is not your friend. And you can bet that
any future relationship you have with this woman will be a mistake with you taking
the brunt of her anger when things don’t go her way.

While traditional, **biblical**, ideas like the “wifely duty” are **unimaginable** to conservative
Christians, they periodically pop up in the strangest places. Now that Christians are
religiously avoiding sharing the wisdom of the Bible, if a Christian wife wants this wisdom she
will be forced to seek it out where you would least expect it. One such unexpected place is a
2003 article by Caitlin Flanagan in The Atlantic, aptly titled **The Wifely Duty**. Flanagan opens
by arguing that sexless marriages are an epidemic:

Dr. Phil—who, like his mentor Oprah Winfrey, has an uncannily precise sense of what
American women in the aggregate are thinking about—noted on his Web site that
“sexless marriages are an undeniable epidemic.” Mass-circulation magazines aimed
at married women rarely go to press these days without an earnest review of some
new sexual technique or gadget, the information always presented in the context of
how to relight a long-doused fire.

As I’ve shown, conservative Christian orthodoxy is that the root of the issue is husbands not
being worthy. Some go so far as to argue that God is speaking to husbands in a sexual desert
through their wives’ frigid vaginas, which act as a sort of modern day [non]burning bush. But
Flanagan destroys this tenet of modern Christian orthodoxy, explaining that the culprit is not
weak men screwing feminism up, but feminism itself!

The fix she proposes is as old as Scripture, and something that even secular scientists are
discovering. Wives don’t need to overthink it, they simply should render unto their husband
due benevolence:

Most important, though, is a recommendation based on exciting new “research”
revealing that for many people, waiting for the urge to strike is pointless; better to
bash ahead and hope for the best. Davis asks, “Have you ever noticed that although
you might not have been thinking sexual thoughts or feeling particularly sexy, if you
push yourself to ‘get started’ when your spouse approaches you, it feels good, and
you find yourself getting into it?” Many of her clients have received this counsel with
enthusiasm. “I really wasn’t in the mood for sex at all,” reports one of her advisees
after just such a night, “but once we got started, it was fun. I really enjoyed it.”

This has Flanagan rethinking the bad old days before second wave feminism:

All of this makes me reflect that those repressed and much pitied 1950s wives—their
sexless college years! their boorish husbands, who couldn’t locate the clitoris with a
A flashlight and a copy of *Gray’s Anatomy*!—were apparently getting a lot more action than many of today’s most liberated and sexually experienced married women. In the old days, of course, there was the wifely duty. A housewife understood that in addition to ironing her husband’s shirts and cooking the Sunday roast, she was—with some regularity—going to have relations with the man of the house. Perhaps, as some feminists would have us believe, these were grimly efficient interludes during which the poor humped-upon wife stared at the ceiling and silently composed the grocery list. Or perhaps not. Maybe, as Davis and her “new” findings suggest, once you get the canoe out in the water, everybody starts happily paddling.

But the real problem is not just a feminist unwillingness to relinquish control and do their wifely duty. The core problem is that feminism teaches women to have contempt for their husbands:

Women are left with two options: endlessly haranguing their husbands to be more womanly, or silently fuming and (however wittingly) launching a sex strike of an intensity and a duration that would have impressed Aristophanes.

Even worse, this ugly feminist mindset creates a scenario where the desired response from the husband will actually dissatisfy the wife:

The men who cave to the pressure to become more feminine—putting little notes in the lunch boxes, sweeping up after snack time, the whole bit—may delight their wives but they probably don’t improve their sex lives much, owing to the thorny old problem of *la différence*. I might be quietly thrilled if my husband decided to forgo his weekly tennis game so that he could alphabetize the spices and scrub the lazy Susan, but I would hardly consider it an erotic gesture.

This is all of course pure heresy for both feminists and the modern conservative Christian, since both desperately hope to leverage the wife’s frigidity to grant her power in the marriage. Flanagan makes this heresy even worse, by arguing that feminists are suffering from a profound misunderstanding of what is good:

What they don’t understand, and what women of an earlier era might have been able to tell them, is that when the little faucet turns off, it is time not to rat out your husband (is there anything more wounding to a man, and therefore more cruel and vicious, than a wife’s public admission that he is not satisfying her in bed?) but rather to turn it back on. It is not complicated; it requires putting the children to bed at a decent hour and adopting a good attitude. The rare and enviable woman is not the one liberated enough to tell hurtful secrets about her marriage to her girlfriends or the reading public. Nor is she the one capable of attracting the sexual attentions of a variety of worthy suitors. The rare woman—the good wife, and the happy one—is the woman who maintains her husband’s sexual interest and who returns it in full measure.
I’ve been reading The Allegory of Love by C.S. Lewis, about the medieval idea of “courtly love”. Lewis sums up the concept as (emphasis mine):

The sentiment, of course, is love, but love of a highly specialized sort, whose characteristics may be enumerated as Humility, Courtesy, Adultery, and the Religion of Love. The lover is always abject. Obedience to his lady’s lightest wish, however whimsical, and silent acquiescence in her rebukes, however unjust, are the only virtues he dares to claim.

This topic is important because it fundamentally transformed the way we view the world:

They effected a change which has left no corner of our ethics, our imagination, or our daily life untouched, and they erected impassable barriers between us and the classical past or the Oriental present. Compared with this revolution the Renaissance is a mere ripple on the surface of literature. There can be no mistake about the novelty of romantic love: our only difficulty is to imagine in all its bareness the mental world that existed before its coming...

This includes not only our idolization of romantic love, but also what we commonly call chivalry*:

Even our code of etiquette, with its rule that women always have precedence, is a legacy from courtly love

In this regard I learned I was incorrect in assuming that there had at one point been something noble to the idea of chivalry. Chivalry (as we know it*) has always been an expression of abject groveling. This is one of the reasons that adultery was a core component:

The love which is to be the source of all that is beautiful in life and manners must be the reward freely given by the lady, and only our superiors can reward. But a wife is not a superior. As the wife of another, above all as the wife of a great lord, she may be queen of beauty and of love, the distributor of favours, the inspiration of all knightly virtues, and the bridle of ‘villany’; but as your own wife, for whom you have bargained with her father, she sinks at once from lady into mere woman. How can a woman, whose duty is to obey you, be the midons whose grace is the goal of all striving and whose displeasure is the restraining influence upon all uncourtly vices?

Lewis describes the groveling and humiliation involved in the poetry of courtly love and it is truly astounding. Gladly bearing the deepest humiliation at the hands of the woman was seen as the greatest virtue.
The other reason courtly love had to be adulterous is because it was considered shameful for a man to have passion for his own wife:

...the impropriety (from the courtly point of view) of loving his own wife. Such a man is in propria uxoré adulter. His sin is heavier than that of the unmarried lover, for he has abused the sacrament of marriage.

Lastly, it is fair to say that medieval fans of courtly love are the original cuckservatives. Chivalry and a quasi religious view of romantic love are conservative ideals today because they are seen as harkening back to a more virtuous time, the time of courtly love. Yet chivalry and courtly love has always been a longing for fictional values of the past:

What is new usually wins its way by disguising itself as the old.

...What was theory for his own age had been practice for the knights of Britain. For it is interesting to notice that he places his ideal in the past. For him already ‘the age of chivalry is dead’.40 It always was: let no one think the worse of it on that account.

The concept of courtly love was a cuckold fetish from the start, and it has always been a longing for bygone days. The only difference between now and the medieval age of courtly love is that we now have a cross-dressing model of husband and wife, freeing cuckold fetishists to finally reverse the position of the husband and the interloper.

But some modern day chivalrous men still prefer the old school model, albeit modified for our age of technology:

*Edit: Oscar pointed out that there was an earlier form of chivalry prior to the concept of courtly love. This didn’t have the groveling to women and was a martial/Christian code. But the code we know today is really the courtly love version, the version that as Lewis explains includes putting women first.
Courtly love is always sexual, even when non physical.

by Dalrock | December 15, 2016 | Link

Red Pill Latecomer noted that courtly love is considered pure, in part because it doesn’t involve sex:

But as I learned it, the highest form of Courtly Love was chaste. No adultery involved. The Knight would have a pure love for his Lady, never to be consummated. Serving her without expectation of reward, other than maybe her handkerchief or nod of approval.

This is why a man could not love his wife. Because their relationship was polluted with sex.

The idea that romantic love is pure is certainly something we hold to be true without really even considering the source. This is why modern Christian leaders believe that sex in marriage requires romantic love to purify it. And we also just know that pursuing a woman romantically without expecting anything in return (beta orbiters) is the purest and noblest form of love a man can express. These ideas have profoundly warped our thinking away from the biblical view of sex and sexual passion, and it isn’t something we generally even know to question.

There is also the fully intended confusion around whether courtly love is sexual in nature and/or involves physical sexual contact. As Roissy would say, it’s complicated. Just like with the modern term hooking up, the degree of sex involved is deliberately vague. If the lady who is the object of courtly love wants to have sex with her lover, she is free to do so. We see this in the story of Lancelot and Guinevere (King Arthur’s wife) as told by Chrétien de Troyes. Not only is physical adultery present, but Lancelot is compelled to defend Guinevere’s honor after she is rightly accused of adultery:

They spend a passionate night together after Lancelot breaks into her tower. He injures his hand during his break-in, and leaves blood all over Guinevere’s sheets. Lancelot sneaks out of the tower before sunrise, and Meleagant accuses Guinevere of committing adultery with Kay, who is the only wounded knight nearby. Lancelot challenges Meleagant to a fight to defend Guinevere’s honor.

The rule in courtly love isn’t that the lady and her lover can’t have sex, it is that her lover can’t expect sex. It is fully at the discretion of the lady to decide if she wants this ambiguous relationship to include physical adultery, and it is the duty of her lover to keep her confidence in this regard.

Moreover, even when the physical act is never performed, the nature of the relationship is still sexual. It is always adultery, either physical or in the heart. Courtly love (romantic love) is not brotherly love, nor the kind of love you would have for your sister. It is in fact forbidden in the rules of courtly love for a brother to be his sister’s lover. CS Lewis explains, citing the rules provided by Andreas Capellanus:
What is the courtly law in the case of two lovers who find out that they are related within the degrees which would have forbidden their union by marriage? They must part at once. The table of kindred and affinity which applies to marriage applies also to loving par amours.77

It is also impossible for a blind man to feel this form of love for a woman, because it is rooted in her physical beauty. If you’ve never seen her, you can’t love her in this way:

The aim of love, for Andreas, is actual fruition, and its source is visible beauty: so much so, that the blind are declared incapable of love, or, at least, of entering upon love after they have become blind.68

Lastly, we can see another twisted (but cherished) idea that we commonly hold today that has its roots to courtly love:

Even a young unmarried woman should have a lover. It is true that her husband, when she marries, is bound to discover it, but if he is a wise man he will know that a woman who had not followed the ‘commands of love’ would necessarily have less probitas.74

None of these things should surprise us given what we know about the nature of men and women. Women are strongly tempted to elevate themselves to a god like position, and men are strongly tempted to go along with this and worship women. This didn’t start with courtly love, but instead goes all the way back to the fall. And the specific details should also be familiar to anyone with a basic understanding of female sexual nature. Women see their own sexual motives as pure, even purifying. At the same time, while seeking the formal status conferred with marriage, they have a very strong tendency to cloak their sexual choices and motives in ambiguity.
The other day Conan the Contrarian asked for a source for the idea that it is shameful for a man to have passion for his wife. I offered the example of St. Jerome in Against Jovinianus (Book I), written in AD 393:

> Hence Xystus in his Sentences tells us that “He who too ardently loves his own wife is an adulterer.” It is disgraceful to love another man’s wife at all, or one’s own too much. A wise man ought to love his wife with judgment, not with passion. Let a man govern his voluptuous impulses, and not rush headlong into intercourse. There is nothing blacker than to love a wife as if she were an adulteress.

As foreign as this concept may seem today, for significant periods in Christian history this has been a widely held view. Jerome held extreme anti marriage views, but the quote above is a sentiment you will see as well from the much more moderate St. Augustine, and even fits fairly well with this argument by Pope John Paul II*.

Having shared Jerome’s more tame arguments on marriage in Against Jovinianus, I thought I would share some of his more extreme arguments in the same piece. Time permitting I’ll do a follow up post with some of Augustine’s more moderate arguments.

I’ll start with Jerome’s striking interpretation of 1 Cor 7:1, explaining that Paul is saying sex in marriage is evil, albeit a lesser evil (all emphasis mine).

> “It is good,” he says, “for a man not to touch a woman.” If it is good not to touch a woman, it is bad to touch one: for there is no opposite to goodness but badness. But if it be bad and the evil is pardoned, the reason for the concession is to prevent worse evil. But surely a thing which is only allowed because there may be something worse has only a slight degree of goodness.

Jerome continues to 1 Cor 7:2, explaining that Paul was referring to Christians who were married before becoming Christians, and encouraging married Christians to not have sex unless they felt that they could not otherwise contain themselves:

But, because of fornications let each man have his own wife, and let each woman have her own husband. He did not say, because of fornication let each man marry a wife: otherwise by this excuse he would have thrown the reins to lust, and whenever a man’s wife died, he would have to marry another to prevent fornication, but have his own wife. Let him he says have and use his own wife, whom he had before he became a believer, and whom it would have been good not to touch, and, when once he became a follower of Christ, to know only as a sister, not as a wife unless fornication should make it excusable to touch her.

Next he explains that 1 Cor 7:3-5 is saying that while it would be better for a married Christian to abstain from sex, they are duty bound to do so if their spouse wishes, even
though married sex is bad because it is incontinence that hinders prayer:

But inasmuch as he who is once married has no power to abstain except by mutual consent, and may not reject an unoffending partner, let the husband render unto the wife her due. He bound himself voluntarily that he might be under compulsion to render it. Defraud ye not one the other, except it be by consent for a season, that you may give yourselves unto prayer. **What, I pray you, is the quality of that good thing which hinders prayer?** Which does not allow the body of Christ to be received? **So long as I do the husband’s part, I fail in continency.** The same Apostle in another place commands us to pray always. **If we are to pray always, it follows that we must never be in the bondage of wedlock, for as often as I render my wife her due, I cannot pray.**

Jerome moves on to interpreting 1 Pet 3:

When he says likewise, he challenges the husbands to imitate their wives, because he has already given them commandment: 1 Peter 3:2-3 beholding your chaste conversation coupled with fear. Whose adorning let it not be the outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing jewels of gold, or of putting on apparel: but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in the incorruptible apparel of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price. You see what kind of wedlock he enjoins. Husbands and wives are to dwell together according to knowledge, so that they may know what God wishes and desires, and give honour to the weak vessel, woman. **If we abstain from intercourse, we give honour to our wives: if we do not abstain, it is clear that insult is the opposite of honour.** He also tells the wives to let their husbands see their chaste behaviour, and the hidden man of the heart, in the incorruptible apparel of a meek and quiet spirit. Words truly worthy of an apostle, and of Christ’s rock! He lays down the law for husbands and wives, condemns outward ornament, while he praises continence, which is the ornament of the inner man, as seen in the incorruptible apparel of a meek and quiet spirit. In effect he says this: **Since your outer man is corrupt, and you have ceased to possess the blessing of incorruption characteristic of virgins, at least imitate the incorruption of the spirit by subsequent abstinence...**

To Jerome, it seems that any piece of Scripture can be read as a condemnation of marriage:

Proverbs 30:15-16 The horseleech had three daughters, dearly loved, but they satisfied her not, and a fourth is not satisfied when you say Enough; the grave, and woman’s love, and the earth that is not satisfied with water, and the fire that says not, Enough. The horse-leech is the devil, the daughters of the devil are dearly loved, and they cannot be satisfied with the blood of the slain: the grave, and woman’s love, and the earth dry and scorched with heat. It is not the harlot, or the adulteress who is spoken of; but **woman’s love in general is accused of ever being insatiable;** put it out, it bursts into flame; give it plenty, it is again in need; it enervates a man’s mind, and engrosses all thought except for the passion which it feeds. What we read in the parable which follows is to the same effect: For three things the earth does tremble, and for four which it cannot bear: for a servant when
he is king: and a fool when he is filled with meat: for an odious woman when she is married to a good husband: and an handmaid that is heir to her mistress. **See how a wife is classed with the greatest evils.** But if you reply that it is an odious wife, I will give you the same answer as before— the mere possibility of such danger is in itself no light matter. For he who marries a wife is uncertain whether he is marrying an odious woman or one worthy of his love. If she be odious, she is intolerable. If worthy of love, her love is compared to the grave, to the parched earth, and to fire.

*To my knowledge none of these arguments represent Catholic doctrine.*
As promised, here are some quotes from St. Augustine’s Of the Good of Marriage. New Advent explains that Augustine’s work is in response both to St. Jerome’s writing on the subject, as well as the original piece by Jovinianus that Jerome was responding to:

This treatise, and the following, were written against somewhat that still remained of the heresy of Jovinian. S. Aug. mentions this error in b. ii. c. 23, de Nuptiis et Conc. “Jovinianus,” he says, “who a few years since tried to found a new heresy, said that the Catholics favored the Manichæans, because in opposition to him they preferred holy Virginity to Marriage.” And in his book on Heresies, c. 82. “That heresy took its rise from one Jovinianus, a Monk, in our own time, when we were yet young.” And he adds that it was soon overborne and extinguished, say about A.D. 390, having been condemned first at Rome, then at Milan. There are letters of Pope Siricius on the subject to the Church of Milan, and the answer sent him by the Synod of Milan, at which St. Ambrose presided. Jerome had refuted Jovinian, but was said to have attempted the defense of the excellency of the virgin state, at the expense of condemning marriage. That Augustine might not be subject to any such complaint or calumny, before speaking of the superiority of Virginity, he thought it well to write on the Good of Marriage.

Augustine allows for two ways a person can have sex in marriage without sinning. The first is if the person is having sex not for pleasure, but to create a child (all emphasis mine):

For intercourse of marriage for the sake of begetting has not fault; but for the satisfying of lust, but yet with husband or wife, by reason of the faith of the bed, it has venial fault: but adultery or fornication has deadly fault, and, through this, continence from all intercourse is indeed better even than the intercourse of marriage itself, which takes place for the sake of begetting.

The other time Augustine explains one can have sex in marriage without sinning is if they are only having sex out of duty. Specifically, he is talking about a scenario where one spouse wants to have sex not specifically to have a child, but out of sexual desire. The spouse who wants sex in that scenario is sinning, but this is a minor sin. The spouse who only has duty sex however is not sinning. Given that Augustine says it is better to abstain even from procreative sex, unwanted sex for the sake of the marital debt is the only time a married person can not only not sin by having sex, but can also be doing what is best:

But because that Continence is of larger desert, but to pay the due of marriage is no crime, but to demand it beyond the necessity of begetting is a venial fault, but to commit fornication or adultery is a crime to be punished...

Augustine explains that an unmarried woman who has sex not for pleasure, but only to become pregnant with an illegitimate child, is more worthy than a married woman who has sex with her husband out of sexual desire:
But further, if from that intercourse, so far as pertains to herself, she has no wish but for sons, and suffers unwilling whatever she suffers beyond the cause of begetting; there are many matrons to whom she is to be preferred; who, although they are not adulteresses, yet force their husbands, for the most part also wishing to exercise continence, to pay the due of the flesh, not through desire of children, but through glow of lust making an intemperate use of their very right... 

Augustine extends this comparison to a husband who has sex with his wife while she is pregnant. A woman who fornicates but doesn’t like it is better than a man who has sex with his wife for pleasure:

For, although it be shameful to wish to use a husband for purposes of lust, yet it is honorable to be unwilling to have intercourse save with an husband, and not to give birth to children save from a husband. There are also men incontinent to that degree, that they spare not their wives even when pregnant.

He also argues that certain sexual sins are less sinful if combined with other sexual sins. Therefore it is less sinful to have “unnatural” sex with a harlot (combining unnatural sex with fornication) than with your wife:

12. For, whereas that natural use, when it pass beyond the compact of marriage, that is, beyond the necessity of begetting, is pardonable in the case of a wife, damnable in the case of an harlot; that which is against nature is execrable when done in the case of an harlot, but more execrable in the case of a wife. Of so great power is the ordinance of the Creator, and the order of Creation, that, in matters allowed us to use, even when the due measure is exceeded, it is far more tolerable, than, in what are not allowed, either a single, or rare excess. And, therefore, in a matter allowed, want of moderation, in a husband or wife, is to be borne with, in order that lust break not forth into a matter that is not allowed. Hence is it also that he sins far less, who is ever so unceasing in approaches to his wife, than he who approaches ever so seldom to commit fornication. But, when the man shall wish to use the member of the wife not allowed for this purpose, the wife is more shameful, if she suffer it to take place in her own case, than if in the case of another woman.

Note that there is also the message that the wife should be in control*.

Augustine’s permission even for natural sex is given grudgingly. He urges married couples to stop having sex at as young an age as possible:

But now in good, although aged, marriage, albeit there has withered away the glow of full age between male and female, yet there lives in full vigor the order of charity between husband and wife: because, the better they are, the earlier they have begun by mutual consent to contain from sexual intercourse with each other: not that it should be matter of necessity afterwards not to have power to do what they would, but that it should be matter of praise to have been unwilling at the first, to do what they had power to do.
At the center of the controversy for both Augustine and Jerome is Jovinian’s claim that:

virgins, widows, and married women, who have been once passed through the laver of Christ, if they are on a par in other respects, are of equal merit.

Having explained that marriage is not intrinsically sinful, Augustine gets on with the business of explaining that men and women today who marry are less holy than men and women who married in the times of the Old Testament:

19. Therefore as many women as there are now, unto whom it is said, if they contain not, let them be married, are not to be compared to the holy women then, even when they married. Marriage itself indeed in all nations is for the same cause of begetting sons, and of what character soever these may be afterward, yet was marriage for this purpose instituted, that they may be born in due and honest order. But men, who contain not, as it were ascend unto marriage by a step of honesty: but they, who without doubt would contain, if the purpose of that time had allowed this, in a certain measure descended unto marriage by a step of piety. And, on this account, although the marriages of both, so far as they are marriages, in that they are for the sake of begetting, are equally good, yet these men when married are not to be compared with those men as married. For these have, what is allowed them by the way of leave, on account of the honesty of marriage, although it pertain not to marriage; that is, the advance which goes beyond the necessity of begetting, which they had not. But neither can these, if haply there be now any found, who neither seek, nor desire, in marriage any thing, save that wherefore marriage was instituted, be made equal to those men. For in these the very desire of sons is carnal, but in those it was spiritual, in that it was suited to the sacrament of that time. Forsooth now no one who is made perfect in piety seeks to have sons, save after a spiritual sense; but then it was the work of piety itself to beget sons even after a carnal sense: in that the begetting of that people was fraught with tidings of things to come, and pertained unto the prophetic dispensation.

*The full scope of this problem is visible when you consider the potentially expansive meaning of “unnatural” given that according to Augustine the only truly sinless reason for marital sex is out of a desire to have children (otherwise at least one spouse is sinning). Under that constraint, anything which goes beyond P in V sex for the purpose of achieving ejaculation inside the vagina could rightly be considered unnatural. While RCC Doctrine (HT ACThinker) includes both procreation and unitive purposes as valid reasons for marital sex, there are some even today who make this very argument:

So, for example, a husband cannot deliberately stimulate the genital organs of his wife in order to give her sexual pleasure, for such an action is defined within the Catechism as a type of sexual act which is “intrinsically and gravely disordered.”
Like a rutting buck.

by Dalrock | December 21, 2016 | Link

Having shared the arguments of both St. Jerome and St. Augustine on sex in marriage (which again are not RCC doctrine*), I want to look at what the Bible says. As several readers have noted, Song of Solomon literally sings the praises of the pleasure of marital sex. But even aside from Song of Solomon, there is also Proverbs 5. As with 1 Cor 7, the proverb starts by warning against sexual immorality and then exhorts the believer to direct their sexual passion as rightfully designed, into marriage:

> 15Drink water from your own cistern, running water from your own well.
> 16 Should your springs overflow in the streets, your streams of water in the public squares?
> 17 Let them be yours alone, never to be shared with strangers.
> 18 May your fountain be blessed, and may you rejoice in the wife of your youth.
> 19 A loving doe, a graceful deer—may her breasts satisfy you always, may you ever be intoxicated with her love.
> 20 Why, my son, be intoxicated with another man’s wife? Why embrace the bosom of a wayward woman?

This isn’t cold sex only to conceive a child, or mere duty sex. It also isn’t a picture of sex “purified” by romantic love**. This is sex with great physical passion. The proverb exhorts husbands to rejoice in their wives’ bodies:

> may her breasts satisfy you always

Contrary to the argument that sexual passion is sinful if it isn’t carefully constrained, husbands are exhorted to be intoxicated with passion for their wives. The proverb offers the example to follow of a buck in the rut. For how else can we interpret this exhortation?

> A loving doe, a graceful deer

Certainly the proverb isn’t encouraging bestiality, but exhorting husbands to approach their wives with the same kind of passion a rutting buck has for a doe.

Aside from Song of Solomon and Proverbs 5, we also learn from Ecclesiastes 9:7-10 that marital sex, along with food and wine, are gifts from God, as they are our earthly reward:

> 7 Go, eat your bread with joy, and drink your wine with a merry heart, for God has already approved what you do.
> 8 Let your garments be always white. Let not oil be lacking on your head.
Enjoy life with the wife whom you love, all the days of your vain[b] life that he has given you under the sun, because that is your portion in life and in your toil at which you toil under the sun. 10 Whatever your hand finds to do, do it with your might,[c] for there is no work or thought or knowledge or wisdom in Sheol, to which you are going.

There is a carnal, matter of fact, feeling to this, since it is associated with enjoying food and drink. This passage is an echo of Ecc 8:15:

15 So I commend the enjoyment of life, because there is nothing better for a person under the sun than to eat and drink and be glad. Then joy will accompany them in their toil all the days of the life God has given them under the sun.

This comes from Ecclesiastes, the book that teaches that our earthly lives are vanity. Yet even while teaching that what matters is the spiritual, it still exhorts us to enjoy the physical pleasures of food, wine, and marital sex. These are it tells us, God’s portion for us for our earthly toil.

*As a Protestant it is not my intention with these posts to teach or comment on RCC doctrine. My point is merely that the teachings of St. Augustine and St. Jerome are not themselves RCC doctrine.

**Romantic love is of course a wonderful thing in the context of marriage, and marriage and sex are both more enjoyable with it. However, the idea that romantic love is purifying is not biblical, and comes from the medieval concept of courtly love, an idolization of adultery.
Merry Christmas
by Dalrock | December 24, 2016 | Link

I’ll be turning on moderation in a few hours. I’ll be back some time with a new post next week. Merry Christmas everyone!

12/29: Moderation is now off. I don’t know when I’ll have a new post up.
In an interview with Hanny, Julian Assange refutes the claim that Russia masterminded the leak of John Podesta’s emails. Even if Podesta hadn’t swallowed the phishing hook, his email password was “password”:

Podesta gave out that his password was the word ‘password’. His own staff said this email that you’ve received, this is totally legitimate. So, this is something ... a 14-year-old kid could have hacked Podesta that way.

Related: Hitler Learns Wikileaks Released Democrat Campaign Emails
Tony Katz is too stingy to pay respect.
by Dalrock | January 4, 2017 | Link


Katz rightly takes aim at the SJWs on college campuses teaching that masculinity is toxic:

College, it seems, thinks being a man is nothing more than a catch phrase for being an unrepentant rapist even if you’ve never had such a disgusting thought in your life, nor actually committed the violent act! In college, being a man means you’re unable to find love, incapable of dealing with your feelings, have (or one day will have!) contributed to the degradation of all women everywhere and, therefore, must be neutered in public and private.

But while criticizing SJWs for disrespecting manhood, Katz manages to disrespect respectable men. Katz claims that as a real man, he is a rarity in a sea of boys:

Ive been a man all my life. My father was a man. My grandfathers were both men. My great great great grandfather was a man, as was his father before him.

...an entire generation of men are refusing to act like men because an entire generation of social justice lying jerks have told men that acting like men is a crime against themselves and humanity.

... 

There are many males out there but there are very few men left in the world.

While we do seem to be witnessing changes on the margins, it simply isn’t true that the vast majority of men are irresponsible. Feminism depends on men continuing to be men, and so far at least this gamble has worked quite well. What is lacking is a sense of propriety by men towards other men. We have become profoundly miserly with respect for respectable men. This isn’t just a problem of a few showboating DJs or pastors posing as the only real man in the room; this problem is widespread, and far more serious than the cancer of SJWs at our universities.

Some day the claim that most men aren’t responsible might actually become true, and as despicable as they are, SJWs won’t be the primary culprits for the massive social change. The primary culprits will be the very men we so regularly see puffing themselves up as the specimen of glorious manhood amongst a sea of weakling boys. The irony here is huge, because men like Katz are posing as the brave defenders of manhood standing up to to the SJW bullies. But in reality they are taking the easy and cowardly way out by attacking the very men the SJW bullies so desperately want to eradicate. They are sending the message to young men that if they become respectable not only will the radicals on campus despise
them, but that other respectable men will likewise treat them with contempt. The message is clear; respect isn’t on offer, even (and especially) from the most vocal voices pleading for more respectable men.

If Katz *really* wants to stand up to the SJWs he should instead honor the average men all around him who are quietly doing their duties despite a legal system and culture that holds respectable men with contempt.

H/T Instapundit
Scott commented on my last post, noting that his blog focused on honoring respectable men runs against the prevailing culture:

So far, the response has been positive but with the caveat that speaks to what Damn Crackers is alluding to. What I do is make a post, then I share it on FB and tag the dad. Generally, I get comments from that dads friends (who are usually not my friends. My FB friend list is VERY small, on purpose) and the comments are characterized by “a well deserved tribute” followed by other statements related to how “hes not like all those deadbeats out there.”

It is basically inconceivable to the average person that I am honoring fatherhood-as fatherhood. (Even though it is expressly written in the about page).

It will take a miracle for this to change.

The irony is this reflexive tendency to denigrate men comes not from a sincere fear of a shortage of good men, but from a sense of extreme and everlasting abundance. It wouldn’t take a miracle to change this attitude, it would take an actual fear of a shortage of good men.

What is confusing is the words people are using all denote a fear of a shortage of good men. But if you look at the attitude that accompanies these missives, you will see that the overwhelming sentiment is one of abundance, of being in a position to nitpick, and select the very cream of the crop. Take for example the fathers who responded on Instapundit to Tony Katz’s claim that there is a severe shortage of real men. Commenter President Friedman concurred with Katz’s assessment, based on his own observation of the men in his teenage daughter’s cohort:

Out of the entire group her age, there are a few young men I’d be proud to call son-in-laws: Athletic, smart, industrious, curious about how things work, courteous, a little mischievous, but with a good moral compass. Maybe 5% of the boys in her age group fit this description.

...So I don’t find very many young men suitable for my daughter...

...which I supposed puts my sentiments about the current crop of young men in the exact same ballpark as every father-of-a-daughter who ever lived.

Commenter Scottie agreed with this sentiment, replying:

Yep, as a father myself, I share your sentiment. Just be sure to raise a daughter worthy of one of those top five percent, dad. I think that’s the key. I know any man
my daughter chooses has run a much harder gauntlet than any I would offer him.

The words are complaining about an acute shortage of suitable husbands for their daughters, but the sentiment is that only the very best of the top 5% can hope to win their daughters’ hands in marriage. Part of the reason we don’t notice this mismatch is we struggle to conceive of a situation where there really is a shortage of good men. In such a scenario, we would be focused on helping young women out compete their peers to be worthy of the very few good men available. We also wouldn’t be focused on the best of the top 5%, worrying if they would be able to win our daughter’s hearts. We would be encouraging our daughters to be realistic about their own MMV positions, and focusing on the true bare bones list of must have qualities in a future son in law. But we know we don’t have to do this, because good men are plentiful. They may represent a smaller percentage of young men today than in the past, but whatever shrinkage this might represent isn’t enough to cause us any true alarm.

We can see the same pattern in Dr. John Piper’s recent post Why Are Women More Eager Missionaries?* Piper explains that missionary work has become a pink ghetto:

...the actual situation among most evangelical faith missions is that between 80–85% of all single missionaries are women. It is a rare thing, like two out of every ten, for a single man to make missions his life’s vocation, which results in the overall statistics being that one-third of those in evangelical world missions are married men, one-third are married women, and 80 percent of the last third are single women. Which means that something just less than two-thirds of the total missionary force are women.

Piper’s main concern with the post however is not that there aren’t enough single men doing missionary work, but that women who choose this field aren’t marrying as they would like. Piper complains that the problem for husband hunting missionary women is really an exacerbated version of the same problem all Christian women have, and that is an overall lack of marriageable Christian men:

Among Christian men who do not get married, say, in their 20s and 30s, they are probably held back from that relationship of marriage by — here are my opinions — a sense of inadequacy that they could be a spiritual leader or a fear that they might be rejected as they pursue a relationship or a lack of purpose in life that would give support and meaning in a marriage relationship. Any of those hindrances to forming a long-term commitment of marriage would also explain why he may have a sense of inadequacy about missions or a fear about missions or a lack of purpose about missions.

In other words, the very things that keep a man single in his late 20s and 30s are probably the same kind of things that would keep him from pursuing a life in missions. On the other hand, single women may not feel any of those hindrances. They would happily marry a godly, mature, purposeful, mission-directed man if he came along. But they can’t make that happen without men doing their part.

But if Piper actually believed this, if he believed that there was a severe shortage of husband material men, he would focus his attention on helping the women reading navigate this
incredibly difficult situation. Overseas mission work may feel empowering for young women, but (according to Piper) single women going into the mission field are greatly handicapping their prospects in an already bleak field. His advice to young women would be to choose which was truly more important to them, being a missionary or finding a husband.

Piper even tells a story which would be a perfect way to teach this lesson. He describes a single woman named Gladys Aylward who went to a place where she found no marriageable men, and then blamed single men for not following her and proposing marriage:

“Miss Aylward talked to the Lord about her singleness. She was a no-nonsense woman in very direct and straightforward ways and she asked God to call a man from England, send him straight out to China, straight to where she was, and have him propose to me.” I can’t forget the next line. Elisabeth Elliot said, “With a look of even deeper intensity, she shook her little bony finger in my face and said, ‘Elisabeth, I believe God answers prayer. And he called him.’” And here there was a brief pause of intense whisper. She said, “‘He called him, and he never came.’”

Now, that experience, I would guess, is not unique to Gladys Aylward.

If Piper really believed that Christian husbands were scarce, he would be sharing this anecdote to warn young women of the foolishness of moving away from the pool of men they hope to choose a husband from and then expecting God to send the man of their choosing across the world to propose. If we were in a culture of scarcity of good men, this would be the obvious lesson from this story. But we live in an age with unshakable confidence that good men are not only available all around us, but will always be abundant. If Piper believed that the husband Miss Aylward was praying for was surrounded by real life English women eager to win him as a husband, this story wouldn’t be complaining about why he didn’t drop everything, fly to China, and propose to a woman he had never met. If Piper believed that the man was sought after as a husband in England, he would be pointing out the foolishness of Miss Aylward flying off to China and then wondering why a man she had never met didn’t show up to propose once she decided she wanted to marry.

We can see another, perhaps more subtle example of this sense of abundance in the recent Dennis Prager/Jim Geraghty video The Sexiest Man Alive**. The video is an expression of the theme of Geraghty’s book Heavy Lifting: Grow Up, Get a Job, Start a Family, and Other Manly Advice. The book’s description on Amazon reads:

What has happened to men in America? Once upon a time, men in their twenties looked forward to settling down and having children. Today, most young men seem infected by a widespread Peter Pan syndrome. Unwilling to give up the freedom to sleep late, play video games, dress like a slob, and play the field, today’s men wallow in an extended adolescence, ostensibly unaware that they’re setting themselves up for a depressing, lonely existence.

In this hilarious ode to male adulthood, Jim Geraghty and Cam Edwards—two happily married, 40-year-old men—have a simple message for their younger peers: Grow up!

Again, if you simply read the words, Geraghty is telling us that there is a terrible man
shortage. And yet, this isn’t the real message of the book. The message of the book, and of the Prager video, is that young men shouldn’t be discouraged by the fact that women their age aren’t interested in good men and instead are chasing after bad boys. The message is that if the good men reading/watching remain good long enough, eventually women will want to hop off the exciting bad boy carousel and marry boring nice guys like themselves. Keep being good men for long enough, and eventually women will tire of the bad boys and find your nice guy qualities irresistible, even sexy! This is both the premise and the promise of the book, which is why Good Reads titles the book:

| 
| Ward Cleaver Is a Stud 

Likewise, the description of the Prager video is:

What makes a man sexy? What makes a man...a man? Is there something about being the “bad boy”? Or is it more about predictability and reliability? Jim Geraghty of National Review explains.

The words say there is a terrible shortage of good men, but the message of the book is that good men shouldn’t be discouraged by the fact that women aren’t interested in them.

*HT Wood Chipper

**HT Trust
Commenter Moses asks:

I want to know “What is behind this?” What forces are shaping a world where women are absolved of all agency in attracting a “man” yet feel entitled to the very best of masculinity? Why do so many pastors preach self-serving “Only real man in the room” and belittle men? Who benefits? Who makes money off it? Power?

The forces may be unconscious and spread across millions, but they are there sure as the sea is not above the clouds.

I’ve touched on this in previous posts, but this is worth restating. What we are seeing is the same pattern as the fall in Genesis. We are replaying the same temptations and sins that Adam and Eve fell to. The Serpent knew the way to tempt Eve was to make her feel like God was holding out on her, that she was getting less than she deserved. Adam knew following Eve was a sin, but chose sin over challenging his wife. It was more important to make Eve happy than to follow God.

Belittling men feels good*, and is easy. Calling out women feels terrible, and is hard. Absent concerted effort not to fall into this rut, we will slide into it. We will do what feels good and is easy over what feels terrible and is hard. It really is that simple. See Pastor Doug Wilson’s recent post related to this (HT Hmm), as well as this and this.

*It feels like courage because you are calling out your own kind, a sort of vicarious self criticism. Yet at the same time it is really a way to elevate yourself above other men, as the only real man in the room. It is cowardice and arrogance that feels like courage and humility. And again it is easy. The men you are belittling will generally go along, because it makes Eve happy.
Was CNN’s Jake Tapper talking about a *different* President-elect Trump?

by Dalrock | January 12, 2017 | Link

On Tuesday of this week CNN published an article about what has since come to be known as peegate*. The most damning allegation repeated in the CNN article is that Trump’s campaign was colluding with Russian intelligence:

The two-page synopsis also included allegations that there was a continuing exchange of information during the campaign between Trump surrogates and intermediaries for the Russian government, according to two national security officials.

CNN took an absurd line here, claiming that the allegations were credible enough to be newsworthy, while at the same time declining to release the details of the allegations because they had not been vetted by CNN. This angle gave CNN a shield to hide behind while dishing dirt, and at the same time made it exceptionally difficult to disprove the allegations. From an early archive of the CNN article (emphasis mine):

CNN has reviewed a 35-page compilation of the memos, from which the two-page synopsis was drawn. The memos originated as opposition research, first commissioned by anti-Trump Republicans, and later by Democrats. **At this point, CNN is not reporting on details of the memos, as it has not independently corroborated the specific allegations.** But, in preparing this story, CNN has spoken to multiple high ranking intelligence, administration, congressional and law enforcement officials, as well as foreign officials and others in the private sector with direct knowledge of the memos.

Some of the memos were circulating as far back as last summer. What has changed since then is that **US intelligence agencies have now checked out the former British intelligence operative and his vast network throughout Europe and find him and his sources to be credible** enough to include some of the information in the presentations to the President and President-elect a few days ago.

Unfortunately for CNN, Buzzfeed responded to CNN’s report by publishing the 35 page memo. This gave Trump’s team something other than vague whispers to respond to, and very quickly his team was able to prove that the memo’s alleged meeting between Trump’s lawyer Michael Cohen and Kremlin officials could not have taken place. The meeting was alleged to have occurred in Prague in August of 2016. From page 18 of the memo:
Cohen was able to prove that he couldn’t possibly have been in Prague when this meeting is alleged to have occurred. This is crucial, because again the most damning allegation CNN was repeating in their original article was that Trump’s team colluded with the Kremlin during the campaign.

But this is where the story gets more bizarre, and even more embarrassing for CNN. Jake Tapper, one of the original authors of the CNN story, responded to this claim being debunked by explaining that it was another Michael Cohen who was in Prague at that time. Brietbart quotes Tapper:

“It was a Michael Cohen with a passport from another country, same birth year [as Trump’s counsel], different birth date. So for Michael Cohen to dispute that he was in the Czech Republic completely confirms with our reporting.”

This cringe-worthy attempt to spin the story falling apart is even worse than Tapper’s original article. That another man named Michael Cohen was in Prague when Trump’s Cohen is accused of colluding with the Kremlin is totally irrelevant. The man being accused wasn’t there, so the accusation has been disproved. How in the world can the accusation being disproved confirm his reporting? Tapper reported that the two page summary (derived from the 35 page memo) claimed that Trump’s team was colluding with the Kremlin. Once the specifics of this alleged meeting were debunked, Tapper pretends this was not about Trump’s Cohen, but some other man by the same name, apparently with no relation to President-elect Trump.

*H/T Instapundit*
Submit to her will, or she’ll use the family courts to take your children away.

by Dalrock | January 13, 2017 | Link

If a wife were saying this to her husband, the story wouldn’t be newsworthy. This would be the family courts functioning as designed. But in this case, it was a social worker allegedly saying it to a single mother, and is therefore a miscarriage of family court justice. From the Orange County Register, County loses $4.9 million lawsuit challenge over lying social workers:

According to court papers, Vreeken threatened that if Fogarty-Hardwick did not “submit” to her will, she would never see her children again. The social workers also tried in 2000 to coerce Fogarty-Hardwick to sign a document saying she was a bad parent by threatening to take her daughters away, Fogarty-Hardwick alleged.

H/T Instapundit
An educated guess.
by Dalrock | January 14, 2017 | Link

Commenter Anonymous Reader ponders the response of prominent Complementarians to the case of social workers lying in court to take a woman’s children away:

I wonder what the usual tradcon suspects like Wilson, Piper, Grudrem, Keller, etc. would have to say about this?

I of course can’t speak for these men, but I can make an educated guess:

**Wilson:** “The county is in the right. Women social workers can’t be expected to understand that lying in court to destroy a family is wrong, unless they also happen to be a lawyer. Although, in a perfect world, perhaps in 1,000 years they could be punished for this.”

**Piper:** “So then the single mother karate kicks the evil social worker, saving the day! Keeyaa!”

**Grudem:** (A year of silence while he finds yet another 1,000 examples of case law showing that perjury is in fact against the law).

**Keller:** “The single mother should have gone into an uncontrollable rage and started breaking things around the courtroom.”

**Edit:** Cane Caldo suggested links to the posts explaining the educated part of the guess. For Wilson, see here and here. For Piper, see here. For Grudem, see here. For Keller, see here and here.
Bad boys, single moms, and the love of a strong independent woman.
by Dalrock | January 16, 2017 | Link

WWE (pro wrestling) Studios has entered the Christian movie business with *The Resurrection Of Gavin Stone*. Based on the preview packed with Christian manosphere cliches, it appears that WWE Studios has thoroughly researched their target audience. As Scott Heisel at UPROXX explains in *Shawn Michaels Loves Single Moms In New ‘The Resurrection Of Gavin Stone’ Trailer*:

...Shawn Michaels plays Doug, a former biker who has found Jesus and is now a mechanic with a good samaritan program called Cars For Single Moms. (If this was Attitude Era Shawn Michaels, “Cars For Single Moms” would have a whole different meaning.) He is opposite Brett Dalton playing the film’s title character, who pretends to be a devout Christian in order to woo the pastor’s daughter.

They even got the leading lady’s age right in casting. The pastor’s strong independent (and severe) daughter is played by 34 year old Anjelah Johnson-Reyes. However, perhaps because it was created by outsiders to Christian culture, there doesn’t appear to be the ritual tearing down of married Christian fathers.
Surely they will be reasonable once they see how reasonable *we* are.
by Dalrock | January 17, 2017 | Link

Back in 2009 Dr. Wayne Grudem wrote a piece titled Personal Reflections on the History of CBMW and the State of the Gender Debate*. Grudem first became involved with the topic in 1979 after reading an article in Christianity Today by Berkeley and Alvera Mickelsen:

[The] article was titled, “Does male dominance tarnish our translations?” They argued that the Greek word kephalē (literally, “head”) often means “source” but never “authority,” so that “the husband is the head of the wife” (Eph 5:23; cf. also 1 Cor 11:3) means “the husband is the source of the wife” and does not have authority over his wife. I thought the argument was wrong, but I didn’t have the time or material at hand to answer it.

Originally Grudem hoped to enlist another scholar to refute this article, but instead he was encouraged to do so himself.

Six years later, in 1985, I published a twenty one-page article in Trinity Journal, “Does kephalē Mean ‘Source’ or ‘Authority Over’? An Examination of 2,336 Examples”—examples which took me some time to look up in ancient Greek literature!

However, even though egalitarians couldn’t point to any examples of the word meaning “source”, and despite Grudem showing that it was regularly used to mean authority, egalitarians continued to question the issue. In response, Grudem wrote an even more thorough refutation of this claim:

There were several responses from egalitarians to that twenty-one-page article. So, five years later, in 1990, I published a seventy-page article in Trinity Journal, responding to other studies on the meaning of kephalē and showing that there were now over fifty examples where it meant “someone in authority,” or “a leader,” but never an instance where someone is said to be the “head” of someone else and was not in the position of authority over that person. Never.

This of course still didn’t satisfy the egalitarians, because this was never really about a serious disagreement on what the Bible said. This was about feminist rebellion against Scripture, with a minimal effort made to pretend this was a real theological discussion. Unfortunately Grudem still hadn’t figured this out, so he went back and did even more research on the topic and published a third scholarly article:

But there were still more responses, and more people disagreeing. So eleven years after that, in 2001, I published another article, forty-one pages in the Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, on “The Meaning of kephalē (“Head”): An Evaluation of New Evidence, Real and Alleged.”

www.TheRedArchive.com
So that’s 132 pages of lexicographical research published in academic journals on one word in the Bible. And these articles spanned sixteen years of my life.

Note that the egalitarians only had to make an unsubstantiated claim, and continue to make the claim despite irrefutable proof to the contrary. By doing so, they managed to tie a scholar like Grudem up for fifteen years. Even after all of this, the organization Grudem founded (CBMW) presents this totally baseless argument as if it has merit.

Grudem makes a strange defense of his choice to keep researching the issue for an additional decade despite having settled the question in his original paper:

> Why did I do this? Because it was a crucial word in a crucial verse in a crucial issue. Destroying the meaning “authority over” for kephalē is crucial to the egalitarian argument. If in fact the Bible says in Eph 5:23 that “the husband is the head of the wife even as Christ is the head of the church,” and if head means, as I am convinced it does, “person in position of authority,” then the egalitarian cause is lost. That is because that verse anchors the husband’s headship in the headship of Christ over the church, which is not something culturally variable (and 1 Cor 11:3 makes it parallel to the eternal headship of the Father with respect to the Son in the Trinity). So the egalitarians cannot lose this argument, because if they lose on the meaning of that word, then they have lost their fundamental argument with regard to manhood and womanhood in marriage.

Grudem is clearly an outstanding biblical scholar, which makes this argument all the more striking. Ephesians 5 isn’t the only part of Scripture covering headship and submission. 1 Pet 3 is if anything even stronger at refuting the egalitarian claim, as it says that wives should submit to their husbands even if their husband fails to obey the word. 1 Pet 3 explains that wives are to do this because it is beautiful to God. Since God is the same yesterday, today, and forever, the rooted in the times argument is out from the beginning. Moreover, 1 Pet 3 says wives should submit to their husbands as the holy women did in the past, again, showing that this is not practical advice related to the times as egalitarians so often claim.

The meaning of head in Ephesians 5 is critical not for egalitarians, nor even for traditionalists. Even if head meant “source” in Ephesians 5, the passage still tells wives to submit to their husbands, and it is merely one of many which does so. Egalitarians are lost even if they win this argument, and traditionalists are largely unfazed even if they somehow lost it. On the other hand, the meaning of the word head is critical for complementarians, because complementarians twist themselves into knots to avoid telling wives to submit to their husbands out of a fear of seeming harsh, demeaning, and male supremacist. The only way complementarians can sound traditional while avoiding preaching submission is to focus all of their energies on the responsibility of the husband to act in such a way that his wife naturally wants to submit. This is not the biblical model of marriage, it is the complementarian model of marriage. The closest to a biblical justification for this invention is the word head in Eph 5. This is true despite the fact that even the word headship is discomforting to complementarians, who have coined the term servant leader and focus on cartoonish chivalry.

Even so, Grudem has done a great service by vigorously refuting the spurious claim about
Why did I do this? So that commentaries, Greek lexicons, and Bible translations in future generations will accurately teach and translate a crucial verse in the word of God. If *head* equals “authority over” as has been shown now in over sixty examples, then the ballgame is over. And even today, twenty-four years after my first article, there are still zero examples where a person is called “head” of someone else and is not in authority over that person. Zero.

But as Grudem notes, despite the original claim being made without evidence, and having been thoroughly debunked, the Bible is not (and never was) the issue:

That kind of evidence would normally settle the debate forever in ordinary exegesis of ordinary verses.

But this is not an ordinary verse. Because the evangelical feminists cannot lose this verse, they continue to ignore or deny the evidence. I think that is very significant.

It now seems to me that, for some people in this dispute who have thought through the issue and are committed to the egalitarian cause and have the academic knowledge to evaluate the evidence for themselves, what the Bible says on this question is not decisive. And, sadly, InterVarsity Press (USA), in spite of being given evidence of multiple factual errors in Catherine Kroeger’s article on “*head*” in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, still continues to refuse to make any changes to the article.

Grudem goes on to recount his recollection of the founding of the CBMW. I won’t summarize it here, but you can read it in the linked piece. After the CBMW was founded, Grudem had his second major learning experience with egalitarians. Christians for Biblical Equality (CBE) asked for CBMW leadership to meet with them in an effort to find common ground. At CBE’s urging the CBMW created what they expected would be a joint statement on abuse. The CBMW leadership did not seem to understand that feminists are very open that their focus on abuse is about *eradicating headship, not on actual abuse*. Even worse, the CBE was merely trying to take the CBMW off message, and had no interest in a mutual statement:

As we talked, there seemed to be agreement that one thing we could do together would be for both organizations to agree publicly that abuse within marriage is wrong. So we agreed to work on a joint statement on abuse. After the meeting, Mary Kassian drafted such a statement, and we got some feedback from the CBE people, and we were going to issue it. But, then on October 10, 1994, we received a letter from them saying that their board had considered it, and they would not join with us in the joint statement opposing abuse. I was shocked and disappointed when the letter came. I wondered then if their highest goal in this issue was to be faithful to Scripture above all and stop the horrors of abuse, or was to promote the egalitarian agenda. We ended up publishing the statement ourselves in *CBMW NEWS* (later renamed *The Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*).

Even after this, Grudem seems to have still expected good faith from egalitarians. In yet
another incident, Grudem and the CBMW were assured that the gender neutral version of the NIV had been scrapped:

But just before the meeting began, the IBS issued a statement saying they had “abandoned all plans” for changes in gender-related language in future editions of the NIV. So we thought the controversy was done and the NIV would remain faithful in its translation of gender-related language in the Bible.

Little did we know, however, that the Committee on Bible Translation for the NIV had not “abandoned all plans”! Far from it! Unknown to anyone outside their circles, for the next four years the Committee on Bible Translation, apparently with the quiet cooperation of people at Zondervan and the International Bible Society, continued working to produce a gender-neutral NIV. They had publicly “abandoned all plans,” but privately they were going full-steam ahead. Then suddenly in 2001, they announced unilaterally they were abandoning the agreement not to publish gender related changes in the NIV, and they published the TNIV New Testament in 2001 and the whole Bible in 2005.

In his conclusion Grudem says he originally thought the whole feminist rebellion would blow over once he and others carefully explained the correct meaning of Scripture:

I am surprised that this controversy has gone on so long. In the late 80s and early 90s when we began this, I expected that this would probably be over in ten years. By force of argument, by use of facts, by careful exegesis, by the power of the clear word of God, by the truth, I expected the entire church would be persuaded, the battle for the purity of the church would be won, and egalitarian advocates would be marginalized and have no significant influence. But it has not completely happened yet!

Unspoken in this (and complementarianism at large) is an attitude that Christian feminists are not rebelling against God in a pattern that dates back to the fall, but are the natural reaction to a suddenly harsh generation of Christian men. This is why Grudem and his colleagues repeatedly fell for the feminist ruses, and why to this day they are most concerned with showing how reasonable they are. Grudem has adopted the feminist sin of a wife “being a doormat”, and teaches that it is a Christian sin! This feminist teaching, along with the statement on abuse the CBE tricked them into, is part of the founding charter of the CBMW.

However, Grudem is slowly starting to realize that at least some egalitarians aren’t arguing in good faith:

After that, in 2006, my book Evangelical Feminism: A New Path to Liberalism? solidified a new viewpoint for me—the conviction that many evangelical feminists are not going to change their minds or be convinced because, it seems to me, they have repeatedly adopted principles or chosen exegetical decisions that undermine or deny the authority of Scripture. Once that abandoning of scriptural authority comes about, then a movement will not be persuaded by Scripture, and in that case, when the culture is going the other way, they will not ever be persuaded on this
issue. That conclusion has affected a lot of what I think about where this controversy is going.

But despite this, it is men who are too strong in their support of biblical headship and submission that Grudem warns complementarians need to forever be on guard against:

(2) Beware the opposite error of male supremacy and dominance. Whenever you fight against one error, those who hold the opposite error will cheer you on and seek to become your allies—but beware. Some will become harsh and demeaning and argumentative, and they will not truly honor women as equals in the sight of God.

*The original article is no longer on the CBMW site, so I have linked to an archived version. You can also find the article in the Spring 2009 Quarterly Journal.
Bob and Jane have some sort of prelude romance and move in together. Either because Bob is just that cool, Jane that desperate, or whatever, Bob hasn’t actually had to put forth that much effort into the relationship.

Time passes. Jane gets nervous and starts pushing for “commitment.”

He is making a larger point, but he has inadvertently framed Jane’s promiscuity in the way Jane would do.

In reality, Jane has had no commitment sex with a string of men, demanding varying degrees of displays of investment by the men along the way. With Bob, Jane decides that she wants him to signal greater investment in their sexual relationship by moving in together. Bob agrees because he is either happy to do so because he expects more sex due to proximity, because he is hoping Jane will be the woman who finally commits to him, or because he feels pressured by threatened loss of sex.

The important part is that Jane has secured the status of public investment while keeping her options entirely open. If Jane decides that she can do better, she will toss him aside as she has done with so many other men, and find a new man to have sex with. Eventually Jane finds that one of these men is the one she wants to marry, so she pressures him to propose. He could be man #3 in her quest, or man #53. If she chooses man #53 and he doesn’t propose, Jane loudly complains that all men are afraid of commitment. And Jane should know, given her wide experience with men.

Jane then says to any conservative who will listen (which is pretty much every conservative): Look at cruel Bob. He moved in together with me for free sex, but now I’m afraid he
isn’t going to commit. He was just using me!

And the conservative is outraged. Here Jane is following the sacred path to marriage, tirelessly sampling penises (poor Jane sampled 53 just to be thorough) until she finds the one whose owner owes her a marriage vow, and now that she found the one she wants to propose he is ruining the whole thing!

Take a number picture by Eric B (archive).
TGC on the importance of a complementarian feminist merit badge.

by Dalrock | January 25, 2017 | Link

The Gospel Coalition’s front page banner article today (archive) is 5 Reasons I’m Glad I Went to Seminary, by stay at home mom Elizabeth Garn. In closing, Garn explains that seminary wasn’t really required for any of the five reasons she offers:

Is seminary absolutely necessary to get that foundation (or any of the other things I’ve mentioned)? No, not necessarily. Could a person learn all I learned without a seminary education? Probably. But it’s harder to do it on your own. There’s something to be said about surrounding yourself with trustworthy, godly professors who will guide you to a deeper faith in God and knowledge of his Word.

Well, there it is. That’s what I’d tell a friend if they asked whether I’m glad I went to seminary. I’d refill her coffee, double check the time to ensure we weren’t late for preschool pickup or whatever errands we were supposed to be doing, and if we still had an extra minute we’d discuss the ways seminary might be possible for her if she were interested.

But if it isn’t really necessary for a Christian housewife to go to seminary, why is an article promoting this so important that The Gospel Coalition chose to make it the lead on their front page? The reason is complementarians are excited about empowering women by sending as many as possible through seminary, and having the women who can’t directly attend seminary seek out other women who attended seminary for theological instruction. Otherwise Christian housewives would suffer the fate of asking their husbands, as Scripture instructs wives to do (1 Cor 14:35, Eph 5:25-28).
Former CBMW president Owen Strachan has an article up at The Gospel Coalition that has been trending for the last few days: Gospel Hope in Hookup Culture. Strachan offers four solutions to the problem of hookup culture, while managing to omit the obvious biblical solution to the problem of rampant sexual immorality; if you burn with passion, marry.

Instead of directly exhorting young people to marry, Strachan offers mostly feminist talking points coated with a thin veneer of what he calls the “Biblical sexual ethic.” The first talking point is:

1. Promote an ethic that focuses on the whole person, not ‘hotness.’

Talking point number two is less overtly feminist, but appeals to the anti biblical idea that romance purifies sex:

2. Promote God-honoring romance, not sexual utilitarianism.

Point number three is back to standard feminist boiler plate, and even uses the feminist term rape culture:

3. Train men to care for women, not prey on them.

...Wade reports, students today are suffering from “rape culture,” sexual assault, the loss of intimacy, the lack of committed relationships

What is so striking here is that women are deliberately rejecting the protections that a biblical model provides for women in the form of fathers and husbands. They are doing so because submitting to a father or husband is unbearable to the feminist mind. Instead of the protective roles of husbands and fathers, feminists have called for all men to make sure all women have unlimited freedom to (among other things) have sex with random strangers. Anything short of this is defined by feminists as “rape culture”, and Strachan is unwittingly adopting and promoting this frame of mind.

Point number four is yet another feminist plea:

4. Help students see they are not defined by their sexuality.

Hookup culture is equally corrosive for women. According to Wade, “Sexy costume themes” at campus parties “reward women for revealing and provocative clothes, stratify them and put them into competition, all while reminding them that it’s their job to make parties sexy” (195).

Not long ago, you would only see this kind of mindframe in women’s studies courses. Today it saturates complementarian Christian thinking.
In a separate related piece Strachan wrote at Midwestern Seminary’s* Center for Public Theology, he asserts that women are being forced into fornication:

The new sexualized marketplace is much like the old one—structured around strict male and female differentiation, with men leading women. But the old culture, one shaped by a Judeo-Christian ethic, called men to self-denying monogamy and self-sacrificial leadership. The old culture disciplined men and protected women. The new culture does neither. It frees men to prey on women and leaves women in a horrifyingly vulnerable place.

The denial here is breathtaking, as women have been very open for decades about seeing marriage as a trap that keeps them from freely exercising their sexuality. There is no secret here; this is an open rebellion. Strachan has to understand this, at least at some level, which is why he and so many others take such great pains to avoid telling young people that the biblical solution is to marry and stay married.

Interestingly, while complementarian leadership has fully internalized large portions of feminist thought, the comments to the article show that the contradiction between slightly re-branded feminist boilerplate and reality is starting to bleed through. Commenter Jason2010 opened his response to the article with:

“Train men to care for women, not to prey on them”.

This statement indicates that the author may not fully understand the realities of the phenomenon he responding to...

Elizabeth M agreed, opening her comment with:

I don’t know whether the author unintentionally meant to say that women are less capable of keeping the moral law or even perhaps that they are better at keeping sexual purity depending on how you read the article...but I do think he is just grossly unaware of the conversations and mindset that young women have today...

As did flgirl850, who replied to Jason2010’s comment with:

I agree 100%.

Note that these are the only three comments left on this trending article since it was published several days ago, and two of them are from women.

*Midwestern Seminary is the same group that brought us The Problem With Our Complementarianism, which compared male leadership of the church with “a room of chimps all chimping…”

See Also:

- Sunday Morning Cartoons
- Is “The Force Awakens” too feminist?
Embracing no fault divorce is the natural result of elevating romantic love to a moral force.

by Dalrock | January 30, 2017 | Link

Some time back my wife and I watched the old TV series Alfred Hitchcock Presents (1955-1962). It is interesting to watch old shows like that because they give you a sense of the Hollywood propaganda of the age. One line was frequently repeated, with slight variations:

| He won’t give her a divorce, even though he knows she doesn’t love him any more.

This line was presented as scathing proof that the man being accused was a horrible monster. Not only was he forcing a woman to remain married to a man she no longer loved, but he was also preventing her from marrying her (latest) true love. Hollywood’s concerted effort to destroy the moral authority of marriage was clearly successful; no fault divorce was enacted in California just eight years after the series ended, and the rest of the union followed suit.

The simple fact is the moment you attribute moral value to romantic love you are creating a rival to biblical sexual morality. In biblical sexual morality it is marriage that creates a moral space for sex and romantic love (with romantic love not separated from sexual passion). We have overturned God’s order here, and are now claiming that romantic love is the moral space for marriage and sex. This is deceptively subtle, and at the same time demolishes the moral meaning of marriage.

The idea that romantic love confers morality to sex is an idea that goes back to the concept of courtly love beginning around 1100 AD. Courtly love was in part a reaction to the widespread belief among Christians in the Dark Age that it was unseemly, and in fact sinful, for a husband and wife to have sexual passion for one another. As St. Jerome argued in Against Jovianus Book I:

| Hence Xystus in his Sentences tells us that “He who too ardently loves his own wife is an adulterer.” It is disgraceful to love another man’s wife at all, or one’s own too much. A wise man ought to love his wife with judgment, not with passion. Let a man govern his voluptuous impulses, and not rush headlong into intercourse. There is nothing blacker than to love a wife as if she were an adulteress.

Passionless duty sex was for marriage, and passion was for adultery. Courtly love built upon this idea with a twist. It added a new concept of romantic love, separating out the emotional aspect of sexual passion. This newly separated concept of romantic love was worshiped and seen as sanctifying. CS Lewis summed up the concept of courtly love as (emphasis mine):

| The sentiment, of course, is love, but love of a highly specialized sort, whose characteristics may be enumerated as Humility, Courtesy, Adultery, and the Religion of Love.
In the 1500s and 1600s the Puritan movement argued that passionate sex in marriage was not immoral, and fought against the idea of sanctified adultery in the form of courtly love. However, some Puritans kept the seemingly innocent vestigial idea of romantic love as sanctifying sex. In this new twist romantic love was seen as sanctifying sex within marriage instead of outside of it. The famous Puritan poet John Milton wrote in *Tetrachordon*:

> And although copulation be considered among the ends of marriage, yet the act thereof in a right esteem can no longer be matrimonial, than it is an effect of conjugal love. **When love finds itself utterly unmatched, and justly vanishes, nay rather cannot but vanish, the fleshly act indeed may continue, but not holy, not pure, not beseeming the sacred bond of marriage**; being at best but an animal excretion...

This is as you will recall the same concept we constantly hear from modern complementarian preachers. They teach that marital sex requires romantic love to consecrate it, otherwise it is merely rubbing body parts together. This is not a biblical idea, and is in fact an anti-biblical idea. Proverbs 5 tells husbands they should be like a rutting buck with their wives. Moreover, the Apostle Paul tells us in 1 Cor 7 that marriage is for life, and that not having sex in marriage is a sin.

This idea is wholly at odds with what the Bible teaches us about sexual morality, and yet it has insidiously wormed its way into our modern thought process. Once you invert the relationship between marriage and romantic love, what the Bible teaches is moral becomes sin, and what the Bible teaches is sin becomes virtue. If romantic love sanctifies marriage and sex, it would be immoral to remain married should the sanctifying romantic love wane. The writers of Alfred Hitchcock Presents understood this in the late 1950s, as did Milton in 1645. The *Tetrachordon*, the piece from Milton that I quoted above, is a tract he wrote advocating no fault divorce:

Milton's divorce tracts refer to the four interlinked polemical pamphlets—The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce, The Judgment of Martin Bucer, Tetrachordon, and Colasterion—written by John Milton from 1643–1645. They argue for the legitimacy of divorce on grounds of spousal incompatibility. Arguing for divorce at all, let alone a version of no-fault divorce, was extremely controversial and religious figures sought to ban his tracts. Although the tracts were met with nothing but hostility and he later rued publishing them in English at all, they are important for analysing the relationship between Adam and Eve in his epic Paradise Lost. Spanning three years characterised by turbulent changes in the English printing business, they also provide an important context for the publication of Areopagitica, Milton's most famous work of prose.[1]
Scaring away the competition
by Dalrock | February 1, 2017 | Link

Scott at American Dad has an excellent new post: Cartoonish Chivalry hurts daughters Scott is responding to the popular meme on social media of fathers trying to scare young men away from their daughters:

First, you can't be serious. Set aside all the stuff you tell yourself and probably your wife about “traditional values and gender roles” or whatever. You cannot, in today's world seriously plan on carrying out any of these threats. You are puffing out your chest to “scare” off the “bad” boys, who know you are full of crap. It feels good, because all the women around you pat you on the head and nod approvingly. You have earned your cookie.

Scott contrasts this “traditional” bluster with his own view as a father who will one day be looking for a husband for his daughter.

When the time comes for her to start looking for a husband, she already knows we are interested in helping her find one and this makes her very happy. And when a young man comes around, he will not be met with a silly cartoon shotgun dad, but a father who wants to help them both succeed at what they are trying to do. We are not setting up an automatic adversarial relationship with him before we meet. I am aware that many young men will be at a very tenuous starting point in their career, development and so forth and I will approach the situation with that kind of sobriety.

The different approaches to suitors reflects the corresponding differences in roles and objectives. Scott will be looking to find a husband for his daughter, while large numbers of “traditional” men are instead hoping to delay their daughter’s marriage by acting as their daughter’s surrogate husband. A man who gives his daughter a mock wedding ring, stages mock wedding photos with her, etc. isn’t going to welcome an interloper trying to steal away his daughter-wife.

But the perversion at times goes even further. While the (hopefully unconsummated) incestuous romantic relationship has bizarrely become “traditional” under the guise of purity, very often these same fathers move from mere surrogate husband to surrogate cuckold. Many brag about their daughter’s conquests on her carousel ride, with statements like “She’s a real heartbreaker!”, and “She’s looking for a man who can keep up with her!”

With this in mind the cartoonishness of the father-cuck comes into sharper view. For all of his bluster warning the men rogering his daughter-wife to treat her as a queen, everyone knows this is just the cherry on top of the whole farce.

See also my follow up post: Romance is sexual.
Boxer astutely notes (emphasis mine):

Some of you guys are assuming something salacious in these inappropriate father-daughter relationships, but it’s not necessary for the father and daughter to have physical sex. The problem is actually fairly well understood (Freud and Jung both wrote article after article about this stuff).

A man who is closed off from psychological feelings of intimacy by his wife will often transfer some of his libidinal energies to his daughter. In doing so he gets to transcend a feeling of shame or failure in his loveless marriage. The daughter, too, gets something out of it. She gets to regress into a more infantile state, letting daddy take care of her emotional needs, rather than learning to take care of herself and pass into adulthood.

If you’re wondering why you meet grown women who haven’t progressed beyond the emotional age of 13, well, this might be a reason in some of those instances...

Again, it’s not necessary for the father and daughter to have physical sex or anything approaching that. In a strange way, that’s why this unhealthy process is so insidious. It masks itself as a normal relationship, with nothing outwardly untoward; but, at the deep structure, it’s unhealthy for all parties.

The reason this isn’t more widely recognized as twisted is the widespread belief that sexual passion can be neatly divided into two forms:

1. Sexual emotion (romance): This is considered pure, non sexual, and if not outright holy then nearly so.
2. Physical sexuality: This is considered dirty unless sanctified (purified) by romance.

But romance isn’t non sexual. It is always sexual. This was understood when the concept of romantic love was originally distilled out of sexual passion, but that was nearly a thousand years ago. The idea has morphed over time, and more importantly we aren’t even aware that we have adopted a view of sexuality that stems from a glorification of adultery in popular fiction in the 11th century. As CS Lewis explains:

They effected a change which has left no corner of our ethics, our imagination, or our daily life untouched, and they erected impassable barriers between us and the classical past or the Oriental present. Compared with this revolution the Renaissance is a mere ripple on the surface of literature. There can be no mistake about the novelty of romantic love: our only difficulty is to imagine in all its bareness the mental world that existed before its coming...
Even worse, nearly all Christians believe that the idea of romance as something non sexual and sanctifying is a biblical concept. This is why the former head of the CBMW refers to romance as “God honoring”, offering romance as a solution to the problem of sexual immorality:

Promote God-honoring romance...

But nowhere in the Bible are we told that romance is pure or “God-honoring”. This is a modern invention, part of the religion of feminism. Romance isn’t even a biblical concept, as the Bible refers to sexual passion as a single thing and does not artificially divide it out into sexual emotion and physical sexuality. Proverbs 5 uses animal imagery to describe a husband’s proper frame of mind toward his wife. Song of Solomon also describes a raw sexual passion. And 1 Corinthians 7 instructs us that the solution to the temptation of sexual immorality is to marry and have frequent sex.

But this brings us to the root of the problem. There is at least a decade between the age we expect girls to seek romantic relationships and the minimum age our feminist culture considers it proper for a woman to marry. Since the biblical solution is (for most) out of the question, the next step for modern Christians was to invent a new code of sexual morality. This new invention however needs to feel traditional, which is why the result is a form of cartoonish chivalry.

Interestingly we would understand how twisted it is to have a parent act as their child’s romantic surrogate if we reversed the sexes. When fathers dress as grooms, give their daughters wedding rings, and pose with their daughters dressed as brides or prom dates, modern Christians can’t see how twisted this is. But if Christian mothers started dressing up as brides or prom dates with their sons and had their sons place wedding rings on their fingers, everyone would immediately understand how sick this really is. The reason is when it comes to men we intuitively understand that romance is sexual in nature. It is only for women that we hold out the fiction that romance isn’t sexual.

Edit: Donal has a post making much the same point, and Cane Caldo has a new post up in response to my previous post.
The Duluth model is working as designed; you won’t smart mouth her again.
by Dalrock | February 3, 2017 | Link

In the spirit of getting ready for the big game, my wife noticed that the Daily Mail has a piece up today quoting from a group of women on Facebook bragging about abusing men:

Threw a chair at him through a glass door. Door smashed and cut him the f*** up. Needless to say he didn’t smart mouth me again...

The disgraceful Facebook page was outed by Black Ribbon Australia, a group dedicated to fighting the current domestic violence paradigm that is powerfully biased to see all men as abusers and ignore violence by women against men. The system is so biased that when men are abused by women they face a high risk of being arrested for abuse.

...Black Ribbon’s chief executive John Paul Hirst says attitudes are changing. But the law isn’t.

“They still can only remove the male from the house, not the female,” Mr Hirst told news.com.au.

“The male has to be moved and arrested and charged at the police station and only gets legal counsel when he stands before a magistrate.

“All she has to say is, ‘He slapped me and I was only defending myself’.”

This legal response of arresting men who are assaulted by women is not limited to Australia. At The Good Men Project Joseph Kerr wrote about being arrested after his wife kicked him in the head, rendering him unconscious.

I ended up on the ground next to the stairs. She kicked my head into the solid wood base. I blacked out, came to, stood up, bleeding. My daughter was screaming, “Stop hurting daddy!”

It was over. We were over. I headed out the door to the police and then the hospital. My daughter stopped me. “Daddy, you need to go to a doctor, here take this,” she handed me a bandage. “I love you” was the last thing I said to her. It’s been almost a month.

When Kerr foolishly went to the police and reported the assault, the police reflexively arrested him:


“We’re sending a car over there to talk to her.” I waited some more.
“You wife is telling a bit of a different story, as happens a lot in these situations, she says you threatened her.”

“We’re going to take you into custody now.”

“Stand up and put your hands behind your back.”

Eventually Kerr was able to see a lawyer, and asked him what a man should do if his wife assaults him. The lawyer replied “Run and don’t go to the police”:

I sat across from my lawyer and talked about the other time. She grabbed me and ripped my shirt. Her nails cut my face. I bled. I tried to walk out the door. She blocked the door. I was a gym-every-day, active duty Marine, fearing someone a fraction of my size. If she had a penis I’d have a dozen ways to put her on the ground. Instead, I was left to sneak out a bedroom window and spend the night in a parking lot.

I tried the police and now in front of a guy practicing law for nearly as long as I’ve been alive I tried again.

“What do you do when a woman hits you?”

“Run. Run and don’t go to the police.”

His lawyer should have added not smart mouthing the wife to make her angry in the first place. Other advice comes from the Web MD article Help for Battered Men, which advises battered men to always have an escape plan when their wife is in a mood, so she can’t trap him in a room and then have him arrested when he tries to get away:

“We tell men if they have to be in an argument, do it in a room with two doors so they can leave; a lot of times a woman will block the door, the man will try to move her, and that will be enough for him to get arrested.”

As the Web MD article explains, the domestic violence legal system and the family courts are designed to empower women who abuse men:

...perhaps the most important difference is that women who batter may have a greater ability to use the “system” to their advantage.

“Systemic abuse can occur when a woman who is abusing her husband or boyfriend threatens that he will never see his children again if he leaves or reports the abuse,” says Philip Cook, program director of Stop Abuse for Everyone. “A man caught in this situation believes that no matter what his wife or girlfriend does, the court is going to give her custody, and this greatly limits his ability to leave. While this can occur when a woman is being abused, it is more likely to happen when a woman is abusing.”
Women, explains Cook, who is author of *Abused Men: The Hidden Side of Domestic Violence*, may also be able to use the system to their advantage in that they are less likely to be arrested if police are called as a result of a domestic dispute.

The important thing to understand is this isn’t the result of a well intentioned system behaving unexpectedly. Nearly all modern domestic violence legal frameworks in the west are based off of what is called the Duluth model. Dr. Don Dutton, head of the University of British Columbia Forensic Psychology lab explains how the Duluth model has been used to train police and other officers of the court to automatically identify the man as the abuser:

Jaffe et al. then go on to define abuse, using the “Duluth Power and Control Wheel” that includes “Using Male Privilege” as a part of an octant of abusive strategies used against women. Jaffe et al. then list, under “whom to assess”: Victimized mothers (p.44), Battering fathers (p.46) and “war torn children” (p. 49). Jaffe et al suggest using an Abuse Observation Checklist (Dutton 1992) and asking the victimized woman to describe the “first, worst and last” incident, followed by allowing the “alleged perpetrator an opportunity to respond”. It is not clear what response, apart from denial might be expected from an accused male. Indeed, the authors warn an assessor that (p. 42) the male perpetrator may “minimize their abusive behavior by blaming their victims or proclaiming that the abuse was uncharacteristic”. It seems that, once accused, the male can only use responses that the evaluator is already primed to see as disingenuous.

This is the very nature of the Duluth model, something its founders openly admit to. The Duluth founders are not interested in ending or reducing domestic violence in itself; instead they are interested in using domestic violence policy as a mechanism to change the dynamics of power and control in heterosexual relationships. Specifically, they want to empower women and dis-empower men. In *Countering Confusion about the Duluth Model*, the founders explain (emphasis mine):

The Duluth curriculum is designed for male perpetrators. In Duluth, a separate court-deferral program called Crossroads was designed for women who use illegal violence against the men who batter them (Asmus 2004). Most women arrested in Duluth have been able to document to the court a history of abuse against them by the person they have assaulted (past calls to 911 for help, protection orders, previous assaults, etc.). Those women who use violence against a partner with no history of that partner abusing them are not eligible for the Crossroads diversion program, but face the same consequences as male offenders after a conviction, i.e., a jail sentence or counseling in lieu of jail. The vast majority of women arrested in Duluth for domestic assaults are being battered by the person they assault. Most, but not all, are retaliating against an abusive spouse or are using violence in self-defense. The notion that battered women share responsibility for the violence used against them because of provocative words or actions is a dangerous form of collusion with men who batter (Mills 2003). We do not accept that these women should complete a batterers’ program. We do agree that there are a small number of women who use violence resulting in police action against
their partners without themselves being abused. This is not a social problem requiring institutional organizing in the way that men’s violence against women is. For these women, a separate gender-specific counseling program may be appropriate.

Note that they acknowledge that women use the legal framework they created to abuse men and then have the men arrested, and they don’t see this as an important social problem. Perhaps someone (but not them), should come up with a counseling program for these women. More specifically, they are against any policy that doesn’t automatically arrest the man while not arresting the woman:

From a public policy perspective, not arresting batterers essentially decriminalizes domestic violence and condemns a victim to either live with the violence or (as in the “bad old days”) be forced to press charges against an abusive spouse. Doing away with pro-arrest policies targeting the predominant aggressor (a core component of the Duluth Model) reduces the total number of arrests but increases the proportion of dual arrests. Dual arrests have proven ineffective in stopping violence, and they also have the unfortunate consequence of making victims more reluctant to call the police when further acts of violence occur.

Some may be mislead in the above by the seemingly gender neutral terms of “batterers”, “predominant aggressors”, and “victims”. If you assumed these terms were neutral, the quote above might seem to contradict the previous quote where they explain that women using the Duluth framework to make men afraid to report being abused is not an important problem. However, under the Duluth model, batterers are men and victims are women:

…not every person who has used physical force against a partner is what we would describe as a batterer. A person who batters is one who uses a pattern of intimidation, coercion, and violence against a partner. It is unusual for men to be arrested for assault in cases where there has been no such history. Women call the police because they are afraid. Neighbors call because the violence is alarming. Children call because they are trying to help their mothers.

Under the Duluth model, domestic violence by women is seen as wholly different than violence by men. Violence by men is a tool of the patriarchy, while violence by women is a tool to fight against the patriarchy (emphasis mine):

When women use violence in an intimate relationship, the context of that violence tends to differ from men. First, men’s use of violence against women is learned and reinforced through many social, cultural and institutional avenues, while women’s use of violence does not have the same kind of societal support. Secondly, many women who do use violence against their male partners are being battered. Their violence is primarily used to respond to and resist the controlling violence being used against them. On the societal level, women’s violence against men has a trivial effect on men compared to the devastating effect of men’s violence against women.

…
Making the Power and Control Wheel gender neutral would hide the power imbalances in relationships between men and women that reflect power imbalances in society. By naming the power differences, we can more clearly provide advocacy and support for victims, accountability and opportunities for change for offenders, and system and societal changes that end violence against women.
Setting the record straight on Duluth.

by Dalrock | February 7, 2017 | Link

I’ve quoted from the Duluth Model document _Countering Confusion about the Duluth Model_ in several posts, and the more I look at it the more astounded I am as to just how open the Duluth Model organization is regarding their philosophy and their goals. This is a document intended to refute criticisms against the model, and is published on the organization’s official website (theduluthmodel.org). The document opens with (all emphasis below are mine):

> Recently, the “Duluth Model” of working with men who batter has received serious criticism, despite being the pre-eminent model internationally. Much of the criticism is based on flawed research that is contradicted by other better-designed, more comprehensive studies. Here the authors respond directly to misinformation generated by 1) a 2003 study from the National Institute of Justice of the U.S. Department of Justice; 2) an analysis of batterer treatment models by Babcock, Green, and Robie (2002); and 3) unsubstantiated criticism of the philosophy underlying the Duluth Model by Dutton and Corvo (2006). The authors, both of whom have worked with the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project in Duluth, Minnesota, rebut inaccurate assumptions and myths about what the model is and how it works and challenge the ethics, as well as the efficacy, of avoiding criminal justice sanctions and relying solely on resource-intensive mental health treatments for batterers. Changing historically entrenched battering behavior is difficult, the authors explain, but the Duluth Model prioritizes victim safety and autonomy.

For the purpose of this post, I’ll focus on their response to Dutton and Corvo, which begins on page four with an outline of the first set of charges the Duluth Model organization wants to set the record straight on:

**Critical Review of Dutton and Corvo**

In their 2006 article, “Transforming a Flawed Policy: A Call to Revive Psychology and Science in Domestic Violence Research and Practice,” Donald Dutton and Kenneth Corvo grossly misrepresent the Duluth curriculum when they write “according to the Duluth Model, all [men] must be treated as patriarchal terrorists regardless of differences in how the violence developed.” They further state that “essentially, the Duluth Model views every man convicted as equivalent to the worst man convicted without gradations or nuance,” and “the primary goal of this model is to get male clients to acknowledge ‘male privilege’ and how they have used ‘power and control’ to dominate their wives.”

Astoundingly, what follows is not even an attempt to refute the bolded portions above, but instead:

1. Confirmation that the philosophy and mechanics of the model are as Dutton and Corvo have accused.
The following is the unedited response* in the paper to the claims I quoted above. Search carefully for any refutation of what Dutton and Corvo assert:

Interestingly, Dutton and Corvo place quotation marks around power and control and male privilege as if they don’t exist, but that is for a later discussion.

The underpinnings of the Duluth curriculum do come from a historical analysis. When Europeans came to this continent, they brought religion, laws, and economic systems that institutionalized the status of women as the property of men through marriage. From the church to the state, there was not only acceptance of male supremacy, but also an expectation that husbands would maintain the family order by controlling their wives. Various indiscretions committed by wives were offenses to be punished by husbands. This system of male dominance (like any social structure where one group oppresses another) was perpetuated by: a) a belief in the primacy of men over women; b) institutional rules requiring the submission of women to men; c) the objectification of women which made violence acceptable; and d) the right of men to use violence to punish with impunity (Dobash and Dobash 1983).

The status quo of male domination remained fully intact until the early twentieth century when state legislatures began to make wife beating unlawful. However, the practice of men using violence to control women didn’t diminish. In the late 1960s, the Women’s Movement began challenging the state to intervene in domestic violence cases and women and some men began to confront the concept of male supremacy in the home. In the 1970s, the Battered Women’s Movement emerged as the voice of victims and advocates to challenge psychological theories about the causes of violence and explanations of why victims often stayed in abusive relationships.

Do all men who batter want to dominate women? This is a complicated question. Clearly, many men who batter believe that women should be submissive to men and there are others who share a variation of these sexist beliefs—“The man is the head of the household” or “You can’t have two captains of one ship.” However, there are other men who batter that don’t believe that their wives or girlfriends should be subservient because of their gender, but they still batter. These men use violence to control their partners because they can and violence works. Violence ends arguments. Violence is punishment—it sends a powerful message of disapproval.

The final bolded part above is the most comical, as it explains that even when men don’t use violence as a tool of the patriarchy, they are still using violence as a tool of the patriarchy! This is merely restating (with approval) the accusation they ostensibly set out to refute:

Donald Dutton and Kenneth Corvo grossly misrepresent the Duluth curriculum when they write “according to the Duluth Model, all [men] must be treated as
patriarchal terrorists regardless of differences in how the violence developed.”

The defense continues:

Some mental health practitioners are now repackaging old psychological theories in opposition to analyses that indicate that culture and socialization shape the way men who batter think and act in intimate relationships. Although there is much of value in mental health theories that can assist the healing of victims and perpetrators alike, we do not see men’s violence against women as stemming from individual pathology, but rather from a socially reinforced sense of entitlement. We believe that the beliefs and attitudes possessed by men who batter can be changed through an educational process.

Try to find a contradiction between this defense of the model, and the claim by Dutton and Corvo repeated below. This is a defense of why it is good that the goal of the model is as Dutton and Corvo describe, not a refutation of the description of the goal itself:

the primary goal of this model is to get male clients to acknowledge ‘male privilege’ and how they have used ‘power and control’ to dominate their wives.

Next they raise a new set of accusations by Dutton and Corvo that they want to set the record straight on:

Dutton and Corvo claim “the Duluth Model maintains an ineffective system where resources are diverted from other potential program responses, e.g., joint treatment of violence and chemical dependency or mutuality of partner violence.” They go on to state “mandatory arrest policies are a product of the ideologically driven view that since domestic violence is always strategic, always intentional, always unidirectional, and always with the objective of female domination by men, that it must be contravened by the power of the state. Once one removes this ideological presumption, the rationale for mandatory arrest disappears.”

And again, instead of refuting the bolded claim above, the Duluth Model organization confirms the claim and justifies the model:

They cite research on mandatory arrest policies in Milwaukee and other cities that apparently fails to demonstrate that mandatory arrest reduces recidivism (Shepard 1992). What they don’t tell us is that the cities chosen for this research had very poor prosecution rates and lacked a tight coordinated community response, which is the cornerstone of the Duluth Model. It is axiomatic that arrest without prosecution, meaningful sentencing, jail, the threat of jail and counseling will usually be less effective in reducing violence because offenders will get the message that the criminal justice system and society as a whole don’t take domestic violence seriously. And, although arrests alone may not reduce recidivism to the level we would hope for, critics of pro-arrest policies would never argue that we should stop
arresting rapists or thieves who assault their victims if arrests don’t measurably reduce recidivism for those violent offenders.

From a public policy perspective, not arresting batterers essentially decriminalizes domestic violence and condemns a victim to either live with the violence or (as in the “bad old days”) be forced to press charges against an abusive spouse. **Doing away with pro-arrest policies targeting the predominant aggressor (a core component of the Duluth Model) reduces the total number of arrests but increases the proportion of dual arrests.** Dual arrests have proven ineffective in stopping violence, and they also have the unfortunate consequence of making victims more reluctant to call the police when further acts of violence occur.

Again, they are in agreement with Dutton and Corvo; they explain that if it police were permitted to respond to each domestic violence incident based on the facts (instead of Duluth’s ideologically driven model identifying the man as an abuser), the police would:

1. Arrest fewer men.
2. Arrest more women!

This brings us to the next point by Dutton and Corvo that Duluth wants to set the record straight on:

Dutton and Corvo also contend that the “best designed studies” (Ehrensaft, Moffitt, and Caspi 2004; Moffit et al. 2001) indicate that intimate partner violence is committed by both genders with equal consequences. They point to these studies to buttress their argument that marriage counseling is an appropriate treatment to end domestic violence.

In this case they do at least make an effort to refute the quoted claims. But this is a disagreement on data and interpreting studies. In the process of making their argument they further reinforce Dutton and Corvo’s claims about the ideological nature of the Duluth model:

We respond that, even if surveys comparing rates of perpetration by gender are accurate, proponents of the argument that women are as violent as men fail to account for the impact of the violence (Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. 1995; Cascardi and Vivian 1995), the severity of the violence (Hamberger and Guse 2002), the level of fear experienced by the person being assaulted (Barnett and Thelen 1995; Hamberger and Guse 2002), or motivation for the violence.

In an emergency room study, gender differences among a cohort of injured patients found that men initiated violence in far greater numbers than women (Phelan et al. 2005). One hundred percent of female respondents versus 39 percent of the male respondents reported being injured in a domestic violence incident. Thirty-six percent of women reported being intimidated by their partner’s size while none of the men reported being intimidated by their partner’s size. Seventy percent of women reported that they were very strongly afraid during partner-initiated violence while only one man reported experiencing this degree of fear. The majority of men (85 percent) reported not being afraid at all when their female partners initiate
violence. From experience, police officers and domestic violence advocates have long understood the contextual differences between the violence of men and women, yet proponents of the “women are as violent as men” agenda downplay the significance of gender differences in the ways that men and women use violence (Dutton and Corvo 2006; Mills 2003).

**Opponents of a feminist analysis of domestic violence** continue to argue their theory that women are as violent as men and that the level of mutual violence calls out for changing arrest and prosecution policies as well as advocating for marriage counseling to stop the violence. This may be an attractive theory to some in the mental health field and “men’s rights” activists. The problem is that practitioners who endorse couples’ counseling while one person is still intimidating or using violence against another ignore the very real risk of violent assaults following counseling sessions. Most psychologists and therapists who have knowledge of domestic violence dynamics would concede that marriage counseling is ineffective if one party is a batterer and has power over the other. How can a victim be honest about what is happening in the relationship or talk about the violence when she fears physical retribution?

Dutton and Corvo’s notion that women are as violent as men or that most domestic violence cases are mutual assaults simply distorts the reality that any law enforcement officer, emergency room nurse or doctor, or domestic violence advocate can validate from their experiences with victims. In 1998, national statistics showed that women were the victims in nearly three out of four of the 1,830 murders attributable to intimate partners in the United States (Rennison and Wechans 2000). That year, women experienced about 900,000 violent offenses by an intimate partner, and men, 160,000. Even if there is some underreporting by men, the claim that men and women commit assaults in equal numbers and with equal severity defies common sense. It is simply untrue. We acknowledge that women use aggression and violence in intimate relationships and not always in self-defense. But we also contend that relying on family conflict studies that utilize the Conflict Tactics Study (CTS)—which simply counts acts of violence without accounting for the circumstances under which these acts occur and the size and strength of the people involved—is deceptive (Kimmel 2002). In a conflict study, a push in response to a beating would be scored as one conflict tactic for each party.

While there are women who kill their male partners for reasons other than self-defense, the numbers pale in comparison to men who kill their female partners when the female partner is trying to end an abusive relationship. In 2006, the U.S. Department of Justice reported that the number of men murdered by an intimate since 1976 had dropped by 70 percent. One third of female murder victims were killed by an intimate, while only three percent of male murder victims were killed by an intimate.

**Stating that domestic violence is gender neutral is not only disingenuous, but also has serious public policy implications.** How often do you read about a woman killing her husband and the couple’s children because the man is trying to
leave the relationship? How many men are raped by an abusive woman as an act designed to punish or retaliate? Yet in city after city, male batterers stalk and murder their partners. Men and women use violence in very different ways, and therefore our response must be different.

*I’ve included much longer quotes than normal in this post because quoting the full response is the only way to show that they never do get around to refuting the claims Dutton and Corvo make about the nature of the model itself.*
Lutheran pastor Hans Fiene has a new post at The Federalist titled Why It's Terrible News That Millennials Are Having Less Sex*. Fiene points out that the drop in promiscuity by Millennials is troubling because it likely presages a drop in marriage.

Fiene identifies two culprits, pornography and social media:

What’s causing millennials to be less sexually active, then? As with any trend, there are numerous explanations. But the two biggest factors seem to be the copious amounts of pornography that millennials, in particular millennial men, have grown up consuming, and the widespread use of socially isolating social networking. Just take a look at this profile of a millennial man, courtesy of Tara Bahrampour:

The fundamental problem, according to Fiene, is that pornography and social media are causing millennial men not to learn how wonderful millennial women are, and what godly and submissive wives millennial women would make:

As men pursue women, however, they come to develop a more robust appreciation of what women have to offer them beyond physical beauty and sexual gratification. They become more exposed to the various feminine virtues—things like kindness, compassion, selflessness, loyalty, tenderness. And the more decent men encounter “the imperishable beauty of a quiet and gentle spirit,” as St Peter calls it, the more they come to value this inner beauty over raw sexuality.

This is a very common approach, and it is founded on a breathtaking denial of what is going on in our society. Indeed, pornography and social media are part of the problem, along with a whole host of other factors. If you will permit me to use a metaphor, these factors are comparable to ignition sources lighting a forest fire. Forest fires can be caused by camp fires, lightning strikes, etc, but they are only part of the equation. The other factor is the health of the forest. If the forest is dry, or even worse, loaded with dead wood or other fuel sources, it is only a matter of time before one ignition source or another ultimately lights the inferno. Focusing on ignition sources is helpful only in the short term, because sooner or later something is going to cause the whole thing to go up in flames.

We have the same kind of problem with modern marriage. Marriage has been systematically weakened for many decades. Each new cohort of women is encouraged to delay marriage longer and longer. No fault divorce and our family courts have replaced legal commitment with an encouragement for women to divorce, including the promise of cash and prizes. The culture, especially conservative Christian culture, despises husbands and views men who marry and have children with contempt. Where in the past husbands were seen as head of the household, a husband who sees himself in this way is quite literally engaging in crime-think. Should this crime-think be reported to the police, the husband will be arrested and forced to undergo reeducation/self criticism until he learns to view headship as a moral and legal offense. As a former facilitator explains, the facilitators of these reeducation sessions
are taught**:  

Confront! Confront! Confront! With the explicit threat that the probation officer will be informed of your non compliance...

So on the one hand we have a coordinated and very public feminist assault on the definition of marriage, which makes marriage far less appealing to men. On the other hand we have new substitutes to marriage like pornography. And all of the main factors (including pornography) trace their way back to feminism one way or another.

But feminism is the problem men like Pastor Fiene dare not whisper! There are two reasons for this:

1. Most people are enthusiastic supporters of feminism, including nearly all conservative pastors.
2. Feminism is an active rebellion, so calling out feminism is scary.

What we get instead of confronting reality is a constant dripping of articles like Pastor Fiene’s complaining about the weak men who are screwing feminism up. Make no mistake; it is true that this is happening. Weak men really are screwing feminism up. It is, however, absurd to focus on the problem in this way. No amount of shoring up will make the feminist model of marriage work, no matter how much conservatives like Fiene want it to work.

Nevertheless, this approach of denial and redirect has worked for decades, so it is understandable why men like Pastor Fiene would be tempted to keep doing it. There is, however, a growing threat to Pastor Fiene in his efforts to frame the problem as weak men screwing feminism up. As I noted last month, Millennials are responding to articles with this frame and pointing out the obvious absurdity of the denial based approach. Commenter Broderick responded to Fiene’s article exposing the feminist elephant in the room:

- This article completely misses the mark. Perhaps it is true that many young men and women find more satisfaction in porn than in real relationships. But this is merely a symptom. In a competition between the virtual and real wherein the virtual wins, we should instead ask why the real has fallen so far.

- In this millennial generation, this has much more to do with confused gender roles than with pornography. Feminism has taught women to be masculine competitors – they are not taught any of the feminine virtues to which Fiene alludes. Modern education (installed, also, with plenty of feminism) has taught men to be feminine subservients – they are not taught any of the masculine virtues to which Fiene alludes.

- As a general rule, men are attracted to femininity and women to masculinity. This is hardwired.

- With the above virtues gone, what else can a man be attracted to in a woman other than her body? Likewise for women with respect to men? At this point, a man may as well just use porn, because he gets all the benefits of a virtual body without the
drawbacks and costs of entering a relationship with a masculine “strong independent woman” (who, I might add, needs that man about as much as a fish needs a bicycle).

Add in legal corruptions to marriage (no-fault divorce, a hostile family court system, etc.) and you’ll find that the pornographers are being entirely rational in their choice to forgo real relationships.

Further down in the discussion Persimmon wrote a defense of masculine women:

Not all masculine women are promiscuous. I am a masculine woman who is not sexually active but I am aggressive. I would not know how else to be.

Also, Maybe the reason things have gone so haywire is because of the 50s. People, particularly women left that society because it did not make them happy. Some women were comfortable with it but others not so much. They wanted more.

*H/T Gurney Halleck

**See also page 33 in the Santa Clara County Probation Department STANDARDS FOR BATTERERS PROGRAMS AND CERTIFICATION for an example of how this is codified.
Time and fantasy.

by Dalrock | February 10, 2017 | Link

Picking up from my last post, the root of declining marriage rates isn’t just that there are substitutes to marriage, but that marriage itself has been degraded for many decades. Time is our enemy here, because inertia has delayed the effects of our war on marriage from becoming fully evident. Each new generation of men is slowly starting to respond to the radical changes we have made to marriage, and this is changing their perceptions of marriage. The first generation of men who grew up watching the societal celebration as fathers were tossed out of the house en masse were largely unfazed; nearly all of them went on to marry. Yet with each new generation witnessing the same pattern we are slowly burning through an enormous reservoir of goodwill from men.

But there is another way that time is our enemy, and this is that as young men are waiting for their future wives to tire of having sex with other men, there are plenty of diversions available to pass the time. A young man knows that his future wife won’t likely be in the market for marriage for roughly a decade. Instead of knocking himself out today to signal provider status while he waits, the temptation for a young man is to focus instead on video games, porn, legal marijuana, and now even a pint sized virtual girlfriend:

Pastor Fiene is concerned that young men will be too distracted by fantasy women to notice how feminine, selfless, submissive, and meek modern young women are. What should worry him instead is that the fantasy women young men are turning to demonstrate by contrast just how aggressive, masculine, and bossy modern women are.

There are after all two opposing fantasies at work here. The pathetic young man above with the virtual girlfriend is engaging in one fantasy, but men like Fiene are trying to sell an equally absurd fantasy. The longer a young man engages with fantasy submissive women, the harder it will be for conservative Christians to convince him that what should turn him on is a bossy woman.

Time is the enemy in other ways. The longer a young man waits for women to be interested in marriage, the more he will be taught about the realities of modern marriage. He will watch movies like Fireproof and learn that a husband’s primary job is to constantly remain on guard, always scrambling to keep his contentious wife from becoming unhappy and divorcing him. This same message will be endlessly reinforced in articles like The secret to a happy marriage may be an emotionally intelligent husband, where he will learn that women are better at marriage because they have years of practice being catty, self centered, and dramatic:

| When boys play games, their focus is on winning, not their emotions or the others playing. If one of the boys get hurt, he gets ignored. After all, “the game must go on.” |
| With girls, feelings are often the first priority. When a tearful girl says, “we’re not |

www.TheRedArchive.com
friends anymore,” the game stops and only starts again if the girls make up. In “The Seven Principles for Making Marriage Work,” Dr. Gottman explains, “the truth is that ‘girlish’ games offer far better preparation for marriage and family life because they focus on relationships.”

**Related:** Losing control of the narrative.
Feel the love.
by Dalrock | February 13, 2017 | Link

Just in time for Valentine’s Day, the New York Times warns us that Husbands Are Deadlier Than Terrorists.

Husbands are incomparably more deadly in America than jihadist terrorists.

And husbands are so deadly in part because in America they have ready access to firearms, even when they have a history of violence. In other countries, brutish husbands put wives in hospitals; in America, they put them in graves.

Red Alert responds, pointing out that married women (and their children) are far safer than unmarried women are.

This constant drumbeat of contempt for men who play by the rules isn’t limited just to Carlos Slim’s blog. The message that married fathers are fools at best, and dangerous brutes at worst is the same message on offer from Christian leaders.

H/T Boxer
UK Millennial men earning like women.

by Dalrock | February 15, 2017 | Link

Lianna Brinded at Business Insider notes that weak men are screwing feminism up: The gender pay gap is narrowing for millennials — ‘but for the wrong reasons’

Millennial men have earned less than Generation X men in every year between the ages of 22 and 30, resulting in a cumulative pay deficit during their 20s of £12,500 ($15,638). However, the unit found that millennial women’s pay is stagnant compared to the last generation.

The problem is that young men in the UK are starting to work like women:

[Men] are taking up jobs that used to be predominantly taken by women — part-time, low-paid work — according the think tank Resolution Foundation’s “Intergenerational Commission” unit.

This is precisely the kind of change we would expect as men slowly react to the removal of the incentives of a marriage based system. We are of course witnessing something very similar in the US.
Will Wilcox and the men of National Review respect you in the morning?

by Dalrock | February 20, 2017 | Link

Over the last year or so there has been a concerted effort by men associated with National Review to woo men into marriage. The most recent example of this is W. Bradford Wilcox and Nicholas H. Wolfinger’s February 9th article at the National Review, Hey Guys, Put a Ring on It. Back in December of 2016 National Review contributor Jim Geraghty and conservative blogger Dennis Prager created a video with the same message titled The Sexiest Man Alive. And prior to that in May of 2016 Prager and Wilcox created another video titled: Be a man. Get married.

I should start by noting that I am a happily married father and a firm believer in marriage. Marriage is not only the foundation of the family, it is given to us from God. However, I am writing to warn you that when Wilcox and the men of the National Review whisper sweet nothings to you about marriage and commitment, they are really only after one thing. Certainly they will cheer you on when you announce your engagement, and no doubt they would heartily pat you on the back if they were at the wedding party. And of course, they will be filled with good wishes (and perhaps a bit of envy) for you on your wedding night. But what about the day after you give them what they desire in response to their flowery words of love and commitment? Will Wilcox and the men at National Review respect you in the morning?

I wish this weren’t true, but I have to warn you; no, they will not.

How can I know? You just have to look at the long string of men that came before you, men they seduced with the very same lines. Once the wedding is over, once the men of National Review have gotten what they wanted, the men who naively trusted them are discarded like yesterday’s trash. Do you really believe you will be the special one, the one they don’t toss casually away once they get what they want?

Wait. You didn’t think you were their first conquest, did you?

Consider just one of the many men who came before you, Carly Israel’s ex husband. Ms. Israel tells us at the Huffington Post that he was a kind man and an excellent father. Despite knowing that it would destroy both him and their three boys, Israel decided to divorce this good man because she was no longer happy honoring her marriage vows. Moreover, Israel is teaching other women that frivolous divorce which devastates good men and children will make a woman more moral:

| You get closer to God |

More troubling is that Israel’s moral message celebrating frivolous divorce is the norm. Modern women shamelessly fantasize about divorce, and publications like the Huffington Post...
have responded with a never ending stream of tales about wives crushing good men and innocent children on the path to moral enrichment. Elizabeth Gilbert’s book Eat Pray Love was a runaway success, and lead to a blockbuster movie by the same name. More recently Cheryl Strayed’s bestselling book about how frivolous divorce made her a better person was also made into a movie.

Not surprisingly Israel is a huge fan of Strayed, and closes her piece with a quote from her:

Go, even though you love him.
Go, even though he is kind and faithful and dear to you.
Go, even though he’s your best friend and you’re his.
Go, even though you can’t imagine your life without him.
Go, even though he adores you and your leaving will devastate him.
Go, even though your friends will be disappointed or surprised or pissed off or all three.
Go, even though you once said you would stay.
Go, even though you’re afraid of being alone.
Go, even though you’re sure no one will ever love you as well as he does.
Go, even though there is nowhere to go.
Go, even though you don’t know exactly why you can’t stay.
Go, because you want to.
Because wanting to leave is enough.

Wilcox, Geraghty, and Prager at the National Review see the culture telling women Divorce him! Divorce him! Divorce him! and their response is to tell men Put a ring on it!

Why aren’t Wilcox and the men at the National Review condemning frivolous divorce, and standing up for the good men and innocent children who are devastated by it? Why aren’t they teaching that frivolous divorce is morally wrong? If they do believe that frivolous divorce is morally wrong, they are careful not to say this publicly. In Dennis Prager’s case we know the answer, as Prager is adamant that high divorce rates are not a moral problem:

...whenever conservatives describe [moral] decline, they include the high divorce rate, along with crime and out-of-wedlock births, as a prime example. I believe conservatives are wrong here.

They aren’t arguing men should marry for reasons of sexual morality; they want men to marry because they believe that more men marrying is good for society. If that means good men are crushed in the process, so be it. Again from Prager:

...as a rule, it is far better for society to have people marry and divorce than never to marry.

What they want is more weddings, even though they know an obscenely large number of those weddings will lead to devastation for the men they are wooing. Wilcox knows it is common for fickle wives to fall out of love and destroy the family, and instead of standing up for the sanctity of marriage lectures husbands that they must work hard to be “emotionally engaged”. If Wilcox respected these men, if he cared about them, he would be outraged at
the rampant injustice. But once he’s gotten what he wants from them they are out of mind, just another notch. Moreover, if he respected men considering marriage he would be forthright with them and tell them that no amount of marriage counseling or emotional availability will stop their wife from falling out of love and destroying their family.

In fact, Wilcox knows men have excellent reason to be hesitant to marry. In 2009 he wrote:

…the ill effects of divorce for adults tend to fall disproportionately on the shoulders of fathers. Since approximately two-thirds of divorces are legally initiated by women, men are more likely than women to be divorced against their will. In many cases, these men have not engaged in egregious marital misconduct such as abuse, adultery, or substance abuse. They feel mistreated by their ex-wives and by state courts that no longer take into account marital “fault” when making determinations about child custody, child support, and the division of marital property. Yet in the wake of a divorce, these men will nevertheless often lose their homes, a substantial share of their monthly incomes, and regular contact with their children. For these men, and for women caught in similar circumstances, the sting of an unjust divorce can lead to downward emotional spirals, difficulties at work, and serious deteriorations in the quality of their relationships with their children….

Yet today, in Hey Guys, Put a Ring on It Wilcox opens suggesting that men are avoiding marriage not because the system is designed to fleece them, but because they are lazy and unwilling to make sacrifices:

Marriage is not worth it. It’s not worth the financial sacrifices, the lost sexual opportunities, and the lack of freedom. All in all, it’s a ball and chain — of little benefit to any man interested in pursuing happiness and well-being. This is the view that we’ve encountered from many young men of late.

Six-pack Craig is right about one thing: There is no doubt that marriage requires sacrifices, and lots of them. Successful marriages require men to work harder, avoid cheating, spend less time with friends, and make a good-faith effort, day in and day out, to be emotionally present with their spouses. Many men find these sacrifices hard.

This is similar to Wilcox’s tone in The Divorce Revolution Has Bred An Army Of Woman Haters, where he dismisses men who fear divorce as misogynistic and lazy. Wilcox sees millions of men making huge sacrifices in a system designed to destroy, not protect, their families, and complains that more men aren’t willing to do so. Wilcox clearly doesn’t respect the enormous sacrifices married men make, or he wouldn’t take them so completely for granted while casually dismissing the very real concerns of unmarried men.

The lack of respect for men who marry is displayed in many other ways, including:

- Wilcox pretends the sacrifices married men make to support their families financially
are not sacrifices at all, but a benefit men receive from marriage. He calls the financial burdens men take on when marrying a “marriage premium” for men. He doesn’t respect married men’s willingness to work longer hours at more stressful jobs, so he pretends they are lucky to be able to do so.

- Wilcox pretends that the man he calls “Six Pack Craig” represent you, the average unmarried man, when he knows that Six Pack Craig instead represents the kind of men your future wife very likely spent years having no strings sex with until she and Wilcox both decided you should put a ring on it.
- Wilcox and Prager give the impression that by marrying and having children you will become respected in our culture. Yet in reality everyone from the secular left to Republicans to modern Christians holds married men, especially married fathers, in contempt.

It is my sincere hope that Dr. Wilcox and the men of National Review will turn away from their love em and leave em ways regarding men and marriage, and start treating the commitment of marriage as sacred. Old habits are hard to break, yet with God all things are possible. But until that day I can only warn you; they are only after one thing, and once they get it they won’t respect you in the morning.

**Note:** I will send a link to this post to Dr. Wilcox and would welcome his response.

Hat tip to readers who shared links used in this article: Heidi, Jeff, Deti, Anon, and Boxer.
Chapter 15 of Jim Geraghty and Cam Edwards’ book *Heavy Lifting: Grow Up, Get a Job, Raise a Family, and Other Manly Advice* is *Marriage is for Keeps: How to Avoid Divorce*. Geraghty’s portion of the chapter is a rambling jumble of modern conservative clichés, with most of the content not addressing the question of the chapter. For example, he provides the obligatory wacky anecdote about how he failed miserably as Mr. Mom that time his wife was ill, along with a sudden and perplexing apology that the book isn’t gayer:

> You may have noticed this whole book is really, really “heteronormative,” as the social justice warriors say. Look, if you’re gay or lesbian, I hope you’re enjoying this book and I hope life treats you well. I don’t doubt gays and lesbians can be fine parents.

> But please refrain from whining that a book about parenting and manhood written by two straight guys doesn’t spend enough time discussing the gay perspective...

This is from chapter 15, not the introduction of the book.

Geraghty offers statistics that most divorces are for reasons other than infidelity, abuse, or
addiction. He then offers his personal theory on what is causing the lion’s share of divorce:

...my divorced friends say that fighting rarely resolved an issue. And maybe that was the problem. There are four ways couples respond to conflict: he concedes, she concedes, they compromise, or it gets swept under the rug. That last option might be the easiest, but it’s a short-term solution at best. Each time you sweep a difficult issue under the metaphorical rug of your day-to-day interaction in your marriage, that rug gets a little harder to walk on. Resentments build. Eventually, the issue you’re fighting about stops being the real issue; the real issue becomes your inability to resolve any other issue.

Geraghty explains that the problem of the risk of divorce can be resolved by threats of divorce. More specifically, he argues that a marriage can be improved by the wife threatening to nuke the husband out of the family if she doesn’t get her way (emphasis mine):

The D-word can actually help a marriage full of conflict. It can be a great clarifier. Using the D-word is the DEFCON Two of marriage. (DEFCON is short for defense readiness condition, the alert state for the U.S. armed forces. DEFCON Five is the calmest, DEFCON One is the most severe, basically meaning nuclear war is imminent.) When your spouse uses the D-word, it is a screaming alarm klaxon that asks you just how much you care about whatever it is you’re fighting about at the moment.

Is it worth divorcing your wife over?

Put that starkly, most of the day-to-day problems in a marriage don’t look that bad. If you can back down from that moment, you’ve endured your marital equivalent of the Cuban Missile Crisis. John F. Kennedy’s 1963 point about the basic common links with the Soviets applies to most warring spouses: “We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children’s future. And we are all mortal.”

Note the weasellyness of the words he uses to blur what he is trying to say.

- He says “your spouse” threatens divorce when he means “your wife”, to make this seem gender neutral, when it clearly is not. He clarifies in the same chapter that he is writing specifically for heterosexual men.
- He says “Is it worth divorcing your wife over?” in reference to the wife threatening to divorce the husband if he doesn’t do as she says. She threatens divorce, and if he doesn’t comply he is implied to be divorcing his wife.
- He says “If you can back down from that moment” when he means “give her whatever she demands”. He already explained that merely stopping the argument is (in his opinion) the root cause of divorce, something threats of divorce will solve.

While Geraghty’s enthusiasm for the threatpoint isn’t surprising, his hypothesis that an ever present threat of divorce makes marriage better by forcing each issue to be resolved is the opposite of what this study found:
Many currently happily married spouses have had extended periods of marital unhappiness, often for quite serious reasons, including alcoholism, infidelity, verbal abuse, emotional neglect, depression, illness, and work reversals. Why did these marriages survive where other marriages did not? The marital endurance ethic appears to play a big role. Many spouses said that their marriages got happier, not because they and their partner resolved problems but because they stubbornly outlasted them. With time, they told us, many sources of conflict and distress eased. Spouses in this group also generally had a low opinion of the benefits of divorce, as well as friends and family members who supported the importance of staying married.

Moreover, one of the core claims of the book is that by following his advice men will become sexy. Geraghty’s wisdom from his own marriage is that as the husband he must always follow his wife’s lead, lest she divorce him. Follow Geraghty’s example, and you will become a stud, the sexiest man alive! Yet it is painfully obvious that he has absolutely no understanding of the mechanics of sexual attraction for women.

Cam Edwards has his own section in the same chapter, and he opens with a lengthy piece on how the negative impacts of divorce on children are overstated, contradicting Geraghty from earlier in the chapter:

Jim paints a pretty grim picture of the children of divorce: more likely to end up in prison, more likely to end up on a reboot of Teen Mom, and simply more likely to end up messed up than the product of a two parent family...

...I relate [my own] story because I’m not sure I buy the statistics that try to prove that divorce is going to cause irreparable harm to the kids involved. That’s not to say it doesn’t suck, but it’s also not an excuse to destroy your life if your parents end up splitting. Absolutely none of the parents I know who’ve gotten divorced say it was because they just had to get away from the kids, so try not to take it personally if it happens.

It is a very strange and uncompelling argument. First he explains that his own parents’ divorce didn’t negatively impact him, even though a string of counselors kept assuring him that it did. Then he says that after his mom moved him away from his father (from New Jersey to Oklahoma*) he resented his father so much for abandoning him that he refused to speak to him for years:

I actually didn’t talk to my dad for a couple of years after that. With the impeccable logic of a hormonal sixteen-year-old, I decided Dad’s belated gift must mean he didn’t care much about me. That being the case, I was bound and determined not to care much about him.

Next Edwards describes how his wife’s children were harmed by her own divorce and decision to move the children to a distant state*, with his wife’s ex husband as the villain:

Flash forward a few years and I was dealing with another father who was largely absent from the scene. Only this time it wasn’t my dad, it was the biological father of
my oldest kids. When my wife and her kids moved from New Jersey to Oklahoma, it’s not like anyone had any expectations that he would be able to come visit on a regular basis. Still, regular phone calls or letters to the kids would have been nice. When a birthday or a holiday would go by with no contact, I would see the looks of disappointment on the faces of my kids. I’d get so angry that I’d write letters to him that I never sent (eventually we wouldn’t even know where to send them). The fact that child support was sporadic (to say the least) didn’t bother me. We could take care of our family without his money. What killed me was seeing my kids go from disappointment that they didn’t hear from their biological father to the resigned expectation that he was going to let them down again. Eventually, on one rare occasion when he called, my daughter declined to talk with him. The next time he called, my son followed his sister’s lead. Their dad never called back.

Edwards then finally gets around to the topic of the chapter, and offers some murky advice on avoiding divorce. Unlike Geraghty, Edwards suggests that an unwillingness to divorce is a key factor to remaining married. However, he then concludes by saying that we shouldn’t judge people who don’t follow his advice:

I understand that not all differences are reconcilable, and most of the friends I’ve had who’ve gone through a divorce tried very hard to make their marriages work. Both my parents married multiple times, and if it weren’t for my wife and her ex splitting up, I would never be the man I am today. I am not here to condemn divorce or people who’ve gotten a divorce (I generally try to tend to the beam in my own eye before worrying about someone else’s mote). All I know is that I’m glad we stuck with it through the hard times. I’m thankful our differences were (and are) not irreconcilable, even if they can still lead to... let’s say spirited debate on occasion. I am truly blessed to have my family, to love them and be loved by them, and I’m mindful of this fact every day.

As is evidently the pattern for the entire book, the chapter ends with What Would Ward Cleaver Do?

Ward had his priorities straight: he kept his focus on his relationship with June and the kids. Work paid for the mortgage, but a marriage and family is forever.

*What are the odds that Edwards would marry a woman who just like his own mother moved her children to Oklahoma, away from their father in New Jersey?
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Go.

by Dalrock | February 24, 2017 | Link

I am inspired by the immense wisdom of Sugar to write to all of the married men who want to break up their families but lack the courage to do what their heart is screaming is right. Go. Do it for God. Do it for you. Do it for your children, for what are you teaching them if you lack the courage to follow your dreams? Do it to inspire other fathers to model courage and righteousness to their own children. But for whatever reason you do it, the important thing is that you summon the courage to do what is right:

Go, even though you love her.
Go, even though she is kind and faithful and dear to you.
Go, even though she’s your best friend and you’re hers.
Go, even though you can’t imagine your life without her.
Go, even though she adores you and your leaving will devastate her.
Go, even though your friends will be disappointed or surprised or pissed off or all three.
Go, even though you once said you would stay.
Go, even though you’re afraid of being alone.
Go, even though you’re sure no one will ever love you as well as she does.
Go, even though there is nowhere to go.
Go, even though you don’t know exactly why you can’t stay.
Go, because you want to.
Because wanting to leave is enough.
A god we must obey.

by Dalrock | February 26, 2017 | Link

14 and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. 15 Yet she will be saved through childbearing—if they continue in faith and love and holiness, with self-control.

— 1 Tim 2:14-15, ESV

Minesweeper was kind enough to provide a link to the original source I was reworking in my previous satirical post. Strayed’s message to women is extremely common, and a message modern women can’t hear often enough. The message is that women become more moral by casting off obligation and following their own desires. We see this message to women so often that it doesn’t stand out. Even when we see it, the full absurdity of it isn’t visible unless you switch the sexes.

This teaching is just one variant of the modern message that women need to worship themselves and their feelings. The highest virtue for women today is not to do their duty and honor their obligations, but to cast off duty and obligation and be true to themselves. Strayed explains that a woman’s own desires are a god she must obey and worship:

I didn’t want to stay with my ex-husband, not at my core, even though whole swaths of me did. And if there’s one thing I believe more than I believe anything else, it’s that you can’t fake the core. The truth that lives there will eventually win out. It’s a god we must obey, a force that brings us all inevitably to our knees. And because of it, I can only ask the four women who wrote to me with the same question: will you do it later or will you do it now?
This concept didn’t begin with Strayed, or even second wave feminism. The vow for the UK equivalent of the Girl Scouts, the Girl Guides, originally included:

- do my duty to God

In 1910 this was modified to remove a sense of obligation to God, and substitute it with emotional feelings for God*:

- to love my God

This was then changed in 2013 to:

- be true to myself and develop my beliefs

We also don’t get this merely from secular sources, or even just from liberal Christian leaders. Women’s feelings are regarded by modern conservative Christians as something holy, divinely inspired. Thus we are taught that wives are light years closer to God than their husbands, and that wives are channeling God’s will when they throw godly tantrums. This is especially true when it comes to women’s sexual/romantic feelings. Pastors Dave Wilson and Dr. R. Albert Mohler Jr. both teach that a wife’s sexual attraction (or lack thereof) to her husband is a signal from God regarding her husband’s righteousness.

Another form of this message is the idea that a woman’s sexual/romantic desires are sanctifying. Drs Mohler and Moore teach that the romantic feelings of the wife (instead of the commitment of marriage) are needed to purify sex. Without the wife providing the purifying cover of her romantic desire, married sex becomes dirty, merely rubbing body parts together.
Former CBMW president Owen Strachan had something similar in mind when he described God honoring romance. All of this of course goes back just under a thousand years to the idea of courtly love, which CS Lewis describes as:

> The sentiment, of course, is love, but love of a highly specialized sort, whose characteristics may be enumerated as Humility, Courtesy, Adultery, and the Religion of Love. The lover is always abject. Obedience to his lady’s lightest wish, however whimsical, and silent acquiescence in her rebukes, however unjust, are the only virtues he dares to claim.

Strayed also teaches that a woman’s sexual/romantic desires are sacred, holy, and sanctifying. However, it is easier to see the ugliness when Strayed teaches it:

> ...in order to heal [my wounds] I needed fifty men and three good women to have sex with me.

**The Brilliant Lie.**

There is a key lie that is used to sell the idea that women become more moral by being self-centered. This is the lie that women’s nature, their great fault, is to forever put others before themselves, and to feel guilty whenever they don’t put others first. This is exactly the message self-centered women want to hear most, and it is why the message of virtuous self-centeredness, of holy selfishness, is so wildly popular in all forms of media aimed at women. This is again both a secular and a modern Christian message. When Strayed tells women they will be more moral if they divorce, she explains:

> Doing what one wants to do because one wants to do it is hard for a lot of people, but I think it’s particularly hard for women. We are, after all, the gender onto which a giant Here To Serve button has been eternally pinned. We’re expected to nurture and give by the very virtue of our femaleness, to consider other people’s feelings and needs before our own.

Notice how amazingly similar the message from Strayed above is to the message Sheila Gregoire is selling to Christian women in Guilt makes the woman go around:

**We women feel guilty about everything.** In fact, they say that the most common emotion women feel is guilt...

We feel guilty for relaxing, for reading a novel and leaving the housework behind, for spending money on a manicure instead of on paying down debt, and for feeding everyone cereal for dinner.

... We feel guilty for not saving more, not loving more, not giving more. ...
Men find it easier to shrug guilt off, go out on the porch, and relax. They don’t tend to bother themselves with silly things like housework standards, menu standards, or etiquette. And they don’t even have to go through labour! They’ve got it easy. But perhaps they just aren’t as susceptible to this particular foible as women are. Instead of listening to God for what we should do, we tend to let society, the media, and the church culture set our standards. It’s no wonder we feel like we’re always falling short.

Maybe, we should try, just for one day, to be a man and not to feel guilt about stupid things. Let’s stop listening to those voices in our head and just seek out God’s voice. It’s worth the effort. If only someone would fold the laundry for me while I tried.

This is a common theme for Gregoire, and you can see another example in her complaint about women being asked to make sandwiches for funerals.

What we are seeing here is a very old pattern, where women are strongly tempted to put themselves (or their feelings) in the place of God, and men are strongly tempted to go along. Put another way, women are tempted to worship themselves, and men are tempted to worship women.

*Loving God* properly means to obey God, but since *obeying* God had to be removed and replaced with *loving* God it is clear this is not what the new vow meant.

**See Also:**

- [The cult of women’s self esteem.](#)
- [The sin of lacking moxie.](#)
- [Repenting of sexual morality.](#)
The ugly feminist compulsion to mark all things masculine as feminine knows no bounds. As single mother Emily McCombs at The Huffington Post explains, now ugly feminist mothers have turned to marking their own sons as feminine in a futile attempt to assuage their envy of men:

All the moms at my son’s school have been gushing about the Cat & Jack line for kids since Target released it last summer. Now there’s an additional reason to love the brand: their “Strong Like Mom” T-shirts that are grabbing the attention of feminist moms everywhere.

That’s right. Strong... Like Mom. Not like Dad or any other boy. Strong like a girl.

The coming backlash will be fun to watch, and if T shirt vendors aren’t already printing up “Strong Like Dad” shirts they should be. While publicly marking their own sons as mama’s boys doesn’t bother these ugly feminists, they aren’t considering the status assault they are opening themselves up to from married mothers.
Alanna Vagianos at Huffington Post is excited to announce that for the month of March the Brawny Man will once again be doing his best Caitlin Jenner impersonation. As Vagianos explained last year:

The Brawny Man just became the Brawny Woman.

A new video campaign from paper towel brand Brawny tells consumers that #StrengthHasNoGender by transforming their iconic Brawny Man into a woman. For the past five decades, the Brawny Man has served as the face of Brawny paper towel products. Known for his manly mustache, red flannel shirt and “brawny” strength, the Brawny Man is a famous example of American masculinity.

But women can be “brawny” too.

This is hilarious, because Brawny has always been a brand/product aimed at women. There is no feminist envy payoff here, because the mascot for this woman’s product never was an icon of manhood, at least not to men. There is nothing to steal; it was theirs all along. They may as well dress up like Fabio and declare:

I can’t believe it’s not butter!

Moreover, a group of feminists dressing up in flannel shirts and sensible shoes isn’t remotely groundbreaking. Instead of women marking a masculine space as feminine, this campaign leaves us with the image of women around the country sticking it to the man by tidying up and preparing meals.

However, one of the commercials from the same campaign last year does manage to work in brawny sized feminist satisfaction. See the swelling feminist pride Linda Alvarado experiences when she describes the moment she realized she had finally stuck it to the man. That “the man” in her story was her own kindergarten aged son seems to have made this pettiness all the sweeter:

I was invited to my son’s kindergarten class for career day. They asked him “Do you want to be a contractor like your mother?” He said “No”. They said “No?” He said “No. (sighs) That’s women’s work.”

See also: Unquenchable
The Village Voice has a great picture of a statue placed on Wall Street for International Women’s Day (HT Instapundit).

Last night, on the eve of International Women’s Day, news outlets and social media seized on the mysterious appearance of a statue of a defiant young girl staring down the famous Charging Bull statue. As it turns out, the statue of the little girl symbolically defying Wall Street was installed by... Wall Street itself.

The statue perfectly captures the essence of feminism: A childish sense of defiance lacking a clear objective. It is childish defiance for the sake of childish defiance.

The feminists at Village Voice are quite taken with the statue itself, but complain that this feminist message comes from a patriarchal corporation. That feminist empowerment is portrayed by a girl, and not a woman, would at first seem counterintuitive. A statue honoring the strength of men would not substitute a boy for a man; this would be absurd. But it isn’t absurd for a statue ostensibly paying homage to the strength of women. Even 54 years after Betty Friedan published *The Feminine Mystique* and 51 years after she co-founded NOW, feminism is still somehow a perpetual brand new experiment. It is something we just know will bear good fruit if we could ever get around to trying it. The girl in the statue represents feminist optimism, in the same way the bull she is opposing represents optimism for our economy.

By making the statue a depiction of a young girl, the artist avoids the need to depict an actual woman doing whatever it is the feminists are sure women are going to do. It also caters to the emotion of feminism, which is based on a burning discontentment with being women, and a driving envy of men. Sticking it to the man is the underlying desire. It is about tearing men and their accomplishments down, not about women building something of their own. While a woman sticking it to the man is delightful, having a mere girl stick it to the man is even better.

And yet, the creator of the statue has a problem. The pose is of a bratty little girl standing defiantly across from the Wall Street bull. This is what you see in the side view photo from Village Voice. If the face on the statue matched the pose, it would also be of a bratty little girl. But while bratty little girl is the emotion the statue is intended to evoke, actually putting a bratty little girl’s face on the statue would go too far. A little girl with a vexed brow or sticking her tongue out would fit the pose, but not the idea of empowerment. Clearly the sculptor recognized this, and instead creepily placed the face of a woman on the body of the bratty girl. Flip back and forth between the side view and the front view to see what I mean; it is uncanny.

**Edit:** Sir Hamster pointed out the following video showing a real girl standing next to the statue.
Also, a quote from a woman on another video which came up on Youtube for me after viewing the one above:

...when we saw it we were very struck, almost emotionally. You know the bull is kind of a symbol of almost a male power in a way, and this little girl is just standing there triumphant. I think it's gorgeous. I love it.
I’ve touched on this before, but I think the chivalrous story of Lancelot fighting for Guinevere’s honor in Chrétien de Troyes’s Lancelot, the Knight of the Cart is worthy of a dedicated post. I should note that I have not read the original work, and all quotes and summaries in this post are from CS Lewis’ Allegory of Love and Infogalactic’s synopsis of the 12th century poem of chivalry and courtly love.

In the poem Lancelot challenges Meleagant to a fight to defend Guinevere’s honor after Meleagant accuses Guinevere of adultery, and this leads to Lancelot fighting in a tournament. However, as Lancelot is duty bound to follow his Lady’s every whim, he at first must humiliate himself by losing. From Infogalactic:

> When he finally did fight the tournament fighters, Guinevere asks for him to lose to prove his love. He obliges and when he starts to lose, Guinevere changes her proposal, now hoping for him to win. Lancelot complies and beats the other tournament competitors...

But a bit of back-story is needed to explain how Lancelot came to defend Guinevere’s honor at the tournament. Guinevere (King Arthur’s wife) was abducted by Meleagant, and Lancelot (one of Arthur’s knights) sets out on a quest to free her.

As one of the prime virtues in courtly love is a man debasing himself out of romantic love for another man’s wife, Lancelot is early on forced to humiliate himself by riding in a cart:

Lancelot encounters a cart-driving dwarf, who says he will tell Lancelot where Guinevere and her captor went if Lancelot agrees to ride in his cart. Lancelot boards the cart reluctantly since this is a dishonorable form of transport for a knight. Gawain, not about to demean himself, chooses to follow them on horseback. Along this journey they encounter many obstacles, with the most prominent one coming from other people being unwilling to talk to Lancelot due to his implied low status because of the cart.

The quote above is from Infogalactic. Lewis offers a more detailed explanation of the symbolism of the cart. The cart Lancelot rides in is no ordinary cart, but a tumbril, a cart to haul manure that was also used to humiliate criminals, similar to a cucking stool*

In this predicament he is met by a dwarf driving a tumbril. To his questions, the dwarf—surly like all his race—replies, ‘Get in, and I will bring you where you shall have news of the Queen’. The knight hesitates for a moment before mounting the cart of shame and thus appearing as a common criminal; a moment later he obeys. He is driven through streets where the rabble cry out upon him and ask what he has done and whether he is to be flayed or hanged.

After much hardship and humiliation, Lancelot finally encounters Guinevere. But his queen...
rebukes him coldly, because she has learned of his momentary hesitation in climbing into the tumbril:

When he has crossed the bridge, wounded in hands, knees, and feet, he comes at last into the presence of the Queen. She will not speak to him.

Eventually Guinevere warms to Lancelot, and she commits adultery with him. Ironically this is the act of adultery that Lancelot is defending. From Infogalactic:

They spend a passionate night together after Lancelot breaks into her tower. He injures his hand during his break-in, and leaves blood all over Guinevere’s sheets. Lancelot sneaks out of the tower before sunrise, and Meleagant accuses Guinevere of committing adultery with Kay, who is the only wounded knight nearby. Lancelot challenges Meleagant to a fight to defend Guinevere’s honor.

When conservatives mourn our ostensibly lost sense of chivalry in our feminist age, the values taught in tales like Lancelot, the Knight of the Cart are what they are referring to as lost virtue. Courtly love was from the very beginning a glorification of adultery, and a worship of women with men ritually debasing themselves to the intertwined sovereigns of romantic love and women. As Lewis explains, Lancelot worships Guinevere and her sexuality:

The submission which Lancelot shows in his actions is accompanied, on the subjective side, by a feeling that deliberately apes religious devotion. Although his love is by no means supersensual and is indeed carnally rewarded in this very poem, he is represented as treating Guinevere with saintly, if not divine, honours. When he comes before the bed where she lies he kneels and adores her...

Even after Lancelot worships Guinevere’s sexuality, and even while he is defending her (nonexistent) honor, Lancelot demonstrates the virtue of courtly love by yet again humiliating himself:

Even when he is forgiven, his trials are not yet at an end. The tournament at the close of the poem gives Guinevere another opportunity of exercising her power. When he has already entered the lists, in disguise, and all, as usual, is going down before him, she sends him a message ordering him to do his poorest. Lancelot obediently lets himself be unhorsed by the next knight that comes against him, and then takes to his heels, feigning terror of every combatant that passes near him. The herald mocks him for a coward and the whole field takes up the laugh against him: the Queen looks on delighted. Next morning the same command is repeated, and he answers, ‘My thanks to her, if she will so’. This time, however, the restriction is withdrawn before the fighting actually begins.53

Above I wrote that conservatives mourn the ostensible loss of chivalry, because the idea that a woman’s sexuality is divine is if anything more deeply rooted today than it was in the original works of courtly love nearly a thousand years ago. In the past this divinity was merely implied, but today we have conservative pastors explicitly teaching that a woman’s sexual desire (or lack thereof) is a message from God, and that a wife’s romantic love is needed to sanctify sex in marriage. We also have country music hits where men explicitly
worship their wives, singing about their sexuality as **holy and sanctifying**:

You're an angel. Tell me you're never leaving  
'Cause you're the first thing I know I can believe in

You're holy, holy, holy, holy  
I'm high on loving you, high on loving you  
You're holy, holy, holy, holy  
I'm high on loving you, high on loving you

You made the brightest days from the darkest nights  
You're the river bank where I was baptized  
Cleansed from the demons  
That were killing my freedom  
Let me lay you down, give me to ya  
Get you singing, babe, hallelujah  
We'll be touching  
We'll be touching heaven

What conservatives commonly mourn as a lost virtue is in reality a sickness that has grown more malignant over time. The problem with courtly love is not that it started as noble and was later twisted. The evil has been there all along, and it plays into a weakness men and women both exhibit going all the way back to **the fall in Genesis**.

*Tumbril is in fact an alternate name for a **cucking stool**.*
Several commenters have objected to my previous post, including Hugh Mann:

I think our gracious host doth read too much into these tales - I was brought up on them, and in none of the printed retellings popular in the pre-60s was it implied that the relationship of Lancelot and Guinevere was anything but a betrayal and a tragedy - THE betrayal, in that from it springs the shattering of the fellowship.

What Hollywood’s made of it since might be a different matter.

Commenter Sean Toddington also felt the need to defend Lancelot’s honor:

Firstly it is important to remember that these are fictional characters, and there are a few versions of it all. If you can’t be bothered to read the originals – Mallory is the main one – I suggest that you treat C.S. Lewis with caution.

Note that Toddington incorrectly claims that Thomas Malory’s Lancelot is the original that inspired Chrétien de Troyes. Yet this isn’t the case, as Malory was born several hundred years later. More importantly, both Toddington and Mann are missing the fundamental point of my previous post. The post was not a treatise on the King Arthur legend but about the way that the concept of courtly love has transformed our moral thinking. As C.S. Lewis explains in The Allegory of Love:

French poets, in the eleventh century, discovered or invented, or were the first to express, that romantic species of passion which English poets were still writing about in the nineteenth. They effected a change which has left no corner of our ethics, our imagination, or our daily life untouched, and they erected impassable barriers between us and the classical past or the Oriental present. Compared with this revolution the Renaissance is a mere ripple on the surface of literature. There can be no mistake about the novelty of romantic love: our only difficulty is to imagine in all its bareness the mental world that existed before its coming—to wipe out of our minds, for a moment, nearly all that makes the food both of modern sentimentality and modern cynicism. We must conceive a world emptied of that ideal of ‘happiness’—a happiness grounded on successful romantic love—which still supplies the motive of our popular fiction.

This transformation is so deep that we aren’t aware it ever happened, as we can’t conceive of any other way of thinking. The concept of courtly love has infected all forms of literature, and is the philosophical foundation for no fault divorce. Even (and especially) conservative Christian theology has adopted the concept of courtly love. Again from Lewis:

If the thing at first escapes our notice, this is because we are so familiar with the erotic tradition of modern Europe that we mistake it for something natural and universal and therefore do not inquire into its origins. It seems to us natural that love
should be the commonest theme of serious imaginative literature: but a glance at classical antiquity or at the Dark Ages at once shows us that what we took for ‘nature’ is really a special state of affairs, which will probably have an end, and which certainly had a beginning in eleventh-century Provence. It seems—or it seemed to us till lately—a natural thing that love (under certain conditions) should be regarded as a noble and ennobling passion: it is only if we imagine ourselves trying to explain this doctrine to Aristotle, Virgil, St. Paul, or the author of Beowulf, that we become aware how far from natural it is. Even our code of etiquette, with its rule that women always have precedence, is a legacy from courtly love and is felt to be far from natural in modern Japan or India. Many of the features of this sentiment, as it was known to the Troubadours, have indeed disappeared; but this must not blind us to the fact that the most momentous and the most revolutionary elements in it have made the background of European literature for eight hundred years.

Anyone who is tempted to white knight for Lancelot tales in general after reading my post illustrating the absurdity of courtly love using Chrétien de Troyes’ Lancelot, the Knight of the Cart is missing the broader point entirely. And yet there is also a reason we use the term white knight to describe men who feel compelled to rescue women from the consequences of their own bad behavior. As Know Your Meme explains (emphasis mine):

The term “white knight” is derived from the knight-errant stock character, a medieval figure in romance literature that would perform various acts to prove his chivalry. According to Wikipedia,[1] the term “knight-errant” was first recorded in the 14th-century poem Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, but was developed as a romance genre character during the late 12th century. The first Urban Dictionary[4] definition was submitted by user Jake on November 3rd, 2004, which defined the phrase as a male who attempts to aid a woman in distress.

The “romance genre” in question is the chivalric concept of courtly love, which brings us back to Lancelot and Chrétien de Troyes. From the Infogalactic version of the Wikipedia article referenced in Know Your Meme:

A knight-errant[1] (or knight errant[2]) is a figure of medieval chivalric romance literature. The adjective errant (meaning “wandering, roving”) indicates how the knight-errant would wander the land in search of adventures to prove his chivalric virtues, either in knightly duels (pas d’armes) or in some other pursuit of courtly love.

The template of the knight-errant are the heroes of the Round Table of the Arthurian cycle such as Gawain, Lancelot and Percival. The quest par excellence in pursuit of which these knights wander the lands is that of the Holy Grail, such as in Perceval, the Story of the Grail written by Chrétien de Troyes in the 1180s.

According to Infogalactic, while there is no canonical version of the Arthur tales, Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia Regum Britanniae is generally the starting point for Arthur, Guinevere,
and Excalibur. Yet it was Chrétien de Troyes who added Lancelot and transformed the story into romance:

Many elements and incidents that are now an integral part of the Arthurian story appear in Geoffrey’s Historia, including Arthur’s father Uther Pendragon, the wizard Merlin, Arthur’s wife Guinevere, the sword Excalibur, Arthur’s conception at Tintagel, his final battle against Mordred at Camlann, and final rest in Avalon. The 12th-century French writer Chrétien de Troyes, who added Lancelot and the Holy Grail to the story, began the genre of Arthurian romance that became a significant strand of medieval literature. In these French stories, the narrative focus often shifts from King Arthur himself to other characters, such as various Knights of the Round Table.

Chances are if you have a cherished tale of Lancelot, it has an embedded philosophy of courtly love and you never even noticed it. This is after all what we love about these tales, even though we aren’t aware that the very concept was manufactured some time in the twelfth century. We love it without being consciously aware that it even exists, because as Lewis explains it simply seems normal. Thomas Malory’s The Knight of the Cart, as just one example, is clearly based on Chrétien de Troyes’ Lancelot, the Knight of the Cart. In fact, it includes a nearly identical scene where Lancelot fights for Guinevere’s honor after she is rightly accused of adultery. From the Cliff’s Notes:

That night Launcelot goes to the queen’s room, tears an iron grill from her window, cutting his hand, and at her request lies with her. Melliagaunce sees the blood on the bed in the morning and accuses her of faithlessness to Arthur. To save Guinevere from execution at the stake, Launcelot says he will be her champion and sets a day for trial by battle.
In The Allegory of Love C.S. Lewis explains that because the concept of courtly love has fully transformed our view of sexual passion, we misread prior works as if they had the same theme. He uses the example of Ovid’s Art of Love, which he describes as an ironic poem on the art of seduction:

Ovid sat down to compose for the amusement of a society which well understood him an ironically didactic poem on the art of seduction. The very design of his Art of Love presupposes an audience to whom love is one of the minor peccadilloes of life, and the joke consists in treating it seriously—in writing a treatise, with rules and examples en rège for the nice conduct of illicit loves. It is funny, as the ritual solemnity of old gentlemen over their wine is funny. Food, drink, and sex are the oldest jokes in the world; and one familiar form of the joke is to be very serious about them.

He offers the following example from the poem:

Go early ere th’ appointed hour to meet The fair, and long await her in the street. Through shouldering crowds on all her errands run, Though graver business wait the while undone. If she commands your presence on her way Home from the ball to lackey her, obey! Or if from rural scenes she bids you, ‘Come’, Drive if you can, if not, then walk, to Rome, And let nor Dog-star heats nor drifted load Of whitening snows deter you from the road. Cowards, fly hence! Our general, Love, disdains Your lukewarm service in his long campaigns.

Lewis explains that this is a joke, mocking the foolish way men pedestalize women and set out to satisfy their every whim (truly a fool’s errand). Since we have adopted the foolish view of courtly love, we can’t imagine Ovid’s mocking as anything other than sincere:

No one who has caught the spirit of the author will misunderstand this. The conduct which Ovid recommends is felt to be shameful and absurd, and that is precisely why he recommends it—partly as a comic confession of the depths to which this ridiculous appetite may bring a man, and partly as a lesson in the art of fooling to the top of her bent the last baggage who has caught your fancy. The whole passage should be taken in conjunction with his other piece of advice—‘Don’t visit her on her birthday: it costs too much.’ But it will also be noticed—and this is a pretty instance of the vast change which occurred during the Middle Ages—that the very same conduct which Ovid ironically recommends could be recommended seriously by the courtly tradition. To leap up on errands, to
go through heat or cold, at the bidding of one’s lady, or even of any lady, would seem but honourable and natural to a gentleman of the thirteenth or even of the seventeenth century...
Is Gen. 29 a modern love story?
by Dalrock | March 21, 2017 | Link

Note: This began as a discussion in the comments section of Riding to Lancelot’s rescue, but it seems worthy of making into a quick post.

Commenter Kevin asks:

I agree that the obsession with romantic love is absurd. But I continue to be confused by the connection between our bizarre expectations and courtly love. Is Dalrock arguing that there was no concept of love or romance prior to courtly love? Or that courtly love was the beginning of the perversion?

Genesis 29 seems to be a love story. The concept of love and romance both licit and illicit is ancient.

There has always existed an emotional aspect of sexual desire/passion. What is novel is our focus on separating the emotional from the physical and declaring the emotional aspect pure, purifying, and holy. As C.S. Lewis explains, we struggle to even imagine how this was viewed prior to the transformation of courtly love. Gen. 29 is a great example of this (NIV version):

16 Now Laban had two daughters; the name of the older was Leah, and the name of the younger was Rachel. 17 Leah had weak[a] eyes, but Rachel had a lovely figure and was beautiful. 18 Jacob was in love with Rachel and said, “I’ll work for you seven years in return for your younger daughter Rachel.”

19 Laban said, “It’s better that I give her to you than to some other man. Stay here with me.” 20 So Jacob served seven years to get Rachel, but they seemed like only a few days to him because of his love for her.

21 Then Jacob said to Laban, “Give me my wife. My time is completed, and I want to make love to her.”

As Kevin points out, in our minds this is a modern love story, a romance. How could it possibly be anything else? We simply can’t imagine otherwise.

But take a look at the original Hebrew and how our translations cover it. I’m not trying to create the “correct” biblical interpretation*, but pointing out the different frame of mind of the Hebrew words vs the massive baggage we have in English about romantic love. Here is an example of how the passage would read choosing just three different English words:

16 Now Laban had two daughters; the name of the older was Leah, and the name of the younger was Rachel. 17 Leah had weak[a] eyes, but Rachel had a lovely figure and was beautiful. 18 Jacob liked Rachel and said, “I’ll work for you seven years in return for your younger daughter Rachel.”
19 Laban said, “It’s better that I give her to you than to some other man. Stay here with me.” 20 So Jacob served seven years to get Rachel, but they seemed like only a few days to him because of his sexual desire for her.

21 Then Jacob said to Laban, “Give me my wife. My time is completed, and I want to go into her.”

Cane Caldo pointed out that Jacob’s “love” for Rachel is not the sentimental, purifying true love of modern love tales:

1. Jacob loved Rachel because she was beautiful. He wasn’t “captivated by her inner beauty”. He didn’t “love her for who she was”. He wanted her to be his, and to have sex with her. Compare this to Dalrock’s post “Like a rutting buck”.

Indeed. So much so that Jacob didn’t realize he had spent the night having sex with the wrong sister until the next morning!

21 And Jacob said unto Laban, Give me my wife, for my days are fulfilled, that I may go in unto her.

22 And Laban gathered together all the men of the place, and made a feast.

23 And it came to pass in the evening, that he took Leah his daughter, and brought her to him; and he went in unto her.

24 And Laban gave unto his daughter Leah Zilpah his maid for an handmaid.

25 And it came to pass, that in the morning, behold, it was Leah: and he said to Laban, What is this thou hast done unto me? did not I serve with thee for Rachel? wherefore then hast thou beguiled me?

Moreover, as Cane also points out, we are never told that Rachel had any romantic or sexual feelings toward Jacob; Jacob never “wins her heart”. Contrast this with 1 Sam 18 where we learn that Michal was in love with David:

20 Now Saul’s daughter Michal was in love with David, and when they told Saul about it, he was pleased. 21 “I will give her to him,” he thought, “so that she may be a snare to him and so that the hand of the Philistines may be against him.”

Jacob offers to work for Rachel’s father for seven years, and her father replies that he may as well give her to Jacob instead of some other man:

19 Laban said, “It’s better that I give her to you than to some other man. Stay here with me.”

And yet, as Lewis explains, the legacy of the courtly love revolution means that we can’t read stories like Gen 29 in any other way than as a “love story”.
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This is not to say that Jacob had no emotional feelings for Rachel. If he didn't have strong emotional feelings for her before the wedding he certainly had them by the time of her death. But the story of their “courtship” is anything but romantic, and the description of Jacob wanting to marry her so he could have sex with her is about as straightforward as it could be. There is also not even an inkling of the idea that romantic love is pure or sanctifying in this story. But the legacy of courtly love hovers over us like a supermassive black hole, warping everything relating to sex and marriage with a nearly irresistible force in our minds. We just don’t notice it because from our perspective it has always been there.

*Just as everyone with access to an acetylene torch is tempted to fancy themselves a welder, everyone with access to Strongs is tempted to see themselves as a scholar of Hebrew. For the record, I am neither a welder nor a scholar of Hebrew. My point is not to offer the correct interpretation/translation of the passage, but to give a sense of the immense baggage the words have in English.
I’ve been swamped all week and will be even more so over the next few days. I’ll be turning on moderation in a few hours, and probably won’t turn it back off until early next week.

In the meantime, if you crave high quality Christian Manosphere discussion, there are lively discussions over at:

1. American Dad: June Cleaver might be unmarriagable right now. Scott published the post this morning and as of 3:30 Central Time it already has 67 comments.
2. Cane Caldo: Where We Used to Live Isn’t Cane posted this yesterday and it currently has 11 comments.

I would also recommend Still Amusing over at Vox Day’s Alpha Game. Hilarious!

Feel free to add any other blogs/posts you think readers would enjoy before I turn moderation on, including plugs for your own blog.
Lancelot and the gruesome demand for the Full Titanic Experience.

by Dalrock | March 27, 2017 | Link

Five years ago this January the cruise ship Costa Concordia ran aground at 11:45 PM with 4,252 souls on board. The engine compartments were quickly flooded, and the ship eventually capsized and sank. Miraculously, all but 32 of the souls on board were rescued. That so many were rescued is astounding given that the ship capsized at night, before the required lifeboat drill had been conducted, and with water temperatures estimated in the mid to upper 50s. It is even more miraculous given the astoundingly bad decisions the captain made after running aground, including*:

1. Delaying reporting the collision to the Coast Guard, and concealing the nature of the problem from the Coast Guard when contacted nearly 30 minutes after running aground.
2. Delaying the order to muster to the lifeboat stations until nearly 45 minutes after the collision, and delaying the abandon ship order until nearly an hour and ten minutes after the collision.

Almost immediately after the shipwreck there were a series of articles complaining that something was missing in the Costa Concordia shipwreck. That something was the romantic gesture made by men on the Titanic 100 years earlier. Unlike on the Titanic, men on the Costa Concordia evacuated the ship along with women and children. This, along with what appear to be three endlessly repeated anecdotal accounts (out of over 4,000 survivors) that some individual men were less than courteous when entering the lifeboats, lead to complaints that the men who survived the shipwreck were collectively a group of brutes and cowards, who had deprived us all of a grand romantic gesture. As National Review Editor Rich Lowry complained in the opening of Dude, where’s my lifeboat?

When they make the movie about the Costa Concordia, the cruise ship that grounded off the coast of Tuscany, there won’t be romantic tales about its captain.

Lowry’s article was a complaint about the lack of romance accompanying the Concordia disaster. While on the Titanic men dressed up in preparation for their deaths and the band romantically played on, on Concordia men focused on getting their loved ones to safety. As Lowry laments in closing, what the Concordia lacked was a romantic “grace note” as the ship went down:

The Titanic went down, they say, to the strains of the hymn “Nearer, My God, to Thee,” as the band courageously played on. It lent a final grace note to the tragedy. Today, we don’t do grace notes. We’ve gone from “Women and children, first,” to “Dude, where’s my lifeboat?” As the women of the Costa Concordia can testify, that’s a long way down.

That grace note that Lowry pines for however would have come at the cost of a much larger
loss of life for men, women and children. Lowry doesn’t come out and say that more deaths would have made Concordia more satisfying to his chivalrous sensibilities, but I see no other way to interpret his gruesome demand for more romance and flair on a shipwreck where it is clear that the vast majority of the men on board handled themselves admirably. There is simply no way that the average man could have handled himself otherwise and have 99.25% of the lives saved.

What Lowry and many others specifically lamented was the lack of a “Women and Children First” (WACF) evacuation policy. This is the romantic gesture that made Titanic, with its loss of 1,513 lives, the gold standard of feel-good shipwrecks. For those who might think I’m being unfair to Lowry and others like him, I should point out that there are no serious arguments that the romantic policy enacted on the Titanic would have saved lives on Concordia. If the goal is to save lives, the best policy is to carry excess lifeboat capacity and load passengers on the lifeboats as they arrive at the muster stations. This is the policy that was (belatedly) followed on Concordia, and this is what left Lowry and others feeling so cheated.

In fact, the romantic gesture Lowry and others crave would have created chaos on the dark, sinking Costa Concordia and have cost many lives. Of course, as far as romantic gestures go more deaths, especially the deaths of more men, would be more satisfying to the spectators. Yet this gruesome desire to emotionally feast on the deaths of hundreds (perhaps even thousands) of men would come at great cost not just to the men who died, but to the women and children on board as well. WACF may make sense in some very extreme exceptions, but as a rule it greatly hampers evacuation in a time of danger, stress, and confusion. The reason is that in times of danger women and children quite understandably:

1. Want to ensure the survival of all of their loved ones, including men.
2. Don’t want to separate from the men who are protecting them.

WACF greatly slows the process of evacuation, as women tend to refuse to be separated from their men. In the prototype for WACF, the sinking of the HMS Birkenhead, the women had to be forcibly picked up and dropped into the lifeboats, as the Daily Mail notes:

> When the ship foundered, the soldiers’ commander told his men to ‘stand fast!’ and allow women and children to make use of the few lifeboats on the vessel.

> Some women did not want to go on their own — they had to be torn away from their husbands, carried over to the bulwark and dropped over the ship’s side. Most of the soldiers and sailors aboard drowned or were eaten by sharks, but all the women and children survived, and the chivalric ethos became known as the Birkenhead Drill...

The same thing greatly hampered the evacuation on the Titanic, resulting in not all of the lifeboats being launched, and the ones which were launched being sparsely filled. Chuck Anesi explains.

> All 14 lifeboats, the two emergency boats, and two of the Engelhardt boats were
launched. These had a capacity of 1,084 passengers. Obviously, many boats were not loaded to full capacity. There were many reasons for this; at first, many women and children were simply unwilling to be lowered 65 feet from the boat deck to the water. Some of the men put in boats were put there simply to show it was safe, and allay the fears of other passengers.

This chaos not only lead to the needless deaths of over five hundred men, but the deaths of 52 children and over 100 women.

There was enough lifeboat capacity for ALL women and children (534 persons total), AND 550 men as well. (Total capacity of the boats launched was 1,084.) This explains why, especially as the situation became more urgent, more men were put in the boats. Indeed, if the boat crews had loaded one man for each woman or child loaded, they could have expected to save all women and children, plus as many men.

For an example of the anguish and chaos this policy caused, see the example offered in Titanic Wikia of the final life boat to be launched, Collapsible D:

Collapsible lifeboat D was the ninth and last boat to be lowered from the port side. Second Officer Lightoller had managed to fit the collapsible boat into the now-empty davits of boat 1. He tried to find women to fill it with, but had trouble in finding any. Finally, he said, he managed to fill the boat with 15-20 people...

The Sun on April 23rd, 1912 gave the account of Mrs Hoyt, one of the women who was on board that final life boat. Like on the Birkenhead, she had to be physically thrown into the lifeboat because she did not want to leave her husband:

Mrs. Hoyt gave a concise account of the tragedy to her father. She did not leave her husband’s side until the last boat was being lowered and then she was torn from him and thrown into a boat.

Fortunately for Mrs. Hoyt (and her husband), Mr. Hoyt made it on board the lifeboat by diving into the icy water and swimming toward the boat:

Frederick Hoyt, who had escorted his wife to the craft and then calculated where the boat would row and thought that if he jumped and swam in that direction, they would pick him up.

The article on Collapsible D notes that there was plenty of extra room on the boat when it was picked up by a responding ship:

There were probably about 20 or 22 (not quite half-filled) in it when he had been picked up.

The foolishness that caused Mrs Hoyt to have to be physically thrown into the lifeboat, and her husband to have to swim to join her on the half empty boat can be traced back to Lancelot and the concept of courtly love. From the Daily Mail:
Mark Girouad, a great social and architectural historian, in his book on Chivalry In Victorian And Edwardian England, says the ‘chivalric’ treatment of women was part and parcel of the Victorians’ cult of the ‘gentleman’ and the ‘amateur’.

The great heroes of the Edwardian and pre-World War I days, such as Captain Scott, were passionate amateurs, and saw themselves as knights errant, women as damsels in distress.

The sacrifice made by over 1,000 men aboard the Titanic over 100 years ago, was profoundly noble. The same is true for the hundreds of soldiers and sailors who perished on board the HMS Birkenhead. But the ghoulish demands by shipwreck spectators for other men to sacrifice themselves is despicable, and something we have yet to come to terms with. The wicked worship of romantic love and adultery that began in the 12th century has not only devastated our families, but it also poses a very real risk to the safety of men, women, and children in cases of disaster.

*Captain Francesco Schettino's lawyers claimed that he heroically decided to delay the launch of the lifeboats because he knew the sinking ship would drift back towards land and he wanted to avoid having lifeboats drift away in the night. However, his decision at the same time to tell the Coast Guard that the rapidly sinking ship merely had an electrical problem makes this argument difficult to take seriously.
An eyewitness account of WACF.

by Dalrock | March 29, 2017 | Link

By way of Encyclopedia Titanica, the words of Titanic survivor Mrs. Emil Taussig as reported by the New York Times on April 22nd 1912:

“Only twenty women were near the boat, and these were put in. My daughter Ruth was among the first, but I said that I wouldn’t go if my husband did not accompany me. There was room for fourteen more after the last woman had found her place, and they all pleaded to let the men take the empty seats.

“But the Captain said that he would not allow it. I was frantic. There was that boat, ready to be lowered into the water and only half full. Then the order came to lower. The men were pleading for permission to step in, and one came forward to take a place next to his wife. I heard a shot and I am sure it was he that went down.

“Then the boat swung out from the deck. I was still with my husband, and Ruth had already disappeared below the deck. I gave a great cry—I remember perfectly calling out the name of my daughter—and two men tore me from my husband’s side, lifted me, one by the head and one by the feet, and dropped me over the side of the deck into the lowering boat. I struck on the back of my head, but I had furs on, and that fact probably saved me from greater injury.

“The terrible thing was that we had so much room left for the poor men who were snatched away...

According to the biographical page for Mr. Taussig on Encyclopedia Titanica, he did not survive.

Mr Taussig escorted his wife and daughter to a lifeboat (number 8) before standing back. He was lost in the sinking and his body, if recovered, was never identified.
LARPing Lancelot
by Dalrock | March 29, 2017 | Link

When researching my recent posts I came across a 2013 blog post by “Word Warrior” Barry Jacobsen titled CHIVALRY IS DEAD, LADIES: AND IT’S (PARTIALLY) YOUR FAULT!

Jacobsen took the sinking of the Concordia as an opportunity to position himself as the only real man in the room (emphasis mine):

…I have led what most would consider an enviably active and adventurous life; leading some of my friends to call me the “REAL most interesting man in the world” (forget that aging Latin lothario!). So it is with some degree of authority and an even greater degree of disgust that I say: I am sickened by my fellow men today.

As a man raised by a WWII veteran with a strong sense of chivalry (particularly toward women), I am disgusted with what passes today for manhood. So many men are mere shadows of what their gender represented in generations past. Military service members excepted (which include an amazing collection of very fine young men) most men today aren’t fit to carry the water of the “Greatest Generation”, my father’s generation; much less the dauntless knights who originally defined “chivalry”.

Like Lowry, Jacobsen was deeply troubled that men evacuated alongside of women and children in Costa Concordia (emphasis mine):

But I was strongly reminded that by modern standards I am a veritable John Wayne compared to most men today; by what happen on 13 January 2012; when the cruise ship Costa Concordia ran aground off the coast of Tuscany.

When this occurred we were treated to the sickening sight of men elbowing women and children aside in their frantic, rat-like scurry for the life-rafts. When the first of these life boats arrived on shore, aid workers were expecting to see them filled with women and children. Right? Instead, they saw lots of burly Tony Soprano-wannabes accompanied by their well-dressed wives and “goomahs”!

After a few paragraphs explaining what a proper shipwreck should look like (the Titanic), Jacobsen gets back to how much better he is than other men:

When I look at today’s young men I see a bunch of pierced, tattooed, slovenly louts. These are not men: they are “manlings”. Boys that never grow beyond their toys.

A beautiful 29 year old acquaintance of mine complains that her husband spends much of his time at work (in his parents Real Estate business) playing online poker. He then comes home, eats the dinner she has prepared for him, and then flops down on his Lazy Boy and plays X-Box most of the night! Never mind that his very sexy wife has needs of her own. When he is too tired to continue playing, he goes to bed.
and passes out.

Not a man: a manling.

While Jacobsen desperately wants the ladies reading (including perhaps one very sexy married lady) to know that he is a real man unlike the man-ling's they are wasting their time with, the point of the post is that **women** are partially to blame for the fact that other men aren't as amazing as Jacobsen is:

But women must accept at least some of the blame for the current deplorable, degraded state of modern manhood.

Not to blame the victim here, but consider: Its women, after all, that raise men (all too often without a man in the house). It’s mostly young female teachers that teach our boys in their most formative years. And, ultimately, its women who accept and give themselves to “manlings”; rewarding thuggish, uncouth behavior by going out with and marrying such cretins.

Were women to choose wisely in their mates, picking the “nice guy” over the “bad boy”; then the old adage that “nice guys finish last” wouldn’t be so sadly true. Were women to demand that the men in their lives not treat them like slutty sex objects; but instead commit to them and family before mating, than many more boys would have involved fathers providing male role models in their lives.

Were mothers to raise boys to be gentleman with a sense of honor, they would grow up into men those mothers could be proud of.

Feminist politics, political correctness, and (most importantly) lack of male role models has left this generation of men with no clue how to behave as MEN!

The obvious part he leaves out is that women aren’t just making babies with sexy badboys who then don’t stick around. Very large numbers of women are marrying honest (but boring) men, having children with these men, and then kicking the men out of the home. How is it that Jacobsen hasn’t noticed this? Has he lived a sheltered life, away from the dysfunction of our modern family structure? How can he not see the anguish of good fathers having their children ripped away from them?

This brings me to Jacobsen’s bio page. According to his bio he is ex Special Forces, and likes to Live Action Role Play (LARP) as a medieval knight:

I’ve been a medieval combat reenactor for 35 years; and a Knight and Count within the Society for Creative Anachronisms since 1978 and 1980 respectively. It was within the Society that I formed the Spartan Warband in 2004, a national combat group that recreates the warrior culture of ancient Sparta.

While some men merely daydream about being a white knight, Jacobsen walks the walk and dresses up as one.
But this doesn’t explain how he hasn’t noticed that women are kicking good fathers out of the home. This is after all an epidemic. At the end of the bio we learn:

| On a personal note, I have 3 amazing children (with two amazing ex-wives). |

This of course leaves us with two options. Either Jacobsen is one of the man-lings who impregnate women and then either abandon them or are kicked out due to abuse, adultery, etc, or he has been cast out of his children’s lives for no good reason by not one but two “amazing” women.

My guess is the latter, since this would be most in line with his LARPing Sir Lancelot. Lancelot’s corrupted sense of honor lead him to cover for the crimes of an adulterous woman. The legacy of this corrupted sense of honor is all around us. Calling women to account is difficult, and feels terrible. While changing the focus to men allows a white knight to avoid what he fears while positioning himself as heroic. In this sense chivalry really is about protecting the weak, in the form of weak men protecting themselves. However, this self protection comes at the expense of both women (who are suffering due to a lack of moral leadership by men) and the truly weak and innocent, the children.

See Also:

- Why he won’t hear it.
- Don’t fear marriage and fatherhood, but beware those who are working to destroy your family.
What’s worse than man face? The schmoes who are attracted to it.

by Dalrock | March 31, 2017 | Link

Instapundit linked to a brutal piece on The Death of Women’s Bodybuilding. Even the author’s ostensible defense of female body builders is devastating:

However true that may seem on the onset, in reality, no man has the right to say that. Personal femininity is defined by each woman for herself and of herself; even if what’s staring at her in the mirror has developed a man face — five-o’clock shadow and all.

Even the seemingly gnarliest of females have an aspect of femininity. As long as she has a va-jay-jay and all X chromosomes, she could make a vintage cigar store Indian look like Cameron Diaz and somewhere in there is going to be a vestige of what makes her feel like a girl.

But the author’s greatest disgust is reserved for the men who find such women attractive:

Interestingly, there is a subculture that finds these extreme cases of masculinized women attractive and/or desirable. We tend to label these people “schmoes” — men who sexually fetishize female bodybuilders.

I used to look at these men in disgust for their perverse nature, booking private sessions for “posing” and “wrestling” and other general kinkiness. But, in respect to the female bodybuilders out there still intent on pushing the envelope, I’m going to change my mind.

These guys have shown their worth in saving some semblance of the upper echelon of female bodybuilding by putting their money where their whack-off lube is.

The disdain for schmoes is common in the industry. Even the women who dedicate their lives to being hugely muscular are disgusted by the kind of man who would find hugely muscular women attractive. From a Muscle Insider column Schmoes in Bodybuilding:

Go to any top bodybuilding show and hang out in the lobby near the female bodybuilders, and you’ll see them swarming around them like ants near a picnic basket! My first encounter with a schmoe was many years ago at a top bodybuilding contest. I was talking shop with a very muscular female pro bodybuilder who was in all the magazines at the time. All of the sudden she grimaced, tried to hide behind me, and cursed under her breath. Unfortunately, a schmoe had her in his sights and was making a beeline straight for her.

Even a post from femalemuscleblog trying to salvage the view of schmoes admits that schmoes are most commonly seen as disgusting for being turned on by women with large...
The term schmoe is a term used describe hardcore fans of female bodybuilders. They should not be confused with other men who just likes muscular women. Schmoes like a certain type of muscular woman. They like the most muscular, strongest, and athletic woman. Although schmoes are fans of the female bodybuilding in particular, they also enjoy fitness, figure, bikini, and physique competitions. Feelings about these types of fans are divided in the fitness industry. Usually, the term has a negative connotation. Stereotypes range from schmoes being perverts, awkward, pathetic, fetishists, or men with some form of mental defect...

...The idea of schmoes being mentally disturbed is repeated constantly. Liking muscular women can hardly be described as a mental disorder. It would be ludicrous to say so.
I pointed out a few weeks ago that the concept of courtly love has thoroughly changed how we read stories like Gen 29 in the Bible. Where the Bible describes a very raw sexual passion, we see a modern romance story. For just one example of this, see Bible.org’s 4. Never Satisfied! – The Story of Jacob and Rachel. This piece is a chapter out of a 1978 book by Dr. Richard L. Strauss originally titled Famous Couples in the Bible. Long time readers will recall Dr. Strauss as the originator of the theology of Women as responders.

When a man claims that his wife doesn’t love him anymore he is unwittingly admitting that he hasn’t loved her as he should have.

Strauss has clearly had a huge impact on modern Christian thought about marriage, which explains why his ideas are still taught by Bible.org. Strauss’ teaching on Gen 29 comes straight out of the Book of Oprah, so it isn’t surprising that it is so well loved. Strauss frames Jacob as a sensitive new age guy who wasn’t afraid to express his emotions, unlike the brutes of the 1970s:

...“Then Jacob kissed Rachel, and lifted his voice and wept” (Gen. 29:11). The emotion of the moment overwhelmed him. The miracle of God’s guidance and care, the thrill of meeting his pretty cousin, the prospect of what the future would hold—all of it filled his heart so full that he wept for joy. Our culture frowns on a man expressing his emotions like this, but honestly expressing one’s feelings might promote greater emotional health and greater marital stability.

Strauss continues, warning that Jacob’s expression of 1970s emotional vulnerability might not be enough to keep this marriage together. While an emotionally vulnerable husband is essential, for a marriage to last what is needed most is true love:

It seems as though this romance was off to a blazing start. The neighborhood beauty and the new boy in town had found each other. But from the beginning we are a little dubious about the match. We know that a relationship based primarily on physical attraction rests on a shaky foundation. Hollywood has given us some good evidence for that thesis. And the marital misfortunes of the proverbial football hero and homecoming queen bear it out too. They can make their marriage succeed, but it will take a little extra effort, and they will need to make their relationship grow far beyond the physical magnetism that got it started.

But when a man is enamored of a woman, he does not want to hear those things. He is going to have her, and nothing else matters. It was only one month after Jacob arrived in Haran that Uncle Laban approached him to see if they could work out a mutually acceptable wage arrangement. The Scripture says that Jacob loved Rachel and offered to serve Laban seven years for her hand in marriage (Gen. 29:18). He
had nothing to offer Laban for his daughter, so his labor was promised in lieu of a dowry. **Now we are even more dubious. One month is hardly sufficient time for us to get to know someone well enough to make a lifelong commitment, and it surely is not enough time to learn whether or not we are in love. True love requires thorough knowledge.** To profess to love someone we do not know intimately is merely to love our mental image of that person. And if he does not measure up to our mental image, then our so-called “love” turns to disillusionment and resentment, and sometimes to hatred.

Strauss’ whole analysis of Gen 29 is rooted in an assumption that our **moral elevation of romantic love** and our **corresponding invention of no fault divorce** are biblical concepts:

But Jacob thought he was in love. When Rachel was near, his heart pounded faster and a wonderful feeling swept over him. She was the most beautiful creature he had ever laid eyes on, and he felt life without her would be worthless. That was enough for him. “So Jacob served seven years for Rachel and they seemed to him but a few days because of his love for her” (Gen. 29:20). That is a remarkable statement. In fact, they are about the loveliest words ever penned of a man’s feeling for a woman. Seven years is a long time to wait, and I think Jacob really did grow to love Rachel during those years. The physical attraction was still there, but he could not live in such close contact with her through a seven-year engagement period and not learn a great deal about her, both good and bad. **This marriage was to see hard times, but had it not been for this long engagement and Jacob’s deepening and maturing love, it probably would not have survived at all.**

This perversion crept into our theology long ago, and no one seems to have noticed. One of the criticisms about my posts on courtly love has been that I’m making too much out of an 11th century literary movement. The problem is that these ideas have so thoroughly changed our thinking that they are now just how we see the world. We don’t think courtly love changed our thinking because we think the moral teachings of courtly love come from God, from the Bible.
As always, it would be petty to point out how petty this is.
How much girlpower is too much?

by Dalrock | April 7, 2017 | Link

Trailer #2 for the upcoming Transformer movie includes an industrial strength dose of girlpower:

The comments on youtube are brutal, including this one from Infamous Greed:

I was hoping for some robot on robot beat down, then they had to cut to the girl every few seconds, I mean damn! I get it, I get your point! you’re a strong girl! now let me see some robot action in peace!

And this one from AFiveSeven

Why is she talking to the camera like she’s trying to sell me her stank ass deodorant? Feminism really is cancer, how hard is it to just make her badass without the arrogance of “AND I A GURL TOO”

And perhaps best stated by MrGojira95:

This girl is giving me bad memories of Scrappy Doo. (Cringe) >_<

Modern audiences will accept a mountain of SJW nonsense, but as Marvel recently admitted, there is a limit. Push too far and eventually they will push back.

What we heard was that people didn’t want any more diversity. They didn’t want female characters out there. That’s what we heard, whether we believe that or not. I don’t know that that’s really true, but that’s what we saw in sales.

This doesn’t mean the new Transformers movie won’t be a smashing success. The movie could bomb the way that Ghostbusters did last year, or it could be a huge success like Logan was this year.

However, the main Logan trailer focuses on the pathos of two aging and well loved superheroes. This accurately depicts the bulk of the focus of the movie:

But Logan was also a feminist dream, with unintentionally hilarious scenes of a shrieking snarling little girl (Laura) flying through the air and slashing men to bits. Like the Transformers girl, she embodies the same comical spirit as the statue on Wall Street.

However even in Trailer 2, which features Laura, the marketers of Logan understood that they couldn’t include the most hilarious scenes feminists are sure to love. While Trailer 2 gives you a bit of a taste, you’ll have to watch the movie to see the most unintentionally comic scenes:
But the fact remains that while audiences will accept a huge amount of feminist propaganda in movies and other forms of entertainment, there is such a thing as too much. Cross that line and your product will flop at great expense. It will be interesting to see which side of the line audiences decide the upcoming Transformers movie falls on.
From the discussion of both my post on manface and girlpower characters it is clear that even in the men’s sphere there is much love for “strong women”. In my most recent post the discussion eventually turned to the question of teaching women to defend themselves (martial arts, weight lifting, concealed carry, etc).

Before I go any further, I’ll state that:

1. My own thinking on this topic has changed over time, as I started with something closer to the mainstream conservative view.
2. I’m inclined to generally respect other men’s choices regarding their own families.

**Temptations of the kickass gal.**

With bullet point number two above in mind, I think we need to be aware of the temptations involved. The kickass gal is a well established conservative feminist trope, and we should be aware of this when considering how we direct the training of our wives and daughters. Feminists know why they want our daughters to move out on their own in the big city and experience the carousel. Conservatives on the other hand pride themselves in knowing how to make this feminist goal “safe” for our daughters to achieve.

The kickass conservative gal trope is easiest to spot when it comes to guns. Conservative shooters love the idea of guns as a realization of the feminist dream. If you aren’t familiar with the subculture, go to any online forum on guns and you will find a group of men eager to explain how tough their pistol packing wives/daughters are. One of the local DFW gun ranges understands this culture well, and features pictures of a kickass gal with a pink gun on their website. This is not, I should add, a range dedicated to women shooters. I’ve been to their store, and their target customers are the same group of men every other range/store in the area caters to. The same is true of another gun shop just a few miles away, B&S Guns. They have a billboard* by the freeway with a picture of a woman shooting a rifle that says “We won’t tell your HUSBAND.”

If you decide you want to teach your wife/daughters to shoot, keep in mind that the entire culture you are bringing them into is designed to tempt them into a feminist rebellious frame of mind. This doesn't mean you shouldn’t do it, but you shouldn’t kid yourself about the temptations you are throwing their way.

There is also the reality of the difference between men’s and women’s interests when it comes to masculine pursuits. All of the men I know who shoot enjoy going to the range to practice, and even enjoy breaking their guns down to clean and maintain them. I have yet to observe a wife or daughter who takes this level of interest in shooting. They may embrace the “empowerment” of it, or simply enjoy infrequently going to the range for a bit of shooting, but I’ve yet to come across a woman who really “got into it” the way men do. This, plus the realities of men’s and women’s different instinctive response to violence means that...
training and arming women is going to be much less effective than gun owning feminists desperately want to believe.

Again, I’m not saying you are wrong if you decide to teach your wife or daughters how to shoot. My wife enjoys coming to the range with me from time to time, and I plan on teaching our daughter to shoot. However, we need to be realistic about the risks and benefits involved with this.

We’re so manly, even our women are like men!

There is another temptation involved with this, and this temptation is for the men involved. Part of the appeal of the kickass conservative gal is the idea that the man who masculinizes his women is proving how much more manly he is than other men. This tends to start with selecting a specific masculine pursuit and declaring it to be the very definition of manliness. In a general sense this could include marriage and fatherhood or even the ability to attract women, but for this specific example it is something like shooting, hunting, rebuilding an engine, weight lifting, or martial arts. These are all positive pursuits for a man (in the right context), but none of them are essential for being a “real man”.

The base temptation for men is to declare that one of these manly pursuits is the real test of a man, and any man who doesn’t do them isn’t a real man. The tie in temptation is then to add another layer cementing the man’s status as the only real man in the room, by declaring that any man who doesn’t think highly of masculinizing women in this specific way is merely too much of a girly man to appreciate strong women. This is a standard feminist slogan, but it comes from a conservative I’m more manly than you are position.

*Thanks to Cane for finding an image of the billboard.
Sporty spice defends Springfield Armory’s legacy.
by Dalrock | April 12, 2017 | Link

Cane Caldo found an image of the B&S guns billboard that I referenced in my last post.

Also, RecoveringBeta pointed out that Springfield Armory has a new marketing campaign focused around women:

..you might check out Springfield Armory’s new ad for their Saint AR. 6 strong (attractive) women...aaand sales to betas and omegas skyrocket.

I hadn’t been to Springfield’s site for probably a year, and I’m surprised to see that Springfield has really gone overboard in this regard. Springfield has remade their entire brand image with a corny marketing campaign centering on their very poorly timed entry into the AR market:

With the new Defend Your Legacy site and hashtag (#DefendYourLegacy), Springfield hopes to open up a dialogue about the importance of defending one’s legacy and encourage others to share ideas on what legacy means to them. All of this seems to be leading up to a the release of a new Springfield Armory product. Named the SAINT, this new product is expected to be introduced on November 1st of this year. The website even features a countdown until the release of the SAINT. So far, little is known about what the SAINT will be, other than this new product will be unlike any other from Springfield Armory.

A week after Springfield joined the already crowded AR market with their SAINT, Trump won the election and sales of AR 15s dropped.

Jeremy S. at The Truth About Guns reviewed the SAINT in December and explained Springfield’s rebranding:

Springfield Armory is embarking on a bit of a corporate re-branding. According to the gunmaker’s marketing mavens, their “Defend Your Legacy” slogan targets Americans between 25- and 45-years-old. Buyers who know their safety is their own responsibility. Who understand that the good guys have firearms because they’re the best tool for the job of self-defense. That all Americans have a historical right to keep and bear arms. Enter The SAINT.

He added some more thoughts on the new Springfield brand image in the comments:

I really like how all of the product ads I’ve seen for this gun are geared primarily towards women, yet it’s a black, “black gun.” No pink or frilly or traditionally “girly” crap. Springfield is being very clear that it’s an excellent rifle for a woman to defend herself and her family, seek out professional training with, etc etc, and it can and should be the same rifle used by the dudes. I really do like this. I don’t know how women feel about it of course or how they’ll react, etc, but I think it’s a breath of
fresh air... we all know firearms are “the great equalizer” and such, and I never liked what I perceived as the condescending nature of the industry saying “we’ve painted this gun pink because it’s for women.”

I think he is right that Springfield is going for the image of a woman’s gun that men can shoot too. If you look at the product pages on the Springfield website, 6 of the 7 products are pictured in the hands of women (X D, XD-MOD2, XD(M), XD-S, SAINT, M1A, and 1911). I’m not surprised that Jeremy S. is enthusiastic about this, as this was a core point in my previous post. However, I think they have gone too far in anchoring their brand so firmly around the kickass conservative gal image.

As much as shooters love the kickass conservative gal image, positioning Springfield as a seller of women’s guns that men can shoot too goes too far. While men will tend to support the campaign, I don’t think most men will want to identify with a product marketed as made for women. Even worse, women want to break into the male space. Now that Springfield is identifying itself as a female space that men can join too, the thrill of breaking into the male space is also gone.

To the extent that marketing doesn’t matter, Springfield should continue to sell well as their entire X D line has a large following. But as marketing campaigns go, I don’t see this rebranding as helping Springfield with either men or women shooters.
Vox has a post up at Alpha Game titled *Equality has consequences* linking to a breathless Daily Mail piece: *Bouncer punches a woman in the FACE after she takes a swing at him in shocking video footage, but was it self-defence or ‘disgusting’ male aggression?*

We live in a strange time, as while the Daily Mail is disturbed that a man would strike back when assaulted by a mere woman, we also are told that women must be allowed into all units in the military since they are able to fight just like men. While the Daily Mail complains about a weak man screwing feminism up by defending himself from a kickass gal, NBC News is reporting that Norway now has an *all female special forces unit* where the women are just like the men:

| ...the female soldiers are just as capable as their male counterparts. |

At the same time our entertainment is filled with images of kickass gals single handedly beating up *groups* of men. Unfortunately, with even our armed forces getting in on the fantasy, many women don’t want to fight just like men. While the Daily Mail complains about outcomes as women attempt to act out the feminist fantasy; instead of beating up men they wind up dead or seriously injured. Several years back I wrote about a female Marine in Iraq who *died after attacking a Navy Sailor*.

| ...she had been spending downtime with other Marines and a group of U.S. Navy sailors when one sailor snarled, “Marines ain’t shit” at them. |

Enraged, Annie rushed the sailor. “I’m going to show you what a Marine is!” she shouted, and proceeded to knock the much larger rival to the ground.

According to the investigator’s account, the sailor then jumped back to his feet, grabbed Annie, and body-slammed her. Her head whip-lashed onto concrete.

The scuffle was broken up by witnesses, and Annie retreated without seeking medical attention. But within a few hours, she complained to commanding officers and fellow Marines of a headache. The next day, she was dead.

More recently Vox wrote about a college age woman who *punched a man on Halloween* and ended up in a coma after he punched her back. Nearly six months later, the young woman is still in the hospital. Her aunt maintains a *public facebook page* where she posts frequent status updates, including this one from yesterday:

| Update. Emily continues to have good days and bad. The neurosurgeon at NYU are looking over her case, and we hope to get ideas from them on what to do next. Right now though she still has the external drain in which they are draining fluid continuously. All the fluid tested from the drain showed no signs of infection. I am currently having discussions with her neurosurgeon on where to put the shunt |
(pleural space of her lung or abdomen) when we do put it back in. She remains weak on the left side especially her arm, but continues to receive therapy daily to help with strengthening. Her appetite is poor lately and they are feeding her continuously right now via the feeding tube in her nose, but they do continue to try and offer her food throughout the day. The nurses did take her outside yesterday, and she enjoyed getting some sun. Hope you all had a Blessed Easter with your families. Thank you all for your continued support and prayers!

This fantasy comes at a huge price, and that price will only get higher.

*HT Lost Patrol
The Daily Mail has an article about a 53 year old new divorcée named “Claire” who learned the hard way that her fantasy of divorce empowerment was just a fantasy. Claire of course didn’t ditch her boring loyal dude in hopes of finding her secret multimillionaire hunky handyman; instead she tells us that he left her after she made it clear that she didn’t want to remain married to him:

‘Bye then,’ she said, as he walked out of the door and out of her life

Though shocked and hurt, Claire, a 53-year-old travel agent from Colchester, Essex, admits part of her was excited at the thought of being single again.

While she loved her husband, like most couples in long marriages, she felt they had become a little staid and set in their ways. Their sex life was hardly the firework display of their 20s, and sometimes she’d look over at this snoring, paunchy, greying man on the other side of the bed and wonder: ‘Is this it?’

Now that Claire has experienced the realities of the SMP, she wishes she could go back and do it differently:

To Claire, it sounded like a different world; a sweet shop filled with thrills and excitement, all available at her fingertips. Just the pick-me-up she needed.

Sadly, six months later, Claire would do anything to be back in the marital home, listening for the sound of her husband’s key in the door.

…she’d be the first to warn any married woman secretly thinking the grass might be greener on the other side to stay firmly where she is.

One of the most brutal hallmarks of older women’s declining SMP power is how open men are about seeing them as good for a quick lay, but not worthy of investment/commitment.

Claire says: ‘I’d hoped to meet some decent men in their 50s, someone with whom I could enjoy a conversation or a meal out.'
‘But it was horrendous and I’ve found that it’s zapped my confidence and made me feel a lot more anxious about the future.

‘I’ve been shocked by the number of men who think it’s acceptable to send you pictures of their private parts.

...

‘What I find particularly depressing is that these men think that’s what women today have been reduced to — that it’s a normal way to speak to a woman in 2017.

Another late life divorcée named Cath describes the same dynamic:

Mike, a 49-year-old mechanic, cut straight to the chase. He pointed out that we were no more than a couple of minutes apart.

‘On my lunch break,’ he messaged. ‘Do you fancy meeting up for a bit of fun?’

The Daily Mail brought in an expert who explained the realities of Rollo’s SMP Chart (emphasis mine):

Marital therapist Andrew Marshall, author of It’s Not A Midlife Crisis, It’s An Opportunity, says he has been seeing more and more women like Claire, bored with their marriages and tempted by one ‘last hurrah’ in the seemingly exciting world of internet dating.

...

Yet the reality of starting again on the dating scene, 30-plus years after they left it, rarely lives up to the expectation, says Mr Marshall.

...

‘For any woman whose last experience of meeting partners was many years ago via friends, work or in a nightclub, she will find the dating landscape has changed considerably — and not in her favour,’ says Mr Marshall. ‘Because, though dating sites offer the prospect of meeting thousands of men, the power dynamic has
shifted once you’re an older woman.

Check out the full article at the Daily Mail for much more.

See Also:

- Not like the movies
- She needs more men!
As I have noted previously, feminism is the assertion that men are evil and naturally want to harm women, followed by pleas to men to solve all of women’s problems.

Feminism is also about the desire to be first, to be the woman who blazes the trail for other women. Feminists set out to attain a goal so that they can show other women that they too can attain the goal, so that still other women will know that they can attain the goal as well. This is a never ending process; it has to continue forever, as feminism is all about empowering women to break barriers.

Obviously the need to continue the claim of breaking barriers requires that the definition of what is pioneering be stretched to ridiculous proportions. Fortunately feminists are quite comfortable accepting the ridiculous as trail blazing, and have been from the very beginning. In June of 1928 Amelia Earhart attained her status of feminist trailblazer by being the first female passenger on a transatlantic flight. This made her the feminist equivalent of Charles Lindbergh, earning her the nicknames of “Lady Lindy” and “Queen of the Air”.

We still see this today. In 2012 Anne Marie Slaughter wrote about the obstacles she faced as the “first woman director of policy planning at the State Department”. While she was in fact the first woman with that specific job title, she reported to a female Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton. Secretary Clinton was herself a pioneer, as she was only the third woman to serve as Secretary of State. This made Secretary Clinton the first woman to be the third female U.S. Secretary of State.

More recently a pregnant hooker came up with a brilliant way to advertise her professional services, by declaring on her brothel’s blog that she too was blazing the trail for other women (emphasis mine).

...if society already looks down on me for being a working girl (even though legal), you can imagine what they will probably think of a pregnant working girl! Even other working girls sometimes look down on pregnant working girls. But I’ve never been one to let myself be intimidated by what others thought! It actually never occurred to me that I would stop working at the Bunny Ranch while I was pregnant...

I want to make a statement that supports the right of a woman to choose...to work as a prostitute while pregnant! I mean, for so many of you that know me, would you expect anything else? I am after all, 1000% open-minded, completely non-judgmental. And, if I can make it any easier for the next working girl to make the choice to work while expecting, then more power to her!

The combination of feminist empowerment and sexual debauchery succeeded in getting her global tabloid exposure, as articles soon followed from Metro, Daily Mail, and NY Post.

But feminist empowerment isn’t just for the tabloids. This weekend Lily Cohen posted a guest
blog for Scientific American about her trailblazing experience as a woman peeing in the woods during winter. Salon saw the trailblazing article and republished it as: “Long live the patriarchy”: One more barrier faced by women in science. Cohen recounts how she bravely and repeatedly peed her pants, preparing the way for other women (emphasis mine):

Last week I peed all over myself in the name of studying climate change in Alaska. Gender barriers in science don’t always take an obvious form, and they get especially perilous in below-zero temperatures. Some of these involve individual’s malice or misogyny, but there is another set of barriers that simply result from being a woman in a male dominated field. **If we continue ignoring those additional challenges by striving for equality instead of equity, the barriers will persist.**

...I’m guessing the men I work with do not have a pair of pants they designate as “the pair of pants I wear when I am going to pee all over myself.”

Cohen decided to **do something** about this problem, so that other women won’t leave a trail of pee when they follow in her footsteps. Carrying forward the great feminist tradition of Amelia Earhart, Cohen knows that the best way to navigate the path to feminist empowerment is to be carried in the strong protective arms of men. While Cohen wasn’t able to master the ability to pee in the woods, she could do something **better**. She could nag men to fix the problem for her, and this is exactly what her Scientific American post did:

Starting at my two bosses and going up the chain of command that ends in the President of the University, every position is held by a white male. I firmly believe in the good intentions of each of those individuals, but I am not surprised when policies and practices are inequitable or missing perspectives.

...Lily Cohen is a Research Professional at the University of Alaska Fairbanks where she studies snow, permafrost and long term weather patterns. She also writes policies and creates opportunities for conversations about making field research a safer and more inclusive working environment.

I have no doubt that Cohen’s expectations will be met, and the goal of the article will be successful. Surely **Chancellor Dana Thomas** and the other men of the evil patriarchy will do whatever it takes to solve her problem. This way Cohen (and the women who follow her, and the women who follow them, etc) can get back to living the dream of breaking the barrier and triumphantly becoming **one of the guys**, as the appropriately placed beer advertisement in
the Salon article depicts:

https://r1---sn-q4fl6nlz.c.2mdn.net/videoplayback/id/65eead38a155b7d5/itag/37/source/
doubleclick_dmm/ratebypass/yes/acao/yes/ip/47.187.231.139/ipbits/0/expire/36321495
23/sparams/acao,expire,id,ip,ipbits,itag.mm.mm.ms.mp.mp.ratebypass.source/signature/
748D3EF618A92CA1E54D5B9AFADF95C7743FBAF5F.5097D61A5DAD9DB394866C1C8D1
2C912A1D252C5/key/cms1/cms_redirect/yes/mm/42/mn/sn-
q4fl6nlz/ms/onc/mnt/1493038932/mv/m/pl/14/file/file.mp4
Reader BillyS linked to My Sex Junk, a video by Social Justice Warrior Bill Nye that is making the rounds. The video is aimed at teenagers and is intended to make sexual deviancy of all kinds “cool”. But instead of being cool the video gives off a terribly creepy vibe. Picture being a teenager and having your parents don short-shorts and perform a hip-gyrating musical number on the joys of pornography, masturbation, gay sex, and straight sex for the kids of the neighborhood, and you have a sense of just how creepy and uncool the video is. In short, the video makes deviancy gay.

As the Daily Caller explains in Viewers Disturbed By Bill Nye’s Video on Transgenderism:

“My Sex Junk,” published on YouTube Sunday, features actress Rachel Bloom singing a song about transgenders, gay sex, and how sexuality is a fluid concept. The clip comes from an episode of Bill Nye’s show “Bill Nye Saves The World.”

“Sexuality’s a spectrum, everyone is on it. Even you might like it if you sit up on it,” Bloom sings on stage. “Drag king, drag queen just do what feels right.”

“This world of ours is so full of choice. But must I choose between only John or Joyce? Are my options only hard or moist? My vagina has its own voice,”

The Daily Caller noted that the video was not well received on Youtube:

The video hasn’t performed well on YouTube. It has received nearly 4,000 dislikes and only 79 likes. The clip seemed to disturb many YouTube commenters.

The Daily Caller article was published on Monday morning, and since then the youtube numbers have only gotten worse. Now the video has over 42,500 dislikes and only 661 likes.

The UK’s Independent agrees: Bill Nye Saves the World jumps the shark with cringeworthy ‘My Sex Junk’ skit

It’s a painful couple of minutes that limps its way to punchlines and sees Nye pretend to ‘drop the bass’.
Unfit for a real relationship.

by Dalrock | April 28, 2017 | Link

For there are eunuchs who have been so from birth, and there are eunuchs who have been made eunuchs by men, and there are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. Let the one who is able to receive this receive it.

–Mat 19:12 ESV

RealDoll’s Matt McMullen describes the target audience for the coming generation of lifelike sex dolls:

There are a lot of people out there, for one reason or another, who have difficulty forming traditional relationships with other people. It’s really all about giving those people some level of companionship – or the illusion of companionship.

From this point of view, the sex doll is a masculine counterpart to the slew of technical, cultural, and legal innovations we have made for women over recent decades. While a large number of women still marry and remain married to a real life man, we have reordered our society around finding ways for women to have the benefits of marriage to a real man even when (for one reason or another) they are incapable of doing so.

Sarah Lenti’s recent opinion piece at CNN offers a striking example of the female counterpart to the target market for lifelike sex dolls:

I am a single mother by choice. Yet I was raised in a Christian, conservative home, where I grew up believing in the traditional family unit. And I was taught that there was an order to achieving it. First, fall in love. Second, marry a man. Third, start a family.

Now in my fifth decade, only one has proven true for me — and it isn’t the first.

On the day that I turned 30, I journaled that I would think about becoming a mother should I still be single at 38. What that looked like, I didn’t exactly know. It was a promise to myself, maybe to God.

…Maybe a man could deny me love, but he would never deny me a child.

Having failed entirely to form a lasting bond with a real life man despite decades of sexual relationships, Lenti turned to IVF to give her sons whom she could use as a substitute:

But from my two little men, I quickly internalized that love is a verb. Love is an action and something you work at every single day...

Though I may never have a significant other, I do have my sons, who’ve taken me
from unloved to loved and from unlovable to lovable. They’ve done this all on their own. They are my miracles, which I almost didn’t allow to happen because of heartbreak, self-doubt and maybe even self-loathing.

Prior to Eli and Abel, I wasted at least half of my adult life obsessing about things I had lost — men who broke my heart, clients who weren’t a good fit, friendships that had faded.

Lenti of course blames her own inability to form a bond with a real life man not on herself, but on men in general. Yet she gives away the truth by inadvertently describing the kind of men she is attracted to. By this I don’t mean her description of the physical attributes she requires in a man:

And so I began my search with a focus on the physical attributes that I have always been attracted to — namely height and athleticism. Six-foot-2 and toned was my baseline.

She gives it away when she is describing what she did to make herself attractive to men (emphasis mine):

Why have I lost that hope? Truth be told, I have been vulnerable with a few men pre- and post-pregnancy. But rejection upon rejection by man after man will do it to you. **Even when you are that aloof gal, who doesn’t ask questions or have expectations of something real or long-term, it still ends.** I guess you just lose your luster after awhile. It’s my reality, and it never changes.

Lenti is an addict of asshole game, and assumes that since she is only attracted to aloof jerks, men must be seeking this in a wife. Good men seeking real commitment (lifetime marriage) don’t exist to Lenti, because she finds such men sexually repulsive. But science and our culture have solutions for women like Lenti who are unable to form bonds with real life men, just like science (if not our culture) is working on a solution for men in a similar situation.

*H/T Jeff Strand
**H/T Novaseeker
In response to my last post several readers challenged my observation that Lenti is an addict of asshole game, arguing that all women are like Lenti in this regard. Damn Crackers argued:

| ALL women are addicted to asshole, aloof game. It is their nature. |

Likewise, theasdgamer responded:

| AWALT, of course. What is there about aloof jerks that women like? |

But this isn’t the case. Women don’t just respond to alpha attraction traits, they also respond to beta comfort traits. Pickup artists know this, and tailor their game to the woman they are trying to seduce. I haven’t read Heartist for some time, but I know that in the past at least this was a common theme for him. For example, he explains that a woman who is a lawyer needs maximum jerk game in What A Girl’s Job Tells You (language warning on this and all following Heartiste links)

| [Female lawyers are] Amoral alpha males with vaginas. Their yin is so deeply buried they spend all their free time (2 hours per week) fantasizing about a powerful dominant man releasing their inner woman. This is your cue to ratchet up the assholery. |

It isn’t just how masculinized a woman is that determines her responsiveness to asshole game. A woman with an inflated ego will also respond well to asshole game. As Heartiste explains in Science Confirms Another Game Concept: Older Women Need Less Game (emphasis mine):

| The 23-27 year old feels she is at her attractiveness peak, despite her peak having passed a few years earlier. This is because she is surrounded by many more high status men than she was while in college (or working at the Piggly Wiggly) who are expressing sexual interest in her. This social dynamic will work to inflate her ego beyond the bounds of her actual beauty ranking. Some consequences result from this. |

| NEG HARDER. The 23-27 year old will require harder negging than any other age group of women, even the hotter 18 year olds. |

Conversely, try asshole game on a woman who has been humbled and you will drive her away:

| So if you want to bang broads teetering on the edge of witherdom with kids and marriage and college funds dancing in their dreams, go easy on the cocky and funny and the negs. The older woman’s ego has taken enough of a bruising from the encroachment of reality; your negs will only push her into self-flagellating withdrawal... |
or indignant lashing out. She needs to know she still has the kind of looks that can
turn heads, so your cloying flattery will work wonders on her.

On the other hand, if you want to date hot girls in their 20s and, for a lucky few of
them, early 30s, you have to give ‘em a bit of the ol’ ultrabadness. It’s the moral
thing to do, if women’s pleasure is your business.

Executive Summary: Young women are harder lays. They require game and a cocky
attitude. Older women are easier lays. They require flowers, compliments and
cuddles.

A woman’s mindframe matters as well, as he explains in Tough Times Are A Bounty For
Betas:

In short, women who thought about their own death suddenly found feminized beta
providers a lot more attractive than masculine alpha cads. This preference was
largest for ovulating women, who normally show the exact opposite preference when
times are good and death is a faraway abstraction.

Keep in mind that asshole game is Heartist’s stock in trade, his trademark. Yet even Heartiste
is aware that not all women are seeking asshole game. This doesn’t trouble him at all,
because the women he wants the most, the youngest and hottest, tend to respond quite well
to his preferred style.

Getting back to Lenti, she is an extreme outlier. Her career didn’t just masculinze her, but it
put her in the orbit of powerful attractive men (emphasis mine):

My life was great on paper. I had done all the right things. I went to Stanford for
graduate school. I worked at the White House under Condoleezza Rice. I had the
opportunity to travel the world.

All of this maximized both her ego and her craving for excitement. She required nothing in
the way of beta comfort:

At the time, I was in a terrible relationship with a man who told me he wanted to be
with me, but he could never love me.

Conspicuously absent in her story is any talk of the man she mistakenly left because she
thought she could do better. Contrast this with Kate Bolick’s Atlantic piece All the Single
Ladies, where Bolick opens with her regret that she rode the carousel for too long, and should
have instead stayed with the great catch she rejected when she was 28:

In 2001, when I was 28, I broke up with my boyfriend. Allan and I had been together
for three years, and there was no good reason to end things. He was (and remains)
an exceptional person, intelligent, good-looking, loyal, kind. My friends, many of
whom were married or in marriage-track relationships, were bewildered. I was
bewildered. To account for my behavior, all I had were two intangible yet undeniable
convictions: something was missing; I wasn’t ready to settle down.
The period that followed was awful. I barely ate for sobbing all the time... On bad days, I feared I would be alone forever. Had I made the biggest mistake of my life?

Ten years later, I occasionally ask myself the same question.

This is entirely missing from Lenti’s story. There is no hand wringing of should she have settled for the boring loyal dude who loved her instead of heading off in search of more excitement before settling down. Instead, Lenti describes herself as “unlovable”, having experienced a lifetime of rejection and infidelity:

...I can honestly write that I have no expectations for love, and I certainly do not believe that there is a father out there for my sons. I am not waiting and hoping, because I have lost that hope.

Lenti’s need for dark triad traits is extreme. Even post wall after a lifetime of rejection, she threw herself into one time hookups with strange men. She was still seeking pure alpha asshole, at an age where as Heartiste has observed nearly all women are strongly seeking beta comfort. She tells us the men she had sex with when she was 38 rejected her over and over, without even texting her the next day:

Dating amounted to small talk with a stranger, who you had briefly interfaced with online because you each thought the other attractive. The small talk was a prelude to hooking up, and there were no expectations even of a text the next day.

It was brutal. And after trying my hand at it, I was no closer to finding the love of my life or starting a family.

Even as a single mother over 40, she clearly is still seeking out men who pump and dump her:

Why have I lost that hope? Truth be told, I have been vulnerable with a few men pre- and post-pregnancy. But rejection upon rejection by man after man will do it to you.

Conventional wisdom is that women like Lenti lack self esteem, but as she explains, only the most attractive men meet her demanding standards:

And so I began my search with a focus on the physical attributes that I have always been attracted to — namely height and athleticism. Six-foot-2 and toned was my baseline.
A German judge has coined a brilliant term for the new family model we have adopted to replace marriage: father roulette. From the Daily Mail German woman loses legal bid to discover male escort’s identity after he got her pregnant during a three-night hotel fling seven years ago:

[She was] attempting to track down ‘Michael’ in order to claim a support allowance.

But a court in Munich has ruled the hotel chain does not have to give up the escort’s identity, saying the woman was playing ‘father roulette’.

The irony is that conservatives, who just five or six decades ago were staunch supporters of marriage, are now the most militant supporters of the child support system we are using to replace (and therefore destroy) marriage. This is, sadly, why we are marooned on slut island.
Someone tell Gilligan.
by Dalrock | May 3, 2017 | Link

From our local DFW channel 8 news: Suspected gunman who shot Dallas firefighter had long rap sheet (emphasis mine):

WFAA talked to family members and learned Brown is the father of 18 children and worked as a janitor at Parkland Memorial Hospital.

Supporters of the family model we are using to replace marriage, the child support model, tend to fall for the it takes two fallacy. This is of course true at the micro level but not at the macro level where policy applies. When we removed the stigma from unwed motherhood and shifted responsibility from single mothers to the men they choose to sire their children, we set up a perverse system. The most responsible men of course are deterred from fatherhood by this new family model. This is increasingly true even for marriage minded men, as there is no legal way for a man to opt out of the child support model. At any time a married father can be removed from the home and forcibly converted to the child support model, solely at the discretion of his wife.

The disincentive for good men to become fathers doesn’t bother the baby mommas at all though, because the men who make them tingle are the sexy bad boys anyway.

Mayor Mike Rawlings described the shooter as “someone that was not mentally stable.”

Court records show Brown had a long criminal history, including an assault charge, several DWIs, and gun offenses...

In 2008, he was involved in a car accident in Dallas, records show. Responding Dallas PD officers approached his vehicle. He yelled, “I’m high... I’m high and I have a gun!”

It only takes a handful of sexy badboys to sire all of the bastards the baby mommas could ever want.
Another case of Duluth working as designed.

by Dalrock | May 4, 2017 | Link

Today’s example of Duluth working as designed comes courtesy of the Sonoma News. The focus of the story is on police brutality, but it is an excellent example of how the Duluth model primes law enforcement to see men as abusers even when they are being abused.

In this case the wife had been drinking and became belligerent when her husband didn’t notice her haircut. The husband retreated into another room to avoid his belligerent wife, which enraged and made her even louder. Neighbors then called the police who came in primed to arrest the victim, since the Duluth model teaches that domestic violence is something men do to women:

According to Del Valle’s formal claim, he had gotten into an argument with his wife, who had been drinking, after he failed to notice her new haircut.

He retreated to another room as her yelling grew louder and neighbors called deputies, who arrived about 10:30 p.m.

They forced their way through the front door when Del Valle’s wife would not let them in and kicked down Del Valle’s bedroom door when he refused to open it.

The husband made things worse in this case by refusing to open the bedroom door so the police could arrest him. It isn’t right that they had come to arrest him for the crime of not noticing his wife’s new haircut, but he should have complied once the police were on the scene.

Del Valle was not able to record the entire encounter in which he was stunned two to three more times and suffered up to 15 baton blows, causing neurological damage and a separated shoulder, Schwaiger said.

Switch the sexes and you have the classic abusive husband that fills popular imagination. He’s drunk and yelling at her for some minor infraction (perhaps dinner wasn’t ready when he got home). She retreats into another room, enraging her drunken husband who gets even louder. The neighbors hear his yelling and call the police.

In that situation, the police would have instantly arrested the drunken husband after knocking down the front door. They would not have pushed past the belligerent husband in order to break down the bedroom door and arrest his wife. But under the Duluth model, it is the man who must be arrested either way.
I’ve done a quick scan of the latest US data I could find on out of wedlock births, and some of the data is very interesting. The first thing that surprised me is that the percent of births out of wedlock leveled off and even declined very slightly after 2009. You can see this in Figure 1 from the 2014 NCHS data brief Recent Declines in Nonmarital Childbearing in the United States:

![Chart showing trends in nonmarital births](image)

The chart above only goes through 2013, but according to this January 2017 National Vital Statistics Report the trend has continued through at least 2015, the last year we currently have data for:

The percentage of all births to unmarried women was 40.3% in 2015, similar to the 2014 percentage of 40.2% in 2014, the lowest levels since 2007. The percentage of all births to unmarried women peaked in 2009 at 41.0%. In 2015, the percentage of nonmarital births varied widely among population groups, from 16.4% for API mothers to 70.6% for non-Hispanic black mothers (Table 15).

Table 15 is itself quite interesting because it gives us some context for cases like Sarah Lenti’s. For women of all races, the percent of births out of wedlock starts at or near 100% for the youngest cohorts, and declines dramatically as you look at older cohorts through the early 30s. At this point the pattern diverges by race. For Black women, the drop continues after the early 30s, but at a much slower rate. For Hispanic women, the percent of births out
of wedlock declines slightly in their late 30s and then remains flat. For White and Asian women, after declining less quickly in their late 30s, the percentage of births out of wedlock not only stops declining but actually increases for women over 40:

Here is the same data, but only focusing on White and Asian women and dropping the teenage brackets:

https://idalrock.wordpress.com/
Source: Table 15 at https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr66/nvsr66_01.pdf
From the data, it does look like we are seeing a spike of aging White and Asian career women intentionally deciding to go it alone at the last minute after failing to find a husband. The spike isn’t huge in absolute terms, but the pattern is easy to spot. The same pattern exists in the 2013 version of the same table:
Zeroing in just on White women, despite the fact that the overall percentage of births out of wedlock declined very slightly between 2013 and 2015, the percentage increased in this time period for all older age brackets:

https://dalrock.wordpress.com/
Source: Table 15 at https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr66/nvsr66_01.pdf
The youngest brackets aren’t included in the chart above, but the only age brackets to decline between 2013 and 2015 were ages 15 and 16:
**Percent of White Non-Hispanic births out of wedlock by age of mother over time.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://dalrock.wordpress.com/

*I had forgotten about the data I shared in this post two years ago.*
There is a well loved refrain, especially among complementarians, that men need to “step up”. This is a deceptive phrase, because in reality the objective is to allow men to avoid what is difficult and uncomfortable. It is false bravado used to mask paralyzing fear. What is being avoided is addressing the feminist elephant in the middle of the room.

For example, over the past decades we have witnessed an explosion in out of wedlock births. Feminists have been entirely open about their desire to make single motherhood an attractive option for women, and after decades of social and legal “progress” 40% of all children are now born out of wedlock in the US.

For feminist Christians this isn’t a problem, as they can simply celebrate their victory while pushing for even more “progress”. But for complementarians and other conservative Christians, this poses a huge challenge. How can they appear to take biblical morality (and the welfare of innocent children) seriously while avoiding upsetting women in our thoroughly feminized culture? There is only one answer, no matter how absurd it is. The answer is to pretend that feminists aren’t really in the final mopping up stages in the culture war, and assert instead that what we are experiencing is a sudden and mysterious change in men.

Here is how Glenn Stanton, the Director of Family Formation Studies at Focus on the Family (FotF), explains the incredible increase we are seeing in out of wedlock births*:

> Women want to marry and have daddies for their babies. But if they can’t find good men to commit themselves to, well... Our most pressing social problem today is a man deficit.
The level of denial here is astonishing, and would be laughable if it weren’t entirely commonplace. Even more astounding, often times the denial of feminism is expressed using feminist terminology, and even includes calls to join feminists in their push to reorder our society**:

> Whatever our views on specific economic policies, we must recognize that much economic hardship of women in our age is the result of men who abandon their commitments. We should eschew obnoxious “welfare queen” rhetoric and work with others of goodwill to seek economic and social measures to provide a safety net for single mothers and abused women in jeopardy. We should join with others, including secular feminists, in seeking legal protections against such manifestations of a rape culture as sexual harassment, prostitution, and sex slavery.

The quote above is from Dr. Russell Moore, president of the Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention. As Moore himself explains, this makes him the head of:

> the moral and public policy agency of the nation’s largest Protestant denomination

Previously Moore was the Chairman of the Board for the Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood.

As astonishing as the above two examples are, they merely scratch the surface. The pattern exists across complementarian/conservative Christian organizations, and across the full spectrum of issues where a Christian approach would offend feminists. In response to women demanding to be allowed to join all units of our armed forces (just as they have demanded in the civilian world), conservative Christians deny the very open feminist rebellion, and pretend instead that cowardly men are forcing brave women to serve in their place. Doug Phillips’ now defunct Vision Forum offers a perfect example with America the Barbarous: New Pentagon Policy Sanctions Women in Combat:

> …our nation’s leaders — in the name of “empowering” women — are now self-consciously placing women in combat units to be shot at and killed as men.

> …Does this “enlightened policy” represent the fullest expression of Woman, as feminists would have us believe?

> Not hardly. It represents an abolition of womanhood and the perversion of God’s design. It represents a deeply-rooted rebellion against the natural roles and functions by which God has distinguished manhood from womanhood.

> Women are to be cherished as the weaker sex, not exploited to fill the roster of an army. Combat is the province of men, and God calls on men to protect women and children. Men fight when their homes and communities are threatened by wicked regimes and lawless rogues who would despoil their loved ones. When necessary, men carry weapons into battle and give their lives to preserve the liberty and sanctity of those they hold dear.
It is barbarians who place their women in the midst of war’s brutalities to fight as men. This is what pagan tribes in Scotland did before they were Christianized and embraced the “Law of the Innocents,” written by the evangelist Adomnan, which forbade sending women into battle.

Though America possesses advanced weaponry and great military might, we have become a nation of barbarians.

It is high time that we as a people repent of our barbarism — that we cherish our women as women, and call on our men to act as men.

Bizarrely, the piece implicitly acknowledges that feminist women in rebellion against God’s role for them are the ones who have insisted on this change for decades. Yet Vision Forum’s solution to women’s rebellion against God is not to confront the rebellion (something terrifying). The closing call to action is for men to act as men and stop insisting that women fight in their place. The idea that women aren’t insisting to join the military, but that cowardly men are forcing women to do so is absurd. It is laughable to everyone who isn’t a complementarian Christian. But in the complementarian Christian world this fantasy land approach to women’s overt rebellion is a closely held doctrine.

Women in combat should be the easiest part of feminism for conservative Christian leaders to oppose, and that even here conservative Christians are terrified of offending rebellious women is most telling.

While very few women in conservative Christian circles want to dress as men and serve in combat, nearly all of them have married or hope to marry. Not surprisingly, the same ridiculous gymnastics are used to deny the much more proximate mass rebellion against the biblical instruction to wives. If a wife is frigid and defrauds her husband, it is not a sin but a sign that God is angry with the husband (Pastor Dave Wilson, and Dr. R. Albert Mohler Jr.). If a wife throws a tantrum in order to get her way, it is not rebellion but a form of submission called a Godly tantrum (Pastor Tim Keller, co-founder and vice president of The Gospel Coalition). If a wife is contentious, it is proof that her husband is not communicating enough (Dr. Clarke & FotF president Jim Daly) or loving her enough (Pastor Strauss). If a wife fornicated before marriage, it is her husband’s fault (Dr. Russell Moore).

Pastor Chandler, President of the complementarian Acts 29 Network of churches, takes it a step further and offers a blanket statement on all possible areas a wife might be tempted into feminist rebellion. If a wife ever feels the temptation of feminist rebellion, it means her husband is oppressing her:

Really, men, here is a great way to gauge how you’re serving, loving, and practicing your headship. If the most secularized feminist in the world showed up in your home and began to kind of coach your wife toward freedom and liberation from your tyranny, our wives should be so well cared for, so nourished, so sowed into and loved, they would say, “What you’re describing is actually tyranny. I love where I am. I am honored. I am encouraged. My man sacrifices so that I might grow in my gifts. He will oftentimes lay down his own desires in order to serve me more. My husband
goes to bed tired at night. He pours in to our children. He encourages me. All that comes out of his mouth, sans a couple of little times here and there, is him building me up in love."

Men, here is a good opportunity. If you’re like, “Well, gosh, I don't think she would say that at all,” then, men, I think on the way home, you should probably repent and confess before the Lord to your wife.

**See also:** Step up, so they don’t have to (part 2).

*Glenn Stanton, Secure Daughters, Confident Sons: How Parents Guide Their Children into Authentic Masculinity and Femininity*

**HT Darwinian Arminian**
Reassurance to husbands, reassurance to wives.

by Dalrock | May 11, 2017 | [Link](#)

Reader YS shared a video advertising the FamilyLife Weekend To Remember “marriage getaway”. The video starts with reassurance to husbands, who instinctively know what these kinds of events are like:

The look on your face says it all. Your spouse just invited you to the FamilyLife Weekend To Remember marriage getaway. You’re thinking:

What did I do wrong?

Relax, this is a good thing. So put away the fancy china and listen up. You aren’t eating crow tonight!

I’ve never been to one of these events, but Sheila Gregoire is one of the “experts” the video mentions, and she describes what they are like on her own blog:

My husband and I speak at FamilyLife marriage conferences around the country...

One of the interesting things about giving the wife talk is that, as I start to talk about what a woman can do to make marriage great, I see many in the audience looking distinctly uncomfortable and shifting in their seats. So, just like clockwork, about seven minutes in, I stop my talk, and say:

I know you women are uncomfortable with me saying all these things that you should do. But let me reassure you that right now my husband has all of your husbands in another room, and he is blasting them and telling them what they need to do, too, in no uncertain terms. So don’t worry.
Step up, so they don’t have to (part 2).
by Dalrock | May 12, 2017 | Link

As I explained in part one, men stepping up is a well loved refrain with complementarians and other conservative Christians. It is a brilliantly deceptive term, because the objective is to appear to be fighting our feminist culture while taking great care not to do anything which would upset the feminist status quo. This is accomplished by pretending that feminists aren’t in the final mopping up stage of the culture wars, and instead complaining about a sudden and mysterious change in men.

The danger of course to exhorting men to man up is that they might actually do so. This would defeat the whole purpose. For this reason Christian leaders who go beyond the steps described in part 1 need to clearly communicate that their program is not a threat to women in feminist rebellion.

Dennis Rainey is the President, CEO and Co-founder of FamilyLife. Rainey is also a Board of Reference member of the Council of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (CBMW). Rainey is all about men stepping up. In fact, he has even trademarked the term Stepping Up®, as it is the title of the video series and accompanying book FamilyLife sells:

### Calling Men to Courageous Manhood

Today, more than ever, the world needs godly men. Men who will step up and courageously lead at home, at church, at work, and in their communities. That’s the message of Stepping Up. In a world where too many men are shrinking back, Stepping Up gives men vision and tools to live godly, courageous lives.

In August of 2013 I did a post on one of the youtube videos FamilyLife used to advertise Stepping Up®. As I noted at the time, the advertisement was brilliantly crafted to seem traditional while reinforcing the feminist status quo:

...the video features a thoroughly broken husband being harangued by his ballbusting wife. For a moment he weakly pushes back, but then she threatens to move out and he submits to her authority. Those who support traditional marriage are no doubt encouraged by this exchange and the larger message of the video, assuming this video series is secretly about returning to the biblical instruction on headship and submission. If their wife gives the ok, they can’t wait to attend the sessions!

This message is so ridiculous many of my readers understandably will struggle to believe that is is the case, especially since the video I was describing has since been removed from YouTube. Fortunately, while the video has been memory holed, another promotion for Stepping Up® is still available on the web. In January of 2013 Rainey did a segment in his radio program titled Encouraging Our Guys (audio, transcript). The introduction to the segment makes it sound like it will be promoting the biblical view, just like the blurb on the page selling the video:
Bob: This is FamilyLife Today for Tuesday, January 8th. Our host is the President of FamilyLife®, Dennis Rainey, and I’m Bob Lepine. We’re going to talk today about men being men and about how women can help them be the men God wants them to be.

Stay tuned.

After the break, Bob explains that churches around the country will be screening Stepping Up® the Saturday before Super-bowl Sunday. This creates a dilemma for the head of the household; how should she manage her husband’s day? Should she send him to Stepping Up®, or should she occupy his time with chores around the house?

Bob: So, I’m thinking of a wife who is planning for that weekend. She’s got the option of either her husband, on Saturday, doing all the projects around the house so that he can watch the game on Sunday; or she can send him to the Stepping Up® Super Saturday event, down at the church, that’s happening in their community. We’ve got hundreds of churches that are participating in this; but she’s not going to get any “Honey, do” lists done that day. What would your counsel to her be, Dennis?

Dennis: Give up the “Honey, do” list for a day.

Rainey explains that a wife should see this as an investment. If she sends her husband to Stepping Up® it will pay dividends for her in the future, as it will very likely make her husband more like she wants him to be:

I’m actually encouraging you, as a wife, to look beyond the “Honey, do” list and beyond to making an investment in your husband’s life—to encourage him, not discourage him—but encourage him to become the man God made him to be. If you send him down to the Stepping Up Super Saturday event—I can’t guarantee this because he’s got a choice—he’s got a real choice, and some guys don’t make it; but a lot will.

Next Rainey introduces their guest for the segment, Kenny Luck:

Kenny Luck joins us. He’s the Men’s Pastor at Saddleback Church. He’s written a book called Sleeping Giant. He’s all over the issue of men stepping up.

Luck of course reinforces the importance of the head of the household sending her husband to the Stepping Up® event, because Stepping Up® and similar programs are designed to make her husband do what she nags him to do:

Kenny: I was just saying—the hall pass—“Ladies, here’s the deal. When you do give permission for a desired activity—but more importantly, when you encourage your man to take ownership of his life—spiritually, relationally, maritally—in the context of other men, that’s when you get a solid result versus hinting, hoping, nagging. It’s just something where he feels that he needs to make that decision on his own—in consideration of you—but in the presence of other men, as an individual man. It’s
that ownership-thing, where it is: “This is my decision, and I want to own it—apart from being in your presence—even though I love you—and apart from being connected to you as a husband and father, who has many shortcomings—I want to make this decision myself.”

**See Also:** Rainey understands his target audience.
Honor your father and your mother, that your days may be long in the land that the LORD your God is giving you.

-Exodus 20:12, ESV
Think of the movies we like to watch. We want the fight. We want our lives to matter. We want to lay it down. We love Saving Private Ryan, everybody getting shot up on the beach. We want to run up on that beach with them. It’s in us.

Brothers, you’ve been called to this. Anything less than this is outside of design and purpose.

—Pastor Matt Chandler

One of the defining characteristics of the man up/step up program is an over the top cartoonish appeal to the virtues of courage and valor. This comes across as cringeworthy not only because it is so childish and over the top, but because the point of the program is to avoid doing what is difficult and terrifying. It is false bravado used to mask paralyzing fear.

As the creators of the program know, most of the men in attendance are there either because their wife gave them permission or their wife ordered them to attend. When the creators of the program are speaking to the wives, they are beseeching the head of the household to send their husband in so they can “fix” him the way she wants. The men for their part know the drill, as they’ve experienced it countless times before. Each man knows the leaders in the program are going to tear him down to nothing, and then build him back up into a real man, a knight fit to serve his lady.

But it isn’t just the participants who are encouraged to see themselves as knights in a LARPing chivalrous army. Pastors are encouraged to see the events as providing them with their own private army, as Dennis Rainey and Kenny Luck explain:

Kenny: Well, I think of the local pastor, first of all—especially, most churches are under 300 people. I got a note just the other day from a local pastor. He has a congregation of 175 people. Nine men, because they had adopted the Sleeping Giant process and pathway, were baptized this last Sunday. It’s almost like he was crying through the email. Here he has help on the way. “The Calvary is coming!” He has a process to get them healthy. He has a strategy to move them into leadership. In most churches that are that small, the pastor needs men forming ranks around him, with his DNA—

Dennis: Yes, he does. Yes, he does.

Kenny: —and so, when they don’t have that, then, we end up hiring disciples versus making disciples and adding staff, which is, for many, prohibitive. So, when the local church—local churches that I see, early adopters to the Sleeping Giant model, the pastors are writing me and going, “I never knew this could be. I didn’t know that I could be the main beneficiary of a solid outreach to men, where we not only develop
the man but we develop the leader;” and they form ranks around that—that senior pastor. That’s really where I feel there is going to be a large Kingdom advance of the Great Commission and the Great Commandment, locally, worldwide.

**Bob:** I’m imagining the pastor who is thinking, “You know, I’d love to see guys energized and mobilized as long as they’re energized and mobilized for what I think they ought to be doing. I’m concerned they’re going to get energized and mobilized and go head in their own direction and have their own agenda...
Rainey understands his target audience.
by Dalrock | May 15, 2017 | Link

When Dennis Rainey wants men to watch his man up videos, he turns to the complementarian head of the household, the wife. It is true that unlike their rivals (egalitarians), complementarians practice headship and submission; they have merely reversed the biblical roles.

As none other than Dr. Russell D. Moore explains in After Patriarchy, What? Why Egalitarians Are Winning the Evangelical Gender Debate (emphasis mine):

...Gallagher shows specifically how this dynamic plays itself out in millions of homes, often by citing interviews that almost read like self-parodies. One 35-year-old home-schooling evangelical mother in Minnesota says of the Promise Keepers movement: “I had Mike go this year. I kind of sent him.... I said, ‘I'm not sending you to get fixed in any area. I just want you to be encouraged because there are other Christian men out there who are your age, who want to be good dads and good husbands.” 7 This “complementarian” woman doesn’t seem to recognize that she is “sending” her husband off to be with those his own age, as though she were a mother “sending” her grade-school son off to summer youth camp. Not surprisingly, this evangelical woman says she doesn’t remember when—or whether—her pastor has ever preached on the subject of male headship.
The cost of going with the crowd.
by Dalrock | May 16, 2017 | Link

You shall not spread a false report. You shall not join hands with a wicked man to be a malicious witness. 2 You shall not fall in with the many to do evil, nor shall you bear witness in a lawsuit, siding with the many, so as to pervert justice

-Exodus 23:1-2 ESV

In After Patriarchy, What? Why Egalitarians Are Winning the Evangelical Gender Debate Dr. Russell Moore takes secular commenters to task for bearing false witness against conservative evangelical men:

One of the most important pieces of sociological data in recent years comes from the University of Virginia’s W. Bradford Wilcox in his landmark book, Soft Patriarchs, New Men: How Christianity Shapes Fathers and Husbands

[Wilcox] brings forth the demographic statistics and survey results on issues ranging from paternal hugging of children to paternal yelling, from female responses about marital happiness to the divisions of household labor. In virtually every category, the most conservative and evangelical households were also the “softest” in terms of familial harmony, relational happiness, and emotional health.

Unlike many secular university researchers, Wilcox actually studies real live evangelicals, rather than simply speculating on how such “misogynist throwbacks” must live. He has read what evangelicals read, listened to evangelical radio programs, and otherwise immersed himself in an evangelical subculture that few academics seem to understand. Wilcox demonstrates that his results are not an anomaly. It is not akin to discovering that nineteenth century slaveholders had less racist attitudes than northern abolitionists. Instead he shows that the “softness” of evangelical fathers is a result of patriarchy...

This raises the question, why do secular academics believe that conservative Christian men are selfish monsters who are forever abusing their wives, when the truth is quite easily observed? One obvious answer is the secular academics are merely listening to what conservative Christian leaders have to say about Christian husbands. If you read the conservative Christian press, there is no more vile group in our society than married Christian fathers. Articles like Ditch Your Delusions of Grandeur and Love Your Child are fan favorites over at CBMW.

The secular academics would get the same impression from reading Dr. Moore as well. Moore is constantly berating Christian husbands as wife abusers. In articles like The Church and Violence Against Women, Moore warns against the barbarian horde of hateful Christian married fathers with their selfish materialism, their libidinal fantasies, and wrathful temper tantrums:
We must teach from our pulpits, our Sunday school classes, and our Vacation Bible Schools that women are to be cherished, honored, and protected by men. This means we teach men to reject American playboy consumerism in light of a Judgment Seat at which they will give account for their care for their families. It means we explicitly tell the women in our congregations, “A man who hits you has surrendered his headship, and that is the business both of the civil state in enacting public justice and of this church in enacting church discipline.”

Church discipline against wife-beaters must be clear and consistent. We must stand with women against predatory men in all areas of abandonment, divorce, and neglect. We must train up men, through godly mentoring as well as through biblical instruction, who will know that the model of a husband is a man who crucifies his selfish materialism, his libidinal fantasies, and his wrathful temper tantrums in order to care lovingly for a wife. We must also remind these young men that every idle word, and every hateful act, will be laid out in judgment before the eyes of the One to whom we must give an answer.

Note that Moore knows the men he is maligning are, as a group, the softest in our society. It is truly baffling that Moore would on the one hand bemoan the fact that evangelical Christian husbands and fathers are wildly mis-characterized by secular academics, only to make it a practice to do the same. My only guess is that he and the others doing the same are assuming they aren’t doing real damage. It feels good, after all, and what can it hurt? Given that the charge is being made against millions of conservative Christian husbands, certainly it is bound to be true for at least a few of them. Perhaps a small percentage of this handful of men will become convicted after seeing all conservative Christian husbands painted in this way.

But this is profoundly destructive in multiple ways. The first is the obvious problem Moore complains about in the link above; he is reinforcing the same false stereotypes which are being used to sell feminist Christianity. The next problem is the marital strife these wild accusations inflame. Our feminist culture is telling Christian wives that they are being oppressed. Having Christian leaders constantly reinforcing this message is a sure fire prescription for at least marital strife, and in many cases this constant provocation will lead to divorce. Even if you don’t care about what you are doing to men and women, surely some thought should be given to the harm this is causing millions of children.

Lastly, there is the impact this constant maligning of married fathers has on young men. The message is clear: Married fathers are contemptible. This is true even for the young men who know, like Moore does, that in reality evangelical husbands are the very softest in our society. Young men don’t have to believe the outlandish charges to receive the very clear message that the married father is an object of deep contempt. Since respect is a primary motivator for men, how long can conservative Christian leaders keep this up before we start seeing a real impact on how young men see marriage and fatherhood? If good husbands and fathers aren’t respected, and if in fact marrying and becoming a father are reasons to lose respect for a man, why should a young Christian man want to pursue marriage and fatherhood?
Their husbands forced them to do it.

by Dalrock | May 18, 2017 | Link

As I’ve been pointing out, the conservative Christian response to feminism has been to pretend that feminists aren’t really in the final mopping up stages in the culture war and assert instead that what we are experiencing is a sudden and mysterious change in men. There is no feminist rebellion, just weak men screwing feminism up.

As yet one more example, here is a quote of Pastor Tony Evans* from 1994. W. Bradford Wilcox explains** that Evans gave versions of this speech to Promise Keepers events around the country (emphasis mine):

The primary cause of this national crisis, that is the decline of the family, is the feminization of the American male. The first thing you need to do is sit down with your wife and say something like this: “Honey, I’ve made a terrible mistake. I’ve given you my role. I gave up leading this family, and I forced you to take my place. Now I must reclaim that role. Don’t misunderstand what I am saying here. I’m not suggesting that you ask to be given your role back. I’m urging you to take it back.”

If you simply ask for it, your wife is likely to say: “Look, the last ten years I’ve had to raise these kids, look after the house and pay the bills. I’ve had to do my job and yours. You think I’m just going to turn everything back over to you?”
Your wife’s concerns might be justified. Unfortunately, however, there can be no compromise here. Treat the lady gently and lovingly, but lead. To you ladies who may be reading this, give it back. For the sake of your family and the survival of our culture, let your man be a man if he’s willing.

Evans is unusual in that he is telling men to take back the leadership. But his simultaneous complete denial of the feminist rebellion is breathtaking. Here he is chastising men to show courage when he is too afraid to say what is actually going on.

As Jennifer A Marshal explains in the same piece, feminists were protesting Promise Keepers as a threat to the new model they had worked so hard to achieve:

This gathering alarmed feminists at groups like the National Organization for Women. Patricia Ireland, who was the president of that group at that time, accused Promise Keepers of being promoters of “a feel-good forum of male supremacy intent on keeping women in the back seat.” Some feminist activists even gathered outside of Union Station to heckle the men arriving at the rally. They taunted, jeered, and even threatened to disrobe themselves.

The attendees passed a throng of feminists eager to guard their hard fought progress to get into the event. Many of the men went because their wives ordered them to go. But once inside everyone pretended that there was no feminist revolution, men just somehow became passive, and this forced the poor wives to grasp for power. To think otherwise was too
terrifying. This is nonsense on stilts, akin to the fantasy land claim that cowardly men are forcing women to reluctantly elbow their way into combat roles– while feminists publicly celebrate their victory.

*Many of my readers will recognize Pastor Evans’ daughter Priscilla Shirer, the women’s preacher and star of the movie War Room.

**H/T Daniel
Real Men Step Up to Fifty Shades of Rationalization.

by Dalrock | May 19, 2017 | Link

There is a blog companion to FamilyLife/Dennis Rainey’s Stepping Up® book and video program, and it has a three part series by Scott Williams on Fifty Shades of Grey (50SOG). With the titles alone, you can’t make this stuff up:

1. What’s a real man do with Fifty Shades?
2. Man up to Christian Grey, Fifty Shades
3. Real manhood: Black & white, not Fifty Shades of Grey

The denial is comical, starting with the refusal to accept that women’s reaction 50SOG is driven by sexual desire, the desire to be objectified by a powerful dominant man:

In case you’re not familiar, Fifty Shades of Grey is based on one of the best selling books of all time. The movie bills itself as a romance between powerfully-attractive young billionaire Christian Grey and a naïve, not-so-self-assured college senior, Anastasia Steele. Without meaning to, she catches his attention when she’s interviewing him for the school newspaper, and he begins to do everything in his power (and he has a lot of it) to make her the object of his desires...

...Ana repeatedly tells Mr. Grey (after each time he does his thing with her) that she doesn’t appreciate it. She’s constantly in tears about it. She tries to leave him, only to have him stalk her and emotionally manipulate her into staying. He demands control of her life to the point of prescribing her exercise and diet, choosing her wardrobe, and having a doctor examine her and put her on the pill.

Here we have a fantasy written by a woman, and consumed by women, and all Williams can see is a fictional man making women sin. This is truly fantastic, because 50SOG came into existence by women going around the standard publishing process. 50SOG started as Twilight fan fiction, and women loved it so much eventually the book and movie industries showed up to give women what they were demanding. As Williams notes, Christian women are just as enthralled with 50SOG as non Christian women are:

What is surprising is who is viewing the film and reading the book—and why in the world they even would. Many refer to the book as “mommy porn” because of its wild popularity among adult women. And ticket sales are briskest in the typically-conservative deep south...

...it’s also reaching our young daughters. According to IMDb (Internet Movie Database), the movie drew the highest reviews by far from girls under 18.

And just in case you’re wondering, a Barna survey found that women who identify themselves as Christians are reading the books at the same rate as the general public. It’s captivating women everywhere.
That should concern any self-respecting man.

Williams can’t blame the Christian women shamelessly consuming the porn; they are being tricked into trying to “rescue a broken man”. There has to be a man to blame, so Williams blames the fictional character E. L. James invented (and E.L. James for inventing him). He’s the one to blame, for not being a real man:

Christian Grey is no real man in any sense of the word. A real man respects and honors a woman’s body and emotions; he doesn’t abuse and manipulate her. But author E.L. James has somehow made Grey the desire of 100 million women. She cleverly plays to women’s innate longings to be sought after, to live a more fulfilling existence and to rescue a broken man. In doing so, she gets women to excuse abusive behavior and to ignore countless warning signs on a fool’s road to romance.

Reading through two very lengthy, very detailed synopses of the first book (I refuse to read the book itself), I was continually struck by how much Mr. Grey’s behavior was the very picture of everything we tell women to run away from to avoid abuse. How many times have we listened incredulously to real-world horror stories of women who endure years of physical, emotional, and sexual abuse from boyfriends and husbands, yet can’t bring themselves to leave. Yet here we are with a book series and movie that draws women into that same warped, powerless thinking—“I’m not worth it. He can’t help it. What will happen to him if I leave?”

While a fictional man is to blame, real men need to step up and solve the problem. Real men do this not by confronting women’s sin and refusing to allow women to deny the nature of their temptations. Real men do this by treating women better and improving their self esteem. This is especially important for daughters. If daughters have enough self esteem, they won’t be tempted to go after sexy badboys:

A young girl needs to know that she’s loved—by her Heavenly father and her earthly father. We daddies need to remind our daughters of their intrinsic worth to us, and especially their value to the God who created them, who knows them intimately, and who loves them unconditionally. The more they accept this, the more likely they will be to look for a man who recognizes and respects their value.

According to Williams, Wives need self more esteem too. But they also need more beta comfort to prevent them from pining for alpha attraction:

Your wife should be the object of your desire. She longs to see in your words and actions that you are always seeking the best for her. Rather than expecting her to sign a contract listing your demands, remind her that you have made a covenant to cherish and care for her, and to love her as much as you love your own body (Ephesians 5:29).

He advises men to get their wives sexual juices flowing with some modern Christian seduction, straight from the Book of Oprah. According to Williams, the key to getting your wife hot is lots and lots of talking about your feelings:
There is a much healthier way to jump-start romance and intimacy in your marriage. It’s called communication. Open, honest conversations about intimacy and sexual fulfillment keep romance and passion alive through years of marriage.

Talk honestly about how each of you assess your love life, frequency, likes, dislikes and wishes. Maybe you can start with some simple questions that you answer together.

- On a scale of 1-10, how would you rate our intimacy?
- What things that I do make you feel most wanted and fulfilled?
- What would you change about our love life?

Lastly, Williams closes the three part series with a warning to husbands not to respond to their wife craving to submit to a man by reminding her that she should be submitting to her own husband (emphasis mine):

The Bible teaches women to submit to the God-given leadership of their husbands in the same way that Christ submitted to the will of God the Father. But here’s a reminder, guys: God doesn’t command a husband to remind his wife to submit. Instead He calls the husband to unconditionally love his wife as Christ loved the church and gave his entire life for her.

This is of course not true. Husbands are to lead their wives spiritually, and wash them in the water of the word; there is no exception for biblical instruction on marriage. If a wife isn’t submitting, her husband has an obligation to remind his wife what Scripture says on the topic.

Related:

- Why Christians need Game.
- She felt unloved.
- Romance 101: How to stop frustrating your wife.
Cucked by Courtly Love.
by Dalrock | May 22, 2017 | Link

Cuckoo’s are diabolical parasites. The video below shows what happens after a cuckoo egg is laid in a Warbler’s nest.

The cuckoo chick ejects the real offspring so it can take their place. The truly disturbing part is that the parents care for the cuckoo as if it were their own. They have no idea the real chicks were pushed out by the fake, no matter how absurd it looks at the end of the video as the small warblers continue to feed the giant cuckoo as if it were a warbler chick.

The same thing has happened to huge numbers of Christians. We adopted the philosophy of courtly love, which is ironically itself a celebration of adultery, as if it were from God. How many even remember what was there before the parasite pushed out the real thing? As C.S. Lewis explains in The Allegory of Love:

French poets, in the eleventh century, discovered or invented, or were the first to express, that romantic species of passion which English poets were still writing about in the nineteenth. They effected a change which has left no corner of our ethics, our imagination, or our daily life untouched, and they erected impassable barriers between us and the classical past or the Oriental present. Compared with this revolution the Renaissance is a mere ripple on the surface of literature.

This is why we have Christians teaching that romance sanctifies sex, and speaking of God honoring romance. You can see the same thing in the three part series on 50SOG at the Stepping Up® blog, with the implicit assumption that women’s sexuality is inherently pure and focused on “romance”.

It also shows up in the comments to the second post of the series. A 16 year old boy replies that unlike young men of the world he knows what God has taught Christian men to do; Christian men are to practice chivalry by opening doors for women, as God commands (emphasis mine):

As a 16 year old teen. I am often faced with choices that effect the kind of man i will be. At times my friends can persecute me for setting such high standards. I have made it my goal to respect and honor women for the true creation that they are as Gods daughters. Not just objects of my desire. In this age of time women have learned that men have fallen weak. To many women have to open their own doors. To many women have to raise their own kids. To many women disrespect themselves. It is our job as men to teach them to respect themselves. You should see the faces of the women i open doors for. We can make a big difference. As a 16 year old teen i am often assumed to be a disrespectful brat. But i have shown people that is not the case with me. Despite what this world will do i will
follow Jesus in the way he would want me to follow him. I will treat women as God would want me to. If i a 16 year old teen can do this so can any man. Thank you guys for what you do praying for you.

The blog host replied (emphasis mine):

Keep stepping up, Kyle. And keep being a godly example for your friends and all us guys.
Servant Leadership in two easy lessons.
by Dalrock | May 24, 2017 | Link

Lesson 1: Your only job as a husband is to sacrifice yourself for her, not lead her. Don’t ever tell her what her role is or what to do. That would be subjugation:

- Subjugation is defined as “defeating or gaining control of a person for their obedience.” Submission is when a person voluntarily places themselves under the authority and guidance of another.

- The Bible teaches women to submit to the God-given leadership of their husbands in the same way that Christ submitted to the will of God the Father. But here’s a reminder, guys: God doesn’t command a husband to remind his wife to submit. Instead He calls the husband to unconditionally love his wife as Christ loved the church and gave his entire life for her.

Lesson 2: If she assumes headship, or otherwise sins, it is your fault. You forced her to sin, by not leading her and reminding her that she should submit (emphasis mine):

- He leads courageously. He doesn’t force women to step in to fill the vacuum of leadership left by passive men. But he also recognizes that his leadership is a position of voluntary submission to Christ, who voluntarily submits Himself to the Father.

In Summary:

1. She’ll do what she wants. Mind your own business.
2. When she sins, it is your fault.

Note: Servant Leadership should not be confused with headship.

See Also:

- Servant leaders mind their own business.
- Their husbands forced them to do it.
News.com.au posted an article last week about Spain’s insane laws on parental obligations, titled Country where unemployed 30-year-olds are suing their parents for financial support:

Under Spanish law, parents are required to support their children until they reach financial independence, with no age limit, and a string of cases in recent years has cemented the rule.

This is nuts. It isn’t just the open ended financial obligation, but the family strife that this kind of policy all but guarantees. It is one thing as a parent to voluntarily decide to help an adult child get on their feet, but something else entirely to have the state force you to pay your adult children a kind of alimony. In the former, you can set expectations of your child and discontinue help if those expectations aren’t being met. In the latter, the child can do as they like and you have to pay up... or else.

This law changes the nature of the parent child relationship even in cases where the child has not (yet) sued for support, as all Spanish parents are now bargaining in the shadow of the law. Who will want to sign up to have children knowing that once they grow up they turn into spoiled ex wives?

This is where it becomes farcical, because Spain is in the grips of severe population decline. Earlier this year Spain appointed a “commissioner for the demographic challenge”, which the international media dubbed Spain’s “Sex Tsar” or “Minister of Sex”. Fox’s article on the subject is typical: Spain appoints ‘minister for sex’ to reverse nation’s plummeting birth rate.

Spain has appointed its first Minister of Sex whose job will be to get people busy between the sheets.

The government hopes to boost Spain’s falling birth rate, which is one of the lowest in the developed world.

As nearly all of the articles on the topic explain, the problem is that Spaniards are simply too busy to have sex (emphasis mine):

The country is faced with a population crisis, with fewer births than deaths recorded for the first time last year.

Experts say long working hours and a culture of eating late at night and going to bed after midnight are partly to blame for the nation’s sex famine.

Rafael Puyol, of the IE Business School in Madrid, said: “They do not help with making a family. Then when a child arrives it is even worse.”

The denial here is astounding. Spaniards are having plenty of sex. What they aren’t doing (at
least enough) is having children. Part of the problem is a vicious cycle. Population decline and less marriage weakens the economy, and a weak economy in turn leads to population decline and even lower marriage rates. But some of the solutions are painfully obvious. The most obvious is the insane rule that adult children can sue their parents for alimony. Repealing that nonsense would be an easy win, and help reverse the current message that people who have children are chumps, too stupid to use birth control.

Other solutions are nearly as obvious, but would likely be much more difficult politically. Just like the adult child alimony requirement teaches Spaniards that parents* are chumps, Spain has sent a clear message that fathers are chumps. Following a change in divorce law in 2005**, Spain's divorce rate doubled. While the new law is “empowering” for women, it is devastating to men. As the New York Times explained in In Europe, Divorce and Separation Become a Burden for Struggling Fathers:

The pain of Europe’s economic crisis is being felt sharply by a new class of people: separated and divorced men who end up impoverished or on the streets as they struggle to maintain themselves while keeping up child support and alimony payments.

In Spain, court filings against fathers who have not paid child support have risen sharply since the start of the economic crisis.

Not surprisingly, the marriage rate began falling dramatically following Spain’s 2005 legal encouragement to wives to kick the father out of the house (emphasis mine):

The incidence of marriage in the Spanish population has been reduced over the past 30 years, from 5.3 marriages for every 1,000 inhabitants in 1981 to 3.3 in 2013 (2 marriages fewer for every 1,000 inhabitants). The reduction in marriage rates has been intensified since 2006.

Certainly not all of the decline in births is due to policies designed to teach Spaniards that parents in general, and fathers in specific, are chumps. Much of this is driven by women prioritizing sexual freedom and education/career in their most fertile and marriageable years. But all of the real root causes share two common traits:

1. They have nothing to do with a lack of sex.
2. Feminist politics and attitudes.

What is obvious in this fiasco is that our elites would far rather play make-believe than deal with the fact that feminism is profoundly destructive, even in a time of crisis. Rolling back feminism, even on the margins, is quite literally unthinkable, so the press and other leaders go into fantasy land mode, just like conservative Christians. Some day the pain of the decline might be great enough that the elites decide to roll back the worst excesses of feminism, but clearly that day hasn’t yet come. The problem for all of us is that the longer we wait, the harder it will be to turn the problem around. We are squandering an enormous amount of goodwill from men, and the same inertia that is propping up the system today will be working against us once we decide to once again encourage marriage and fatherhood.
Update: Welcome Instapundit readers.

Related:

1. How the destruction of marriage is strangling the feminist welfare state.
2. Disrespecting respectability, dishonoring the honorable.
3. More ominous than a strike.

*In theory the law applies to both mothers and fathers, but in reality since fathers are overwhelmingly the breadwinners the law is primarily aimed at fathers. However, since a married mother would have to divorce her husband to formally get off the hook, mothers are at least theoretically the target as well.

**There was also a change in Spanish domestic violence law in 2004 which is claimed to automatically jail men accused of domestic violence based solely on the accusation of a woman. If this is true, it reinforces the message that husbands/fathers are despicable and would be another obvious explanation for why marriage rates suddenly started declining around 2006.
Rescuing Wonder Woman from the Ugly Feminists.

by Dalrock | May 31, 2017 | Link

The LA Times has an article up describing how the cast of Wonder Woman downplayed the feminist aspect of the movie at a recent premier:

Despite the obvious girl power on display, many of the film’s stars and creators shied away from identifying it as a feminist film, hoping not to isolate the male fans in attendance.

This is very wise, but not just to make sure the movie appeals to men. Modern audiences love feminist heroines, but both men and women want their feminist heroine to be hot. This was the real problem with Ghostbusters. No one, neither men nor women, wanted to go watch four butch women in dumpy jumpsuits and combat boots save the world.

The makers of the upcoming Wonder Woman movie seem to understand this, and have so far avoided running into the ditch ugly feminists keep demanding they aim for.

Predictably, there were calls to make Wonder Woman an in your face lesbian:

“The character has to stand up and say, “I’M GAY!” in all bold caps for it to be evident,” he said. “For my purposes, that’s bad writing. That’s a character stating something that’s not impacting the story.”

When that failed, the call was to ensure that Wonder Woman had (you can’t make this stuff up) hairy feminist armpits.

Through careful analysis, the internet has exposed a perhaps, not-so wonderful aspect of DC Comics’ newest incarnation of the classic, girl-power super heroine: She has no armpit hair.

But the studio responded to the controversy by digitally evening out the skin tone on Wonder Woman’s armpits-of-girlpower, instead of giving her pits a set of CGI dreadlocks.

Lastly, instead of a dumpy feminist jumpsuit and combat boots, the movie’s creators wisely gave her a sexy costume, including high heeled fashion boots women are bound to envy.

All of this will give Wonder Woman a chance at success that Ghostbusters never had.
A movie so feminist, it makes men and women cry?
by Dalrock | May 31, 2017 | Link

Red Pill Latecomer pointed out that I left out the special women only viewings Alamo Drafthouse is holding for Wonder Woman, and the feminist outrage when the double standard was pointed out:

It’s time to pour one out for the countless male tears that are being shed in Austin, Texas over a grave injustice some men feel is being committed against the fragile male species.

I left this out of my previous post for brevity, but it is true that both the women only showings and (much worse) the feminist screeching that followed could have posed a risk to the success of the movie*. Luckily for the creators of Wonder Woman, aside from a few exceptions there hasn’t been much focus on the all women showings and the feminist harpies screeching about men invading their space. It isn’t the feminist philosophy audiences would object to, but how dour and ugly the feminist aesthetic is. People want to have fun at the movies, not be scolded by a women’s studies major.

There is still time, however, for ugly feminists to ruin the perception of the movie before it opens this weekend. USA Today and the woman who directed the movie did their part today with Why are women crying when they watch ‘Wonder Woman’ fight?

Director Patty Jenkins has grown accustomed to hearing stories about audience members welling up as Gal Gadot, playing DC Comics heroine Diana Prince, grabs her shield and sword and plunges into battle in the new superhero epic (in theaters Thursday night).

“I didn’t even realize I needed this,” says Jenkins, who makes history as the first woman to helm a superhero movie. “I didn’t realize that I needed to let this out, that’s what I was tasked with. But it opened a door to all the expressions of this superhero, all the dimensions of a woman that maybe we haven’t seen or felt.”

*The men black knighting by threatening to show up to the women-only screenings are funny but don’t pose a threat to the perception of the movie. Most people don’t take feminists seriously regarding their claims of wanting equality, so the charge of hypocrisy doesn’t really have any currency. The only real threat would come from the demand from feminists to “Take me seriously!” that the black knighting can provoke.
A recent MarketWatch article on “gray divorce” made me want to revisit the topic. Interestingly while the article itself doesn’t seem to have changed since it was first published in March, the spin the title places on the article has changed twice. Here are three different snapshots of the article with the respective titles:

1. Your failing marriage is about to make the retirement crisis worse
2. This is why baby boomers are divorcing at a stunning rate
3. The good news behind why baby boomers are divorcing at a stunning rate

Regardless of the title, the opening message in all of the versions of the article is the same; older women are fed up with their long marriages and have decided en masse to divorce their boring loyal dude husbands. Underneath an image of women deciding if they should let their men out of jail or abandon them, all three open with:

Looking ahead to the next phase of life can seem pretty dreadful if you can’t stand the person who you’ll be spending it with.

That may be what some boomers are facing. Among U.S. adults ages 50 and older, the divorce rate has roughly doubled since the 1990s, according to a recent Pew Research Center report.

The problem, according to the article, is that we live much longer now, and “we” (women) are now too enlightened to see marriage as a lifetime commitment. Therefore, the boring loyal dudes must go (emphasis mine):

Statistically speaking we’re healthier and probably going to be living a lot longer — possibly 30 years longer — than average retirees once did. The surge in late-in-life — or “gray” — divorce is one possibly unintended consequence of this so-called longevity bonus.

“What’s pushing gray divorce is people are living longer and they feel more entitled to living fully. They’ve contributed to raising children, they want an emotional journey, it’s their time now,” says Lili Vasileff, a certified financial planner and president of Divorce and Money Matters, which specializes in divorce financial planning. “They may have (decades) ahead and don’t want to be unhappy anymore.”

This article and the Pew study it cites are part of a long running pattern in the media. The 2008 American Community Survey (ACS) found that divorce rates for Americans over 50 had increased substantially compared with the same statistic from 1990. This lead to a barrage of breathless media stories about an “explosion” or “surge” in divorce rates as long married couples got older, with a generation of empowered Boomer wives deciding life was too short to remain married to their boring loyal dudes. As the Market Watch story demonstrates, the
pattern continues today. Nearly ten years later, we are still getting news stories about this empowering new trend.

And yet, it is all a sham! For starters, the breathless headlines about this new trend are highly misleading. The Pew research report is titled Led by Baby Boomers, divorce rates climb for America’s 50+ population. After two paragraphs explaining this “new” trend, the report finally spills the beans; divorce rates for couples over 50 have remained steady for nearly a decade (perhaps longer):

While the divorce rate for adults 50 and older has risen sharply over the past 25 years, it has remained relatively steady for this age group since 2008, when the Census Bureau began collecting divorce data yearly as part of its American Community Survey.

The change occurred some time between 1990 and 2008. Since then it has remained “relatively steady”. Yet here we are, nearly 10 years later, and Pew is reporting a change that happened between 1990 and 2008 as if it were something new!

But the misinformation campaign is even worse, because even from the beginning the message has been the opposite of reality. While it was true that late life divorce rates had increased significantly from 1990, and it was also true that older women (just like younger women) initiate the vast majority of divorces, the narrative being sold was and is nonsense. There has been no “surge” or “explosion” in Boomer divorce rates as couples aged. In fact, the exact opposite occurred. As Boomers aged, their divorce rates dropped dramatically. As the data in this NCFMR report shows, this was the case for every cohort of Boomers, just like the Silents before them:
What the 2008 and subsequent ACS surveys measured was the fact that Boomers were continuing their life long trend of divorcing at higher rates than the generations that preceded and followed.*

The simple fact is that divorce rates don’t increase late in life. The exact opposite is the case, as divorce rates decline dramatically as the age of the wife increases:
There is an obvious explanation for this, as divorce rates are driven by women, and women's options drop dramatically as they get older:

The reality is even bleaker than the chart above would suggest for older women in the Sexual Market Place (SMP) and Marriage Market Place (MMP). Older men’s higher remarriage rates come at a time of SMP strength, as Rolo’s chart predicts. Most of them don’t need to remarry.
to be successful in the SMP. Older women on the other hand tend to end up terribly alone if they don’t remarry, as the 2004 AARP survey on late life divorce discovered (emphasis mine):

Almost 9 in 10 men (87%) dated after their divorce, compared to 8 in 10 women (79%)... Among those who dated after the divorce, more than half of men (54%) but fewer women remarried (39%).

... Many women, especially those who have not remarried (69%), do not touch or hug at all sexually. An even larger majority of women who have not remarried do not engage in sexual intercourse (77% saying not at all), in comparison with about half of men (49%) who have not remarried.

The AARP survey painted a truly bleak picture for women who divorce late in life, showing that nearly 70% of the women didn't remarry, and failing to remarry for women meant living in a sexual desert, not even getting hugs! And yet, fitting with the media narrative, the AARP survey chose a cover image of a lonely old man devastated by divorce.

See Also:

- Boring loyal dudes
- Grannies gone wild!
- Women’s morphing need for male investment.
- The Whispers.

*This chart using ONS data demonstrates this same pattern in the UK. See this post for more on how the chart was created.
As I explained in A long term commitment to selling divorce, the media has been selling “gray divorce” as empowerment to boomer women for nearly a decade, using a highly misleading narrative. Fortunately few women (statistically) are actually taken in by this message; despite the hype late life divorce is statistically rare, as most women intuitively understand the reality of Rollo’s Chart.

But limited success hasn’t discouraged those who are selling gray divorce, and even limited success still can translate to large numbers of men, women, and children being harmed. For an example of the constant barrage selling gray divorce to boomer women, see the 2010 article in the Denver Post Women getting feet under them after “gray divorce”. As the title suggests, the article is about the empowerment late life divorce offers to women. The poster child for the article is then 52 year old Mandy Walker, who is shown standing confidently next to a step-stool, the very picture of divorce empowerment.

Not surprisingly, the text of the article is selling the same message as the headline and the image. Older women are ditching their boring loyal dudes and opting for an empowering new life! This is an exciting new trend!

Women in long-standing marriages tend to want to move on more...

Unlike their mothers and grandmothers, who may have stayed married out of economic dependency, boomer wives are more likely to be financially independent, having carved out successful careers.

...when boomer women aren't happy in a relationship, they seek change for fulfillment...

More so than men, women begin to look back on their lives and think about what their interests and passions were before marriage...

The article then quotes Mandy Walker, the confident woman with the step-stool:

The biggest thing was knowing I was approaching 50 and thinking I didn’t want to live the rest of my life married to someone I no longer loved...

Over the years, you give up a part of your life for your children, a part for your husband and a part for your work...

You are left wondering, ‘Where is the part that’s left for me?’

The article explains that divorce empowered Walker to follow her dream of being a writer. Walker went back to school to get a masters degree in journalism. Now Walker writes... about divorce.
Given that seven years have passed since Walker posed as the poster child for gray divorce, I thought I would see what living the dream looks like. While her short stint writing about divorce for Huffington Post seems to have ended in 2013, Walker still hosts a blog called Since My Divorce where she continues to write about divorce. The blog is heavily monetized* with advertisements and guest posts from divorce related service providers and links to the full range of divorce related services Walker herself sells.

My goal is to support you through the end of your relationship and beyond, with compassion and without judgment, while sharing tons of valuable insights and practical guidance.

One of her offerings is a free course to help women decide if they should divorce their husbands, titled Is Divorce The Answer?

Every marriage has its ups and downs, right?

Right.

So how do you know when you’ve crossed that invisible line, when you’ve reached the point of no return, when your relationship is truly beyond repair?

If after taking her free course you decide that divorce is the answer, Walker will then assist you with paid coaching time, or for those on a budget My Divorce Pal, an online self paced program Walker sells for $167.

But what about after the divorce? What does Walker offer divorcées who have completed their empowering gray (or otherwise) divorce and have come out on the other side? Walker has them covered on her site as well, with articles like the current guest post, How To Overcome Unfairness In Divorce:

It happens to the best of us. We navigate divorce, trying our hardest to be logical and rise about the drama and pettiness of our former partners, but every once in a while, the feeling hits.
Fairness. Unfairness. The feeling like we’ve been screwed over during divorce.

The guest post is written by fellow Divorce Coach Martha Bodyfelt who, like Walker, has her own website and offers her own services:

Martha Bodyfelt is a CDC Certified Divorce Coach® whose website “Surviving Your Split” helps readers gain clarity and get their confidence back so they can move on with their lives. For your free Divorce Goddess Recovery guide, stop by [http://survivingyoursplit.com/](http://survivingyoursplit.com/) or say hello at martha@survivingyoursplit.com.

Bodyfelt elaborates, knowing precisely what her audience has experienced after the intoxicating promise of empowerment has faded and reality has finally set in:

You know exactly what I’m talking about. Do any of the following sound like things you have said or thought?

“It’s not fair that my ex has already moved on and I’m stuck here with nothing.”

“It’s not fair that he’s out having a great time with his new girlfriend while I’m here heartbroken.”

“It’s not fair that my adult children are going to be in my ex’s wedding, and they don’t understand what I’m going through.

“It’s not fair that they’re taking the kids to Disneyland and I don’t even have money for a haircut.”

“It’s not fair that I will have to work for another 10 years instead of retiring next year.”

Many of us have stewed in the injustice of it all, thinking that our ex should be punished...

See Also:

- Her husband was her best friend.
- The secret to staying married

*The blog also appears to be a ghost town, with almost no reader comments on recent articles. For the articles I found that did have reader comments, roughly half of the comments were made by the author or host.*
My own divorce story is woven into many posts usually as part of my commentary at
the end of each post. I have, however written a few posts specifically about my
journey which I’ve always seen in my mind as a climb up a mountain. When I reach
the top I stand up tall, raise my arms to the sky, lift my face up and let the wind blow
through my hair. I’m not there yet but I’m getting there.

–Mandy Walker, Divorce and Me

In my last post I introduced Mandy Walker, professional divorcée and gray divorce poster
child. Walker wears many hats. She is:

1. A divorce coach.
2. A divorce mediator.
3. A host/facilitator of divorce support groups.
4. A writer about divorce, including her blog Since My Divorce and (formerly) divorce
related posts at Huffington Post.

All of this was made possible by, you guessed it, divorcing her husband. Divorce changed
her life and gave her her new identity. And yet, Walker is deeply troubled that her doctor
would ask about her marital status. Walker asks Huffington Post readers to join her in
refusing to answer this question in Why I Refuse To Give My Marital Status:

Asking about marital status is an anachronism. It no longer serves a purpose and is
irrelevant. Won’t you join me in boycotting this question?

Walker has made her divorce the defining moment of her life; she literally can’t shut up about
it. Yet she is uncomfortable identifying herself as a divorcée to her own doctor. Why?

As absurd as this sounds, there is a good reason for it. For women, divorce involves a huge
loss of status if it isn’t quickly followed by remarriage. Checking the box “Divorced” is a
painful admission of profound failure.

It isn’t just Walker who is haunted by her status as a divorcée. Fellow professional divorcée,
divorce blogger, and Huffington Post Divorce author Rosemond (Rosie) Perdue Cranner is also
deeply troubled by the post divorce status double standard. Rosie explains in I’m a Divorcee?
But what do you call a man who’s divorced?

…it is telling that the world needs a word to describe a woman’s previous marital
status but society doesn’t feel the need to label a man’s track record. Why? No one
really cares if a man’s been married before but a woman? It’s a mark.

…nobody cares if a man has been married before, but for a woman there is still a bit
of old world stink. A slight stench of previously used goods. I think that the literal
Rosie is wrong on one part, and right on the other. There already is a word for a man who is divorced. The word is divorcé. But she is absolutely right about the different status implications for divorced men and women. This is one of those intractable problems that feminists simply can't solve, because it comes down to the heart of the differences between men and women. Feminists can try to change the language all they like, but they won't be able to change the way both men and women think about these things. The same goes for the terms frigid, slut and coward, and the different perception of single mothers vs single fathers.

For example, on another post Rosie warns divorced women over forty to avoid dating never married childless men over 40:

**Don’t waste your time dating a man over 40 who’s never been married and had kids.**

Rosie, who elsewhere argues that men should face the same stigma women do for being divorced, argues that women should shun never married men and seek out divorced men:

| Here’s my advice. Want a real shot at happiness? Find yourself a man who’s been married before. Find a man who’s had kids. Someone who knows what its like to drive carpool. To hold his wife’s hand in the hospital. Someone who’s got battle scars and loss. Find a real man, not a self involved 40 something man child. |

Laughably, Rosie tries to claim that having broken a solemn vow is more moral than not having made the vow at all:

**4. Being married before means you are brave enough to make a commitment.**

Yes, we’ve been married and our marriages failed but at least we had the courage to say I Do.

Maybe we failed miserably but we took the walk down the aisle, threw the wedding bouquet and put ourselves in debt to have a kick ass party. At least we tried. Men who’ve made it to 40 and can’t commit? Let them go.

See Also: Haunted by a number
I thought I was done with Wonder Woman, but yesterday’s Wonder Woman Op Ed by Jessica Bennett at the NYT is too hilarious not to share. See the accompanying photo, described as:

Attendees of an all-women screening of “Wonder Woman” at the Alamo Drafthouse in Brooklyn.
Credit Nicole Craine for The New York Times

The photo shows two women in “Nasty Woman” T shirts wearing paper tiaras, with facial expressions so stunted the woman in the foreground looks like she just soiled herself.

Was the crowd at the theater so incredibly stunted that this was the best photo the Times could run to display the empowerment of the movie? Or perhaps the professionals at the NYT were crying too hard after watching the film to notice how laughable the photo was:

It was the first fight scene of the movie, and I was trying not to sob.

Maybe they were blinded by a strange feeling of ferociousness:

In fact, I was proud. So were legions of women I know who took daughters, nieces, nephews, mentees or simply went in droves, some of them to women-only screenings — and walked out of theaters with a strange feeling of ferociousness.

Bennett explains that the movie is important because visual images are important:

…visual storytelling — which brain researchers will tell you is processed tens of thousands of times faster than the written word. And yet so much of the messaging we receive about who can do what in the world is subliminal...

Indeed.
A radical Father’s Day proposal.

by Dalrock | June 9, 2017 | Link

Several weeks ago I outlined the way modern conservative Christian leaders avoid confronting feminism by pretending that something mysterious has happened to men. This is something that is easy to prove and yet is a surprisingly well kept secret. Nearly all conservative Christians are in denial regarding this fact, as the whole exercise is one of denial to avoid something terrifying. Non Christians and even liberal Christians are generally not aware of this either, because the reality goes against the stereotype of conservative Christians as patriarchal throwbacks.

For this reason, most would be quite surprised to learn that Father’s Day is generally viewed very differently by conservative Christian culture than by secular culture. Secular culture generally accepts Father’s Day for what it is, a day to honor fathers. There is of course a recurring theme of a few single mothers arguing that like Mother’s Day, Father’s Day should be all about them, but this is greeted with a surprising degree of pushback from feminists. For the most part, in the secular world Father’s Day is about honoring fathers.

Unfortunately it isn’t so simple for conservative Christians. Instead of setting Father’s Day aside as a day to honor fathers, it has traditionally been used as a day to tear Christian fathers down in front of their families. As Sunshine Thiry’s pastor explained (emphasis mine):

...Father’s Day is one of the worst days that dads can ever choose to go to church. Because often it’s the only time churches feel like they’re going to have the ears of dads and so what they do is they plan to beat them up royally for all they’re not doing right. Ever been to one of those Father’s Day services? Oh man, I have...

Thiry’s pastor decided to try a different approach on Father’s Day, and try to encourage all of the terrible dads in the congregation to be better instead of beating them up:

We don’t do that anymore. What we want this to be is an encouragement to you, we want this to lift you up...

What makes the conservative Christian aversion to honoring fathers so striking is that honoring fathers (and mothers) is one of the ten commandments. If anything, conservative Christians should be the gold standard for honoring fathers.

This brings us to a relatively new movement among conservative Christians to do something simple but truly radical. They propose that Christians honor fathers on Father’s Day:

Imagine the national and global impact if every family, organization, and church were sharing the same message this Father’s Day: s for children, young and old, to Honor Your Father.

Again, in secular culture such an initiative would seem pointless. This is what Father’s Day is
for, after all. But in conservative Christian culture this is a break from tradition, and such an initiative is badly needed. The group is called Honor Your Father Today. They explain on their About page why they want to break with conservative Christian tradition on Father’s Day and instead use the day to honor fathers (emphasis mine):

Helping Dads from the “Bottom Up”

Traditionally, churches, organizations, and social or government groups try to tackle the problem of fatherhood “top down” by teaching, encouraging, and often begging fathers to step up to become better dads. But what if we approached it from the “bottom up” by encouraging children, both young and old, to honor their fathers in some small way? One of the strongest motivators for men are their children. If anything can move a dad, even one who’s disengaged, it’s their child reaching out and honoring him with a word, video, or a letter of thanks.

Note that even here the tone is one of how terrible Christian fathers are. Honoring fathers, an act that is simple to everyone else, is an enigma to conservative Christians. Honoring fathers can’t simply be about honoring fathers because God commands it, or even about a means to receive the blessing God promises for those who obey. It has to be a means to a different end, honor begrudgingly offered to fathers in an effort to move them to be better. As with Thiry’s pastor, this group founded on the simple idea of honoring fathers on Father’s Day ends up landing instead on encouraging fathers to be better. If anything can encourage fathers to finally straighten up, surely this new movement will.

This isn’t a problem conservative Christians have regarding Mother’s Day. Honoring mothers, even single mothers by choice, is natural and easy to conservative Christians. It is honoring fathers that is deeply uncomfortable, especially honoring married Christian fathers. Mitch Temple, Executive Director of the Fatherhood Comission, discusses the unique discomfort Pastors have with honoring fathers in the opening of his message to pastors about his radical idea of honoring fathers on Father’s Day (emphasis mine):

Hey Pastor this is Mitch Temple, Executive Director of the Fatherhood Comission. As a pastor for over twenty years I used to get very nervous after Mother’s Day because, I always wonder now what, we’ve only got a few weeks, what are we going to do with Father’s Day?

Well, we want to try to help solve that problem for you. The Fatherhood Comission along with about a hundred and fifty other organizations have come together to really encourage dads. And one of the things that God lead us to was this idea of doing something around Father’s Day.

In the opening to a different promotional video for the program, Christian filmmaker Stephen Kendrick describes the ease conservative Christians have with honoring mothers, and how different it is when it comes to honoring fathers (emphasis mine):

There is a command in Scripture that comes with a promise. It says if you honor your father and your mother God will give you a good life and a long life. Well it’s easy
for us to oftentimes to honor our moms, but too often we don’t honor our dads.

Kendrick opens yet another video with the same basic statement:

It’s easy for us to honor our moms, but too oftentimes people don’t honor their fathers. And so this Father’s Day, and leading up to it, we want to encourage you to honor your father.

Again, the idea of honoring fathers on Father’s Day is so foreign to conservative Christians that the About page and all three of the promotional videos above open by acknowledging this fact! Even though this is denied, the idea of honoring fathers is so counter-cultural that they can’t broach the topic of honoring fathers on Father’s Day without dealing with how strange, how foreign, this concept is.

I pray that they will be successful in their initiative to have Christians honor fathers on Father’s day, but as they repeatedly acknowledge what they are proposing is a truly radical idea.
Don’t refer to God as the Father, call him a “Best Friend”.

by Dalrock | June 12, 2017 | Link

In A radical Father’s Day proposal I introduced Honor Your Father Today, a group that is proposing that Christians honor their fathers on Father’s Day. Yet even though they propose honoring fathers, they are clearly conflicted about the idea. They explain that a sudden and mysterious change in fathers (and not feminist rebellion) is the reason we have an epidemic of broken homes:

In a society where fatherlessness (or at least dads who aren’t stepping up to the plate) runs rampant, one thought must race through the minds of so many men and women out there: “How do you honor someone who isn’t honorable?”

Given this attitude it isn’t surprising that Honor Your Father Today struggles greatly to think of ways that Christians could actually honor their fathers. The foreignness of honoring fathers comes out most clearly on their resources page:

Use these resources as a tool to help honor fathers and help with our campaign.

I’ll go through other items on the resource page in the next few days, but today I will focus on the example sermons they offer, and primarily on the 2016 Honor Your Father Sermon. The sermon offers three different impressions Christians might have of fathers:

We each have personal images intricately tied to the tender yet powerful word, “father.” For some, the visualization of “father” is an always-smiling, ready-to-embrace-you, tender man who instantly promotes feelings of joy and acceptance. Others remember the massive, outstretched hand that seemed to pull a never-ending supply of candy from his trouser pockets. There are also those who hear the word, “father,” and conjure up images of a scowling, rumpled brow, and disappointed frown that seemed to cut the heart of a child, desperately longing for expressions of his approval. Finally, there are others who may simply draw a blank when they try to visualize a father. As empty as a fresh pack of computer paper, no matter how many pages they turn, the landscape is full of empty memories. No calls, no visits, no talks with dad.

Note that this boils down to:

1. Good fathers, who are a never ending supply of positive affirmation, hugs and candy.
2. Bad fathers, who hurt their children by being mean.
3. Absent fathers.

It gets worse later in the sermon, where it explains that because we have an epidemic of bad fathers, we should (at times) avoid calling God the Father, and instead think of him as a best friend:
It’s so sad the number of people who have an unhealthy fear of their father. It has a negative impact on their lives and especially on their attitude toward God. They have a skewed image of God as only a wrathful, angry, hostile God. Their God is a person they want to avoid, and that’s not accurate. He loves us.

A young woman taught Sunday school in an inner-city mission project. “In the projects,” she says, “when you talk to the kids, you never refer to God as father. With these inner-city kids, ‘father’ is likely to bring up thoughts of the man who left me, the man who beats me, who beats my mother. The kids have so many negative images of fathers. So we always refer to God as a best friend. The kids know what that is. It’s a positive concept. We start there and work into God’s other attributes.”

What About You?

Maybe you had a horrible father. That may well affect your relationship with God. It may be wise for you to think first of God as a best friend. Approach Him as a best friend...

This is a sermon offered as a way to honor fathers on Father’s Day, and it explains that since fathers are so dishonorable we should avoid calling God the Father!

They offer a second sermon on the resources page, simply titled the Honor Your Father Sermon. This sermon isn’t quite as bad as the first sermon, but it still focuses a great deal on how terrible fathers are, and blames the feminist rebellion in the church on abusive and neglectful fathers:

...consider the women’s ministry leader who is vengeful toward any male authority figure who questions her leadership. The connection between such resentment could relate to the tragedy of childhood neglect or abuse of some kind.
Ideas on how to honor your father on social media for Father’s Day.
by Dalrock | June 13, 2017 | Link

Honor Your Father Today offers suggested social media posts to promote the campaign and honor fathers for Father’s Day. Here are the first 12 suggestions:

Now is the time... Honor Your Father Today. Learn how at honoryourfathertoday.com

“How do you honor someone who isn’t honorable?” Go to honoryourfathertoday.com to learn how

“A wound will only become infected if it is left untreated.” -Matt Haviland, The Daddy Gap – Go to honoryourfathertoday.com to learn to heal wounds with your parents.

“How honoring a not so honorable Dad can change him and your relationship with him” Learn more at honoryourfathertoday.com

“My dad was never around. My dad died many years ago. My dad doesn’t deserve to be honored.” If any of these statements fit you go to honoryourfathertoday.com for insights on how to move on.

“My dad was the meanest man I know. I have nothing good to say” - It that describes you, go to honoryourfathertoday.com

“Want to help your church, pastor to do something a little different this father’s day? Go to honoryourfathertoday.com to learn how to plan a special service and access free resources.

Tried everything to make amends with your dad but failed? Here’s an uncommon approach that may turn his heart to you and yours back to him. Honoryourfathertoday.com

Don’t know how to help a spouse who is struggling with their relationship with their dad? There’s help at honoryourfathertoday.com

Have you thought about saying something that you need to say to your dad before it’s too late? Go to honoryourfathertoday.com to learn what to do, what not to do.

Feel you are alone in not knowing how to feel or treat your dad who has hurt you deeply? Go to honoryourfathertoday.com for help.

For Christians, we are often called to do something (obey) because God said do it. But what about honoring a dad that don’t deserve it? Get insight and help at honoryourfathertoday.com
Can you feel the love? No one celebrates Father’s Day like Christians do!

Following this litany of father trashing there are a few suggestions to make a video for your father, write him a letter, or pray for him. Then the suggestions close with a grand finale of father bashing:

Daddy wounds run deep. Learn how to heal them @ honoryourfathertoday.com

Want to break the cycle of Father wounds? Learn how @honoryourfathertoday.com

Listen to Dr. John Trent author of book The Blessing discuss how he honored a dad who chose to not be in his life http://www.honoryourfathertoday.com

Want free resources your church can use to really bless Fathers this Father’s Day? Go to honoryourfathertoday.com

Research shows that Fathers are key to healthy child development. Learn how to encourage Dads to be connected Dads @ honoryourfathertoday.com

20.3 million Children (27%) live in a home with no father. Let’s turn that around. Go to http://www.honoryourfathertoday.com

Children growing up without a father present are more likely to suffer physical, emotional or educational neglect, engage in juvenile delinquency including violent crime, abuse drugs and alcohol, be a teenage mom and live in poverty. http://www.Honoryourfathertoday.com (* Get more promo tools, images at http://honoryourfathertoday.com/promotools
Man up and honor your father.
by Dalrock | June 14, 2017 | Link

This is the fourth post in a series on the program Honor Your Father Today. If you want to read the first three posts, you can do so here:

1. A radical Father’s Day Proposal.
2. Don’t refer to God as the Father, call him a “Best Friend”.
3. Ideas on how to honor your father on social media for Father’s Day.

Honoring fathers means honoring men, and the idea of honoring men, even fathers on Father’s Day, is as uncomfortable to conservative Christians as the idea of french kissing your sister.

What conservative Christians would far rather do than honor men is do what they always do: blame men for the sins of women and issue men an endless series of challenges to man up. This is cowardly and easy, but feels heroic. Yet this is a campaign to encourage people to honor their fathers on Father’s Day, and the campaign is in response to Scripture. Given the choice of doing what is cowardly, easy, and feels good or doing what God has commanded, what did the men of Honor Your Father Today choose? Did they man up? For the most part they did not. For the most part, they chose the easy, feel good, cowardly way out. If you look at the page they use to turn their proposal into concrete action, you will see that aside from talking about how terrible fathers are and promoting the program in general, nearly all of the focus is on challenging men to man up. Along with many similar resources, they suggest honoring fathers by sending them to Dennis Rainey/FamilyLife’s Stepping Up®, and a program called Father School:

- Father School was originally established by Duranno in October, 1995, in Seoul, South Korea, in response to the growing national epidemic of abusive, ineffective and absentee fathers.

They also suggest honoring the fathers in the congregation by having them pledge to be better fathers via the Resolution Ceremony from the movie Courageous:

- Set a date for this event at your church. Promote it, prepare for it by leading a study of The Resolution for Men and then make it happen!

Most people give their father a Hallmark™ card on Father’s Day; conservative Christians celebrate Father’s Day by telling their dad to promise to be a better dad.

Maybe next year Dad!

But the most creative solution to this dilemma comes in the Three Point Challenge for Churches. In the three point challenge they take the general command to all believers to honor their fathers and change the focus to telling fathers to step up, and... honor their fathers! The pastor’s guide opens with:
Pastor,

This is a request for you to prayerfully consider participating in the Honor Your Father 3-Point Church Challenge. Below is an overview of the initiative. Attached is a specific challenge to be issued to each man as well as an outline to reference for a Father’s Day sermon.

Honor Your Father is a nationwide campaign coordinated by the Fatherhood CoMission, a coalition of fathering initiatives across the country working to raise the bar for dads to be engaged in family. Visit http://www.honoryourfathertoday.com to learn more about the campaign and view video testimonies from Tony Dungy, Kirk Cameron, Darryl Strawberry and others.

Below is the 3-Point Church Challenge aligned with the Honor Your Father campaign. Please prayerfully consider issuing a call (specifics attached) for each man in the church to:

Points one and two of the three point challenge to the fathers are:

1. Meet with their father.
2. Write their father a letter.

Point three of the three point Father’s Day challenge to fathers doesn’t even involve the fathers honoring their fathers. It is yet another pledge by the fathers to become better fathers:

Commit to grow as a father – be a study of the Father and of fathering. Seek out resources and training opportunities that will encourage & equip you as a father. Commit to completing one study for dads across the summer. One easy and accessible option is the Dads Becoming Heroes study that can be completed on your own or in a small group. This study can be downloaded as a .pdf file from http://www.faithfulfathering.org/educate.

Take the initiative to Honor Your Father through intentional study to become the father God calls you to be, the father the next generation needs.

• Take a picture of you doing the study on your own, with a buddy or in a group;
• Record a short video testimony of how the study impacted you; and
• Record a short video with testimony from your family on how the study influenced your fathering from their perspective.

Accept this challenge to Honor Your Father and begin a journey that will be challenging and affirming, convicting and encouraging. In the process, you will be equipped and strengthened to become the father you are called to be, the father the next generation needs.

Prayers are with you on the journey,
While the letter to the Pastor says the program is for all men in the church, the accompanying sermon outline says the program is for the fathers in the congregation:

As you know, a number of weeks ago we initiated an Honor Your Father challenge to dads. The emotions around the topic of our dads run the spectra from elation, “I really appreciate being issued this challenge while my dad is alive”, to frustration, “Are you kidding me? My dad was abusive. I have not spoken to him in years and I don’t see any reason to honor him!” Actually there is a very important reason to honor our father and mother, it is the fifth commandment. Exodus 20:12 does not say, “If” your father and mother are honorable then honor them...

Either way this is brilliant, albeit incredibly cynical. It carefully minimizes the number of men in the congregation who are at risk of being honored on Father’s Day (yuk!), tells the men of the congregation to man up, and doesn’t ask anything of the women in the congregation. At the same time, it reinforces the same message given by the Father’s Day sermons and the Father’s Day social media post suggestions; fathers don’t deserve to be honored.
So common no one notices.
by Dalrock | June 15, 2017 | Link

Several commenters have noted that their pastor doesn’t give anti-father sermons on Father’s Day*. I don’t doubt this, as the church I attend doesn’t do this either. But the anti-father sermon on a day reserved to honor fathers is just one of the more visible symptoms of the problem. Other symptoms are more universal but harder to spot precisely because they are so common they feel normal.

Christian films are a better way to see how universal the attitude is. Because the Christian movie market is a niche market, the films are carefully designed to have a message that appeals to a wide Christian audience, including Protestants and Catholics*. Also, Christians have a trade-off when they view movies. They can watch a secular movie and get the best production qualities at the cost of a message they disagree with, or they can watch a Christian movie with a message they agree with at the cost of lower production qualities.

Christian movies are all about the message, and anti-married-father messages are extremely common in Christian movies. What is often telling is the startled reaction secular reviewers have to the anti-father message in well-loved Christian movies. Mom’s Night Out was loved by Christians as just another good Christian movie about the family. But the feminists at Dame were appalled by the anti-married-father message in Mom’s Night Out.

‘Moms’ Night Out’ may be a Christian movie, but it’s part of a long cinematic tradition portraying men as useless louts. And that’s not good for anyone.

As the Dame review noted, Mom’s Night Out was just a Christian retread of the common fathers-as-buffoons theme we see in secular entertainment. But Christian films often have a much darker anti-father message than secular entertainment. The widely popular Kendrick brother** movies are the obvious example of this darker message, with War Room being their most recent. In War Room the married father is portrayed not as a hapless idiot, but as a truly vile man, devoid of any positive qualities at all. As the reviewer from rogerebert.com observed:

The film’s centerpiece sequence occurs early on, as Elizabeth sits weeping in her closet while pleading, “God, help him love me again.” This moment is heartbreaking for all the wrong reasons. Since the Kendricks have mistaken one-dimensional caricatures for people who exist in the real world, they forgot to provide Tony with any redeeming qualities that would make us want to root for his marriage.

Neither of these movies caused controversy for their anti-father messages in conservative Christian circles, because they are simply “normal” Christian movies with a message that Christians love.

But the best example of all with relation to conservative Christians tearing fathers down on Father’s Day is the Kendrick brother movie Courageous. In the first few years after it was
released the movie itself and its accompanying resolution were widely touted as excellent Father’s Day gifts. The message of Courageous is that married Christian fathers who seem like they have it together are actually terrible failures as fathers, and need to sign a pledge to man up. The movie is, as the description of The Resolution for Men explains, “an emotionally charged wake-up call to fathers”.

In order for Courageous to motivate good fathers to man up, it must first tear good fathers down. This leads to a disturbing scene where the protagonists sit around a backyard barbecue complaining about their fathers. For those who haven’t seen the movie, note that this isn’t something the characters are shown as having to repent of later in the movie. On the contrary, it is the movie makers speaking in a very clunky way through their characters, and by doing so modeling how good Christians should speak of their own fathers. Most astonishing is the fact that this scene (and the message of the movie) didn’t create a controversy in Christian circles.

From the movie script at Springfield Springfield:

```
I wonder where all the good fathers went.
Ain’t that the truth?
What? I remember you talking about your dad.
Wasn’t he an usher at your church?
Yeah, but that doesn’t mean anything.
Soon as the church service started, he’d step out back for a smoke.
You know, one time he says to me, “I better not catch you drinking.”
Had a beer in his hand when he said it.
My mom used to nag him.
That is, till they got divorced.
Look, it’s not like I don’t love the guy, but it’s hard to respect a hypocrite.
What about you, David?
Um...
I had a good dad.
I guess.
I mean, the guy wasn’t perfect.
My parents split after he had an affair.
But I think he regretted it.
```

This movie, and it’s accompanying pledge to be a better father, was seen by conservative Christians as an excellent gift to give fathers on Father’s Day. This movie that tears good father’s down, is seen in conservative Christian circles as a way to honor fathers! In fact, Courageous, it’s resolution ceremony, and the other movies I referenced in this post are all offered as resources to honor fathers by Honor Your Father Today.

*Based on feedback from Catholic readers the anti-father Father’s Day sermon is either uncommon in Catholic churches or doesn’t occur at all. However, the movie Courageous was supported by at least 10 Catholic organizations. You can see Catholic reviews of the movie here, here, and here. You can see a discussion on Catholic Answers Forum here. You can also see Catholic reviews of Moms Night Out here, here, here, and here. You can see Catholic
reviews of War Room here, here and here, and a discussion of the movie on Catholic Answers Forum.

**Stephen Kendrick is featured in my post A radical Father’s Day proposal where he urges fellow Christians to honor their fathers. His brother Alex plays the role of the pastor in Mom’s Night Out.**
Hair shirts and chest thumping.
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Conservative Christians are terrified. They are terrified of offending women, especially women in feminist rebellion. This creates a problem, because conservative Christians still want to condemn the outcome of feminism. The question is, how to condemn the outcome of feminism without offending feminists?

For an example of the fear conservative Christians have of offending feminists, critics accused the movie Mom’s Night Out of not only failing to pander to women, but of being anti-feminist:

Directed by brothers Andrew and Jon Erwin, this ostensible femme-powerment film is strangely unsympathetic, even demeaning, to its target audience. Rather than pandering to moms, this unfunny, unabashedly anti-feminist comedy consistently points out how wrong or unnecessary or ungrateful they are.

Failing to pander to women, and even worse, being anti-feminist are serious charges to a conservative Christian! According to The Blaze, the creators of the movie were alarmed at these accusations. ‘Moms’ Night Out’ Director Blasts ‘Alarming’ Media Reviews Calling Film ‘Unabashedly Anti-Feminist’ and ‘Borderline Dangerous’ (emphasis mine):

Erwin said he was “blown away” by the fact that critics seemed to go after stay-at-home moms by claiming that the movie, which simply portrays their lifestyle, is “anti-feminist.”

“I think we all want to live in a country where no one’s bullied for their way of life and that should extend to moms,” he told TheBlaze. “Every woman should be free to choose her way of life ... and I think this word ‘tolerance’ should be enforced in this regard.”

Erwin clarified that Mom’s Night Out went out of its way not to make any judgment about the decisions of mothers, including women who choose to be single mothers:

“If at any point in the movie the stay-at-home mom [and protagonist], Allyson, said, ‘This is how you should live life,’ then there would be grounds for some of this stuff. But that’s not in the movie,” Erwin added. “And the movie features a single mom, a full-time working mom — and they support and encourage people throughout the film.”

Erwin reiterated the importance of not restricting women’s choices:

“The message that I would deliver to critics is that I think we should embrace the ideal that every woman is free to choose whatever life she feels like she wants to live,” he said. “And that we believe in a world where no one should be bullied for their way of life and that should extend to stay-at-home moms and it’s
Obviously not right now.”

Normally conservative Christians don’t come right out and say they support women choosing to become single mothers. Normally conservative Christians instead ignore the sins of single mothers and focus on blaming men for the fact that single mothers don’t want to be married.

**If only men would man up, women wouldn’t want to be single mothers.**

We see this sentiment from conservative Christians all the time. Glenn Stanton, the Director of Family Formation Studies at Focus on the Family (FotF), explains:

> Women want to marry and have daddies for their babies. But if they can’t find good men to commit themselves to, well… Our most pressing social problem today is a man deficit.

Pastor Mark Driscoll explained the same thing:

> The latest statistics, 40 percent of all children are born out of wedlock. It is now at the point where women aren’t even pretending they’re gonna ever get married. They go to college, get a good job, get pregnant, have a kid. They’ve lost any hope of ever finding a guy who can actually carry the load, and that’s tragic. We’re a culture that is working hard to protect women and children, and no one has the common sense to beat on the guys who are the cause of so much of the pain.

There is a variation of this same message from Honor Your Father Today:

> In a society where fatherlessness (or at least dads who aren’t stepping up to the plate) runs rampant, one thought must race through the minds of so many men and women out there: “How do you honor someone who isn’t honorable?”

Many of the programs listed on the Honor Your Father Today resource page are founded on similar statements. Father School explains the premise of their program (emphasis mine):

> Father School was originally established by Duranno in October, 1995, in Seoul, South Korea, in response to the growing national epidemic of abusive, ineffective and absentee fathers. **Father School was founded on the premise that when the father stands firmly as the head of the household, society will too stand firm**, ultimately making the world a better place.

UNCOMMEN explains:

> UNCOMMEN exists to encourage men to be better Leaders, Husbands and Dads by equipping individuals and organizations with inspiring and educational resources. Our vision is to help men succeed at being the man they were always meant to be...

> When men win, we don’t have to build as many shelters for abandoned families, or pay the psychological and emotional toll for fatherless kids, or care for so many abused and neglected wives.
If we’re going to solve societal ills...

Legacy Minded Men states (emphasis original):

The greatest challenge this country, and yes the world, faces is not unemployment, the environment, drugs, violence, teen pregnancy, government corruption or even terrorism. The greatest challenge we face are men who have abdicated their role as leaders, husbands and fathers. Legacy Minded Men exists to bring this truth to light AND provide the tools to reverse this trend.

Clearly there is wide agreement that if men would only man up, the feminist assault on the family would be reversed. But how can men man up without offending the very feminists assaulting the family? Since biblical patriarchy and headship are out of the question, conservative Christians were forced to invent an entirely new “Christian” seeming ritual. This ritual is what conservative Christians are talking about when they say *Man Up! or Step Up!*

**What is the “Man Up” ritual, and how do you perform it?**

The Man Up ritual consists of equal parts hair shirt and chest thumping. The hair shirt comes first, and it consists of finding the flaws in men that are causing women to sin. While the headlines often misdirect with claims of abuse or men impregnating innocent women and refusing to marry them, the real focus is on carefully cataloging the most minor sins of the best married Christian fathers. In fact, the more petty the accusation, and the more godly the father being accused, the better! This change in focus is critical because it is almost exclusively the responsible married Christian fathers who are performing the ritual.

For an example of the hair shirt part of the ritual in practice, see the Focus on the Family review of the movie Courageous:

That’s the life lesson Adam Mitchell, an Albany, Ga., deputy sheriff, learns in *Courageous*, Sherwood Pictures’ follow-up to *Fireproof*. Adam is someone many fathers will identify with. He wears his uniform with pride. He provides for his wife, Victoria, and his two children. And because of that he figures he’s not actually required to join his teenage son, Dylan, in a 5K father-son race. And even though 9-year-old Emily is the apple of his eye, he’s quite positive that he’s too dignified (read: embarrassed) to dance with her in a parking lot just because she begs. “I’m dancing with you in my heart, honey,” he explains.

Adam’s sins in the movie are:

1. Not dancing with his young daughter in a parking lot.
2. Asking his son to help build a shed, when the son would rather run with his father.

Note that the FotF reviewer agrees with the message of the movie. Adam needs a stern wakeup call so he is properly motivated to wear the uniform of the married Christian father, the hair shirt. Without spoiling the movie, I can assure you that Adam receives the harshest wakeup call imaginable, and proceeds to wear the hairiest hair shirt he can find. From there Adam joins with other hair shirted fathers, and their wives instruct them in the proper way to
thump their chests. It is a truly glorious message (if you are a conservative Christian).

**What is the proper method of chest thumping?**

There is no single right way to chest thump, so long as it is hyper masculine while being non offensive to feminists. For this reason, actual headship is out, but borrowing from images in secular culture is in. Military/combat and sports metaphors are probably the most popular. For example, the featured program by Legacy Minded Men is a football based program called Move the Chains:

What would the world look like if men were REAL men? What difference would it make in your home, community, workplace or church? It’s Time to MOVE THE CHAINS!

...

2-time Super Bowl champion Lee Rouson, Legacy Minded Men founder Joe Pellegrino and Certified Life Coach Juan Garcia provide the men with powerful and fun tools to answer this important question wrapped in a football metaphor.

The program even has a football themed chant to ground men’s ministries (emphasis mine):

“Our Move the Chains Workshop had over 60 men in attendance. **Lee’s chant of “Go, Go, Get it, Get it” fired us up and laid down the ground work for our men’s ministry** to begin understanding how God desires us to become better husbands, fathers and men of honor!” – Pastor Eric Butler, True Vine Christian Church

Be aware that at times it can be very difficult to distinguish between the hair shirt and the chest thumping. For example, making a public resolution to be a better husband and father serves the function of both the hair shirt (he’s not good enough) and a chest thump (this is what a real man looks like).

**What to do when the ritual doesn’t work?**

Since the whole point of the exercise is to avoid confronting the feminist rebellion, the ritual doesn’t work. But conservative Christians have faith. Not in the Bible, but in the Man Up! ritual they have created. They believe that if they only practice this ritual often enough and hard enough, all of the problems in our post feminist culture will go away. Feminists have faith that feminism isn’t working because real feminism hasn’t been tried yet. Conservative Christians have faith that feminism isn’t working because weak men are screwing feminism up.
When the ritual fails (as it is bound to do), this is proof that the men aren’t manning up hard enough. They must seek out even hairier hair shirts, and thump their chests even louder. If they do this often enough, hard enough, and publicly enough, they are certain it will work. Conservative Christians turn up the volume on their calls for men to Man Up!, and married fathers answer the call by completing more and more man up programs, hoping that this time they will get the ritual right and make the world safe for feminism. This naturally has created a multitude of Man Up! programs, books, and DVDS. There are even Man Up! apps* for your phone.

I’ll close by noting that there is a certain twisted logic to the Man Up ritual. Feminists have flooded the world with irresponsible unfeminine women. Conservative Christians are countering by attempting to flood the world with hyper-responsible cartoonishly masculine men.

See Also:

- God’s Drill Instructors (language warning)
- Sunday Morning Cartoons

*Available here, here, and here.
Honor your father and your mother, that your days may be long in the land that the LORD your God is giving you.

-Exodus 20:12, ESV
It is all about clarity.
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Recently The Atlantic ran an article crowing about the feminist victory at the Southern Baptist Convention. Southern Baptists Embrace Gender-Inclusive Language in the Bible:

Last fall, the publishing arm of the 15-million member Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) released the Christian Standard Bible (CSB). LifeWay Christian Stores, America’s largest Christian retailer, which is owned by the SBC, sells the translation at hundreds of its locations nationwide and touts it as a work of superior scholarship. But patrons are largely unaware that the denomination-approved translation is gender-inclusive.

Council of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (CBMW) President Denny Burk was incensed at the accusation, explaining:

The CSB is not a gender-neutral translation of scripture, nor were the CSB translators trying to produce one. On the contrary, the translators intended to produce an accurate translation that faithfully renders what the authors of scripture intended to communicate. The CSB has admirably achieved this goal. The critiques of Merritt and Robinson in The Atlantic are completely off-base.

According to Burk this is a made up controversy. Burk contrasts this with the NIV translation, which he opposes for being gender inclusive. He also points to the Colorado Springs Guidelines as the gold standard for the Complementarian position on the right and proper way to replace masculine terms with gender neutral ones in Bible translations.

Dr. Wayne Grudem explained how the Colorado Springs guidelines came to be created in Personal Reflections on the History of CBMW and the State of the Gender Debate:

Eventually Dr. James Dobson called a meeting of twelve people at Focus on the Family in late May, 1997. It included representatives from CBMW, World magazine, the NIV’s Committee on Bible Translation, Zondervan (the distributor of the NIV), and the International Bible Society (the copyright holder for the NIV), and some others. But just before the meeting began, the IBS issued a statement saying they had “abandoned all plans” for changes in gender-related language in future editions of the NIV. So we thought the controversy was done and the NIV would remain faithful in its translation of gender-related language in the Bible.

Little did we know, however, that the Committee on Bible Translation for the NIV had not “abandoned all plans”! Far from it! Unknown to anyone outside their circles, for the next four years the Committee on Bible Translation, apparently with the quiet cooperation of people at Zondervan and the International Bible Society, continued working to produce a gender-neutral NIV. They had publicly “abandoned all plans,” but privately they were going full-steam ahead.
The distinction Burk and other Complementarians are making is that there are good Complementarian gender neutral translations (CSB), and bad feminist gender neutral translations (NIV). The difference is that the Complementarian gender neutral changes are only made to make the Bible easier to understand, while the wily Committee on Bible Translation at NIV is caving to feminist pressure and sneaking in feminist changes.

But the line demarking feminism and complementarianism is much more blurred than Burk and others will admit. From the very beginning, the CBMW has tried to split the difference with feminists. In their founding book, Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism, the CBMW presented a new interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:13, one that turned the Apostle Paul’s words upside down in order to allow women to preach. They brought in Dr. Douglass Moo to write an entire chapter justifying this new feminist friendly interpretation of Paul’s prohibition on women preaching.

Twenty five years after Grudem and Piper brought him in to provide a new feminist friendly interpretation of 1 Tim 2:13, Dr. Moo is still on the cutting edge of scriptural interpretation. He is now the Chairman of the Committee on Bible Translation for the NIV, chairman of the same committee that lied to Grudem in 1997. Just like Burk defends the latest gender neutral CSB, Dr. Moo defends the latest gender neutral NIV. The whole controversy over the NIV gender neutral translation is made up. There is no feminist agenda, as the wording is only being changed to make it easier to understand:

Books At a Glance:
Okay, if I may, I’d like to turn to a question a bit more controversial and give you opportunity to respond. There has of course been a lot of noise made over the question of the NIV’s “gender neutral” translations, some people even contending that the CBT has an egalitarian agenda. Would you speak to this for us? And from a translator’s perspective, just what considerations give rise to this issue in the first place?

Doug Moo:
Our decisions about gender are part and parcel of our fundamental translation philosophy: figure out what the text is saying, then find a way to express that meaning in natural, contemporary English...

To put it simply: our “agenda” on the CBT is clear and single: to put the meaning of the Scriptures into accurate, natural, and contemporary English. We view our gender decisions in this context – and only in this context. To render expressions in the original text that clearly refer to human beings in general with words such as “man,” “he,” etc., is to betray our mandate to put the Bible into accurate English.

The fundamental lie that complementarians like Moo and Burk are telling themselves is that there is no feminist rebellion. They deny the envy and temptation to usurp that motivates feminism inside Christianity, and therefore pretend that all they are really doing in accommodating feminists is helping readers understand what the Bible really meant all along. But the feminists at The Atlantic and Slate know exactly what is going on, and they are ruining the whole charade.
*H/T Vox Day.

**The CBMW claims women can preach, but with nebulous restrictions. As John Piper explains, women like Beth Moore can preach to both women and men, so long as the men she is preaching to don’t see her as a leader: “there is a certain dynamic between maleness and femaleness that when a woman begins to assume an authoritative teaching role in your life the manhood of a man and the womanhood of a woman is compromised.”

***Dr. Moo joined the NIV Committee on Bible Translation in 1996, the year before Grudem says NIV publisher lied to him by claiming they had abandoned the project. Moo has therefore been involved with the gender neutral translation from the furtive (according to Grudem) beginning.
But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.

-1 Tim 2:12, KJV

While researching for yesterday's post I came across a complementarian controversy regarding the NIV translation of 1 Tim 2:12 back in 2010. Denny Burk, who has since gone on to assume the role of CBMW president, strongly objected to a change of a single word in the NIV’s translation of the verse. The 1984 and 2002 NIV translations were:

I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must be silent.

But in 2005 the NIV changed “have authority” to “assume authority”:

I do not permit a woman to teach or to assume authority over a man; she must be quiet.

Burk smells a rat, as he sees this as feminist translators at the NIV opening the door for churches to ordain women and place them in leadership roles over men. He sees this as encouraging churches to read this only as a prohibition of the woman assuming the authority of her own decision, leaving open the option for churches to place her into a position of authority.

Dr. Douglass Moo of the NIV translation team appeared in the comments to defend the change, arguing that the phrase assume authority can be read multiple ways.

As one of the NIV translators, let me just make four comments....

Third, the footnotes were dropped in the updated NIV simply because the translators believed that “assume authority” could be taken in either direction. We often use this phrase in a neutral way (e.g., “When will the new President assume authority”?).

What is so strange about all of this is that complementarians gutted this verse of nearly all meaning decades ago. What we see here is merely fighting for the scraps. If complementarians hadn’t gutted the verse of nearly all of its meaning, the controversy over “have” vs “assume” would not really matter. The Apostle Paul instructed Timothy that women were not to teach, and they were not to have authority over men. In 1991 the founders of the CBMW decided to abandon the long accepted meaning of this verse for a feminist friendly interpretation. The new CBMW interpretation claimed that all Paul was prohibiting was women having authority over men in the church. The claim was that when Paul wrote women were not to teach, he really meant teach men, because teaching men
meant assuming authority over men. To get here they had to entirely ignore the last part of the verse:

…she must be silent

Moreover, they had to torture the verse that immediately follows, which explains why women are not permitted to teach nor to hold authority over men. Paul explains in 1 Tim 2:14 that it was Eve who was deceived. The CBMW recognized that the traditional (and obvious) reading of 1 Tim 2:14 was that women were more prone to being deceived than men, but they didn’t like that reading because it meant that clearly Paul was saying women couldn’t teach/preach. They came up with a new feminist friendly interpretation, claiming that when Paul mentioned Eve being deceived what he really meant was that Adam was created first:

28. Do you think women are more gullible than men?

First Timothy 2:14 says, “Adam was not the one deceived; it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner.” Paul gives this as one of the reasons why he does not permit women “to teach or have authority over a man.” Historically this has usually been taken to mean that women are more gullible or deceivable than men and therefore less fit for the doctrinal oversight of the church. This may be true (see question 29). However, we are attracted to another understanding of Paul’s argument. We think that Satan’s main target was not Eve’s peculiar gullibility (if she had one), but rather Adam’s headship as the one ordained by God to be responsible for the life of the garden...

If this is the proper understanding, then what Paul meant in 1 Timothy 2:14 was this: “Adam was not deceived (that is, Adam was not approached by the deceiver and did not carry on direct dealings with the deceiver), but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor (that is, she was the one who took up dealings with the deceiver and was led through her direct interaction with him into deception and transgression).”

When I laid out the CBMW argument for women preaching in March of 2016, many of my readers liked the CBMW’s claim that women are permitted to preach to other women. However, none of these same readers could bring themselves to swallow the CBMW’s absurd rational for coming to this conclusion. They liked the reading because it would feel weird not to allow women to preach to women, but they could not bring themselves to defend the CBMW’s argument as to why Paul wasn’t telling women to remain silent (not teach) when he said they were to remain silent.

Paul says women are not to teach three different ways in the segment of Scripture in question:

11A womana should learn in quietness and full submission. 12I do not permit a woman to teach or to assume authority over a man;b she must be quiet. 13For Adam was formed first, then Eve. 14And Adam was not the one deceived; it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner. 15But women will be saved through childbearing—if they continue in faith, love and holiness with propriety.
If there was any question over what Paul meant when he said women were not to teach, the fact that he opens and closes by saying women are to remain quiet should settle all doubt. And again, verse 14 also removes all doubt by explaining that it was Eve who was deceived. Lastly, after explaining what women should not be doing (preaching, leading the church), Paul explains what women should be focused on (having and raising babies). Paul couldn’t have been more clear, but complementarians want to read this as feminist empowerment so badly they came up with an absurd and novel interpretation.

One thing feminists never tire of reminding us is that the accepted roles of men and women were very different in the patriarchal ancient world. This fact ironically is yet another piece of incontrovertible evidence that Paul was telling Timothy that women were not to preach. How else would you expect the men of the ancient world to interpret verse 14, but to see it as an explanation that women are more easily deceived? Grudem and Piper’s novel interpretation only makes sense if you assume Paul only expected his first century letter to Timothy to be understood two thousand years later! The whole argument is nonsense, which is why everyone in favor of women preaching to women wants to avoid defending it.

Ironically, when Grudem and Piper wanted to advance this radical, feminist friendly interpretation of 1 Tim 2:12, the man they brought in to make the case is the same man who leads the NIV translation team, Dr. Douglass Moo. As Kevin DeYoung at The Gospel Coalition pointed out at the time, this is a debate not between complementarian and feminist scholars, but between different factions of complementarian scholars:

Craig Blomberg and Doug Moo, for example, maintain that the NIV rendering does not tip the scales one way or the other. Their goal was to stay neutral and bow to no theological agenda.

Blomberg and Moo are among evangelicalism’s best scholars (and complementarians too).

Yet complementarians like Burk have to fight this last remaining battle with their fellow complementarians, because having gutted the verse twenty five years ago, the question of “have” vs “assume” is all complementarians have left. Having swallowed a camel, they are forced to strain for gnats. Complementarians already claim that Paul meant women can be preachers when he said they were not to teach, and instead were to remain silent. Complementarians accept women as preachers, not just preaching to women, but preaching to men. All that is left of this shredded Scripture from the complementarian perspective is the question of whether women can be ordained as preachers.

As Dr. John Piper explains, it is fine for Beth Moore to be a preacher. It is even fine for her to preach to men. But according to Piper, Paul didn’t want Beth’s preaching to compromise her and her audience’s manhood and womanhood:

The Bible is clear that women shouldn’t teach and have authority over men. In context, I think this means that women shouldn’t be the authoritative teachers of the church—they shouldn’t be elders. That is the way Rick Warren is understanding it, and most of us understand it that way.
This doesn’t mean you can’t learn from a woman, or that she is incompetent and can’t think. It means that there is a certain dynamic between maleness and femaleness that when a woman begins to assume an authoritative teaching role in your life the manhood of a man and the womanhood of a woman is compromised.
I mentioned UNCOMMEN in *Hair Shirts and Chest Thumping* last week. One of their recent blog posts is *Her Needs Above Yours*, which claims that God orders husbands to follow pop psychology and become “emotionally available” to their wives:

"...**God does not make this command to men lightly.** If a husband wants God to hear his prayers, which he is going to need to be doing a lot to learn to be emotionally available to her, then he will seek to open his heart to her in an open and honest way.

Despite the allusion to 1 Pet 3:7, this supposed biblical wisdom in fact comes from the Book of Oprah, an entirely new book created in the 1970s by *sensitive new age guys* and the women who dominate them.

Note that the fundamental problem would exist even if the blogger weren’t putting *bad* pop psychology into God’s mouth. This would be no less of a misrepresentation of Scripture if he instead claimed that God commands husbands to run Game."
In Straining out gnats I noted that the CBMW’s argument for reinterpreting 1 Tim 2:12 is so weak, even people who prefer their interpretation avoid trying to defend their argument. But there are other ways to create wholly new meanings from existing Scripture. The most flexible method is to create a zany backstory that causes the existing text to have a whole new meaning. For example, take 1 Cor 14:33b-35 (ESV):

As in all the churches of the saints, 34 the women should keep silent in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be in submission, as the Law also says. 35 If there is anything they desire to learn, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church.

At first glance, this is devastating to an enterprising feminists looking to rewrite Scripture. But what if you cook up a kooky backstory, claiming that the Apostle Paul’s letter to Corinth was in response to a secret letter from Corinth to Paul that when considered, changes the whole meaning of the offending verses? This example appears to come from a now deleted FAQ by Rick Warren’s Saddleback Church:

**Question:** I was reading in 1 Corinthians 14:34 that women are not allowed to speak in the church. Whoa– what’s up with this!?

**Answer:** Historical perspective really helps with this one. In that day, men and women sat on different sides of the church. For a woman to ask her husband a question she would have to shout it to the other side of the church or disrupt the church service by getting up and walking over to him. Apparently, this is exactly what was happening in the Corinthian church, and their worship services were becoming a zoo. Paul is saying, “Listen during the worship service, and talk about your questions on the way home.”

Note how much more freedom this method offers than chiseling around the edges using creative translations. Using this method, you can make an Epistle appear to say anything you want it to say, by creating a tortured backstory instead of torturing the text itself. All it takes is a convincing bluff and a gullible mark willing to buy it.

New commenter Derek Ramsey tried his hand with this same technique to create a new meaning for 1 Tim 2:11-15. Here is the original Scripture for reference (ESV):

11 Let a woman learn quietly with all submissiveness. 12 I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet. 13 For Adam was formed first, then Eve; 14 and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. 15 Yet she will be saved through childbearing—if they continue in faith and love and holiness, with self-control.

As you can see, Ramsey has his work cut out for him if he is going to bluff his way into...
claiming that the Apostle Paul was actually saying that women can preach, and can exercise authority over men. He needs to make the Scripture appear to say the opposite of what it actually says. Yet this method is so powerful, in the hands of a skilled manipulator a semi plausible BS backstory can be crafted:

The Ephesians were dealing with the cult of Artemis which taught that woman was the originator of man. These women were trying to assert their dominance over men by teaching that man comes from woman. Verse 12 instructs the woman not to teach that she dominates a man due to the superiority of her gender. Now the applicability of verse 13 is obvious: “For Adam was formed first, then Eve” directly contradicting the cultist teaching. Verses 14 and 15 states that Eve was deceived, cursed with painful childbirth, and will be saved through faith in Jesus Christ (a man who came through childbirth).

... It all depends on your presuppositions. The woman (singular in the text) is supposed to be quiet in direct contrast to making her specific aggressive false teachings. The instruction to be quiet has no bearing on the broader issues of women teaching. The text is silent on that point.

As Ramsey notes, the key in this method is not to change the text itself, but to create the right presuppositions to change the meaning of the text into whatever you want to change it to. One other key strength of this method is it is impossible to disprove, so long as the backstory you create doesn’t violate our historical understanding of the time and place involved. Ramsey explains that his backstory not only gives the answer he wants, it doesn’t violate our historical understanding:

Timothy was in Ephesus (1 Tim 1:3). There is no historical question that Artemis was the fertility goddess of Ephesus. The Temple of Artemis at Ephesus is one of the 7 ancient wonders of the world. This isn’t even remotely controversial.

If you decide to create your own new meanings for the Epistles, you will need to do as Ramsey does and make up a story that fits with history. From here, the critical next step is to be unshakable in your bluff. This method will only work on the easily deceived, but for Ramses’ purposes this is all he needs.

Impressed with Ramses’ skill, I was inspired to try my own hand at this method by creating my own entirely new meaning for 1 Tim 2:12. Note that I’m not actually trying to con my readers into a BS reading of the passage, so I’m not presenting this in a serious way.

---------------- BS Backstory ----------------

As we all know there was a famous library in ancient Ephesus. It turns out that Paul was responding to a problem of Christian women talking loudly in the library in an effort to teach some of the men in the congregation. Even worse, the women were being especially rude by loudly ordering the men to pay the fines for books the women hadn’t returned on time. The librarian was upset and wrote to Paul begging him to solve the problem plaguing this
magnificent library. Therefore, Paul’s instruction to Timothy was not instruction on how
women should conduct themselves in church, it was a lesson in how to properly behave in a
library: Be quiet in the library and always return your books on time! That this was needed
may seem strange to us in our modern era, but at the time libraries were still quite rare, and
not everyone learned proper etiquette while growing up.

--------------- End of BS Backstory ---------------

As I noted, I’m not offering this seriously. This is the first problem with my bluff. The other
problem is that construction on the Celsus library didn’t begin until 117 AD, decades after 1
Timothy was written. However, this was my first attempt, and if I had more carefully
researched the history before creating the backstory I could have come up with a more
convincing one. In the comments section feel free to offer your own favorite BS backstory
you’ve heard others use to redefine Scripture, or try your hand at creating one yourself. Most
importantly, understand what hucksters are doing when they use this method and don’t be
taken in by them.
Stephen Green (Vodkapundit) over at Instapundit has a new post up about a WSJ article: Who Pays on the First Date? No One Knows Anymore, and It’s Really Awkward. The WSJ article is behind a paywall, but the Instapundit post includes a snippet, including this gem:

There was a time when Tinesha Zandamela would dig around for her wallet at a first date, anticipating that the guy would insist on paying.

That was before she went out with one who “forgot” his wallet, or the one who requested to split the check 50-50 after eating nearly all the food. Now when the bill arrives, she sits still, not even attempting what some call “the reach.”

Green offers the following analysis:

The only awkward part is the confusion created by women who want to be seen as willing to pay when they actually aren’t — and skinflint beta males eager to exploit the chaos.

This kind of post is pure Trad Con bait, and the resulting Instapundit comments don’t disappoint:

If a fella pays for his girl’s meal, he was raised right. If the girl expects him to pay, she was raised wrong.

But whose girl is Tinesha? Who is her “fella”? It sounds like a long string of men, perhaps over several decades, have mistakenly thought Tinesha was their girl. More importantly, why should beta men pay for the experience of taking Tinesha (or modern women in general) on a test drive? I get that modern women need the energy to properly service bring the movies man (language warning). But why should a beta sign up to be the one to feed her?
Sharon Pope writes about the whispers at divorcedmoms.com My Marriage, My Affair And My Hard Learned Lessons:

Our souls are always whispering to us. The whispers of our lives tell us there’s more. The whispers of our souls speak of and point us toward the desires of our hearts. The whispers of our hearts appear all the time in our marriages. But we don’t always listen, do we?

The whispers were telling her to exchange her boring loyal dude husband for a sexy badboy.

Michael was tall, broad-shouldered, strong, and confident. He had money, a career, and a personality that was magnetic, a little dangerous, and more than a little narcissistic.

It didn’t last, as the sexy badboy quickly dumped her. But Pope learned her lesson. She explains that she didn’t learn not to blow up a marriage to a perfectly good man, nor did she learn not to cheat. What she learned was to listen to, trust, and embrace her whispers:

The lesson is that we need to pay attention to our longings, to the whispers on our hearts. When we have a longing for more...more connection...more meaning...more love, it’s time to wake-up and pay attention. Our lives are talking to us. We didn’t place those desires on our hearts so we’re not going to be able to get rid of them either; maybe it’s time to begin embracing them.

Pope is now a professional whisperer, who (for a fee) coaches women on whether they should remain married:

BY THE END OF MY 2-MONTH COACHING PROGRAM:

You will have clarity about your most important relationship and if you’re struggling to know whether you should stay or go; you will have your answer for your life and your heart.
Selfishness as wisdom and virtue.

by Dalrock | June 29, 2017 | Link

Sharon Pope expresses a very common sentiment in Why I Hate the Label Mid-Life Crisis:

- As women, we’re **constantly evolving**.
- As spiritual beings, we’re **waking up**.
- As seekers, we’re becoming more **self-aware**.
- As mothers and wives, we’re realizing it’s time to put **our needs** first.
- This means we’re changing….growing….developing;
- We’re becoming **more ourselves**.
- We’re getting in touch with **our needs**.

In women, shallow selfishness is presented as deep wisdom, something holy. Fighting against the virtue of women’s desires and feelings are the forces of evil:

- This may make some people in your life uncomfortable.
- They will want you to stop changing and go back to who you were.

On her **About Me** page, Pope explains that this is what she learned when she had an affair and divorced her husband:

- I had to learn to love myself, forgive myself and stay true to myself.

What is striking is that while this idea is banal, it is always presented as a deep and profound insight that the woman discovered, an epiphany. Equally striking is the lack of pushback against this truly vile religion of self worship, especially by Christians.
A very long season (part 1).

by Dalrock | July 3, 2017 | Link

For several decades now the feminist life script for women has been to delay marriage as long as possible to focus on education, career, travel, and sexual experience. Many have mistaken this strategy by feminists as signaling that they don’t value marriage, but this is not the case for the vast majority of them. Marriage is essential to the feminist dream of having it all, they just don’t want to waste a day more of their youth and fertility on their husbands than absolutely necessary. Even the fictional protagonist from Sex and the City must eventually marry Mr. Big at the overripe age of 42; otherwise she would just be a slutty failure and not a feminist heroine.

Each year the age of first marriage has continued to advance, and eventually the White UMC feminist chattering class started to show periodic signs of panic; maybe they had waited too long and missed their chance to marry? In March of 2008 The Atlantic published Lori Gottlieb’s now famous piece Marry Him! warning of a shortage of eligible men for marriage delaying women:

…despite growing up in an era when the centuries-old mantra to get married young was finally (and, it seemed, refreshingly) replaced by encouragement to postpone that milestone in pursuit of high ideals (education! career! but also true love!), every woman I know—no matter how successful and ambitious, how financially and emotionally secure—feels panic, occasionally coupled with desperation, if she hits 30 and finds herself unmarried.

…if you say you’re not worried, either you’re in denial or you’re lying. In fact, take a good look in the mirror and try to convince yourself that you’re not worried, because you’ll see how silly your face looks when you’re being disingenuous.

Whether you acknowledge it or not, there’s good reason to worry.

In November of 2011 The Atlantic published Kate Bolick’s All the Single Ladies, wherein Bolick described missing her chance to marry by waiting too long:

We took for granted that we’d spend our 20s finding ourselves, whatever that meant, and save marriage for after we’d finished graduate school and launched our careers, which of course would happen at the magical age of 30. That we would marry, and that there would always be men we wanted to marry, we took on faith. How could we not?

…

But what transpired next lay well beyond the powers of everybody’s imagination: as women have climbed ever higher, men have been falling behind. We’ve arrived at the top of the staircase, finally ready to start our lives, only to discover a cavernous
room at the tail end of a party, most of the men gone already, some having never shown up—and those who remain are leering by the cheese table, or are, you know, the ones you don’t want to go out with.

In 2015 Bolick drove the point home with her book *Spinster: Making a Life of One’s Own*.

**Christians rationalize the same feminist life script.**

Modern Christians have for the most part adopted the feminist life script for women, with some modification. Instead of admitting what they are doing, Christian women generally claim that what looks suspiciously like a feminist lifestyle is really a sign of piety. The catchphrase for marriage delaying Christian women is “season of singleness”. The longer the woman’s season of singleness, the more pious she is said to be.

In the Christian feminist life script, God is ordering Christian women to move to the big city (or at least out of their parent’s house) and pursue education and career. Women who do this are thought to be demonstrating that they trust God will keep His promise to deliver their dream husband if they stay strong and independent long enough. Shari Funk explains in *The Season of Waiting* at Today’s Christian Woman:

“Why doesn’t anything just happen for me?” I often find myself grumbling, tired of waiting, tired of trying to hang onto hope as the months and years slip away and so many questions remain unanswered. I long for a breakthrough in a tedious career that does little to spark life in my heart. I struggle to find a meaningful purpose to center my life around. I wonder when God will finally bring the right man into my life to love and be loved by. I look inwardly at all the healing, growth, and freedom I’ve yet to experience and wish God operated on *my* timetable instead of his.

So many times I’ve begged God to finally reach down from heaven and move, speak, act, shine a light on my path. But so often when I go to him with my questions and restlessness, he doesn’t reveal anything instantly. Yes, he brings hope, he renews my faith, and he gives me strength to keep going.

But in that gentle, quiet voice, he also speaks the words I’ve heard over and over again . . . *my daughter, wait*.

Likewise, Maggie Niemiec has been faithful to God by doing all that he has lead her to do. She moved out of her parents house at 18 to go to college, then moved across the country to another new city when she graduated, and eventually moved to New York City to start a career. And yet, though she knows her feminist lifestyle pleases God, what she really longs for is to be a wife and mother. It is only due to her great faith that she stays the course and continues to delay marriage:

**Waiting is quite possibly my least favorite thing to do. My mother can attest—even**
since I was a little girl, I've been impatient. Living in New York City only amplifies this...

Scripture instructs us to wait. We’re told to stay dependent on God, and He will honor our waiting.

Even though I know waiting is good, I still wrestle with it. Just hurry up, God. If you’re going to grant me the desires of my heart, then can you make it happen sooner rather than later? That would be great, thanks.

Full disclosure: I’m waiting for a husband, a man who is God’s best for me to come into my life. I’ve been in love. I’ve been in a long-term relationship with someone I thought I could marry. And I’ve been hurt. So I’ve started to become hardened, thinking maybe I’ve missed my chance. Maybe my standards are too high. Maybe I’m meant to be single forever. I can't help but think: If I have to experience this much pain and longing, is the wait really worth it?

Fortunately Niemiec met Marian Jordan Ellis, founder of Redeemed Girl Ministries, who inspired her to stay the course:

Marian lit a fire in me, one that’s been dimmed for months because of heartache, doubt, and fear. I know The Lord is absolutely using this woman and her story to be a light to others.

She talked about how God redeemed her, and what she’s learned in waiting. Marian got married in her mid-30s, after hosting countless bridal and baby showers for her friends. She knows what it feels like to deeply desire something that doesn’t seem to be happening, and to have glimpses of the relationship she so wanted only to have it taken away.

“I thought my life should look a certain way,” she said. “But God was holding out His hand and saying, ‘This is what I have for you in this season.’”

If Marian Jordan Ellis hadn’t intervened to reassure Niemiec to stay the course, surely Mandy Hale could have done the same:

Invited by Oprah to cover her Lifeclass: the Tour events as part of OWN’s “VIP Press Corps” in 2012, Mandy has also been a featured speaker at the Women of Faith conference, TD Jakes’ “Woman Thou Art Loosed” conference, and Lakewood Church. She has been named a “Twitter Powerhouse” by the Huffington Post, a “Woman of Influence” by the Nashville Business Journal, and a “Single in the City” by Nashville Lifestyles magazine. She has also been a featured in Forbes magazine, the Huffington Post, and on Glamour.com, Fox News, The 700 Club, and many other outlets. With followers from all over the world, Mandy has made a name for herself as the voice of empowerment and sassiness for single women across the globe.
Mandy’s first book, *The Single Woman: Life, Love & a Dash of Sass* was released in August 2013 and has gone on to garner nearly 500 five-star reviews.

Hale’s newest book is **Beautiful Uncertainty**: Mandy has shown women how important it is to be secure in singleness by being smart, strong, and independent. In this all new book, she will prompt readers to never settle and not miss out on the beauty that can be found in times of “waiting”.

But even Hale sometimes has her doubts about staying the sassy empowered course. Hale writes at Today’s Christian Woman that *Waiting for Marriage Is Hard*.

As I read the prayer out loud, something in me broke, and I started crying, all too vividly remembering the many times I’ve cried out to God about my desire for a family, children, traditions, people to grow old with, and a husband to hold me and tell me everything was going to be okay. I cried, remembering all the years of waiting, of enduring the space between “no longer” and “not yet,” and reliving all the moments when I’ve felt forgotten by the God who claims to love me. I recalled the countless instances of frustration and impatience and even despair as the birthdays pass, and my situation seemingly grows more and more hopeless. I might never find the simplest and most complicated of life’s blessings: someone to love who also loves me.

But Christian women should never lose faith. If they only wait long enough, never settle, and persevere as strong empowered women, God will deliver their dream husband. A strong empowered woman may have to wait until her late thirties or early forties to find a husband on God’s timetable, but what matters is that delaying marriage is God’s plan. Carolyn McCulley explains in *The God Who Knows the End of Your Singleness*.

Moments like these are glimpses of the Lord’s sovereignty in action and treasures to be stored up in the hearts of single women especially. Only occasionally do we have the privilege of seeing so clearly how “in all things God works for the good of those who love him, who have been called according to His purpose” (Rom. 8:28). We should cherish and retell those evidences of God’s grace to encourage and strengthen each other. Our Lord is not a random God: His plan includes blessing us but also making us a blessing to others.

I didn’t know Charlotte when she was single, but I do remember reading her testimony in our ministry magazine, one that was written just weeks prior to her wedding. At the time, I was thirty-two, a fairly new Christian, and to be unflatteringly honest, horrified at the prospect of having to wait until thirty-nine to be married. Now I am thirty-seven, a little less arrogant (hopefully), and grateful for Charlotte’s example. Last year in my church, a woman got married for the first time at forty-three. That pushed Charlotte’s benchmark out of the way and gave me six more years to hope, so to speak.

**See Also:** [A very long season (part 2)](http://www.TheRedArchive.com).
She doesn’t need a man. Why hasn’t God sent her a husband?

by Dalrock | July 5, 2017 | Link

I plan on getting around to part two of Monday’s post later in the week. In the meantime, I see that Mandy Hale was busy on Twitter yesterday, with her own take on “Independence Day”. Hale is the woman who wrote at Today’s Christian Woman that Waiting for Marriage Is Hard.

As I read the prayer out loud, something in me broke, and I started crying, all too vividly remembering the many times I’ve cried out to God about my desire for a family, children, traditions, people to grow old with, and a husband to hold me and tell me everything was going to be okay. I cried, remembering all the years of waiting, of enduring the space between “no longer” and “not yet,” and reliving all the moments when I’ve felt forgotten by the God who claims to love me. I recalled the countless instances of frustration and impatience and even despair as the birthdays pass, and my situation seemingly grows more and more hopeless. I might never find the simplest and most complicated of life’s blessings: someone to love who also loves me.

Hale has two different twitter accounts. On her personal account yesterday she tweeted:

There's something kinda awesome about being able to say I've never had to rely on a man for one single thing ✌️Happy Independence Day y'all

— Mandy Hale (@MissMandyHale) July 4, 2017

On her separate book/blog related Twitter account, The Single Woman, she tweeted:

Hey! The e-book version of my book #BeautifulUncertainty is just $2.99 right now for a limited time! https://t.co/kUu7PX6nmS  pic.twitter.com/Z8d1rlNqKQ

— TheSingleWoman (@TheSingleWoman) July 3, 2017

And:
Edit: I also found this youtube video she created, the top ten reasons she is not sad to be single:

Related: An attitude of abundance.
Rollo Tomassi made me aware of a blog post by J. Lee Grady at charismamag.com that mentions both of our blogs. The article is Don’t Swallow the ‘Red Pill’. It is aimed primarily at the Red Pill subreddit, but clearly is intended to warn readers off of all of the men’s sphere. It is a sloppy drive-by post, not worthy of a serious rebuttal. But it does offer a springboard for some Friday afternoon entertainment.

As confused as the author is (intentionally or otherwise), it is clear that Grady is a hard core feminist, and we therefore have radically different views of Christianity. Recent posts from Grady include Break Free From the Patriarchal Spirit and Why Women Belong on the Front Lines of Ministry:

This past weekend my oldest daughter, Margaret, quietly made history. She was ordained as a pastor at United Assembly, the church in Seneca, South Carolina, where her husband, Rick, has served as an associate pastor for several years. Margaret and another woman, Marly, are the first females to be ordained into pastoral ministry at this church.

As Margaret’s father, I couldn’t be prouder. I have watched her spiritual anointing develop since she was a little girl. But I’m also aware that the road won’t be easy for her or for any woman who embraces the call to leadership.

Thankfully, Margaret’s church is affiliated with a denomination (the Assemblies of God) that fully embraces the ordination of women. But there are hundreds of thousands of churches in 2017 that limit women’s gifts by enforcing a spiritual glass ceiling that was actually shattered long ago on the day of Pentecost.

This lines up quite well with a recent post by Larry Sparks, Grady’s fellow blogger at charismamag. Sparks recently blogged about being moved to prophecy by the movie Wonder Woman. From Prophetic Word: God Is Handing Out Swords and Mantles to His Wonder Women:

While watching Wonder Woman with my family, I sensed the Holy Spirit present a series of prophetic thoughts directed at what He is doing in women in this generation.

The Lord is handing out swords to women in this hour!

A sword represents authority. A sword qualifies you to fight. A sword is not a shield. A shield is defensive, but a sword is offensive...

I decree that you are receiving a sword in this season—a sword of authority for your assignment. I decree that, right now, you are being set free from any intimidation...
associated with the assignment the Lord is extending to you.

Sparks decrees that the feminist innovation of the CBMW regarding women preaching is no longer enough*. It is time for the next step:

For too long, Christianity has perpetuated a “women’s conference” mentality, where anointed and gifted women preachers are given opportunities to share what Holy Spirit has put on their hearts—but in a restrained setting, woman-to-woman. Yes, continue to have women’s conferences. Yes, continue to ensure that women disciple women. The problem is this cannot be all there is.

I prophesy that the hour is at hand where women are going to be released from exclusively speaking to women. Because they have been knighted by their Father in heaven, I see the daughters of God arising to boldly declare the Word of the Lord to the church and release supernatural solutions into the broken parts of society.

Grady and Sparks no doubt find me and my theology shocking and weird. I would be concerned if they did not.

*Sparks however seems to be behind the feminist Christian power curve, as Grady’s daughter already has taken up her Wonder Woman sword.
A very long season (part 2).
by Dalrock | July 10, 2017 | Link

Put on then, as God’s chosen ones, holy and beloved, compassionate hearts, kindness, humility, meekness, and patience,

- Colossians 3:12, ESV

In part 1 I described the feminist life script of women delaying marriage as long as possible, and the modern Christian adoption of the feminist script as not only compatible with Christianity, but God’s will. The longer a Christian woman waits to marry, the more pious she is said to be.

But even the originators of the life script have begun to see the dangers in taking the feminist ethos too far. Back in 2008 Lori Gottlieb warned of what she had personally learned the hard way; women who delay marriage too long will find themselves with a rapidly declining pool of marriage prospects. Gotlieb urged younger women to do the unthinkable, to settle! She even included the word settle in the title of her article and later book: Marry Him! The case for settling for Mr. Good Enough:

My advice is this: Settle! That’s right. Don’t worry about passion or intense connection. Don’t nix a guy based on his annoying habit of yelling “Bravo!” in movie theaters. Overlook his halitosis or abysmal sense of aesthetics. Because if you want to have the infrastructure in place to have a family, settling is the way to go.

In fact the word settle (including variations like settling) is repeated 118 times in Gotlieb’s article. Gotlieb understood that by suggesting women settle she was broaching a great taboo of both feminism and our modern age:

Obviously, I wasn’t always an advocate of settling. In fact, it took not settling to make me realize that settling is the better option, and even though settling is a rampant phenomenon, talking about it in a positive light makes people profoundly uncomfortable. Whenever I make the case for settling, people look at me with creased brows of disapproval or frowns of disappointment, the way a child might look at an older sibling who just informed her that Jerry’s Kids aren’t going to walk, even if you send them money. It’s not only politically incorrect to get behind settling, it’s downright un-American. Our culture tells us to keep our eyes on the prize (while our mothers, who know better, tell us not to be so picky), and the theme of holding out for true love (whatever that is—look at the divorce rate) permeates our collective mentality.

The feminist reaction to this message has been predictably chilly, but there is also a grudging acceptance of the underlying truth of it. However, modern Christian culture has identified the feminist life script as coming from God. The very unbiblical feminist obsession with women’s self esteem has become a core tenet of modern Christianity. She is a daughter of the King! Nothing is too good for her! Moreover, for a modern Christian woman settling is seen as an
act of denying the power and trustworthiness of God, an act of apostasy. While the Bible teaches women that they should cultivate a quiet and gentle spirit, something beautiful to God, modern Christians teach women that God wants women to be the opposite, that they are to be sassy, big and bold, loud and proud.

Before I go any further I should note that there is a fundamental problem with Gotlieb’s thesis. She is of course right that marriage delaying women are creating ever growing and unrealistic expectations for their future husband, and that in the long run the unrealistic woman is the one who ultimately bears the brunt of this folly. But strictly speaking settling isn’t the answer. A woman who decides to marry a man whom she isn’t attracted to (because she sees him as beneath her) isn’t doing the man, her future children, or anyone else a favor. The real problem isn’t her ever growing checklist of required attributes, but the mindset that created the unrealistic list in the first place. What a woman with an unrealistic perception of her own marriage market value (MMV) needs to do is not ruin some unsuspecting man’s life, she needs to accept reality and humble herself. The more inflated the woman’s sense of self regard is, the more painful the humbling will be. Yet from here she will be able to choose and appreciate the best from her real prospects, not settle.

But a woman humbling herself goes directly against modern Christian teaching. Instead of jettisoning toxic anti-Christian feminist teaching, modern Christians are doubling down on it. After failing for decades to fall for a good man in their own league (who therefore is also interested in them), modern Christian women regularly declare that the problem is they didn’t have a high enough regard for themselves! The problem as they see it is not their own overinflated ego and decision to push good men aside to chase alpha assholes; the problem is with men for not being good enough for them. As 38 year old* never married Mandy Hale explains in Dash of Sass: ENOUGH:

“Why wasn’t I enough for him?”

I can’t tell you how many times that was the cry of my heart...all within the bounds of one relationship...because I chose for years to stand there waiting for someone to look at me and actually SEE me. To love me. To treat me like I was ENOUGH. When really, he was the one who was lacking. Lacking in depth. Lacking in character. Lacking in honesty. Lacking in integrity. I thought I wasn’t enough for him when the truth was...he wasn’t enough for me...

These men will never understand women like us. Women who love with all our heart, mind, body, and soul. Women who refuse to settle for mediocre but hold out for magical. Women who believe that love should never be average or lukewarm or just “okay” but life-changing and earth-shaking and boundary-breaking.

Women like us may stay single for awhile longer, as it takes a special man to handle everything that we are. Because to make ourselves less in order to be pleasing to a man is simply not something we are willing to do.

What is even more astounding than a 38 year old never married woman offering her own errors for marriage minded women to emulate, is the fact that such women are eagerly
accepted as possessing great wisdom on the topic. The longer a woman has failed to accomplish something nearly all women accomplish, the more qualified she is seen to instruct other women on the matter!

**Enter Wendy Griffith, Grand Master of not finding a husband.**

From this perspective, fellow never married career woman Wendy Griffith has Hale soundly beat. While 38 year old Hale has only failed to find a husband for 20 years, 53 year old Griffith has failed to find a husband for 35 years! At 38 Hale could in theory still manage to marry and have a child or two if she did so right away. At 53 Griffith’s reproductive years are over.

Griffith’s book, like Gotlieb’s, includes settle in the title: *You Are a Prize to be Won!: Don’t Settle for Less Than God’s Best*. But unlike Gotlieb, Griffith isn’t offering her own refusal to settle as a cautionary tale. She is offering it as a roadmap for all women to follow! Even worse, this is the message modern Christian leaders enthusiastically endorse. At CBN Pat Robertson introduced Griffith’s book as one that every Christian girl and single woman should read:

> I’m holding in my hand a very special book. It’s a book that every young girl should have. Teenagers should have it, college students should have it, and young single women should have it. It’s called You are a prize to be won. Written by none other than the lovely Wendy Griffith, and she has had all kinds of experiences!

As Robertson notes Griffith has had all kinds of experiences. However, this experience represents decades of failure! Imagine a 65 year old man who worked in the mailroom his entire career writing a book on climbing the corporate ladder, and the full hubris of Griffith writing this book comes to light.

Like Hale, Griffith’s epiphany came when she was dumped by an alpha she was chasing. In *Knowing Your True Value* Moira Brown interviews Griffith for 100Huntly Street, and they both diagnose Griffith’s *one that got away* as running a kind of push-pull game on her. But Griffith’s takeaway was not that she should stop chasing alphas and learn to be attracted to good men. Her takeaway was that she needed to further inflate her own ego:

> Brown: You know I think psychologists would refer to this as a sort of “Come here. Go away”. Do you see that in this guy?

> Griffith: Well absolutely. He was hot and cold. But the thing that I learned was that when you know your value, it’s a game changer. I didn’t know my value; I didn’t know that I was a prize to be won. And when you don’t know your value, you put up with bad behavior, you settle. You settle for emotional crumbs. I thought I’m in my mid 40s, I’ve never been married. This is my last chance. And so you tell yourself, you know, you’ve got to make it work, you know you’re gonna make this work.

Brown was upset that Griffith would not have an inflated sense of self regard. Isn’t she a Christian woman? Griffith explained that God Himself had spoken to her and told her that she was a prize to be won. She even compares her self worth to what Christ said about the value
of the Kingdom of Heaven!

Brown: Some of us we’re scratching our heads. She’s gorgeous, she’s got this amazing career. How could you not see your value? You’re already a daughter of the King.

Griffith: Well you know “You are a prize to be won” it was a word that God spoke to me years ago, before I was even in that relationship. I guess I hadn’t been tested on it. Because I was even preaching it to other women “You are a prize to be won” and they were getting it like “Yeah!” But until I got into that relationship and I realized that I didn’t really know my value. I didn’t know that I had that value that God talks about in His word. And if we don’t know that, if we don’t know that we’re that pearl of great price. You know, that we’re royal daughters.

Brown: Yes!

Griffith goes on to explain that God hates it when women settle:

Griffith: If we don’t know that, again we’ll settle for much less. You know it breaks God’s heart when we settle. And that’s the other thing that the Lord taught me through the heartbreak was God hates compromise! He hates it when we settle, because He’s a good daddy, he wants to give his daughters – and his sons – His very best. And He’ll let us settle if we ignore all the red flags and if we keep going He’ll say ok but He desperately doesn’t want us to settle. He want’s us to hold out for His best.

You can see the whole exchange here:

I was curious if the misuse of the pearl of great price was a slip of the moment in the interview, or something Griffith truly misunderstands, so I checked to see if I could find a reference to it in the amazon preview of her book. I found it in the concluding paragraph of the preface:

My sister, God has a special word for you that will change your life. You are a royal daughter of the Most High King, a princess in the palace, a pearl of great price and beautiful beyond measure. Your greatest love, the man of your dreams and the father of your children, is out there waiting for you, because you, my sister, are a prize to be won!

Griffith dedicates the book:

To my future husband: I know you will be worth the wait!

For those who want more wisdom about marriage and finding a husband from women who have failed to marry, see also Griffith interviewing Hale. In this twofer Griffith asks Hale what a single Christian woman should focus on. This leads to Hale’s wisdom on how to have a happy marriage, which Griffith of course loves:
**Hale**: As long as you’re in this moment, as a single woman, loving yourself, thriving where you are at, deciding to live as big and bold and brave of a life as you can, regardless of whether you are flying solo or not.

**Griffith**: Now, how is being happily single a precurser to being happily taken?

**Hale**: I think it’s all about realizing that your self worth and your value is really based on what’s inside you and not in who is standing beside you. And I think, I’ve heard quotes that talk about, your married life can only be as successful as your single life. And so I think you really just work on as a single person becoming all the things you hope to attract in another person, you can’t go wrong.

**Griffith**: And Mandy I love what you said, you said “Stop looking for a hero and become your own hero.” How do you do that?

**Hale**: I think that, you know I’m such a fan of the fairy tales and the happily ever after, but I think that it’s kind of ingrained in us that we are supposed to be rescued from our lives and that we’re waiting for this prince charming to ride up on a white horse, and really the heart of my message is realizing that living happily ever after is all about building a life that is so wonderful that you don’t want to be rescued from it.

**Griffith**: Wow! Thats...

**Hale**: So, I think that it’s all about just creating your own happiness and allowing someone else come in and compliment that, and not to complete you. Because you are already complete, you are already all the things that what you want to be, you just have to tap into it.

You can see the exchange between Griffith and Hale here:

*In her June of 2016 post Stop Apologizing For Having High Standards, Hale wrote she was 37. HT Hank Flanders.

**Griffith’s bio at the bottom of this page says she graduated with her Bachelors degree in 1986. Assuming she was 18 when she graduated high school and only took 4 years to get her Bachelors that would put her at 53 today. This estimate is corroborated by her statement here that she was in her mid 40s in 2012. Update: See this podcast for confirmation.*
Have faith in self esteem.
by Dalrock | July 12, 2017 | Link

The dominant religion of our age is feminism, and feminism means placing your faith in self esteem. More specifically, feminism means placing your faith in women’s self esteem. The fundamental premise of feminism is that if it weren’t for men tricking women into thinking they are different, women would either be just like men, or better than men, at everything. This is why feminists consistently focus on make believe over real achievements. In the religion of feminism make believe creates women’s self esteem, and self esteem will create real achievements.

Faith in self esteem is why Wonder Woman was of such out-sized importance to feminists. It is why they didn’t just cheer during the action scenes, but sobbed, uncontrollably. It wasn’t just that the movie scratched the feminist fantasy itch; it was their deep and abiding faith that believing in the fantasy would make the feminist dream come to pass. As Emma Grey explained at Huffington Post in ‘Wonder Woman’ And The Power Of Watching A Woman Save The World:

I cried within the first five minutes of “Wonder Woman.” And then about 10 minutes later. And then another 15 minutes after that. In fact, I found myself choking up on and off throughout the entire 2+ hour film — not because the movie was sad, but because I had never seen anything quite like it. Just the visual of seeing an army of ripped, powerful women charging down to protect each other and their world was enough to bring me to tears.

These were tears of empowerment, of seeing, and feeling, a great shift in history. Grey and her fellow feminists were crying because they finally understood what it felt like to be a man:

Since “Wonder Woman” opened at the end of last week, my social media feeds have been filled with women talking about how meaningful — sometimes shockingly so — watching the movie was for them.

She offered the following tweet as an example of the sentiment:

NO WONDER WHITE MEN ARE SO OBSCENELY CONFIDENT ALL THE TIME I SAW ONE WOMAN HERO MOVIE AND I'M READY TO FIGHT A THOUSAND DUDES BAREHANDED

— meg s.s. (@megsauce) June 4, 2017

But Wonder Woman wasn’t the only movie this summer aiming to transform nature by boosting the self esteem of women. Ashley Stoney at Romper explains in Forget ‘Wonder Woman’: This ‘Cars 3’ Heroine Is The Feminist Hero Of The Summer. (Spoiler Warning)
Cruz has her own aspirations of being a racer, but she couldn’t, because she was always told she wasn’t good enough or fast enough, a criticism that will ring true to any moms who work in male-dominated fields. She’s plagued with self-doubt, but by the end of the movie, after the two have reconciled, and Lightning ends up entering Cruz, now his protégé, into the race during the final lap, much to the frustration of his peers. Of course, Cruz wins, a triumphant victory against the loud male cars who told her she was not good enough to compete with them.

Ultimately, the message of Cars 3 is an eminently valuable one: you don’t need a man to teach you things that you can learn yourself, because self-esteem comes from within. It’s a noble attempt to make girls realize their worth, and as parents, it’s our job to reinforce and further shape that notion.

As I wrote in the beginning, feminism is the dominant faith of our age. This may seem like an overstatement to some, but this is true. Very often feminism is dressed up as something else entirely. Very often feminism masquerades as the previously dominant religion of our society, Christianity. Notice how similar the overt feminism in the quotes above is to the covert feminism-masquerading-as-Christianity in the preface to Wendy Griffith's You Are a Prize to be Won!: Don’t Settle for Less Than God’s Best:

There are many reasons why we as women cannot properly gauge our worth. Whether we’ve been raised by parents or a parent who simply didn’t know how to nurture and raise an emotionally healthy child, whether we have allowed society, men or a man in our past (or present) to define who we are instead of what God says about us, or whether we have endured cheating, physical abuse or emotional abuse at the hands of a man we thought would always protect us, there are numerous reasons why women enter relationships with the wrong men. The bottom line is we begin to believe the lie that we’re really not worth that much, and we end up being attracted to men who can never truly love us the way we long and deserve to be loved.

Men and society have conspired to keep women down, but if we can only teach women their worth, God’s will can finally be achieved. Have faith in self worth, for Self Worth is a Christian woman’s source of power:

Do you know your incredible value? Do you know what you are truly worth? The way you answer this question—or, more importantly, what you truly believe is the answer to it—has the power to change everything in your life. Everything! The way we perceive ourselves, whether as royalty or peasants, as worthy of love or unworthy, will dictate not only how we treat ourselves but how others treat us. It will influence everything from how much favor we receive at work, to how our boyfriends and husbands treat us, to whether we fulfill our God-given destinies.

Do you want to know how to be a Christian wife? Focus on your Self Worth and it will transform your marriage into God’s design! Griffith explains that the battle for women’s self
esteem is nothing less than a supreme battle between good and evil, between Feminism/Christianity and the Patriarchy/Satan:

Many of us have not seen ourselves as God sees us. The enemy of our souls has painted a bleak picture of who we are (not worthy of love, not talented, not beautiful, too young, too old, too fat, too skinny, not smart enough, etc.), and unfortunately, we have believed the lies and not lived up to our potential.

On the cover of the book TD Jakes reminds us of the same truth taught by Cars 3. Women’s greatness comes from self esteem, and self esteem comes from within the woman herself:

Wendy Griffith reminds us that every woman has within herself the seeds of greatness.

Related: Something in common.
A lack of empathy.
by Dalrock | July 13, 2017 | Link

Jody Allard’s latest piece slamming her teenage sons has rightly gone viral. Vox Day describes it as a case for paternal custody, and Ed Driscoll at Instapundit darkly joked about naming her mother of the year.

Allard is the most shameless of the shameless, a professional divorcée who plies her trade by repeatedly humiliating her sons in print. In February of last year Allard wrote in the Washington Post about one of her sons being committed to a psychiatric ward after expressing the desire to kill himself. Starting with the title, it was all about her: I have to learn to care for my suicidal teen with limits but without fear

I am a good enough mother. I know that because my son’s psychiatrist told me so last week, as she explained bell curves and Skinner’s theories, and said that suicidal thoughts are normal. Forty percent of teenagers have them, she said, and it’s only verbalizing these thoughts that pushes my son out of the realm of normal and into the abyss of mental illness.

…I have been searching for what I did wrong since it happened, and I’ve examined my son’s life with a fine-toothed comb, finding a thousand examples of my mistakes. I married the wrong men...

Allard followed up six months later with another humiliating piece, this time accusing her sons of perpetuating rape culture. My teen boys are blind to rape culture.

My sons are part of the problem.

I’m a survivor of rape and sexual abuse. My sons know this like they know I was once a reporter and I love curries and coffee...

...they aren’t allies in the fight against rape culture because they refuse to acknowledge their own culpability when they call a girl a slut or a whore, laugh at a sexist joke or remain silent when their friends talk about their own questionable sexual behavior.

And in this broken system, anyone who isn’t with us is against us. Particularly, and especially, men. Even my own sons — even yours. It’s not enough to teach our sons about consent; we have to encourage them to have the courage to speak out against rape culture, too.

The deep irony is that she is accusing her sons of lacking empathy, something Allard displays a truly pathological lack of. What kind of mother would publicly humiliate her suicidal son repeatedly, all under the guise of offering parenting advice?

This brings us to Allard’s latest article about her sons, I’m Done Pretending Men Are Safe
(Even My Sons) (emphasis mine):

I wrote an essay in *The Washington Post* last year, during the height of the Brock Turner case, about **my sons and rape culture**. I didn’t think it would be controversial when I wrote it; I was sure most parents grappled with raising sons in the midst of rape culture. The struggle I wrote about was universal, I thought, but I was wrong. My essay went semi-viral, and for the first time **my sons encountered my words about them on their friends’ phones, their teachers’ computers, and even overheard them discussed by strangers on a crowded metro bus**. It was one thing to agree to be written about in relative obscurity, and quite another thing to have my words intrude on their daily lives.

**One of my sons was hurt by my words**... He is angry at me now, although he won’t admit that either, and his anger led him to conservative websites and YouTube channels; places where he can surround himself with righteous indignation against feminists, and tell himself it’s ungrateful women like me who are the problem.

This woman is incredible. She *knows* what she is doing to him, but she simply won’t stop. No depth is too low. More astounding is that her editors haven’t come to their senses and pulled the plug on her.

And as always, it is all about *her*. Tossing her sons under the bus yet *again* is merely a segue into how hard it is for her to date as a single mother:

As a single mother, I sometimes wonder whether the real problem is that my sons have no role models for the type of men I hope they become. But when I look around at the men I know, I’m not sure a male partner would fill that hole. Where are these men who are enlightened but not arrogant? Who are feminists without self-congratulation? If my sons need role models, they may have to become their own.

I joined Bumble recently, after a six-plus year break from dating. I’m not overly interested in dating in the first place, but I’m starved for adult conversation so dating feels like a necessary evil. Bumble, as I explained to my married friends, is like the feminist Tinder. Women have to initiate contact with men, so at least there’s no inbox full of dick picks every day. But, feminist or not, the men are no different from the men anywhere else and I quickly felt deflated. If the feminist men — the men who proudly declare their progressive politics and their fight for quality — aren’t safe, then what man is? No man, I fear.

**See Also:** [Harming your kids for attention and profit](#)
LawDog Book Bomb underway!
by Dalrock | July 17, 2017 | Link

Larry Correia is calling for a book bomb for new Castalia House offering The Lawdog Files:

As a small town Texas cop he used to post these funny true life stories, and they were hilarious. Seriously, the guy has a gift. Some of these stories have become internet legend, like the amorous armadillo, the pink gorilla suit, and the shootout with Santa.

After nearly two decades of us bugging him, Lawdog has finally written a book!

Sounds like a fun read! If you want in on the run, you can do as I just did and click on the Amazon link and buy the kindle version for only $4.99.

The purpose of a BOOK BOMB is to get as many people as possible to buy the same book on the same day. That gets it to go up in the sales rankings on Amazon as much as possible. The higher it gets, the more eyes see it, the more new readers check it out. Success breeds success, and the most important thing is that the author GETS PAID. So please check it out, and if you like it, tell your friends and spread the word.
Bombing Damage Assessment
by Dalrock | July 19, 2017 | Link

Many thanks to all who joined in Monday to make the book bombing run a huge success.

At the link above Vox Day offers an excerpt from the book, titled:

| FILE 8: The Six-Foot Chickens |
The other day a woman mentioned her frustration with smartphones to my wife. The woman’s complaint was that her husband would play or read on his smartphone while she browses through stores. My wife asked why that was bad, and the woman explained:

Because now he isn’t miserable.

This is an example of what I’ve termed **punishing with her presence**, and a Game lesson that should be easy for men to grasp if they can make it past their own denial. If it seems like your wife wants to spend time with you for no other reason than to make you miserable, *that is almost certainly what is going on.* Yet the concept is so illogical and foreign to men’s thinking that few men will recognize it.

If you can get past your own denial, the appropriate response is to calmly and lovingly call out what she is doing. You aren’t doing your wife any favors by signing up for the role of henpecked husband, and in fact putting up with this will only frustrate your wife.

For another example of this kind of thinking, see the recent post by Jezebel Managing Editor Joanna Rothkopf: [Chinese Mall Installs ‘Husband Pods’ for Husbands Too Lazy to Accompany Their Wives for 1 Freaking Afternoon!!!](https://jezebel.com/chinese-mall-installs-husband-pods-for-husbands-too-lazy-to-accompany-their-wives-for-1-freaking-afternoon-1834256456)

The Telegraph, translating from state-run site the Paper, reports that the Global Harbour mall in Shanghai, China is testing this new pilot program of baby bouncers for stupid adults, in the form of four glass pods where men (or theoretically women) can go to play video games while their wives shop. God forbid they spend one minute participating in an activity that doesn’t specifically revolve around feeding them sexually, emotionally, or spiritually!!!

I bet Rothkopf is fun at parties!
In my previous post I quoted Jezebel Managing Editor Joanna Rothkopf. From her Bio at Bustle, she is a walking, breathing, men’s sphere cliché:

Joanna is a New York-based writer and performer. Her work has appeared in Vanity Fair, The Atlantic, Foreign Policy, The Huffington Post, and Epicurious.com, among others, and her body has performed at UCB, Standup NY and the Secret Theater, among others. She is currently a Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Fellow in Science and Health Journalism at Columbia University and holds degrees in Literary Studies and French from Middlebury College. She loves her cat like a son.

More specifically, Rothkopf is what The Other McCain calls The Writer, in ‘Broken People,’ Cats and Prozac:

Cats. Of course, she’s got cats. Did I mention she’s 29? And an alumna of New School University (2014-15 tuition $41,836)? Also, you may not be surprised to learn, Ms. Stokes lives in Brooklyn.

See, this is the thing with young feminist writer types nowadays. They can’t go to Podunk State University. No, they must attend one of those private schools where annual tuition is at or near the median U.S. household income. This is the only way to become that glorious being, The Writer. And, probably because as girls dreaming of becoming The Writer, they watched a sitcom or movie about the lives of quirky bachelorettes in Brooklyn, they simply must live there after graduation.

Well, you may ask, what does The Writer write about?

Herself, of course! Do these elite colleges offer a major in Solipsism Studies nowadays?

Going through the list for official scoring:

• Cats? Check!
• Went to an expensive private university? Check!
• Lives in Brooklyn? Here Rothkopf only gets partial credit, but NYC is the next best thing for The Writer.
• Writes about herself? Check! Check! Check!

From Rothkopf’s Teen Diary: ‘I Get a Little Teenage Girl Privilege Right Now’:

Growing up, I had upwards of 15 diaries—none of them finished, or even really given a chance to thrive. I’d buy one at the beginning of camp or if I was in a bookstore, sit on my bed, write six pages about how I wanted to be a writer, and then immediately forget about my diary and never return to it.
This is the solipsism Hat Trick, with Rothkopf writing about herself writing about how she wanted to write (about herself).
Spotting the presence punisher in the wild.
by Dalrock | July 21, 2017 | Link

Reader getalonghome asks regarding women who punish with their presence:

“Yet the concept is so illogical and foreign to men’s thinking that few men will recognize it.” I don’t recognize it, either. I know you don’t make things up, but I’m having a hard time with this. What kind of detestable creature is this?

...Again, what kind of woman is that? I know none like this!

Women who do this are all around us, you just have to know how to spot them. The thing to keep in mind is very few women who do this are aware of it. When my wife originally asked other women how they handled the impulse, every woman she asked said they had no idea what she was talking about. Yet my wife had witnessed many of these women doing exactly the same thing.

While the woman in smartphones ruin everything was surprisingly open about her desire to make her husband miserable, this isn’t what you will normally observe. Such women almost never come out and state that they want to make their husbands miserable. What they say is:

My husband never wants to spend any time with me!

When women complain to you in this way*, gently ask them if they make it a point to be sweet and nice to be around when they are with their husband. The reaction you will get will either be a look of pure hatred for challenging a sacred birthright of the sisterhood, or a look of sudden perplexity, as the woman tries to understand not only why she expects her husband to want to be around her when she is being a bitch, but why something this obvious never dawned on her before**. However, most women will fall into the former category, so be prepared for a look of unbridled hate.

Assuming the woman is interested in solving the problem, the solution my wife has found is to simply resist the urge and get busy doing something else for a short period of time, after which the urge tends to rapidly go away. Even better, by doing this over time, the frequency and severity the urge will also diminish.

*There is a similar common complaint “My husband never has time for me!” or “My husband is so boring and lazy all he wants to do is sleep when he gets home from his third job! He so selfish, he never has time for me!” In that case the woman in question almost certainly spent the previous 30 min bragging about her conspicuous consumption in the form of automobiles, travel, housing, and name brands/fashion. In this scenario the hate inspiring Titus 2 question is “Have you considered trading down in house/car/fashion/etc, or getting a job so your husband doesn’t have to work so many hours?”

**This isn’t logical, but when the desire to drive the husband away is accomplished the wife
tends to feel a deep sense of loss/abandonment. The complaint is as heartfelt as it is absurd.
Submission with a twist, and denying rebellion.

by Dalrock | July 24, 2017 | Link

Pastor Doug Wilson has a new post up titled 21 Theses on Submission in Marriage (HT Hmm). Taken individually, most of the theses are good, and parts of the post are excellent. For brevity I’ll focus on what I see as the main flaws in the post, but I would encourage my readers to follow the link and read the whole thing.

One of the key ways complementarians neuter headship is by adding a special rule to husbands; submission is mandatory, they tell us, but husbands must not instruct or try in any way to coerce their wives into accepting their biblical role. As Mary Kassian explains in 7 Misconceptions about Submission, husbands must only love their wives sacrificially, and hope their wife gets the hint:

Misconception #4: Submission is a right—a husband has the right to demand his wife’s submission.

A husband does not have the right to demand or extract submission from his wife. Submission is HER choice—her responsibility... it is NOT his right!! Not ever. She is to “submit herself”— deciding when and how to submit is her call. In a Christian marriage, the focus is never on rights, but on personal responsibility. It’s his responsibility to be affectionate. It’s her responsibility to be agreeable. The husband’s responsibility is to sacrificially love as Christ loved the Church—not to make his wife submit.

Kathy Keller explained the same thing in her sermon on submission at FamilyLife:

Submission is something that a wife gives. It’s not something that a husband can demand.

Coercion, complementarians tell us, is reserved for wives to use against husbands. As Kassian explains:

Submission is neither mindless nor formulaic nor simplistic. Submitting to the Lord sometimes involves drawing clear boundaries and enacting consequences when a husband sins.

And likewise Keller:

He’s controlling, threatening (maybe even abusive). Am I supposed to submit to all of this?”

The answer is, “No!” Your submission to a husband who is sinning against God is to oppose him...

If he’s abusive, call the police—I mean, if necessary—but with the motive of trying to
serve and save him—not punish, or dominate, or threaten him…

Note how this inverts biblical instruction to husbands and wives. In the Bible, husbands are to love their wives by actively leading them, by instructing their wives verbally (Eph 5:26, 1 Cor 14:35). Wives, on the other hand, are to win their husbands over *without a word*, even if the husband is sinning (1 Pet 3:1-2, ESV):

3 Likewise, wives, be subject to your own husbands, so that **even if some do not obey the word**, they may be won without a word by the conduct of their wives,² when they see your respectful and pure conduct.

I mention all of this as background, because Wilson does something very similar in his 21 theses. His instruction to husbands is to win disobedient wives without a word, and his instruction to wives is to bring in others to coerce husbands who aren’t obeying the word. Read the quotes below from Wilson’s points 5 and 11, and note how similar they are to the quotes above by Keller and Kassian:

5. ...When the authority of a husband turns rancid, a wife should receive the help of fathers, brothers, friends, and/or elders to help her stand up against it. I have been involved in this sort of intervention more than once.

...  

11. The Bible does not teach husbands to enforce the requirement that was given to their wives. Since true submission is a matter of the heart, rendered by grace through faith, a husband does not have the capacity to make this happen. His first task is therefore to love his wife as Christ loved the church. He is to lead by example.

Wilson may not be trying to encourage the rebellion of Kassian and Keller, but at the very least he is inadvertently encouraging this kind of thinking.

I’ll add that the question of a truly abusive husband is a difficult one, and while I’m not aware of any specific direction in Scripture indicating that elders should intervene, I believe that the general instruction regarding following civil authorities as well the instruction on church discipline can be carefully and wisely applied here. But we must be aware that:

1. The purpose of the intervention should be to help bring a brother back from serious sin, and to protect the wife. The purpose should *not* be to help the wife stand up to her husband’s authority, as Keller and Kassian teach, and as Wilson says he has done. The purpose should be Christian, not feminist.

2. Abuse has been redefined to mean anything that frightens or upsets the wife, and is being very openly used by feminists as a way to abolish headship and make husbands submissive to their wives. The creators of the pervasive legal and social model regarding abuse (Duluth) are *very open about the fact* that from the beginning their objective has *not* been to stop domestic violence, but to stop men from seeing themselves as heads of the household and teach wives to stand up to their husbands.
3. When the Apostles Peter and Paul wrote about headship and submission, they did not feel the need to remind wives to monitor their husbands for sin and call in the authorities. Instead, they instructed wives to win sinning husbands over without a word. This was in the ancient world, in a time (as we are forever reminded) when husbands were violent chauvinists. Yet in our age of open feminist rebellion and docile men, no discussion of headship and submission can occur without telling husbands to mind their own business if their wives rebel, and reminding wives to call the cops if the husband is abusive. Was there an embarrassing omission by the apostles, or is this being added to appease the feminist rebellion? Why must the tone and content of the teaching be so radically different today than in the ancient world?

To understand the depth of this perhaps (to some) subtle flaw in Wilson’s teaching, imagine if he had instead told wives to win sinning husbands over without a word, and had encouraged husbands with wives who rebelled against submission to seek out church discipline. Flipping the message like this would have lead to an open rebellion.

The other major flaw with Wilson’s theses on submission is his denial of the nature of the defining feature of our age, the very open feminist rebellion all around us. This is despite initially promising statements in theses 2 and 10:

2. We live in a time when honest exegesis is routinely threatened with calumny, and there are frequently honors and rewards for dishonest exegesis. It should not be surprising that we are getting less and less of the former, and more and more of the latter.

10. At the same time, because of the curse that followed the Fall, women have a deep resistance to dutiful submission, even though such submission would lead them into the joy and true satisfaction that comes from obeying God. It may or may not improve the marriage (depending on his sin issues), but it will most certainly improve her walk with God. The prophecy that her “desire shall be for her husband” was not speaking of romantic getaways, but rather predicting that there would be a struggle for mastery. So instead of trying to gain mastery over her husband, she should struggle to gain mastery over this besetting impulse within herself.

The problem is that while Wilson recognizes that we live in an age of open feminist rebellion, and while he recognizes that women will naturally be inclined to feminist rebellion, he chalks the widespread feminist rebellion up to men tricking women into feminist rebellion:

17. The liberation of women was a false flag operation. The true goal was the liberation of libertine men, and in our day this was a goal that has largely been achieved. These were men who wanted the benefits for themselves that would come from easy divorce, widespread abortion, mainstreamed pornography, and a promiscuous dating culture. The early twentieth century was
characterized by the Christian wife. The early twenty-first century is characterized by the tattooed concubine. And these sons of Belial have the chutzpah to call it “progress for women.”

It is true that part of the massive sin involved with our adoption of feminist rebellion involves men, including Christian men, hoping to exploit feminism. But this overlooks the much more pervasive sin by men, the same sin of Adam in the Garden, of listening to women when they should have listened to God. Calling women out on sin is hard, and feels uncomfortable. I know Wilson knows this, because he has written that the idea of confronting women’s sin from the pulpit is so disturbing that other pastors avoid it entirely, and while Wilson is more brave than other pastors the very idea of doing so evokes a kind of nervous laughter.

Cowardice in the Pulpit

And the reason we have such cowardice in our homes is because the example has already been set in our pulpits...

Now suppose—just suppose—the presenting problem in three marriages I am trying to help is the problem of lazy and idle housewives. Is there any practical way, without becoming a Pariah for the Ages, to preach on “Lazy Housewives”? I could get myself into a fit of the giggles just thinking about it.

Moreover, the idea that feminism is merely about a few alpha men wanting to get out of the restrictions of marriage doesn’t pass the laugh test. Not only does our new family structure perfectly align with women’s (and not men’s) preferred form of promiscuity, but the rebellion involves much more than merely destroying the family. Women are acting out their envy of men all around us, and demanding to be placed into every conceivable male role. This includes everything, including men’s sports, combat, and church leadership. Wilson and others observe women demanding to usurp men’s roles, and they tell us men are forcing women to sin. This position requires a parade of embarrassing rationalizations, including the fantastic claim by complementarians that men are forcing women to push their way into combat roles. Wilson is more subtle than complementarians in this regard, but still engages in the same basic thought process. In thesis #7 he describes women finding themselves in leadership roles over men, which he says is driven by male fecklessness:

7. The requirement of submission within marriage does not prohibit the occasional circumstance when a woman in civil society finds herself in a leadership role over men. Deborah, Esther, and Lydia come to mind. At the same time, when feminine leadership becomes widespread and common in a society, it is not a sign of progress at all, but is rather a sign of cultural decadence driven by male fecklessness.

Worst of all, by claiming that the feminist rebellion is caused by trickster men who want to exploit the rebellion, Wilson manages to avoid confronting the pervasive sins of both men and women. Men are sinning by being too cowardly to stand up to the rebellion. Women are sinning by giving into the temptation to rebel. Yet Wilson is encouraging women to rationalize
this widespread rebellion as something men are making them do, and encouraging men to mind their own business.
Wilson’s intellectual stink bomb.

by Dalrock | July 26, 2017 | Link

Pastor Doug Wilson is clearly a smart and learned man. At times I greatly appreciate his insight, as with his explanation of Luke 22:35–38. But at other times Wilson stumbles in his writing, and when he is challenged to defend weak ideas he manages to dig himself in even deeper. You can see a recent example of this with his response to critics of his 21 Theses on Submission in Marriage. Wilson’s response to his critics is titled: And Now a Brief Word for the Wife Beaters.

Accusing men who disagree with him of being wife beaters is tantamount to intellectual surrender, and Wilson is so eager to do this he does so in the title of the post. The internet is a big place, and I have no doubt there were some who disagreed with Wilson’s neutered form of headship and offered wife beating as a superior alternative. But Wilson is clearly using this as an opportunity to pop an intellectual stink bomb to cover his retreat from criticism he isn’t equipped to rebut.

The key words here are enforce and make. No mortal can force such a thing. It does not come from right-handed power. But husbands can love and lead their wives. A husband can love, and Scripture teaches that this kind of love is efficacious. Love bestows loveliness. Husbands cannot duplicate the Lord’s substitutionary atonement, but husbands are most certainly commanded to imitate it. And when they imitate it as they ought, the results are not—work with me here—a beating for the little missus. And a man who thinks it is just demonstrates how far away from the spirit of the gospel he actually is.

Wilson explains that his prescription of love her sacrificially and she will follow is not to be confused with the complementarian servant leader model:

At some point in every husband/wife relationship, there will be a clash of wills. When that happens, it is often the case that the husband gets owned and he loses. Let us be blunt, and call it what it is. However, we live in flattering times, and he has been given sufficient cover by the church to retreat demurely into his designated background, and to call what he is doing “servant leadership.”

Having set his prescription apart from other forms of neutered headship, he closes the piece with a rebuttal to the men he most wants to respond to, the men who disagree with his form of neutered headship but aren’t advocating wife beating. These men, he explains, are meanie chauvinists:

That kind of weakness is not what I am commending. It is not how Christ loved the church. But it is a mistake of the highest order to think that the opposite of this kind of cowardly coyness is to stand on the recliner in one’s man cave beating one’s chest. That is not how He loved the church either.

So authority flows to those who take responsibility. Authority flees those who seek to
| evade responsibility.

I now understand why Wilson’s defenders so strongly prefer the *shut up* form of argument. Just like his opening accusation that those who disagree with him are wife beaters, this is carefully crafted to make further discussion impossible by sowing *strife*. The tactic is easy enough to utilize, but it betrays an inability to defend his arguments.
As I mentioned in my previous post, Pastor Doug Wilson’s reply to critics of his 21 Theses on Submission in Marriage is titled:

And Now a Brief Word for the Wife Beaters

Despite the title referring to wife beaters, the post is a response to all of his critics. This includes Facebook users who objected to his comments about submission being an “erotic necessity”:

In the other peanut gallery, a discussion broke out on Facebook over my statement that submission was an erotic necessity, running along the “shades of 50 shades!” line. Maybe I had come out in favor of corporal kinky punishment for wives. Who’s to say?

Wilson assures his readers that he had no such thing in mind. What he was thinking about was a pseudo-Christian (chivalric) pedestalization of women. The offending phrase, he points out, is a quote from the man he says is his mentor on the subject. It is from C.S. Lewis in That Hideous Strength. Wilson explains that the book demonstrates a sexual element to submission, and offers as the prime example a scene where Merlin kneels before another man (Ransom):

Life at Belbury is one extended orgy of biting and devouring. In contrast, life at St. Anne’s is a staggering hierarchy of masculinity and femininity running all the way up, and with a sexual element included where appropriate. There is one horrific scene between Wither and Frost which ends with them in a clinch driven by the lust of mutual animosity, each knowing that at some point a devouring must happen. The corresponding scene is between Ransom and Merlin, and ends with Merlin kneeling, rendering honor like a loyal king’s man. “Slowly, ponderously, yet not awkwardly, as though a mountain sank like a wave, he sank on one knee; and still his face was almost on a level with the Director’s.”[1] No devouring at all.

I had to read this several times to make sure I hadn’t missed something, but the quote above, including the part I have bolded, is exactly what Wilson wrote. I have not read the book, but I’m fairly confident that Lewis wasn’t really pushing a homoerotic ethos with the scene. I also suspect that Wilson didn’t really have that in mind either, but that he so desperately wanted to invoke the idea of Lancelot submitting to his Lady as Christian chivalrous eroticism he overlooked whom Merlin was kneeling to.

However, I strongly suspect that Wilson is on firmer footing when he suggests that Lewis was selling a form of Christian pedestalization (can I touch you there?) Game:
...the reconciliation between Mark and Jane is profoundly Christian. She has learned the humility of true submission. Her entire life had been driven by the desire not to be taken in, not to be possessed.

...

But this is not treated by Lewis as Mark Studdock’s standing permission to continue on as an oaf and a coarse rube, barging into her sexually, but now with impunity because she had become “submissive.” No, his frame of mind has been explicitly transformed.

Once she submitted, Wilson explains that Mark learned to stop approaching his wife like a rutting buck, and instead learned to place her on a pedestal. Wilson quotes Lewis:

“This time at last he thought of his own clumsy importunity. And the thought would not go away. Inch by inch, all the lout and clown and clodhopper in him was revealed to his own reluctant inspection; the coarse, male boor with horny hands and hobnailed shoes and beefsteak jaw, not rushing in—for that can be carried off—but blundering, sauntering, stumping in where great lovers, knights and poets, would have feared to tread . . . How had he dared?“[3]

Forget about that earlier stuff where Wilson describes one man erotically kneeling to another. This is what he was no doubt really getting at:

How had he dared? His wife, although a sinner, was a very great lady. He, though a very great sinner, was to return as her lord. But it is not the case that humility is required for a wife to assume her station, but pride will do for the husband. Mark now knew better than that.

Based on the specific quote he offers as well as what I can find on Lewis’ life story I think it is likely that Wilson has this part right. This doesn’t mean that pedestalization is Christian, only that Wilson is likely right when he relates how Lewis got it wrong. When Lewis wrote Hideous Strength he was a lifelong bachelor, and it would seem that his understanding of the relationship between husband and wife was gleaned from medieval poetry and popular culture (which was itself influenced by the same poetry).

Lewis, despite his genius, seems to have internalized the pedestalization in his otherwise insightful study of Courtly Love. Eleven years after publishing That Hideous Strength, Lewis married a divorced single mother of two named Joy Davidman, in a romance that can best be described as a men’s sphere cliché. Like Eat Pray Love and How Stella Got Her Grove back, it involves a marriage for the purpose of securing a visa. From Infogalactic:

In 1956, Davidman’s visitor’s visa was not renewed by the Home Office, requiring that Davidman and her sons return to America. Lewis agreed to enter into a civil marriage contract with her so that she could continue to live in the UK, telling a friend that “the marriage was a pure matter of friendship and expediency.” The civil marriage took place at the register office, 42 St Giles’, Oxford, on 23 April 1956.[29][30]
The couple continued to live separately after the civil marriage.

Eventually Lewis discovered that he felt romantic love for her, and they decided to marry again (for real this time):

The relationship between Davidman and C. S. Lewis had developed to the point that they sought a Christian marriage. This was not straightforward in the Church of England at the time because she was divorced, but a friend and Anglican priest, Reverend Peter Bide,[33] performed the ceremony at Davidman’s hospital bed on 21 March 1957.[34] The marriage did not win wide approval among Lewis’s social circle, and some of his friends and colleagues avoided the new couple.

As the New York Times explains, part of the reason Lewis’ friends did not approve was Davidman’s lack of a submissive spirit:

The homely American, disliked by Lewis’s friends for her Hebraism and her pushiness...

But no doubt at least some of his friends must also have been troubled by the impropriety of their relationship, which began with then married Davidman leaving her family in a bid to seduce Lewis*:

With their marriage in trouble, Davidman and Gresham together read Lewis’s Christian apologetics, and were converted. They joined a Presbyterian church, and she began corresponding with Lewis — even as, oddly, she and her husband dabbled in Scientology.

Through their letters, Davidman fell in love with Lewis, although at first he did not seem to reciprocate. Still, in 1952, she set sail for England, leaving behind her husband and sons, making no secret of her intentions.

As the Infogalactic article notes, Davidman was staying in Lewis’ home when her husband wrote her asking for a divorce:

After several lunch meetings and walks accompanying Davidman and his brother, Warren Lewis wrote in his diary that “a rapid friendship” had developed between his younger brother and Davidman, whom he described as “a Christian convert of Jewish race, medium height, good figure, horn rimmed specs, quite extraordinarily uninhibited.” She spent Christmas and a fortnight at The Kilns with the brothers and by this time was said to have fallen in love with C. S. Lewis, but he seemed to be oblivious to her feelings.[19]

She returned home in January 1953, having received a letter from Gresham that he and her cousin were having an affair and he wanted a divorce.

Wilson claims that Lewis was anchored in a much older (Christian) tradition, one wiser than
modern men can understand:

And so I get a big kick out of moderns—we who do not even know which bathroom to use—learnedly discussing how Lewis was limited by the perspective of his times. Look. Lewis was an old Western man, standing on the other side of a vast chasm that separated him from his times. His erstwhile critics, meantime, have only managed to get about 20 millimeters away from the spirit of their times.

But the reality is that Lewis was painfully modern in this regard. If anything Lewis was ahead of his time. The circumstances leading up to his marriage would have made for an episode of the Jerry Springer Show. The real chasm happened in the eleventh century, as Lewis himself explains in The Allegory of Love:

French poets, in the eleventh century, discovered or invented, or were the first to express, that romantic species of passion which English poets were still writing about in the nineteenth. They effected a change which has left no corner of our ethics, our imagination, or our daily life untouched, and they erected impassable barriers between us and the classical past or the Oriental present. Compared with this revolution the Renaissance is a mere ripple on the surface of literature.

This chasm is so great that nearly everyone today believes as Wilson does, that the morally twisted chivalric tradition of Courtly Love represents Christian values and teaching on marriage and sexual morality. Even Milton made this same mistake.

*A Christianity Today post claims in her defense that when then married Davidman announced she was going to England to seduce Lewis, she was merely making a joke.
C.S. Lewis on the erotic necessity of submission.

by Dalrock | July 28, 2017 | Link

In response to my last post reader Gaius Marcius was kind enough to point out the C.S. Lewis quote on erotic necessity:

Lewis’s phrase ‘erotic necessity’ is not from That Hideous Strength, but from his Spectator article ‘Equality’ in 1943, which is also included in the essay collection Present Concerns. That Hideous Strength is a dramatic presentation of themes Lewis explored in dozens of essays. In this case the point Lewis makes is that inequality is inevitable, necessary, and erotic. If Wilson couldn’t remember the citation for the actual phrase he quotes, a simple Google search would point him in the right direction.

I found an archive of the essay at the Spectator (emphasis mine):

This last point needs a little plain speaking. Men have so horribly abused their power over women in the past that to wives, of all people, equality is in danger of appearing as an ideal. But Mrs. Naomi Mitchison has laid her finger on the real point. Have as much equality as‘ you please—the more the better—in our marriage laws: but at some level consent to inequality, nay, delight in inequality, is an erotic necessity. Mrs. Mitchison speaks of women so fostered on a defiant idea of equality that the mere sensation of the male embrace rouses an undercurrent of resentment. Marriages are thus shipwrecked. This is the tragi-comedy of the modern woman; taught by Freud to consider the act of love the most important thing in life, and then inhibited by feminism from that internal surrender which alone can make it a complete emotional success. Merely for the sake of her own erotic pleasure, to go no further, some degree of obedience and humility seems to be (normally) necessary on the woman’s part.

Lewis erred when he assumed that feminist resentment stems from a history of terrible mistreatment by men. If Genesis isn’t enough to prove that no mistreatment is required for the condition to occur, the 70+ years of feminism since Lewis wrote the essay should win over any remaining doubters. The more we have radically reordered our society to appease feminist demands, the greater the clamor of feminist resentment has become.

But Lewis’ observation that women are sexually attracted to men they submit to is extraordinary. He understood in the 1940s what pickup artists rediscovered fairly recently.
Two additions to the men’s sphere lexicon.
by Dalrock | July 31, 2017 | Link

Cane Caldo coined a hilarious term in his comment on Submission with a twist, and denying rebellion.

A concubine is a committed slave who may not leave without her master’s command, and she receives no more providence when that occurs. What Wilson actually sees are tattooed sluts. A slut is an informal whore who loves her work. In the twenty-first century, sluts not only aren’t concubines, they have have legal rights to extract from their johns future pay for past work; a sort of whore pension. That isn’t anything like concubinage. If we fix Wilson’s phrase so that it reflects the real world it read (“…the twenty-first century is characterized by the tattooed slut.”) it makes sense.

Which gives the lie to Wilson’s sentiment that it’s not progress for women. If twenty-first century women as a group are characterized as tattooed sluts (informal whores), then a clear-eyed observer might call a government enforced whore pension as progress; at least from an economic perspective.

As Zippy observed:

“Whore pension,” as a succinct and accurate description of alimony granted to a woman who chose to divorce her husband, is a stroke of genius.

While I’m sharing Cane’s brilliant term, I thought I would share another term coined by a M.A. Shaw in his Amazon.com review of Jim Geraghty and Cam Edwards’ book Heavy Lifting: Grow Up, Get a Job, Raise a Family, and Other Manly Advice. Shaw aptly notes that the term No Fault Divorce makes as much sense as a No Fault Foreclosure:

Good advise for any young man to marry early but what is needed is a companion novel for young women. It has been my observation – as a 63 year old – that it is women that are equally responsible for the decline of the institution of marriage as the Peter Pan mindset. I recall the motto “A woman needs a man like a fish needs a bicycle” as a teen. No fault divorce (makes as much sense as no fault foreclosure) has led to the present situation where nine of ten divorces are initiated by the wife. Combine a fifty percent divorce rate with the family law paradigm of “What’s hers is hers and what’s his is theirs” in the division of community assets does not make marriage a good business plan for any man. The racetrack gives better odds.

Jim and Cam are obviously very lucky to find their wives but not everybody can be lucky. Still the book was an enjoyable and easy read I would recommend it to anyone.
Rollo Tomassi’s new book is now available.
by Dalrock | July 31, 2017 | Link

Rollo reached out to me late last week to let me know his latest book *The Rational Male - Positive Masculinity* is now available. I picked up a copy on Kindle on Friday afternoon hoping to have time to finish it over the weekend, but so far have only made it through the first 18%. What I have read so far is very good, including a moving tribute to *The Private Man*, and chapters on fatherhood from a “red pill” perspective. Rollo has offered a full breakdown of the contents [here](#).

Rollo writes from a secular perspective, but a solid understanding of the sexual marketplace, the importance of a man’s frame, and the devastation feminists have wreaked on the institution of marriage is just as important for Christians as it is for non Christians. For a primer on how a Christian husband can approach the topic of Game, see [Headship Game](#).

If you are interested, you can pick up your own copy in either [paperback](#) or [kindle](#) format.

**Edit:** Update from Rollo.

- The Rational Male - Positive Masculinity is now the number 1 best seller in Fatherhood, number 2 best seller in Parenting Boys and number 4 best seller in Family Relationships/Fatherhood on Amazon now.
When women first began attending the U.S. Naval Academy in 1976, many observers foolishly asked “What’s the point?” While progress at times may have seemed imperceptibly slow, the naysayers have been proven wrong. We now have a steady stream of victories, lead by a new breed of warrior who brought priorities the Navy had previously never dreamed of. Now, with the U.S. Navy’s newest aircraft carrier, these warriors have finally achieved full freedom of navigation by depriving the enemy of their last last toehold on the open seas:

The new aircraft carrier Gerald R. Ford has all sorts of high-tech gear equipped for 21st century naval warfare. But there is one thing that male sailors will notice is no longer available: Urinals.

“This is designed to give the ship flexibility because there aren’t any berthing areas that are dedicated to one sex or the other,” Operations Specialist 1st Class Kaylea Motsenbocker told Navy Times...

...urinals on aircraft carriers may be a thing of the past.

This long fought battle was not without significant cost, as marking all spaces on our warships as feminine came at the cost of both money and less important (war-fighting) priorities:

When he is designing a bathroom, Kaufman says he is required to allot around 1,500 square inches of space for a urinal. A toilet needs more than 3,300 square inches.

For a ship like the Ford, which cost upwards of $13 billion, every inch of space matters tremendously.

“Why would you want the ship to be bigger just for fixtures?” said Kaufman. “You can get twice as many urinals as water closets.”

But the brave social justice warriors who brought us the urinal free warship can’t rest now. As is the nature of war, each new victory sets the stage for the next battle:

[A toilet is] by far a less clean environment than a urinal. By far,”...

The only way to ensure men accurately aim into a toilet bowl is to force men to sit down, which is unlikely to happen, said Kaufman.

Moreover, sitting down to pee makes trips to the bathroom take longer.

Kaufman lacks faith in these warriors, but I do not.
Changes in the theater of battle also affect civilian supporters. I have received unofficial confirmation from my sources in the CBMW that their leadership is furious that the men of the U.S. Navy are making brave women sit down to pee in their place:

When will these cowardly men learn to stand up and sit down to pee?

*See also: It would be petty to point out how petty it is.*
Does this mean there wasn’t any sobbing?

by Dalrock | August 1, 2017 | Link

My wife found a hilarious review of Dunkirk by a feminist named Mehera Bonner at Marie Claire: I Think ‘Dunkirk’ Was Mediocre at Best, and It’s Not Because I’m Some Naive Woman Who Doesn’t Get It As you can see from the title, Ms. Bonner wants you to know upfront that her objection to the movie isn’t that it sticks to the story and therefore offends her feminine sensibilities. She loves war movies!

>Dunkirk is] a story worthy of being told and re-told, and I really enjoy war movies in general, but still—actual stuff needs to happen. Stuff other than scenes of men burning in oil-covered water, ships sinking, and bodies drowning. If you want to argue that the non-stop violent intensity of the film was the point, and that we should feel fully immersed in the war like we’re living it ourselves—I present Harry Styles.

Nope. She isn’t another feminist bimbo who objects to stories that aren’t about women, or aren’t tarted up with out of place romance scenes featuring pop culture icons to keep the womenfolk entertained. She is cool like that.

What bothers her is her fear that other moviegoers (who aren’t totally chill like she is) won’t be able to see the movie and avoid squealing OMG, it’s Harry Styles!

>The One Direction band member did a surprisingly impressive job in what turned out to be a pretty major role, but I refuse to believe it’s possible for any viewer with even a semblance of pop-culture knowledge not see him and immediately go “OMG, it’s Harry Styles.”

I haven’t yet seen the movie, but when I do I’ll be on the lookout to see if the men in the audience start to squeal when the aforementioned dreamboat makes his entrance. I’m not familiar with the band or the man, but it sounds like it should be pretty obvious when he appears on-screen.

But the fact that the main character is too dreamy for her totally non flighty sensibilities isn’t what most bothers Ms. Bonner about the movie. Her real problem is that it appeals to men, and reminds her of the kind of men who reject her:

>But my main issue with Dunkirk is that it’s so clearly designed for men to man-out over. And look, it’s not like I need every movie to have “strong female leads.” Wonder Woman can probably tide me over for at least a year, and I understand that this war was dominated by brave male soldiers. I get that. But the packaging of the film, the general vibe, and the tenor of the people applauding it just screams “men-only”—and specifically seems to cater to a certain type of very pretentious man who would love nothing more than to explain to me why I’m wrong about not liking it. If this movie were a dating profile pic, it would be a swole guy at the gym who also goes to Harvard.
But enough about her, because, as she explained in the title, this isn’t about her objecting to a movie that breaks the current year mold by telling a story about men, in a way that unashamedly appeals to men. This isn’t about petty envy or the need to mark all spaces as feminine. Bonner explains in conclusion that she just thinks the movie would be much better if it focused on the kinds of inter-sectional feminist issues she personally finds so fascinating:

...to me, Dunkirk felt like an excuse for men to celebrate maleness—which apparently they don’t get to do enough. Fine, great, go forth, but if Nolan’s entire purpose is breaking the established war movie mold and doing something different—why not make a movie about women in World War II? Or—because I know that will illicit cries of “ugh, not everything has to be about feminism, ugh!”—how about any other marginalized group?

**Update:** I’ve now seen the movie, and have written my thoughts on it. There was no sobbing or squealing, and Merlin was magnificent.
Wife beaters and the prairie muffins who love them.

by Dalrock | August 2, 2017 | Link

Pastor Wilson has a response of sorts up to some of my recent posts.

In the meantime, my original 21 theses had apparently been responded to here, which I just now read in the writing of this post, and I am afraid my response to the corporal punishment aficionados was taken as an assertion on my part that any disagreement with me from my right must be coming from wife beaters. Such poisoning the well would be a bad thing, and so for any readers who were disappointed in what they considered charitably to be uncharacteristic squid ink, please know that I did not do this thing. I was not responding to any possible conservative critic in that second post. I was responding a particular problem in my own comment thread.

While it is true the only conservative critics Wilson acknowledged in And Now a Brief Word for the Wife Beaters were wifebeaters, the post wasn’t solely a reply to wifebeaters. Wilson spent roughly half of the wifebeaters post responding to feminists who objected to his assertion that submission was an erotic necessity, and even a bit of energy criticizing complementarians on the topic of headship. The wifebeaters post was not a response to a specific group of wifebeating critics, it was a response to critics in general*. Either way, by repeatedly focusing on what I can only assume is a strong Wilsonian** streak of wifebeatery, Wilson did in fact poison the well. We are now in our third (out of three in the series) post by Wilson on submission that chums the waters with accusations that men who believe in headship are really just abusers. This is textbook well poisoning, not that it is a difficult maneuver to pull off. Whenever the topic of submission comes up, if you want to nuke the discussion simply imply that men who believe in headship are likely wife abusers. The women reading will get their feminist dander up, and the men reading will flee from the idea of headship and submission in terror. Calm, rational discussion of headship and submission is now impossible, even for the few who are wise enough to try to look past the bait. Note that you can repeat this pattern as often as you like, and it even works when you yourself are the one who brought up the topic of headship and submission in the first place. Wilson either doesn’t understand how this works, or is intentionally and repeatedly poisoning the well.

This brings us to Wilson’s odd attack on some women’s hairstyles and fashion choices (emphasis mine):

…words like patriarchy do have accumulated cultural connotations, and those connotations are not simply manufactured by the feminists. In other words, biblical practice is caricatured by the feminists, sure enough, but there are more than a few self-professed advocates of the biblical understanding who do their level best to live out the caricature.

So this means that when you come across some rabid feminist online who was brought up in a prairie muffin jumper, and who had her hair in a bun for a
couple decades, but who is now a lesbian queer theorist, we have to keep in mind the fact that when she attacks the patriarchy as an absurdity, she is quite possibly doing so as someone who grew up in the middle of such absurdity, frequently presented to her on a daily basis and in technicolor. In other words, she is not necessarily hallucinating. What she is rejecting is actually out there.

...Their mistake is that they (too conveniently perhaps) ascribe the errors they have known personally to absolutely everyone who ascribes to the label they reject. She grew up with her mother browbeaten and harassed by her jerk of a father, the kind who would use Ephesians 5 as a club, and so she simply asserts that any married couple that seeks to live out Ephesians 5 must be doing exactly the same thing her parents did.

Wilson is either being catty here, or he is implying that such hairstyles and clothes on a woman are a sign of an abusive husband (or both). The term prairie muffin jumper threw me for a bit of a loop, as while I'm familiar with the basic form of cattiness I've never heard that particular term. Long time readers of this blog will recall a similar snide comment by a different blogger:

And that I tend to strongly disagree with the flavor of “trads” who think that women shouldn’t be educated or pursue careers while single. This is for the simple reason that I find educated and accomplished women far more interesting than those whose only accomplishments are long hair, lack of makeup and prairie skirts.

So I had heard of prairie skirts, but not prairie muffin jumpers. However, a search of the term immediately brought up the Prairie Muffin Manifesto, where the author explained why she chose to embrace this term:

What is a Prairie Muffin? I borrowed the term from R.C. Sproul, Jr. who jokingly and lovingly called his wife a Prairie Muffin (note: R.C. Sproul, Jr. has nothing to do with the writing of this manifesto). This was in response to those who make snide and derogatory remarks about those of us who choose a quiet life, diligently pursuing our biblical role as women and protecting the innocence of our children. Some women have been caricatured as denim jumper-wearing, Little House on the Prairie-worshiping, baby machines who never trim their hair or wear makeup. Like the Americans who bore the name Yankee Doodle as a badge of honor rather than be cowed by the enemy who used it in a derogatory way, the name Prairie Muffin is meant to convey the message that we are sticking to our convictions despite the silly labels people try to stick on us.

This is all I have to share about the post, as Wilson explained in the end that he will come back to the substantive questions in a future post. I look forward to his clarifications on the issues I raised, especially in my response to his first post in the series.

*For clarity, Wilson’s wifebeaters post was written before my response to his 21 Theses on Submission in Marriage, so the wifebeaters post could not have been a response to me. However, when I wrote my initial post on the series I had not yet noticed his wifebeaters post
defending his 21 theses.

**I’m not referring to Wilson himself here, but referring to Wilson’s comment section, following Wilson’s pattern with the term Dalrockian.**
On Wednesday Pastor John Piper published a response to a single mother named Anna who asked if she had a biblical obligation to marry.

My question for you is one that I have wrestled with since the birth of my only child, a son. He is three. I’m a single parent and have been since his conception. I thank the Lord for his work in my heart that has transformed my soul and lifestyle from where it was then. Now, as I attempt to wrap my head around the overwhelming task of raising this boy into a man by myself, I do not feel called to marriage. But am I obligated to find a godly mate to complete the model of family that is clearly laid out in Scripture? As a single parent, is it forbidden for me to embrace a life of singleness and ‘unhindered service’ to the Lord as described by Paul in 1 Corinthians 7?"

She doesn’t say she knows she came to be in this position due to her own sin, and she doesn’t say she repented, she says God changed her soul and lifestyle. She is saying she is saved, and not that kind of girl anymore. This is especially important because there is a very common tendency for single mothers to deny their own sin and instead say something like “life dealt me a difficult hand”, and compare themselves to widows.

Not only does Piper not address the issue of sin and repentance, but he goes so far as to make the rationalization himself. Piper likens her to the widow in Luke 7:12-13. He speaks in the language of the harlot, saying life has dealt her a difficult hand (emphasis mine):

…First, Jesus, the incarnate Jesus that we know in the Gospels as an expression of God’s own heart, has a special concern for mothers who have children to raise on their own.

For example, in Luke 7:12-13 we read, “As he drew near to the gate of the town, behold, a man who had died was being carried out, the only son of his mother, and she was a widow.” Her husband is gone, the only son she has is gone, and this is the next thing we read: “A considerable crowd from the town was with her. And when the Lord saw her, he had compassion on her.”

…

He says to her, “Do not weep” (Luke 7:13). The point of the story is that he has power to raise the dead. He raises the boy from the dead. He does it, he uses that kind of power in the service of compassion, for someone for whom life has dealt a very difficult hand. That would be the case for Anna. The first thing, Anna, is to take heart that Jesus has a special kind of compassion for women in your situation.

Keep in mind that this is a message not just for Anna, but for all of the single mothers who
are reading.

**It takes a village.**

But then Piper does something even more astounding. He explains that married couples are the *old* way to make a family. It turns out that women like Anna are a sort of cutting edge Christian:

---

**Departure of the Nuclear Family**

Second, never think of the family — the nuclear family: husband, wife, and children — as the only or the eternal or the main family with which God is concerned. The church is God’s main family on the earth. In the age to come, there will be no nuclear family because Jesus says in that age that we will “neither marry nor are given in marriage” (Matthew 22:30). The nuclear family is temporary. The eternal family is the church with God as our Father and all of us as brothers and sisters.

I want to elevate this. She didn’t mention the church, but I’m sowing the seed for her to think about it. I want to elevate the local church as the expression of God’s family for her life. That’s precisely where she should embed this child in relationships with the wider family — men, women, boys, and girls — so that the child will connect in all the varying ways that he’s going to need in order to be as rounded as he should be.

The third is just an expansion of it. The church is where this little boy is going to find or should find strong, humble, godly men in action.
There was no sobbing or squealing, and Merlin was magnificent.

by Dalrock | August 7, 2017 | Link

Following my original post on Dunkirk, I have now seen the movie (twice). I am pleased to report that not only was there no sobbing in the theater, but there was no squealing when Harry Styles came on screen.

It is really astounding to think that Mehera Bonner at Marie Claire watched the movie, and instead of feeling empathy for the men (and a few women) undergoing such an ordeal, felt envy for men:

…to me, Dunkirk felt like an excuse for men to celebrate maleness—which apparently they don’t get to do enough.

As I noted I ended up watching the movie twice. The first time I went with my wife. After my wife described the movie our daughter asked if I would take her to see it too. My wife had in the meantime read about the process the filmmakers used to shoot the aerial scenes in IMAX, and this made me decide to watch it the second time in an IMAX theater. As USA Today explains in How Christopher Nolan shot those amazing aerial ‘Dunkirk’ dogfights:

“I would be on the ground waving (them off),” says Nolan. “Craig would run the camera and fly the plane. They would do a half-hour sortie, come back and we’d look at the tape.”

IMAX cameras allow for only three-and-a-half minutes of film shooting at one time, so the process was drawn out — each short shoot required a landing, review and film reloading.

“There were literally hundreds of take-off and landings. Up and down. Reload and shoot,” says Hosking

I’m not sure I noticed a big visual difference between the regular theater and IMAX, but the sound was much better in the IMAX theater. Either way, the entire movie is excellent, and the Spitfire scenes are truly magnificent.

One aspect of the movie shatters the normal pattern, and is especially unusual if your frame of reference is Christian movies. One of the protagonists (Mr. Dawson) is a father, and yet his character is portrayed entirely positively. There is no reference to God, but otherwise in word and deed he is the archetypal Christian father. He is a courageous and wise leader who not only cares for the survival needs of the men he rescues, twice he also steps in to defend individual men’s dignity when their courage is questioned. While this kind of positive
portrayal of a father sadly can't be permitted in Christian movies, at least some secular film makers are still willing to buck the feminist anti father narrative.

At one point Dawson makes a reference to one of my other favorite characters in the movie. Dawson recognizes the Spitfires without having to turn to look at them, telling his son:

| Rolls-Royce Merlin engine. Sweetest sound you could hear out here.  

Indeed it was a sweet sound.
Dispatch from the friend zone.
by Dalrock | August 8, 2017 | Link

MSNBC host Joe Scarborough has been getting mocked for a series of tweets criticizing millennials:

Our smartphone culture impacts young men in the most profound way. It is often younger women who suffer the most. https://t.co/cagBUD9rUE
— Joe Scarborough (@JoeNBC) August 7, 2017

Young men in the 1940s liberated Europe from Nazism and the Pacific from the Japanese Empire. Today, too many stay home playing video games.
https://t.co/e7FTe0O20P
— Joe Scarborough (@JoeNBC) August 7, 2017

Scarborough’s ideal activity for young men –fighting in wars– really is a strange view of the good old days. A more obvious answer would be starting a family, or working towards being able to start a family. But our societal turn away from marriage can’t be blamed on smartphones and video games, even though smart-phones and games provide some of the diversions that fill up the time men used to focus on leading and providing for a family. The truth is that we have formally adopted a new family structure to replace marriage, the child support model. While we keep marriage around in a ceremonial form, wives forever retain the option to convert these nominal marriages into the child support model at will.

Moreover, as much as Scarborough was pummeled for telling millennial men to man up and do what he didn’t do (join the military), he would have left himself even more open if he had told them to do what he did do; Scarborough will soon enter his third marriage, which puts him in a tough spot to sell marriage as a moral imperative. Either Scarborough didn’t honor his own vows, or his wives elected to convert what he thought were marriages to the child support model.

Why can’t other men be humble and noble, like me?

All of this started when Scarborough decided to throw his weight behind Rod Dreher’s recent American Conservative article: Deforming Teens’ Moral Imagination. Dreher’s article in turn was primarily the publication of a letter from an unnamed reader, a young (Millennial) man.
Dreher’s reader explains that unlike himself, his peers are antisocial and think they are better than everyone they meet:

The presence of other people is treated as a nuisance, an exhausting and tedious task of putting up with overly-energetic plebeians who couldn’t possibly understand your tastes in photography and gritty, authentic literature. I’ve even heard more than one particularly nasty people in this group say, on multiple occasions, that they hate people. Full stop, without qualification, “I hate people.” This is usually occasioned by some petty rudeness or ignorance on part of the unwashed masses with whom these elevated introverts have the misfortune of using the same grocery store or university.

In an ironic twist, the young man explains that he also finds that he is too superior to participate in groups with men his age (emphasis mine):

RUF is about as far from the stereotypical entertainment fluff stereotype of youth / college ministries as you can get. And yet in my senior year when I tried out a couple of community groups, which were split by sex, I found that I simply couldn’t join them. To the best of my recollection, every single male besides myself in both RUF community groups I visited (and there was no overlap of people) was an active porn user, or had been relatively recently. As the discussions went on in both groups, I found myself uncomfortably silent — I’ve never watched or even wanted to watch porn, but I didn’t want to say so and sound impossibly holier-than-thou.

Clearly the young man doesn’t understand the hair-shirt and chest thumping model of modern Christian manhood, and has forgotten the hair-shirt.

Finally he gets to the heart of the issue. These antisocial men were not only lesser men than him, but they were the men the women his age were attracted to. Even worse, these are the same women who have friend-zoned our intrepid letter writer:

So there I sat, listening as guys whom girls I know and deeply respect had crushes on and wished would ask them out, go on about how porn was just too hard of a habit to break because of dopamine addiction. The young women who were taken with these young men would no doubt be shocked and horrified to know what these gentlemen spent their evenings doing, and were at risk of walking into a relationship with a porn-addicted man who would almost certainly conceal his private habit from this girl until she was emotionally involved enough that breaking off the relationship would be hard. Because of the confidentiality involved, I couldn’t warn these girls off from dating these guys, and I couldn’t bear to think about the indignity these women would be subjected to in dating these men, so I left and never went back. Most of my good platonic friends in college were women; and I consider the lack of male community where perversion was not the accepted norm to be one of the principal causes of that fact.

Related:
• Why aren’t men responding to economic signals?
• Why he won’t hear it.
Is marriage the cause of sexual immorality?
by Dalrock | August 9, 2017 | Link

There is a recurring argument in the comment threads which claims that some forms of extramarital sex are not prohibited. The argument is that fornication isn’t a biblical concept, and only a small set of defined extramarital sex activities are prohibited:

1. Adultery. Sex with a woman who is another man’s wife, or sex with a woman who is not your wife (but for this latter definition only if you are married).
2. Sex with a virgin. But after another man has had sex with a virgin, she is fair game unless one of you is married.
3. Sex with prostitutes. Some claim this is only a prohibition against sex with certain kinds of prostitutes (e.g. pagan temple prostitutes).
4. Incest.
5. Bestiality.
6. Homosexuality.

All other forms of sex outside of marriage are then claimed to be permitted. I won’t lay out the entire foundation of faulty logic used to arrive at this claim, but in broad strokes it involves a very narrow reading of the OT, focusing on Leviticus and Exodus, and a tortuously narrow reading of the NT, specifically 1 Cor 6:13-20 (ESV):

13 “Food is meant for the stomach and the stomach for food”—and God will destroy both one and the other. The body is not meant for sexual immorality, but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body. 14 And God raised the Lord and will also raise us up by his power. 15 Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ? Shall I then take the members of Christ and make them members of a prostitute? Never! 16 Or do you not know that he who is joined[d] to a prostitute becomes one body with her? For, as it is written, “The two will become one flesh.” 17 But he who is joined to the Lord becomes one spirit with him. 18 Flee from sexual immorality. Every other sin[e] a person commits is outside the body, but the sexually immoral person sins against his own body. 19 Or do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, whom you have from God? You are not your own, 20 for you were bought with a price. So glorify God in your body.

I’m not spending time identifying and correcting the long and twisted path of rationalizations used to arrive at the no such thing as fornication claim, because even if the logic used to get there weren’t in fact faulty, 1 Corinthians 7 is sufficient to blow all of these rationalizations out of the water.

7 Now concerning the matters about which you wrote: “It is good for a man not to have sexual relations with a woman.” 2 But because of the temptation to sexual immorality, each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband. 3 The husband should give to his wife her conjugal rights, and likewise the wife to her husband. 4 For the wife does not have authority over her own body, but the husband does. Likewise the husband does not have authority over his own
body, but the wife does. 5 Do not deprive one another, except perhaps by agreement for a limited time, that you may devote yourselves to prayer; but then come together again, so that Satan may not tempt you because of your lack of self-control.

6 Now as a concession, not a command, I say this. I wish that all were as I myself am. But each has his own gift from God, one of one kind and one of another.

7 To the unmarried and the widows I say that it is good for them to remain single, as I am. 9 But if they cannot exercise self-control, they should marry. For it is better to marry than to burn with passion.

What the Apostle Paul explains repeatedly in this passage is that marriage is the solution to sexual temptation. If you don’t desire sex, do not marry. But if you desire sex, the only licit way to pursue it is to marry. And once married, you don’t have the right to refuse sex to your spouse because this would create temptation for sexual immorality.

The text is clear. Marriage is the only permitted path to sex. That we have done great violence to marriage doesn’t (and can’t) change this. However, the fact that we are thwarting God’s plan by destroying marriage should be deeply humbling and convicting. Divorce, child support, and even the subversion of headship are all questions of sexual immorality.

So 1 Cor 7 blows all of the no such thing as fornication rationalizations out of the water at once. But it is even worse for the rationalizers, because their implicit claim is that marriage is the cause of sexual immorality. If no one were married, excluding prostitution homosexuality bestiality incest and sex with virgins, there would be no sexual sin. Every unrelated woman who wasn’t a virgin or a temple prostitute would be fair game for a randy Christian man, so long as neither had married. Christians could be having a giant sexual free for all, if only men and women didn’t marry*. This is not only absurd, but it is the exact opposite of what the Apostle Paul explains is the case. Marriage is the solution to the problem of sexual immorality, but through tortured logic the rationalizers have come to the inescapable conclusion that marriage is the cause of sexual immorality!

I’ll close by noting that Proverbs 5 teaches the same message as 1 Corinthians 7. Verses 1-14 warn the reader to resist the temptation of sexual immorality, or you will fall into the same trap as the speaker:

I did not listen to the voice of my teachers
or incline my ear to my instructors.
14 I am at the brink of utter ruin
in the assembled congregation.”

Then verses 15-19 explain the proper solution to this temptation, before verses 20-23 again remind the reader of the risk if he doesn’t heed the instruction:

15 Drink water from your own cistern,
flowing water from your own well.
16 Should your springs be scattered abroad,
Let them be for yourself alone, and not for strangers with you.
Let your fountain be blessed, and rejoice in the wife of your youth, a lovely deer, a graceful doe.

Let her breasts fill you at all times with delight; be intoxicated[d] always in her love.
Why should you be intoxicated, my son, with a forbidden woman and embrace the bosom of an adulteress?[e]
For a man’s ways are before the eyes of the Lord, and he ponders[f] all his paths.
The iniquities of the wicked ensnare him, and he is held fast in the cords of his sin.
He dies for lack of discipline, and because of his great folly he is led astray.

*Non Christians would of course have to do the honors of having sex with virgin women to change their status, but so long as Christians aren’t the ones doing this (according to the rationalization) Christians could engage in an endless orgy without sinning.
Looking for more LawDog?

by Dalrock | August 11, 2017 | Link

If so, Vox has you covered with a teaser and a link to LawDog’s new book:

The following is an excerpt from one of the many hilarious stories in LawDog’s second straight bestseller, THE LAWDOG FILES: AFRICAN ADVENTURES.

Related: LawDog Book Bomb Underway!
Cocky funny fail.
by Dalrock | August 14, 2017 | Link

It is all in the execution.

I see that Netflix has this movie available for streaming (in the US at least).
Righteous prostitutes, spreading their legs free of sin.

by Dalrock | August 15, 2017 | Link

We are at over 750 comments in the discussion of Is marriage the cause of sexual immorality? and I assume that most readers (like myself), have not carefully read all 750+ of the comments. With this in mind, I offer an update of sorts, with a Artisanal Toad’s description of righteous Christian prostitutes:

That’s the “loophole” that allows prostitutes. Righteous prostitutes who are not in sin when they spread their legs for paying customers.

That makes modern churchians scream in outrage, but the fact is, God knew all about women when He gave His Law, and He chose not to forbid ordinary payment-for-sex prostitution. He did choose to ban cult prostitutes, which points to the fact He didn’t have anything to say about ordinary non-idolatry prostitutes. And the Lord could easily have had one of the Apostles state a prohibition on Christian women working as whores, but He did not, which means He chose not to.

You can see the original comment here, but will have to read through 1843* words in the comment before you get to this bit, as one doesn’t merely blurt out such absurd claims upfront. You have to slowly ease people into this kind of nonsense, even when they are eager to accept it.

However, there is a loophole that closes the loophole. Christian men aren’t allowed to have sex with prostitutes:

There is nothing in Scripture that forbids a man from having sex with a woman he is eligible to marry. Because sex is how marriage begins. The only exception to that is Christian men are forbidden to have sex with prostitutes.

In a later comment Toad reiterates that prostitutes are righteous:

Prostitution isn’t even an offense and you know that... otherwise you’d have cited chapter and verse. Prostitution is the same as farming, it’s a regulated way of earning a living. And if a farmer can be righteous, so can being a prostitute.

*This makes the wall of text preceding this statement longer than my original post, which was only 1,229 words (including Scripture). And the 1843 words are just the wall of text preceding the absurd claim in that specific comment. This does not count the multiple walls of text which came before in his previous comments.
This question of how to format comments comes up periodically, and it is difficult to respond to in the comments section because if you don’t escape the tags wordpress just processes them and doesn’t show them. This isn’t intended to be a comprehensive tutorial, but to give a bit of a primer on the tags you might most often use.

I’ll show the effect first, and then I’ll show a snapshot of the text used to get the effect:

This is quoted text.

This is **bold**.

This is *italic*.

This is a [hyperlink](https://dalrock.wordpress.com/2017/08/15/righteous-prostitutes-spreading-their-legs-free-of-sin/).  

This is *strikethrough*.

Here is what the code for the above looks like:

```
I'll show the effect first, and then I'll show a snapshot of the text used to get the effect:
<blockquote>This is quoted text.</blockquote>
This is <b>bold</b>.

This is <i>italic</i>.

This is a <a href="https://dalrock.wordpress.com/2017/08/15/righteous-prostitutes-spreading-their-legs-free-of-sin/">hyperlink</a>.

This is <del>strikethrough</del>.

Here is what the code for the above looks like:
```

Update (H/T OKRickety): The site [http://htmledit.squarefree.com/](http://htmledit.squarefree.com/) allows you to verify the formatting of your comments before submitting them.
Cheapening seduction.
by Dalrock | August 24, 2017 | Link

The Angry Therapist wants kids these days to get off his lawn*, and bang hos the right way. When you bang a ho, treat her like a lady:

When I was in my twenties and had a date, this is what I would do. I would wake up early like it was Christmas and wash my car. Hand wash. None of this driving through a machine bullshit. Then I would hand pick the songs I wanted to play and load the CDs into my six disc changer in the trunk. Then I would go workout so I felt good about myself. Then I would drive to the movie theater to buy the tickets in advance so we wouldn’t have to wait in line (this was before the internet). And of course, dinner reservations were already made. After getting ready, I would pick her up from her apartment. I would park my car, walk to the door, and knock. I would compliment her appearance and mean it as we walked to my car. I would open the door for her. And if there was a spark and things went well on the date, she’d get flowers or a note or something she can actually hold in the next few days.

This was a magic ritual, that made banging hos moral. Like all conservatives, The Angry Therapist wants to recapture the better days of our past.

If you’re a male in your twenties, you may read this and think, “Wow, what a loser.” Well, okay. But this process is what made dating fun, exciting, romantic, and fulfilling. It made the date a mini event, something to look forward to. It wasn’t just about the person. It was about the whole date experience.

What we need is for men to treat hos with chivalry:


The Angry Therapist has misdiagnosed the problem. He thinks technology has cheapened the process of banging hos. He doesn’t realize that banging hos should never have been treated like courtship in the first place. Just like the trunk mounted CD changer, the idea he is trying to recover (chivalrously courting hos) only lasted for a short period because it was never a good idea. It is this fundamental misunderstanding that made The Angry Therapist so angry to begin with.

*HT Instapundit
Sounds promising.
by Dalrock | August 25, 2017 | Link

Via Dr. Helen at Instapundit:

God bless the Cajun Navy.
by Dalrock | August 28, 2017 | Link

I hadn’t heard of this group until yesterday, but I see that some of our neighbors from Louisiana are busy helping my neighbors to the South in Houston. May God bless them.

"#Houston Hang on. The CAJUN NAVY is already activated and on the way."https://t.co/J62KpUODPg pic.twitter.com/q4n7HuO9Pq

— KPLC (@KPLC7News) August 27, 2017

Here is some video from: Louisiana’s ‘Cajun Navy’ rooted in its beginnings during Katrina
http://abc13.com/video/embed/?pid=2349584

See also: Members of Cajun Navy resuscitate Houston resident found floating lifeless

And here is some footage of the boat traffic in Houston, with airboats, jon boats, Jet Ski’s and flats boats along with more general use boats. Clearly a large number of local private citizens are helping as well.
Toxic masculinity and male privilege.
by Dalrock | August 29, 2017 | Link

Lew Rockwell describes the toxic masculinity on display in the aftermath of Hurricane Harvey (H/T MKT).

USA Today offered a picture of male privilege in this article.
Following the violence in Charlottesville last month, NBC News asked *What is Antifa? What Is ‘Antifa’? Meet the Fascist-Fighting Coalition Dubbed the ‘Alt-Left’ by President*:

They relish in punching Nazis. They protest in all black. And they’ve vowed to physically confront racists and extremists across the country.

But who exactly are the protesters that violently clashed with white nationalists in Charlottesville, Virginia?

NBC brought in Dana Fisher to explain that Antifa is a violent reaction to Trump’s hateful rhetoric:

Dana R. Fisher, a sociologist who has studied protest movements in the United States for decades, said she’s come to view Antifa protesters as a militant response to the rise in visibility of white nationalist organizations since Trump’s election.

“Violence begets violence,” she said. “One of these groups is coming out with this violent message of hate, and the other has responded with a violent, reactive message.”

But as the NBC article hints at, Antifa has a long history of using violence to silence anyone they disagree with. They are very much like Mao’s Red Guards, running amok with tacit government approval.

One of Antifa’s cherished symbols is a bloody picture of a black man kicking a white man in the head. The caption reads “Good night white pride”. The Tumblr site Antifa International explains the origin of the symbol.

May 9, 1998: The KKK, decide to hold a rally in Ann Arbor, Michigan despite having their asses handed to them there two years earlier. The Ann Arbor city council obliges them, spending $137,000 of taxpayer money to accommodate their hatefest in the middle of town.

Anti-Racist Action, the Revolutionary Workers’ League, and the National Women’s Rights Organizing Committee all mobilize to confront the KKKlowns.

This photo of Harlon Jones, an Ann Arbor anti-racist showing a racist scumbag some Michigan hospitality, is legendary and is where the Good Night White Pride logo comes from.

The article closes explaining that Antifa learned a critical lesson from the incident. They learned that their role as a violent political militia was endorsed by the state (emphasis original):
The lessons of Ann Arbor on May 9, 1998 have repeated themselves in the years since: people standing together can take their streets back from racist scum; city officials and police are happy to spend tax dollars protecting racists and persecuting anti-racists; and most importantly, **fighting hate is not a crime!**

Antifa International offers more of the back-story in *Good Night White Pride! An interview with Harlon Jones*. Jones describes the moments leading up to him kicking the white man in the head. Jones was frustrated that the group he was with was merely chanting anti-racist slogans. He wanted *action*, and he soon found his opportunity:

> People are standing around. And I’m like “where’s the action?” And people are trying to figure out where the KKK are at.

> Then all of a sudden, I saw people running in the other direction, so I ran that way and there’s like five people chasing the guy you see in the picture, his friend, and one of their girlfriends. One of them had been approached and asked if they were KKK and he said yes. So we were kinda chasing them and the smaller guy and his girl got away but the other, bigger guy – it just felt like everybody backed up for one millisecond and I just came in and kicked him.

Notice that at best he *heard a rumor* that the white man he kicked supported the KKK. But given his description of how quickly it all unfolded, even this seems incredibly unlikely.

Yet this wasn’t the end of Jone’s action for the day. It wasn’t even the highlight of his day, which was when police ran away after the Antifa mob started throwing rocks at them:

> But to me that was a small incidental part of the day...

> ...There was a rock garden across the street. Everybody just went over there and grabbed rocks and hurled them at the cops. It was the best scene I’ve ever seen in my life – the cops retreating! I swear to God, I’ve never seen anything more fulfilling than the cops running away like that.

The next day, the photo of Jones kicking the white man in the head was on the cover of the local newspaper. Jones was at first afraid he would be arrested, as the local police knew who he was. But Jones explains that the police he had thrown rocks at the day before had no interest in arresting him:

> ..all the police used to come in the store every day and they all knew me. They knew that was me, everyone knew it was me! And the crazy part about that was that they were so scared to prosecute me and have all this negative press on the university itself, they didn’t even pursue me. Not at all.

AI: That’s weird, because the cops went after people pretty hard after the fact.

HJ: But they saw me on a daily basis and didn’t pursue me. You gotta understand, at the time the university had a real problem with race relations and I feel like arresting me was a war they didn’t want to fight. I was literally the easiest person to find and
they did nothing.

Part of the reason Antifa is given free rein to “punch nazis” is because they are an arm of the left, and therefore the left has no interest in stifling them. NBC News brought in Professor Mark Bray to explain why Antifa and their long history of functioning as a political militia is ethical. Bray explained that the important thing is that Antifa doesn’t shut down Democratic party affiliated groups. From Antifa Violence Is Ethical? This Author Explains Why:

If you establish that so-called fascist speech is illegitimate, then who decides who will be targeted as fascist? Can’t it lead more mainstream politics to end up being targeted?

...there is a certain political lens that — agree or disagree with the lens — there is an element of continuity in terms of the types of groups targeted. I don’t know of any Democratic party events that have been ‘no platformed’ (shut down) by anti-fascists. So there is a political lens, people will quibble about what the lens is, who designs the lens, but I don’t think the slippery slope is actually, in practice, nearly as much of a concern as people imagine it would be.

But the other reason Antifa has been given free rein is that despite the constant propaganda, the right has no sympathy for Klansman and Nazis, or anyone merely accused of being one. The man Jones kicked:

1. Was white.
2. Had a suspicious haircut.
3. Was rumored to be a Klansman.
4. Was being chased by the mob.

This was enough for Jones, and moreover enough for everyone else. The right and the police looked the other way and the left celebrated him as a hero:

Al: How did other people react to the photo?

HJ: I mean, everybody loves me, you know? To this day, I have friends that are so proud of that whole situation that they have me come over and tell the story to their kids at dinner, just so they know that they don’t have to be scared to go out there and do something.

Punch a nazi! Hey, you kind of look like a nazi...

The problem for the right is that looking like a nazi is a very flexible standard, and the left is using a very old tactic of dehumanizing their adversaries to justify a wide range of political persecution. It isn’t just bald white men in the proximity of a Klan rally that have to worry. To Antifa, Trump supporters look like nazis. To Charlie Hebdo, the people of Houston look like nazis.

“God Exists! He Drowned All the Neo-Nazis of Texas,” the weekly mag’s cover screams.
An illustration of half-submerged swastika flags and arms giving the Nazi salute accompanies the headline.

This standard is so flexible that literally anyone can now be labeled a nazi, and therefore the subject of the pogrom. Houston has a black mayor, but since the left hates the way Texans think on a number of issues they are deemed nazis. When the citizens of Houston suffer and die, the left praises God!

Social Justice Warrior technology companies are also joining in on the pogrom. Just this week Google successfully pressured The Liberty Conservative to remove an article Google disagreed with (H/T Vox):

Despite this necessary surrender, The Liberty Conservative writer remained optimistic. “We look forward to the day where rival ad platforms who respect the intellectual freedom of their customers can outcompete Google, but those days have not arrived yet,” he wrote. “These tech companies have us all by the short hairs, and post-Charlottesville, they are all working in unison to enforce the Orwellian nightmare. Nobody is safe.”

This is all part of a coordinated attack from the left on everyone they deem not sufficiently enthusiastic with the party line. Antifa, Google, and Charlie Hebdo are not alone. They are part of a massive machine. Groups like SLPC are contributing by publishing lists of enemies that need to be taught a lesson, and organizations like CNN and GuideStar then get the word out:

The Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) is a cash cow that uses its coffers to slander mainstream conservative and Christian organizations as “hate groups.” The SPLC began by tracking real hate groups like the Ku Klux Klan and black nationalist groups, but later it added mainstream groups to its list.

...CNN broadcast the SPLC’s “hate map” on its website and Twitter account this month (with the FRC still marked on the map). In June, the charity navigation website GuideStar adopted the SPLC “hate group” list, marking each profile of the targeted organizations as a “hate group.” ABC and NBC parroted the SPLC’s “hate group” label against Alliance Defending Freedom (ADF) last month.

Punishing the wicked.

This is a religious war to the left, and anyone who isn’t radical enough is wicked, and needs to be punished:

First they came for Daily Stormer. Then they came for The Liberty Conservative. Then they came for the Family Research Council. LGBT activists speak openly about “punishing the wicked,” by which they mean anyone who refuses to take part in a same-sex wedding.
Still going.
by Dalrock | September 6, 2017 | Link

Just shy of a month after I posted Is marriage the cause of sexual immorality?, I see that Artisanal Toad has now responded with Dishonest Dalrock Thinks He Won:

Rather than prohibit sexual activity “outside marriage” as Dalrock claims, Paul actually said “it is good to not have sex a woman who is not your wife”. Meaning, “yes, that is permitted, but it’s good not to do that.”

The same day I wrote my original post (Aug 9th), I predicted how the discussion would play out:

The challenge as is the rationalizers want to play a game of theological rope a dope, firing off rationalizations faster than you can refute them with references from the text, hoping that eventually you or the people reading will grow exhausted and give up. But this still leaves the fact that they have inverted the fundamental teaching on marriage, holding it as the cause of sexual immorality instead of the way to avoid it.

After a thorough filibuster, Toad is now claiming that I didn’t give him a chance to make his argument! A month later, he now comes back claiming that I banned him:

Dalrock banned me before I could respond and 1) call him out for not actually answering the question and 2) point to the real issue. Of course, I’d have also called him out for lying, once again, but that’s beside the point.

This is a lie, but I will happily ban him now. With that in mind, for those who want more Toad feel free to follow the link above and read him on his own blog.
Spike linked in the comments to a podcast of Independent Man chatting with Bettina Arndt:

Audio issues and accents aside, this is an interesting conversation. Arndt is a dating coach who has taken observations she originally came across in the early Manosphere and applies them to help her female clients.

Long time readers will recall that Arndt wrote a column by the same name in the Sydney Morning Herald back in 2012: Why women lose the dating game. Arndt was evidently at one time a reader of this very blog, as she not only mentioned it in the piece, but she quoted me as well:

But there is another conversation going on – a fascinating exchange about what is happening from the male point of view. Much of it thrives on the internet, in the so-called “manosphere”. Here you will find men cheerfully, even triumphantly, blogging about their experience. They have cause for celebration, you see. They’ve discovered a profound change has taken place in the mating game and, to their surprise, they are the winners.

Dalrock (dalrock.wordpress.com) is typical: “Today’s unmarried twentysomething women have given men an ultimatum: I’ll marry when I’m ready, take it or leave it. This is, of course, their right. But ultimatums are a risky thing, because there is always a possibility the other side will decide to leave it. In the next decade we will witness the end result of this game of marriage chicken.”

The endgame Dalrock warns about is already in play for hordes of unmarried professional women – the well-coiffed lawyers, bankers and other success stories. Many thought they could put off marriage and families until their 30s, having devoted their 20s to education, establishing careers and playing the field. But was their decade of dating a strategic mistake?

The post she quoted is Supply and demand in the marriage market. She also quoted a comment by Greenlander:

That’s when some men start behaving very badly – as the manosphere clearly shows. These internet sites are not for the faint-hearted. The voices are often crude and misogynist. But they tell it as they see it. There is Greenlander, an apparently successful engineer in his late 30s. In his early adult life, he was unable to “get the time of day from women”. Now he’s interested only in women under 27.

“The women I know in their early 30s are just delusional,” he says. “I sometimes seduce them and sleep with them just because I know how to play them so well. It’s just too easy. They’re tired of the cock carousel and they see a guy like me as the
perfect beta to settle down with before their eggs dry out ... when I get tired of them I just delete their numbers from my cell phone and stop taking their calls ... It doesn’t really hurt them that much: at this point they’re used to pump & dump!"

The basic strategy Greenlander describes is one I speculated on in one of my very first posts (July 2010): Next Phase of the Hypergamous Arms Race: Revenge of the Nerds? Soon after I speculated that some men might be employing a beta provider con on the women seeking to con men with “free sample” sex, Marcos confirmed that it worked for him.
Wendy Griffith’s secular doppelganger.

by Dalrock | September 11, 2017 | Link

From the Daily Mail: Why I’m proud to have frozen my eggs at 38: Top scientist urges women in their 30s to follow her lead as she delays motherhood to ‘side-step her biological clock’

A scientist and broadcaster told how she had frozen her eggs ‘to side-step her biological clock’ – and urged other women in their 30s to consider doing the same.

She said: ‘I strongly believe that all women in their mid to late 30s should be made aware of the risks of waiting too long to try for a family … and, more importantly, that there’s no shame in freezing your eggs.

‘Thanks to modern science we have the opportunity to take a look at our biological clocks and side-step them for long enough to give ourselves a chance of motherhood that otherwise might not have been possible.’

The “top scientist” is Dr Emily Grossman, a TV personality on a British science show. The similarities to Wendy Griffith are uncanny:

- Griffith is a TV presenter for Christian Broadcasting Network, while Grossman is a TV presenter for the secular religion, science.
- Both women have set themselves up as role models other women should follow to attain marriage (Griffith) and motherhood (Grossman), even though both have failed to achieve these goals.
- Both use a poor understanding of their respective religions to not only justify their own bad decisions, but urge gullible young women to follow in their footsteps.

In line with the last bullet point, The Mail explains that Grossman’s strategy is a very low percentage bet (emphasis mine):

…official figures show only around 15 per cent of IVF cycles using frozen eggs are successful – and just 60 babies have been born from frozen eggs since 2001.

This makes it a tight competition for which woman is offering worse advice. Is it 53 year old never married Griffith, explaining to young Christian women that if they hold out long enough God will give them their perfect husband? Or is it 38 year old childless Grossman, explaining that science allows women to focus their fertile years on their careers without losing the opportunity to conceive?

Edit: According to USC Fertility, approximately 5,000 babies have been born worldwide from frozen eggs.
Something wrong with the sluice box?
by Dalrock | September 12, 2017 | Link

From our friends at the Daily Mail*: Too picky or just unlucky? Woman who rates every man she meets on a SPREADSHEET says she’s been on 77 first dates in two years... and won’t stop until she finds Mr Right

**Related:** She needs more men!

*H/T Nick

Bagger 288 panoramic image licensed as Creative Commons by Martin Röll
**Boldly inoffensive.**

by Dalrock | September 14, 2017 | Link

---

**Note:** This started as a comment on Cane Caldo’s blog, and has been slightly cleaned up and modified into post form.

In *Real Men Don’t Impede Her Desires*, Cane Caldo explains:

> Now, once in a great while a man will set a very general expectation on women. If he is a bold Christian he might say, “The Bible says wives should submit to their husbands.” It’s hard to imagine a safer statement than that. The man himself hasn’t actually placed any expectation on women. Yet even then he will surround it with quibbles and bromides and caveats and exceptions so that the plain and unoffensive statement has no practical meaning whatsoever; lest some man out there start to actually believe what the Bible says. But at least he made some vague attempt at something that might look like an expectation if it is seen at some distance in a dark alley on a moonless night.

Cane is right. Even when it initially *seems* like they are placing this expectation, the surrounding words negate it. After Cane’s post on the Nashville Statement Fortified I looked to see who the fortified statement came from, and found the names of the authors here. While I recognized Pastor Wilson, the other names weren’t familiar. One of the signers is Pastor Tim Bayly, an early Executive Director of the CBMW. Bayly still supports the CBMW founding document, which invented the sin of a wife submitting to her husband in a servile way. He also supports the CBMW founding book, which carved out space for women preachers like Beth Moore, so long as they aren’t technically in authority over men*. But he subsequently broke from the group for (among other things) not promoting one of Pastor Wilson’s books. Bayly is also surprisingly critical of fellow PCA Pastor Tim Keller, calling him a feminist.

So Bayly is not only an ally of Pastor Wilson, but like Wilson is on the bleeding edge of pastors publicly defending “traditional” sex roles. He supports some of the terrible things the CBMW did at their founding, but not the worse things they have done since then. Not surprisingly, Bayly has written a book titled *Daddy Tried: Overcoming the Failures of Fatherhood*. In promoting the book he did a Q&A at the Barnabas blog where he was asked what wives can do to help their husbands stop failing as fathers:

> Q: What can wives do to help their husbands better fulfill their role as fathers? What about sons and daughters, how can they help?

> A: Well, this is the million-dollar question, but here are some thoughts.

> WIVES: Don’t nag, but pray. Don’t become bitter, but sweeten up. Don’t try to fill in the gaps in you and your children’s emotional lives by doubling down on your own intimacy with your children. Teach your children to honor their father, and honor and submit to him yourself without complaining or giving subtle looks that tell your

---
If he had ended here, his answer would be quite good. He tells wives not to nag, and to submit. But of course, he can’t end there, as that would prove Cane’s observation to be incorrect. Starting with the very next sentence, he undoes his good work and tells wives to nag their husbands for not making them feel loved (where did that come from?), and to use their Pastor as a sock puppet through whom they can lead their husbands:

Explain to your husband that you wonder if he loves you because real love between a man and his wife is as emotionally intimate as it is physically intimate. Ask your husband to go with you to meet with the pastor; tell him that there are some things you’d like the pastor’s help explaining to him. Don’t baby him. Ask questions that are open-ended. Study him. Learn his fears.

Pray for your husband. Neither parade nor hide his failures. Don’t use your emotional intelligence to show him up in front of your children. Let him make mistakes. Sometimes, you’ll be surprised to find out he was right. Many men learn fatherhood by watching their wife’s motherhood and doing what helps and strengthens and protects her.

*To argue this feminist interpretation, the CBMW founders Piper and Grudem brought in Dr. Douglass Moo to explain that when Paul wrote in 1 Tim 2:14 And Adam was not the one deceived; it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner that Paul didn’t mean that women are more easily deceived. Dr. Moo joined the NIV Committee on Bible Translation in 1996, which means he was on the committee at the time Grudem says they were secretly working on a gender neutral translation after lying to Grudem by claiming they had abandoned the project.
Playing ballerina.
by Dalrock | September 14, 2017 | Link

By way of Pastor Tim Bayly in Redeemer’s effeminate worship... is the following fruity dance at Pastor Tim Keller’s church (click on the blue button to watch it at Vimeo):

Lest you think that Pastor Bayly and I are exaggerating, be sure to let it play long enough to get to the part where one of the men carries the other man as he would a ballerina.
Cleansing the palate.
by Dalrock | September 15, 2017 | Link

As a matter of mercy, I thought I would include some manly videos this Friday after the sickening fruitiness of Tim Keller’s Redeemer Presbyterian Church worship video.

First up is a compilation of knife and sword tests from the reality show “Forged in Fire”.

In my opinion Doug Marcaida steals the show, and the next three videos feature him. In this first Marcaida video he explains the philosophy of Kali martial arts on weapons. His language is unashamedly masculine, and at the 2:20 mark he describes the fun of training with his brothers.

Next, Marcaida (a knife fighter) teams up with Instructor Zero (a gun fighter) to develop strategies for a gunfighter attacked by a knife. You can also see in a separate video Marcaida referring to Zero as his brother.

In this final video Marcaida demonstrates the Karambit. This is truly brutal business:
Sometimes excellent.
by Dalrock | September 15, 2017 | Link

Commenter Neguy wrote:

I spent some time browsing through Tim Bayly’s archives about Redeemer. Some of his very earliest posts have some blue pill thinking embedded, but he quickly becomes radically based. This guy is very rare. See:


His discussions about some of the contortions Redeemer went through to promote women into leadership were very illuminating, and disappointing to read about.

Sadly, he would appear to be on the losing side of a battle within the PCA.

Neguy is right that much of what Pastor Bayly writes is quite good, and the article he points to is an excellent find. In it Bayly eviscerates the Complementarian movement:

‘Complementarian’ is the new word invented by a small group of scholars who were trading the presidency of the Evangelical Theological Society among themselves a couple decades ago. These men intended their neologism to provide them a place to stand somewhere between Scripture’s patriarchy (literally “father-rule”) and Evangelicalism’s feminism.

... 

Caught, then, between their niche market and that nasty word ‘patriarchy’ which set off catcalls from fellow scholars, these men created a label for themselves that would allow them to avoid looking old and passé as they defended a few of the last vestiges of historic father-rule where it mattered most to them: in the Christian church where most of them wanted their preachers to remain men, and in the Christian home where all of them were intent on holding on to what Tim Keller calls the “tie-breaking authority” of the husband.

You get the idea: God’s Creation Order of Adam first, then Eve, was embarrassing to have to explain to their fellow scholars, so they adopted this equivocation that made it look like they, themselves, were not ignorant or chauvinist; a euphemism that allowed them to distance themselves from Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Paul, and Peter—and of course their own fathers, grandfathers, and great-grandfathers, none of whom could help being sexist since they lived prior to our own evolved and progressive era.

Complementarians sold our godly fathers down the river:
Bayly is in a position to know this, as he had an inside view. He doesn’t mention it in the post, but Bayly was an early Executive Director of the CBMW, the very group that coined the term complementarian. As Mary Kassian explains, the word was chosen to avoid the concepts of hierarchy, patriarchy, and tradition:

I’ve read several posts on the internet lately from people who misunderstand and/or misrepresent the complementarian view. I was at the meeting, 25 years ago, where the word “complementarian” was chosen. So I think I have a good grasp on the word’s definition.

...

In our name-the-concept meeting, someone mentioned the word “traditionalism” since our position is what Christians have traditionally believed. But that was quickly nixed. The word “traditionalism” smacks of “tradition.” Complementarians believe that the Bible’s principles supersede tradition. They can be applied in every time and culture. June Cleaver is a traditional, American, cultural TV stereotype. She is NOT the complementarian ideal. Period. (And exclamation mark!) Culture has changed...

Feminist theorists maintain that male-female role differences create an over-under hierarchy in which men, who are like the privileged, elite, French landowners (bourgeois) of the 18th century, keep women—who are like the lower, underprivileged class of workers (proletariat)—subservient. Complementarians do not believe that men, as a group, are ranked higher than women. Men are not superior to women—women are not the “second sex.” Though men have a responsibility to exercise headship in their homes, and in the church family, Christ revolutionized the definition of what that means. Authority is not the right to rule—it’s the responsibility to serve. We rejected the term “hierarchicalism” because people associate it with an inherent, self-proclaimed right to rule.

Getting back to Bayly’s post, he describes how complementarians tie Scripture up in knots under the guise of a husband’s responsibility of “leadership”:

Ah yes, “a failure to lead.” Dr. Mounce is quite pleased to place his readers on the horns of a dilemma. On the one hand, we could allow the Apostle Peter’s exhortation concerning Sarah to speak to the heart of our own wives, leading them to call their own husbands “Lord” or “sir,” but then Dr. Mounce shows us his other hand holding a high trump card: any Christian man today who allows his wife to obey the Apostle Peter’s commendation of Sarah would be “failing to lead.”

Yikes! We don’t want to do that, do we? Fail to lead? What real man fails to lead?

And what is an academic if he’s not a leader?

No, if one thing’s certain, it’s that we must—we absolutely must—lead.

Poor Abraham: he failed to lead. Poor Apostle Peter: he too failed to lead. Poor
church fathers across history: all of them failed to lead.

Not Dr. William Mounce, though; no siree! He will lead his wife to yield to her husband’s superior understanding of semantic range such that she never ever gives in to the temptation to sign her submission to her husband, verbally, out there in public where it might be in danger of being viewed as a public confession of Christian faith.

Clearly Bayly “gets it” at one level, and I have no question I can learn much from him. His fight against some forms of feminism in the PCA is also heroic. But at the same time, he obviously has a huge and very common blind spot. As nearly everyone else does, he sees the very open feminist rebellion of generations of Christian and non-Christian women and declares that something mysterious has happened to men.

In the introduction to Daddy Tried: Overcoming the Failures of Fatherhood, Bayly frames the problems of fatherhood as men abandoning their families. While there certainly are some men who are doing this, the much larger social and legal trend is women kicking fathers out of the family, and the remaining fathers living under the ever present threat that the same will happen to them. This is something feminists are very open about, as the goal is to put wives in control*. To twist this around into men abandoning their families is sickening, and a refusal to deal with reality.

Barnabus opens its multi part series on Bayly’s book with:

For millions more, the father may be there in body but is checked out emotionally. Arguably, the institution of the family, and specifically fatherhood, has never been in such a mess. Absentee fathers, angry fathers, abusive fathers, apathetic fathers, addicted fathers are just a few of the categorical labels applied to a role intended by God to be a position of honor, a source of provision, a place of protection, and a voice of guidance and justice within both the family unit and society at large.

There appears to be a sentence missing from the original post, one stating that millions of fathers have physically abandoned their families. But this would have been a segue into what is the larger focus of the book, men who are emotionally unavailable. As the quotes I shared above prove, sometimes Bayly can spot new age hokum. But on this point he clearly can not. Emotionally unavailable men is straight from the Book of Oprah, and his focus here makes his answer on what wives can do to help suddenly make sense:

Q: What can wives do to help their husbands better fulfill their role as fathers?...

Explain to your husband that you wonder if he loves you because real love between a man and his wife is as emotionally intimate as it is physically intimate. Ask your husband to go with you to meet with the pastor; tell him that there are some things you’d like the pastor’s help explaining to him. Don’t baby him. Ask questions that are open-ended. Study him. Learn his fears.

This teaching is firmly rooted in the 1970s worldview**, and it is tied up with a host of similar fallacies, including the idea that women are naturally inclined towards commitment and
sexually and romantically attracted to virtue. If a man’s wife doesn’t feel the tingle, or
doesn’t feel loved, this is taken as proof that the husband is committing the sin of emotional
unavailability. Other pastors have taken this same nonsense so far as to claim God speaks to
sinful men through their wives frigid vaginas.

There is however a silver lining, as the same sexual revolution that birthed the new age idea
of the sin of emotional unavailability also set the stage for a small group of men to exploit the
new post-marriage sexual marketplace. As a result, younger generations are slowly learning
the falseness of the Book of Oprah model of men and women. However, the change is slow,
and it is a great tragedy that for the time being at least young men and women are far more
likely to learn the truth about these new-age ideas from pickup artists like Heartiste than
they are to learn it from Christian leaders.

**Related:** Don’t blame Heartiste for the equation of Alpha with virtue.

*Modern Christian’s have enthusiastically adopted this new tool of wife rule with the model of
the wakeup call.*

**Some might argue that the worldview started in the 1960s. Others would point out that the
1980s solidified this thinking. Both points are true. However, my own sense is that the 70s
are when this form of thinking became mainstream. Either way, proponents of the host of
related new age thinking will most commonly invoke the 1950s as a sort of shorthand for the
prior unenlightened age, which feminism, the sexual revolution, child support, and no fault
divorce “rescued” us from.
The one obstacle she can’t remove.

by Dalrock | September 20, 2017 | Link

Shana Lebowitz at Business Insider writes that the problem with marriage is that it is so terribly permanent:

…I was left worriedly wondering: Is it possible that a couple can start out perfectly compatible, and then become less so over time?

Here’s the answer he gave: “Even if we achieve compatibility in the marriage, there’s no guarantee that that compatibility will remain strong over time.”

Yikes.

It turns out the danger is worst for carousel riders looking to marry at the last minute:

That’s especially true, Finkel added, if those two years are when you’re “in your late 20s, and you’re building a career, and you’re still hanging out some with your college friends, and you have some new friends.

This caused Lebowitz to recall an article she wrote in July, where she discovered that the problem with marriage was that divorce was seen as failure:

Finkel’s unsettling observations reminded me of something Susan Pease Gadoua, co-author of “The New I Do,” told me in July: It’s helpful to know you have an “out” of your marriage. That is, if one or both people grow out of the relationship, it might be upsetting, but it won’t be shameful to leave.

As Lebowitz’ explained in her July article, the idea of lifetime marriage is unhealthy (emphasis original):

When I spoke with Pease Gadoua in June, I asked her if it was useful to keep the possibility of divorce in the back of your mind.

She told me: “When people see divorce as never an option, it can create some unhealthy dynamics.”

This lead to a breakthrough idea. What would revolutionize marriage, and make it really thrive as an institution, is easy divorce:

The implication for marriage is, if you accept that you might grow out of your relationship — or your partner might — you’re freeing yourself to be in the marriage because you want to, and not because you have to.

What is so telling about this is that easy divorce has been the law of the land for over four decades, and the church has even gotten with the program and stands by ready to
rationalize divorce morally as well. Feminists have gotten everything they could possibly want from our formal institutions. And yet Lebowitz is troubled enough to write repeated articles on the topic because she understands a fundamental truth. Other women will judge her as a failure if she marries and can’t stay married. The exception here would be if she divorced, traded up, and stuck the landing. But sticking the landing is a long shot. If a woman could expect to do better than her first husband, she wouldn’t have settled for marrying the first husband in the first place. Even worse, for round two she will not only be older with a history of divorce, but she will likely be a single mother.

So the fear remains, leaving Lebowitz with no other option but to try in vain to change the reality more stubborn than the law and the church. While her readers may well like the idea of not being judged themselves, what she won’t be able to do is change the judgments her readers make about other women.
Why the blind spot matters.
by Dalrock | September 21, 2017 | Link

And to Adam he said, “Because you have listened to the voice of your wife and have eaten of the tree of which I commanded you, ‘You shall not eat of it,’ cursed is the ground because of you; in pain you shall eat of it all the days of your life;

-Gen 3:17

Commenter Robert very politely disagreed* with my previous post on Pastor Tim Bayly:

I do not know much about this guy, but I’ve clicked on a few links from this post. Links that are supposed to be the evidence against this guy that he is sometimes not excellent...like what can wives do for unemotionally available guys. I won’t quote but in the two paragraphs it says she should submit to him, be sweet to him, pray for him and make sure she and their children honor him. Remind me again why this guy is having a post written about him and this is the evidence against him?

We all have blindspots. This guy, myself and Dalrock also. I think you are looking for a fight, or at least undercutting a brother, in this case Dalrock from someone who is friendly to our cause and is inline with God’s Word.

Novaseeker replied*:

I doubt you will find too many even here who disagree with the idea that there are many men who are also failing in their husbandly responsibilities. We all know cases of that, we are also not blind to them, either.

The jarring thing, however, is that the churches almost uniformly focus on these (and boy, do they) but almost never address what is happening on the other side of the sexual aisle. This is the overwhelming trend in the churches, and it is so ever-present that it can be hard even to notice it precisely because it is the default setting. There are many reasons for this, and Dalrock has discussed most of them on this blog at length. But the reason why he focuses as he does is because this is simply underfocused on the churches, and this blog is a kind of corrective to that overwhelmingly common tendency.

Novaseeker is right, but there is more that I would add. The problem isn’t merely that men’s sins are obsessed over while women’s sins are ignored. This would be bad enough, as it would only permit men the opportunity to repent while depriving women of the same. The much larger problem is that the mis characterization of feminist rebellion prevents both men and women from acknowledging what is really happening, and therefore prevents the opportunity of repentance for both sexes.

The general pattern of men’s and women’s sins goes back to Genesis, where Eve was easily primed to believe that something great was being unfairly withheld from her, and Adam
chose to take the easy path and go along with her instead of putting his foot down.

This pattern is exactly what we see played out today. Women are filled with a spirit of resentment and rebellion (feminism), and men don’t address the issue because calling out women on their sins is extremely difficult and feels terrible. Instead, we find a way to call out another man, because that is easy and feels heroic. This pattern is so common we don’t even notice it, but perhaps the most ridiculous example is the complementarian response to women demanding to serve in combat. Instead of pointing out that women are rebelling and engaging in a form of cross-dressing, complementarians pretend that what is really happening is cowardly men are forcing innocent women into combat. As absurd as the claim is, it is widely popular because it avoids what is unpleasant and difficult, and elects instead to do what is easy and feels good. Note that both sexes are sinning in this dynamic; women are rebelling, and cowardly men are doing whatever it takes to avoid what would be the loving response.

Understanding this is critical if we hope to stop making the same mistake over and over again. For men, the problem is not that we are calling out their sins, but we are carefully avoiding calling out the sin enabling the recurring pattern.

For another example, this time I’ll share a post written by someone other than Pastor Bayly. This is a guest post by Pastor David Wegener on Bayly’s blog, and like Bayly’s writing, most of it is outstanding. The post is titled PCA debate over woman deacons: It’s about rebellion—not exegesis… and includes gems like:

Does anyone really think this issue is about what Scripture actually says? Would that it were true. Why is it that men all over the PCA are bringing up this topic at this particular moment in history? Might it have something to do with the air we breathe every day?

And:

Our pastors preach through books like Ephesians and Colossians and sweat bullets as they approach Ephesians 5:22-24 and Colossians 3:18. And if they do preach on the topic, they talk mostly about what submission does not mean. So the final result is, “wives, be nice to your husbands.”

Afterwards, when they greet the congregation, their mouth shows the same expression as a dog cowed into submission by the pack’s alpha dog. The non-verbal communication is obvious.

I highly recommend reading the whole post. I’ve only included a few snippets for brevity, but the post is brilliant until Pastor Wegener gets to his diagnosis of the root of the rebellion:

But the roots of this rebellion are not in exegesis, and so we must not fight this battle only on that level. The roots lie in our sin. We don’t love our wives and sometimes they become a seething cauldron of bitterness. We love pornography or commit adultery and so we refuse to call our wives to submit (in any area of their lives). Guilt over our compromised state eviscerates our authority. Fathers sexually
molest their daughters and bring rebellion into the church for generations to come. Fathers hold their darling on their lap and tell her how she can become president someday. Mothers push their daughters to get the education she’ll need so that she can earn a good living after her husband divorces her and leaves her with three children. Single women, whose fathers and mothers have failed to teach feminine deference, whine about lacking a voice in the church.

Notice that every time a woman sins in the quote above, a man made her do it. Wives rebel because their husbands don’t love them. Women rebel in church because their fathers sexually molested them. Mothers push their daughters to be career women because her future husband will abandon her and her children. Also note that it is true that men can sin in all of the ways Wegener blames for feminist rebellion. Yet this technical truth is used to sell the lie that women aren’t capable of sinning all on their own. Pastor Wegener rightly points out that we need to understand the roots of the rebellion if we are to address the problem, but then goes on to obscure those very roots.

This is something much worse than obsessing over men’s sins and minimizing or denying women’s sins. It is refusing to address the prevailing sins of men and women.

*These are only small excerpts. See the comment thread for the full exchange.*
Let them become elite.
by Dalrock | September 26, 2017 | Link

The New York Times has made a stir with How Did Marriage Become a Mark of Privilege?

Marriage, which used to be the default way to form a family in the United States, regardless of income or education, has become yet another part of American life reserved for those who are most privileged.

After blaming a lack of good paying jobs for working class men*, the Times then offers a second solution. Those who are not privileged should simply become privileged, so that the new form of marriage designed for and by the privileged will work as well for them as it works for our elite. The non privileged need to learn to become privileged by relying on birth control, abortion, delayed marriage, high levels of education, and high incomes:

People with college degrees seem to operate with more of a long-term perspective, social scientists say. They are more likely to take on family responsibilities slowly, and they often benefit from parental resources to do so — like help paying for education, birth control or rent to live on their own. In turn, the young adults prioritize waiting to have children until they are more able to give their children similar opportunities.

“The cultural reinforcement, people relying on contraception and abortion, reinforces a norm, that you don’t have the kid with the wrong guy,” Ms. Carbone said.

The Times closes the article with a quote from W. Bradford Wilcox explaining his “success sequence” thesis:

Mr. Wilcox suggests a bigger emphasis in high schools and pop culture on what’s known as the success sequence: degree, job, marriage, baby. “The idea is that if people follow that sequence, their odds of landing in poverty are much lower,” he said.

Wilcox has been selling his “success sequence” thesis for many years. From the 2010 State of Our Unions report:

...highly educated Americans (and their children) adhere devoutly to a “success sequence” norm that puts education, work, marriage, and childbearing in sequence, one after another, in ways that maximize their odds of making good on the American Dream and obtaining a successful family life.

The callous elitism on display here is astounding. Both the Times (on the left) and Wilcox (on
the right) are observing that the new family model is creating massive human misery, and both respond by asking why the peasants don’t simply eat cake.

This is a problem Herrnstein and Murray described in detail in their much maligned book *The Bell Curve*. In Chapter 8 (*Family Matters*), they explain that the reason college graduates and the UMC have lower divorce rates is because these things correlate positively with IQ, not because high socioeconomic status (SES) and higher education themselves reduce divorce rates. In fact, both of these factors increase divorce rates once IQ is controlled for (emphasis mine):

> The consistent finding, represented fairly by the figure, was that higher IQ was still associated with a lower probability of divorce after extracting the effects of other variables, and parental SES had a significant positive relationship to divorce—that is, **IQ being equal, children of higher-status families were more likely to get divorced than children of lower-status families.**

It is clear to all researchers who examine the data that higher education is associated with lower levels of divorce. This was certainly true of the NLSY, where the college sample (persons with a bachelor’s degree, no more and no less) had a divorce rate in the first five years of marriage that was less than half that of the high school sample: 7 percent compared to 19 percent. But this raw outcome is deceptive. Holding some critical other things equal—IQ, socioeconomic status, age, and date of marriage—**the divorce rate for the high school graduates in the first five years of marriage was lower than for college graduates.**

In their closing chapter, *A Place for Everyone*, Herrnstein and Murray explain the reason thinking honestly about IQ is so important. If we are honest about IQ, we can be compassionate towards those who aren’t on the right hand side of the bell curve:

> Our central concern since we began writing this book is how people might live together harmoniously despite fundamental individual differences. The answer lies outside economics.

> The initial purpose of this chapter is to present for your consideration another way of thinking about equality and inequality. It represents an older intellectual tradition than social democracy or even socialism. In our view, it is also a wiser tradition, more attuned to the way in which individuals go about living satisfying lives and to the ways in which societies thrive.

They argue that public policy is currently being made by the elite, for the elite, without regard for the needs of everyone else:

> **SIMPLIFYING RULES**

> The thesis of this section may be summarized quickly. As of the end of the twentieth century, the United States is run by rules that are congenial to people with high IQs and that make life more difficult to everyone else. This is true in the areas of criminal justice, marriage and divorce, welfare and tax policy, and business law, among
The systems have been created, bit by bit, over decades, by people who think that complicated, sophisticated operationalizations of fairness, justice, and right and wrong are ethically superior to simple, black-and-white versions.

The new elite focused systems of course include the new model of the family. Herrnstein and Murray take it as a given that our new view of sexual morality can’t, and shouldn’t, be changed. This leaves the legal definition of the family. Their proposal is to jettison the family structure that we have used to replace marriage (the child support model):

Repeatedly, the prerogatives and responsibilities that used to be limited to marriage have spilled over into nonmarital relationships, whether it is the rights and responsibilities of an unmarried father, medial coverage for same sex partners, or palimony cases. Once the law says, “Well, in a legal sense, living together is the same,” what is the point of getting married?

For most people, there are still answers to that question. Even given the diminished legal stature of marriage, marriage continues to have unique value. But to see those values takes forethought about the long term differences between living together and being married, sensitivity to many intangibles, and an appreciation of second-hand and third-hand consequences. As Chapter 8’s evidence about marriage rates implies, people low on the intelligence distribution are less likely to think through those issues than others.

Our policy prescription in this instance is to return marriage to its formerly unique legal status. If you are married, you take on obligations. If you are not married, you don’t. In particular, we urge that marriage once again become the sole legal institution through which rights and responsibilities regarding children are exercised. If you are an unmarried mother, you have no legal basis for demanding that the father of the child provide support. If you are an unmarried father, you have no legal standing regarding the child—not even a right to see the child, let alone any basis honored by society for claiming he or she is “yours” or that you are a “father.”

The reality is that to our elites on both the right and the left, such a proposal is unthinkable. Both would rather have millions of innocent children suffer than switch to a model that is not optimized specifically for the elites. At some point down the road, the profound economic cost of this new family model will eventually make at least some of our elites more open to reconsidering this. But for now, expect to see ever louder calls from the elites on the left and the right for weak men to stop screwing feminism up, and for non elites to simply become elites so our dysfunctional family system won’t be so obviously dysfunctional.

See Also: Will Wilcox and the men of National Review respect you in the morning?

*While it is true that men without good earnings are far less likely to marry, it is also true that weakening marriage as an institution greatly reduces men’s incentives to have high earnings. This isn’t a problem of uni-directional causation, but a vicious cycle.
She’s got balls.
by Dalrock | September 29, 2017 | Link

Via Drudge, a tragic story from the local CBS station in Chicago: Family Attacked By Teens Who Cut In Line At Six Flags “Fright Fest”

The melee started about 8:45 p.m., when a group of young people cut in front of a 50-year-old woman in line with her 51-year-old husband and 12-year-old son in the park’s Southwest Territory, near the Raging Bull and Giant Drop rides, Smith said.

The woman asked the group to stop using foul language in front of her son...

The thugs retaliated not against her, but her son. Her husband was then obliged to get involved to protect their son, and this lead to all three of them getting a serious beat down:

...one of the teens “sucker-punched” the boy, Smith said.

The boy’s father stepped in, as did his mother, but the group overpowered them, continuing to kick, punch and stomp them as they went down to the ground, Smith said.

Almost certainly the wife thought she was protecting her son when she provoked the beat down, and she probably also thought she was doing the job her husband was failing to do.

The scenario above is strikingly similar to one I read about on a gun forum a number of years ago. In the gun forum scenario three families were walking back to their cars on a dark street and a group of thugs was walking behind them talking loudly and cursing amongst themselves. A woman in the group turned to the thugs and told them to stop cursing and learn some manners, since there were women and children (the gun owner’s son) present. I described the gun forum scenario in 2011 in my post Chivalry and protecting the weak*. In that post I pointed out that the woman who told the thugs to stop cursing was not protecting the group, but putting the group in danger. This observation provoked an outraged emotional response from a woman in the comment section:

The example the man used of punks cursing and using foul derogatory language around his family and him doing nothing was appalling. I mean if you are at a little wayne concert okay (no business bringing kids there). However if you are at a family friendly event you should expect your family to be treated with a certain level of respect. I call it a manitude. You should be able to exude enough manliness to make other men back down, especially if they know they are in the wrong. If you won’t protect your own family from punks what good are you? And it’s wrong to blame the woman for wanting to be able to walk back to her car IN THE COMPANY OF MEN, and not have her kids ears assaulted.

In both scenarios a group of thugs was cursing around a family, and a woman in the family group decided to put the thugs in their place since (to her mind) the men were failing to
protect the group. Luckily in the gun forum scenario I shared in 2011 it didn’t escalate into violence.

This is an area where feminism, conservatism, and chivalry mix to create a prescription for disaster. Feminism tells women they are just as tough as men, and conservatives tell women they are kick ass gals who show more balls than men. Lastly chivalry promises that men will step in and solve the problem if a kick ass gal miscalculates how a group of thugs will respond to her tough talk. Most of the time the men are able to keep the kick ass gal’s actions from creating a catastrophe, but as the Chicago scenario demonstrates this isn’t guaranteed.

*See also my follow up post at the time, Let's you and him fight
As I wrote in *A very long season*, feminists don’t want to waste a day more of their youth and fertility on their husbands than absolutely necessary. As if to prove this very point, 30 year old Mona Chalabi writes in the NY Times* *I Want My 2.3 Bonus Years*:

If I could prolong my time as a young adult by, say, 2.3 years, here is a list of things I would like to do:

• Go to more parties. Preferably wild parties that I can think about, years later, at mild parties.

• Get fit (i.e., get at least one ab before I die). This, I’m told, is easier to achieve when you’re young.

• Have more romantic partners. Preferably ones with abs.

• Get a bit higher up the career ladder a bit earlier on. That would probably boost my earnings, giving me more financial security. I could use that money to go to more parties, get a membership to a fancy gym and maybe even meet a romantic partner on the ab machines.

To drive the message home, the image at the top of the article is a cartoon of a resentful Chalabi *giving her future husband the side eye* for her lost years of sampling penises!

On the bright side men, Chalabi appears to still be available, and she is frantically making a lifetime’s worth of happy memories with other men as you read this. Give her say 2.3 more years (give or take a penis or three), and you could be the lucky man paying the bills and getting the side eye!

On a related note, I did a Google search trying to find the previous post where I wrote about women not wanting waste their youth and fertility on their husbands. Google not only helped me find my own post, it suggested a number of related searches by Chalabi’s peers:
Searches related to dalrock waste youth and fertility on husband

- finding a husband after 35
- how to find a husband in 30 days
- how to find a husband fast
- odds of getting married after 30
- being 32 and single
- 32 and single female
- find love after 35
- 35 year old woman single

See Also:

- Debasing marriage.
- Losing control of the narrative.

*HT Just Sharing.
Abigail’s daughters.

by Dalrock | October 2, 2017 | Link

3 Wives, in the same way submit yourselves to your own husbands so that, if any of them do not believe the word, they may be won over without words by the behavior of their wives, 2 when they see the purity and reverence of your lives. 3 Your beauty should not come from outward adornment, such as elaborate hairstyles and the wearing of gold jewelry or fine clothes. 4 Rather, it should be that of your inner self, the unfading beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is of great worth in God’s sight. 5 For this is the way the holy women of the past who put their hope in God used to adorn themselves. They submitted themselves to their own husbands, 6 like Sarah, who obeyed Abraham and called him her lord. You are her daughters if you do what is right and do not give way to fear.

— 1 Pet 3:1-6, NIV

As he promised in August, Pastor Doug Wilson has revisited the subject of submission in his recent post Miserable Wives*. Much of the post is good, and Wilson does say that (some) wives should submit to their husbands. Yet there is a common pattern with Wilson where he seems to think that in order to teach something good, he must simultaneously teach something false so he doesn’t seem extreme in his adherence to Scripture. Sadly, Wilson follows this same pattern in this recent post. He awkwardly breaks from the subject at hand and assures us that if the husband a jerk, a wife’s godly responsibility is to oppose him and “bring things to a head” (emphasis mine):

Now before getting into what we see, I wanted qualify something first. I want you to know and understand that nothing said here would apply to a woman who was married to a genuine tyrant. I have often wished that more women would be willing to be Abigails in dealing with their Nabals, and those situations are scarcely rare. I know that there are marriages where the husbands are thugs and bullies, and that their wives need to learn how to bring things to a head. I know of such situations at first hand. When that happens, and it happens too often, I am firmly in the corner of the wife who is the victim. Many women need to learn to be an Abigail.

Wilson is teaching the opposite of what the Apostle Peter taught in 1 Peter 3:1-6. In the process he has substituted Abigail for Peter’s example of Sarah. Sarah as you will recall submitted to Abraham even when Abraham foolishly instructed her to say he was her brother and not her husband. Sarah complied, and but for the intervention of God this would have caused Sarah to have been raped! Sarah is the example Peter gave for Christian women to follow, to submit to their own husband even if he does not believe/obey the word**. If they do this, they will please God and be Sarah’s daughters.

Peter’s instruction to wives with sinning husbands is a hard teaching for us to accept. However, note that modern Christians are quite enthusiastic about this teaching once they
apply it to the husband instead of the wife. Modern Christians love the passage if they can do some cross-dressing; it is only in the original form that they can’t stomach it.

Not only is Sarah (and not Abigail) the woman Scripture tells us Christian wives should emulate, Wilson is badly misrepresenting Abigail. In 1 Sam 25 Abigail does not take action to “bring things to a head”. In fact, her aim is to do the opposite. Abigail intercepts David on his way to kill her husband Nabal and pleads with David not to do so. Things were about to “come to a head”, and Abigail interceded just in time to prevent this from happening. Moreover, when Abigail returns home and her husband is drunk, she delays telling him what she has done to avoid provoking him in his drunken state.

It is true that Abigail tells David that her husband is a worthless fellow and a fool, but Abigail knows that David is God’s anointed and that Nabal had deeply offended this man in whom God has favor. Abigail is saying this in an effort to stop David from killing him:

23 When Abigail saw David, she hurried and got down from the donkey and fell before David on her face and bowed to the ground. 24 She fell at his feet and said, “On me alone, my lord, be the guilt. Please let your servant speak in your ears, and hear the words of your servant. 25 Let not my lord regard this worthless fellow, Nabal, for as his name is, so is he. Nabal is his name, and folly is with him. But I your servant did not see the young men of my lord, whom you sent. 26 Now then, my lord, as the Lord lives, and as your soul lives, because the Lord has restrained you from bloodguilt and from saving with your own hand, now then let your enemies and those who seek to do evil to my lord be as Nabal. 27 And now let this present that your servant has brought to my lord be given to the young men who follow my lord. 28 Please forgive the trespass of your servant. For the Lord will certainly make my lord a sure house, because my lord is fighting the battles of the Lord, and evil shall not be found in you so long as you live. 29 If men rise up to pursue you and to seek your life, the life of my lord shall be bound in the bundle of the living in the care of the Lord your God. And the lives of your enemies he shall sling out as from the hollow of a sling. 30 And when the Lord has done to my lord according to all the good that he has spoken concerning you and has appointed you prince over Israel, 31 my lord shall have no cause of grief or pangs of conscience for having shed blood without cause or for my lord working salvation himself. And when the Lord has dealt well with my lord, then remember your servant.”

*HT Hmm

**See Cane Caldo’s You Bowed Up When You Should Have Bowed Down for a discussion of the application of this when a husband instructs his wife to do evil.
Helping victims stand against their abuser.

by Dalrock | October 3, 2017 | Link

We’ve all seen the telltale signs: The cowed look. The downtrodden posture. The never ending series of excuses:

- He isn’t usually like that.
- You don’t know the real man.
- He is getting so much better.

And of course:

- Pleeease don’t say anything! You’ll only set him off and make things worse!
- His theology...
- it bites back...

Blog abuse leaves its victims too crushed, too terrified to speak up. We need to stand with victims of blog abuse against their blogger, so they can bring the issue to a head.
They’re back in your 20s where you left them.

by Dalrock | October 4, 2017 | Link

Margaret Wente at the Globe and Mail asks where all the good men have gone. Wente comes to the conclusion that women need a sex cartel:

…it’s up to us to make the rules. “Why buy the cow when you can get the milk for free?” my father used to say. It drove me crazy when he said that. Now, it’s dawned on me that he was right.

Since the women’s cartel collapsed, women’s bargaining power has seriously eroded. That’s why so many single women hate Tinder, which has further commodified sex for the benefit of men. Women are just another consumer good in the shop window.

The apex fallacy aside, Wente is partially right. Women (as a group) have signaled to men that what they really want are exciting sexy badboys, not boring loyal dudes. It isn’t that women no longer want to marry beta providers, they just don’t want to waste a day more of their youth and fertility on their husband than absolutely necessary.

As a result, some up and coming boring loyal dudes aren’t knocking themselves out in their twenties while they wait for their future wife to tire of having sex with other men. Wente (partially) understands this too:

It may take a village to raise a child. But it takes a village to raise a husband, too. And modern society has largely abdicated from the job. “Good husband material doesn’t occur naturally, but is instead the product (in part) of socialization, development, and social control,” Mr. Regnerus writes. “[I]n the domain of sex and relationships men will act as nobly as women collectively demand.”

Time to get our act together, ladies. If we don’t, they won’t either.

What Wente doesn’t understand is that timing is everything. From an economic point of view, women are dividing up sexual access that traditionally would have been reserved only for their husband into two blocks. The first block contains their most attractive and fertile years, and it is dedicated to no strings sex with exciting badboys. Then, once women reach what Rollo calls the epiphany phase, they want to bargain sexual access in their remaining (older and less fertile) years for maximum beta bucks.

The problem with this strategy is (generally speaking) not that the previously overlooked beta men will refuse to marry the suddenly reformed party girls. The problem is that young men now look at the men 3-5 (and even 5-10) years older than them and don’t see an indication that signaling provider status will make them attractive to women. They also see a
society that holds married fathers in contempt**. Most of these men are still working hard in their late teens and twenties to prepare to signal provider status in their 30s. But a growing minority of young men are no longer doing so. These men are instead working like women. Once the reformed party girls are ready to find Mr. Beta Bucks, there is a shortage of 30 something men who fit the bill. Even worse, no amount of complaining or shaming will cause the missing beta providers to go back in time and spend the prior decade preparing for this moment.

To add insult to injury, because we have abandoned any meaningful concept of sexual morality there is no moral force to hold Wente’s proposed cartel together. It is doomed to fail.

*HT Nick MGTOW

**With Christians leading the way.
As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them. O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths.

–Isaiah 3:12, KJV

Michael Moore is proposing that the US repeal the Second Amendment and replace it with a new amendment. Moore’s proposed amendment would include a provision to make a man get permission from his wife or girlfriend before buying a gun:

As over 90% of gun violence is committed by men, in order for a man to purchase a gun, he must first get a waiver from his current wife, plus his most recent ex-wife, or any woman with whom he is currently in a relationship (if he’s gay, he must get the waiver from his male spouse/partner). This law has greatly reduced most spousal/domestic gun murders in Canada.

CNS News points out that Moore is not entirely accurate in his description of Canada’s law:

An information sheet and firearm license application form posted online by the Canadian Royal Mounted Police suggests that conjugal partners don’t have to sign off on the license; they just must be notified of their partner’s intent to obtain one

CNS News also notes that under Moore’s proposed amendment MGTOW’s would be treated like adults and not need a woman’s permission to buy a gun.

Moore’s plan does not require waivers for single men who are loners and shun relationships who want to buy guns.

As absurd as Moore’s proposal is, it is being presented as a serious solution from the left. The Hill closes Michael Moore proposes ‘28th Amendment’ to regulate gun ownership with:

Democratic lawmakers are facing pressure from the left to introduce new anti-gun violence measures after Sunday’s shooting, which was the most deadly in modern U.S. history.

Republicans have rejected the idea that such violence has a legislative solution.

Related: Setting the record straight on Duluth.
From the NY Post, Teacher allegedly called out cheerleaders who ‘showed a lot of vagina’

Eubanks, 59, a city teacher for two decades and former educator with the New York City Ballet, was accused of saying the girls “showed a lot of vagina” or “flashes of vagina,” and using the words “g-string,” “burlesque moment” and “nasty” within earshot of students, thus embarrassing or belittling them in violation of chancellor’s rules.

Fortunately she wasn’t fired and only received a letter of reprimand. But this still serves to demonstrate our new feminist morality. Policing modesty is the new sin, and this has left women naked in more ways than one.

The article opens with the hilarious line:

She saw something — and said something.
Heidi Stone has decided to build up her own home, instead of tearing it down*:


That’s you and me, darlin’. You and me. We’ve already invested our perky selves, baby-making hips, and the “looks cute in a two-piece” years. We’ve given them to the man we wake up to and the children we make dinner for and unless we are careful, that investment might not pay off.

I know I want to reap the rewards of that investment.

I’ve earned those rewards. There is no way I want to jeopardize where I end up and how I live because I didn’t have the courage or willingness to pursue my marriage and family with integrity now. Before the hurricanes and menopausal tornadoes.

See, to be blunt, we don’t fare well in the re-marriage market as only 25% of women who are divorced in their 30’s-40’s actually remarry. Men will generally marry at a rate closer to 50% but, even then, they aren’t looking at our Match.Com profiles. They tend to marry women far younger than themselves the second time and, well, that rather gives a raspberry to both our aging marketability and our chances at second time marital bliss.

*H/T Vox Day.
How you’ll learn to love Big Brother.
by Dalrock | October 10, 2017 | Link

Vox Day has a brutal but compelling excerpt from SJWs Always Double Down. If reading it doesn’t evoke at least two gin-scented tears and a desire to buy the book, then you my friend have a heart of stone.
Gotta ask the boss, Christian edition.
by Dalrock | October 13, 2017 | Link

In the discussion of Gotta ask the boss, commenter AnonS described a man up group he found via his local mega church:

Local mega church had a small group listing for a ‘radical men’s mentoring group’ that I emailed for more information about. This church is non-dom but quite conservative for the area; forbids female teachers and gives lip service to submission when it comes up.

The ‘radical men’s mentoring group’ send out an email that required the married men to get a signed permission slip from their wives in order to attend. I replied that I was no longer interested.

Based on what AnonS shared, I was able to find a link to the Men’s Radical Mentoring Mentee Covenant, which does indeed require the wife to give her husband permission to participate in the program (emphasis mine):

9. I discussed this commitment with my wife and she fully supports my involvement. She willingly relinquishes the time it will take to attend the sessions and retreats and to do the reading and homework, with the goal of my becoming a godlier man.

Note that this is the same approach Dennis Rainey takes with his Stepping Up® program (emphasis mine).

Bob: So, I"m thinking of a wife who is planning for that weekend. She’s got the option of either her husband, on Saturday, doing all the projects around the house so that he can watch the game on Sunday; or she can send him to the Stepping Up® Super Saturday event, down at the church, that’s happening in their community. We’ve got hundreds of churches that are participating in this; but she’s not going to get any “Honey, do” lists done that day. What would your counsel to her be, Dennis?

Dennis: Give up the “Honey, do” list for a day.

Men are sold on the program with the promise of finally becoming a respected man:

This is man stuff! Finally, I’ll become a man!

But those who market to conservative Christians know that wives are firmly in the driver’s seat in modern Christian marriage. The husband isn’t the decision maker, and his thoughts don’t matter very much. What matters is what the boss thinks. To sell their books, videos, programs, etc, they need to appeal directly to the head of the modern Christian family, the wife. The first thing they need to do is reassure the wife that no matter how much they talk...
about believing in the Bible and biblical roles, they have absolutely no intention of challenging the feminist status quo. The ever present danger of a man up program is that the men might in fact man up. Coming to the wife upfront and formally asking her permission reassures the wife that nothing biblical is at risk of happening during the Christian man up program.

**Nagging by proxy.**

Having assuaged the wife’s understandable fear, the next thing the man up program salesmen need to do is convince the wife to order her husband to attend/participate. To do this, they need to convince her that the lost time bossing her husband around will be worth it, since the goal of the program is to rework her husband to her liking. She needs to know that

1. Someone else will be filling the void, bossing her husband around during the time she isn’t able to do so.
2. The people bossing her husband around in her absence will be able to be more effective in molding her husband into the man she wants him to be.

Here is how Rainey made this part of the pitch:

I"m actually encouraging you, as a wife, to look beyond the “Honey, do” list and beyond to making an investment in your husband”s life—to encourage him, not discourage him— but encourage him to become the man God made him to be. If you send him down to the Stepping Up Super Saturday event—I can”t guarantee this because he’s got a choice—he’s got a real choice, and some guys don’t make it; but a lot will.

Radical Mentoring founder and Chairman Regi Campbell gets the same message across in the preface to his book *What Radical Husbands Do, 12 Steps to Win and Keep Your Wife’s Heart.*

**A Word to the Wives**

I’ve been around long enough to know that women get real curious about books their men read, probably because we read less than you do. I have three things to say to the “maverick” wife who might be reading this, especially if you’re a wife who is hanging by a thread on the other end of a failing marriage...

If he’s coming to realize some of his “issues”...starting to accept them and take ownership...and there’s sincere humility and conviction in his heart, you’re an idiot to abandon this marriage. He’s on his way to becoming the man you wanted and thought you married to begin with. Give him some time and encouragement. What’s rewarded is repeated. You get what you glorify. So catch him when he does stuff right and brag on him...

Finally, if your marriage is in trouble, know your challenges will be forgiving and forgetting. You may be totally justified in throwing the bum out or taking off. What he’s done, what he’s said, his selfishness, his constant criticism...maybe all of the above...any rational woman would get out and start over. But now he’s ready to
try...really try...really try to make things different. He’s been using different words. There’s an earnestness that hasn’t been there. If you see this kind of movement on his part, you’re smart to move toward him and see what comes of it. After all, do you really want to start over and train another hardheaded man to be a decent husband? It’s so much better for you, the kids, your folks, for everyone, if this marriage becomes rock solid.
It could be no other way.
by Dalrock | October 16, 2017 | Link

Sam Adams has a commercial with beer drinkers training for a contest to see who can hold a stein full of beer at arm’s length the longest. Beer commercials have typically been about being one of the guys, but in our feminist era this has been modified somewhat.

Beer commercials are still about being one of the guys, but now they are about a woman becoming one of the guys too. What makes the commercial above noteworthy is that it isn’t noteworthy at all. This is perfectly normal to us. Of course women have more upper body strength than men. And of course a woman can become one of the guys.

Related:

- Unquenchable
- She’s number one.
- Why can’t women do pull ups? It’s a culture thing.
- It would be petty to point out how petty it is.
I came across a YouTube video by Pastor Gabriel Hughes that exemplifies the complementarian position. There are two competing messages in the video below:

1. We believe in solid Bible based theology, and therefore women are not to be in leadership.
2. This theology is good because a woman approves!

In theory complementarians have only partially gutted 1 Timothy 2:11-15. But as the video demonstrates, the underlying sentiment is one of theological obedience to women and feminism. What the CBMW founders called the traditional reading of the passage is rejected out of hand in the beginning of the video for being unacceptable to modern women:

After presenting the new and improved reading of the previously offending verse, the narrator then goes back and asks the wife if she approves:
This is how we know the narrator has arrived at the correct theology.

**Bonus frame:** No complementarian capitulation to feminism would be complete without the obligatory call for men to step up:

![MEN STEP UP & LEAD](image-url)
Gone Fishin’
by Dalrock | October 19, 2017 | Link

I’ll be taking a blogging break over the next few days. I’ll turn moderation on in a bit and will take it back off on Monday.

Oct 23: I’m back. Default moderation is now off.
Ford ran a commercial here in Texas at the beginning of game two of the World Series last night selling the message that their F-150 pickup trucks are both tough and safe. You can see the ad at iSpot, which describes the message of the commercial:

Mom and Dad have differing priorities when it comes to their children’s football game. Dad puts safety first and makes sure shoulder pads are secured and helmets are fastened tightly. However, Momma’s building champions. She tells them to be the hammer, not the nail, and she sends them on their way. Ford demonstrates how safety and toughness complement each other in both sports and in its F-150 model.

What iSpot doesn’t note in their summary* is that the commercial is supposed to be funny. We are supposed to be shocked that the commercial for pickup trucks (a product associated with men and manliness), about a football game in Texas, has flipped the roles for mom and dad. Our reaction is supposed to be:

Ha ha, dad is the one mothering the sons, and mom is the one teaching them to be tough and manly!

But the joke doesn’t work, because there is nothing counter cultural about presenting fathers as effeminate and mothers as butch. In emasculating the Texas fathers they hope will buy their pickup trucks, Ford is merely going with the flow. Ford is following the lead of Angel Soft, which shows that real fathers shave their legs, and JP Morgan Chase & Co., which as Ad Age explains has redefined what it means to be a father:

Dads can be heroes in many ways — and, according to JP Morgan Chase & Co., that could mean putting on makeup and a wig and donning a tutu to play the fairy princess at a birthday party

None of these commercials are truly edgy. They are merely parroting the approved narrative. What would be edgy, and truly counter-cultural, is if Ford showed fathers as masculine and mothers as feminine. The Ford truck ad isn’t funny because it could be no other way. Imagine the same ad with the roles reversed. Picture the commercial as the “traditional” narrative Ford is ostensibly poking at. Imagine if the mother were the one gently mothering her sons and focusing on their safety gear, and if the father were the parent urging his sons to be aggressive. And of course, imagine if the father smacked the mother on the ass at the end of the commercial. That would be shocking and edgy, because in our culture it simply can’t be done.

Related: It could be no other way.

*iSpot characterizes the mood of the commercial as “Funny” in the specs section of the page.
Bustle has an article by Emma Lord about a Reddit post making the rounds: “Dave The Period Fairy” Has Become A Viral Sensation After A Woman Shared A Nightmare Hiking Experience On Reddit. Lord claims Dave is sexy because he is a feminist new age guy:

Personally, I am the one who is stupid — stupid in love with Jane’s friend Dave, that is.

It isn’t just Dave’s unexpectedly feminist Boy Scout preparedness, but that this is the kind of thing that normalizes periods in general. All too often, the burden of lifting the stigma on menstruation falls on women...

This is another round in a very long feminist con, telling men they will be sexy if they carry tampons and lift the stigma of menstruation. As Lord explains:

...maybe the mere existence of Dave the Period Fairy will inspire a whole new movement of period fairies and we can all live in relative, menstrually sound peace.

This is of course nonsense, and any white knights trying to win over women in this way will find it has the opposite of the desired effect. Nice guys, and especially nice guy feminists, aren’t just not sexy, they are repulsive.

But this story has a twist. If you read the original Reddit post, Dave really was sexy. As “Jane” the author of the post explains in the comments:

Lol I should link him this thread. Except I just expressed my desire to, and I quote, “Fuck the shit out of him” which might be weird.

Normally I would say she is running the same con on nice guys Emma Lord is running. But if you look at her description of the event you can see why this ostensibly feminist nice guy really did turn her on*. It isn’t what Dave did (provided her with a tampon), but how he did it. When Dave sensed that something was wrong, he didn’t sheepishly ask m’lady if he could be of assistance. Dave approached her like a father would approach a daughter in the same situation:

Dave looks back and notices me walking like a goblin. To my horror, he falls back and starts walking next to me. He leans in and whispers,

“Do you need to pee?”

I’m like, huh? Then I realized I’m like doubled over with my hands on my crotch. Seemed obvious.

“No, I, that’s not,” I’m stammering.
“Period issue?” he says next.

At that point I’m like this and I just mumble “yeah.”

Note the image she links to that demonstrates that she felt like a little girl who needs daddy to help. As Heartiste explains, tingles are born in the defensive crouch.

At this point Dave takes charge of the situation, giving everyone, including Jane, clear instructions:

And then, this guy, this fucking glorious, magnificent guy, he calls out to John and Teddy: “Hey, Jane’s scraped her arm on a tree or some shit, I’m gonna tend to it but it’s gonna be like five minutes. Just get to the road and set up lunch and call the car.”

John says sure and the two of them keep on walking. Dave slides off his magical backpack and opens a pouch on the front of it. “Pads or tampons?” he says.

I mutter “tampons,” completely stunned at all this. He pulls out three tampons, the good kind, and a handful of wet-naps. Hands them to me and then he opens the main compartment and pulls out a long sleeve black t-shirt. “Go in the trees and take care of it, then tie the shirt around your waist.” He then pulls out a big band-aid and slaps it on my arm to keep up his cover story.

There is a lesson men can learn from this story on how to be sexually attractive to women. It isn’t to become a walking tampon dispenser**, or to be a feminist nice guy in general. The lesson is to be a strong man who effortlessly and unapologetically takes charge of the situation, whatever that situation may be.

H/T Instapundit.

*The story itself strikes me as almost certainly fiction, but the reason this particular Reddit post has gone viral is that the fantasy it is selling is compelling to women.

**Or as modern Christians put it, emotionally available.
World Net Daily has an article up today titled Church: Out with George Washington, in with ‘Mother’ god. In it they note that one of the exclusively female pastors at Washington’s former church recently read a new and improved version of the Apostle’s Creed during worship. Click on the link to see the video, or you can see the text version from the author of the new creed, Sarah Moon:

I believe in God, our Mother Bear,  
source of all being.  

I believe in Jesus Christ, God’s wisdom made flesh,  
along with Sophia, the church, and all that live in wisdom.  
Born of the bad-ass womanist liberation theologian, Mary,  
suffered under the systems of oppression of this world,  
was crucified, died, and was buried,  
forever joining in solidarity with those murdered by Empire.  
On the third day, the women declared him risen;  
signifying God’s “No” to oppression.  
He points to God our Mother Bear,  
who works in this world, calling for justice for the poor and oppressed.

I believe in Sophia Spirit,  
Christ’s body, the church,  
the communion of saints,  
the grace to reject this world’s systems,  
hope for justice in the future,  
and renewed life everlasting. Amen.

This is something to keep in mind whenever someone offers the fact that (overt) feminist Christians strongly disagree with them as proof that they are valiantly fighting against feminist corruption of Christianity. Merely teaching new age ideas like God commands husbands to be emotionally available, or God communicates his favor through your wife’s holy vagina is enough to seem like a radical anti-feminist when compared with the teachings of overt feminists. But the reference point for sound theology should not be the teachings of overt feminists, but whether the teaching is faithful to Scripture*.

*For Orthodox Christians and Roman Catholics, the reference point would also include church doctrine.
A tough spot for conservatives.

by Dalrock | November 3, 2017 | Link

DC McAllister at PJ Media wrote a post arguing that Special K’s marketing campaign encouraging girls to play football is hurting women. Her first argument is that men, and young men especially, need their own spaces:

While I don’t want to take away from the athletic ability, hard work, and beauty of these young women, I simply cannot celebrate girls playing football. Not only do I refuse to celebrate it, I outright condemn it.

First of all, why in the name of “equality” do women insist on invading man spaces? There is a camaraderie among boys that is necessary for their development as men, and this is fostered in all-boy sports. It’s a kind of initiation into manhood — something that must be done by men in a male-only environment. Injecting females into the mix dilutes the experience, robbing boys of training in masculinity and male bonding that they desperately need.

Instead of tearing down the walls between boys and girls, we need to encourage boys to build more tree houses with signs like “No Girls Allowed” on the door. They need it to develop, grow, and discover what it means to be a man, but as a society we’re taking this from them. It’s not fair to them, and the girls don’t need to take over their space. They have their own tree houses (and their own sports).

Her objection to the invasion of all men’s spaces is extremely uncommon, as both conservatives and liberals as groups view this as merely progress. Besides, noticing the pettiness of women who insist on invading all men’s spaces is considered petty. We expect women to be petty, but for men to mind this pettiness is unacceptable, because we expect more from men. If men would be petty to mind the invasion, who is McAllister to bring such a petty thing up?

Stephen Green at Instapundit linked to McAllister’s piece, and as expected conservative readers objected to McAllister pointing out women’s pettiness:

Lighten up and quit looking for things to be offended by. Some people on the right are starting to sound like the panty waist losers on the left (sounding like that stupid inane daily Vox alert in my cell phone that I am 100% sure I never signed up for and cannot seem to shut off).

... 

My daughter and her friends enjoyed the “Powder Puff” flag football game they played the day before Thanksgiving. This faux outrage is a case of “Lighten up, Francis.”
Who cares? Stop ramping back up the culture wars with this nonsense. If a school district wants to let girls play football, bfd. Don’t we have enough real problems?

McAllister’s second argument is that as a result of women’s invasion of all men’s spaces, she fears this will lead to young men not learning to protect women:

Sports can have a positive impact on personal development, but this is only when the sport isn’t being perverted into something it’s not meant to be. When you put a girl on a football field, you are training boys to go against their natural (and good) instincts not to hit girls. Part of growing as a man is to learn how to properly treat women, to protect, respect, honor, and cherish them. Not to beat the crap out of them in sports or anywhere else.

This second argument is better tuned to the conservative sensibility. However, it has the problem of blaming women, or at least potentially leading to the terrifying possibility of telling a woman no. Had she framed the problem as one of football playing boys lacking chivalry when tackling kickass gals, she would have been right on target. If she were really good, McCallaster could have gone the extra mile and accused weak young men of insisting that these valiant young women play a dangerous game so the young men could remain safe. But that would be Grand Master level conservative denial, and very few can compete on that level. McCallaster also seems sincere in her objection to women invading men’s spaces.

As it was, conservative Instapundit readers were forced to manually rework the argument themselves.

I’m not offended. But I am deeply concerned that anybody thinks it’s OK for boys to tackle girls.

See Also: It would be petty to point out how petty it is.
Novaseeker found an excellent chart over at Reddit. It isn’t my chart to share, so I won’t publish it here. However, you can see it at the link.

Some quick thoughts:

1. The chart confirms Men’s Sphere conventional wisdom about the changed SMP.
2. While there has been a large (3 fold?) increase in the number of women at 45 who have never married, today at least most women still marry.
3. Instead of showing men on a marriage “strike”, it is clear that there are plenty of thirsty men quite happy to wife up nearly all of the 30 something carouselers looking to marry.
4. The feminist claim that women no longer value the status of wife is put to death by the data. The women who married in the tail end of the curve will for the most part have settled hard.
5. The never married women in their 20s and early 30s today should not expect to marry at the same rate as the women who are currently 45 have. These are very different cohorts, as today’s 45 year old women came of age in the 1980s.

Edit: See Cane Caldo’s take on the data here.

See Also:

- A very long season (part 2).
- 2014 Never married Data
More bad news for marriage is baked in.

by Dalrock | November 8, 2017 | Link

Back in September W. Bradford Wilcox and Wendy Wang published an American Enterprise Institute report titled The Marriage Divide: How and Why Working-Class Families Are More Fragile Today. I’ve written previously about the NYT response to the report, but not about the data in the report itself. For the most part the report features refreshed data to make the case that Wilcox has been making since at least 2010; marriage has become highly stratified by class. Figure 1 of the report shows the share of adults age 18-55 who are currently married, by class:

![Bar chart showing percent of adults 18-55 currently married by class. US, 2015. Poor: 26%, Working Class: 39%, Middle and Upper Class: 56%.]

Source: Figure 1 http://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/The-Marriage-Divide.pdf
https://dalrock.wordpress.com/

Figure 4 shows the percentage of children born out of wedlock by class:
One of the main points of the paper is that the stratification of marriage by class is being partially masked by immigration. As the Executive Summary explains:

The class divide would be even larger were it not for the presence of immigrants, who are disproportionately married and members of working-class or poor families.

In the Appendix they re run several of the breakdowns to show the stratification with immigrants excluded. Figure A5 shows what figure A1 (above) would look like excluding immigrants, and this allows a side by side comparison:
Figure A7 allows the same side by side comparison for out of wedlock birth rates:

Source: Figure 6 http://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/The-Marriage-Divide.pdf
https://dalrock.wordpress.com/

What these charts can’t tell us, however, is what this will look like for the next generation. I haven’t seen data for other immigrant groups, but we know that for Hispanics* at least subsequent generations fare terribly under our *for elites only* marriage model.

Normally when you see divorce rates broken out by race, Hispanics have a slightly higher divorce rate than Whites, and a much lower divorce rate than Blacks:
But lumping all Hispanics together masks the fact that foreign born Hispanics have a much lower divorce rate than native born Hispanics:

https://dalrock.wordpress.com/

https://dalrock.wordpress.com/
Native born Hispanics also have much higher out of wedlock birth rates than foreign born Hispanics.

Hispanic women who gave birth were more likely to be unmarried (42%) than were non-Hispanic women (34%) who gave birth. The share of out-of-wedlock births to Hispanic women immigrants (35%) was nearly equal to that of non-Hispanic women and was much lower than the share for native-born Hispanic women (50%).

Not all of our foreign born population is Hispanic, but I can see no reason to expect that the same family model that is a disaster for poor and working class Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics will not be similarly destructive to the next generation of poor and working class immigrants across the board.

*According to this source, 45% of current immigrants are Hispanic.*
Marriage strike paradox.
by Dalrock | November 8, 2017 | Link

Commenter astrapto asks in response to Percentage of U.S. women never married, by age, 1980 & 2015

3. Instead of showing men on a marriage “strike”, it is clear that there are plenty of thirsty men quite happy to wife up nearly all of the 30 something carouselers looking to marry.

Dalrock, doesn’t this undermine your conclusion that women delaying marriage won’t be able to find anyone?

Just for the record, I’ve been consistent on this point for the last 7 years, and the data has yet to change my mind. Nearly all women are still able to marry. If we could break this data out for just White women the percentage who marry by 45 would be even higher, around 90%!

Moreover, the change we are seeing is almost entirely a delay in the age of marriage. If men were driving this change, it would mean that men were refusing to marry young hot women, and insisting on marrying clapped out party girls instead. Even if you stipulated that this was indeed what was happening, insisting on an older, less hot, less chaste, more demanding wife doesn’t count as a “strike” in my book.

What we are seeing instead is women continuing to push out the age of marriage. As they are doing this, they are changing the signal young men receive regarding how to be sexually successful. Beta Bucks (BB) used to be a very effective strategy for an 18 year old young man. He might have to wait a few years, but he could see the plan working for his 3-5 year older bother and his friend’s older brother. Now a young man would have to look to men 10-15 years older to see examples of the BB model finally paying off. Meanwhile, they see the Alpha F**** (AF) model working all around them. AF gets rewarded, and BB is not only not rewarded for a decade or more, but our whole society (especially Christians) despises husbands and fathers, the epitome of the BB model. This is a very powerful message, and an unmistakable one.

Not surprisingly, we are starting to see fewer men working hard to signal BB status in their late teens and early 20s. When the party girls suddenly decide they aren’t that kind of girl, they still find nearly all of the would be BB men are willing to marry, but many of these men haven’t done the preparation needed to really fulfill the role. They can no more go back and spend their teens and 20s on education and career advancement than the 30 ish career gal can go back and dedicate her most attractive and fertile years to her husband. Many of the men they find have instead been working like women. Also, the men who did well in the AF paradigm and are eventually inclined (and prepared) to marry aren’t going to prefer aging career gals. They are the ones with options, and the prettiest marriage seekers have the best shot with them. This means the women who waited too long to marry are stuck with terrible prospects. Choosing last always sucks, but men’s rational response to women’s anti-BB signal...
means it sucks much more now than it did in the past.
It must be exhausting.
by Dalrock | November 13, 2017 | Link

A few weeks back Vox Day quoted the lyrics of “Let It Go”, the hit song from the Disney movie Frozen. I hadn’t heard the song before but I knew it was extremely popular, especially with women and girls. Not surprisingly, the message of the song is our standard message to women and girls. The only way women can sin is to deny themselves what they desire*. The song teaches girls and women to stop trying to be the good girl, and embrace a philosophy of No right, no wrong, no rules for me:

Don’t let them in,  
don’t let them see  
Be the good girl you always have to be  
Conceal, don’t feel,  
don’t let them know  
Well now they know

...  
And the fears that once controlled me  
Can’t get to me at all  
It’s time to see what I can do  
To test the limits and break through  
No right, no wrong, no rules for me,  
I’m free!

As I noted, this is the message our culture is endlessly telling women and girls, and for obvious reasons it is a message women and girls can’t get enough of**. What strikes me about all of this is how curious this will be to future historians trying to understand how our culture became so rapidly debased. That progressive elites owned the commanding heights will be quite easy for future historians to observe, as songs like Let it go, aimed directly at young girls, will make clear.

What will no doubt puzzle future historians processing the mountain of digital data from our period is where were conservative Christians while all of this was happening? It isn’t just that Christians are passively silent on the very overt feminist rebellion all around us. Modern Christians are so afraid of confronting the rebellion that they aren’t merely silent, they are in active denial that any rebellion is taking place. When future historians look for the conservative Christian reaction to feminists putting women in all parts of our armed forces, something feminists achieved after working tirelessly for decades, they will find that conservative Christians were so terrified of confronting the feminist rebellion that they pretended that cowardly men were forcing noble kick-ass gals to fight in their place.

Likewise, future historians will see that conservative Christians like Pastor Chandler responded to the constant feminist agitation in the culture by assuring men that the agitation...
will have no impact on their wives and daughters, so long as the men are nice enough, and
tired enough:

> If the most secularized feminist in the world showed up in your home and began to kind of coach your wife toward freedom and liberation from your tyranny, our wives should be so well cared for, so nourished, so sowed into and loved, they would say, “What you’re describing is actually tyranny. I love where I am. I am honored. I am encouraged. My man sacrifices so that I might grow in my gifts. **He will oftentimes lay down his own desires in order to serve me more. My husband goes to bed tired at night. He pours into our children.** He encourages me. All that comes out of his mouth, sans a couple of little times here and there, is him building me up in love.

This level of denial takes constant effort, and it only gets harder as the denial becomes more and more absurd. Moreover, it has to be demoralizing to know that one day historians will struggle to determine if their earnest denial of the feminist rebellion at the very height of the rebellion was merely satire. I can only imagine how completely exhausted all of this denial leaves our conservative Christian leaders at the end of the day. And yet, each day they manage to get up and do it all over again.

The alternative is simply too terrifying.

*Or alternately, to not have high enough self esteem, which in turn causes them to sin by denying themselves what they desire.

**The song has also been called an LGBT anthem.
Anonymous Reader notes that *Let it go* is well loved by modern Christians:

I have not yet encountered a single churchgoing person in my social circle who has a problem with “Frozen” the movie or with “Let it go” the song. Not one. That includes a couple of families that are part of leadership. Pointing out the “no rules” part is like describing the color “purple” to someone who is blind. They *literally* can’t see anything wrong – perhaps because “It’s DISNEY” or something. I’ve gotten blank stares from people over 40 but also parents under 30. It’s bizarre.

I don’t think the messenger makes the message palatable. It is the message itself that is loved. Women and girls learning how to throw off all rules and inhibition is core to our new morality. The song isn’t loved as a guilty pleasure; it is loved as a bold moral declaration. *Stop trying to be a good girl and learn to worship yourself* is a moral exhortation. As Vox pointed out in *The devil that is Disney*:

Disney is run by literal satanists preaching Alastair Crowley’s “do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the law” to children. They are one of the primary engine’s of the West’s degeneracy and decline. It is not an accident that everything they touch, in every industry, turns into morally radioactive slime.

Children, including Christian children, understand this best of all. They know what their parents worship, what their parents see as righteous (even if their parents fall short of living the ideal). They know that Frozen and *Let It Go* is a morality tale that teaches them about our most sacred beliefs.

With this in mind, it shouldn’t be too surprising that when Baptist minister Ross Chandler* in Marble Falls, Texas asked children in his congregation to explain part of the Bible, their response very quickly devolved into the song *Let It Go*. Even more telling, Chandler was so delighted with children confusing the words of the Bible with the words of Disney, he made it into youtube video.

As *Today* observed:

Who knew the New Testament had so much “Frozen” in it?

*Not to be confused with Pastor Matt Chandler, also in Texas.*
Perhaps the concept is a little easier to grasp when it isn’t a pretty cartoon character warbling, but Leo Moracchioli doing what is a more aesthetically honest version of the song. The only thing that would really improve upon the song is a video full of tattooed strippers on poles doing drugs that ends with snow falling upon a grave with a woman’s name and dates indicating that she died in her 20s.
Trevis Wax of The Gospel Coalition (TGC) asks Are We Missing the Point of Frozen’s ‘Let It Go’? Wax took his family to the movie expecting it to teach them a toxic moral message:

We took the family to see the film on Thanksgiving weekend, fully expecting the common, tired storyline of a princess being true to herself and finding salvation through romantic love. It is the Disney dogma, after all.

Wax was then surprised to see that the movie instead taught a good moral message:

Surprisingly, the movie’s storyline takes us in the opposite direction. The princess who is “true to herself” wreaks havoc on the world and leaves shattered relationships in her wake. Her devoted sister pursues her, even at great personal cost. And when all seems to be lost and you hope a prince will save the day with romantic love, there is instead a stunning portrait of self-sacrifice, described as the only kind of love that can melt a frozen heart.

But then, much to Wax’s surprise, the audience seems to take away the same toxic message he expected when he took his family to see it:

“Let it Go” is the stand-out song on the soundtrack due to its beautiful melody and memorable lyric. The music video has been viewed more than 88 million times. But the success of this particular song leaves me scratching my head, especially when you consider its place in Frozen’s storyline.

If there ever was a song that summed up the Disney doctrine of “being true to yourself” and “following your feelings” no matter the consequences, it’s “Let it Go.”

... Thousands of little girls across the country are singing this song – a manifesto of sorts, a call to cast off restraint, rebel against unrealistic expectations and instead be true to whatever you feel most deeply inside. What’s ironic is that the movie’s storyline goes against the message of this song. When the princess decides to “let it go,” she brings terrible evil into the world. The fallout from her actions is devastating. “No right, no wrong, no rules for me” is the sin that isolates the princess and freezes her kingdom.

Wax took his family to learn what he expected would be a toxic moral message, and then was surprised when the message was good after all. But then, Wax is baffled as to why the audience took away the very toxic message he expected all along. How could millions of women and girls miss the point, when Wax so clearly gets it?

This kind of mental gymnastics takes a great deal of effort, just like physical gymnastics.
HT Darwinian Arminian

Related: Solipsism as a religious experience.
Aging lonely feminist humor.
by Dalrock | November 20, 2017 | Link

AutoZone is running a commercial titled Fix Finder advising their customers that AutoZone thinks they are idiots:

This is a strange message for a DIY store, because much of the payoff for fixing things yourself is the feeling of mastery that comes with it. So why would AutoZone spend a large sum of money telling their ostensible target audience you’d have to be an idiot to shop there? Why would AutoZone go to so much trouble to associate going to their store with looking like a fool?

In the DFW area AutoZone is one of the big two parts stores. However, I very seldom go there, because in my experience the cranky middle aged woman in the commercial would have been better cast in the role of the AutoZone employee than the bitter wife of the loser who shops at AutoZone. The only thing I did tend to go to AutoZone for was car batteries. I’ve had decent luck with their batteries and like the fact that the warranty isn’t pro rated. This isn’t something I had given much thought to, it had simply become a habit. If I needed a battery, I went to AutoZone. If I needed anything else, I went to O’Reilly.

However, a few days after I saw this commercial the battery on the car my wife drives went out. After I pulled it out I decided to check out the batteries at O’Reilly first. It turns out they don’t pro rate their warranty either, so I bought the replacement battery there. As luck would have it later that same day I found that the power steering pump on my truck was leaking, and when I took the serpentine belt off to get a better look I found that the belt tensioner was shot too. Those last two items don’t represent lost share of wallet for AutoZone, because I would have gone to O’Reilly for them anyway. However they do show that I (with my 20 year old truck) am in the target market.

But AutoZone both by their hiring practices and their advertisements seems to eschewing the DIY car repair market (almost exclusively men), and trying to make their business on a new market. The comments on the commercial at Youtube offer a hint at who that new market might be. Denise Robb responded:

This is exciting. My check engine light comes on all the time and this will save me running to a mechanic and potentially getting charged for things I don’t need.
Thanks.

Kylie D responded:

I actually used this. As a single woman it was so nice to know what was wrong when my ‘check engine light’ came on, before going to a mechanic! Gave me more confidence. Then I spent time in the store getting other things I needed and could
Interestingly, both women’s profile images resemble the cranky middle aged woman in the commercial. It turns out that Denise Robb does bitter feminist stand up comedy: Kylie D (Kylie Delre) is likewise a comic of sorts. She also appears to be the actress who played the cranky middle aged woman in the commercial:

But the commercial still doesn’t make sense if you assume AutoZone is targeting women in general. Young single women aren’t going to identify with the bitter aging wife with a loser husband. And most married women don’t aspire to be the bitter aging wife of a loser either. But the ad does work for a narrow category of women, bitter aging unmarried feminists. They can watch the ad and laugh at all three of the participants. They may be bitter cat ladies, but at least they aren’t like the losers who shop or work at AutoZone, and at least they don’t have a loser husband!

This is a strange niche market for AutoZone to go all in on, but they do seem to have their message zeroed in quite well.

**Update:** You can’t make this stuff up. Here is a video of Denise Robb doing a routine about her cat.
In response to my last post, several readers mentioned that they had no idea what the AutoZone Fix Finder 30 commercial was about. Other readers didn’t find anything objectionable with the way AutoZone portrayed the men who shopped and worked there. I think these two issues are linked. AutoZone spent so much energy denigrating men in the commercial that the point of the ad was lost. At the same time, denigrating men is so normal in our culture that it can be hard to notice it, or even imagine a commercial not doing so.

Interestingly AutoZone has a Spanish version of the Fix Finder 30 commercial. Perhaps some of my Spanish speaking readers will pick up on an anti father message in the commercial, but just looking at the Spanish version it strikes me how much better both the AutoZone employee and the customer are portrayed:

For reference, here is the English version again:

From a marketing perspective both commercials are trying to get across the same brand/value message, but visually at least the Spanish version seems to do a much better job (try watching both with the sound off). In the English version the brand/value message is so overwhelmed by the bitter anti-man message that it is difficult to even detect. Here is the synopsis of the English version of the commercial’s message from ispot.tv:

| AutoZone provides its Fix Finder engine tool to help customers check their engine light on the spot, then offers mechanics to help them get the most likely fix. This couple discovered their problem was most likely an O2 sensor, and they can get it repaired right away. Turns out the husband didn’t have to wait a whole month to get that looked at...because it totally just came on yesterday. |

Here is the English translation of the same synopsis from the Spanish commercial on youtube (via Google translate):

| The rivalries of fans will exist. But when it comes to your car, the AutoZone team is always by your side. With Fix Finder, you find the problem when your ‘check engine’ light comes on. Free. Hopefully the rivalries between fans would be solved that easy. |

In the Spanish version the rivalry exists because the youngest son is rooting for a different team than his father and older brother. This is light and airy compared to the dark, bitter feminist contempt the wife has for her husband in the English version.

**Update:** Welcome Instapundit readers.
The other day I pointed out that part of the benefit of DIY is the feeling of mastery that comes with it. There is a related benefit, and that is the enjoyment that comes from practicing traditional sex roles. When your wife cooks something for you, it tastes better. This is true even if what she cooks is imperfect; it is an expression of service and love. Likewise, my wife had wanted a new chest of drawers for a good while. After urging her for years to pick out one that she liked and buy it, I finally broke down and made her one.

I could have knocked out a bare bones pine chest of drawers and she would have loved it. But I wouldn’t have loved it, as I would always know I could have done better. So I made her as nice a piece as I could out of cedar. It isn’t perfect, but she prizes it more than if I had spent a few grand to buy her the best chest of drawers I could find. It tastes better because her man made it for her.

There is a profound beauty in the pleasure we can give to one another as men and women, but our culture despises this very beauty. Feminism is founded on avoiding two virtues the ugly feminist can’t stand, feelings gratitude and love:

1. Feelings of gratitude toward men.

This is the sentiment behind the slogan:

| I don’t want to have to depend on a man to...

This twisted feeling is so prevalent that we don’t even notice it. It feels normal to us that a woman would order her life around never depending on a man (or men), and therefore never risking feeling grateful to a man. This is why every unit of our armed forces must be open to women. The number of women who supposedly benefit from opening up special forces or submarines is so minuscule it isn’t even a rounding error. But once women are in all units of the armed forces, never again will women suffer the indignity of feeling grateful to men for protecting them. Never again will they hear the unbearable words Thanks to the men who sacrificed so much for us without feminists chiming in “and women too!” This is why no unit can be left untouched, even the most elite ones.

2. Acts of service to others.

Ugly feminists likewise can’t stand the idea of serving others, especially if these acts of service come out of (and/or evoke) a feeling of love for others. They are so obsessed with not showing Christian love that they make it a priority not to serve their own families. Cooking, cleaning, and caring for their own husbands and children is a concept which is repulsive to them. Acts of service to others are in their twisted minds traps to be avoided, and many go so far as to order their entire lives around avoiding showing love to others, especially their families. These women are so gripped by miserliness they have made it a priority not to show love to their own children. When they find themselves unable to avoid an act of service
and love to their families altogether, they first steel their hearts with resentment, turning their hearts to stone to avoid the feelings of selfless love they live in constant terror of developing.

Even worse, our society is so thoroughly feminist that the values of the ugly feminist have seeped into every nook and cranny of our culture. This is most easily spotted with the venom directed at women who break the ultimate taboo: women who dare to not only bake for their men, but who do so out of a genuine desire to serve. Baking for men is in our culture seen as the ultimate trap, one that every woman, even conservative Christian women, needs to be ever vigilant to avoid. It is the absolute opposite of the strong empowered woman. Sure, serve your man (if you must!), but beware the trap of baking out of a desire to please your man! The warnings are everywhere. Even Pastor Doug Wilson explains that the very idea offends his modern sensibilities in *Unleashing Your Inner Fundamentalist*:

> A fundamentalist woman in a sun bonnet and a gingham dress, who gets a wicker basket to go pick blueberries, so she can bake her man a *pie*, with a golden crust, the kind he likes, may be a little bit hokey for your tastes, and certainly for mine. But at least she is trying to achieve an effect that the Bible says women should strive for — she wants to be modest and discrete. She is not trying to achieve an effect that the Bible never urges women to strive for, as in “edgy.” Or “provocative, but not too skanky for an evangelical.” She may be playing the instrument badly, but at least she is playing the right one.

The blockquote formatting makes italics in the original harder to spot, but notice the sneering emphasis on pie: “so she can bake her man a *pie*, with a golden crust, the kind he likes...”.

And yet, despite the fact that this ugliness thoroughly pervades our culture, the beautiful truth is that nothing is stopping women who want to bless their men from rejecting this twisted sentiment. Likewise, nothing is stopping men from blessing our women in similar ways.

*There is a caveat to this. If giving her flowers would result in resentment instead of gratitude, giving her something much more meaningful will be even worse.

**Imagine a man obsessed with ordering his life so that he never had to depend on a woman, never had to suffer feelings of *gratitude* for women. We would instantly spot this bitterness for the twisted sentiment that it is. Yet in women this strikes us as perfectly normal, and even a *good* thing. We don’t worry when a woman is gripped by this twisted sentiment, but instead when she is *not* gripped by it.
Cowardly cisgendered men forcing heroic transgendered women to fight in their place.
by Dalrock | November 27, 2017 | Link

Back on Oct 30th, the New York Times announced the latest setback for President Trump: Judge Blocks Trump’s Ban on Transgender Troops in Military

The leadership of the complementarian Christian movement was expectedly livid at this ruling. Here was yet another case of cowardly cisgendered men forcing heroic trans women to serve in their place. Pastor John Piper, one of the founders of the Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (CBMW), excoriated the cowardly cis men behind the judge’s ruling:

> If I were the last cis man on the planet to think so, I would want the honor of saying no trans woman should go before me into combat to defend my country. A cis man who endorses trans women in combat is not pro-trans woman; he’s a wimp. He should be ashamed. For most of history, in most cultures, he would have been utterly scorned as a coward to promote such an idea...

Piper reinforced this in a separate statement:

> The courage of trans women will show itself in a hundred ways. But when a cis man is around, he will not exploit that courage to fight the battle where he belongs.

Joe Carter’s response to the ruling was very similar:

> Unfortunately, many cis men will be more than willing to allow trans women in combat if it will lessen their chances of having to defend their country in wartime. One of the harsh realities we face is that American society is filled with cis men who are anti-trans woman cowards.

Denny Burke was concerned that this ruling could one day lead to trans women being drafted:

> Perhaps some people believe that trans women ought to be able to volunteer for whatever job they are qualified to do. But what if the draft were reinstated? Under the right conditions, the draft would be a very real possibility, and that specter of a draft is really clarifying. It’s one thing for trans women to volunteer for combat service. It’s an entirely different matter for them to be drafted into it.

Owen Strachan, former president of the CBMW, responded to the ruling with Trans women in combat: A complementarian perspective:

> If cis men will not own this responsibility, then trans women will be forced to take it on....
And in another statement Strachan reinforced this concern:

...the call by cis men for trans women to fight in their place is the height of cowardice, and worthy of the strongest possible rebuke.
The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman’s garment: for all that do so are abomination unto the LORD thy God.

-Deut 22:5 KJV

Back in August of 2016 Pastor John Piper published an interview with Rob Smith titled Why Did the Transgender Revolution Catch Us by Surprise?

This week we are talking about transgender, a topic of frequent inquiry from our readers, and to help us, we welcome Rob Smith to the podcast. Rob is a theologian who lectures in systematic theology and ethics at Sydney Missionary and Bible College in Australia. He is also an honorary assistant minister at St Andrew’s Anglican Cathedral in Sydney.

He approaches the topic of the transgender revolution as a biblical theologian, as a historian of the movement, and as a pastor whose own family has been touched by gender dysphoria. It hits close to home for him.

Smith gives a good high level summary of the historic movements that brought us to our current state, including:

- Feminism and the idea that gender is a social construct
- Homosexual acceptance
- The sexual revolution

It is worth reading at the link above. Overall the explanation is good, but I want to zero in on a massive blind spot for conservative Christians; feminist envy and rebellion. Specifically, feminists have worked tirelessly to remove the stigma from women dressing like men. Feminists have been so successful here that the very idea of a woman “dressing like a man” is foreign to our current thinking.

Deut 22:5 tells us that men dressing like women, and women dressing like men is an abomination to God. The Bible doesn’t give us a strict dress code for men and women, although Pastor Wilson explains that a literal translation of the verse would prohibit women from wearing combat gear.

Notice the odd construction — “that which pertains to a man.” The Hebrew underneath is keli geber, and should be read as the “gear of a warrior.” Whether we are talking about a man in fishnet stockings, or a woman decked out in full battle regalia, we need to recognize that God finds it loathsome. So should we.

This brings to mind an insult that was already dated when I was a child:
Your mother wears combat boots!

One dictionary of British and American English catch phrases explains that other variants of the same insult included:

Your mother drives a tank!
Your mother eats K rations!

I know as a child that I always assumed the combat boots insult was an accusation that your mother was unfeminine, or manly. It would be like saying your father wears a dress, or women’s undergarments. Not surprisingly, according to the dictionary linked above another variant of the insult was:

ah, yer mother wears cotton drawers!

All of these insults most obviously shame the person for having a mother who is unfeminine, or to use a similarly dated phrase, unladylike. The problem is, for decades we have been taught that there is nothing shameful about a woman dressing like and acting like a man. This is so much the case that it is really difficult to conceive of what would be considered cross-dressing for a woman in our culture, including modern conservative Christian culture. Which of the following would cause a modern woman to be shamed for being a cross dresser?

- Wearing jeans instead of dresses and skirts? Nope.
- Wearing boxer shorts? Nope.
- Joining the army and driving a tank, eating field rations, and wearing combat boots? Nope.
- Dressing up like a lumberjack? Nope.
- Wearing a man’s haircut? Nope.

A woman today who dresses like a man might be chided for her questionable fashion sense, but she wouldn’t seen as cross dressing. For a woman to be considered a cross dresser, she would have to go to the greatest extremes. Not only would she have to make herself look like a man in every way, she would have to actually claim to be a man for us to consider her a cross dresser.

Contrast this with a man who does any of the below. Is he seen as a cross dresser?

- Wears women’s underwear? Yes.
- Wears women’s dresses or skirts (excluding kilts)? Yes.
- Wears women’s shoes? Yes.

We have in our culture two kinds of clothing/styles:

1. Clothing and styles everyone can wear.
2. Clothing and styles men must not wear.

From a practical perspective, it is all but impossible for a woman to cross dress in our culture. We have great difficulty even conceiving of the idea. Cross dressing in our culture is
something that almost exclusively pertains to men, because a woman cross dressing is simply normal. From this perspective, we were already half way to accepting cross dressing as far back as the 1980s. We’ve lived for decades rejecting the idea that something God detests is even possible. Even worse, we have denied that our perspective on the issue has changed. We forgot it, and then we forgot that we forgot it.

Conservative Christians are as blind to this as the rest of our culture, if not more so. Men like Piper have spent a lifetime pretending that women (including conservative Christian women) aren’t in open rebellion. When after decades of activism women were finally able to push their way into combat roles in the US military, Piper and his colleagues went into fever dream mode, pretending that men were forcing reluctant women to act like men. Piper wrote:

If I were the last man on the planet to think so, I would want the honor of saying no woman should go before me into combat to defend my country. A man who endorses women in combat is not pro-woman; he’s a wimp.

And:

Women may be more courageous than men in any given situation. They may have nobler vision. They may be smarter. That is not the issue. What God has written on our hearts and designed for our survival and our joy is the issue. Manhood puts itself forward between the women and the enemy. That is part of what manhood means. That is who we are by God’s design. The courage of women will show itself in a hundred ways. But when a man is around, he will not exploit that courage to fight the battle where he belongs.

Owen Strachan wrote:

...the call by men for women to fight in their place is the height of cowardice, and worthy of the strongest possible rebuke.

And:

If men will not own this responsibility, then women will be forced to take it on as did biblical women such as Deborah and Jael...

Acknowledging reality was simply too terrifying, so they pretended it wasn’t happening and tried to distract us with cartoonish chivalry. This kind of absurd denial of what was going on right in front of our faces left us blind to the very idea of cross dressing for half of the population. Now that we have fully accepted cross dressing for women, the path for doing the same for men is already paved.
Via Breitbart, Disney has premiered their first male princess in Star vs. The Forces of Evil:

As Breitbart noted, the same Disney cartoon featured Disney’s first gay kissing scene on TV back in March. Note how the supposed purity of romantic love is used to sell the concept.
If you haven’t watched Tucker Carlson’s new show on Fox*, it is worth watching purely for entertainment value. Carlson has an unmatched ability to get his guests to say the most ridiculous things. It is truly extraordinary.

 Earlier this week Carlson interviewed Stephen Ledrew, formerly the president of Canada’s Liberal Party, regarding Canadian teachers being taught about the “LGGBDTTTIQQAAPP community.”

 Well, the tolerance police have a lot of power here in America, in case you haven’t noticed, but they’re even stronger in Canada. Just yesterday Canadian prime minister Justin Trudeau delivered an official apology to gay and transgender Canadians for the past state discrimination against them. But now, teachers in Durham, Ontario, had to attend an inclusiveness training course for the—deep breath—here—LGGBDTTTIQQAAPP community, which is apparently a community. That 15-letter acronym, intended to encompass all sexual minorities, may soon be required soon at schools.

 Anyone trying to defend the obvious absurdity of LGGBDTTTIQQAAPP is naturally going to need to play a game of motte and bailey. In the interview, Ledrew does his best to pretend that no one really wants to make LGGBDTTTIQQAAPP part of the culture, as LGBTQ is the acronym everyone currently uses. As the argument goes, critics like Carlson are the ones being absurd by even bringing the idea of LGGBDTTTIQQAAPP up. But Carlson knows that Ledrew has a problem; Ledrew can’t criticize the absurdity of LGGBDTTTIQQAAPP without risking the wrath of the SJWs behind this latest culture war offensive. Ledrew wants to imply that no one takes LGGBDTTTIQQAAPP seriously, but he simultaneously has to take LGGBDTTTIQQAAPP seriously or he knows he will be cast out of the warren for being insufficiently inclusive.

 Watch as Carlson calmly and effortlessly maneuvers Ledrew from the motte to the bailey, forcing Ledrew to either defend the indefensible or betray the SJW objective. As so often happens on Carlson’s program, hilarity ensues.

 *I was pleasantly surprised at how good Carlson is at his craft, as I have been critical of him in the past.
Cane Caldo nails it in But Pants Aren’t in the Bible!

The fundamental issue of restricting men’s clothes from women is about whether or not it is acceptable for men (the heads of society) to exclude women. And the answer from everyone (but most egregiously from Christians) is: “No.”

These comments about women’s pants in Asia, or Roman men’s robes, are totally wrongheaded. Whether legs are wrapped versus draped, and which for whom, is a subjective decision of a society. However, subjective does not mean irrelevant, or unimportant. It means we should use our freedom to orient towards the good, the true, and the beautiful. That orientation is more important than whether or not we can suss out the Natural Law of Pants and Robes.[1] The search for the science of pants is a silly distraction used by the perverse and libertine to discredit and mock sound cultural standards and further the destruction of good order. They are like so-called environmentalists who uproot gardens so that weeds may flourish “naturally”.

Don’t worry. We’ll get used to it.
by Dalrock | December 6, 2017 | Link

The Daily Mail ran an article this past summer titled: **Talented ten-year-old boy takes the beauty industry by storm with his flawless make-up looks**

In our current culture it seems strange to see a young boy (or a man) made up the way young Jack is made up. But the Social Justice Warriors have a plan to make what looks freakish to us today feel entirely normal. The Daily Mail quotes Jake-Jamie Ward:

> ‘Seeing Jack’s Instagram photo’s have absolutely melted my heart, it so lovely to see a young boy so confident within his own skin.

> ‘I think it’s an excellent idea to embrace makeup at a young age – it’s creative, it’s fun, it’s art!

> ‘The #MakeUplsGenderless campaign was geared towards making these changes - to help create a world whereby future generations can freely grow up being who they personally want to be, therefore seeing movements like these leave me bursting with pride and with a huge sense of hope for the future.’

The conservative impulse is to dismiss this kind of “progressive” gender bending plan as something that doesn't stand a chance. **They will never make it seem normal for a boy to look like that,** we tell ourselves. Yet this is surely what conservatives back in the 40s and 50s said to themselves when feminists set out to remove “confining” “gender conforming” limitations for **women.** What strikes us as freaky today will very likely seem as normal to our children and grandchildren as **these women** seem to us today. Yet if you could somehow travel back in time to the 40s and 50s and show them what feels perfectly normal to us today, they would be incredulous.

**Half** of all crossdressing feels perfectly normal to us. It is in fact now a tradition we are quite proud of. Why should we expect the other half to feel any different in a few more decades?

HT Red Pill Latecomer. See also **His Eye Makeup Is Way Better Than Yours**
Vox Day has a post up on a new shirt he designed for Crypto Fashion:

One of Vox’s readers thought I would have an issue with the message of the shirt:

This is the sort of thing Dalrock rips to shreds every chance he gets. I don’t always agree with every detail of his argument but it’s definitely worth thinking about.

I think Vox’s reader is probably thinking about my post Scaring away the competition.

Vox and I live in different parts of the world, so this probably accounts for our different perspectives. Based on my reading of Vox’s statements on the topic, I take it that Vox sees this as simply a loving father committing to protect his daughter, with no feminist connotations. In my neck of the woods (redneck heaven*) the shirt pictured above would be well loved as a signal to young men that all sexual encounters with said daughter will occur on the daughter’s terms. It would be loved as an announcement of moxie, sexual liberation and empowerment, enforced by the girl’s father.

*As a card carrying AR 15 shooting redneck, I use the term with all affection.
Cartoonish chivalry, drill instructor edition.

by Dalrock | December 7, 2017 | Link

Simplytimothy linked to the Rules for dating a drill instructor’s daughter.

The DI’s daughter has a penchant for thugs. Saying no to his daughter is frightening and therefore out of the question, so the fictional drill instructor invokes cartoonish chivalry to seem traditional.

Rule Three:
I am aware that it is considered fashionable for boys of your age to wear their trousers so loosely that they appear to be falling off their hips. Please don’t take this as an insult, but you and all of your friends are complete idiots. Still, I want to be fair and open minded about this issue, so I propose his compromise: You may come to the door with your underwear showing and your pants ten sizes too big, and I will not object. However, in order to ensure that your clothes do not, in fact, come off during the course of your date with my daughter, I will take my electric nail gun and fasten your trousers securely in place to your waist.

She also has a penchant for players. The important part is that the player plays by her rules, until she is done with him:

Rule Six:
I have no doubt you are a popular fellow, with many opportunities to date other girls. This is fine with me as long as it is okay with my daughter. Otherwise, once you have gone out with my little girl, you will continue to date no one but her until she is finished with you. If you make her cry, I will make you cry.

She is a precious snowflake, and daddy DI is there to make sure the parade of thugs and cads know how to respond:

Rule Seven:
As you stand in my front hallway, waiting for my daughter to appear, and more than an hour goes by, do not sigh and fidget. If you want to be on time for the movie, you should not be dating. My daughter is putting on her makeup, a process that can take longer than painting the Golden Gate Bridge. Instead of just standing there, why don’t you do something useful, like changing the oil in my car?

She has a habit of taking off her clothes and falling on her back. The job of the thug/cad is to make sure she isn’t in an environment where she is most likely to spontaneously do this:

Rule Eight:
The following places are not appropriate for a date with my daughter: Places where there are beds, sofas, or anything softer than a wooden stool. Places where there are no parents, policemen, or nuns within eyesight. Places where there is darkness. Places where there is dancing, holding hands, or happiness. Places where the
ambient temperature is warm enough to induce my daughter to wear shorts, tank tops, midriff T-shirts, or anything other than overalls, a sweater, and a goose down parka – zipped up to her throat. Movies with a strong romantic or sexual theme are to be avoided; movies which features chain saws are okay. Hockey games are okay. Old folks homes are better.

Lastly, the most important rule is to take the clown looking out the window in camo makeup seriously:

Rule Ten:
Be afraid. Be very afraid. It takes very little for me to mistake the sound of your car in the driveway for a chopper coming in over a rice paddy near Hanoi. When my Agent Orange starts acting up, the voices in my head frequently tell me to clean the guns as I wait for you to bring my daughter home. As soon as you pull into the driveway you should exit your car with both hands in plain sight. Speak the perimeter password, announce in a clear voice that you have brought my daughter home safely and early, then return to your car – there is no need for you to come inside. The camouflaged face at the window is mine.
An Australian father wasn’t able to keep his daughter away from the head of the local biker gang. After two years of pleading, he and his son joined the biker gang to provide overwatch:

A FATHER has told of the extraordinary steps he took to protect his daughter from a gang member — by joining the gang himself.

Stephen Pattman was living an ordinary life in suburbia when he learned his daughter Chloe, who was then 19 years old, had begun a relationship with ACT Rebels president Ali Bilal.

From the article, the time-line appears to be:

1. Daughter bangs Harley McBadboy for two years, while Daddy begs her to stop.
2. Father and son join the biker gang for three years to escort her ride.
3. Father and son leave the gang, and are harassed for an undisclosed period of time until the father fires a gun near the head of one of the gang members.
4. Father and son hide out in the wilderness for a year.
5. Father and son return from the wilderness. Father pleads guilty to endangering life and unauthorised use of a prohibited firearm. As of the date of the article (July 2017) he was awaiting sentence.

Since the daughter and Harley McBadboy are still together, this would mean they have been together for over six years. Fortunately, Harley McBadboy has seen the error of his ways and left the gang.

Despite the possibility of jail, he didn't regret joining the gang. He’d spoken to Chloe, who told him Bilal was no longer in the gang scene.
If she has enough self esteem she won’t tingle for Harley McBadboy

by Dalrock | December 7, 2017 | Link

Over a series of comments, Michael offers the conventional wisdom that women are attracted to bad boys because they lack self esteem:

...Girls are fragile and they want to be loved. If you would rather they do not desperately seek out male attention, any male attention then surround them with love, teach them healthy self esteem and equip them with the tools they need to say no to the jerks and users...

...The message is about surrounding your girls with love and regular reminders of their INHERENT self worth. Such a girl is a hard target for the jerks...

...the fool is reduced to mocking the notion that girls need a strong sense of self worth to fend of the manipulative jerks who prey on the big girls, the akward, the late bloomers, even the pretty ones with a bad case of ‘hate myself’. You are not man enough to to put aside your own bloated fragile ego nor intelligent enough to fathom what some girls need to epuip them for the losers, the cads, the jerk boys and the users...

This is of course the wisdom of our age. This belief varies slightly from the secular left to the religious right, but the fundamental message is the same. As Michael points out, the left and right disagree on the source of this all important self esteem:

Now as to your implication that girls have TOO MUCH self-esteem? I won’t mock you since you post was serious, misguided but serious. There is a difference between self-esteem and the sugary grill power black power gay power sap that is cooked by harveywood and the educrats. One is internal, lasting, and calibrated on real characteristics such as compassion, beauty, intelligence, and real accomplishments such as academic or athletic achievement. The former is empty and hollow and is typically based on identity alone i.e. you are worthwhile because you are black, or a girl, or a black lesbian girl. Those aren’t accomplishments nor are they characteristics which have any value in themselves. Yeah you are a girl, so what? But: I am a smart girl, or a pretty girl, or a kind and generous girl and I can afford to act like a lady while my friends compete in the slutstakes pageant and wait for a man who wants a virtuous girl rather than a slut. That’s the real deal self-esteem, with consequences of the good variety for those young ladies who have it.

The secular left teaches that self esteem should come from group membership. The secular right on the other hand teaches women that their value comes from their beauty, etc.

But modern Christians have everyone beat in this game, teaching women that they won’t be attracted to bad boys if they understand that they are the daughter of the King. The 700
Club’s Wendy Griffith explains that women (and not salvation) are what Christ was talking about in the parable of the pearl of great price:

Well you know “You are a prize to be won” it was a word that God spoke to me years ago, before I was even in that relationship. I guess I hadn’t been tested on it. Because I was even preaching it to other women “You are a prize to be won” and they were getting it like “Yeah!” But until I got into that relationship and I realized that I didn’t really know my value. I didn’t know that I had that value that God talks about in His word. And if we don’t know that, if we don’t know that we’re that pearl of great price. You know, that we’re royal daughters. If we don’t know that, again we’ll settle for much less.

Griffith teaches the very same conventional wisdom that Michael teaches in the preface to her book You Are A Prize to be Won!: Don’t Settle for Less Than God’s Best:

There are many reasons why we as women cannot properly gauge our worth. Whether we’ve been raised by parents or a parent who simply didn’t know how to nurture and raise an emotionally healthy child, whether we have allowed society, men or a man in our past (or present) to define who we are instead of what God says about us, or whether we have endured cheating, physical abuse or emotional abuse at the hands of a man we thought would always protect us, there are numerous reasons why women enter relationships with the wrong men. The bottom line is we begin to believe the lie that we’re really not worth that much, and we end up being attracted to men who can never truly love us the way we long and deserve to be loved.

Griffith closes the preface with a reminder to the women reading that they are the pearl of great price:

My sister, God has a special word for you that will change your life. You are a royal daughter of the Most High King, a princess in the palace, a pearl of great price and beautiful beyond measure. Your greatest love, the man of your dreams and the father of your children, is out there waiting for you, because you, my sister, are a prize to be won!

As a culture we are drenched in this kind of thinking, and it is flat out cruel to women and girls to teach them that if their heart desires something that isn’t good, the problem is they don’t have enough self esteem.
Devouring a lifetime of courtship.
by Dalrock | December 8, 2017 | Link

I’ve written in the past about women’s complaints that men aren’t meeting their expectations for courtship, and why it is **entirely rational** for men to either withdraw from traditional courtship altogether or limit and carefully target their courtship expenditure. Women have (as a group) greatly expanded the period of time they expect men to court them.

![Median Age of First Marriage](https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/demo/tables/families/time-series/marital/ms2.xls)

**He gets the desert. She gets dessert.**

The poster child for women drawing their husband search out has to be the 700 Club’s Wendy Griffith. Griffith urges Christian women to slow down in their husband search in order to hold out for the perfect man God has in store for them. 53 year old Griffith* dedicated her book on the topic:

| To my future husband: I know you will be worth the wait!

But what about her imagined future husband? Will it be worth the wait for **him**? If she’s 53 and still hasn’t found him yet, he’ll probably be in his 50s or early 60s by the time they marry. Will 30-40 years of courtship all be worth it to marry a woman who is too old to have
children, a woman who spent her youth building her career while forming and dissolving romantic attachments with a parade of other men? Was it really God’s plan for him to spend 40 years wandering in a sexual desert, buying an endless string of unserious and ever more demanding women dinner (and more), to ultimately marry a woman in her 50s?

As a sign of our age, not one of the 98 reviews currently on Amazon.com points out how ridiculous it is for a never married woman in her fifties to offer herself as a husband hunting role model. Griffith doesn’t say she did everything right, but her takeaway from a lifetime of not finding a husband was that she needs to slow down and be more demanding. Chapter 11 is titled:

You Are Worth the Price of Dinner and Dessert!

Griffith is so proud of this chapter that she published it as an article at CBN and elsewhere. Read the whole thing to see the full absurdity. She closes the chapter with:

God wants you to know that you are worth the price of dinner and dessert—and so much more! You are worth someone being “extravagant,” even lavish, over. After all, you are a daughter of the Most High King, a royal treasure, a beautiful masterpiece, a pearl of great price. You are a lady, and a true gentleman will recognize your value and act accordingly. Don’t settle and don’t forget to order dessert.

Related:

- She needs more men!
- How should women respond to men withdrawing from courtship?

*See this podcast.
Novaseeker notes that Wendy Griffith is well above average in attractiveness for women her age, and speculates that she really isn’t serious about finding a husband:

Griffith is well, well above average looking for her age. She’s in the top 5-10% of women in their mid 50s, easily. That in and of itself makes her advice almost completely useless for the average woman of 53, never mind the average woman of 43 or even 35...

Which leads me to my final point. I doubt that she is genuinely serious about getting married. Self-deception is a powerful thing, but almost all women at 53 know the score when it comes to the marketplace they’re in, and they either deal with it realistically or, in many cases, just abstain because they don’t like the market. I am guessing that Griffith is doing the “soft” version of the latter — not really very serious about finding a husband (I mean how can she be with the approach she is taking at 53), but selling average women the fantasy that they, too, can find a superlative, fantastic man themselves if they are never married at 53. She can’t be serious, really — it’s just unfortunate that so many *other* women are so gullible...

I think there must be some truth to this. However, it is important to remember that from Griffith’s point of view the men she is rejecting don’t matter. What matters to Griffith are the men who are rejecting her.

There is an old Game maxim that says whenever you meet an incredibly hot woman, remember that somewhere there is a man who is tired of her crap. The intent of the maxim is to prevent pedestalization, but I think it also should help us put ourselves in Griffith’s shoes. Sure she is attractive. But the men she finds attractive are rejecting her, and this is crushing. This is what her book is all about. Griffith cleverly titled her book with the harlot’s refrain:

Never Settle!

But what she is really saying is:

Never settle for the men who are rejecting you!

Yes, this is flat out nuts. But it really is the message of the book. From the description page at CBN:

Wendy Griffith had often preached to other women about being a prize to be won, but did not practice it. She didn’t realize her true value in Christ, and became the “beggar” in a year-long romance, begging for a few scraps of love. When her romance ended, she was devastated. Through her tears, God showed her that she had settled for emotional “crumbs.” She learned that God had so much more for her, (Eph. 3:20) and that she was a pearl of great price.
Now she shares her past heartache and experiences, defining what real love is and showing how you can guard your heart by recognizing the counterfeit. God’s love for you is extravagant and you shouldn’t settle for emotional crumbs. You are a prize to be won.

The book centers around a man she calls Michael, the one that got away. Michael was one among many men who responded to a segment Griffith did complaining that Christian men aren’t asking single women like her out:

Michael clearly stood out from the rest of the “interesting” inquiries I had received in response to my no-nonsense interview in which I had urged men to man up and not be afraid to ask women out!

Michael lived in another city, but immediately began courting her extravagantly. He would fly in drive for several hours every weekend and stay at a hotel to wine and dine her. Griffith loved the attention, but wasn’t that into him. As a result, she explains that she treated him coldly during the opening months of their courtship, especially when she was working and on the road. However, at some point Griffith decided that Michael had “unlocked her heart”, something a man hadn’t accomplished for decades (since her college boyfriend). But at this point the damage was already done; Michael was in love with her, but didn’t think it would be wise to marry her. Griffith was heartbroken when Michael explained this, and set out to change his mind by no longer being cold and bitchy. Griffith’s take away from this experience was that if Michael was really the one, he would not have grown hesitant to marry her just because she treated him badly while he pulled out all of the stops to win her over. Her mistake was not the months she spent treating this one in a thousand man badly; her mistake was the months she spent trying to make it up to him. This is the thesis of her book. Griffith had forgotten that she was the prize to be won, that she was the pearl of great price. The book is a vow never to make that mistake again, and to warn younger women not to fall into the same trap.

The story of her being worth dinner and desert also stems from a rejection of sorts, by a man she clearly felt was beneath her:

A few years ago, I was asked out by a college professor whom I assumed had a good-paying job, although the jalopy he drove and his sloppy appearance said otherwise. But it had been an embarrassingly long time since my last date, and I was determined to give this guy a chance. On our first date, he took me to a classy steakhouse, where we both enjoyed top-of-the-line steaks surrounded by an elegant atmosphere.

On our second date, we had pizza, and on our third date, we were at a cute little fish shack by the beach when this guy suddenly brought up the bill. “I think we should split the check,”...

...This man told me that I was extravagant and not a good steward of other people’s money, namely his. He actually made me cry (not in front of him, but later)! I was so upset at being called extravagant simply because I had expected him to treat me
like a lady...

The very title of the book comes from the time she asked a man she was attracted to out to dinner, and he **politely declined**:

I had been in Florida covering Terri Schiavo’s right-to-life case, one of the biggest stories of 2005... I asked a guy out who was closely involved with the story and with whom I’d been working all day if he’d like to go out to dinner. He was my age, handsome and a single Christian like I was, and after a whirlwind day of interviews and a few laughs, I rationalized that it would be fine to ask him to have dinner with me instead of dining alone. His response was not what I had been expecting: “I have to go to the gym.”

I felt sick! It was as if someone had punched me in the stomach... Discouraged and a little mad at myself, I drove back to the hotel alone, when suddenly I heard the unmistakable voice of the Lord in my spirit. He whispered so clearly to me, Wendy, you are a prize to be won!

I knew the Lord’s voice, and I knew that He was speaking to me about my value. I didn’t need to be the one pursuing in a relationship or running around like a chicken with my head cut off, looking for love in all the wrong places. God has my man, and that man is going to recognize me as his prize! And the same goes for you.

Unfortunately, I have had to learn this lesson the hard way.

**Pearl of Great Price**

Ladies, the Lord wants you to know that you are a pearl of great price, a treasure worth pursuing and protecting. You are worth fighting for...
She made a mistake once.

by Dalrock | December 12, 2017 | Link

She thought she was wrong, but it turned out she wasn’t.

This is the lesson Wendy Griffith learned in the process of becoming a 53 year old never married career woman. After five months of dating, Griffith started pushing “Michael” for a marriage proposal. When Michael told her she was attractive but not marriage material, Griffith pushed for answers:

How could this guy who drove several hours every weekend to see me, spent big bucks on hotels, dinners and flowers and kissed me passionately, not see me as “the one”?...

...Michael told me that he had doubts about our relationship because of the way I had treated him when I was on the road for work, reporting in New York and elsewhere around the country during the previous months. “I didn’t feel like I had a girlfriend when you were traveling,” he told me. “You were so cold and distant.”

I apologized. Perhaps he was right. I had been a bit heavily focused on work, but truth be told, that had been months before, when I still hadn’t been too sure about us.

But the lesson of the book is that if Michael were the man God had chosen for her, he would have wanted to marry Griffith no matter how she treated him. Later on the same page Griffith confesses her sin, the sin of lacking faith in her own awesomeness (emphasis mine):

All I knew was that fear had seized every part of my being. As irrational as it may sound, I felt as if the circumstances were all my fault. The enemy of my soul had ruthlessly pushed the “rejection button”, and my life would never be the same.
Weak men are screwing her feminism up.

by Dalrock | December 12, 2017 | Link

As I mentioned before, Wendy Griffith tells us she met “Michael” after doing an interview with a Christian dating site, where she chastised Christian men for not manning up and asking Christian women out. Michael saw the interview and sent her an email through the site.

Michael clearly stood out from the rest of the “interesting” inquiries I had received in response to my no-nonsense interview in which I had urged men to man up and not be afraid to ask women out!

Based on the content and the timeline, this 2011 interview with ChristianCafe.com appears to be the interview that spurred Michael to ask her out.

The interviewer asked Griffith if part of the problem is that Christian men aren’t asking Christian women out. She replied:

Oh, absolutely. I was talking to a young guy at the gym the other day, and he said that he never asks women out. He was a nice guy and I asked him why. He said, “Oh, I got hurt once.” You know, be a man! That’s part of life to take risks! I’m not going to ask a guy out. I don’t think it’s my place. I was taught that men like a challenge and they are the hunters and all that. I was shocked that this guy was just going to let all the women ask him out, because it was less risky. Something is wrong with that picture and I certainly don’t think that was the way God intended it. I think that men need to step up and take a chance!

Michael watched the interview and surely thought to himself Why not take a chance? What’s the worst thing that could happen? In retrospect, plenty! Aside from what Griffith tells us was a sizable financial and time investment, he also was trashed by Griffith across Christian media (their common profession). She even wrote a book about what a terrible suitor he was! Granted, she didn’t give his full name, but she tells us he also has a successful career in Christian media. Surely many in his personal and professional circle know that he is the bad man who broke Griffith’s heart, prompting her to write a book warning all Christian women away from men like him!

If men have an obligation to man up and ask women out, women have an obligation to not drag the man through the mud if things don’t go as hoped. But Griffith’s one sided view of tradition comes out in other ways as well. While men must act traditionally by risking nuclear rejection and spending lavishly, women have no obligation to avoid the temptation to draw out the courtship process for decades. One of Griffith’s recurring complaints in the interview is that churches aren’t doing enough to cater to women like her who have drawn out their husband search into their 40s*:

I’ve never been married and I’m in my 40’s. There are a lot of families present, but it seems like the men come only after they’re married. The few guys that are there usually aren’t the “manly” men that I know I’m looking for. I think there is a lack of
“real” men in the church.

...

[Churches] have singles outreaches for the 20-something crowd and early 30’s, but they don’t have anything for those over 40. But, even if they did, the men just aren’t there! But, thank God that there are some ways to connect online. The men are out there, as the statistics show. But, finding them, that’s the issue.

In the same interview Griffith complains that Christian men need to *man up and get with the times* since women like her refuse to be confined to traditional roles:

**Interviewer:** Some men are intimidated by successful women such as yourself.

**Griffith:** Well, they need to get over it, because we’re here and we’re waiting! “Man-up” and come and find us. There are a lot of gorgeous single women in the church, so get the men in here!

*At the time of the interview just under seven years ago. Now she appears to be in her early 50s.*
No respect.
by Dalrock | December 14, 2017 | Link

Vox Day has created a bit of a stir with his post Low morale men. If you read the post, you will notice that there are two groups of men Vox doesn’t respect:

1. Men who do not marry and have children.
2. Men who marry and have children.

There is however a third category of men to whom Vox is holding out an implied promise of future respect. These are men who aspire to marry and have children, but haven’t yet done so. This is quite obviously a false promise, as once these men do as Vox instructs they will merely have moved from one category of men Vox doesn’t respect to another category of men he doesn’t respect.

This is of course a very common pattern in our age, as it is the same false promise of respect W. Bradford Wilcox, Jim Geraghty, Dennis Prager, and other men at National Review offer men if they marry.

The reality is that our current anti married father policies are merely the formal legal expression of our societal disrespect of married fathers. The men of National Review, and now sadly Vox, are searching for a way to motivate men to marry without offering married fathers respect. Though the details of their arguments differ, the form is the same; married fathers deserve the contempt the system has for them. If you disagree, your are either lazy or a coward.

The fact that men are concerned about the disrespect of married fathers only shows that they don’t deserve respect. Wilcox frames it this way in Hey Guys, Put a Ring on It:

There is no doubt that marriage requires sacrifices, and lots of them. Successful marriages require men to work harder, avoid cheating, spend less time with friends, and make a good-faith effort, day in and day out, to be emotionally present with their spouses. Many men find these sacrifices hard.

Vox makes a similar argument, but instead of saying that married fathers don’t deserve respect because they don’t work hard enough and aren’t emotionally available, he tells us we shouldn’t respect the modern married father due to his lack of commitment to murder-suicide (emphasis mine):

The truth is that men often suffer the legal order they deserve, because they tolerate it. Would any Roman patrician have meekly submitted to being made an indentured servant at the whim of his wife and the word of a judge?

No. He would have killed the judge, the wife, and everyone who assisted either of them, then calmly gone home and opened his veins in the bath. That’s why Roman law permitted patriarchs to kill those under their authority who crossed them in any
way – because they were going to do it anyway and the maintenance of legal order in their society relied upon acknowledging that reality.

But the modern man values his toys more than his honor. That’s why no one, including the legal system, respects his possession of either.

Feminism is a disease of envy. It spreads via women due to the temptation to envy the position of men. For men, it spreads via the temptation to declare oneself the only real man, as other men aren’t worthy of respect.
It’s complicated.
by Dalrock | December 18, 2017 | Link

Even when a woman sticks the landing, divorce still has strong class implications across generations. From Bloomberg’s Divorce Is Making American Families 66% Bigger

This holiday season, many Americans may need a flow chart to figure how they’re all related. What do you call, for example, your stepmother’s son’s live-in girlfriend’s 11-year-old son?

Related: The normalization of the trashy single mother.
Sporty spice had *one* job.
by Dalrock | December 19, 2017 | Link

Back on April 12th I wrote Sporty spice defends Springfield Armory’s legacy. For those who aren’t familiar with Springfield Armory’s new brand image, Springfield is identifying itself as the feminist defender of tradition. The google description of defendyourlegacy.com reads:

Since 1794, we’ve built our legacy by making firearms for the independent and the free.

If you go to the site, you will see looped footage of what happened when Springfield Armory handed AR 15s to six kick ass gals in spandex. If I’m interpreting the video correctly, originally the women were confused by the rifles, mistaking them for workout equipment. Eventually a man was able to explain that these were not barbells, but firearms, and was able to teach them how to load and fire them. The video ends with all six kick ass gals bravely standing guard over Springfield’s legacy. The text below the looped video reads:

LEGACY DEFENDED

The willing and capable who refuse to give into the growing plague of believing “somebody else is going to do it for me.”

This is where I left it on April 12th, with Springfield’s 223 year legacy* safely guarded by a band of kickass gals in spandex. Only recently did I learn that just two weeks later something went terribly wrong. Springfield’s lobbying arm was accused of colluding with anti-gun legislators in their home state of Illinois. The Truth About Guns April 27th headline read: Springfield Armory, Rock River Arms Trade Opposition to Illinois FFL Licensing Scheme for Carve-Out

It turns out that just months after Springfield Armory put sporty spice in charge of guarding their legacy, someone snuck up on them and tarnished it:

TTAG exposed the carve-out, unleashing a firestorm of criticism. Days after the news broke, Springfield and Rock River issued public statements denying any knowledge of the deal. By implication, they were saying that their lobbyist, Jay Keller, had gone rogue.

*Peasant pointed out that Springfield Armory Inc. was founded in 1974.
Brutal

by Dalrock | December 21, 2017 | Link

[The Duluth paradigm] blinds assessors to another source of threat to children; their mother. As we will see below, severe physical child abuse is more likely to be perpetrated by mothers than fathers.

— Dr. Donald G. Dutton

JudgyBitch shares her story of paternal alienation in First I feared him, then I loathed him, then I forgave him and now I take care of him: the story of my Father and me.

Both of her parents were violent when she was a young child, but her mother was the worse of the two:

| My mother was ecstatically violent, and my father less so, but they were both culpable.

Eventually her mother discovered feminism and drove her father out of the home. This greatly increased the violence she and her brothers suffered:

| And then….my mother discovered feminism. She exchanged one violent, irrational, dehumanizing ideology for another, and she soon decided that she needed a man like a fish needed a bicycle. After countless physically violent arguments with my father, including one episode where she hit him in the head with a cast iron frying pan and left him for dead on the front porch, he turned his back and walked away from us, just like his first family.

One day we woke up and he was gone. My mother was quick to inform us that he simply walked away, and left us to starve in the streets, and that she alone would be the sole reason we survived and prospered. She never missed an opportunity to curse him...

| Being a child, I believed it. So did my brothers.

And we loathed him for it. How could he leave us with such an evil woman? My mother once held a knife to my throat and made me beg for my life. When I was eleven. And I remember going to bed, thinking not how much I hated her, but how much I hated HIM for leaving us to her devices.

Years later she learned the truth:

| And then the truth came to light. He hadn’t walked away. He certainly had not left us to starve. My mother had filed for an annulment and requested a restraining order, which she was granted. When I finally saw my father again, he had two boxes with him. One was filled with income tax returns showing that he had never missed a
child support payment, and court orders preventing him from seeing us based on his violence towards my mother, along with supervised visitations that were all scheduled for when he was overseas, working to meet his child support payments.

The other box contained cards and letters. Birthday cards and so many letters. All returned. By my mother. He never stopped sending them, hoping one of us would one day get the key and fetch the mail, but my mother was always adamant that the mail was her business. It was one of those community mailboxes, where you had to go and fetch your mail, and since I never got any mail, it never occurred to me that there was anything untoward about my mother’s insistence that only she would have access to it.

As an adult, it makes so much sense. How did we continue to live in our house? How was my mother able to afford food and clothing and YMCA memberships for four children without my father’s support? Of course she had his support. But she hid it from us, and poisoned our minds against our father. It’s called parental alienation, and she is not the first, nor the last woman to destroy her children in this way.

Related: The Duluth model is working as designed; you won’t smart mouth her again.

H/T Heartiste
The author of *Cat Person* wants the reader to know the main character is a good girl, unlike the sluts who didn’t follow the *college boyfriend script*. When her hookup partner asks her if she has ever had sex before, she laughs:

Losing her virginity had been a long, drawn-out affair preceded by several months’ worth of intense discussion with her boyfriend of two years, plus a visit to the gynecologist and a horrifically embarrassing but ultimately incredibly meaningful conversation with her mom, who, in the end, had not only reserved her a room at a bed-and-breakfast but, after the event, written her a card. The idea that, instead of that whole involved, emotional process, she might have watched a pretentious Holocaust movie, drunk three beers, and then gone to some random house to lose her virginity to a guy she’d met at a movie theatre was so funny that suddenly she couldn’t stop laughing…

The extra touches are nice, especially the mother booking her a room at a bed-and-breakfast and writing her a card commemorating the moment.

It is interesting to see that this concept is still around this far into hookup culture. This is fiction, and obviously it doesn’t mean the average woman still follows the ritual. But the inclusion of the ritual in fiction shows the power of the idea either way. Absent real, meaningful moral boundaries, women will make up their own. They have to. Otherwise they won’t be able to draw the line between good girl and slut.

**Edit:** Note that this is a slight deviation from the AF/BB trajectory. Instead, she first has ceremonial sex with a Beta who completes a ritual to prove that the virginity losing sex is purified with romantic love. This then frees the woman move on to the AF stage prior to later settling for BB.
Celebrating the arrival of The everlasting Father.

by Dalrock | December 24, 2017 | Link

6 For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.

-Isaiah 9:6, KJV

Merry Christmas
Commenter Ofelas pointed out the absurdity of the main character in *Cat Person* imagining how much a future boyfriend would enjoy hearing about her having sex with other men:

...she imagined that somewhere, out there in the universe, there was a boy who would think that this moment was just as awful yet hilarious as she did, and that sometime, far in the future, she would tell the boy this story. She’d say, “And then he said, ‘You make my dick so hard,’ ” and the boy would shriek in agony and grab her leg, saying, “Oh, my God, stop, please, no, I can’t take it anymore,” and the two of them would collapse into each other’s arms and laugh and laugh—but of course there was no such future, because no such boy existed, and never would.

*Cat Person* is fiction, but this is an idea you will often see in real life as well. For women there is a temptation to see dating not as a *mutual* evaluation for fitness, but as a sort of reality show where they are paradoxically both the prize (entirely passive) and the judge (in complete control). If you look for it, you will see this pattern all over.

The blogger at Diary of Why explained back in October of 2013 how she came to write a blog chronicling the men she had sex with in her quest for a husband:

Six (and a half) years ago I was living in Boston. I had recently ended things (been forced to end things) with the person I thought I would be with forever. Heart-broken is a word that is too casually thrown around to describe what I actually was, which was shell-shocked, a walking exposed nerve, and utterly lost. Looking back, I should have gone to therapy, I should have done a lot of things, but instead I started a blog. And I started dating. Then I moved to France, I dated, and I blogged about it. And I moved to Ithaca, I dated, and I blogged about it. Then I moved to DC and, well.

In the back of my mind, I always hoped that if one day I did decide to stop blogging, that I would go out with a triumphant, look-at-me-now-world post. I hoped that I would be able to (only sort of gloatingly) say that it had all been worth it, because I had finally gotten everything I had ever wanted. But I guess that’s not really the way life works, is it?

Note that each stop on the carousel is seen as part of an *extended courtship*, leading ultimately to her future husband. As absurd as this concept is, her readers were right there with her. In 2010 she wrote about breaking it off with the unemployed pot smoker she had been having sex with. Just like the fictional character in *Cat Person*, the blogger explained that she finally realized that she wasn’t attracted to the loser she was having sex with:

So it only took, what, a week for *this most recent dating venture* to crash and burn? A new record, to be sure, but then again, this is the guy that invited me to meet his mother after date one (I politely declined), and was talking exclusivity by dates two and three (and four and five and oh my GOD please give it a rest). So I suppose it is
only fitting that the ending was equally precipitous. You see, while all this time I thought the biggest hurdle to get over was that I wasn’t attracted to him physically, it turns out that, appearances aside, once I got past the physical I didn’t necessarily like what was inside. Huh. Didn’t see that one coming, did you, Internet? To be honest, I didn’t either.

This whole experience has been akin to trying to shove a square peg in a round hole, and of convincing myself that, no, it’s not such a big deal, we’ll just shave a little off this side here, and nip off a corner there, and look!

Notice the complete lack of introspection. There is no sense of what in the world am I doing having sex with one loser after another? The only question is, what is wrong with these men, don’t they know they are failing to impress me? This is especially astounding given that the woman in question had by this time been blogging about her own thoughts and experiences for three years.

The problem for women who fall into this trap is that other women typically will encourage them in this thinking. Commenter Just Sayin responded to the post explaining that sex with a string of losers was a rite of passage, something noble women do as an act of love for their eventual husband:

That lasted a week too long. And the condom bit... well there would have been NO LOVE without a glove!!!!

Dont give him another thought.

stepping stone to bigger and better things. It’s like a right of passage that we dont want to take, that all women venture into one of these guys and dont end it sooner.

Commenter Tuppence likewise reassured the blogger that having sex with a string of losers was an essential part of the blogger’s husband hunt:

Oh what an utter wanker! It’s so much better to be single than having to endure the company of someone like that. It’s just a shame we have to kiss so many frogs and toads along the way before we find someone worth keeping. It will happen though...keep your chin up.

Commenter Dawn agreed:

It’s just one more frog that you had to kiss in order to get one step closer to the prince.

Commenter Eliza took the absurdity up a notch, explaining that one day the blogger would share this shameful experience with her grandchildren!

You can still tell the story to your grandkids because in 40 years it will be funny (are you not sort of laughing now at the incredulousness of it all) but LUCKILY you will be
with another and non-money pinching lovely man and this episode will just be filed under “grandma’s funny dating stories”.

One commenter (anonymous) broke the pattern and suggested the blogger consider what she should do differently:

ummm...really, I don’t want to be unkind. i’ve been reading your blog for quite a while, and it seems like you might want to talk to someone. professionally. you seem kindof messed up. you’re a brilliant writer-incredibly sharp and witty. but you seem to continually make crappy choices. especially about sleeping with loosers. maybe if you just waited a few weeks, or months before jumping into bed with them? maybe i’m wrong. but there appears to be a rather unsuccessful pattern in your life...

Commenter gabbiana then reassured the blogger that she shouldn’t let haters suggesting introspection get her down. Having sex with losers is something every good woman must do, and of course it will eventually make for a great story to share with her grandkids:

Haaaaa this story is awesome and the punchline is awesomer and also don’t let the haters get you down. We all date crazies; we very often sleep with crazies; we very, very often require what seems, in retrospect, to be an inordinate amount of time to pick out the crazies. But like everyone up there said, this will be a great one to tell the grandkids. Eventually.

This story does have a happy ending of sorts. After parking her blog some time back in 2014, the blogger returned this October to announce that she is now engaged and planning her wedding. This was, as she explained back in 2013, what it has always been about from the beginning:

So, I’m engaged. And lately I’ve been having a lot of thoughts, specifically of the wedding variety, and I’m finding I have nowhere to put them. So far I’ve been putting these thoughts in a large spreadsheet, and while that is helpful and necessary, it’s not particularly satisfying. So here we are. Just me, my thoughts about weddings, and you.

Strangely, all of her posts about the men she had sex with for over six years have been deleted. Perhaps her fiancé doesn’t find them as hilarious as her grandchildren will no doubt find them.
Women hardest hit.
by Dalrock | January 1, 2018 | Link

One of the changes in the new tax law involves the tax status of alimony. Previously the payor (men) could deduct the money they pay in alimony, and the payee (women) would have it taxed as income. Starting with divorces commenced after Dec 31 2018, alimony payments will be treated like child support payments have been. Men won’t be able to deduct the amount they pay from their income, and women won’t have to pay taxes on alimony received.

You would expect that the pro divorce lobby (nearly everyone) would be cheering this enhancement to the cash and prizes we offer as a reward to women who don’t honor their wedding vows. However, the problem is ex husbands are already being bled white. It has gotten so bad that the parasite is now expressing concern for the host. All of the articles I could find on the subject object to the changes, not because they object to soaking men for women’s benefit, but because the change is seen as potentially hurting women. The NY Post/AP article explains:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many people get alimony anyway?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government statistics vary. The Census Bureau says 243,000 people got alimony last year, 98 percent of them women.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the concerns?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critics fear that without the deduction, higher-earning spouses won’t pay as much to their exes. New York City matrimonial lawyer Malcolm S. Taub foresees future alimony recipients losing 10 to 15 percent of what they’d get under the current law.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The National Organization for Women and the American Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers opposed the change.

CNBC worries in Tax reform could shrink alimony for ex-spouses:

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, unveiled on Thursday, includes a provision to kill the deduction that taxpayers get for making such payments to an ex-spouse. Although it’s just one of the many tax breaks eliminated under the legislation, experts say it will end up most hurting the person receiving the money.

“Alimony payers won’t be able to afford to give as much because they’ll have to give it to Uncle Sam instead,” said Nancy Hetrick, a certified divorce financial analyst and senior advisor at Better Money Decisions in Phoenix, Arizona.

Forbes explains:
The bottom line: The elimination of the tax deductibility of alimony means, in most cases, the government will no longer help support the spouse receiving the income, usually the former wife and the couple’s children.

The Hill explains the same thing in **GOP should divorce itself from alimony scheme in tax bill:**

At first glance, one may believe Trump’s intended repeal of alimony deductions is aimed at providing tax relief to the lower-wage spouses by excluding alimony payments from taxable income..

But most seasoned family law attorneys are of the position that eliminating a tax deduction for high-income earners who make alimony payments would have unintended consequences on the low-income earning ex-spouses who receive alimony.

Market Watch **explains:**

Divorce lawyers say the higher-earning spouse will have more leverage to argue for lower alimony. “We settled a case this week in court where my wealthy client agreed to pay his dependent wife significant alimony because he could deduct it,” said Randy Kessler, an Atlanta-based lawyer who wrote the book, “Divorce: Protect Yourself, Your Kids, and Your Future.” “The deduction, as it stands, is a great motivator to encourage the higher wage earner to agree to help support the spouse with less income.”

USA Today ran the CNBC article I linked/quoted above, with a headline worrying that **Tax reform could shrink alimony.**

CBS News warns in **GOP plan to cut alimony tax deduction has some divorcees on edge:**

Toni Van Pelt, president of the National Organization for Women, said the tax change could make it more difficult for divorcees to get the support they need because their ex-husbands would have less money without the deduction.

“It’s something that’s really important to women,” Van Pelt said. “We are really concerned because it would make tough, tense negotiations between couples even worse.”
In my last post I quoted the NY Post/AP article on the number of women who are getting alimony:

**How many people get alimony anyway?**

Government statistics vary. The Census Bureau says 243,000 people got alimony last year, 98 percent of them women.

But I noticed today that the CNBC article I quoted in the same post gives a figure that is over twice as large:

In 2015, according to the data from the Internal Revenue Service, an estimated 598,888 taxpayers claimed the alimony deduction on their Form 1040, for a total of more than $12.3 billion.

If anything, I would expect the tax data to understate the number of men paying alimony, since some of them could be taking the standard deduction.

Granted, these are slightly different stats, since one is the number of payees (women) and the other is the number of payers (men). But this would only line up if the average woman receiving alimony received it from more than two men. It is much more likely that one of these sources is incorrect. My bet is that the larger estimate is more accurate but still probably understates the real number.

Either way, child support is the defining feature of our modern family model, since it is the replacement for marriage whether or not a wedding has occurred. Alimony is a vestige of the old system, and aside from some noteworthy exceptions appears to be on the way out.
In response to Women hardest hit commenter Micha Elyi smugly explained that the RCC’s hard line on divorce puts Protestants to shame:

Kind’a makes you think that King Henry VIII and Martin Luther were wrong and the Catholic Christians have been right about divorce all along.

God hates divorce so a mark of God’s true Church is its unwillingness to accept what God hates.

I would be inclined to agree with him, if the RCC wasn’t infected by a slightly different strain of the same disease Protestantism is infected with.

The RCC sees the explosion in destroyed homes in the US after the 1960s as progress, as justice. They just don’t call it divorce*. As the Archdioceses of Boston explains in its lengthy defense of the modern annulment process, the only problem is that the rest of the world hasn’t caught up with our divorce annulment revolution:

13. There are too many declarations granted in the United States - NO. The United States vs. other countries

In the last twenty years, the numbers of declarations are much higher in this country than they had been in the past. Yet this is due to the fact that the procedural laws governing marriage cases were expanded in the late 1960’s. Cases no longer had to go to Rome. They could be adjudicated locally. The appellate system was also somewhat streamlined. Furthermore, Roman jurisprudence was expanded in the light of the teaching of the Second Vatican Council. Cases could be heard on new grounds of jurisprudence.

Tribunals across the United States are operative so that individuals may vindicate their rights. The bishops of our country have invested personnel and resources to ensure the church’s jurisprudence and procedural law are fulfilled. Unfortunately, such an investment in justice is not as evident in other parts of the world. This is why the numbers in the United States appear high. In fact they are skewed.

Think of the implications of this statement. For 2,000 years the RCC got it wrong by not granting absurd numbers of annulments. But along came the 1960s, and the RCC finally understood that the whole process needed to be... streamlined. The same document explains that as a result of this streamlining, so many declarations of nullity are now issued that Catholics believe they are easy to obtain:

The misconception that it is thought to be easy may rest in the increased number of declarations over the past twenty years. In 1968 the Boston tribunal processed 10 cases involving defective consent. In 1996 the same tribunal processed over 700 of
these cases. The increase is due to a substantial change in the procedural law of the church. Cases are heard locally rather than in Rome. They may also be handled by single judges, rather than a tribunal panel of three judges. However, the sentence of every case is sent to the Appeal Court and reviewed by a tribunal, i.e., a panel of three judges.

One way a marriage can be ruled to have defective consent is if one of the spouses thought marriage isn’t permanent. What the RCC has effectively taught with this process is if you think marriage isn’t permanent, it isn’t. Now canon lawyers wonder why so many Catholics think marriage isn’t permanent. Why isn’t the laity getting the message?

Either this progress is what Elyi is so smug about, or he smugly has no idea what is going on regarding marriage in the RCC. I don’t know which is worse.

While Elyi is Catholic, his smugness is no less common among Protestants. When Instapundit linked to one of my posts on the topic of modern churches being corrupted by feminism, Pastor Donald Sensing smugly responded:

Maybe the author needs to get out more.

His church is different. As a United Methodist pastor, he is fighting the good fight against SJWs and feminists. He doesn’t see the rot I was writing about, so I must not get around much. But how blind do you have to be if you are a United Methodist pastor and don’t see the rot all around you? From Lesbian Bishop Calls Jesus a Bigot

United Methodist Church bishop Dr. Karen Oliveto is not only a lesbian, she also believes (and publicly teaches) that Jesus was a bigot filled with prejudices. She does say that Jesus grew and changed, and that’s her point. Bishop Oliveto admonishes, “If Jesus can change, if he can give up his bigotries and prejudices, if he can realize that he had made his life too small, and if, in this realization, he grew closer to others and closer to God, than so can we.”

Moreover, on a separate Instapundit post Pastor Sensing put in a plug for a book by his gender nondescript child:

Grateful for the link, Glenn, thanks!

I hope you will indulge a “proud dad” moment for me in providing the link to my eldest’s first novel on Amazon, Winter Three, a military sci-fi tale of far future Marines landing on their homeworld to wrest it back from the bad guys. It went live on Kindle today. It does rely quite a bit on the author’s experience as a US Marine in the Iraq War (Fallujah and environs, 2005-2006) and pays homage to Heinlein. It’s only $1.99, so give a vet a break and buy it!

What Pastor Sensing is carefully not disclosing with his gender neutral language is that his hard bitten combat veteran “eldest” is his daughter [Correction: it is his son].

The smugness of men like Elyi and Pastor Sensing is all around us, and it is this very militant
cluelessness that makes feminism possible in Christian culture.

*Instead, the RCC prefers the term *annulment*. Coincidentally, before you can request an annulment you have to first get a civil divorce.

**See Also:**

- *Sentence first; verdict afterwards.*
- *Do it for the validation.*
It’s a man, baby!
by Dalrock | January 4, 2018 | Link

In my previous post I originally assumed that Pastor Donald Sensing’s “eldest” was his daughter. I made this assumption based on his very awkward phrasing in praise of his eldest child’s book, and the fact that while his “eldest” was drawing on “the author’s” combat experience as a Marine in Iraq, the main character of the book is a female (space) Marine:

I hope you will indulge a “proud dad” moment for me in providing the link to my eldest’s first novel on Amazon, Winter Three, a military sci-fi tale of far future Marines landing on their homeworld to wrest it back from the bad guys. It went live on Kindle today. It does rely quite a bit on the author’s experience as a US Marine in the Iraq War (Fallujah and environs, 2005-2006) and pays homage to Heinlein. It’s only $1.99, so give a vet a break and buy it!

The bolded references, especially the second one, are very awkward. Pastor Sensing uses similarly awkward language in the disclosure he includes at the bottom of his Amazon review of the book:

Disclosure: Saintsing is a variant of my own last name; the author and I are related. But this is my honest, kid-you-not opinion of the book.

Who writes like that? Moreover, his consistency in this regard is striking. From his 2007 Bio page*, he has a son, a daughter, and an eldest:

I married the former Catherine Stephens of Durham, N. C., in 1980. We have three children, the eldest is a former U.S. Marine and Iraq veteran, the second is a physician in the US Air Force’s Medical Corps. His wife is a civilian doctor. Our third child, a daughter, is a chemical engineer.

In a recent post on his blog titled Four Veterans, Sensing remains cagey when describing the picture of his eldest child:

This is our eldest, Lance Cpl. S. M. Sensing, USMC, who deployed to Iraq on the date shown in the photo, shown at Camp Lejeune, NC, with Cathy.

This is not the case when Sensing describes his middle child in the same post:

Dr. (Capt.) Thomas Sensing is in surgical residency at Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, in the US Air Force Medical Corps. As a retired officer, I administered his oath of commissioning upon his graduation from medical school in 2016, one of the most memorable and fulfilling things in my life.

Based on the picture of Lance Cpl. S. M. Sensing in the Four Veterans post, he does appear to be a man. But Sensing’s blog post A rollicking good sci-fi read about his eldest’s book is just as cagey about the child’s sex as all of the other examples I had previously found:
If a combat-vet US Marine were to write a short novel about far-future Marines mounting an assault to recapture their home world from the bad guys, and wanted to give homage to Robert Heinlein at the same time, what would it be like?

It would be like Winter Three, now on Kindle, a novella by my eldest, former US Marine Lance Corporal S.M. Saintsing (pen name for the book).

The cover picture shows a woman (space) Marine dressed in full battle regalia.

However, the link at the bottom of the quote points to a republication of a post Pastor Sensing wrote back in 2005. Back then Sensing did what normal fathers do when writing about their sons (emphasis mine):

Yesterday my eldest son, Lance Cpl. [S.] Sensing, deployed with his unit to Iraq. His mother, brother, sister and I traveled to Camp Lejeune, NC, to see him off. Cathy’s dad, from Durham, went with us also.

He was released Monday at 10 a.m. until noon Tuesday, so we had a very good visit with him. Then he and his unit drew weapons and gathered their sea bags at the barracks to await transportation. The time of departure slipped a couple of times, but not by much. They shipped out to Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC, on commercial buses about 30 minutes later than the originally scheduled time.

At MCAS CP they flew by chartered commercial air to Kuwait; I don’t know the route. Just as I was typing the last paragraph, [S.] called from Kuwait to report he arrived fine and there were no problems. He couldn’t talk but a moment, so that’s all the news we got, but it was wonderful to hear his voice and know all was well. He did say he doesn’t know just when they’ll move into Iraq. He does know where they will go, but I’m not going to include that here.

It could be that Pastor Sensing is cagey about his son’s sex because it is awkward that his son writes from the perspective of a woman. This is a very mild form of gender bending in our SJW culture, but even in current year it is at least a little awkward.

All of this merely reinforces my point in my previous post. Pastor Sensing smugly claimed that he (ze?) and others like him (hir?) were holding the line on traditional sex roles, and that if I or my readers thought that Christian culture was caving in this regard, well we must not get out very much...

Related: If you can’t feel the current, you have already been swept away.

*Anchorman pointed out that the repost of the same bio page on his new blog says he has two sons.
Feminism (and the larger SJWism) has spread with the assistance of Conservatives who are not just clueless, but militantly clueless. If someone points out the culture war, they say lighten up Francis, or they smugly accuse them of not understanding what is really going on in the larger culture (you must not get out much!). Sure your group is infected with the disease, but mine is immune! As a result feminism and gay marriage and gender bending complete their long march through the institutions, while Conservatives stand watch to make sure no one notices or responds.

G. K. Chesterton famously wrote:

The whole modern world has divided itself into Conservatives and Progressives. The business of Progressives is to go on making mistakes. The business of Conservatives is to prevent mistakes from being corrected. Even when the revolutionist might himself repent of his revolution, the traditionalist is already defending it as part of his tradition. Thus we have two great types — the advanced person who rushes us into ruin, and the retrospective person who admires the ruins. He admires them especially by moonlight, not to say moonshine. Each new blunder of the progressive or prig becomes instantly a legend of immemorial antiquity for the snob. This is called the balance, or mutual check, in our Constitution.

This is true. But there is an earlier stage Chesterton didn’t mention, the stage where the Progressives are in the process of making the mistakes, and the Conservatives are telling everyone to lighten up, nothing is happening.

Note: This started as part of a comment in reply to Derek Ramsey, but strikes me as worth posting separately as well.
SkylerWurden scoffed at my assertion that the 70 fold increase in RCC annulments in the US after the 1960s* represents a important shift in RCC thinking on the permanence of marriage. He revised his calculations several times, but he seems to have finally landed at an estimate that around 7% of Catholic marriages end up being annulled. Yet the crux of his argument remained the same. There are simply too few annulments in the US to have a meaningful impact:

This is one of the dumbest things I’ve ever read period and easily the dumbest thing Dalrock has ever written.

1.2 billion Catholics worldwide. In 2007 there were 58,322 annulments, worldwide.

Round that up to 60 thousand.

60 thousand is .00005% of 1.2 billion.

So the scourge of ‘Catholic divorce’ currently affects .00005% of worldwide Catholics yearly. It’s an epidemic! A terrible tidal wave sweeping across Catholicism! Look at those numbers and weep in despair!

Seriously, this is retarded.

...

Yes, it is definitely retarded.

Also, another correction!!!!

Catholic “divorce” (Annulment) rate is actually closer to 7%

Leaving the question of the actual percentage aside, the problem with his argument is that the US annulment tribunals have by decades of practice taught all American Catholics that a very large percentage of what they think are marriages aren’t actually binding. More specifically, the lesson that has been taught is that your own marriage might not actually be a marriage at all, and your vows are only binding if you think they are binding. This of course fits right in with our divorce revolution, as nearly every divorcée will be quick to assure you that her divorce wasn’t a “real” divorce, because her marriage was never a “real” marriage in the first place.

Even worse, the RCC teaches that annulments merely are a formal recognition that the marriage never was binding. They aren’t “granting” an annulment, they are investigating and then declaring what was always true. Getting an annulment is merely a formality. As others
pointed out on the same post, many divorced Catholics simply marry again outside the RCC. The explosion in annulments hasn’t just destabilized the marriages of 7% of Catholics. It has destabilized the marriages of all Catholics.

But SkylerWurden denies this as well:

That’s just poor theological understanding. The marriage is assumed valid until “proven” otherwise. The divorcée can say they don’t think marriage is permanent all they want now, what matters is what they thought about it on the day of their marriage. If a person never intended to keep the vow, then God didn’t consecrated the vow. That seems pretty simple and straightforward to me. That doesn’t destroy the Catholic marriage or add instability, it just recognizes the destruction that already occurred: if people treat marriage like a 7-year shack-up then God isn’t going to call it marriage and neither is the Church. Nor should they.

Technically he is correct, the stated position of the US tribunals is that a marriage is presumed valid until it is proven otherwise**. But in practice (in the US and most countries) the tribunals betray the opposite belief. If one party to a marriage believes the marriage isn’t valid, the tribunal insists that the first thing to be done is to get a divorce. Only then, after the required divorce, will the tribunal take up the question of whether the marriage was really a marriage. As Robert J. Kendra explains in Defending Families Against Forced No-fault Divorce: American Annulment Mills (emphasis mine):

A worse problem for the Church is complicity in promoting divorce. A conscientious petitioner (the party seeking the annulment) would first seek an annulment to be assured that no valid sacramental marriage existed, prior to seeking a civil divorce. However, faced with this request, tribunal officials respond that a divorce is required prior to accepting an application for annulment, allegedly to assure that the marriage is irreconcilable. But Jesus clearly condemned divorce even without remarriage, “Therefore, what God has joined together let no man put asunder” (Mk 10:9), and canon 1060 stipulates, “in doubt the validity of a marriage must be upheld until the contrary is proven.” Therefore, a tribunal must prejudge the marriage to be invalid prior to judging its validity, in order to justify a divorce preceding an annulment. Assurances of obtaining an easy annulment, given by the pro-annulment pastoral tribunals to perplexed petitioners (little or no effort is made toward reconciling the couple), actually precipitates the divorce. Once divorce is granted, which is a given with no-fault divorce laws, the tribunal is programmed to grant an annulment.

Getting an annulment is rather like registering your purebred puppy. It is a formality only required in specific circumstances. For puppies registration is required to show or breed the dog. For divorced Catholics an annulment is only required if you want to marry again in the RCC. In both situations, it is a formality that in nearly all cases merely confirms what you already thought was the case. Not surprisingly, after the initial explosion of annulments taught American Catholics the reality of the RCC’s new (practical) view of the permanence of marriage, over the decades US Catholics have become less and less inclined to go through the formality of requesting an annulment after divorcing:
The result has been an increase from 338 annulments in 1968, to 5,403 in 1970, to a peak 61,945 in 1991. Since then, the explosion has stabilized at around 40,000 U.S. annulments per year. However, these commonly quoted statistics implying a recent decline are deceiving.

Tribunals are not getting tougher on granting annulments. They are getting fewer petitions for annulments, probably due to divorced Catholics cohabitating and not bothering with annulments. Since 1964 the tribunals have consistently ruled for annulment in about 97 percent of the cases they accept. Seventy percent of annulments worldwide are accounted for by American marriage tribunals though the U.S. has a mere six percent of the world’s Catholic population.

*Using the data presented in the original post from the Archdioceses of Boston showing that the Boston tribunal had gone from issuing 10 declarations in 1968 to 700 in 1996. The national data presented above shows that the jump for all of the US was an even larger 183 fold from 1968 to 1991 (338 to 61,945)!

**Just like the stated position of the family courts is that the whole process is about what is best for the child, and is not biased against fathers.
From the ironically titled site For your marriage, comes a pitch to use the annulment process to validate your decision to divorce even if you don’t plan on remarrying:

**I do not plan to re-marry. Why should I present a marriage case?**

Some people find that simply writing out their testimony helps them to understand what went wrong and why. They gain insights into themselves. Others say that the process allowed them to tell their whole story for the first time to someone who was willing to listen. A person cannot know today if they might want to marry in the future when crucial witnesses may be deceased or their own memories may have dimmed.

For contrast, compare the above, as well as the tone of the entire article, with the description of canon law in Defending Families Against Forced No-fault Divorce: American Annulment Mills. In the former, the tribunals stand ready to rationalize your decision to blow up your family. The tribunals are described as taking on the role of a sympathetic girlfriend, but with the power to declare that God is on your side. The latter recognizes that even in the rare cases that an annulment is actually warranted, divorce is a terribly destructive thing:

Whether or not the tribunal judges theorize that a sacramental marriage exists, the fact remains that a civil marriage existed. With rare exception, divorce from that marriage is wrong, has been condemned by the Church since the time of Christ, and has undeniably harmful consequences, particularly to children of the marriage, and should not be facilitated by compliant tribunals.

See both pieces in full for the stark differences throughout.
Satisfaction guaranteed.
by Dalrock | January 10, 2018 | Link

The Atlantic explains that Cat Person went viral because it connects with the current mood of women & feminism:

Into this steps “Cat Person,” a New Yorker fiction story by Kristen Roupenian that explores how badly people can misread each other, but also how frightening and difficult sexual encounters can be for women, in particular.

The feminist objective is to remove all risks that women face with promiscuity, including the risk of having a dissatisfying sexual experience. This is the meaning behind the new standard of “enthusiastic consent”:

What are we to make of a sexual encounter that is technically consensual, but which Margot still considers to be “the worst life decision” she’s ever made?

In the recent powerful-man purge, and in the rape-on-campus crisis before that, there’s been a reckoning over the true meaning of consent. Some have questioned whether women who get drunk, go to men’s dorms, and even initiate intercourse could later have a genuine claim of sexual assault. Margot was at his house, wasn’t she? To some women, this passage in the story underscored the importance of the “enthusiastic” part of the new “enthusiastic consent” standard.

Not only must the woman’s satisfaction be guaranteed, but she must also be freed from the constraint of considering the needs and feelings of men. The Atlantic quotes the author of Cat Person:

She assumes that if she wants to say no she has to do so in a conciliatory, gentle, tactful way, in a way that would take “an amount of effort that was impossible to summon.” And I think that assumption is bigger than Margot and Robert’s specific interaction; it speaks to the way that many women, especially young women, move through the world: not making people angry, taking responsibility for other people’s emotions, working extremely hard to keep everyone around them happy. It’s reflexive and self-protective, and it’s also exhausting, and if you do it long enough you stop consciously noticing all the individual moments when you’re making that choice.

As Rollo observes in Dangerous Times Part 2, the new standard of enthusiastic consent will not just be applied to casual sex, but to sex within marriage as well:

What were witnessing here is the insertion of college campus consent laws into Marriage 2.0, and as designed its intent is to further disrupt marriage and family. Even in the old books presumptions about marriage a man could expect his commitment to a wife and family meant a plenary exchange of sexual access. But when enthusiastic consent is a prerequisite for legitimizing sexual encounters,
anything resembling a woman’s putting out duty sex for her husband, even starfish lack luster obligatory sex is defined as rape.

This may sound far fetched, but in a way feminists are just catching up with conservative Christians, who clearly anticipated this feminist desire. For several years conservative Christians have been teaching that a wife’s sexual desire for her husband is a sign from God that her husband is a godly man, and a wife’s lack of sexual desire is God’s punishment for bad husbands. As Dr. R. Albert Mohler Jr., president of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, explained back in 2012, a wife’s enthusiastic consent is a sign that her husband is worthy in God’s eyes:

Put most bluntly, I believe that God means for a man to be civilized, directed, and stimulated toward marital faithfulness by the fact that his wife will freely give herself to him sexually only when he presents himself as worthy of her attention and desire.

Pastor Dave Wilson and his wife Ann have been teaching this the same message at FamilyLife since at least 2015. Ann wasn’t attracted to Dave, so she wasn’t giving enthusiastic consent:

And I knew it, too, because our sex was terrible. I was so resentful when he touched me—it didn’t take a crockpot / it took for eternity. I could never, ever get used to Dave’s touch. It was a red signal going off...

Ann finally told Dave how she felt, and Dave realized God was speaking to him through Ann’s [non] burning bush:

Dave: Yes. Here’s all you need to know about that night—the thing that changed our marriage is when Ann was sharing with me what she felt—I had a pretty unique encounter with God. I sensed God was speaking to me, through Ann;

...and the word I heard from God was only one word: “Repent.” I knew, when I heard that word, what it meant—it wasn’t “Repent of being a bad husband,” or “…being gone too much.” It was: “Repent of your relationship with Me,”—God / vertical. See, I had been so busy that my walk with God was sort of on the fly—I wasn’t sitting with Him / I wasn’t studying His Word. I got into His Word—why? So I would have something to preach. I hadn’t been intimate with God in months.
How to guarantee satisfaction.

by Dalrock | January 11, 2018 | Link

This was originally a comment I left at Rollo’s blog back in April of 2012. Shortly after that, Rollo and I both included it in separate posts. I’m reposting it today because it describes the guarantee promiscuous women are demanding.

I think there is another side to the same coin. These women don’t just want to build a better beta, they want to tame the alpha. In fact, I think the former is just another way they are trying to approach the latter. They want to take an inherently unsafe activity and make it safe. They want to submit to a man without having to submit; they want a man who can tame their feral self. They want him to trip their danger signals. Even better if he is a stranger from a strange land.

They want this all to happen without giving up their freedom; they want to play this out in the context of serial monogamy, so they can feel loved while also claiming their promiscuity is moral. They want to lose control to a string of strangers who have all of the hallmarks of very dangerous men, and they want a promise that this will always end well.

They want to know that this will be safe, without it losing the excitement of it feeling unsafe. They are telling men to build a sort of serial monogamy amusement park where they can ride the roller coaster and experience the fear of falling or crashing, while knowing that just behind the scenes grown ups are actually in charge and are responsible for them safely feeling unsafe.

One more thing. As I mentioned above they don’t want to be hemmed in. So instead of building an actual amusement park, they want roller coasters to spring up randomly in the same exact circumstances where the real danger they mimic would appear. They want to be driving their car on the freeway one instant, and the next experience the fear of careening out of control. They want to impulsively jump off the edge of the Grand Canyon and have a parachute appear and deploy at the last minute. And all they ask is your guarantee that all of this will be safe.
Commenter Elisea observed the temptation women have to worship what they fantasize as the purifying power of their vaginas:

This is the prototypical female story, stemming from the original Beauty and the Beast. There’s a reason why they are so obsessed with vampires, werewolves, BDSM billionaires, and stunningly crazy things like werebears and weredragons. The creature is inherently dark and dangerous, but she tames him with her moral purity and magical sexuality (by which I mean she starts out as a complete virgin having sex with a man who has bedded hundreds of women before her, yet she wows him sexually into being insatiable for her). Not only is it important for him to be an otherworldly creature so as to provide her with the best possible protection (vampires and werewolves are pretty unbeatable), but they are also creatures of darkness- and obviously this applies just as well to BDSM billionaires, criminals, and the like. By being considered morally inferior by the female, which she frequently and openly acknowledges, she then has a lifetime of opportunities to use it against him whenever she wants.

This is why women are interested in vampires over superheroes. The ideal male must be eligible to go through the female purification system.

This temptation is equal parts self worship and rationalization of women’s promiscuity and sexual attraction to dark triad traits.

What makes this particular temptation so pernicious is that men share the same temptation, as this goes all the way back to the fall. Just like women, men are strongly tempted to worship what they see as the holy vagina. Earlier this week I shared two examples of conservative Christian leaders teaching that God speaks to men through their wives’ vaginas. But this also manifests in a more general form, where women’s sexuality is seen as a benevolent mystical force guiding society. As George Gilder explains in Men and Marriage:

Modern society relies on predictable, regular, long-term human activities, corresponding to the sexual faculties of women. The male pattern is the enemy of social stability. This is the ultimate source of female sexual control and the critical reason for it. Women domesticate and civilize male nature. They can jeopardize male discipline and identity, and civilization as well, merely by giving up the role.

Gilder believes that women are more cerebral and wise about sex than men, who unlike women have mindless sex drives. This wisdom comes from women’s ability to conceive and bear children. Women use their innate sexual wisdom to decide how to dispense salvation with their vagina:

…greater sexual control and discretion–more informed and deliberate sexual powers–are displayed by women in all societies known to anthropology. Indeed, this
intelligent and controlled female sexuality is what makes human communities possible.

This difference between the sexes gives the woman the superior position in most sexual encounters. The man may push and posture, but the woman must decide. He is driven; she must set the terms and conditions, goals and destinations of the journey. Her faculty of greater natural restraint and selectivity makes the woman the sexual judge and executive, finally appraising the offerings of men, favoring one and rejecting another, and telling them what they must do to be saved or chosen. Managing the sexual nature of a healthy society, women impose the disciplines, make the choices, and summon the male efforts to support it.

**Note:** Gilder is clearly a primary influence on Glenn Stanton, and Stanton quotes this same work by Gilder in his recent article [Manhood is not natural](H/T MikeJJ). I’ll do a follow up post on Stanton’s article shortly.
Waning pussy power.
by Dalrock | January 12, 2018 | Link

Last January the symbol most closely associated with the Women’s March was a pink knit hat with ears, called the “pussy power hat”. The headline at Time’s Motto announced: Women Will Wear Pink ‘Pussy Power Hats’ to March on Washington. The headline at Women in the world read: Women knit thousands of ‘pussy power hats’ to support the Women’s March on Washington As Huffington Post explained:

Hundreds of thousands of protestors are expected to flood Washington D.C. on January 21, 2017 to take part in the Women’s March on Washington, the day after Donald Trump’s inauguration.

And thanks to a knitting project that has gone viral, thousands of them will be wearing bright pink and cat-eared “pussy power hats.”

Other feminists felt that this was too subtle, and elected to dress as giant vaginas.

Over the last year feminists seem to have reconsidered the wisdom of so openly stating their case for power. The original term pussy power hats seems to have disappeared in favor of the more subtle pussy hat, although you can still find it in news articles from last year and on archives of the pussy hat website.

But the news is even worse for the pussy power hat. Not only is it being stripped of its power, but it has now been deemed politically incorrect. As the Washington Times explains:

Women’s March organizers are moving away from the iconic “pussyhat” because it may be offensive to trans women who don’t have female genitalia.

... 

She said several state and national organizations have tried “to move away from the pussyhats for several months now” and are not using the hats in promotions because there are “a few things wrong with the message.”

“It doesn’t sit well with a group of people that feel that the pink pussyhats are either vulgar, or they are upset that they might not include trans women or nonbinary women or maybe women whose [genitals] are not pink,” Ms. Hopps said.

I suspect an even bigger problem with the messaging is that the women trying to capitalize on the power of the pussy are making the very image seem ugly, not to mention downright frigid.
With friends like Gilder, married fathers don’t need enemies.

by Dalrock | January 13, 2018 | Link

In response to my post Vagina worship, Neguy came to George Gilder’s defense:

Men and Marriage is actually a re-released second edition of Gilder’s 1973 book Sexual Suicide, which was interestingly published by New York Times Books. It’s easy to sit here in 2018 and criticize Gilder, but writing back in the early 1970s (no fault divorce only began in 1969) he was actually one of the most prescient critics of the sexual revolution, one who foresaw a lot of what came to pass. He also understood the implications of things like government provided universal day care, which he strongly opposed. Yes, Gilder got some important things wrong, but his work needs to be seen in the context of when he originally wrote it and developed the ideas and the many things he got right. We also need to have the humility to realize that future generations, if they take notice of what we’re writing here at all, will be judging us for our blind spots.

There are two main weaknesses to this defense. First, Gilder’s response to the feminist arson against fathers was to break out the gasoline. Instead of calling out the evil of a system designed to destroy families, he praised the system as natural and right. On the same page as the quotes I provided yesterday, Gilder explains why fathers are and must be expendable. If fathers aren’t expendable, women can’t tame men the way civilization requires:

The female responsibility for civilization cannot be granted or assigned to men. Unlike a woman, a man has no civilized role or agenda inscribed in his body. Although his relationship to specific children can give him a sense of futurity resembling the woman’s, it always must come through her body and her choices. The child can never be his unless a woman allows him to claim it with her or unless he so controls her and so restricts her sexual activity that he can be sure he is the father. He cannot merely come back nine months later with grand claims. He must make a durable commitment.

Even then he is dependent on the woman to love and nurture his child. Even in the context of the family, he is sexually inferior. If he leaves, the family may survive without him. If she leaves, it goes with her. He is readily replaceable; she is not. He can have a child only if she acknowledges his paternity; her child is inexorably hers. His position must be maintained by continuous performance, sexual and worldly, with the woman as the judge. The woman’s position, on the other hand, requires essentially a receptive sexuality and is naturally validated by the child that cannot ordinarily be taken away. The man’s role in the family is thus reversible; the woman’s is unimpeachable and continues even if the man departs.

The man’s participation in the chain of nature, his access to social immortality, the
very meaning of his potency, of his life energy, are all inexorably contingent on a
woman’s durable love and on her sexual discipline. Only she can free the man of his
exile from the chain of nature; only she can give significance to his most powerful
drives.

The essential pattern is clear. Women manipulate male sexual desire in order to
teach men the long-term cycles of female sexuality and biology on which civilization
is based.

Again, Gilder isn’t sounding the alarm about the terrible destruction of the family courts. He
is providing the philosophical foundation for them. He is explaining that fathers need to be
expendable for civilization to work. This matters all the more because as other readers have
noted, Gilder is highly influential among conservatives, and has been for decades.

The second problem with Neguy’s defense of Gilder is that Gilder, now 78, has had over forty
years to observe reality since he first wrote Sexual Suicide. If he had learned and corrected
his error, this would be one thing. The quote I included above and the quotes in my previous
post were from the re-release of Sexual Suicide (renamed Men and Marriage) in 1992. By the
early nineties the evil of decades of family destruction were obvious, but Gilder was still
pushing his destructive line that mothers need to be able to kick out fathers in order to
perform their civilizing role of men.

In 2010 Gilder doubled down on this message in an interview he did with Religion & Liberty:

**R&L:** What are the differences between the genders as articulated in your book Men
and Marriage and what impact does this have on the social order?

**Gilder:** The key difference is that the woman holds in her very body a link to the
long term future of the race. Her sexuality determines her long term goals. As a very
physiological consciousness, she knows she can bear and nurture children. She has a
central role in the very perpetuation of the species. The man is estranged from this
process; his sexuality arises merely as a compulsive drive to pleasure. It’s short term
by nature. It’s predatory and quickly gratified. The Women’s Movement tragically
reduces female sexuality to the terms of male sexuality. When this happens, she
reduces herself to the male level of recreational sex. Paradoxically, when that
happens the woman loses all her power over men and the reverence and respect
toward the procreative potential of woman is lost. And that really destroys the
family. But if the power of “choice” is given up, the woman actually ascends to a
higher level of sexuality and her body attains an almost mystical power over men.

The interviewer asked Gilder about divorce, but Gilder was all but uninterested in divorce:

**R&L:** How does the divorce rate affect economic life and the number of poor?
Gilder: The real source of poverty is not divorce, although it does spread poverty, and bitterness, and feminism, and other problems. The key culprit is illegitimacy. Among the poor, the welfare state has legitimized children born out of wedlock and de-legitimized marriage. Even conservatives who want workfare want to further enrich the welfare state. To them, it’s not enough to give mothers of illegitimate children all sorts of supports and special pregnancy services, housing, special educational and training programs. You now have to give them jobs and daycare centers on top of it.

This constant enrichment of the welfare state ignores the victims of the real problem who are not on welfare. They are unmarried men and they have rendered many of our big cities unlivable. They have reduced the real-estate values in American cities by trillions of dollars. It is single men who commit the violent crimes.

Gilder said these things in 2010, despite understanding full well the evil being unleashed in order to ensure that women could have the power over men that Gilder argued was essential. Gilder is quoted by Stephen Baskerville:

During the debate leading up to welfare reform, George Gilder warned of the bipartisan bandwagon being marshaled to punish private citizens who had been pronounced guilty by general acclaim:

The president wants to take away their driver’s licenses and occupational accreditations. Texas Governor George W. Bush wants to lift their hunting licenses as well. Moving to create a generation of American boat people, Senator Bill Bradley is leading a group of senators seeking to seize their passports. Congressman Henry Hyde wants to expand the powers of the IRS to confiscate their assets. Running for president, Lamar Alexander wants to give them “jail time,” presumably so they won’t vote. Also running for president, Alan Keyes suggests caning, recommending “a trip to Singapore to learn how to administer a civil beating.” Governor William Weld in Massachusetts wants to subpoena their DNA, put liens on their houses, and hound them through the bureaucracies of 50 states. (1995, 24)

And it isn’t that no one has pointed out Gilder’s error. In 1990 Dr. Daniel Amnéus dedicated a chapter of his book The Garbage Generation to correcting this very error*. From Chapter 7, titled The Gilder Fallacy:

Precisely the opposite of Gilder’s view that “civilization evolved through the subordination of male sexual patterns—the short-term cycles of tension and release—to the long-term female patterns.” “In creating civilization,” says Gilder,
homes, and families; link men to specific children; rear children into citizens; change hunters into fathers, divert male will to power into a drive to create. Women conceive the future that men tend to fell; they feed the children that men ignore.

Why, if so, didn’t civilization precede patriarchy and the regulation of female sexuality? This regulation was the precondition enabling males to create stable families from which they could not be expelled. The earlier matriarchal pattern is this: “The women are not obliged to live with their husbands any longer than suits their pleasure or conscience....” In such a society women, including married women, are sexually autonomous and the men can do nothing about it. That’s the way women prefer things.

*H/T Bee
Stanton’s dilemma
by Dalrock | January 14, 2018 | Link

Glenn Stanton closes his article *Manhood is not natural* with an odd question:

The question is, how can we recover manhood today? We must find the answer. For it is not only the fate of men that is at stake, but the fate of our women, children, and society as well.

The question is odd because Stanton has just explained how good men are made. According to Stanton and his philosophical father Gilder, good men are made by the magical civilizing power of women’s sexuality. According to this thesis, women naturally just know what is good, and use the power between their legs to create civilization by steering men. In a separate [youtube video](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dQw4w9WgXcQ), Stanton explained that he was a sort of Peter Pan manboy until his wife took charge and made him into a man:

> My situation, I grew up as a skateboarder in the panhandle of Florida. Surfer. I was a good kid, didn’t get involved in drugs, didn’t do bad things. But that was my life. School, I didn’t spend a whole lot of time in that. So I continued in that, after I got married and Jackie said, “you know what Glenn, here’s how it’s going to be” and what did I do? Okay, I guess I’m going to have to go to college. I was scared to death of college. Didn’t think I could survive there. Didn’t think I could compete there. But this woman was making me do something, this either or, so I went and did it and I became a better person.

> Again, I would have never imagined that I get to do the things that I get to do today. Written a number of books, things like that. But I am who I am because Jackie said not you can do it, you will do it. And every man here knows that that’s true. So the bargaining chip for the man is, it’s going to work out better for me if I be what she wants me to be.

> It’s quieter at home, she’s more likely to make the kind of food I like, I’m going to get physical access to her more often...

Yet Stanton also is arguing that the reason women are choosing single motherhood (in any number of ways) is because the men they encounter are Peter Pan manboys, *just like he was* before his mommy-wife married him and took charge:

> The majority of women want marriage and babies, and usually quite dearly. They don’t need to be talked into them and never really have. Ask women today their biggest obstacle to achieving this goal. It’s not a shortage of males, but of responsible adult males. Men. If they cannot find marriageable men, they often go with other choices. It’s no coincidence that the two fastest growing family formation trends are unmarried cohabitation and out-of-wedlock childbearing among twenty- and thirty-something women.
Stanton has been making this case for years, including in his 2011 book *Secure Daughters, Confident Sons: How Parents Guide Their Children into Authentic Masculinity and Femininity*:

If women can’t find good men to marry, they will instead compromise themselves by merely living with a make-do man or getting babies from him without marriage. Unfortunately, this describes exactly the new shape of family growth in Western nations by exploding margins...

Women want to marry and have daddies for their babies. But if they can’t find good men to commit themselves to, well... Our most pressing social problem today is a man deficit.

Which is it? Do women naturally marry Peter Pan manboys and turn them into good men, like Stanton’s wife did? Or faced with men like Stanton to marry, do women instead naturally opt for a life of promiscuity?

This is the dilemma. Stanton wants to blame men for the fall of civilization while giving women credit for civilizing men. How do you put women in charge while claiming that men are responsible for every bad outcome? One seemingly promising answer would be to blame fathers for not making Peter Pan manboys like they used to, and Stanton indeed makes this case:

**Manhood Is Taught**

The opposite is true of manhood. As George Gilder explains pointedly in *Men and Marriage*, “Unlike a woman, a man has no civilized role or agenda inscribed in his body.” The boy has no onboard GPS directing him toward his future. His transition into manhood can only come into being with significant, intentional work by other men. As a behavior, manhood must be **learned**, proven, and earned. As an identity, **manhood must be bestowed by a boy’s father** and the community’s larger fraternity of men. His mother can only affirm it. She cannot bequeath it.

But then Stanton directly contradicts this by arguing that fathers are (and should be) just the pawns of mothers, who do the mother’s bidding.

The woman is not only the stabilizing force of male sexuality; **she is the authorizing factor in fatherhood**. If a particular man desires to be involved in the life of his child, **it is the child’s mother, and she alone, who determines whether and how he may do this**.

If this is the case, blaming fathers is just a round about way of blaming mothers! And it doesn’t help to take it back another generation, or 50 generations.

The only way to get around this circular logic would be to posit that somehow, women’s vaginas have either lost their way and are no longer beacons that can be trusted to point to goodness, or they still point to goodness, but they have lost their power. I won’t speculate on which of these possibilities would be more horrifying to Stanton and the women he is pandering to, but it is clear that neither suits his goal of denying women’s responsibility for their own sins while crediting women as the source of civilization.
*H/T MikeJJ
Commenter James asks if there isn’t at least a kernel of truth to Stanton & Gilder’s view of men, women, and marriage, even if they have in the process mangled this kernel of truth:

Isn’t there some sense where the “woman civilizes the man” is true, or am I conflating two different ideas? In other words, the lament about the Peter Pan man-boys not desiring to achieve much in life, because there’s no reward for them in marriage, or the women are not choosing them, so therefore they don’t try too hard to better themselves, and this is understandable. In way then, this is saying that being able to get a nice female is a reason why young men would want to improve themselves or to become providers and have all the resources they need, instead of living at home with their parents and playing video games. Perhaps this “civilizing” is not done in the terms and conditions which Gilder says it is, but something like it is going on. Gilder’s terms for what he says is the woman’s role in civilizing men is horrendous, for sure.

James is right. There is a kernel of truth there. But while Stanton and Gilder have accurately noticed that marriage and civilization go together, they have incorrectly pointed the causal arrow. Stanton and Gilder think that women naturally civilize men. Starting with this catastrophic misunderstanding, Stanton and Gilder have created the conservative intellectual foundation for the destruction of marriage in general, and specifically the destruction of headship and fatherhood. As Dr. Daniel Amnéus explains in Chapter 1 of The Garbage Generation, The Pathology of the Female-headed Family, the feminist model of the family that Stanton and Gilder are celebrating is not a path towards greater civilization, but retreat from civilization:

“Men and women,” rejoices feminist-anthropologist Helen Fisher, “are moving toward the kind of roles they had on the grasslands of Africa millions of years ago….Human society is now discovering its ancient roots….The recent trend toward divorce and remarriage is another example of a throwback to earlier times….[T]he so-called new extended family [read: broken family] may actually have evolved millennia ago….At long last, society is moving in a direction that should be highly compatible with our ancient human spirit….The ‘traditional’ role of women is a recent invention.”

Biologically speaking, it is indeed a recent invention, scarcely older than the civilization which it made possible and which emerged coevally with it and created the wealth which reconciled women to accepting it. But women’s new economic independence is leading them to yearn for a return to the prehistoric mammalian arrangement. “[W]herever women are economically powerful,” says Fisher, “divorce rates are high. You see it in the Kung and you see it in the United States.” Let’s say, wherever women are economically powerful and there are no social guarantees to ensure male headship of families, divorce rates are high—such being the case among
the Kung and the Americans. The Kung have no social guarantees to ensure male headship of families because the Kung never emerged from the Stone Age. The Americans have no social guarantees to ensure male headship of families because there exists an elementary confusion in the heads of policy makers, lawmakers and judges, who imagine that the obvious strength of the biological tie between the mother and the infant (the “biological fact” Margaret Mead refers to) means that it requires their assistance. A biological fact does not require the services of the legal system. What does require these services is the weakest biological link in the family, the role of the father. It was the creation of this role—only a few thousand years ago—which made patriarchal civilization possible. Prior to that, mankind had to muddle through the million years of the Stone Age with the female-headed reproductive arrangements of the ghetto, the barnyard and the rain forest.

Related: More ominous than a strike.
Incentives matter.
by Dalrock | January 17, 2018 | Link

From the Daily Mail: ‘Child support is 18 years of easy money’: Women reveal the REAL reasons why they’ve lied about being on the Pill - and many DON’T regret what they’ve done

• Anonymous women confessed why they had lied about using birth control
• A large number of women revealed they had hoped to secretly try for a baby
• Others wanted to lock men into paying 18 years worth of child support to them
The gospel of child support.

by Dalrock | January 18, 2018 | Link

Brother Jed preaches the gospel of child support:

Okay, time to “preach” a little...

...it’s not really “bad” *AT ALL* for a woman to assume financial aid for the provision and security of her bastard offspring if the no-good, dead-beat father doesn’t want to at least “man-up” and at least “take care of *HIS RESPONSIBILITY*” of “providing and guiding” his flesh and blood into adulthood.

So I really don’t put *NO BLAME* on women for expecting child support to the deadbeat men who shirk their responsibilities as *FATHERS* of their *OWN FLESH ‘N BLOOD*.

In fact women are *OWNED* financial support from the father or “fathers” of their children just for the sake of the welfare and development of their children; together or not. Whether the single mom women in check or selfishly “leeching” on the rightful financial support of the father(s) of her children is selfishly using the money for her own selfish purposes does NOT at all ever excuse the living *FATHER* of the children to not keep supporting the mother or “mothers” of his kids financial support: the “absenteeism” of fathers is the real issue causing these problems.

Women left to their own devices can only do so much to rear up children in a *FATHERLESS HOUSEHOLD*: don’t blame them, *BLAME THE MEN WHO HAD CHOICE TO DECIDE NOT TO SLEEP AROUND OR NOT TO MAKE THESE BABIES*!

Women have the “gift to grant sex” to a man, but it’s only the *MAN* who decides to make the *DECISION* to lay down and have sex with the woman which the purpose of sex results in *PROCREATION* of children!

Sex is *NOT* for some “recreational activity” for men to just have with women: it’s *PURELY ONLY FOR REPRODUCTION*; the “pleasure” is merely the “byproduct”!

Men love the “pleasure” of sex only and *NOT THE RESPONSIBILITY OF SEX*!

That’s why I don’t take any “players”, pua, gamers any other lame, “irresponsible men-boys” who just want to “screw” around but don’t take “manhood” seriously: they’re pure jokes in the face of the true sacred Christian Faith that’s been overshadowed by the filth of this sinful world.

It’s truly *NOT WOMEN AT FAULT* here at all: it’s *MEN* here! It’s *MEN* who just want to screw women to *SELFISHLY* pleasure their penises and *NOT TAKE OF THE “REAL MAN STUFF”* of being *HUSBAND*, *FATHER* and *HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD*. 
The *MAN* can choose *NOT TO HAVE SEX* with a woman to not have kids to begin with.

It starts with *HIM*, “not here”

In preaching this evil gospel, for the destruction of marriage *is* evil, Brother Jed is ignoring the only truly innocent party to the process he loves: the children. Child support is designed to replace marriage, and it is wickedly effective at this. The point of the post Brother Jed was responding to was that child support creates a powerful incentive for women to deliberately become single mothers.

You can see part of the runaway success of child support in Figure 1 from the 2014 NCHS data brief Recent Declines in Nonmarital Childbearing in the United States:

![Graph showing recent declines in nonmarital childbearing](image)

Over a million and a half children are now born out of wedlock each year in the US alone. Not all of this “progress” is due to the financial incentives Bro Jed loves so much. Part of the credit must go to the moral cover Bro Jed and other conservatives provide for single mothers. Bro Jed deceives single mothers like the serpent deceived Eve:

*So I really don’t put *NO BLAME* on women for expecting child support…*

…women are *OWNED* financial support from the father or “fathers” of their children.

…don’t blame [women], *BLAME THE MEN…*

…it’s only the *MAN* who decides to make the *DECISION* to lay down and have sex with the woman which the purpose of sex results in *PROCREATION* of children!
It’s truly *NOT WOMEN AT FAULT* here at all: it’s *MEN* here! It’s *MEN* who just want to screw women to *SELFISHLY* pleasure their penises and *NOT TAKE OF THE “REAL MAN STUFF”* of being *HUSBAND*, *FATHER* and *HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD*.

**Related:** [We are trapped on Slut Island and Traditional Conservatives are our Gilligan](#)

*Child support doesn’t just encourage women to have children out of wedlock, it also encourages women to kick married fathers out of the home.*
Fighting choice addiction.

by Dalrock | January 18, 2018 | Link

To my future husband: I know you will be worth the wait!

— Wendy Griffith, Age 53*

Choice addiction is part intoxication with the process of judging suitors, and part fear of missing out on something better. The risk is that a woman can become caught in analysis paralysis while her best real options evaporate. Not all women fall into choice addiction, and for those who do most don’t wallow in this stage forever. Sooner or later, most realize (even if only intuitively) that the rare gem of a man they are so unhurriedly seeking is also being sought out by other women. And once he’s off the market, her next best chance is also being snapped up by another woman who is quicker on the draw. Put bluntly, it eventually dawns on her that:

That bitch is trying to steal my man!

The power in the emotion isn’t in the general shrinking size and quality of the pool of suitors, but the sense that another woman is taking what is rightfully hers. Her thoughts shift from a blissful daydream about the perfect man who is patiently waiting for her to discover him, to the woman on a mission to poach what is hers. Now instead of savoring the power of finding every flaw in an endless stream of suitors, the woman actually starts trying to find her best possible man and march him down the aisle before that other bitch does.

This same kind of analysis paralysis can occur when making other big decisions, like buying a home. Women especially can get stuck looking for a theoretical option that doesn’t exist, rejecting what in reality are their best case choices. Realtor.com has a brilliant marketing campaign tuned perfectly to demolishing real estate choice addiction:

*See the second footnote at the bottom of this post for the calculations behind my estimate of Griffith’s current age, as well as this.
Kind words from The Other McCain

by Dalrock | January 22, 2018 | Link

The Other McCain writes in You Should Be Reading Dalrock:

I’ve occasionally linked and quoted Dalrock here, and some of his regular readers are also my regular readers. He is unafraid to make tough arguments: “Child support is designed to replace marriage, and it is wickedly effective at this. . . . Child support doesn’t just encourage women to have children out of wedlock, it also encourages women to kick married fathers out of the home.” Remember all those Maury Povich show episodes where unwed mothers learned the results of DNA tests to determine who their Baby Daddy was? That kind of irresponsibility is actually encouraged by the existence of a legal system that uses punitive measures to enforce child-support payments. It protects women’s “right” to screw around by forcing men to pay for the predictable result of such promiscuity. But as Dalrock points out, many conservatives are OK with this destructive policy. “We are trapped on Slut Island and Traditional Conservatives are our Gilligan” is the title of one of Dalrock’s classic rants, in which he makes the point that “slut shaming” works.

Follow the link above for the full post. I’ve read McCain for several years now, and especially enjoy his lampooning the feminist cliché of the writer.
Help for a Christian brother.

by Dalrock | January 22, 2018 | Link

Vox Day has graciously created a plan to help a Christian man who was fired after SJWs swarmed his employer:

This is an announcement for a special one-week campaign designed to provide work for Will Caligan, a military veteran, a Christian, and a comic artist who was swarmed by SJWs and lost his publishing arrangement due to his willingness to stand up for his beliefs about right and wrong. All of the funds raised will go to paying for the production of one or more comics illustrated by Will that will be published by Arkhaven. The graphic novel – or novels – will be based on novels chosen by the backers that have been contributed by various authors, and comics legend Chuck Dixon will be providing the adapted scripts for free. A Gold-rate team of colorists, Arklight Studios, will provide the colors for the cover at a steep discount.

50 percent of the revenues from any subsequent sale of the comics and graphic novels will go to Will and to the direct contributors to producing the comic. (The author whose work is selected, the colorists, etc.) This does not include me or the Arkhaven team. For more details about the campaign and to view the backing options, please visit Freestart. And please spread the word, especially on Twitter.

Per Vox’s update, the plan is already off to a good start, and this is still the first day of the week long campaign.
From Megan Fox at PJ Media: Internet Rallies for Disabled Veteran Besieged by SJWs, Raises $21,000 and Counting

Last week, PJ Media reported about Will Caligan, a conservative disabled veteran who lost his job after offending the Transgender Mafia with science. Caligan is a talented comics artist who found himself in a bigoted work environment run by people hostile toward anyone with conservative Christian views. Instead of tolerance, Caligan experienced public shaming, threats, a job loss, and colleagues turning their backs on him after he stated a man can not change his DNA based on wishes.

Sane people everywhere were alarmed and dismayed that a person could lose his livelihood after one inconsequential exchange on social media. So within hours of PJ Media publishing that story, Vox Day of Castalia House Publishing reached out to Caligan and offered him a project.

Caligan is humbled by the outpouring of support from the comics community, but not used to the attention as his profile has been launched into the national spotlight. The attention can only bring positive things, however, as the industry is buzzing about Caligan and his work. All Short Fuse Media seems to have accomplished with their politically correct panic attack is push Caligan to the next level of his career.

Now, not only is Castalia House funding a project for Caligan, but other publishers are following suit.

Fox quotes Day from a recent periscope:

One of the most important aspects of the Will Caligan’s Comic campaign is sending the SJWs the message that even when they successfully swarm and disemploy someone, that person will not be left behind. What we are doing is publicly defanging the isolate-and-starve strategy that they use to keep everyone intimidated and silent in the face of the SJW narrative.

When people see that they will actually be better off as a result of being attacked by an SJW swarm, they will be less reluctant to stand up for themselves and their
beliefs.

As I mentioned in the comments section this morning, I kicked in a few bucks to the Freestart campaign yesterday. My thoughts were:

1. That was really easy.
2. That felt great!

Now it feels even better. Try it and you will see what I mean.

Edit: Here is the latest update from Vox.
David and Louise Turpin are accused of chaining up and starving their 13 children. This is understandably a huge story for the media, but it is also one that presents a difficult challenge. All of the information I’ve seen to date strongly indicates that Louise Turpin was the leader and her husband David was the follower. Normally this would lead to feminist gloating, but in this case the narrative requires ignoring the obvious signs that the wife was in charge.

When it came out that Louise wanted to feature her family on reality TV, the headline turned Louise into “Parents”: Parents In Perris Torture Case Had Reality TV Aspirations.

Likewise, the Daily Mail described Louise as having a midlife crisis:

Teresa Robinette says Louise Turpin was just about to turn 40 when her sister hit a midlife crisis.

...‘At that same time she started gambling, she started taking trips down to Vegas and she got a totally different hairstyle — dramatically different,’ said Teresa

But the Daily mail changed Louise to the Turpin couple in the headline: Turpin couple hit a ‘midlife crisis’ says Louise’s sister.

The same sister features in a hilarious quote about the couple sowing their wild oats that they didn’t get to sow while she was still young. From the NY Post, quoting an interview with the sister by Megyn Kelly:

Apparently weary of their button-down religious lifestyle, the Bible-thumping couple began to cut loose about a decade ago, “experimenting in different religions” and forcing their older children to “take care of the younger children so that her and David could kinda sow those wild oats that they didn’t sow when she was younger,” Robinette said.

This is in reference to Louise Turpin cuckolding her husband David, who we are told signed off on the arrangement:

“She met this man at a motel, slept with him, and what makes it even worse and even weirder is that exactly one year to the day of the anniversary that she did that, she called me and thought it was funny that David was taking her back to the exact same hotel room — the exact same bed that she slept with this man in — so that
David could sleep with her in the same bed.”

But despite the mountain of evidence that Louise was in charge—from the cuckoldry to the statements by family, not to mention the body language in the pictures and videos of the couple—her sister and half brother speculate in the Daily Mail article that David put her up to the abuse of their children:

‘I blame both of them equally,’ added Teresa. ‘If she had nothing to do with it she should have stepped up and left. She could have got out at any time — unlike their children.’

And Billy added: ‘I would rather believe that David put this into her head, but I can’t because she grew up knowing this sort of thing was wrong. We were not brought up like this.

‘If it was David, she should have got out of that situation herself a long time ago.’
He’s seen this movie before.

by Dalrock | January 24, 2018 | Link

Picking up where I left off yesterday, the headline at the Sun reads:

Turpin dad was ‘mythical cult leader who made his wife and 13 house of horrors kids worship him in deeply Christian sect’, lawyer claims

Yet despite the sensational claim in the headline, the quotes in the article don’t back up the assertion. From the quotes provided, the lawyer (Rodriguez) didn’t claim that the father was the leader of a cult. What he said was that in some cases this is what has happened:

It’s not clear what motivated the Turpins to live a secluded life with their large brood or what went on in the house.

But parents convicted in similar cases exerted control over their children though intimidation, psychological and physical coercion, and frequently possessed their own belief system, claims Attorney Ambrosio Rodriguez.

He said: “They develop a kind of cultish doomsday type of religion where the father becomes this mythical leader and the mother and children’s duty is to serve the father.”

Like I did in my post yesterday, Rodriguez is speculating. While I pointed out the evidence so far that strongly suggests the wife was in charge*, Rodriguez is basing his speculation on past experience:

“I’ve seen this movie before,” Rodriguez said.

“It’s going to get more creepy and make our skin crawl. And at the end of it, we’re all going to be asking the same question: ‘How did this happen in front of us and no one noticed?’”

The article references a case Rodriguez worked in the past, where a Christian pastor abused five children. However, the case they offer to bolster the claim that it must have been the father abusing the wife and children doesn’t fit the pattern. In the movie Rodriguez saw before, the perpetrator was a woman, and there was evidently not a man around to blame her actions on:

Rodriguez was a longtime Riverside County prosecutor who sent Jessica Banks, a pastor and mother, to prison for life for beating, starving and drugging her five adopted daughters, who were kept locked in her garage.

H/T HoseB

*Which would not lessen the father’s guilt.
Won’t someone think of the children who want to become single mothers?
by Dalrock | January 25, 2018 | Link

Commenter Evan Turner asks how Christian fathers are supposed to facilitate their daughters becoming single mothers without child support:

Wow i used to like reading the blog and comments on here but this is a true “jump the shark” moment for me. Child support is evil? Really? ...

Everyman who has sex knows the risk, if they don’t want to pay for 18 years don’t have sex. We all know that there are consequences for every action. For Christians here to give cover to irresponsible men is disturbing. If there were no child support laws here and your underage daughter got pregnant what would you do?

Like nearly all proponents of the system designed to replace marriage, Turner wants to create a false dichotomy where everyone is either on team single mother (with him), or on team cad. But I am on neither team, and neither should Turner be. I am on team marriage. Instead of worrying about the aspirations of children to grow up to become single mothers (keeping the dream alive!), Turner should be worrying about the millions of fatherless children born due to the family model he so passionately defends*:

Turner also roughly equates the child support model (which replaces marriage) with God’s law in the Old Testament (which forced marriage).

Do you think an irresponsible man in ancient Israel would have sex with a virgin
without marrying her again after having to pay the virgin dowry or having to work off
the debt for several years? Likewise a man who is paying child support for 18 years
will think twice about being irresponsible again. I know some of these men who
learned the hard way.

This is the other massive problem with the child support model. It isn’t just that it offers
women a **cash incentive** to become single mothers. Defenders of the child support model, as
both Turner and Brother Jed have demonstrated, provide a passionate moral argument that
women deserve to have the option to become single mothers, going so far as to imply that
the child support family model has God’s blessing.

*Figure 1 from the 2014 NCHS data brief Recent Declines in Nonmarital Childbearing in the
United States.*
“Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the great and awesome day of the Lord comes. And he will turn the hearts of fathers to their children and the hearts of children to their fathers, lest I come and strike the land with a decree of utter destruction.”

-Malachi 4:5-6 ESV

Cane Caldo makes the case for bringing the concept of bastard back:

Mothers of bastards are incentivized to make peace with the fathers. Currently, bastard mothers are incentivized to be at war with the father, and to threaten him with no access to his child. She is incentivized to recruit the power of the courts against him because it is her best bet financially; even though it is the worst bet for the bastard’s spiritual, mental, and emotional good. “Blessed are the peacemakers.”

This is the old conservative view, and is contrary to the new conservative view which has great zeal for the new family model based on single mothers collecting child support. Interestingly, while modern conservatives almost universally love the new destructive family model, some on the left are concerned about the way this new model alienates fathers from their children (emphasis mine):

...child support is generally perceived as a pure good: a benefit to children, families, and society, as well as a moral and legal obligation of absent parents. But for the millions of children whose child support has been assigned to the government, the reality of child support is anything but pure or good. Poor mothers are forced to name absent fathers, and then sue them—and sue them again and again. Because the fathers are often also poor, the vast amount of assigned child support goes unpaid and insurmountable arrearages quickly result. The fathers who try almost always fail as the automated enforcement mechanisms throttle endlessly: a trucker’s license is suspended, so he cannot work; a laborer’s wages are garnished at sixty-five percent, so he cannot afford to pay his own rent; a father obtains a new job and then loses it after being incarcerated for contempt because of his child support arrearages. The relationships between the mothers and fathers, fragile at their beginnings, can be obliterated through the process. The hopes of children to have fathers who are supportive and involved in their lives are often dissolved.

The quote above is from the paper Child Support Harming Children: Subordinating the Best Interests of Children to the Fiscal Interests of the State, by Daniel L. Hatcher. Hatcher is arguing against the Republican welfare reform of the 1990s. This reform all but obliterated the line between welfare and child support and thereby exposed a new class of broken families to the corrosive power of the child support system.
While Hatcher is on the left and would prefer to remove all stigma from single motherhood (just like modern conservatives), he unintentionally makes Cane’s point that the concept of bastard promoted reconciliation and marriage due to the stigma attached to the term. Hatcher quotes an 1832 decision of the Court of Appeals of Kentucky regarding the bastardy act in Burgen v. Straughan (emphasis mine):

[N]or can we perceive how it can be unlawful or immoral, or inconsistent with the policy of the law, for the mother of a bastard to agree with the father that, if he will co-operate in the maintainance [sic] of their child, she will not proceed under the bastardy act . . . . It should not be deemed injurious to the community or county. It is not the public duty of the mother of an illegitimate child to assert her statutory right. Her voluntary forbearance is no breach of any moral or civil obligation. Her child may become a burthen to her county; but this might happen, and would, perhaps, be more likely to occur, if such contracts as that we are now considering should be declared illegal and void. Many, in her condition, might prefer all the wretchedness of destitution and poverty, to a voluntary promulgation, in a county court, of all the circumstances necessary to coerce contributions under the bastardy act.
One of Cane Caldo’s readers suggested that feminists are likely to complain that he hasn’t made his case regarding the term bastard with sufficient detail. Cane responded:

I can live with that and refuse to explain things to Feminists anyways. Explaining the realities of civilization to Feminists is like explaining the internal combustion engine to Feminists: You will talk about the need for a proper mixture of fuel, air, and spark and they will come back with a demand for a bigger pink key because everyone knows its keys that make cars go.

They don’t lack explanations. That’s not their problem.
Prager’s next lesson?
by Dalrock | January 29, 2018 | Link

Background here and here.

H/T Red Pill Latecomer.
Erasing “fathers” from Scripture.

by Dalrock | January 30, 2018 | Link

When I looked up the quote of Malachi 4:5-6 for Turning the hearts of children from their fathers, I noticed that the NIV translation has replaced “fathers” with “parents”.

> 5 “See, I will send the prophet Elijah to you before that great and dreadful day of the Lord comes. 6 He will turn the hearts of the parents to their children, and the hearts of the children to their parents; or else I will come and strike the land with total destruction.”

This is in line with Honor Your Father Today providing a sermon to honor fathers on Father’s Day that advised Christians to not refer to God as the Father, but to call him a “Best Friend”.

It is worth noting that Dr. Douglass Moo, the Chairman of the Committee on Bible Translation that produced the new father free translation of the verse above, is the same man John Piper and Wayne Grudem turned to when they wanted to make the case for women preaching to women. However, to Wayne Grudem’s credit, the translation Grudem edits (ESV) has not feminised the passage, and has actually made recent changes that are sure to offend egalitarians.

Related: It is all about clarity
Does God want us to complain?
by Dalrock | January 31, 2018 | Link

anonymous_ng linked to a post by pastor and Christian life coach Dr. Raymond Force, titled Where Men Blow It. Force explains that Scripture teaches us that God doesn’t mind it when we complain, and therefore Christian husbands shouldn’t discourage their wives from grumbling (emphasis mine):

On many occasions in the scriptures, especially Numbers 11:11-15, God’s men offered their complaint before the Lord.

[Quotes Psalm 77:3 and Numbers 11:11-15]

What I love about scriptures as such is they teach us that it is okay to reverentially offer our concerns, fears, worries, and even complaints before the Lord. What I also feel is fascinating is that one never finds God taking these complaints as though they are an attack against his person, nor do they find God getting defensive or taking things personally.

A woman needs a place to express, complain, vent, et cetera without condemnation. But, if a man is too wrapped up in his own sensitivities, he will fail to provide that which Christ offers to him on a daily basis.

The emphasized part is a bold claim, but very easily disproved. In fact, the very chapter Force quotes in Numbers as proof that God doesn’t mind when we grumble is all about God’s anger when we grumble. Numbers 11 opens with God’s fiery anger with the Israelites for complaining. This isn’t just metaphorical fiery anger, but God’s anger in the form of actual flames (Num 11:1, KJV):

11 And when the people complained, it displeased the Lord: and the Lord heard it; and his anger was kindled; and the fire of the Lord burnt among them, and consumed them that were in the uttermost parts of the camp.

God was so angry with the Israelites for complaining about the food that he provided them, that He chose to punish them by feeding them (Num 11:18-20, KJV):

18 And say thou unto the people, Sanctify yourselves against to morrow, and ye shall eat flesh: for ye have wept in the ears of the Lord, saying, Who shall give us flesh to eat? for it was well with us in Egypt: therefore the Lord will give you flesh, and ye shall eat.

19 Ye shall not eat one day, nor two days, nor five days, neither ten days, nor twenty days;

20 But even a whole month, until it come out at your nostrils, and it be loathsome unto you: because that ye have despised the Lord which is among you,
and have wept before him, saying, Why came we forth out of Egypt?

The same chapter ends with God killing some of the Israelites because of his anger at their complaining (Num 11:33-34, KJV):

33 And while the flesh was yet between their teeth, ere it was chewed, the wrath of the Lord was kindled against the people, **and the Lord smote the people with a very great plague.**

34 And he called the name of that place Kibrothhattaavah: because there they buried the people that lusted.

Even the part that Force quotes where Moses complains to God is about the evil of people complaining to their leaders. Force left this out by starting at verse 11 instead of 10, which provides the context. Moses was complaining about the burden the complainers were to him as a leader*:

10 Then Moses heard the people weep throughout their families, every man in the door of his tent: **and the anger of the Lord was kindled greatly**; Moses also was displeased.

11 And Moses said unto the Lord, Wherefore hast thou afflicted thy servant? and wherefore have I not found favour in thy sight, that thou layest the burden of all this people upon me?

Later, in chapter 14, God becomes so angry that the Israelites are still complaining that He tells Moses that He is going to smite them and start over with a new people (Num 14:11-12, KJV):

11 And the Lord said unto Moses, How long will this people provoke me? and how long will it be ere they believe me, for all the signs which I have shewed among them?

12 I will smite them with the pestilence, and disinherit them, and will make of thee a greater nation and mightier than they.

After Moses intervenes on their behalf, God agrees to forgive them. However, none of the complainers will be permitted to enter the promised land. Instead, the entire tribe must wander the desert for 40 years until the complainers are all dead (Num 11:33-34, KJV):

20 And the Lord said, I have pardoned according to thy word:

21 But as truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord.

22 Because all those men which have seen my glory, and my miracles, which I did in Egypt and in the wilderness, and have tempted me now these ten times, and have not hearkened to my voice;
23 Surely they shall not see the land which I sware unto their fathers, neither shall any of them that provoked me see it:

So given the clarity of the Scripture Force is quoting, why does he assert that:

..one never finds [in Scripture] God taking these complaints as though they are an attack against his person, nor do they find God getting defensive or taking things personally.

Why does Force make such a laughable statement, one so easy to completely disprove? The answer is, Force wants to excuse the sin of wives by making it a sin for husband to teach his wife what Scripture says about complaining, or to in any way discourage her from complaining:

A woman needs a place to express, complain, vent, et cetera without condemnation. But, if a man is too wrapped up in his own sensitivities, he will fail to provide that which Christ offers to him on a daily basis.

**Note:** I plan on writing a follow up post on the rest of the claims Force makes in Where Men Blow It. Edit: The follow up post is Winning her over without a word.

*See also Hebrews 13:17.*
99% servant, 1% leader.

by Dalrock | February 2, 2018 | Link

In Exactly What Does it Mean for the Wife to Submit to Her Husband, pastor and Christian life coach Dr. Raymond Force explains that the reason women bristle at the New Testament verses on submission is that they mistakenly think the verses mean they are to submit to their husband, who is the head of the marriage. Force assures them that the husband’s job is serve his wife, and only in the most rare occasions should he try to lead:

Some have an Unbiblical View of these Biblical Verses

In other articles, I talk about what biblical headship actually means, and I accentuate that **headship is 99% service and 1% decision making**. However, some seem to assume that headship means that the husband lords over the wife. I do not find that to be the spirit of these teachings at all.

This has always been my impression of the term Servant Leader. While it **sounds** biblical, in practice it is a term used to **deny headship**. However, I’ve never seen a complementarian put numbers to it like this before. Note that 1% is the absolute smallest number he could assign to leadership without adding a decimal point, and this is what he is really communicating. From this perspective, he could have just as well said headship is 99.99% service and .01% leadership, or 99.999% service and .001% leadership, etc. No one is going to actually do the math, as the point is that leadership is to be portrayed as **insignificant as possible** while still claiming headship includes leadership.

This 1%, or .01%, or .001% leadership (in theory) is what distinguishes complementarians from egalitarians, so it is extremely important to complementarians on a philosophical level. But from a practical perspective, for complementarians headship is always suspect and guilty until proven innocent of being abuse just as Force has framed it above. In Force’s framing above, if you believe that headship is from a real and practical perspective about leadership, you are one of those people who thinks headship means lording over your wife. Force reinforces this frame later in the post:

Religious Abusers

Everyone has met religious abusers that use the Word of God as a form of control over people. Because of the presence of people as such in the world, some have thrown the baby out with the bath water and followed their own ways and feelings rather than the Word of God.

When it comes to the above mentioned verses, we all know men that have abused these teachings. However, this does not mean that we should refrain from following these biblical precepts.

Having set the table to deny that headship means leadership/decision making in **practice**,
Force can then explain that in theory it means the husband leads without risk of his words actually resulting in leadership. At some point, in theory, after weeks, months, or even years of discussion, a wife should ultimately let her husband make a decision:

I see couples that will fight for weeks, months, and even years about where to move, financial decisions, what to purchase, et cetera. At some point, someone will have to pull the lever, and, from a biblical perspective, it should be the husband.

This in turn frees Force to present himself as the only real man/pastor in the room:

I know the temptation to play it safe, but, as a teacher of the Word, I am not called to keep the ship afloat. My responsibility is to please the Father. Though I preach to the masses, I still have an Audience of One, God the Father.

When it comes to verses on headship, I do believe that pastors are often afraid of teaching on these verses. Maybe it is because they are afraid of women (this is a consideration), or it is possible that they do not know how to articulate the true meaning of these verses. However, these verses are just as inspired as John 3:16 or Ephesians 2:8-9. And, if pastors are going to be true to their calling, they should be careful of conveniently omitting their responsibility to teach the whole counsel of God.

See Also:

- Complementarian marriage: Egalitarian marriage with a veneer of headship.
- She who must be obeyed.
In my last post I pointed out the pattern of complementarians defining headship as service in practice, and leadership in theory. Dr Raymond Force puts this into numbers as 99% service and 1% leadership, but the message is that leadership is to be minimized to the greatest extent possible without outright denying leadership.

But there is another problem, and this is the very framing that asserts that leadership and service are at odds, and that any time a husband leads/decides he is by definition not serving. The reality is that leadership is a form of service, and is a heavy weight the husband bears. That wives are being taught both by feminists and by complementarians that a husband exercising leadership is claiming (male) privilege at best, and in practice is really a form of abuse, only makes this burden heavier for the husband and makes submission harder for the wife.
BillyS noted in response to Leading *is* serving that Christ only washed his disciples’ feet once:

…Jesus washed their feet once, not throughout His time on the earth!

Cane Caldo advised against changing the subject in this way:

I recommend not quibbling with complementarians or egalitarians over how many times Jesus washed feet. That is a trapdoor into a room with no exit where you are not even Jesus and who knows how many washings is too many for a sinner like you?

Keep the focus on the truth that leading well IS serving. Make them defend the idea that Jesus didn’t serve God and His people while He was leading them.

Cane is right.

Complementarians start with the false assertion that a husband can either lead or serve. The frame here is that Christian husbands want to lead instead of serve. This false frame is easily destroyed by pointing out that leadership is service.

Changing the subject to foot washing, and especially complaining about foot washing, is a reframe back to the original complementarian error. In essence, if you do this you are asserting:

But I want to lead, not serve!

I have yet to meet a Christian husband who feels this way, but the internet is a huge place. So it is possible that this really is BillyS’s sentiment. However, I suspect this isn’t really his perspective. My guess is that BillyS is so used to being bombarded by the complementarian frame that he finds it difficult to leave it behind, and slipped back into it inadvertently.
Check out Fabius Maximus
by Dalrock | February 5, 2018 | Link

Reader Nick Mgtow was kind enough to point to a recent article on Fabius Maximus that referenced ideas from this blog: Child support payments create the new American family. The post is excellent, and I’m very pleased to see others outside of the Men’s Sphere pointing out the reality of our new family model.

---

Summary: Here are some mind-blowing facts about America’s new family system, and what encourages it and makes it work. No matter how traditional the marriage, what follows is often quite different.

Unmarried mothers are one part of the new American family. Divorce is the other.

Other related posts include:

- A look at America’s future after marriage becomes rare
- The coming crash as men and women go their own way

Edit: You can see a full list of his posts on gender topics here.

Fabius Maximus editor Larry Kummer writes on a wide range of topics, most of which aren’t specific to the Men’s Sphere. For example, his most recent post is: Dark secrets about our war in Afghanistan.

Summary: Trump has began his term by boosting the war in Afghanistan, just as Obama did. Accompanied by the usual happy talk. But this time we have 16 years of experience and good data. We will not be fooled again — if we pay attention. We can end our mad wars.

I don’t have the expertise to critique his assessment of the war in Afghanistan. However, I can say that it matches my own gut feel, and that I find it persuasive and interesting.

Kummer describes his political perspective (and the politics of the site):

One virtue of the FM site is its clear position about the politics of 21st century America: I stand against them. Choosing a party today is like cattle at the stockyards choosing a pen. They (being smarter than us) don’t bother with party identification. They don’t cheer the “left-side” pen: the virtue of its prisoners, the beauty of the fence, the free food. Those in the “right-side” pen don’t wear logos or bumper-stickers, or trumpet their superior intelligence over those in the other pen.
Sisters aren’t about to do it for themselves.
by Dalrock | February 7, 2018 | Link

As I’ve noted before, Feminism is the assertion that men are evil and naturally want to harm women, followed by pleas to men to solve all of women’s problems.

3x as many male managers are now uncomfortable mentoring women in the wake of #MeToo. This is a huge step in the wrong direction. We need more men to #MentorHer. https://t.co/RyPo0PBz7N

— Arianna Huffington (@ariannahuff) February 6, 2018

H/T Twitchy

See Also: “I have always depended on the sexual kindness of strangers.”
God spoke to him about the holy threatpoint.
by Dalrock | February 9, 2018 | Link

3 Likewise, wives, be subject to your own husbands, so that even if some do not obey the word, they may be won without a word by the conduct of their wives, 2 when they see your respectful and pure conduct. 3 Do not let your adorning be external—the braiding of hair and the putting on of gold jewelry, or the clothing you wear— 4 but let your adorning be the hidden person of the heart with the imperishable beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which in God's sight is very precious. 5 For this is how the holy women who hoped in God used to adorn themselves, by submitting to their own husbands, 6 as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord. And you are her children, if you do good and do not fear anything that is frightening.

— 1 Pet 3:1-6, ESV

Complementarian Gary Thomas went to a Christian Woman's conference and was confronted by a stream of women complaining about their husbands.

I recently spoke at a long-standing North American woman's conference and was overwhelmed by the quantity and horrific nature of things wives are having to put up with in their marriages. Between sessions, I was bombarded by heartfelt inquiries: “What does a wife do when her husband does this? Or that? Or keeps doing this?” It broke my heart...

He found the odds of this happening so unlikely that he concluded it must have been the hand of God:

...I don’t think it was an accident that I was constantly stopped at that woman’s conference and forced to hear despicable story after despicable story (“forced” isn’t the right word. I could, of course, have walked away. I think God wanted me to see the breadth and depth of what is going on, and in this case, perhaps to be His voice.

The message from God that Thomas took away from this freak series of presumably random encounters is the importance of the wakeup call theology (emphasis original):

Christian leaders and friends, we have to see that some evil men are using their wives’ Christian guilt and our teaching about the sanctity of marriage as a weapon to keep harming them. I can’t help feeling that if more women started saying, “This is over” and were backed up by a church that enabled them to escape instead of enabling the abuse to continue, other men in the church, tempted toward the same behavior, might finally wake up and change their ways.

Christians are more likely to have one-income families, making some Christian wives feel even more vulnerable. We have got to clean up our own house. We have got to say “Enough is enough.” We have got to put the fear of
God in some terrible husbands’ hearts, because they sure don’t fear their wives and their lack of respect is leading to ongoing deplorable behavior.

I want a man who was abusive to have to explain to a potential second wife why his saintly first wife left him. Let men realize that behavior has consequences, and that wives are supposed to be cherished, not used, not abused, and never treated as sexual playthings. If a man wants the benefit and companionship of a good woman, let him earn it, and re-earn it, and let him know it can be lost.

Note that when he says “fear of God”, he means fear of wife.

H/T The Question
David Marcus has a new post up at The Federalist demonstrating that modern conservatism is feminism with a chivalrous cherry on top. From We Must Still Keep Teaching Our Boys They Must Never Hit Girls (emphasis mine):

Several years ago while at a barbecue, an old friend who is a liberal feminist and I were watching my 4-year-old son play with her 4-year-old daughter. Eventually there was some dispute over a water gun that led to shoving. Almost simultaneously my friend cried out “No shrinking violets” to her daughter as I yelled “We don’t hit girls” to my son.

It was an interesting moment, because I realized that my friend was absolutely right to teach her daughter not to back down from confrontations with boys. But I also knew that I was right to tell my son not to push or hit girls. These two ideas are both correct, but feel in some sense at odds with each other.

A few years later, after a girl hit his son, Marcus was forced to revisit the importance of chivalry while again reiterating his commitment to feminism:

But at the same time as establishing this important difference between the sexes, it’s necessary to make it understood in the context of a broader equality. Not hitting girls is not transactional. Boys and men don’t get something in return from women for obeying this rule.

H/T Darwinian Arminian
Larry Kummer at Fabius Maximus responds to the illogical modern conservative position in
Modern women say “follow the rules while we break them”. Kummer points out that the
position modern conservatives are trying to conserve (feminism plus chivalry) is inherently
unstable, and as a result must eventually fall:

Societies can be disrupted, just like businesses

Marcus’ son went to the heart of the matter when saying that his dad’s rules were
not fair. In our system where each individual has agency — making his or her own
moral choices — the system must appear fair. If it requires a philosopher or
professor of women’s studies to explain the logic of the society’s rules, the rules will
not stand for long.

... 

What lies ahead?

Change. We have broken the old gender regime. It can no more be restored than
toothpaste put back into the tube. But the emerging feminist regime seems
irrational, unfair, and unstable. There is no obvious alternative to it now, but ...

“Mankind sets itself only such tasks as it is able to solve, since closer
examination will always show that the problem itself arises only when the
material conditions for its solution are already present or at least in the
course of formation.”

— Karl Marx in A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy (1859).

His economics is mostly bunk, but he was an incisive social analyst.

Kummer notes that the constant bombardment in all forms of media of women hitting and
otherwise physically attacking men is working as designed; over time it is changing our views
of what is normal. As an example of the change, my wife was talking to a roughly 20 year old
man the other day, and he mentioned in conversation that he and his friends have stopped
going to parties due to young women trying to start fist fights with the men. This young
man’s decision to exit the party scene is an example of women playing by an entirely new set
of rules and men continuing to play by the old, but there are already fissures appearing in
this new model. The young man described a scenario where after being refused by several
white men, a moxie filled feminist was finally obliged by a black man who proceeded to (with
minimal effort) knock her across the room. As expected, the complaint from the women
present went immediately from taunting “you are too chicken to fight a girl”, to outrage “you hit a girl”!

The reason both conservatives and feminists are so confident that this new arrangement can be maintained is their faith in chivalry as an immutable trait of men. While feminists constantly accuse men of being evil, the foundation of feminism is an unshakable faith in the goodness of men (examples here and here).

Losing chivalry as a (near) universal value by men would be a disaster for the feminist project, as while the domestic violence paradigm is intellectually founded on an attack on past patriarchal values, implementation of the model relies on an extreme sense of chivalry. How else could feminists implement a legal model where wives and girlfriends are free to attack their boyfriends and husbands while enforcing the harshest sanctions against men who fight back or even leave the room before the woman is done? This is why feminist UFC fighter Ronda Rousey refuses to fight a man while at the same time boasts that she could beat up the men in her weight class. If Rousey were to back up her boasting in a sanctioned fight the man would have to be allowed to fight back. This is unthinkable:

They’re not gonna do anything like that. Fights are chaotic. Anything can happen. And there’s no setting in which we should condone a man hitting a woman. I really just don’t think that any athletic commission on Earth would ever condone something like that.

Fights are going to go both ways. You’re going to see both people hitting each other. I don’t think we should celebrate a man hitting a woman in any kind of setting.

It isn’t that Rousey objects to images of women fighting with men. That is something she relishes. But her feminism suddenly becomes conservative when it comes to the idea of men hitting back.

As Kummer notes, chivalry is a vestige of a previous time, and is entirely inconsistent with an age where we are repeatedly told women are as tough as men. Today most people accept the feminist position that not including women in Delta and the SEAL Team 6 is a terrible injustice (because women are as tough as men), while also believing that a husband who hits his wife back is a monster (because men are far stronger than women). This commonly accepted contradiction isn’t a natural position; it is merely an artifact of our transition from a time of different values. Conservatives want to freeze this moment in time, but this simply isn’t possible. Even if feminists immediately stopped pushing for further change, eventually the contradiction would fall of its own weight.

Yet feminists aren’t done pushing for further change. There is another more subtle feminist message in all forms of entertainment that will ultimately prove even more corrosive to the idea of chivalry than showing women regularly beating up men. As if it were enforced by law, all modern action stories follow a very specific pattern. First we see two or more men banding together fighting their enemies. Usually it starts with women in the periphery, in leadership roles (the general ordering the men into battle), and/or in supporting roles (the kickass hacker gal, etc). But once the group of men are established as elite warriors, the stage is set for every feminists’ wet dream; the woman who proves she is one of the guys.
While our heroine (let's call her Mary Sue) is just as tough as the men (if not tougher!), she is different than the men in one very important way. Part of the original scenes establishing the group of men as elite warriors is the depiction of a manly comradery. Each man depends on the other men to have his back, and typically this will be demonstrated by one or more scenes where one man takes out an assailant who is in the process of attacking a comrade who is situationally vulnerable. These moments aren't incidental, as they demonstrate that the woman is breaking into a bonafide group of fighting men. But once Mary Sue has arrived on the scene and started kicking ass, a different version of this exchange is called for almost immediately. As the men did with one another, one of the men will take out an assailant who has gotten the drop on Mary Sue. But instead of building comradery, this will result in over the top fury by the woman. The man defending her will not be seen as treating her as one of the guys, but as practicing chivalry by defending a woman. This isn't shown as Mary Sue being irrational, but as a moral lesson for the men (especially the young men) watching. While this message is less noticeable than the trope of the kick ass warrior woman, the assault on the concept of chivalry is even more potent here because the men watching can often rationalize the men fighting the warrior woman as bad guys. But here the object of the lesson is an ostensible good guy, and the moral is clear that defending the woman was an outrageous act of disrespect because it smacks of chivalry. Older men aren't likely to abandon their chivalry as a result of this conditioning, but younger men will, and eventually all men will have grown up under this new conditioning.
Setting a record in trailblazing.

by Dalrock | February 19, 2018 | Link

On September 21, 2017 the Washington Post triumphantly announced that the first woman had completed the Marine Infantry Officer Course:

In a historic first, the Marine Corps plans to assign a female officer to the infantry following her anticipated graduation from its grueling training program, service officials said Thursday.

Four days later came the NY Times Op Ed explaining that women Marines would be accepted as combat officers because their peers would know they are the real deal:

By integrating only women who have already met the infantry’s difficult training standards, the corps acknowledges that military readiness is paramount. At the end of the day, this newly minted infantry officer will prove herself by the way she carries herself around her fellow Marines. Peer leadership, too, will be important. Her classmates have seen her perform and can be powerful allies as she integrates into the operating forces.

Indeed, as the Op Ed concluded, this was the beginning of a brave new world:

I anticipate there will be little fanfare from the Marine Corps regarding the graduation. As The Times has noted, the Army’s graduation ceremony for its first female infantry soldiers made no mention that some of them were women — and that is as it should be. Monday’s graduation is important because it paves the way for women in combat arms not to be a big deal in the future. Like her male classmates, this officer has met an exceptionally high standard. Soon, she will be just one more Marine infantry lieutenant, picking up her first platoon.

But this brave new world where women were just as tough as the men and had to meet historic standards was not only short lived, it was a universe of one. Having proved that they could (by hook or crook) graduate one woman through the Infantry Officer Program without officially making the course much easier, the Marine Corps waited just over four months to stop pretending women could qualify without changing the rules. On Feb 7th, the Marine Corps Times announced Passing Combat Endurance Test is no longer required for infantry officers. According to the article this is such a minor change that it hardly merits noting. At the same time, it explains that the previous standard was so ridiculously high it had to be changed or women would be prevented from becoming infantry officers:

In a slight change to the grueling initial stage of the 13-week Infantry Officer Course, Marines will no longer be required to pass the Combat Endurance Test to move on.

The Corps has come under criticism for what some have claimed to be unnecessarily high standards to graduate from the course. To date, only one unnamed female Marine has successfully completed the entire course.
But Marine officials at Training Command contend the changes are not an effort to water down standards.

This is the official beginning of stage two for Marine infantry. Given that stage one lasted only four months, we should expect lightning progress moving forward.
The changing “thoughts and prayers” narrative from the left.

by Dalrock | February 20, 2018 | Link

With the full court press by the left condemning figures on the right for offering “thoughts and prayers” for the victims of the Florida mass shooting, it is worth noting that at other times the left feels the only appropriate response to mass murder is thoughts and prayers.

Just hours after ISIS terrorist Mohamed Lahouaiej-Bouhlel killed 86 and injured another 434 in Nice on Bastille Day, the Guardian ran an opinion piece titled Sympathy should be our only response to the Nice terror attack:

We should not pretend that any state can stop one madman in a truck. Most official responses are likely only to make things worse.

Eighty-four people died late on Thursday night as a lorry drove for more than a mile through the Bastille Day crowds in the southern French city of Nice. The driver eventually died in a hail of police bullets. The incident, on a day when the French celebrate equality, liberty and fraternity, could hardly be more horrific.

The victims are beyond help, but the French people should have whatever sympathy the world can usefully offer. The danger is that ritualised global responses to these incidents become their megaphone. They raise the multiplier impact of the terror - and also raise public expectation that “something can be done”.

The Guardian preemptively warned that there was no such thing as sensible terrorist control:

The French president, François Hollande, has extended for three months the state of emergency resulting from the Charlie Hebdo killings and the events in Paris last November. He has announced, yet again, that France is “at war” with the threat of Islamist terrorism.

... Such responses may comfort the citizens of Nice in their state of shock. But there is no defence force on Earth that can defend a crowd from a madman in a truck.

Since their invention at the end of the 19th century, motor vehicles have been agencies of terror and death. The first car bomb was “Buda's wagon”, which blasted Wall Street in 1920. Cars and trucks are not going to be banned, any more than America is going to ban guns. The only sensible response is to accept the degree of risk that they will always pose, and not pretend it can be made to disappear.
Note that the Guardian implicitly coopted the argument of second amendment supporters when responding to the Nice attack.

The same day, the Independent ran a positive story about President Obama’s response to the terror attack:

> On behalf of the American people, I condemn in the strongest terms what appears to be a horrific terrorist attack in Nice, France, which killed and wounded dozens of innocent civilians. Our thoughts and prayers are with the families and other loved ones of those killed, and we wish a full recovery for the many wounded.

Likewise, after the terrorist attack in Manhattan in November of last year, the NY Times ran an opinion piece titled After the Terror decrying the “tiresome” calls for sensible border control:

> But the hard fact is that it is not possible, and never will be, to anticipate every attack, to make cities teeming with life immune to the desperate acts of men seething with resentments, especially when final preparations are as banal as renting a truck.

> And as for the tiresome calls for draconian border controls, could immigration authorities really have foreseen in 2010 that a 22-year-old arrival from Uzbekistan — which is not on the list of countries on the Trump administration’s travel ban — would be radicalized and evolve into a killer? Mr. Saipov’s cries of “Allahu akbar” and other evidence speak to an affinity for the Islamic State, but it does not require a long apprenticeship in a terrorist network to rent a Home Depot truck and drive onto a bicycle path.

Compare the above with the obviously coordinated effort on the left to condemn leaders on the right for expressing thoughts and prayers for the victims of mass shootings. After the Florida shooting the Guardian ran an opinion piece titled Heartbreak isn’t enough. Shootings will continue until laws are changed:

> We deserve to have lawmakers who understand that prioritizing public safety is not a political issue – it is a matter of common sense

> But being heartbroken over these tragedies isn’t enough. We must act. We must demand that our lawmakers do more to end the crisis of gun violence in our schools, in our homes and in public places. Gun violence will continue to happen in every American community, until we finally change our gun laws. What happened in Florida was preventable – gun violence is preventable.

After the Vegas shooting the Guardian went so far as to imply that after Muslim terror attacks
everyone agrees that we should demand action, not offer thoughts and prayers. From Mourn the Las Vegas shooting, we’re told. But don’t ask why it happened.

We don’t stop talking about terrorism after another Isis attack. But many want the gun control debate to be a taboo after a mass shooting.

After the Las Vegas massacre, we’re told we cannot talk about politics. At times of public mourning, we must maintain some dignity that is otherwise entirely absent from our politics: we must pray, reflect on the nature of evil, but never debate what to do next.

Because what we’ll do next is mourn the next mass murder in the United States.

There is a strange exclusion zone around white gun violence by second amendment fanatics. Mass murder by Muslims (or foreigners who may have come from majority Muslim countries) is not subject to the same kind of hushed grieving. Gang warfare in Chicago receives no such respect.

Note: This post started as a comment at Instapundit. See also this related post at Instapundit.
Huge improvements! But don’t worry, nothing is changing.

by Dalrock | February 22, 2018 | Link

The USMC puts on a clinic on how to lower standards to accommodate women while denying that anything is being done to accommodate women. From Infantry Officer Course lowers requirement for hikes. Brig. Gen. Jason Q. Bohm leads the way, explaining that the goal was not to reduce the number of students who failed, but to increase the number who passed:

...it was not about lowering attrition, it was about making students more successful to complete the course.

Inspired by the masterful work of Gen Bohm, Marine Corps Times senior reporter Shawn Snow tries his own hand. Snow explains that the changes followed a full court press by feminists to lower the standards to move women into a previously all male field.

The Corps has come under criticism regarding the notoriously grueling 13-week infantry course that so far has only seen one woman successfully graduate.

But the changes can’t be due to an effort to help women, since the class in question used to be a male dominated field:

But most washouts from the IOC are men — only 35 women have attempted the course, and only five of those have attended the IOC after the job field was opened to women.

Most importantly, when the Corps lowered the standards, it had nothing to do with lowering standards:

The recent changes, the Corps argues, have nothing to do with gender integration in the combat arms job fields or a watering down of any standards.

Key to obscuring the change is to have all of the students continue to go through the motions:

While the Corps has modified graduation requirements to accurately reflect the infantry manual, Marines attending the course will still have to participate in all the events.

...

“The course is as hard as it’s ever been. We did not do away with any training events,” Bohm said.

And while the standards haven’t been lowered as part of the effort to integrate women, the standard was lowered as a result of the push to integrate women:
One of the evaluated hikes was changed to meet gender-neutral standards referred to as Military Occupational Specialty Specific Performance Standards, or MSPS, Bohm said.

The 2015 NDAA called for the service branches to draft gender-neutral standards as the services began gender integration into the combat jobs previously closed to women.

That hike that was changed is the 15-km hike, which must be completed within three hours while humping 105 lbs of kit and weapons.

But as good as he is, even Snow can’t keep up with the General’s masterful use of doublethink:

But the Corps has struggled to adequately explain how its changes to the IOC are not an attempt to make the course easier, especially if one of the intended goals is to increase graduation numbers.

Back to that march that was made easier as a result of the push to integrate women (but doesn’t represent a watering down of standards to accommodate women). Here the USMC has outdone itself by creating a structure where the men will have to carry the heavy gear for the women, all with plausible deniability (emphasis mine):

Previously, Marines had to conduct a single file forced march carrying heavy and medium weapon systems that could weigh anywhere from 125 lbs-150 lbs.

“There was a lot of angst about our students having to carry 150 lbs,” Bohm said.

Now the hike is done as a tactical displacement, where Marines practice bounding during a simulated attack. The Marines are no longer required to single-handedly carry all 125-150 lbs, and can pass the weight off to a buddy as they tire.

Brilliant!

H/T Lost Patrol.

See Also: How to cover up a girly Marine cover.
God, guns, and single mothers.
by Dalrock | February 26, 2018 | Link

Spoiler alert: This post discusses the plot of the movie The 15:17 to Paris.

I had the chance to watch The 15:17 to Paris last week, a movie the critics have brutalized. Slate’s review of the movie is titled The 15:17 to Paris Is Such a Meandering, Tedium Ride It’s Almost Avant-Garde and features the quip:

| The geese in Sully were more well-rounded characters.

I should start by noting that the last 30 minutes or so of the movie was very compelling, and the three men the movie is about are true heroes who deserve the honor of having a movie made about them, as well as the honor of playing themselves in said movie.

And yet I find myself in surprising agreement with Slate. There was something very clunky about the arc of the plot. There was an obvious attempt to make a feel good movie for social conservatives, where a lifetime immersed in traditional values of God, guns, and masculine virtues leads three ordinary seeming men to step up when it mattered most and do something profoundly heroic. Even if the movie succeeded here it would probably have been a little bit clunky (think the production quality of Fireproof), but it would have been a feel good clunky. That is the movie I was expecting, or at least hoping for.

The problem is the story contradicts the very arc it is trying to convey. The movie shows Spencer Stone and Alek Skarlatos as children of single mothers who are clearly desperate for the missing fathers in their lives. Everyone in the early part of the movie notices this except for the boys and their mothers. Even worse, while the movie provides this information, the perspective of the movie is that such an idea is nonsense; whenever the importance of fathers is mentioned it is portrayed as an attack on God, family, and an unfair attack on the boys themselves.

The best example of this bizarre perspective is when the boy’s public school teacher calls the mothers in for conferences. The mothers decide to team up and have both conferences at once to provide each other moral support, since the teacher is unfairly picking on their sons. After the teacher states that boys of single mothers struggle more (statistically), Stone’s mother is outraged and responds with:

| My God is bigger than your statistics!

This is delivered in such a way that it is clearly intended as one of the key feelgood lines of the movie. Ha! She sure taught that godless public school teacher a lesson about Christ!

While craven excuses for rampant single motherhood are extremely common in conservative Christian circles, this scene was so bizarre that even modern Christians are likely to scratch their heads. The official modern Christian tack when excusing single motherhood is to acknowledge the cost that children pay but blame the fathers. But the movie doesn’t even bother trying to do this. There is no hint that Stone’s father cheated on or abused his mother.
or abandoned the family. The message is one of outrage that the ostensibly godless teacher had such antiquated views of the family and dared to shame the Christian single mothers.

When googling the line I happened on the relevant section from the book, and while the book explains that she only wished she said the feel good line it is clear that the message was outrage at shaming single mothers by suggesting that fathers are essential:

“You know, boys with single moms,” the teacher went on, “it’s just statistics, Ms. Eskel. Statistically they’re more likely to develop problems.”

Statistics? Joyce seethed. How dare this woman look down on her just because she was a single mom and her kid was a little behind? She lit up with a million things she wanted to say to this woman. You know what, she thought, my God is bigger than the world’s statistics, so I don’t really care what any of you say. You don’t get to talk to me like that.

One thing both the book and the movie do is weave in this outrage at the idea that fathers are essential with the mothers’ rejection of the teacher’s advice to put the boys on ADD drugs. In essence, both the book and the movie are ironically using ADD as an attempt to distract the viewer/reader from the absurdity of the single motherhood is God’s way tack.

From here the boys are sent to a private Christian school, but they continue to have the same problems relating to lack of discipline and respect for authority. The movie shows them remaining in the halls having a casual conversation after the bell rings, even as all of their peers scramble to get to class. When confronted by a teacher, the boys cop an attitude, and this same attitude causes them to repeatedly be sent to the principal’s office. This is framed in the movie as the school being unfair, even though the movie shows the boys repeatedly acting out. I noticed from the same link to the book that the movie is true to the book here as well:

[After Spencer didn’t win his bid for School President], Spencer’s hatred for the school grew. The place rubbed him the wrong way. They were too involved. The way they enveloped every part of his life was too much; he had gone from a fatherless home to a place with a dozen new fathers and mothers. It didn’t feel right, even though he didn’t quite know how to explain why it felt wrong. Spencer was small and unconfident, and the teachers felt off to him; they were unlike the teachers at his old school. He didn’t like going to church and school with the same people, under the same authority; it was the mixing of two worlds for which some separation felt natural. People were always watching. They were too interested in him, but seemed to be looking past him, through him, like he had some rotten thing inside he hadn’t known about but they were certain was there. When he bristled and pushed back they punished him, pulled him into the principal’s office and kept him there for hours, which felt like days, insulting his character, invoking God to reduce him to tears and assure him he was shaming the Lord, that he needed to conform because he was walking down a path toward sure damnation.

From here the movie switches from God to guns, but the same problem occurs. After it is well established that Spencer is growing up without a father and rebellious against authority,
Spencer invites a friend (Anthony Sadler) over to see his room. Spencer starts showing Anthony his collection of Airsoft (toy) guns, and then pulls out what looks like a 12 gauge shotgun. Spencer confirms that the chamber is empty before dry firing it, explaining that it is for hunting. Anthony replies that black people don’t hunt, and the two head off to teepee the neighbor’s house. The scene was clearly intended to invoke a feel good feeling from firearm enthusiasts, but as a solid member of their target audience I was left with the same feeling as the line about God and single mothers. The right way to make the point they were trying to make would have been to show Spencer’s father taking him hunting and teaching him self discipline and gun safety. Hopefully that happened prior to the divorce, because there is no hint that Spencer’s mother did these things.

Eventually the movie shows the mean authority figures of the Christian private school as strongly suggesting that Alek move in with his father. Again, the events the movie shows make his and Spencer’s need for their fathers abundantly clear, but the frame of the movie is that this was mere cruelty on the school’s part. Alek goes to live with his father and we don’t see him until all three friends are around 18 or 19. I won’t go through the rest of the plot with the same level of detail, but the story arc continues to suffer because of the movie’s internal contradiction. Adult Alek (now played by the real life Alek) comes off as much more self assured than adult Spencer does, but Spencer and to a lesser extent Alek are both shown as continuing to struggle with paying attention and discipline.

In the end, all three of these men did something truly extraordinary, and they deserve all of the adulation they have received. But the movie itself fails because it is at war with the very message it is trying to convey.
Winning her over without a word.

by Dalrock | February 28, 2018 | Link

3 Likewise, wives, be subject to your own husbands, so that even if some do not obey the word, they may be won without a word by the conduct of their wives, 2 when they see your respectful and pure conduct. 3 Do not let your adorning be external—the braiding of hair and the putting on of gold jewelry, or the clothing you wear— 4 but let your adorning be the hidden person of the heart with the imperishable beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which in God’s sight is very precious. 5 For this is how the holy women who hoped in God used to adorn themselves, by submitting to their own husbands, 6 as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord. And you are her children, if you do good and do not fear anything that is frightening.

— 1 Peter 3:1-6, ESV

On the surface it would seem that modern conservative Christians (eg complementarians) are on the same page as feminists/egalitarians on the issue of headship and submission in marriage. Both are deeply troubled by headship and submission as they are defined in the Bible. However, there is an important distinction. Feminists/egalitarians want to abolish biblical headship and submission and replace it with a gender neutral model where husbands and wives have the same roles. Conservative Christians on the other hand want to abolish biblical headship and submission while keeping distinct sex based roles in marriage. Conservative Christians manage this contradiction by substituting cartoonish chivalry in place of biblical teaching, and by reversing the roles of husband and wife.

Thus, the difference between conservative Christians and egalitarians is very much like the difference between traditional feminists and Caitlyn Jenner. Traditional feminists want to minimize if not abolish the distinction between the sexes, whereas Caitlyn is obsessed with the differences between the sexes; (s)he merely wants to switch places.

What is fascinating is this new crossdressing version of Christianity is so common, no one even notices it! Imagine a world where no one even understood that Caitlyn was doing something unusual, and you will understand the complete transformation that has occurred within conservative Christianity. The Bible tells us that husbands are to actively lead their wives, washing them with the water of the word (Eph 5:22-27). Wives on the other hand are to submit to their husband, and win their husband over without a word (1 Pet 3:1-6). In the new crossdressing version of Christian marriage, wives are to lead their husbands, and husbands are to win their wives over without a word.

The most popular example of the new crossdressing view of Christian marriage is the movie Fireproof from 2008. In Fireproof, the wife files for divorce and starts an affair with a colleague at work. The husband learns that his response as a Christian husband is to remain silent and try to win his wife over through his submission. This leads to a triumphant scene where the husband confronts the man his wife is having an affair with and announces that he...
is going to fight for his wife’s heart:

Caleb Holt: I know what you’re doing. And I have no intention of stepping aside as you try to steal my wife’s heart. I’ve made some mistakes, but I still love her. So just know that I am going after her too. And since I’m married to her, I’d say I’ve got a head start. By the way,

[closes his hand to form a fist]

Again, Fireproof* shows the husband living out the biblical role of the wife, and presents it as the Christian model for marriage. To the film’s credit, in a surprise plot twist at the end we learn that originally it was a wife that had to win her husband over without a word (imagine that!). However, this is mentioned as a reference to one specific woman, not to the fact that the movie has reversed scriptural teaching.

But Fireproof is just the most widely praised example of this ubiquitous modern Christian teaching. Last month I wrote about a post by pastor and Christian life coach Dr. Raymond Force, titled Where Men Blow It. In my previous post I covered Force’s absurd claim that Scripture teaches us that God doesn’t mind it when we complain, and therefore Christian husbands must encourage their wives to complain as much as they like. As I showed in my previous post, the very Scripture Force quotes to back his claim that God doesn’t mind when we grumble is actually all about God’s wrath when the Israelites were grumbling! Force took a chapter of Numbers that featured God consuming the Israelites with fire and putting a plague on them for complaining, and claimed this showed that God wants us to feel free to complain.

This is pure nonsense, but his message is what modern Christians love so Force can write these things without fear of being challenged. But this was only the first part of Force’s twisted teaching. In the rest of the post Force goes on to teach that husbands need to win their wives over without a word. Force does this in two parts. The first message is that husbands need to give their wives the “Freedom to Learn Gracefully”:

Christ supplies an environment that allows men to learn gracefully. In other words, He allows us to trip up over ourselves, rethink our approach to life, and even blow it at times yet all in an atmosphere of grace. (I John 1:9, Romans 5:20, Matthew 11:28-29, I Peter 5:7, and Matthew 12:20) If a man is going to love his wife as Christ loved the church, then I believe he should provide the same atmosphere for his wife.

On many occasions, however, a man will see the shortcomings of his wife, her emotional vulnerabilities, or mood swings and offer criticism rather than grace. If this occurs, then it must be understood that he is failing to love his wife as Christ loved the church in that he is allowing the atmosphere in his marriage to be that of criticism rather than grace and understanding.

So while the job of a wife is to constantly complain, the job of a husband is to win her over without a word. Force reinforces this in the next section titled “Freedom to Respond on Her Own Volition”, explaining that a husband’s job is to (just like Fireproof) win his wife’s heart (emphasis mine):
Men that are trying to win back the heart of their wife can come across as controlling, even while using good Biblical behavior. Whereas they formerly used anger and selfish behavior to secure their selfish desires, even their good behavior can have a string of expectation attached.

A man in this situation will do well to do what we teach in chapter 6 of our marriage book and love his wife because it is right not because it may secure a desired result.

It must be noted that just as Christ loves and then allows us to respond, a man must enter that vacuum of sorts where he does not know how his wife is going to respond. He may be waiting a while, but if I remember, Christ patiently waited for us.

*And the accompanying book The Love Dare.*
Their love for crossdressing is sincere.

by Dalrock | March 1, 2018 | Link

Reader Swanny River commented on the zeal conservative Christians have for the husbands winning their wives without a word:

---

Take it from a submitted husband, the church has no limits and continue burdening husbands, even once they go to bed exhausted from servant-leadership.

So even if a man succeeds at doing wordless actions to win his wife, the church will not say, “atta boy.” That tells me their real motivations are probably different than they say. In other words, Force and Kendricks are crying crocodile tears for the state of believing households. The leaders are best at Status Quo, and they work to maintain their position, using whatever topic at hand. I made the mistake of thinking they think before talking or writing.

---

I agree that no amount of husbandly sacrifice or service would ever be enough to satisfy conservative Christians. No matter how much they get, they are always greedy for more. But I disagree that this is merely a tactic conservative Christian leaders use to maintain power. They truly love the new model they have come up with (to replace the Biblical model). There is a barely hidden giddiness that comes out when modern Christians speak of men submitting to their wives, and especially men suffering because of their rebellious wives, that isn’t in the biblical model. The Apostle Peter isn’t giddy when he tells wives to win sinning husbands over through submission. He doesn’t relish the idea of Sarah nearly being raped due to her obedience to sinful Abraham. The tone regarding this suffering is serious, not triumphant. Real wives will suffer due to the sins of their husbands, and Peter doesn’t relish this. Compare the tone of 1 Pet 3:1-6 with Force’s cutesy delight at the idea of husbands suffering while waiting for their submission to win their wives over:

---

It must be noted that just as Christ loves and then allows us to respond, a man must enter that vacuum of sorts where he does not know how his wife is going to respond. He may be waiting a while, but if I remember, Christ patiently waited for us.

---

We see the same frame of mind when conservative Christians relish the sin of wives. Rebellious wives are cherished because only then can the husband truly be made to suffer in his submission. This is the hair shirt part of the hair shirt and chest thumping theology. Repentance on the part of the wife would ruin the whole arrangement.

The biblical model has the utmost love for husbands and wives. The crossdressing model is perverted and features an insatiable craving for rebellion and suffering.
In response to Winning her over without a word, Larry Kummer of Fabius Maximus asked:

This is great commentary. For those of us unfamiliar with these discussions among modern conservative Christians, have you written about how these men should act in marriage — realistically, given today’s circumstances? That is, when married to a modern American women.

I haven’t written much in the form of specific instructions for husbands, but I have written a fair amount about the mind frame a Christian husband should have. The following posts come to mind:

- **Hostage negotiator for life?** is a short introduction into the topic.
- **Headship Game.** gives some more detail, with a focus on aligning the concept of Game with the biblical role of headship and providing a framework to consider when a given Game practice is consistent with biblical headship.
- **Radio Silence and Dread** discusses the topic of dread game and the problems with the concept. In short, the problem with dread game is not specifically dread, but (potentially) the mechanism used to create it.
- **Slow your roll** is a response to readers who missed the point of Radio Silence and Dread, and also includes some suggestions for a specific blogger who was dealing with an especially rebellious Christian wife.
- From Cane Caldo: **Tacomaser desires steadfast love.**
- **Reframing Christian Marriage** (with links to the rest of the series at the bottom).

Less directly related to the question but potentially helpful posts to help a Christian husband maintain frame are:

- **Romance 101: How to stop frustrating your wife.**
- **He was like a little boy that night.** An example of what not to do.
- **What is closeness?** along with the follow up posts **How much should a husband share with his wife?** and **Insensitive.**

To understand the tools feminists are using to defeat headship:

- **Threatpoint** and the Christian embrace of the concept, the **Wakeup call.**
- You can dull the threatpoint to some degree if you understand the inherent problems for women who play this card. **Women’s morphing need for male investment** and it’s predecessor post give an overview of this.
- I’ve written quite a few posts on the Duluth model, which you can find under the **Duluth tag.** However, perhaps the best post on the topic to start with is: **Hierarchy equals abuse.**
- **A Tale of Two Beaches** and the follow on post **Rebuilding the mound.**
- **Frigidity and power.**
I’m sure readers will share other resources in the comments, both from this blog and from other sources.
Bdash77 pointed me* to the book Every Man’s Marriage, an Every Man’s Guide to Winning the heart of a woman. This is the follow up book to the wildly popular Every Man’s Battle, and is by the same authors (Stephen Arterburn and Fred Stoeker). Given how influential Arterburn and Stoeker are in evangelical circles, when I found a used copy of Every Man’s Marriage I bought it. I haven’t read the entire book yet, but I’ve read enough to know the message of the book. As the title explains, the book is about teaching husbands to win their wives’ hearts. How does the book explain a Christian husband should go about winning his wife’s heart? By submitting to her. This is a modern Christian staple and is an expression of theological crossdressing.

In the very beginning of the book we learn how both men began their journey to understanding the importance of submitting to their wives. Arterburn wrote the introduction, titled Have you found the keys to her heart? In the introduction he describes how he came to marry his current (at the time) wife:

I rushed the relationship because I was acting out of fear that I would go through life unmarried, unloved, and an outcast in the Christian community. I only divulged the existence of my first marriage and subsequent divorce when I thought Sandy could handle the news, but I never let on regarding the desperation I felt to marry again. Sandy was a “catch”–bright, attractive, talented, and gracious–and I didn’t want to mess up this courtship. I would hide who I really was.

Despite his sickening neediness, he tells us he had it all backwards and thought that wives should submit to their husbands and win them over without a word:

But was I so different from most other men? Rather than connect with women and understand them, most men seem to want to command them. Many husbands use 1 Peter 3 as their official standard, for it instructs women married to non believers to keep silent and win their husbands over with loving words and actions. This Scripture passage has given many men free rein in their behavior of leaders, often shattering marital oneness and intimacy to smithereens.

I know of these things because I became one of the worst offenders after I married my first wife...

The introduction is confusing because Arterburn switches fluidly between discussing his first and second wives (he had not yet met his now third wife when he and Stoeker wrote the book**). However, the important part is that it took two wakeup calls before he decided to radically redefine headship and submission. The first wakeup call came when his first wife divorced him:

Amazingly, I thought everything was going well until the day she said she was leaving me.
Rather than humble myself to ask what I had done to be hurtful, I pulled out the Bible to prove to her that it was not right for her to go. I just knew this “scriptural club” would knock some sense into her. I preached Ephesians 5 at her so often that I had it memorized. In my narrow view, this passage said that she should submit to me and that God was going to be very upset with her if she did not get in line with what He wanted for His boy Steve. But my arrogant reaction to her announcement simply proved that she was right. I was an insensitive, egotistical, self-obsessed, uncaring jerk of a husband who had no idea how to win the heart of a woman.

She left my house for the courthouse and filed for divorce.

He tells us he hadn’t changed when he married his second wife (Sandy), and says that as a result his second marriage was also “dying”. Finally after going to counseling he learned that he had to win Sandy’s heart:

I limited my travel to two days per week. I came home from work by 6:00 PM. and left my briefcase at the office so I wouldn’t work at home. I regularly called Sandy to ask her to join me for lunch. Most of all, I decided to meet her needs by lavishing thoughtful gifts and getaway weekends on her– and by taking the trash out without being asked and making sure my dirty laundry actually reached the clothes hamper and then by learning how to operate the washing machine.

These seemingly small but dramatic changes revived my dying marriage. Our relationship improved when we brought our daughter, Madeline, home from the hospital in 1990.

But as Arterburn explains in the introduction, the book focuses on the wakeup call Stoeker received from his wife Brenda. Chapter 1 is titled *In the Beginning: A Painful Revelation*, and opens with:

I sat across the kitchen table from my wife, Brenda, and I could tell she was waiting until she had my undivided attention.

Then she looked intently into my eyes and changed my world. “I don’t know how else to say this to you, so I’ll say it straight,” she began. “My feelings for you are dead.”

*It turns out that reader Bee had actually pointed to the same book two years ago, but it escaped my attention at the time.*

**According to his bio at Family Life, Arterburn started dating his third wife (Misty) in 2003. This suggests that something went terribly wrong almost immediately after the publication of the book in October of 2001.*
Her soul essence is your master, and sets the terms for oneness.

by Dalrock  |  March 5, 2018  |  Link

As I explained in my last post, the book *Every Man’s Marriage* is founded in fear. Fred Stoeker explains in Chapter 1 that when his wife Brenda announced she didn’t have feelings for him any more he went into a crippling panic that lasted for days. Not only did it trigger unresolved feelings of childhood trauma from when his own parents had divorced, but he had built his wife up to absurd levels from the moment she first sat next to him in church:

Brenda Hulett stepped into our row, and I stood up to shake her hand. As our eyes met, my heavenly Father seemed to lean down and whisper, *This is the girl you’re going to marry.* I really felt that I would become her husband! This thought, premonition—whatever you want to call it—struck me as funny, which caused me to giggle throughout the service whenever I glanced at her.

You can see the depth of this trauma from the organization of the book. The first three chapters are under the heading *When Love Grows Cold.* The next four chapters are under the heading *Starting To Breathe Again.* Stoeker says he was in such a state of panic when his wife lost feelings for him that he vowed to do whatever it took to get them back.

What follows is Stoeker and Arterburn’s rationalization for a new religion, one which clearly is heavily influenced by the new age mysticism of the 1970s. Stoeker tells us that before he became a Christian this is what he turned to in search of knowledge:

…I turned to Eastern religion, a fad that swept the Stanford campus in the late 1970s. I even accepted a flower and an invitation from the Moonies, who “love bombed” me but failed to convince me to join their ranks. Meanwhile, I meandered up and down the West Coast, spending seminar weekends with enlightened gurus as they “merged” with the universe.

The new religion that Stoeker and Arterburn have created is a barely concealed vagina worship loosely wrapped in the trappings of Christianity. In this new religion, the goal of marriage is to achieve marital oneness. More accurately, it is the husband’s responsibility to achieve this marital oneness by obeying his wife’s soul essence, which sets the terms for marital oneness. Closely tied up in all of this is the wife’s sexuality and sexual desire*. In Chapter 3 they write about a wife who was repulsed by the idea of french kissing her husband, including during sex. After explaining that french kissing isn’t a sin in itself, they explain that french kissing is a sin for this particular husband because he isn’t obeying her sexuality/soul essence (emphasis mine):

But for Richard, French kissing has become sin within the context of his relationship with Megan because it tramples her sexuality, a precious essence of her soul. Nothing breaks oneness like trampling your wife’s soul essence—the mysterious, God-created combination of her innermost qualities.
In Chapter 5 they explain that a wife’s feelings of sexual desire (or the lack thereof) are determined by the husband’s righteousness:

Oneness has terms. Comply with the terms and emotional closeness follows. If you don’t comply, the emotions will die. We need to act right, or more precisely, act righteously. If we do, the feelings will follow.

Brenda’s “feelings” for me had died. The feelings she spoke about were not of oneness, but of the intimate feelings that flow from oneness.

They go on to explain that God sets the terms for our “oneness” in our relationship with Him:


But while God sets the terms for oneness with Him, it is your wife’s essence that sets the terms for oneness in marriage:

Who sets the terms for oneness in marriage? Your wife. More accurately, your wife’s essence.

In Chapter 7 they explain that your wife is your “master”. They say that master is in scare quotes because she isn’t really your master, but since God commands you to submit to her soul essence to achieve oneness with her, you should think of her as your master:

But Fred, my wife is not my master! True, but becoming-one-with-her-essence is your master. That’s your highest call, and that call owns you, my friend. As leader of your home, you must submit your rights in whatever way necessary to attain oneness, not because she has authority over you...

In Chapter 8 they clarify further:

What I’m trying to say is that the “master” defines your rights (and remember again that though we refer to your wife as your “master,” it’s our shorthand for the fact that becoming one with her essence is actually your God-given master). Why? Because you’re called to oneness and her essence sets the terms.

The whole book is shot through with this kind of crackpot new age theology. The truly disturbing part of this is not that two Christian men were so terrified of rejection from their wives that they created this new religion, but that this crackpot theology would be enthusiastically accepted by the Christian book buying public.

**See also:** Is fear of women the beginning of wisdom?

*The original title of the book was Every Woman’s Desire.*
That the word of God be not blasphemed
by Dalrock | March 6, 2018 | Link

As bad as Stephen Arterburn and Fred Stoeker come off in Every Man’s Marriage, I think Brenda Stoeker comes off the worst. None of this is intentional, as Stephen and Fred are supposed to come off bad for having not obeyed their wives’ soul-essences not for creating a mystic vagina worship religion, and Brenda isn’t supposed to come off bad at all.

Yet as Fred describes how they met and married followed by Brenda completely shattering his will, the picture he paints of her becomes one of a pathologically manipulative woman. Fred tells us that early in the marriage he at times sinned by resisting her will. That ended when Brenda crushed him completely:

Long ago, when my parents’ divorce loomed over my life, a merciless question swirled over and over within my frightened heart. What are we going to do? I asked myself. What are we going to do?

Brenda’s words [that her feelings were gone] brought the question sweeping back, with an even more personal twist.

...Waves of panic washed over me for days, buckling me in unguarded moments.

Fred then agreed to submit to Brenda, first regarding his family, and eventually in everything. Fred tells us he knew he was dealing with something extraordinary here because making him submit was far more gratifying to Brenda than he would have expected:

Still, I was very confused. Why was this working? All along, I thought Scripture taught that women were supposed to submit to their husbands. Why did my submission revive the marriage this way? And why was the impact of my decision so huge and dramatic? With the family issues, I thought we’d just been dealing with a simple conflict of wills. But the scale of the turnaround suggested something much deeper had been going on between us.

Fred tells us that when he finally found a hobby he absolutely loved (upland bird hunting), Brenda’s reaction was to tell him he could only spend two days a year on it:

“Sweetheart, you can’t imagine how good it makes me feel to know you’ve found a hobby you love,” she began. “You’ve needed one for a long time, but you need to understand what this means to my life. Hunting means I’ll have to handle the kids six days a week all by myself. Besides, what good are Saturdays without the fun you bring to the mix?

...

She continued, “Since you like hunting this much, we should agree now how many times per year you can go. This way, you won’t be tempted to stretch it when your
buddies call."

Fred suggested three days a year was a reasonable number. Brenda told him he could have two. After some back and forth, Fred obeyed her mystical soul essence and agreed to only spend two days a year on the hobby he absolutely loved.

But the most damning things Fred says about Brenda involve the lessons she has taught him and the way he tells us he has come to see her. Fred is teaching other men what his master Brenda taught him:

Oneness has terms. Comply with the terms and emotional closeness follows. If you don’t comply, the emotions will die.

Try reading that out loud a few times. Keep in mind for Fred this isn’t just about sex. When Brenda’s “feelings die”, he goes into a debilitating panic. He can’t breath until he has regained her approval.

One of the first things Brenda did was take complete control of how, when, and how often Fred interacted with his family. This of course would fall under the catch all rule of obeying her soul essence, but for Brenda this was especially important. Fred explains with all seriousness:

You see, Brenda has the gift of discernment. When it comes to family relationships, she knows the good from the bad (Christianity stretches back at least four generations into every branch of her family tree), and what she saw in our in-law relationships made her uncomfortable.

What would happen if Fred were in contact with his family against Brenda’s wishes?

Oneness has terms. Comply with the terms and emotional closeness follows. If you don’t comply, the emotions will die.

Brenda also decides how Fred spends every minute of the day (Chapter 9).

Oneness has terms. Comply with the terms and emotional closeness follows. If you don’t comply, the emotions will die.

She decides what he watches on TV (Chapter 8).

Oneness has terms. Comply with the terms and emotional closeness follows. If you don’t comply, the emotions will die.

And when and how he should bathe and wash his face (Chapter 8).

Oneness has terms. Comply with the terms and emotional closeness follows. If you don’t comply, the emotions will die.

In the Old Testament a Hebrew slave had to be freed by his master after six years. However, if at that time the slave wished to remain a slave, he could elect to remain the master’s slave
for life. The master would then drive an awl through the slave’s ear on his master’s door post as a lifetime mark of this decision. In Chapter 7 Fred offers this story as the picture of his marriage to Brenda.

Setting his lobe to the post, he joyously receives the mark, submitting his rights and future for the honor of serving and pleasing his master for as long as he lives.

...

This Old Testament scene suggests another picture that I’ll paint for you. One day my eyes opened to see Brenda before me, a woman I’d never known. Seeing value in me, she paid a dear price to have me as her own, giving up her freedom to seek any other to have or to hold. I returned this love, happily receiving the mark of a golden ring that told everyone I was now hers. She was my “master,” to whom I was forever pledged to serve.
The thought of holding hands with him made her sick, but fortunately he convinced her to marry him.

by Dalrock | March 6, 2018 | Link

In Chapter 20 of *Every Man’s Marriage*, Stephen Arterburn explains that when he was dating his wife Sandy she found the idea of holding his hand revolting:

When Sandy and I were dating, I attempted to hold her hand one night. She jerked back and said that the thought of holding my hand kind of made her sick. She said it in the nicest way possible, but for whatever reason, I simply wasn’t appealing to her.

Arterburn claims in the introduction that when he first married her he was a backwards thinking he-man traditionalist, and only learned to be a Sensitive New Age Guy (SNAG*) after she threatened divorce, thus “reviving” the marriage. But in Chapter 20 we learn that he was a sniveling SNAG from day one. His reaction to finding out that she found him revolting was to LJBF himself. Arterburn continues:

My temptation was to lick my wounds and walk away. Instead, I told her that I wasn’t in this relationship to hold hands or do anything else but be with her. Well, that obviously had an impact on her because we eventually did hold hands. Furthermore, we eventually got married.

Arterburn tells this story as an example that proves the SNAG model the book is selling really works, as well as an example of God’s providence. Because he was obedient to God during their courtship by LJBFing himself, he was prepared by God for his unexpectedly sexless marriage. This helped him double down on stupidity:

It is amazing how God lays things out in our lives that make sense only years later. This was one of those weird things...

When we finally married, I was shocked to find that sex was a painful experience for her. She wanted no part of it. I was humiliated, felt like a failure, and had no idea what to do. Then I remembered the hand holding incident. I went back to that place and realized that I had to be of the same mind now that I was then.

After years of applying the methods Arterburn and Stoeker teach in the book, it has all been worth the wait:

It would take years to work out the problems, but the end of the story is that we’ve had some wonderful sexual experiences in recent years that we never had in our earlier years. It was worth the wait and worth my learning some new things about her—that sex could be something she would actually want versus dread.

This is just one more example of the danger of the heretical model Arterburn and Stoeker are teaching in the book. Instead of helping other men avoid making the mistakes the culture was teaching, they doubled down on the mistakes and presented them as coming from God.
Simply put, the new religion they invented is not only not from God, it doesn’t work. Women aren’t turned on by men who submit to them. A woman’s sexual desire isn’t stimulated by a man complying with her soul essence as it sets the terms of oneness. It is all nonsense.

At some level at least Arterburn had to know what he was writing wasn’t true. The book the quotes above are from was published in October of 2001. In the introduction to Every Single Man’s Battle Arterburn explains that some time in 2002 he learned that Sandy was cheating on him, and when he confronted her on it she filed for divorce.

...I had arranged [a trip to Australia] to celebrate our twentieth anniversary together, trying to mend what had been so very broken for twenty difficult years. I had thought we were making progress, and as I walked that beach with my wife, I presumed she felt as close to me as I did her. Alas, that simply was not the case. The betrayal had already occurred, and she was making plans for divorce...

Many readers of Every Man’s Battle will be stunned to discover that my marriage ended in 2002...

*My words, not Arterburn’s.
They had a good run.
by Dalrock | March 7, 2018 | Link

Last week Tucker Carlson had Mark Steyn on for a segment about the trans boy* who won the Texas state championship for girls high school wrestling. In the discussion Steyn stated that this has ruined the girl’s state wrestling championship.

This had me wondering just how long girls high school wrestling has been around. Carlson and Steyn are also talking about a broader issue, but with regard to girls wrestling in specific it struck me that there is a very narrow “progressive” window for what the two conservatives are mourning. A society has to reject traditional sex roles enough to encourage girls to wrestle, but it has to be traditional enough to not yet embrace transsexualism. Girls wrestling is a sort of Goldilocks phenomenon. It can only occur for a short window when everything is just right.

With this in mind, I set out to learn how long there has been a girls wrestling championship for trans wrestlers to ruin. How long is the girls wrestling Goldilocks window? It turns out that only six states in the US currently have state championships for girls wrestling, and that Texas has the second oldest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Alaska</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Hawaii</th>
<th>Tennessee</th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>Washington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Twenty years ago when Hawaii created the first girls wrestling state championship the conservative argument would have been that girls shouldn’t be wrestling. Today the conservative argument is that trans wrestlers shouldn’t ruin girls wrestling. This puts the observed outer limit of this Goldilocks zone at twenty years, but most states today still don’t have a girls wrestling state championship, and half of the states that do have one have had one for less than ten years.

*A girl taking hormones to transition to a boy.
Cane Caldo hilariously describes Pastor Doug Wilson’s new post *Masculinity without Permission.*

Even when he tries to avoid blaming men—for one post!—he has to caveat that he would really rather talk about the bad men...but he won’t do it here...even though he thinks he should.

The segment Cane is commenting on is (emphasis mine):

As we confront this disaster—and it is a disaster—the definition of masculinity that I believe we must return to is this: *masculinity is the glad assumption of the sacrificial responsibilities that God assigned to men.* Now this is the point where, **in normal times**, if I were not writing in a culture that was not so well-advanced in its pathological condition, I would hasten to add that masculinity was not bluster, bullying, self-seeking aggrandizement, abusive behavior, and so forth. I would qualify against the counterfeits. All that is quite true, but I don’t want to emphasize it right now.

The reason for not yelling up that particular rain spout is that it has been counterproductive. We have been doing that in an unrelenting way for a generation or more, and by doing this we have helped to create and shape the awful conditions that we so lament.

Note that Wilson is nostalgic for the days when feminism was powerful enough that whenever masculinity was discussed the feminist heckler had to be preemptively placated, but not so far down the line that the damage of decades of placating feminists had already produced an undeniable disaster. This is the same kind of nostalgia conservatives have for girls wrestling.

For it is not normal to reflexively bash men as he says he wishes he could do, indeed as he does while claiming he will not. This is an artifact of feminism. And as Wilson explains, as gratifying as it was to reflexively bash men for decades, doing so has lead us to our present disaster:

The sincere Christian men, who falsely believe they are being taught in accordance with the Word, will dutifully disarm. They will abdicate their essential role of actual leadership in the home, and they will call it servant leadership, leading from behind, or “just-what-I-was-going-to-suggest-leadership.” But there is a vast difference between real servant leadership, the kind Christ practiced and enjoined, and the kind that requires men to stand down whenever mama ain’t happy. By so emphasizing servant leadership, the church has not succeeded in establishing more of it, but they have succeeding in giving men a noble-sounding name as a fig leaf for their cowardice.
Note also whose fault it is that we can no longer afford to coddle feminists. It is the good men who listen to Christian leaders. If these men were better, they wouldn’t take what they were being taught seriously. These cowards, these weak men, are screwing feminism up!

*H/T Hmm, The Question.

**Edit:** Related: If mama ain’t happy
Some readers of my recent series on the book *Every Man’s Marriage* may feel that I’ve unfairly lumped Stephen Arterburn and Fred Stoeker in with complementarians. After all, their book teaches that the wife is the master, and that the husband’s job is to submit to her, to comply with her soul essence in all things. On page 90 Fred explains that he is Brenda’s slave for life, and she is his “master”. But on page 93 they caution not to fall into the feminist trap of making your wife your master (emphasis mine):

> Remember, we’re not talking about abdicating the crown when you choose to mutually submit. We’re talking about abdicating your style. Playing Chief Tiebreaker will trample your wife’s convictions and eat away at her soul essence. She’ll never blossom under that scenario, and there’ll be no oneness. You won’t experience intimacy.

...  

Of course, we must be wise as we become Chief Servant, because there are two sides to the coin of mutual submission. On one side are those men who think they’re kings of the realm, and they lord that role over their wives. This attitude creates resentment and imbalance in the relationship. **On the flip side are those men who have abdicated their godly role of male leadership because of feminism. In other words they make their wife king of the realm, deferring to their wives** and failing to take leadership.

This is the soul essence of complementarianism; they don’t believe that men should succumb to feminism, but instead practice headship and submission, just like Stephen Arterburn and Fred Stoeker teach.

Alternately, if you read the quote immediately above and your first thought was:

> Aha! I knew Dalrock was holding out on me! Sure they teach some terrible things, but they teach some good things too!

Then you might be a complementarian.
Dinner theater *Medieval Times* has changed the script of its play, and the new script is being celebrated as a feminist triumph. Now instead of a king as the lead, the play will have a queen as the lead. ABC News explains in *Medieval Times cast queen as lead for first time in history*:

The decision to put a strong female at the helm of the show came in response to audience feedback.

“We were really ahead of the curve in that sense,” Zapcic said.

Feminism has always been about theater, so the fact that feminists are crowing about this latest landmark achievement for women shouldn’t come as a complete surprise. Yet even the breathy *NY Times* article about this great feminist triumph was forced to acknowledge that the audience mostly didn’t care:

“If it can help empower women and we can be role models for these young women and men and show you need to respect women, then it is very fortuitous timing,” Ms. Lerner said. “It gives you the chills.”

...questions about the social significance of the new show were largely met with blank stares.

One Australian tourist allowed that it was a clever idea, but many audience members said they had no inkling — or didn’t care — that the show had changed.

This is something feminists should get used to. They’ve marked off all of their top and medium priorities on their “To Do” list. In the past feminists could give a woman a mannish haircut, put a leather jacket on her, and have a man fly her across the Atlantic and she would be celebrated as a great feminist hero, complete with ticker tape parade and solemn meeting with the President. Now all of the great play acting roles have been done before. The first woman to play the lead role in a local dinner show just isn’t exciting anymore.

Feminism used to be great theater. Sure it was make believe, but it was make believe on a grand scale. Now it is reduced to reminding paper-hat-wearing grown men and women not to forget to tip the wait staff.
If you only knew Wilson like they know Wilson, you would know he does not mean what he writes.

by Dalrock | March 12, 2018 | Link

Several readers objected to my recent post Harkening back to the golden age. As so often happens with Pastor Doug Wilson, the defense is not that what he wrote is correct, but that I’m being uncharitable for not assuming he meant something different than what he wrote. OKRickety wrote in defense of Wilson (emphasis mine):

To be clear, I will say that I am not of fan of Doug Wilson’s writing style. It is not easy to read and excessively lengthy, tending to obfuscate what he wishes to communicate.

I think Wilson’s perspective on the “times” is that today we have so-called “servant leadership”, whereas before (in what he unfortunately calls “normal times”) we only had feminist claims that normal masculine behavior often (always?) led to bluster, bullying, etc.

This is a standard defense of Wilson, and one that were I Wilson I would strongly object to. OKRickety is saying that Wilson, after blogging and writing dozens of books over a period of decades, is quite poor at his craft as a writer. Not only that, he is implying that Wilson’s stylistic claim to fame, of being a “hard hitting” Christian author (his theology bites back!), is untrue. If OKRickety is correct, instead of being a hard hitting author who tells it like it is, Wilson is in fact a producer of muddled bombast. This is a cruel defense, and with friends like these Wilson does not need enemies.

It is possible that OKRickety has the benefit of a close personal relationship with Wilson and knows from experience that Wilson gets it right when say discussing an issue at the local fishing hole, but disaster ensues whenever he puts his fingers to the keyboard. I think it is more likely that OKRickety is merely assuming he knows what Wilson means to write, so that no matter what Wilson writes, it must always mean what OKRickety assumes it means. Anyone who thinks otherwise must be biased.

Either way, as a result of my responding to what Wilson actually writes instead of what OKRickety knows Wilson meant, OKRickety says I’m being unfair, and guilty of poor reading comprehension:

I think the crux of our disagreement is that I think Doug Wilson’s post is indeed quite correct in regard to Christian masculine behavior, but your post makes great effort to throw shade on Wilson. I just don’t understand why you and others are so nitpicky about Wilson’s post, seemingly having a greater desire to find fault than recognizing the ample positive. Sure, I’d like for him to be perfect in his statements. I’d also like it for you and all of the commenters here, but I have not found that to be the case.

On top of that, it is my opinion that many claims of Wilson’s red-pill failure display
poor reading comprehension or faulty presumptions about his motives. In other words, the claims are faulty.

In my opinion, Wilson is on the same side as you and most of your readers even if you don’t like his playbook or style of play.

I would suggest that instead of assuming Wilson is muddled in his writing, that OKRickety give Wilson the benefit of the doubt and assume that he is in fact writing what he wants to write. Moreover, if Wilson happens to be writing the opposite of what he intends, pointing out the logical flaws is doing Wilson a great service, as it offers him the opportunity to write a correction.

See OKRickety’s full comment here.

**Related:** [Helping victims stand against their abuser](#)
Larry Kummer of Fabius Maximus has a new post up titled: The Lone Wanderers’ solutions to dating and marriage. The bulk of the post is a cleaned up version of our discussion of the topic on his previous post. I don’t think much (if anything) will be new to regular readers of this blog, but I think he has done an excellent job crafting our exchange into an accessible introduction into the issues we discuss in the Men’s Sphere.
They built the airstrip, but no cargo appeared.
by Dalrock | March 15, 2018 | Link

Elizabeth Holmes and Theranos are once again in the news*: Theranos CEO and former president charged with massive fraud

The interesting thing is that while a settlement has been reached, I don’t think we know anything more today about the much vaunted Theranos technology than we did in 2016 when I wrote Going through the motions.

However, while we still don’t really know the details behind the deception, this seems like a good time to revisit how Holmes came to become a famous billionaire in the first place. For some reason you won’t find much on this in the recent news stories. For example, CNN released an article today titled The rise and fall of Theranos and Elizabeth Holmes. But while the CNN article notes that she dropped out of Stanford to start the company in 2003, the timeline in the article doesn’t start until 2014.

Thankfully there are still stories around from 2014 and 2015 when the press was touting Holmes as the feminist heroine of the century. While there is still a huge gap between the founding of the company and 2014, the older articles do cover how she came to launch her own company at age 19. From the 2014 article The Dropout Who Became A CEO, And The Professor Who Became Her Employee we learn that Holmes attended Stanford after graduating high school. As she was just beginning her studies she imagined herself using what she was learning to change the world:

The inspiration to start a business came from Holmes taking Robertson’s freshman seminar on advanced drug-delivery devices. This, and a summer internship at the Genome Institute in Singapore, spawned her idea of a patch that would dispense a drug while monitoring a patient’s blood, as well as sending the results to the patient and doctor.

Dr. Channing Robertson was a professor and dean at Stanford. When he looked into the pretty young coed’s eyes he felt something very special:

I realized I could have just as well been looking into the eyes of a Steve Jobs or a Bill Gates.

Inc’s 2015 piece How Playing the Long Game Made Elizabeth Holmes a Billionaire describes the magic moment slightly differently, presenting Holmes’ freshman fantasy as if it were a real invention (emphasis mine):

The summer before her sophomore year, she worked at the Genome Institute of Singapore, doing SARS testing with traditional methods, like nasal swabs. At Stanford, she’d been exploring lab-on-a-chip technology, which enables diverse results to be extracted from a minuscule amount of liquid on a microchip. By the time she returned to California in 2003, Holmes had developed a novel drug-
delivery device—a wearable patch, or an ingestible, that could adjust dosage according to variables in the patient’s blood and update doctors wirelessly. She filed it for her first patent. “It was not only bold, but also remarkable in terms of its engineering and scientific integrity,” says Robertson.

The Inc piece says Holmes was only 19 when she hired Robertson as an adviser and hired a number of his students to develop... something. Exactly what Holmes dropped out of college to create is a mystery. The Inc piece speculates that the original intent was to invent what Holmes had ostensibly already invented, but somewhere along the way they decided it wasn’t feasible and switched to revolutionizing blood testing:

Theranos won’t share many details about those early days, but it seems to have been trying to build on the wearable-patch patent that had so impressed Robertson.

Robertson was just the first of many prominent older men who looked into Holmes’ eyes and felt something special, and this allowed Holmes to raise hundreds of millions of dollars. The money in turn allowed her to acquire office space and hire scientists, and kept her swimming in lab coats and black turtlenecks. But after over a decade of confidently dressing like Steve Jobs, her ability to create that special feeling was no longer enough. Ultimately it all fell apart.

*H/T Deti.*
Why Game is a threat to our values.
by Dalrock | March 16, 2018 | Link

Chances are you’ve heard of a concept called “Game”, and if you are like most people you suspect this concept poses a dire threat to our most cherished values. These suspicions are correct; Game is fundamentally incompatible with our values and is eroding the very foundation of our society. Even the proponents of Game would agree that this is true!

Chivalry and the virtuous man.

Feminists may object to the concept of chivalry, but it is closely related to how we measure the virtue of a man. Moreover, without chivalry feminism would be ineffectual, as feminism is the belief that men are evil and naturally want to harm women, followed by pleas to men to solve all of women’s problems*.

But while chivalry is closely related to how we measure the virtue of a man, a man’s chivalry (in itself) is not what we use to determine a man’s virtue. In our society a man proves his virtue by his ability to seduce women. I don’t mean this merely in the sense of locker room boasting or the values of a small group of “pickup artists”. I mean this in a much more fundamental sense.

As a society we are obsessed with generating sexual attraction in women. We see this ability as the most pure test of goodness in a man. A woman’s feelings of sexual attraction are a mystical force, godlike for non-Christians, and God’s message for Christians. We can’t see how incredibly crass this is because we call it romantic love, but romantic love is far more intertwined with sexual desire than we are willing to admit**. To truly seduce a woman is to make her fall in love with you.

Generating the tingle (attraction) is an obsession with our society, and you can see it in our popular films. The Fifth Element is over the top in this regard on the secular side, as is Fireproof on the Christian side.

We believe that good things should happen to men who can generate the tingle. This is why we reserve our daughters’ most sexually attractive years as a reward for such men. Our greatest fear in doing this is that our daughters might become confused and bestow their gift of sex on the wrong (unsexy) men. Luckily there’s an app for that.

This is also why we need no fault divorce and child support. Yes it is important that we encourage men to settle down and become fathers, and yes it is important that children have the immense benefit of growing up with their fathers. These are good things, but when these objectives interfere with our core values, it is our core values that must prevail. What court in the land could overrule the woman’s holy vagina? If she no longer tingles for the father of her children, he deserves to be ejected from his children’s lives and have a more sexy man take his place. Think of the vitriol we heap on such men who dare to complain when this happens to them. They are the lowest of the low in our society, except perhaps for those most detestable men of all, the omegas who can’t attract a woman at all.
All of our sexual morality is directly anchored to the tingle. The #metoo movement doesn’t object to women trading sex to get ahead, it objects to the fact that in doing so such women are enticed into having sex with unsexy men!

**What about virtue in women?**

While the ability to generate sexual attraction is how we measure virtue in a man, we measure virtue in a woman by her ability to be strong and independent. Bad women are doormats with low self esteem who commit the cardinal sin of being *untrue to themselves*. Good women are strong and independent, and most of all, true to themselves. All of our moral messaging to young girls is designed to spur them to fight against the temptation to conform to someone else’s idea of what is good. In the UK the Girl Guide vow has changed over time from obeying God to *be true to myself and develop my beliefs*. And every girl in the west can sing along with the moral message from Disney’s *Frozen*. Elsa’s moment of triumph comes when she learns she must stop trying to be a good girl and instead be true to herself:

```
Be the good girl you always have to be
Conceal, don’t feel,
don’t let them know
Well now they know
...

And the fears that once controlled me
Can’t get to me at all
It’s time to see what I can do
To test the limits and break through
No right, no wrong, no rules for me,
I’m free!
```

This is because we strongly believe that women deep down have a mystical gift for understanding what is truly good, which is why a woman falling in love with a man is the purest sign of his virtue.

**Chivalry keeps our concepts of male and female virtue in harmony.**

As I already noted, chivalry is what converts feminist demands into concrete action. But chivalry is also the way we reconcile the concepts of male and female virtue. Our unstated assumption is that being chivalrous is sexy. This is why Game is such a corrosive concept in our society. Game teaches that chivalry is an attraction killer, and that women are instead attracted to a host of traits that are neutral at best.

The problem we have is that young men now are able to see for themselves that Game works. This is true even though most men are not able to master Game in practice. The men who fail at seduction are able to observe the men who succeed, and it is painfully obvious that chivalry really is an attraction killer. All of this is made worse by the fact that not only are young men highly motivated to have sex, but our society is ordered around the sacred belief that being able to seduce women is the mark of virtue in a man. Even if a man rejects
Game on the grounds that premarital sex is immoral, he still has to grapple with the fact that sexiness is the mark of male virtue in our society— and this includes the view of nearly all Christians. As Dr. R. Albert Mohler Jr. (President of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary) explains:

Put most bluntly, I believe that God means for a man to be civilized, directed, and stimulated toward marital faithfulness by the fact that his wife will freely give herself to him sexually only when he presents himself as worthy of her attention and desire.

The threat that Game poses is not that large groups of men will learn how to put it into effective practice (although many have and will). The threat comes from its assault on young men’s belief that chivalry is sexy and therefore chivalry is virtuous. Even worse, a young man doesn’t even have to ever hear the word “Game” or directly study its theories to be at risk of concluding that chivalry isn’t sexy. This is a message that is slowly making its way through the culture.

Game is so corrosive to our moral order because the normal methods to return to course only make the corrosion worse. Lectures on the importance of chivalry will be met with ridicule, since chivalry is unsexy. Lecturing men to be unsexy for the sake of virtue will likewise fail because our very definition of male virtue is sexiness.

It gets worse from here, because as Game dissolves the moral case for chivalry it is dissolving the foundation for sustaining feminism (in practice). This in turn jeopardizes the virtue of women by making it harder for women to be true to themselves. Without chivalry converting feminist theory into practice, millions of women will find it harder and harder to stop trying to be good girls and adopt a “No right, no wrong, no rules for me” attitude.

Game is destroying our most cherished values, our very concept of virtue! As a Christian all I can say is this destruction can’t happen quickly enough.

*I hereby dub this Dalrock’s Law of Feminism.

**Our very concept of romantic love connoting virtue itself comes from the same 11th century poetry that brought us the idea of chivalry.
Complementarians have the problem of wanting to *seem* biblically traditional, while avoiding actually *being* so. The goal is to create something separate from formal feminism/egalitarianism, while avoiding offending feminist sensibilities. This has led complementarians to invent a host of weasel words that sound like something traditional but mean something else. This starts with the very term complementarian, a term meant to *seem* traditional while rejecting tradition. This allows complementarian women to *seem* traditional while they discuss *Women in ministry kissing traditionalism good-bye*.

Other complementarian weasel terms are *servant leader*, a term that means *not headship*, and *step up*, a word that means whatever you want it to mean so long as it doesn’t mean *take charge*.

But today’s complementarian weasel word is *reject passivity*. This is the other term you say to men when you want to *seem* like you are telling them to *take charge*, but are terrified of the idea of them actually taking charge. For this reason *reject passivity* is often used in conjunction with the weasel term *step up*. Note that *reject passivity* is an oddly *passive* term that criticizes passivity. It has no real meaning, aside from *seeming* to say something it is very careful to *avoid* saying. You can do your own search for the term and find complementarians using the expression all over, but here are two examples:

From *4 Characteristics Of Authentic Manhood*:

Men I am not suggesting that you run out and get crucified, but move away from the Adam model and step up to the Jesus model of manhood. Do you need to get it right all the time? No. Is God expecting perfection? No. What we need to do is step up and become men, because the world is craving for real authentic men and our our families desperately need leadership in the home. Men they are they are looking for you to step up and man up!

Are you ready to step up and reject passivity?

From: *What is Authentic Manhood? A Biblical Definition*

REJECTS Passivity

He’s not apathetic or indifferent about life or God and the things of God. Like Jesus, a real man is always the initiator. He’s constantly vigilant, fully engaged in life and has both his head and heart in the game. He’s not a spectator but a player in the role assigned him by God

Related: *Hair shirts and chest thumping.*
List of recent posts Larry Kummer has created from our discussion.
by Dalrock | March 21, 2018 | Link

Larry Kummer posted a comment with links to the entire series he has created from our discussion on his blog, but since the comment contained multiple links it went into moderation. Unfortunately by the time I saw and released the comment it was no longer recent enough to display in the comment section of the side bar. I haven’t had the time to go through the more recent posts but I want to allow readers to see the handy set of links that he shared.

—-Begin Larry Kummer’s Comment—-

Here is the series Dalrock mentions in this post. “Enough analysis! What are possible solutions to the gender wars?”

A return to traditional values.
Men finding individual solutions.
Coming next week, my answer: A counter-revolution in society.

Dalrock posted some powerful comments to my first two posts. I posted our dialog as a series of posts. This was a useful pause before writing my concluding post, as I learned much from his comments.

An expert discusses individual solutions.
Discussing women’s responses to men’s solutions.
An expert sees wonders ahead!
An expert: respect is a key battleground in the gender wars.
An expert’s insight: Game is toxic to feminism.
An expert describes the road to respect for men.
What was Adam’s sin?
by Dalrock | March 21, 2018 | Link

Several readers noted that there is a creation myth for the complementarian weasel word reject passivity. This creation myth is rooted in a twisted version of the real creation story in Genesis. In this new twist on Genesis, Adam’s sin was failing to prevent Eve from being tempted into eating the forbidden fruit. As Reject Passivity at Authentic Manhood explains:

Genesis 3 changes everything. It’s in that infamous chapter that Satan tempts Adam and Eve to do the one and only thing God had asked them not to do—to eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. God had given man “only one no in a world full of yes.”¹ But Satan tries to convince Adam and Eve to believe the lie that this one “no” must mean that God doesn’t have their best in mind and is holding out on them. Here’s how this climactic moment plays out:

“When the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise, she took of its fruit and ate, and she also gave some to her husband who was with her, and he ate” (Gen 3:6).

Here’s the question for us as men: Where was Adam in this critical moment? Where was Adam when his wife was being tempted by Satan? You might want to believe that he wasn’t around when it happened, that maybe he was out hunting for food or building something. Unfortunately, the Bible makes it clear that he was right there “with her.” Silent. He passively stood there while his wife was under attack by Satan. In a moment when he could have spoken up and stepped into the situation and acted courageously to protect his wife, he just stood there with his manhood pants down.

Men have been living in Adam’s shadow ever since.

There are several fatal flaws with this argument, starting with the fact that God tells us in Gen 3:17 what Adam’s sin was:

17 And to Adam he said,

“Because you have listened to the voice of your wife
and have eaten of the tree
of which I commanded you,
‘You shall not eat of it,’
cursed is the ground because of you;
in pain you shall eat of it all the days of your life;

Adam’s sin was listening to (obeying) his wife instead of obeying God. We don’t need to guess what Adam’s sin was unless we are in a mood to argue with God.
But for the sake of argument, let's assume God didn't tell us in Gen 3:17 what Adam's sin was. The argument is that Adam was right there when Eve was tempted/deceived by the Serpent. But that didn't happen in Gen 3:6 as Authentic Manhood claims. It happened in Gen 3:1-5 (ESV):

3 Now the serpent was more crafty than any other beast of the field that the Lord God had made.

He said to the woman, “Did God actually say, ‘You[a] shall not eat of any tree in the garden’?” 2 And the woman said to the serpent, “We may eat of the fruit of the trees in the garden, 3 but God said, ‘You shall not eat of the fruit of the tree that is in the midst of the garden, neither shall you touch it, lest you die.’” 4 But the serpent said to the woman, “You will not surely die. 5 For God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.”

The first question is where was Eve when this conversation took place? Was she in the center of the garden looking at the tree of knowledge of good and evil? We don't know for sure, but I would say probably not. Nothing in Eve’s description of the tree suggests that she and the Serpent are looking at it:

3 but God said, ‘You shall not eat of the fruit of the tree that is in the midst of the garden, neither shall you touch it, lest you die.’”

Eve describes the tree in a way that suggests it is located out of view, in a different part of the garden. Granted she is quoting God, so that might explain the phrasing. But at the very least there is nothing in Gen 3:1-5 to indicate that Eve and the Serpent are in close proximity to the tree when Eve is being tempted. Yet we know Eve was near the tree in Gen 3:6 when she took the fruit and ate it, and then gave some to Adam. Genesis doesn’t tell us that eve was tempted (3:1-5) while she was with Adam (3:6), so we don’t know that Adam was with Eve when the Serpent tempted her.

The other question is how much time elapsed between Gen 3:1-5 and Gen 3:6? In Gen 3:1-5 the Serpent got Eve's hamster spinning by telling her that if she disobeyed God she could become like God. We can see the hamster wheel still turning in the beginning of Gen 3:6:

6 So when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise...

How much time elapsed while Eve’s hamster ran on the wheel? Was it a few seconds? An hour? We don’t know. We just know that time was involved for her to decide to eat the fruit, which is reinforced by the word when.

The very argument complementarians offer to disregard what God himself tells us is Adam’s sin is that Adam was right there when the Serpent tempted Eve. But Genesis tells us no such thing. All it tells us is that Adam was with Eve when she picked the fruit and ate it.

There is yet a third problem with this modern feminist friendly interpretation of Gen 3, and that is the fact that it takes original sin from disobeying a specific command from God, to
something we must assume Adam should just have known to do. If we reject what God tells us in Gen 3:17 and assume facts not in evidence (that Adam was with Eve in Gen 3:1-5) we still end up in a theological quagmire. If we expand original sin from a simple act of disobedience to God, we have to then determine when Eve first desired to disobey God in order to become like God, as that would be the sin Adam would need to protect her from. We must also determine when Adam, without having knowledge of good and evil, knew Eve was going to be tempted in this way. We must assume that Adam could anticipate how Eve could be tempted before Eve could experience this temptation.
Pastor Douglas Wilson explains in Reforming Marriage why women’s sexual sin is different than men’s sexual sin. When dirty men sin it is because they want sex. But when misguided and unfortunate women sin it is because they are looking for love in all the wrong places:

If we interviewed a thousand men who were immoral and sexually promiscuous, we would find we had a thousand men with a lack of self-control with regard to sexual temptation. If we were to do the same with a thousand promiscuous women, we would not find a thousand women with a sexual problem, but rather with a security problem. They are generally not looking for great sexual satisfaction, but rather for emotional security.

Luckily normal women aren't tempted to become promiscuous. Only women damaged by failing fathers are tempted in this way (emphasis mine):

The girl has a big vacuum in her life—a need for masculine attention—that is not being filled by her father. When she enters adolescence, she will suddenly discover that she now has a commodity with which she can bargain, and she will be tempted to begin to use it. This is because she still has a need for the security, and a void that still needs to be filled with masculine attention. Now all of a sudden men are voluntarily paying attention to her. Before, as a little girl, she was a nuisance chasing after men, but now they are coming to her. Of course they are after one thing, and she is after another. They consequently make an exchange that makes neither one of them truly happy.

This idea that women’s sexuality is naturally pure, and only goes haywire when men damage it in some way is not unique to Pastor Wilson. But it is not a message you will find in the Bible. This idea comes from the new religion that replaced Christianity without anyone noticing.

See Also:

- Maybe in a thousand years.
- Real Men Step Up to Fifty Shades of Rationalization.
- If she has enough self esteem she won’t tingle for Harley McBadboy
- She wants 2.3 more years of sex with other men before she settles for you.
Huffington Post warns of a “new dating trend” called *mosting* in *This New Dating Trend Is Even Worse Than Ghosting*.

It’s essentially a subcategory of ghosting, said Tracy Moore, the journalist who coined the phrase in a January article for MEL Magazine.

“One mosting is ghosting, but where before you ghost, you completely love bomb the person with praise, compliments and faux perfect soulmate-type stuff,” she told HuffPost.

“It’s so over the top,” she added. “The ghosting is much more confusing and painful, because this wasn’t just a ‘meh’ date that you could take or leave. This person really made you feel like you had a rare connection in a sea of duds.”

It is hard to say what Moore is doing wrong given so little information. Perhaps it is the hot farts that are scaring the men away?
Headship tomorrow and headship yesterday, but never headship today.
by Dalrock | March 26, 2018 | Link

“The rule is, jam to-morrow and jam yesterday—but never jam to-day.”
“It must come sometimes to ‘jam to-day,’” Alice objected.
“No, it ca’n’t,” said the Queen. “It’s jam every other day: to-day isn’t any other day, you know”

— Lewis Carroll, Through the Looking-Glass and What Alice Found There

Last week I covered the complementarian argument that Adam’s sin was failing to prevent Eve from being tempted into sinning. This specific bogus claim is part of a larger pattern where headship alternates between being denied (or minimized to irrelevance) and headship being used as a handy club to bludgeon husbands (usually to blame men for women’s sins).

The speed with which the transformation occurs often makes this particular method of complementarian rationalization quite comical. I once attended a sermon where the pastor started by explaining that his wife is in authority over him, and discussed the proper ways she punishes him when he sins. Then, without missing a beat, he went back to Genesis and blamed Adam for not exercising headship and preventing Eve from sinning.

If you look for this pattern you will see it all over. In the movie Courageous there is a scene early on where the wife goes from nagging and bossing her husband Adam around to suddenly being sweet and making a big point of having him be the one who decides if their daughter can attend a friend’s birthday party. As with the sermon I attended, suddenly headship appears out of nowhere, only to vanish just as quickly. The reason is the same; this scene is a setup.

Pastor Doug Wilson plays a variant of this game in his book Reforming Marriage. In Chapter 2 (Headship and Authority) Wilson explains that when he does marriage counseling he starts with the assumption that the man is responsible for all of the problems in the marriage:

When a couple comes for marriage counseling, my operating assumption is always that the man is completely responsible for all the problems. Some may be inclined to react negatively to this, but it is important to note that responsibility is not the same thing as guilt. If a woman has been unfaithful to her husband, of course she bears the guilt of her adultery. But at the same time, he is responsible for it.

Wilson defends this unbiblical assumption by pretending that the husband is like the captain of a ship:

To illustrate, suppose a young sailor disobeys his orders and runs a ship aground in the middle of the night. The captain and the navigator were both asleep and had nothing to do with his irresponsible actions. Who is finally responsible? The captain
and the navigator are responsible for the incident. They are career officers, and their careers are ruined. The young sailor was getting out of the Navy in six months anyway. This may strike many as being unfair, but it is indisputably the way God made the world. The sailor is guilty; the captain is responsible. Without this understanding of responsibility, authority becomes meaningless and tyrannical. Husbands are responsible for their wives. They are the head of their wives as Christ is the head of the Church. Taking a covenant oath to become a husband involves assuming responsibility for that home. This means that men, whether through tyranny or abdication, are responsible for any problems in the home. If Christian men had loved their wives as Christ loved the Church, if they had given direction to their wives, if husbands had accepted their wives’ necessary help with their God-ordained vocation, there never would have been room for any kind of feminist thinking within the Church. Christian men who abdicate their God-given authority, or who feel embarrassed about it, are leaving their wives unprotected.

Setting aside the problem of defining biblical roles in marriage based on the rules of a secular organization, note that Wilson isn’t serious when he implies that the husband is in complete command of the home. You can see this in Wilson’s 21 Thesis on Submission in Marriage, where he explains that a husband is not responsible for trying to make his wife submit (or do anything):

The Bible does not teach husbands to enforce the requirement that was given to their wives. Since true submission is a matter of the heart, rendered by grace through faith, a husband does not have the capacity to make this happen. His first task is therefore to love his wife as Christ loved the church. He is to lead by example.

The very metaphor Wilson uses to justify his take on marriage counseling is also absurd if you look at it from the other direction. Sailors don’t get to drag their captains to navy counseling where the captain is presumed to be in the wrong if the sailor isn’t happy. Moreover, the sailor doesn’t reserve the legal right to eject the captain from the ship and take over command like wives do. This is important because threats of divorce are inherent in the whole marriage counseling model.

But again, this isn’t about a serious belief in headship, it is about keeping headship around as a handy club and then discarding the club once it is no longer needed. Note how quickly Wilson switches between the two modes in Chapter 3, Duties of Husbands and Wives:

In any discussion of a wife’s duties, we must understand the context of these duties. The previous section did not just give us “the husbands’ part,” with this section giving us “the wives’ part.” Rather, all the responsibilities for wives listed below can legitimately be added to the husbands’ list of responsibilities. Not only is he responsible before God to do his job, he is responsible before God to see that she does hers. And of course, this is not done by bossing her around. It is done through nourishing and cherishing her.

Wilson’s defenders have acknowledged being baffled by his seemingly erratic shifts on the topic of headship, but if you understand the formula that he is copying from other
complementarians it is not erratic at all. When headship is useful as a club against men it quite suddenly appears, oftentimes in cartoonish form. Once the club is no longer required, headship is just as instantly redefined back to the feminist friendly role of 99.999% servant, .001% leader.

**Related:** [Hair Shirts and Chest Thumping](#).
As I’ve been looking at more of Pastor Doug Wilson’s books I’ve noticed that some time around 2004 (perhaps earlier*) he added a new chapter to his theology of marriage. According to Wilson’s new theology, headship and submission doesn’t apply in the sphere of the home. In the sphere of the home the roles are reversed. Wilson explains in Chapter 3 (The Wife as Ruler) of the book linked above:

As the apostle Paul is urging young women to marry, he lets a very interesting comment fall in passing. “I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully” (1 Tim. 5:14). The word translated here as “guide the house” is oikodespotein. The wife is to be the ruler or despot of the home. This means that when she tells you to take your shoes off at the door, you will take your shoes off—and cheerfully.

He reinforces this in Chapter 4, titled An Honored Guest (emphasis mine):

A wife therefore has true authority over her home which no one, including her husband, can take away from her. She must be obedient to him, as this verse states, but this is a clearly delimited obedience. This can easily be misunderstood or misrepresented, but it is still necessary to emphasize. In a certain sense, a husband (as the head of his wife) is an honored and permanent guest, but he should learn to see himself as a guest. He wipes his feet at the door, he eats what is served to him, and he seeks to conform to the pattern established by her—as she in her turn seeks to honor him. He has authority—where Scripture gives it. She has authority where Scripture gives it...

[In the sphere of the home] he is to delegate and then do as he is told. But as in everything that Christians do, such “telling” is to be done with grace. A peevish wife is no more scriptural than a cantankerous husband. A wife has authority over her husband’s sex life (1 Cor. 7:4). She has authority over his food (Prov. 31:14). She is responsible for his clothing (Prov. 31:21). (She is supposed to stay out of his fishing gear though.) Is the husband the head of his wife the way Christ is the head of the Church? Absolutely. Is he the boss man? Not even close.

Aside from a passing reference to this on one of Wilson’s blog posts last year, I had never encountered this theology. In doing just a bit of searching I haven’t been able to find the same concept being promoted by the usual complementarian suspects. In an article from 2007, the CBMW explains that while the wife has authority in the home, it does not supersede headship (contrary to Wilson):

...the wife has a ruling function within the household. This is most clearly expressed in 1 Tm 5:14, which states that wives are expected to “rule their households.” The Greek word here is oikodespotein, to “house-rule.” The verb despotein is related
etymologically to the English word “despot.” The wife’s role thus involves a real governmental function. Although the husband is head of the house, the wife functions under him as someone who rules the house. Chrysostom describes her as a “second authority.”(13) In other words, the husband’s headship over the house neither relieves the wife of responsibility nor makes her passive. Nor does it make her a simple servant in the house. Instead the wife’s subordination to the husband expresses an order of authority with the wife’s ruling function carried out subordinate to the husband’s.

The word oikodespotein is also used in the 1997 CBMW article Saved Through Childbearing?, but like the previous CBMW article it does not offer Wilson’s innovation. It is possible that alternate forms of the word** in question would pull up articles that adopt Wilson’s new theology of marriage, but so far I haven’t found anything that suggests the CBMW has gotten on board with this view. Likewise, I haven’t been able to find any reference to this in Matt Chandler’s Village Church, John Piper’s Desiring God site or The Gospel Coalition. From what I can tell, Wilson is over a decade ahead of the complementarian curve in this regard. So far, this idea seems to only be popular with Wilson and Christian feminists.

If you have any background into the origin of this theology, please let me know in the comments.

*I can’t find any reference to this in Reforming Marriage (1995) or the follow up book Federal Husband (1999). The first book I’ve seen that references this idea is My Life For Yours (2004). How to Exasperate Your Wife is from 2015, but it appears to be a republication of Wisdom is a Woman (2004).

**I’ve also searched using the word “oikodespotes”.
If mama ain’t happy
by Dalrock | March 28, 2018 | Link

A few weeks back I quoted a post from Pastor Doug Wilson castigating Christian men for listening to pastors and living by the rule if mama ain’t happy (emphasis mine):

When a false definition of servant leadership is mandated for the church, the only people who will simply ignore that teaching will be the dullards and pigs. The sincere Christian men, who falsely believe they are being taught in accordance with the Word, will dutifully disarm. They will abdicate their essential role of actual leadership in the home, and they will call it servant leadership, leading from behind, or “just-what-I-was-going-to-suggest-leadership.” But there is a vast difference between real servant leadership, the kind Christ practiced and enjoined, and the kind that requires men to stand down whenever mama ain’t happy. By so emphasizing servant leadership, the church has not succeeded in establishing more of it, but they have succeeding in giving men a noble-sounding name as a fig leaf for their cowardice.

A number of readers speculated that Pastor Wilson himself had taught the very message he was castigating husbands for following. After reading the introduction to Wilson’s book Reforming Marriage, I can confirm that their suspicion was correct.

In the introduction Wilson explains that we can determine if a home is pleasing to God if the home has a distinctive spiritual aroma. This is something that can’t be faked (all emphasis mine):

...keeping God’s law with a whole heart (which is really what love is) is not only seen in overt acts of obedience. The collateral effect of obedience is the aroma of love. This aroma is out of reach for those who have a hypocritical desire to be known by others as a keeper of God’s law. Many can fake an attempt at keeping God’s standards in some external way. What we cannot fake is the resulting, distinctive aroma of pleasure to God.

How do you test to see if God is pleased with a home? For married couples, Wilson tells us that this aroma comes from the mood of the wife. If the wife is happy, this means that her husband is loving her as the Bible commands.

In the home, where should this wholehearted obedience begin? Where should the aroma originate? Jesus taught us, with regard to individuals, that cups must be cleaned from the inside out. If we apply this principle to the home, we should see that the “inside” of a family is, of course, the relationship between husband and wife, as they self-consciously imitate the relationship of Christ and the Church.

... The health of all other relationships in the home depends upon the health of this
relationship, and the key is found in how the husband is treating his wife. Or, put another way, when mamma ain’t happy, ain’t nobody happy.

Wilson tells us that teaching husbands how to create this aroma (a happy wife) is the purpose of the book:

In the same way, husbands are to love their wives alone. This is the duty I hope to explain and amplify throughout the course of this small book.

He includes a caveat that husbands must not worship their wives, but he is teaching that the wife’s mood is the unfakable sign of God’s pleasure! If your wife is happy, this is a non falsifiable sign that God is pleased with you. If she is unhappy, this is likewise proof that God is angry with you. He closes the introduction with:

When a husband seeks to glorify God in his home, he will be equipped to love his wife as he is commanded. And if he loves his wife as commanded, the aroma of his home will be pleasant indeed.

See Also: Women as responders
Sheila will make a man out of you.
by Dalrock | March 28, 2018 | Link

Last week I linked to a post by the complementarian group Authentic Manhood in in What was Adam’s Sin? It turns out that this group has hired Sheila Gregoire to help teach you how to be a man. Who better than a woman’s studies major to teach you about the roles in marriage?

In this release from 33 The Series, A Man and His Marriage, marriage experts Paul Tripp and Sheila Wray Gregoire along with our 33 The Series presenters, tackle head-on some of the key issues in marriage and show that as we learn to embrace God’s plan for marriage, a wonderful thing happens. We become both more holy and more happy.

As long time readers will remember, Gregoire teaches women that submission in marriage means the wife gives her husband lists of chores to do around the house. In her book To Love, Honor, and Vacuum: When You Feel More Like a Maid Than a Wife and Mother. Gregoire describes her husband as he twirls around the house doing as she bids:

My husband is motivated by lists. If I just tell him I would like him to help clean up after dinner, he doesn’t know what to do. But if there is a list of daily and weekly chores on the fridge, and he can see what is left to be done, he’s like a Tasmanian devil whirling around the house, cleaning.

Nothing says authentic manhood better than twirling around the house!
World Net Daily has a hilarious article about a man in Argentina who took advantage of the new transgender law to identify as a woman in order to retire five years earlier. The funny part is he is being judged for doing this. He isn’t being judged for being confused about his sexual identity. He is being judged for not being confused about his sexual identity.

“The law is very good and protects the transgender people,” said Enzo. “That there are people who do not have ethics does not mean that the law is wrong, it means that people are wrong. It’s a moral flaw and Sergia is one of those people. He is taking advantage of the law. Just by listening to him speak, to refer to himself, one realizes that what he says is a lie.

“It is not just a macho issue, it is fraudulent and it is a theft of rights. He is demonstrating that if he can do it, anyone can do it. This is a totally selfish and harmful act, very low. It saddens me to be familiar with a person capable of doing anything to get what he wants.
Sheila Gregoire at Authentic Manhood coaches frustrated Christian husbands on how to seduce their wives in In Search of the Secret Switch. To her credit, she admits upfront that she has no idea how to actually do such a thing:

> If I could share any secret with you, it would be this: we women don’t actually know what that switch is either. After almost two decades of marriage, I’ve decided women’s sex drives are such a mishmash of competing elements that only God knows what’s really going on.

But not knowing how seduction works doesn’t stop Gregoire from offering six pieces of advice to creep your wife out, one piece that reminds us that neither spouse should defraud the other, and an 8th piece of advice to get used to Gregoire’s advice not working. I’ve paraphrased and commented on her eight tips below. In some cases I have quoted bits of detail:

1) **Compliment her.** It isn’t that you should never tell your wife she is beautiful, but if you are telling her she is beautiful in an effort to get laid you are pandering to her for sex; this is creepy. Moreover, if she’s seldom in the mood she already thinks she outranks you in SMV. Assuring her that this is true will only make things worse. Besides, you’ll both have more fun if you playfully tease her instead.

2) **Touch her like you are just friends.** This is just formalizing your role as your wife’s beta orbiter. It is also creepy, because you are pretending you aren’t expecting anything when the whole reason you are touching her is to try to get her to have sex with you.

3) **Choreplay.**

   If you want more sex, then go out of your way to make sure your wife isn’t exhausted. Pick up a mop. Put the kids in bed.

   Better yet, make a cardboard sign that says “If I do the dishes can I touch your privates?”

4) **Become her best girlfriend.**

   Want more action in the bedroom? Better make sure there’s action outside the bedroom too! Just take a walk with her every night and catch up, giving her a chance to share her heart. Ask about her day and what she’s worried about. This helps clear her head too so that she won’t be so distracted when making love.

   More beta orbiter game. Talking with your wife is good, but doing so in order to get sex is needy and creepy. If her mind is focused elsewhere and you want sex, pick her up and carry her into the bedroom.

5) **Conduct a sex survey on your wife.**
If your wife isn’t having a good time in bed, she certainly may have sexual issues. But for the vast majority of women, when sex doesn’t feel pleasurable, it’s because her husband hasn’t taken the time to learn how to make her feel good, and she’s given up.

Nope. She wants you to Just get it. Pay attention to what she responds to. Don’t ask “Is it ok if I touch you like this?”

6) **Stop using porn.** This is good advice, and the Apostle Paul tells us in 1 Cor 7-2:5 that neither husbands nor wives should deny the other sex to avoid the temptation of sexual sin. Gregoire doesn’t like that bit of instruction however, and advises wives to do the opposite.

7) **Take a shower.** Not in itself bad advice, except the frame is “Now that I’m not stinky, can I touch your privates?” Moreover, if she were hot for you, whether you showered or not would not be an issue.

8) **Get used to it.** This is sadly Gregoire’s best advice, because men who are foolish enough to listen to her are all but guaranteed to creep out their wives. This is especially true because the whole point of the *Authentic Manhood* program is to ensure that husbands don’t mistakenly take the bible’s instruction on headship and submission seriously. Women are attracted to men who lead them, as Sheila’s husband Keith learned quite by accident:

**See Also:**

- *A Tale of Two Beaches.*
- *The thought of holding hands with him made her sick, but fortunately he convinced her to marry him.*
- *Romance 101: How to stop frustrating your wife.*
- *Like a rutting buck.*
In Dalrockian and Disoriented Pastor Doug Wilson responds to my recent posts If mama ain’t happy and She’s the boss, you’re a guest. Click through and read his full post, and you will notice that Wilson is careful not to defend the ideas I challenged. This is an especially shrewd move when it comes to his theology of Christian wives as house despots, outranking their husbands in matters of the home (emphasis mine):

A wife therefore has true authority over her home which no one, including her husband, can take away from her. She must be obedient to him, as this verse states, but **this is a clearly delimited obedience.** This can easily be misunderstood or misrepresented, but it is still necessary to emphasize. In a certain sense, a husband (as the head of his wife) is an honored and permanent guest, but **he should learn to see himself as a guest.** He wipes his feet at the door, he eats what is served to him, and he seeks to conform to the pattern established by her—as she in her turn seeks to honor him. He has authority—where Scripture gives it. She has authority where Scripture gives it...

This is clearly a topic Wilson wants to avoid on his blog, as he even avoids defending this theology while responding to my post about it. Wilson’s only defense is that he contradicts this teaching later in the same book:

And here are a couple of things from How to Exasperate Your Wife, the book that Dalrock is using to highlight my feminist, or at any rate soft patriarchal, sins.

“One of the most important word in the marriage vows is ‘obey’” (p. 95).

“If a wife is a servant or a dominatrix, the husband needs to confess his sin” (p. 97).

But it is Wilson’s art of self contradiction that is at the root of the problem. As I pointed out in If mama ain’t happy, Wilson teaches in the introduction to his book Reforming Marriage that the way to tell if a home is pleasing to God is by the mood of the wife! He paraphrases this theology with the well worn phrase *when mamma ain’t happy, ain’t nobody happy:*

Where should the aroma originate? Jesus taught us, with regard to individuals, that cups must be cleaned from the inside out. If we apply this principle to the home, we should see that the “inside” of a family is, of course, the relationship between husband and wife, as they self-consciously imitate the relationship of Christ and the Church.
The health of all other relationships in the home depends upon the health of this relationship, and the key is found in how the husband is treating his wife. Or, put another way, **when mamma ain't happy, ain't nobody happy**.

Wilson is shrewd enough not to try to defend *this* theology on his blog either. How could he possibly defend something like this? The bits of Wilson’s theology that I referenced in my two posts are the theology he writes in his *books*. In his *blog* he writes that the problem with Christian marriage is that Christian husbands have foolishly listened to Christian leaders who teach them to defer to their wives to keep mama happy:

> When a false definition of servant leadership is mandated for the church, the only people who will simply ignore that teaching will be the dullards and pigs. The **sincere Christian men, who falsely believe they are being taught in accordance with the Word, will dutifully disarm**. They will abdicate their essential role of actual leadership in the home, and they will call it servant leadership, leading from behind, or “just-what-I-was-going-to-suggest-leadership.” But there is a vast difference between real servant leadership, the kind Christ practiced and enjoined, and **the kind that requires men to stand down whenever mama ain’t happy**. By so emphasizing servant leadership, the church has not succeeded in establishing more of it, but they have succeeding in giving men a noble-sounding name as a fig leaf for their cowardice.

So Wilson’s defense is technically accurate. For any given claim Wilson makes putting women in charge, you can find another instance of him teaching that men are cowards for listening to just this kind of advice. But make no mistake; this doesn’t make Wilson stand out in the complementarian world. Teaching men that their wives are holy barometers of God’s approval while castigating men for failing to lead is *exactly* what complementarianism is all about.

H/T Hmm
Ross Douthat wrote an opinion piece for Easter in the New York Times titled: God and Men and Jordan Peterson. Douthat is concerned that young men are turning away from Christianity, and that men like Jordan Peterson are filling the void. Douthat wonders why this could be the case, even though he inadvertently answers this question in the opening of his piece:

The men fled; the women stayed.

That’s the story of Easter weekend in the New Testament. Most of Jesus’ male disciples vanished when the trouble started, leaving his mother and Mary Magdalene and other women to watch by the cross, prepare his body for his burial, and then (with the men still basically in hiding) find the empty tomb.

Male absence and female energy has also been the story, albeit less starkly and dramatically, of Christian practice in many times and places since.

There are two glaring problems with this opening. The first and most serious is Douthat succumbing to the temptation of our age, and trying to find a way to make Christ’s death and resurrection a story of female supremacy, if not feminist triumph. The second problem is that his characterization contradicts the Gospels. In John 19:38-42 we learn that it was two men who took Christ’s body off the cross, prepared it for burial, and placed it in the tomb (NIV):

38 Later, Joseph of Arimathea asked Pilate for the body of Jesus. Now Joseph was a disciple of Jesus, but secretly because he feared the Jewish leaders. With Pilate’s permission, he came and took the body away. 39 He was accompanied by Nicodemus, the man who earlier had visited Jesus at night. Nicodemus brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about seventy-five pounds. 40 Taking Jesus’ body, the two of them wrapped it, with the spices, in strips of linen. This was in accordance with Jewish burial customs. 41 At the place where Jesus was crucified, there was a garden, and in the garden a new tomb, in which no one had ever been laid. 42 Because it was the Jewish day of Preparation and since the tomb was nearby, they laid Jesus there.

In Mark 15:43 we learn that Joseph of Arimathea boldly asked for Jesus’ body (NIV):

43 Joseph of Arimathea, a prominent member of the Council, who was himself waiting for the kingdom of God, went boldly to Pilate and asked for Jesus’ body.

In two of the accounts of Christ’s burial (Mat 27:61 & Mark 15:47) we learn that two women witnessed Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus burying Christ’s body. But this isn’t what Douthat claims. Douthat claims that the men disappeared, leaving the work of the burial to women.
But perhaps Douthat is referring to the third day, when Jesus was resurrected. Luke 24:1-8 tells us that on the third day a group of women brought more spices to prepare Christ’s body, but when they arrived His body was gone (NIV):

24 On the first day of the week, very early in the morning, the women took the spices they had prepared and went to the tomb. 2 They found the stone rolled away from the tomb, 3 but when they entered, they did not find the body of the Lord Jesus. 4 While they were wondering about this, suddenly two men in clothes that gleamed like lightning stood beside them. 5 In their fright the women bowed down with their faces to the ground, but the men said to them, “Why do you look for the living among the dead? 6 He is not here; he has risen! Remember how he told you, while he was still with you in Galilee: 7 ‘The Son of Man must be delivered over to the hands of sinners, be crucified and on the third day be raised again.’ ” 8 Then they remembered his words.

I want to reiterate that our posture here shouldn’t be to see which sex was the “winner” with respect to caring for Christ’s body. This is Douthat’s gravest error. But since in the process he contradicted the Gospel accounts, it is important to correct the record. It isn’t clear why the women were bringing yet more spices on the third day. Perhaps in the confusion they weren’t aware of all that the men had already done. Perhaps they simply wanted to honor their Lord by bringing more. But either way, note that they are given a mild rebuke from the angels for seeking Christ’s body in the tomb on the third day. Showing up on the third day expecting to see Jesus’ body wasn’t an act of superior faith. It was a demonstration of the very lack of faith all of Christ’s disciples appear to have demonstrated at that moment.

But to Douthat this is a moment to spike the feminist football, and by implication ask why other men are so inferior to him. More importantly, Douthat isn’t alone in this regard. Nearly all Christian leaders follow this same pattern. It is this miserliness of respect for other men that has created the void that Peterson is filling. Note that Peterson isn’t telling young men they are great as they are, just let it all hang out. Peterson is telling young men they need to man up. But Peterson’s man up message is fundamentally different than the modern Christian man up message. Peterson’s message doesn’t celebrate the feminist triumph that is afflicting young men. Peterson offers both love and the possibility of respect for men who work to improve themselves. This is profoundly different than the modern Christian message, the very message that Douthat chose to stress as the message of Christ’s resurrection. If Douthat can’t bring himself to respect the legendary boldness of Joseph of Arimathea and the generosity of Nicodemus, he surely can’t be bothered to acknowledge when a young man starts Peterson’s process by cleaning his room, or even respect a young man who mans up and marries despite a legal system and culture fully hostile to married fathers.

H/T natewinchester
Pastor Wilson will no doubt thank me.
by Dalrock | April 3, 2018 | Link

Commenter katech0 writes:

Anonymous Reader wrote: Fact: Wilson wrote that a wife’s happiness is the standard to judge a marriage. Full stop. That is what “If mama’s not happy....” means. Full stop. If Anonymous Reader could make this case, believe me that I would have no use for Wilson. Fortunately, this charge is easily refuted. Here’s a quote from Wilson’s blog post, titled “Miserable Wives”:

What katech0 doesn’t understand is that it isn’t possible to prove Wilson didn’t write something in the introduction to Reforming Marriage by pointing to Wilson writing something else somewhere else. To see what Wilson wrote in the introduction to Reforming Marriage, you have to read the introduction to Reforming Marriage. There is I'm afraid no way around this fact.

My challenge to katech0 and anyone else who doubts my characterization of the introduction is to spend a mere $8 and buy a Kindle copy of Reforming Marriage and go read the introduction right now. It will only take a minute or two. If I’ve pulled a quote out of context, it should be child’s play to show what I’ve done. This way you can both defend Wilson and support him financially. And if I’m wrong, you will also have gained a book full of Christian wisdom on marriage! If I’m right (which I am) you will learn the truth of the matter, which is certainly worth a measly $8.

For example, once you read the introduction you will find where Wilson writes (emphasis mine):

The health of all other relationships in the home depends upon the health of this relationship, and the key is found in how the husband is treating his wife. Or, put another way, when mamma ain’t happy, ain’t nobody happy.

Perhaps you will find that I’m taking this out of context, and Wilson is really quoting someone he disagrees with when he writes this. Then you can point out my error for all to see.

But I’m confident that you won’t find any such problem with my characterization of the introduction, because I’ve actually read the introduction. But either way, if you doubt my word, surely you have nothing to lose by spending a few bucks to know for sure.

However, if you are convinced I’m right but don’t want to actually see the truth, by no means should you buy the book and read the introduction. In that case your best bet would be to avoid reading the introduction and change the subject.
How to spot a faker.
by Dalrock | April 4, 2018 | Link

In the introduction of *Reforming Marriage* Pastor Wilson explains why some men do everything right but their wives are still unhappy. The reason this happens is the man isn’t right with God (emphasis mine):

> In other words, keeping God’s law with a whole heart (which is really what love is) is not only seen in overt acts of obedience. The collateral effect of obedience is the aroma of love. **This aroma is out of reach for those who have a hypocritical desire to be known by others as a keeper of God’s law.** Many can fake an attempt at keeping God’s standards in some external way. What we cannot fake is the resulting, distinctive aroma of pleasure to God.

> ...This is why I am afraid that this book will be of little use to those who simply want a “formula” to follow that will build them a happy marriage. When it comes to the externals, the mere copyist can always say of himself what the unregenerate Saul could say, “concerning the righteousness which is in the law, blameless” (Phil. 3:6). However hard the externalist tries, he cannot produce the aroma of godliness. This is why so many people attend marriage seminars and read marriage books with so little result. The obedience of the Christian man is not limited to new actions—actions which, after all, can be copied mechanically. This does not appear to be a rare or unusual error; many people who are miserable in their marriages are also those who have read all the books on how not to be. Of course, certain actions—godly obedience in externals—must be present in all healthy marriages; but in order to produce this distinctive aroma, the externals must proceed from new hearts.

> ...the love of the Christian husband does not proceed from reading the “right books,” including this one, or going to the right seminars. God will not patch His grace onto some humanistic psychological nonsense—even if that nonsense is couched and buried in Christian terminology.

> ...

> When a husband seeks to glorify God in his home, he will be equipped to love his wife as he is commanded. And if he loves his wife as commanded, the aroma of his home will be pleasant indeed.

Note how well this ties in with the psychology of the frivolous divorcée. She is absolutely certain that her husband is the reason she is so terribly unhappy. The more he does what she (and Wilson, and Oprah) demands, the more furious and miserable she becomes! Finally Wilson comes along and explains why she feels this way. It is because her husband is a hypocrite. Sure he does everything he is told to do, but he is a fraud, and God is using her feelings of discontentment to show the world the truth!
See Also: How to tell if you are a godly man.
I’ll be turning on moderation in the morning, and will probably be away through the early part of next week.

In the meantime, you may want to check out Wintry Knight’s post: What do pastors teach Christian women about relationships and marriage?

Larry Kummer also has a new post up titled: Starting World War G: the gender wars

Feel free to link other posts you think readers might be interested in the comments below before I turn on moderation.
An excellent piece at the Federalist.
by Dalrock | April 9, 2018 | Link

Matthew Cochran at the Federalist kindly links to a recent post of mine in: If You Want Men In Your Church, Stop Treating Them With Contempt
Winning the arms race (made you look!)

by Dalrock | April 10, 2018 | Link

In women’s online race to acquire beta orbiters and ensure that the maximum number of men know that their bodies are sexy, it is tough for a woman to stand out while still pretending to not be seeking sexual attention. One Tennessee coed has succeeded using a clever ploy that no one, especially thirsty beta orbiters, will ever suspect.

**Related:** Broadcasting what they bring to the table.

H/T Instapundit.
Larry Kummer continues his analysis of the war between the sexes at Fabius Maximus in his most recent post *Men standing together can end the gender wars*.

Radical feminists have captured major institutions, using them to implement their ideology. Men have respond like frightened sheep. This has allowed feminists to implement drastic changes to America with blinding speed, as social changes go. Almost all the institutions in America have joined the new orthodoxy, from the Boy Scouts to *conservative Christian organizations*. (see here and here). So the men who rebel are outlaws. They craft solutions as individuals, such as Game and MGTOW (men going their own way).

As promised, Larry has moved from analysis to solutions. One thread he is exploring is men’s natural tendency to form into packs, given the right stimulus:

But there is always a counter-revolution. Now – slowly – automatic systems engage, driving behaviors hard-wired into men. These are the equivalent of a BIOS – the instructions in a pc’s permanent memory. When attacked, men band together into packs. Tight groups with common beliefs and goals, respected leaders, and willingness to act. Not organizations, run with Roberts Rules of Order and committees. Packs, like wolves.

Larry doesn’t harbor any delusions that this will automatically lead to good outcomes:

Pack formation is a hard-wired process, and like all such it is amoral. It produces biker gangs, inner city gangs, and organized crime networks as easily as reform movements. See how the fasces’ glorious history was contaminated by its adoption by Italy’s fascists. The difference between a failed State and a successful one is how this process works.

I think Larry is right that packs will play a powerful role in whatever comes next. As he observes, exactly what kind of packs form and the nature of their impact is not something we can hope to accurately predict. One troubling aspect of this is that as it stands there is a strong bias toward “outlaw” packs, as men are effectively legally forbidden from creating men only organizations. To rework a phrase from the gun debate, when male packs are outlawed, only outlaws will form (and join) male packs.

The other unknown is how married beta men will respond to the packs. It would seem that to some degree we should expect beta married men to attempt to respond with their own packs, and the form this takes will depend on the strength of the government. Ironically it takes a strong and ordered government with a high degree of male trust to create the specific kind of disorder we are currently experiencing. So far beta married men have formed a de facto pack to enforce the matriarchy. Outlaw packs of other men might cause them to double down in this regard, and this is what I would expect under current conditions.
However, if the formal government loses enough of the confidence of married betas it could encourage them to meet the threat on more of their own terms.
Commenter 7817 asks:

Dalrock, have you read Wilson’s post from last year where he says that one of the beautiful things the puritans did was to enshrine Chivalry in marriage?

From the post:
"This was the origin of the romantic and chivalric ideal of a knight and his lady fair.

What the Puritans did was to take this ideal, keep the romantic and chivalric aspects of it, and then combine it all with faithful and monogamous marriage."

Given your past articles about chivalry, Wilson’s take is interesting, because he knows what it was, but thinks that our adoption of it in marriage is a good thing.

The post in question is Obeying Your Double Helix, and I had not seen it prior to 7817 asking. In the post Wilson is right on some points. The puritans are indeed mischaracterized as being anti sex, when they were quite the opposite. It is also true that puritans tried to reconcile the idea of courtly love/chivalry with biblical marriage.

But it is not true that in the process of incorporating chivalry into marriage that puritans somehow improved on the biblical view of marriage. While puritans removed the most obvious problem with chivalry/courtly love (the overt worship of adultery), they still greatly corrupted the idea of biblical marriage in the process. Chivalry is philosophical cancer; it is the mechanism that transformed feminist complaining into concrete action.

Even without the overt encouragement of adultery, chivalry is anti biblical. Chivalry teaches us that women are inherently moral. As CS Lewis explains in The Allegory of Love (emphasis mine):

It is in courts that the new feeling arises: the lady, by her social and feudal position, is already the arbitress of manners and the scourge of 'villany' even before she is loved. The association of love with adultery—an association which has lasted in continental literature down to our own times—has deeper causes.

As the second part of the quote above indicates, even when the overt worship of adultery is removed from chivalry/courtly love, a glorification of adultery remains. Biblical marriage is antithetical to the kind of wife worship chivalry demands. This involves associating both women and their feelings of romantic love with virtue and the divine. As Lewis explains, biblical marriage is anti chivalry because of male headship and because it is based on commitment instead of emotion (emphasis mine):

The love which is to be the source of all that is beautiful in life and manners must be the reward freely given by the lady, and only our
superiors can reward. But a wife is not a superior. As the wife of another, above all as the wife of a great lord, she may be queen of beauty and of love, the distributor of favours, the inspiration of all knightly virtues, and the bridle of ‘villany’; but as your own wife, for whom you have bargained with her father, she sinks at once from lady into mere woman. How can a woman, whose duty is to obey you, be the midons whose grace is the goal of all striving and whose displeasure is the restraining influence upon all uncourtly vices? You may love her in a sense; but that is not love, says Andreas, any more than the love of father and son is amicitia. We must not suppose that the rules of love are most frivolous when they are most opposed to marriage. The more serious they are, the more they are opposed. As I have said before, where marriage does not depend upon the free will of the married, any theory which takes love for a noble form of experience must be a theory of adultery.

It is only by doing great violence to biblical marriage that modern Christians can practice marital chivalry. The specific form of the violence will vary, but the general nature of it remains easily identified. Stoeker and Arterburn refer to a wife’s sexuality as her “soul essence”, which the husband must obey in Every Man’s Marriage:

What I’m trying to say is that the “master” defines your rights (and remember again that though we refer to your wife as your “master,” it’s our shorthand for the fact that becoming one with her essence is actually your God-given master). Why? Because you’re called to oneness and her essence sets the terms.

Wilson himself on the other hand is a bit more circumspect in his book Reforming Marriage, even though he makes what is ultimately the same argument. According to Wilson, the emotional state of wives is God’s way of telling us if a man is virtuous or not (emphasis mine):

In other words, keeping God’s law with a whole heart (which is really what love is) is not only seen in overt acts of obedience. The collateral effect of obedience is the aroma of love. This aroma is out of reach for those who have a hypocritical desire to be known by others as a keeper of God’s law. Many can fake an attempt at keeping God’s standards in some external way. What we cannot fake is the resulting, distinctive aroma of pleasure to God.

But while Wilson avoids directly equating a woman’s sexual desire for her husband with the man’s goodness in Reforming Marriage, in his blog post The Suitor and His Porn Wilson explains that if a wife doesn’t desire her husband sexually this is an indication that the man is not treating her right:

The most common way this happens in marriage is that a man does not treat his wife right, they start to quarrel and drift apart, and this naturally includes their sex life, and he feels just as entitled as he ever did.

Pastor Doug Wilson, Stoeker, and Arterburn are of course not alone in corrupting biblical marriage with this chivalrous concept. Pastor Dave Wilson explains in The Art of Marriage that God revealed His displeasure with Dave through Dave’s wife’s (non) burning bush:
Dave: Yes. Here’s all you need to know about that night—the thing that changed our marriage is when Ann was sharing with me what she felt—I had a pretty unique encounter with God. I sensed **God was speaking to me, through Ann**;

President of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Dr. R. Albert Mohler Jr. is surprisingly bold in laying out this same moral vision (emphasis mine):

Put most bluntly, I believe that **God means for a man to be civilized, directed, and stimulated toward marital faithfulness by the fact that his wife will freely give herself to him sexually only when he presents himself as worthy of her attention and desire.**

As Lewis notes, the very idea of headship destroys the moral order of chivalry. How can a wife use her divine power to express God’s will if she is supposed to obey her husband? How can a husband kneel to his Lady, his *midons*, if she is supposed to submit to him and call him lord? Pastor Doug Wilson clearly has wrestled with this problem, and this lead to him creating a new theology of marriage. While (in theory) the husband is head and the wife is to obey her husband, Wilson discovered that **there is a loophole to headship and submission.** It turns out that the wife is the *despot* of the home, and her husband should see himself as a guest. This new theology is nothing if not chivalrous (emphasis mine):

In a certain sense, a husband (as the head of his wife) is an honored and permanent guest, but **he should learn to see himself as a guest. He wipes his feet at the door, he eats what is served to him, and he seeks to conform to the pattern established by her**—as she in her turn seeks to honor him.

Moreover, since under chivalry women’s romantic love is seen as *something pure and holy*, the lifetime commitment of biblical marriage is incompatible with chivalry. This is the very root of our current acceptance of no fault divorce, and this view goes all the way back to the puritans. The famous puritan poet John Milton wrote in *Tetrachordon*:

> And although copulation be considered among the ends of marriage, yet the act thereof in a right esteem can no longer be matrimonial, than it is an effect of conjugal love. **When love finds itself utterly unmatched, and justly vanishes, nay rather cannot but vanish, the fleshly act indeed may continue, but not holy, not pure, not beseeming the sacred bond of marriage**; being at best but an animal excretion...

This idea that romantic love (and not marriage) *purifies sex* is not a biblical idea, and in fact the Bible tells Christian husbands that they should approach their wives like a rutting buck!

We can see other signs of the corruption chivalry has wrought on Christian thought in the form of what is commonly called “white knighting” for women’s sins. Pastor Doug Wilson has drank deeply from this cup, and is uncharacteristically consistent in denying women’s sins. Wilson teaches us that men sin sexually due to sexual temptation, but **women’s sexual sin is more innocent.**

If we interviewed a thousand men who were immoral and sexually promiscuous, we
would find we had a thousand men with a lack of self-control with regard to sexual temptation. If we were to do the same with a thousand promiscuous women, we would not find a thousand women with a sexual problem, but rather with a security problem. They are generally not looking for great sexual satisfaction, but rather for emotional security.

Likewise in Chapter 9 (Divorce and Remarriage) of Reforming Marriage Wilson explains (emphasis mine):

In relating this to divorce, it means that wives are much more likely to be wronged by their husbands than the other way around. If a man is unfaithful to his wife, it is quite possible that she was being the kind of wife God wants her to be. **If a woman is unfaithful to her husband, it is much less likely that he was fulfilling his role properly.**

In his conclusion to How to Exasperate Your Wife, Wilson offers “A Chiastic Catechism on Biblical Sexuality” where he explains that homosexuality among men is due to men’s sin:

10. Why are men sexually attracted to other men? It is the judgment of God upon our culture because we would not honor God as God and would not give Him thanks. Therefore God has given men over to the downward spiral of their renegade lusts fueled by father hunger.

However, in the same Catechism on Biblical Sexuality Wilson explains that women’s homosexuality is caused by men mistreating women:

16. Why are women sexually attracted to other women? This also is the judgment of God upon our culture, **and is the result of men—fathers, brothers, cousins, boyfriends, husbands, and ex-husbands—mistreating girls and women.** Women ineffectively try to build a fortress that will protect them from rebellious male sexuality, but it cannot work. Despite this protest, many self-identified lesbians remain sexually accessible to selfish men, and the “burned by men” phenomenon just gets continually worse. This too is fueled by father hunger.

Men’s sexual urges tempt them to sin, but in the chivalrous world women’s sexuality is *pure.* It only results in sin if men somehow corrupt women’s natural purity. This is not the biblical view, but because Christians have adopted chivalry it has replaced the biblical view.
Chivalry and biblical marriage can’t coexist.
by Dalrock | April 16, 2018 | Link

Swanny River asks in response to Blinded by Chivalry:

Can someone explain to me what is meant by a marriage depending upon the free will of the married means? Is an arranged marriage an example of people without free will? Women freely divorce and commit adultery by marrying another, so how is that different than a theory of adultery?

I assume Swanny is referring to the following quote from CS Lewis:

As I have said before, where marriage does not depend upon the free will of the married, any theory which takes love for a noble form of experience must be a theory of adultery.

What Lewis is saying is that when we elevate romantic love to something moral, then marriage can no longer be moral. At that point marriage must bend to romantic love, not the other way around. This is you will notice our current view. It isn’t just about arranged marriage. If a woman marries someone she doesn’t love because she wants something else out of the transaction (power, money, etc), then she must be allowed to exit the marriage at will. And if she marries for love but later falls out of love, she must be allowed to exit the marriage at will. If marriage is seen as something moral, a real, binding commitment, then in order to glorify romantic love you have to glorify adultery. Chivalry and courtly love are the antithesis of biblical marriage. You can’t get around this by trying to bring chivalry/courtly love into marriage, because the logic remains the same. Either marriage has moral meaning, or romantic love has moral meaning; both cannot be the case.

When the puritans incorporated chivalry into marriage they killed biblical marriage. Even Milton understood this, which is why he argued that when the feelings of romantic love were gone a marriage could no longer exist.
In his post Obeying Your Double Helix Pastor Doug Wilson recommends the book The Worldly Saints by Leland Ryken. This is a book I read when I originally wrote about Courtly Love back in December of 2016. At the time I decided not to post on the book because Ryken muddies the waters by attributing a quote from St Jerome to a Puritan. Ryken does this while explaining that Puritans believed that married sex was dirty unless consecrated by romantic love (emphasis mine):

If the main purpose of married sex is the expression of mutual love and companionship, it is a perversion of sex to reduce it to a merely physical act. “How can two...become one flesh lawfully,” asked Cleaver, “when as there wanteth the union and conjunction of the heart, the true and natural mother of all marriage duties?” 60 Perkins had something similar in mind when he wrote, “Nothing is more shameless than to love a wife as though she were a strumpet.” 61 And Milton wrote,

Although copulation be considered among the ends of marriage, yet the act thereof in a right esteem can no longer be matrimonial than it is an effect of conjugal love. When love...vanishes,...the fleshly act indeed may continue, but not holy, not pure, not beseeeming the sacred bond of marriage, being at best an animal excretion.62

I can’t find an online reference at the moment, but the work from Perkins that Ryken quotes* is actually Perkins quoting St Jerome**. Here is an alternate translation of the same quote from Against Jovinianus (Book I), with a bit more context:

Hence Xystus in his Sentences tells us that “He who too ardently loves his own wife is an adulterer.” It is disgraceful to love another man’s wife at all, or one’s own too much. A wise man ought to love his wife with judgment, not with passion. Let a man govern his voluptuous impulses, and not rush headlong into intercourse. There is nothing blacker than to love a wife as if she were an adulteress.

In the same piece Jerome offers his striking interpretation of 1 Cor 7:1, explaining that Paul is saying sex in marriage is evil, albeit a lesser evil than sex outside of marriage (all emphasis mine).

“It is good,” he says, “for a man not to touch a woman.” If it is good not to touch a woman, it is bad to touch one: for there is no opposite to goodness but badness. But if it be bad and the evil is pardoned, the reason for the concession is to prevent worse evil. But surely a thing which is only allowed because there may be something worse has only a slight degree of goodness.
At any rate, I believe that Ryken is right in general; Puritans (falsely) believed that romantic love was required to sanctify married sex. After all, the quote from Milton is correct, even though Ryken failed to note that Milton made the argument in an essay arguing for the adoption of no fault divorce!

What is striking is that Ryken's error in mistaking Jerome for a Puritan is an understandable error. Both viewed married sex as something dirty. The only difference is the Puritans decided that married sex could be made clean, sanctified, through feelings of romantic love, an idea that doesn’t come from the Bible.

*Ryken’s note for this says “61 A Godly and Learned Exposition of Christ’s Sermon in the Mount [Schnucker, p. 360]”. When writing this post I found an online version of the text: A GODLY AND LEARNED EXPOSITION of CHRIST’S Sermon in the Mount, but cannot find the quote in question. If you find the quote please let me know in the comments.

**See my post St. Jerome on marriage for more detail.
Tackling the patriarchy, holding the door open for trannies.
by Dalrock | April 16, 2018 | Link

Last week the media was aflutter with the news that the Boston Marathon was formally inviting transvestites to compete. If you wondered who to thank for this latest example of progress, you can thank chivalry. As the Boston Herald explains in Boston Marathon pioneer hails trans ruling today’s progress can be tied back to 1967, when the first woman defied race officials:

Kathrine Switzer endured more than snow squalls and low temps during the 1967 Boston Marathon. Steely No. 261 fought to stay on track while fellow runners pushed her, angry that a woman dared to join the male-dominated race.

Five decades later, the first female Boston marathoner celebrates Sunday’s breakthrough decision to accept openly transgender women.

Switzer’s triumph was made possible by multiple acts of chivalry, but the most overt chivalrous act came when race co director Jock Semple tried to remove her official race number:

John Duncan “Jock” Semple (October 26, 1903 – March 10, 1988) was a Scottish-American runner, physical therapist, trainer, and sports official. In 1967, he attained worldwide notoriety as a race official for the Boston Marathon, when he attempted to tear off the number of Kathrine Switzer, who was officially entered despite a ban on female competitors.[1]

Switzer describes the scene in her own account:

A big man, a huge man, with bared teeth was set to pounce, and before I could react he grabbed my shoulder and flung me back, screaming, “Get the hell out of my race and give me those numbers!” Then he swiped down my front, trying to rip off my bib number, just as I leapt backward from him. He missed the numbers, but I was so surprised and frightened that I slightly wet my pants and turned to run. But now the man had the back of my shirt and was swiping at the bib number on my back.

It would have ended there, and Switzer wouldn’t have been able to finish the race as a numbered contestant, were it not for the chivalry of her football playing boyfriend, Big Tom Miller. At that moment, Big Tom literally tackled the patriarchy:

I felt unable to flee, like I was rooted there, and indeed I was, because the man, this Jock guy, had me by the shirt. Then a flash of orange flew past and hit Jock with a cross-body block. It was Big Tom, in the orange Syracuse sweatshirt. There was a thud—woomph!—and Jock was airborne. He landed on the roadside like a pile of wrinkled clothes.
With that one act, Big Tom brought the Boston Marathon’s 70 year history as a race for men to a close. Now, 51 years later, the race finally officially welcomes trans runners. None of this would be possible without the chivalry of Big Tom and men like him.

The same is true for the progress that has been made in the church. Only an unchivalrous man would tell a woman she couldn’t teach, or divorce her husband, or have children out of wedlock, etc. If you’ve ever spoken out against feminism in the church, you’ve no doubt had an experience similar to Jock Semple, albeit with a metaphorical tackling instead of a literal one. But what matters is the impulse is the same. Feminism has relied on the chivalrous impulse every step of the way, even as feminists have expressed contempt for chivalry.

Laughably conservatives have assumed all along that they would appease the feminist impulse by engaging in more and more chivalry. When women complained about the patriarchy, men chivalrously offered women the vote. When women responded by complaining louder, more concessions were made. Women complained that it wasn’t fair that they were excluded from the military, so men chivalrously opened first the military, and then combat, to women. After all, what kind of a man would say no to a woman? Can’t they see that she is upset? This is true even though chivalry says only men should fight. Modern day chivalrous men square this circle by pretending that other (cowardly) men are somehow forcing women to fight in their place.

We are to this day still stuck in this same pattern, with conservatives still believing that one more chivalrous push will finally win the war against feminism.

Related: They had a good run.
Casual dating and serial monogamy as lost virtues.
by Dalrock | April 17, 2018 | Link

There is a story making the rounds about a Boston College professor trying to entice her students to go on dates. The shocker for older generations outside the men’s sphere is that dating is now a dead practice. But what makes the article stand out to me is the way that serial monogamy and casual dating are framed as lost virtues that need to be recovered:

If students don’t learn how to date while they’re in college, while surrounded by thousands of peers all in a similar stage in life, Cronin says, it only gets harder to build those skills after graduation...

Cronin has received all sort of pushback to her dating project – from super-Catholics, from super-feminists and from students who’d rather focus on getting a job than getting a date. Her defense? “Not everybody is called to romantic relationship, not everyone is called to marriage,” Cronin says. “But everybody’s called to relationships — that what it means to be human.”

And that’s what she’s trying to foster. She tells students: “This is mostly not about meeting your soul mate; it’s mostly about social courage and challenging yourself to be a little countercultural, to do something you know you want to do. And to just be okay with being a little awkward, a little vulnerable and asking a little bit of yourself.”

This is a quixotic desire is to take a snapshot of the sexual revolution and freeze the frame there, but it won’t work. The supposed virtues of serial monogamy and casual dating are not in fact virtues at all. Conservatives long for them out of nostalgia, not a real sense of morality. Moreover, what has destroyed our popular conception of the courtship ritual is the massive extension of the period we expect this ritual to take place (both before marriage and after divorce). The longer we stretch the process out, the more ridiculous the seeming formality of the process (with no real rules) becomes to the young people we expect to participate in it. That older generations pine for a bygone era doesn’t make this seem less ridiculous to young people; it makes it seem even more ridiculous.
She got the message.
by Dalrock | April 19, 2018 | Link

Sarah Bregel has the credentials, but can she compete in this already crowded field?

Sarah Bregel has joined a long list of mommy writers who converted their kids’ misfortune into career success. Bregel used her new status as professional divorcée to get published at Slate, with The work of marital maintenance is a privilege not everyone can afford.

Bregel’s piece is about another mother informing her that divorce has lowered her status:

A few months ago, my husband and I announced we were parting ways after eight years of marriage. The response has mostly been supportive, though a few reactions hinted at something else: the idea that I simply didn’t do enough to make my marriage work. This well-meaning acquaintance and would-be marriage counselor thought Target was the place to tell me what I’d done wrong, just as others had before: I didn’t take enough date nights; I didn’t employ enough teenage babysitters; I didn’t go to therapy with enough consistency. I also didn’t take “marital maintenance vacations,” (which is what vacays sans kids are called these days, or so I’ve been told by fellow parents who often take them). I didn’t even take staycations, which, if you didn’t know, is when the kids go to grandma’s for a week so you can stay in your pajamas and spoon-feed one another tiramisu.

To be clear, this is not about wealth, vacations, marriage counselors or baby sitters. It is also not about keeping romantic love alive (keeping mama happy). This is about class and status. Bregel’s status dropped when she signaled to the world around her that raising her kids in an intact home wasn’t a priority. Bregel’s kids are no longer a good match for the married mother’s kids to hang out with (although it sounds like this already wasn’t common). It would be considered crass for the married mother to say this outright, but she used the cover of advice to get this message across. Clearly Bregel got the message, which is why the “advice” stung so much.

Bregel responded in the only way she knew. She wrote an article accusing the mothers who remain married to their children’s father of having privilege. The subtext is sure they have
higher status (for who can deny it?), but they didn’t earn it. Bregel closes with:

What’s not said enough is that becoming passing ships doesn’t just happen out of sheer negligence, though. Romantic dinners and getaways might be one helpful component to a lasting marriage. But imagining everyone has that kind of freedom is a certain kind of privilege. No, money might not buy happiness, but it does buy more date nights, therapy, and those ever-loving adults-only vacations I keep hearing about. I missed the boat on that one, but you go ahead and sip that piña colada at your all-inclusive resort. I’ll be over here babysitting all the neighborhood kids and writing about fitness gear at 4 a.m. so I can finance my divorce.

When Bregel submitted the piece to Slate, the editors obviously knew it was a winner. Married mothers can gloat over their higher status while feigning concern for the unfortunate. Baby mamas can join in mock solidarity to express their outrage at being excluded by the higher class married mothers, dooming them to the company of their fellow trashy single mothers. Everybody wins. Almost everybody that is.

Related: Harming your kids for attention and profit.

H/T: Heidi
Visible in absence.
by Dalrock | April 23, 2018 | Link

As I’ve noted before chivalry is the mechanism that turns feminism (women’s complaints) into action. This is at times hard to observe because chivalry is most men’s default condition in our culture*. Most men don’t actively think of themselves as chivalrous, but at the same time they would be deeply troubled if accused of being unchivalrous.

But women aren’t expected to be chivalrous, so they often provide a window into how chivalry has warped most men’s thinking. For example, Yahoo has a new article up titled Thousands of girls joining boys as Cub Scouts. The article focuses on a little girl who is joining her brother’s Cub Scout pack. The boy understands that it would be unchivalrous to ask for a space he and his father can focus on manly things:

I was a little skeptical because it was me and my dad’s thing, but when Tatum got in it was even more fun

Since women don’t have to be chivalrous, the mothers of boys are the only ones who can point out that the girls are being petty by invading all male spaces. In the comments to the article single mother ClaireW laments what girls are taking away from her son:

This is heart breaking to me. As a single mom to a young boy I know he desperately needs strong male role models guiding him. He’s just turned 8, this is the time he needs these men most of all, but now it’s not going to happen. Why can’t the girls have these activities in Girl Scouts? Girls & boys are equal, but that doesn’t mean they are the same. And why would we all want to be?

Likewise, single mother Kasey Ferris at Huffington Post objects to the cartoonish chivalry of modern fathers in Please Don’t Threaten My Son For Dating Your Daughter:

It’s not “funny” to threaten my son. It’s not “cute” to treat your daughter as if she has zero common sense.

... Above all, realize and come to terms with the fact that teenage sexuality is not a “boy thing”. Teenage sexuality is a teenage thing. Young men and young women alike are going to be curious, interested, and looking to learn more about sex. Your daughter is just as curious as my son, I can virtually guarantee it. Yet you don’t see me polishing a shotgun when she comes over to do homework. You don’t see me posting pictures on Facebook with watered-down threats about personal harm should I find out she gets handsy with my son.

The idea of threatening young women to keep their hands off young men is ludicrous, yet when roles are reversed it’s completely accepted and even encouraged. Why?
*This varies by race, and for white men at least has strong class implications. For white men not being called unchivalrous is the mark of a “gentleman”, which connotes both class and virtue.
9 Therefore God has highly exalted him and bestowed on him the name that is above every name, 10 so that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, 11 and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

–Phil 2:9-11 (ESV)

Courtly love started out as a game, a parody of Christianity. In the parody God’s love was exchanged for romantic/sexual love, and women became the object of worship instead of God. The forms of worship remained the same, but the worship was redirected away from God. This is why we now have the custom of singing songs in praise of romantic love and women, and of a man getting down on one knee and confessing his love and devotion to a woman. While it started ostensibly as a game and parody of Christianity, very quickly Christians began adopting the parody in place of the real thing. Today this substitution is nearly complete, but the process began almost immediately.

One way to see the amazing speed with which courtly love replaced Christianity is in the story we have of St George and the dragon. Per the BBC St. George provided a sort of blank slate our medieval ancestors could fill in:

Very little, if anything, is known about the real Saint George. Pope Gelasius said that George is one of the saints “whose names are rightly reverenced among us, but whose actions are known only to God.”

There are at least two variants of the story of St. George and the dragon*, but the most popular one is rich with symbols of the religion that replaced Christianity, the religion of courtly love. This version comes from The Golden Legend, an anthology compiled by Archbishop Jacobus de Voragine on or around 1275. But since The Golden Legend was an anthology of existing tales (much like the Brothers Grimm), the story itself would have been circulating for some time prior.

In The Golden Legend, St. George slays a dragon to rescue a beautiful princess and convert a pagan kingdom to Christianity. St. George manages to wound the dragon with his lance after making the sign of the cross. But he needed a symbol of something more powerful than Christ to control the dragon (a noble woman’s sexual purity). This came in the form of the virgin princess’ girdle (an exterior belt). Once the noblewoman's girdle was placed on the dragon’s neck, the dragon was tamed and the princess (not St. George) lead the dragon back to town:

…St. George was upon his horse, and drew out his sword and garnished him with the sign of the cross, and rode hardily against the dragon which came towards him, and smote him with his spear and hurt him sore and threw him to the ground. And after said to the maid: Deliver to me your girdle, and bind it about the neck of the dragon
and be not afeard.

When she had done so the dragon followed her as it had been a meek beast and debonair. Then she led him into the city, and the people fled by mountains and valleys, and said: Alas! alas! we shall be all dead.

Once in town, St. George offered to slay the dragon if the kingdom converted to Christianity. After the kingdom converted St. George kept his promise and slew the dragon.

Note that the girdle is a classic courtly love symbol a noble woman would give a knight to demonstrate that he had won her favor:

For a classic gift of love, a medieval lady could bestow a favour on a knight on the tournament circuit, usually one of her detachable sleeves, a handkerchief, a ribbon, or a scarf. Something fluttery and easily tied would make a good public declaration;

...Other handmade gifts from ladies, as Gilchrist notes, could be “a pillow, towel, kerchief, girdle or purse”

Not only is the dragon subdued by the power of a noblewoman’s sexual purity, but St. George symbolically had to win the noblewoman’s favor in order to do God’s will.

In 1350, King Edward III made St. George the patron saint of England. This coincided with Edward III creating the Order of the Garter. The motto of the Order of the Garter is:

\[ Honi soit qui mal y pense \] (Shame on him who thinks evil of it)

Infogalactic explains:

The most popular legend involves the “Countess of Salisbury” (either Edward’s future daughter-in-law Joan of Kent or her former mother-in-law, Catherine Montacute, Countess of Salisbury). While she was dancing at a court ball at Calais, her garter is said to have slipped from her leg. When the surrounding courtiers sniggered, the king picked it up and returned it to her, exclaiming, “Honi soit qui mal y pense” (“Shame on him who thinks evil of it.”), the phrase that has become the motto of the Order.[3]

Unlike the girdle in the tale of the dragon, the garter was an undergarment (emphasis mine):

Since garters were not intended to be seen by any man other than her own husband or wishful lover, a woman’s garters may have fine needlework embroidered onto them, French mottoes of courtly love or amorous words of love.

This explains the snickering when the Countess of Salisbury accidently dropped her undergarment for the king to pick up. It also shows the futility of trying to separate the ostensibly noble concept of royal/military chivalry from courtly love. This is the highest order of chivalry in England, and it is directly tied into the themes of courtly love.

The reason we don’t notice that the two are hopelessly intertwined is that as a society we
have adopted courtly love as something virtuous, and we struggle greatly to distinguish between courtly love and Christianity.

*The other variant was created during the reformation and dispenses with the courtly love symbolism.

**Edit:** Added a quote from the Golden Legend. See also this new post for clarification.
The magic in the girdle.
by Dalrock | April 25, 2018 | Link

In my previous post I summarized the The Golden Legend version of St. George and the dragon but did not quote the original. This created some confusion since it wasn’t entirely clear what was directly in the legend and what parts were my own commentary. In the Golden Legend, St. George manages to wound the dragon with his martial skill after making the sign of the cross. But after he wounds the dragon, it is the princess who tames it with the magic of her girdle. Once she ties it around the dragon’s neck the nature of the beast is transformed:

Thus as they spake together the dragon appeared and came running to them, and St. George was upon his horse, and drew out his sword and garnished him with the sign of the cross, and rode hardly against the dragon which came towards him, and smote him with his spear and hurt him sore and threw him to the ground. And after said to the maid: Deliver to me your girdle, and bind it about the neck of the dragon and be not afeard.

When she had done so the dragon followed her as it had been a meek beast and debonair. Then she led him into the city, and the people fled by mountains and valleys, and said: Alas! alas! we shall be all dead.

Then St. George said to them: Ne doubt ye no thing, without more, believe ye in God, Jesu Christ, and do ye to be baptized and I shall slay the dragon.

Then the king was baptized and all his people, and St. George slew the dragon and smote off his head...

St. George’s power here as the hero (beyond his skill as a knight) is knowing what kind of magic will defeat the beast. He knew the sign of the cross would allow him to wound the dragon, but that another kind of magic was required to tame the dragon. This is very common for heroic tales. It very often takes a combination of martial skill as well as secret knowledge for heroes to vanquish the beast.

One thing that is confusing in the account is that St. George tells the princess to:

1. Give him her girdle.
2. Bind the dragon with her girdle.

This is an odd contradiction, but it makes sense when you consider the courtly love imagery involved. When a noble woman gave a knight her girdle it was a symbol that he had won her favor. Thus we have the princess demonstrating that St. George had indeed won her favor. But we also have the princess, through the magic of her virtuous femininity, taming the dragon. Courtly Love/Chivalry are all about the mysterious power of noblewomen to tame what is vulgar. Usually it is a knight who is tamed, but in this case it is the dragon.

Nevertheless, the important part is that even though her two actions (giving St. George her
girdle vs tying it around the dragon’s neck) are in contradiction in the plot, they are in harmony in message.

Here is an excerpt from the plot summary in Infogalactic, which struggles with the contradiction. First it says St. George puts the girdle around the dragon’s neck, and then immediately after it says “when she did so”:

| Saint George by chance rode past the lake. The princess, trembling, sought to send him away, but George vowed to remain. The dragon reared out of the lake while they were conversing. Saint George fortified himself with the Sign of the Cross,[[citation needed]] charged it on horseback with his lance, and gave it a grievous wound. He then called to the princess to throw him her girdle, and he put it around the dragon’s neck. When she did so, the dragon followed the girl like a meek beast on a leash. [citation needed] |

The princess and Saint George led the dragon back to the city of Silene, where it terrified the people at its approach.
Rules for dating a Daughter of the King.
by Dalrock | April 26, 2018 | Link

I don’t recall what I was searching for, but the other day I stumbled upon a reproduction of *Rules for Dating a Drill Instructor’s Daughter* at The Gospel Coalition: [Daddy’s Rules for Dating His Daughters](https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/article/daddy-s-rules-for-dating-his-daughters).

How long should you date a Daughter of the King? Until she’s done with you!

**Rule Six:**

I have no doubt you are a popular fellow, with many opportunities to date other girls. This is fine with me as long as it is okay with my daughter. Otherwise, once you have gone out with my little girl, you will continue to date no one but her until she is finished with you. If you make her cry, I will make you cry.

And remember, the cartoonish face in the window is his:

**Rule Ten:**

Be afraid. Be very afraid. It takes very little for me to mistake the sound of your car in the driveway for a chopper coming in over a rice paddy near Hanoi. When my Agent Orange starts acting up, the voices in my head frequently tell me to clean the guns as I wait for you to bring my daughter home. As soon as you pull into the driveways you should exit the car with both hands in plain sight. Speak the perimeter password, announce in a clear voice that you have brought my daughter home safely and early, then return to your car – there is no need for you to come inside. The camouflaged face at the window is mine.

**See Also:**

- Cartoonish chivalry, drill instructor edition.
- Devouring a lifetime of courtship.
- Scaring away the competition
The love of a virtuous pagan woman tames the beast inside.

by Dalrock | April 27, 2018 | Link

The idea that women are inherently virtuous, and that men need women to sanctify them is deeply ingrained. You won’t find either of these concepts in Scripture, but even commenters on this site can’t distinguish between the moral views of Courtly Love/Chivalry and the Bible.

SkylerWurden explains that the Courtly Love tale of St. George and the dragon is really teaching the Christian message, a message about the glorious power of the virtuous pagan woman:

I still don’t see it. The way I read the story is this:

St. George is representing the Christian ideal and Christianity here. The dragon is obviously the devil and the townsfolk are the pagans under the thrall of the devil, with the Princess representing the virtuous pagan (being that she is willing to sacrifice herself to save the townsfolk). St. George, with the power of Christ, wounds the devil, and the virtuous pagan girl gives him (now representing Christ) her virginity. Once she gives over her virginity to Christ, she can now snare the devil and instead of being controlled by him and under his boot, she is greater than him and has bound him up. That is, she has conquered temptation by handing over her virtue to God. As she leads the dragon back to the people, they see that the power of Christ and of virtuous living has conquered the dragon and are converted, and then St. George (again standing in for Christ) slays the dragon and ends releases them from slavery.

jbarruso explains that men can’t follow Christ (and have virtue) unless they love a woman:

You’ve missed the symbolism. The dragon is the beast inside every man externalized. No man is any good to anyone especially God until he’s tamed his inner beast. The way he does that is by obediently loving God and the way he demonstrates that is selflessly loving a woman. For a man this isn’t possible apart from the Lord Jesus the Christ. And the cross. The problem is mankind sees everything through our immense self. We believe the sun revolves around the earth and God around us. St. George is nothing without the Lord. So essentially George is obedient to the Lord as a sleighs his inner beast for the love of a woman ehich demonstrates his love for God. George does what Adam failed to do.
The Chicago Tribune/AP has a new article up titled: With girls joining the ranks, Boy Scouts plan a name change. Chief Scout Executive Mike Surbaugh explains that moving forward there won’t be “girl” scouts and “boy” scouts, just scouts:

Surbaugh predicted that both boys and girls in Scouts BSA would refer to themselves simply as scouts, rather than adding “boy” or “girl.”

But in the very next paragraph, the article explains that boys and girls will be separated in order to advantage the girls.

The program for the older boys and girls will largely be divided along gender-lines, with single-sex units pursuing the same types of activities, earning the same array of merit badges and potentially having the same pathway to the coveted Eagle Scout award.

Surbaugh said that having separate units for boys and girls should alleviate concerns that girls joining the BSA for the first time might be at a disadvantage in seeking leadership opportunities.

The Girl Scouts aren’t taking the BSA intrusion into their territory lying down; they are counterattacking with the power of STEM:

Girl Scout leaders said they were blindsided by the move, and they are gearing up an aggressive campaign to recruit and retain girls as members.

Among the initiatives is creation of numerous new badges that girls can earn, focusing on outdoor activities and on science, engineering, technology and math.

H/T Instapundit
That’s gonna leave a mark on the narrative.
by Dalrock | May 4, 2018 | Link

The concept of the cock carousel is entering the mainstream lexicon, complete with a beta chump at the end of the line to pick up the tab. From Tully, reviewed, at Slate:

She has… a sexless but functional marriage with Drew (Ron Livingston), whom Marlo describes as the grounded bench in the careening sexual merry-go-round that was her 20s...

The reviewer at Slate is delighted that the movie shows motherhood as ugly:

The 50 pounds Theron gained for the role is just the beginning of the film’s mission to expose the less-than-enchanting facets of motherhood. After the delivery, we see Marlo shuffle to the hospital bathroom in a diaper and yell at a nurse about urinary catheters while forcing herself to pee on the toilet. The maternal and bodily scenarios here that we never see in other pop cultural depictions are painful and manifold, and that’s the point.

See Also:

- Losing control of the narrative.
- She’s saving her farts for you.
- Friday afternoon ugly feminists: Hot farts edition.
He’s a bully.

by Dalrock | May 8, 2018 | Link

The British tabloids are out for blood after a video surfaced of an army bayonet instructor yelling at a female recruit. The headline in the Sun reads: Bully army corporal reduces female recruit to tears in harrowing training video

The Harrowing video has emerged of a female army recruit being reduced to tears by a bully corporal

...

The soldier is ordered to come towards her senior, before being hit with a barrage of abuse

The Sun quotes a “former senior army officer” who explained that yelling at recruits is “old school”, and a thing of the past in the UK’s modern feminist friendly army:

“Army training is rightly tough. There’s nothing wrong with being plunged in puddles and the like, but this is over the top,” he said.

“There are very strict guidelines in place these days. It is all about positive encouragement now, more ‘come on you can do it’.

“The aggressive, degrading verbal abuse in this clip is way out of line with modern practice.”

He added: “That way of doing things is very old school. New research shows that encouraging soldiers is far more effective.

“This aggressive yelling is not how things are done these days.”

The bad old days the unnamed officer is referring to appears to have been as recent as 2011, based on the publication date of this video:

Compare the above with the video the Sun was responding to:

According to the Daily Mail, the Corporal who filmed the incident did so in violation of the rules. However, this is not the true source of the outrage. The true source of the outrage is the Corporal being unchivalrous and making a woman cry. This weak man is screwing feminism up! Again from the Sun:

He then orders the woman to show him her war face, and to trudge out of the water to stab a dummy enemy as he tells her: “you’re not a killer.”
At one point he lies to her, telling her she has finished the exercise only to order her back into the water.

She bursts into tears as he mocks her for crying.

H/T Oscar
He wipes his feet and eats what he is served.
by Dalrock | May 10, 2018 | Link

Instapundit linked to a post by Dr. Helen titled How Have Men been Affected by Feminism?

The stories ranged from an immigrant from India who felt that “feminism was a cultural force that had the effect of dehumanizing me in a manner far more severe than the experience of racism”... to a man who was fired from his job due to baseless allegations. In-between, there are other accounts of men who did not have children because they were afraid of having them taken away after seeing this happen to so many others, men whose fathers were abused by their wives without intervention, and men who no longer wanted relationships with women because of the psychological (and sometimes physical) pain they have caused, all without concern or empathy.

Old_School_Conservative53 wanted Instapundit readers to know that he hasn’t been impacted by feminism at all:

I haven’t been affected at all. I was raised to treat ladies with respect and courtesy, to keep my hands to myself unless openly invited, and not to shit where I eat. For the last 18 years of my career I supervised 8 women directly and never had one problem with them. In fact when I retired they embarrassed the heck out of me with the way they hugged and cried.

His message is that if you are a good boy like him feminists will be nice to you. All of those other men must have had it coming. The men who lost their jobs due to baseless allegations nevertheless deserved to be fired. Likewise the fathers Dr. Helen referenced deserved to be kicked out of their kids’ lives, and their sons deserved to grow up without a father.

But even more sickening than his inability to feel empathy for other men is the subtext of pleading for praise from mommy. See, I’m not like those other men! Aren’t I a good boy mommy?
Honi soit qui mal y pense
by Dalrock | May 11, 2018 | Link

From the Daily Mail: Cornell University senior strips down to her underwear to give her thesis presentation after her female professor questioned how short her denim shorts were

See Also: Winning the arms race (made you look!)
When I first started blogging one regular criticism I received from traditional conservatives (especially when writing about Game) was that I was killing chivalry. For the most part I disregarded this with the assumption that they either didn't understand Game or didn't understand chivalry. But the more I have learned about chivalry the more I have come to realize that the conservatives were right all along. I had mistaken chivalry for something that was originally noble that was somehow corrupted in the latter half of the 20th century. But the chivalry we love today comes from a glorification of cuckoldry and a worship of women and romantic love that dates back to around 1100.

Last month I shared the tale of St George and the dragon. Today I’ll share a bit of the tale of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight. From the plot synopsis at Infogalactic:

...Many adventures and battles are alluded to (but not described) until Gawain comes across a splendid castle where he meets Bertilak de Hautdesert, the lord of the castle, and his beautiful wife, who are pleased to have such a renowned guest...

Before going hunting the next day Bertilak proposes a bargain: he will give Gawain whatever he catches on the condition that Gawain give him whatever he might gain during the day. Gawain accepts. After Bertilak leaves, Lady Bertilak visits Gawain’s bedroom and behaves seductively, but despite her best efforts he yields nothing but a single kiss in his unwillingness to offend her. When Bertilak returns and gives Gawain the deer he has killed, his guest gives a kiss to Bertilak without divulging its source. The next day the lady comes again, Gawain again courteously foils her advances, and later that day there is a similar exchange of a hunted boar for two kisses. She comes once more on the third morning, this time offering Gawain a gold ring as a keepsake. He gently but steadfastly refuses but she pleads that he at least take her belt, a girdle of green and gold silk which, the lady assures him, is charmed and will keep him from all physical harm. Tempted, as he may otherwise die the next day, Gawain accepts it, and they exchange three kisses. That evening, Bertilak returns with a fox, which he exchanges with Gawain for the three kisses – but Gawain says nothing of the girdle.

As with St George and the dragon, the lady’s girdle has sexual connotations, indicates that the knight has won her favor, and contains the magic the hero needs to succeed in his quest. At least in the tale of St. George there is no three way make-out session between the knight, the nobleman, and the nobleman’s wife.
Tucson Traditionalist objects to me including the tale of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* with the tradition of courtly love:

> It’s a mistake to cite the case of Gawain without noting its outcome. Gawain is rebuked for having flirted with Bertilak’s wife and taken her favor, without disclosing this to her lord husband. As Tolkien said, Gawain represents a divorcing of the chivalric ideal from the notions of courtly adultery and obedience to a lady’s commands. He is commended for resisting her seductions, and chastised for yielding as much as he did.

> So yes, chivalry *is* a good thing — all of it, from the code of honor to the pious brotherhood to the courtesy given to women — when it has been purified from the later Provencal tendency to delight in fornication, adultery, and the abasement of men. It was so cleansed in the greatest medieval literature (Gawain, Malory, Dante, etc.), and represents a point to which Christians in the 21st century should rally.

The reason chivalry is so pernicious is the inability of it’s proponents to spot the very obvious corruption. *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* is a morality tale that teaches the moral primacy of courtly love. When the obligations of masculine honor (keeping his word) contradicts the morality of courtly love, our hero chooses courtly love as the higher morality. As Infogalactic explains this is how he passes the test and ultimately is victorious (emphasis mine):

**Temptation and testing**

Knights of Gawain’s time were tested in their ability to balance the male-oriented chivalric code with the female-oriented rules of courtly love. (God Speed! – Edmund Blair Leighton 1900)

At the heart of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* is the test of Gawain’s adherence to the code of chivalry. The typical temptation fable of medieval literature presents a series of tribulations assembled as tests or “proofs” of moral virtue. The stories often describe several individuals’ failures after which the main character is tested.[19] Success in the proofs will often bring immunity or good fortune. Gawain’s ability to pass the tests of his host are of utmost importance to his survival, though he does not know it. **It is only by fortuity or “instinctive-courtesy” that Sir Gawain is able to pass his test.[20]**

**In addition to the laws of chivalry, Gawain must respect another set of laws concerning courtly love.** The knight’s code of honour requires him to do whatever a damsel asks. Gawain must accept the girdle from the Lady, but he must also keep the promise he has made to his host that he will give whatever he gains that day. Gawain chooses to keep the girdle out of fear of death, thus breaking his promise to
the host but honouring the lady. Upon learning that the Green Knight is actually his host (Bertilak), he realises that although he has completed his quest, he has failed to be virtuous. This test demonstrates the conflict between honour and knightly duties. In breaking his promise, Gawain believes he has lost his honour and failed in his duties.[21]

The hero originally feels ashamed for yielding to the woman and choosing deceit over honoring his word. But he learns that this feeling of shame was his real mistake. Again from Infogalactic:

Gawain is ashamed to have behaved deceitfully but the Green Knight laughs at his scruples and the two part on cordial terms. Gawain returns to Camelot wearing the girdle as a token of his failure to keep his promise. The Knights of the Round Table absolve him of blame and decide that henceforth that they will wear a green sash in recognition of Gawain's adventure.

What started as Sir Gawain's reminder of shame turned into a badge of honor other knights chose to emulate. This is the moral of the story. For those who might have missed this quite obvious moral, the poem concludes with:

Honi soit qui mal y pense (Shame on him who thinks evil of it)

This ties the tale back to St. George and the Order of the Garter. Tellingly, there is a longer version of the French expression the Order of the Garter is said to be founded on:

Honi soit qui mal y pense. Tel qui s'en rit aujourd'hui, s'honorera de la porter.

The latter part of the expression translates to:

Those who laugh at this today, tomorrow will be proud to wear it.
Kevin Williamson at National Review writes in *Advice for Incels*:

In the 1960s and 1970s, there were some social disruptions touching marriage and family life. It was, they told us, a “sexual revolution.” The thing about revolutions is: Somebody loses. The so-called incels are some of the losers in that revolution, though not the only ones or, socially speaking, the most significant ones. *(Those would be the abandoned single mothers.)* But their situation is worth considering.

The fiction that what we are witnessing is men abandoning their families, and not women ejecting the fathers from the homes, is the very foundation of conservative support for the destruction of traditional marriage. Lost in all of this are the millions of innocent children who grow up without their fathers because mom wanted freedom to bang other men, and cowardly men like Kevin Williamson couldn’t bear to speak, or even think the truth of the matter.

**Note**: I originally wrote this as a comment at Instapundit.
Headship is unchivalrous.
by Dalrock | May 14, 2018 | Link

Last week I shared the tale of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight. Today I’ll share the tale of The Wedding of Sir Gawain. I fear that fans of last week’s tale will be disappointed to find that today’s tale doesn’t include a three way between Sir Gawain, a dude, and the dude’s wife. However, once they get past their homoerotic disappointment I am confident they will still find much to love in today’s tale.

In The Wedding of Sir Gawain, King Arthur must find out what women most desire in order to save his life. Arthur meets an ugly woman (Ragnelle) who promises to tell Arthur the answer if Sir Gawain agrees to marry her in return. Sir Gawain agrees, and the ugly woman tells Arthur the answer to the riddle:

King Arthur tells her that Sir Gawain accepts her terms and she reveals to him that what women desire most is sovereynté, the ability to make their own decisions.

With Arthur’s life saved, the only thing remaining is for Sir Gawain to put this new found wisdom into practice. Gawain marries Ragnelle and gives her sovereignty. As a result, he is blessed with a beautiful wife!

...the new pair retire to the bedroom. After brief hesitation, Gawain assents to treat his new bride as he would if she were desirable, and go to bed with her as a dutiful husband is expected to do. When he looks up, he is astonished to see the most beautiful woman he has ever seen standing before him. She explains she had been under a spell to look like a hag until a good knight married her; now her looks will be restored half the day. She gives him the choice to have her beautiful at night, when they are together, or during the day, when they are with others. Instead, he gives her the sovereynté to make the choice herself. This answer lifts the curse for good, and Ragnelle’s beauty returns permanently.

See Also: It started with a whimper (a servant leader is born).
In The Wedding of Sir Gawain we learn that what women want is sovereynté (control). If a husband loves his wife, he will grant her the sovereynté that she covets. As a result of her loving husband granting her sovereynté, the wife will become extremely beautiful.

This of course isn’t just a moral message from the 15th century. Modern Christian leaders teach variations on the same theme. Dr Richard Strauss taught in the early 1970s that wives are “responders”. If her husband treats her right, she will blossom and become beautiful. If he doesn’t, she will become (or remain) ugly (emphasis mine):

**The woman is a responder.** This is the obvious role of someone who depends on another person. Flowers depend on sunshine and rain; when they get it, they respond by blossoming into gorgeous beauty. This is how God made a woman too. She responds to what she receives. If she receives irritability, criticism, disapproval, unkindness, indifference, lack of appreciation, or lack of affection, she will respond with a defense mechanism, such as bitterness, coolness, defiance, or nagging. Some women turn to drinking or submerge themselves in social activities.

**But if the woman receives love she will respond with love, and will blossom into the most beautiful creature under God’s heaven.**

Pastor Doug Wilson teaches something similar in his book Reforming Marriage. Wilson opens Chapter 4 with a feminist critique of the pressure women feel to “keep themselves up”:

**Love Bestows Loveliness**

A common assumption in the world is that women must “keep themselves up” in order to keep a man. In the world of attracting and being attracted, women are taught to view themselves as being primarily responsible for their own attractiveness or loveliness. This viewpoint is inculcated early. Once young girls used to play with baby dolls, seeing themselves in the role of the nurturing mother; now they can be seen playing with Barbie dolls, seeing themselves in the place of the doll. And of course, the doll is both pretty and stacked. The pressure is on and stays on.

The problem, according to Wilson, is the evil patriarchy. Women should not feel pressure to conform to conventional standards of beauty. Their fathers and husbands have the obligation to make them beautiful by loving them properly. Wilson continues (all further emphasis mine):

**The perversion in this is not that women desire to be attractive or lovely. The perversion is the modern divorce of a woman’s loveliness from the behavior of her**
father and husband. There is nothing wrong with wanting a lovely garden; there is a
great deal of folly in wanting a lovely garden which will tend and keep itself. The
Bible teaches that a Christian husband is responsible for the loveliness of
his wife. Before she is married, her father is responsible for that loveliness. When
she marries, her husband assumes this responsibility. The husband’s example in this
kind of loving is Jesus Christ.

...when a man takes a woman into his home, all who know them should expect to
see her flourish and grow in loveliness in the years to come. If their wedding
ceremony referred at all to the fifth chapter of Ephesians, was this not what he
vowed he would do? As a husband treats his wife in the scriptural fashion, he
should expect her to grow increasingly lovely. This is not because the husband
has earned it, but rather because through the grace of God, he has been blessed

Note that Pastor Wilson isn’t writing about the kind of internal beauty the Apostle Peter writes
about in 1 Pet 3:1-6. If he were writing about that, he would need to acknowledge that it is
the wife herself who is responsible for cultivating this through her submission to her husband.
Wilson devotes several pages to explaining that he is writing about physical beauty, and
eventually explains:

This may all seem like a belaboring of the obvious—“everyone knows there are
pretty women”—but it is an important point for husbands to understand. When
husbands undertake the assigned responsibility of loving their wives in
such a way that they grow in loveliness, they need to understand that the
results will be visible. This does not mean that, with the right husband, all women
could be equally beautiful. Some women have the advantage of a greater natural
beauty, and others had exceptional fathers—men who treated their daughters right.
But it does mean that a man who marries biblically should expect his wife
to be visibly lovelier on their tenth anniversary—and if she is not, he knows
that he is the one responsible. But as the one responsible, he has to know where
true beauty begins. Every husband should learn how to ask, “What will living with a
man like me do to this woman’s appearance?”

Eventually Wilson does get around to quoting 1 Pet 3:1-6, but he only does this after
creating a fictitious biblical requirement for husbands to make their wives physically
beautiful. Wilson explains that 1 Pet 3:1-6 must be read as an injunction to husbands to make
their wives physically beautiful by loving her as Christ loves the Church:

Peter urges this internal gentleness upon the wives. But taking the teaching of all of
Scripture into account, we can see that a woman concentrates on this under the
loving oversight of her husband. As he loves her, she bears fruit. As she bears this
fruit, it delights him. In this delight he loves her more, and she bears more fruit. The
wife is to cooperate fully, receiving his love, but he is the one responsible to give it.
Not enough cash and prizes.
by Dalrock | May 18, 2018 | Link

The Telegraph has an article up about the impact of reduced cash incentives for women to divorce:

Fewer wives are being awarded income for life and they are increasingly having their divorce settlement limited to a few years.

This is making some of them back off from going through with a split, law firms say.

This should surprise no one. Incentives matter. Raise the cash reward paid to women who blow up their families, and more women will choose to blow up their families. Lower the cash reward, and more children will grow up with daddy in the home (but mommy is restricted from having sex with other men).

There is a less obvious but socially even more powerful impact of these cash incentives. Cash incentives aren’t just designed to blow up some families, they are designed to destabilize all families. As Wolfers and Stevenson explain in Bargaining in the Shadow of the Law: Divorce Laws and Family Distress, by encouraging wives to divorce, feminists are able to give wives power and control over their husbands (emphasis mine):

In the literature on the economics of the family there has been growing consensus on the need to take bargaining and distribution within marriage seriously. Such models of the family rely on a threat point to determine distribution within the household. The switch to a unilateral divorce regime redistributes power in a marriage, giving power to the person who wants out, and reducing the power previously held by the partner interested in preserving the marriage.

To see how divorce laws affect the external threat point, note that prior to unilateral divorce, a partner wishing to dissolve the marriage could leave without their spouse’s consent. However, in such a situation, a legal divorce is not granted and, as such, the right to remarry is forfeited. Under unilateral divorce the value of the exit threat increases for the unsatisfied spouse, as the right to remarry is retained regardless of the position of one’s spouse. Thus, the exit threat model predicts that changes in divorce regimes will have real effects. If the divorce threat is sufficiently credible, it may directly affect intrafamily bargaining outcomes without the option ever being exercised.

By slightly reducing the cash and prizes women receive as a reward for divorcing, UK judges are transferring some of the power in marriages back to the party that wants to honor the marriage vows (the husband).
H/T DR Smith
She’s too traditional to marry her baby daddy.
by Dalrock | May 18, 2018 | Link

From the *Daily Mail*:  Mother reveals she REJECTED ‘thoughtless and lazy’ blackboard proposal.

I said I didn’t like the ring and it was obvious that it was completely mid judged with the timing of the proposal.’

The mother explained that they agreed that he would try again with another ring, but that the surprise element had been ruined for her.

Adding that her partner was an amazing father but put no effort into occasions, she questioned whether she could move past the fact that he wasn’t romantic, admitting that she had stayed awake crying at night over it.

In her defense, while we still pretend otherwise, marriage is no longer a real family model. Legally speaking, marriage is now almost entirely symbolic, an optional facade we place over our real family model, the child support system. Since legal marriage is a matter of aesthetics, there is a certain logic to only constructing the facade if the aesthetics are right.

Moreover, even if she refuses to marry her baby daddy after he manages to jump through all of her proposal hoops, she knows that traditional conservatives will do her the favor of pretending that she was “abandoned” by her children’s father.
Shame on him who thinks evil of it.

by Dalrock | May 24, 2018 | Link

The Daily Mail has a new article up naming and shaming a young man who is accused* of privately telling his (then) girlfriend the dress she bought was too slutty: US high school student, 16, who dumped her slut-shaming boyfriend after he said her prom dress ‘showed too much skin’ finally reveals the offending gown – but says she WON’T be attending

Slut shaming is one of the gravest sins of our feminist age, but it is not merely a feminist sin. Slut shaming is also a sin against chivalry. This goes all the way back to the 1300s and the Order of the Garter, Britain’s highest order of chivalry. The founding motto of the Order of the Garter shames any man who commits the sin of slut shaming:

| Honi soit qui mal y pense (Shame on him who thinks evil of it) |

In the case of the slut shaming boyfriend, it was the girl’s father who wanted the world to know who had sinned against his daughter in this way:

The teen had initially kept her ex’s identity anonymous, but her father, Kevin Witham told DailyMail.com: ‘My daughter’s ex-boyfriend’s name is Justice Champion. He is a 19-year old boy who lives in a nearby town.

‘In the past I met him a few times and I was really impressed by him. Justice graduated from high school last year. His father is a local policeman in the area.’

Not surprisingly, many of the responses the Daily Mail recounted came from a chivalrous perspective:

‘We love a queen that knows her self worth!!!!!!!!!!’ one user wrote to the teen.

…

‘Yes girl drop that boy and find yourself a real man!’

One man who stepped up to the plate even offered to be a stand-in for her prom date writing: ‘If you need someone to give you a great night and treat you the way you deserve let me know. You deserve better than that. Respect.’

Her father’s attitude strikes me as a natural blending of both chivalry and feminism:
Her father added: ‘Madison is a strong young women and wasn’t expecting all of the media attentions she had garnered from all of this.

‘But she is happy with the amount of followers she is getting on Instagram.’

*The accused claims that he did not send the text messages in question. H/T Devon35
Rules for dating the candidate’s daughter.
by Dalrock | May 25, 2018 | Link

Kemp is running for Governor in Georgia, but I think the same message would go over well in Texas.

H/T Cane Caldo
He had to know they would one day come for him.

by Dalrock | May 26, 2018 | Link

Vox.com recently announced A major evangelical leader just lost his job. It’s a huge moment for #MeToo.

Paige Patterson was removed as Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary president after sexism controversy

Dr. Patterson was a founding member of the Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (CBMW), and was instrumental in realizing what is arguably the CBMW’s greatest lasting accomplishment. Thanks to Patterson and the other CBMW founders, nearly all conservative Christians now believe that it is essential to have women be the ones who teach Christianity to women. The CBMW has been so successful in this regard that scarcely anyone remembers that for two thousand years 1 Tim 2:12 was understood as prohibiting women from preaching.

The CBMW’s opening salvo against the traditional reading of 1 Tim 2:12 came in 1991, in the group’s founding book Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism. In Chapter 2 Drs. Wayne Grudem and John Piper explain that they wish to break with the (then) accepted reading of 1 Tim 2:12, and replace it with a more feminist friendly reading:

Paul gives this as one of the reasons why he does not permit women “to teach or have authority over a man.” Historically this has usually been taken to mean that women are more gullible or deceivable than men and therefore less fit for the doctrinal oversight of the church. This may be true (see question 29). However, we are attracted to another understanding of Paul’s argument.

Grudem and Piper brought in Dr. Douglass Moo to write an entire chapter making the case for their desired innovation. Moo would go on to be an influential figure in the NIV’s push to make the Bible more feminist friendly, but at the time he shared a common cause with the CBMW.

Under the CBMW’s new interpretation of 1 Tim 2:12, women are permitted to preach, so long as they only preach to other women. This new interpretation meant that women preachers like Beth Moore were formally accepted by conservative Christians. As time went on, the CBMW founders pushed to further expand the loophole they had created for women to preach. In 2010 Piper offered an even more feminist friendly doctrine. Women like Beth Moore could in fact preach to men, so long as the men didn’t become dependent on her:

I’m a guy. Is it wrong for me to listen to Beth Moore?

No. Unless you begin to become dependent on her as your shepherd—your pastor.
But interpreting 1 Tim 2:12 wasn’t enough. To fully achieve their desired revolution the CBMW had to create women’s studies programs at conservative seminaries in order to produce an army of women with the credentials they would need. This is where Patterson came in. With the assistance of his wife Dorothy, he personally created women’s studies programs at two different seminaries:

[Dorothy] Patterson, along with her husband, were instrumental in establishing women’s studies programs at Southwestern and at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, where Paige Patterson was president until his election at Southwestern in 2003.

As time went on, the doctrine of women preaching to women continued to expand. What started as a novel reading granting women permission to preach quickly turned into a mandate. The army of complementarian women’s studies majors started aping their secular feminist counterparts. At the Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Lore Ferguson Wilbert complained that complementarian church leaders are “maddeningly male”:

In the 35 years or so since then, liberal churches grew more liberal and the conservative—heaven help us. McQuinn uses the term androcentrism to describe the shift in neo-reformed environments in particular. It means being dominated by or emphasizing masculine interests or a masculine point of view. It wasn’t that the theology was all wrong, it was that the voices of church leaders were maddeningly male, through the male perspective, with male interests paramount, and evaluated by males.

Imagine with me for a moment a room of chimps all chimping about how to be a better room of chimps and pandas.

Over at The Gospel Coalition (TGC) Wilberts asked: Who Will Teach the Women Who Want to Be Taught? The answer of course is not the woman’s husband (1 Cor 14:35, Eph 5:26), and not male pastors (1 Tim 2:12), but other women.

As secular feminism rises, more and more women within the church will be looking for strong female voices.

The Women’s Studies section of Paige Patterson’s Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary makes the same case:

Will you tell her?

Most women will hear and respond to the Gospel through the words and influence of another woman. Are you ready to engage in woman-to-woman Bible teaching and discipleship and extend your talents and gifts to meet the needs of your family, to serve the church and to reach the world?

The Women’s Programs at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary will equip you for kingdom ministry. You will prepare theologically through biblical studies;
practically through the development of home, life, and ministry skills; and spiritually through mentoring and accountability relationships.

Become a woman who can open God’s Word and teach eternal truths, engage the culture, and help women and their families come to Christ locally and around the world.

For a period the plan seemed to be working. Complementarian feminists were appeased by men like Piper and Patterson and didn’t make them the object of their revolutionary zeal. But it wouldn’t work forever. This spring the complementarian wing of the SJW lynch mob descended on Patterson for (among other things*), counseling separation instead of divorce in cases of abuse.

While the lynch mob made the issue about Patterson ostensibly forcing women to endure abuse, the real issue is about all women having the ability to use threats of divorce to gain power over their husbands. Academic feminists Wolfers and Stevenson explain this in their paper Bargaining in the Shadow of the Law: Divorce Laws and Family Distress (emphasis mine):

To see how divorce laws affect the external threat point, note that prior to unilateral divorce, a partner wishing to dissolve the marriage could leave without their spouse’s consent. However, in such a situation, a legal divorce is not granted and, as such, the right to remarry is forfeited. Under unilateral divorce the value of the exit threat increases for the unsatisfied spouse, as the right to remarry is retained regardless of the position of one’s spouse. Thus, the exit threat model predicts that changes in divorce regimes will have real effects. If the divorce threat is sufficiently credible, it may directly affect intrafamily bargaining outcomes without the option ever being exercised.

But facts don’t matter to a lynch mob. The mob smelled blood and came after Patterson, with Beth Moore carrying the banner. The Christian Post headline read: Beth Moore Slams Christians Who ‘Demonize’ Divorce as Worst Sin: ‘We Do Not Submit to Abuse’

Evangelist Beth Moore, founder of Living Proof Ministries, has slammed Christian church culture that she says “demonizes” divorce as the worst sin even as wives are being abused by their husbands.

Moore’s comments come in the midst of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary President Paige Patterson seeking to clarify past comments of his that many say appeared to support women staying with abusive husbands rather than separating.

I’m pro marriage. Nearly 40 years of ups and downs to back that up. But when we as a church culture demonize divorce as the worst possible outcome – the sin of all sins – we truly have no clue on this ever loving earth what some people are enduring. We do not submit to abuse. NO.
I’ve dealt with sexism in my church culture for 60 years. Had to accept certain degrees of it to serve & serve I would because I was called. Then 18 months ago the meticulously groomed dog that is sexism rolled over & we who’d bear to look saw its gross underbelly, full of ticks.

— Beth Moore (@BethMooreLPM) April 29, 2018

Now that Patterson has resigned as head of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, the mob has responded by demanding yet more power. The new Christian Post headline reads: Beth Moore on Paige Patterson Controversy: ‘Broken System’ Will Not Mend If Men Refuse to Listen.

The men of the CBMW and TGC saddled this bronc. We shall see if they can ride it.

H/T dudedont

*Patterson was also accused by a women’s studies major at his former seminary of not responding correctly to her allegation of date rape against another student.
As I mentioned in my last post, the Christian feminist lynch mob went after Dr. Paige Patterson for multiple crimes against feminism. From what I have found, there are three specific charges.

**Charge #1: Objectifying women.**

Patterson’s first crime against feminism was caught on film. The video is short and worth viewing:

**Charge #2: Not assuming an accused man is guilty.**

From the Washington Post Southern Baptist leader encouraged a woman not to report alleged rape to police and told her to forgive assailant, she says:

She said she had been dating the man she alleges raped her and had allowed him into her apartment the night she said he assaulted her. The two were kissing when he forced himself on her, she said. She said she reported it the next morning to the administrator who handled student discipline. That administrator then reported the incident to Patterson, she said, and she was required to meet with Patterson and three or four male seminarians she said were proteges of Patterson’s. She said she doesn’t remember the specific words Patterson used but that he wanted to know every detail of the rape.

…

The woman said she was put on probation for two years, but she doesn’t know why, saying it was perhaps because she was with another man alone in her apartment, which was against seminary policy.

We only have the woman’s account of the story. However, from her account it sounds like Patterson took the complaint seriously but after carefully listening to the details wasn’t convinced that it was really a case of rape. Not assuming that an accused man is guilty is itself a crime against feminism, no matter how ambiguous the circumstances.

**Charge #3: Offering biblical instead of Christian feminist counsel to wives with abusive husbands.**

Charge number three stems from Patterson’s comments here (alternate link):

https://ia902606.us.archive.org/13/items/PaigePattersonsbcAdviceToVictimsOfDomesticViolence/paigepatterson_64kb.mp3

This one is a bit more complex than the other two. First, there are multiple parts to this. For
women who aren’t facing serious abuse, Patterson said he counsels wives to pray for their husbands and to remain submissive as much as possible. For serious abuse he counsels that wives separate but not divorce. Patterson is on solid biblical ground here on both counts (1 Pet 3 1-6, 1 Cor 7 10-11), but this doesn’t matter to the very mob he helped create. His advice is heresy against their true religion (feminism), and that heresy cannot go unpunished.

The other reason I find this last charge more complex is that something is very off in the story he tells to illustrate his point that 1 Pet 3 1-6 can actually work. Here is a transcript of this part of the audio from a critic of Patterson:

I had a woman who was in a church that I served, and she was being subject to some abuse, and I told her, I said, “All right, what I want you to do is, every evening I want you to get down by your bed just as he goes to sleep, get down by the bed, and when you think he’s just about asleep, you just pray and ask God to intervene, not out loud, quietly,” but I said, “You just pray there.” And I said, “Get ready because he may get a little more violent, you know, when he discovers this.”

And sure enough, he did. She came to church one morning with both eyes black. And she was angry at me and at God and the world, for that matter. And she said, “I hope you’re happy.”

And I said, “Yes ma’am, I am.” And I said, “I’m sorry about that, but I’m very happy.”

And what she didn’t know when we sat down in church that morning was that her husband had come in and was standing at the back, first time he ever came. And when I gave the invitation that morning, he was the first one down to the front. And his heart was broken, he said, “My wife’s praying for me, and I can’t believe what I did to her.” And he said, “Do you think God can forgive somebody like me?” And he’s a great husband today. And it all came about because she sought God on a regular basis.

And remember, when nobody else can help, God can. And in the meantime, you have to do what you can at home to be submissive in every way that you can and to elevate him.
Swanny River asks:

So if I am understanding you and Dalrock correctly, that third story, and Patterson, are complex because Patterson may be lying? That sounds like a leading question, but I do just want to see if I understanding what is being talked about. That is, I don’t understand why that third example is complex, but that could be because I didn’t listen to it.

He shouldn’t lie, if that is the case, but his accusers didn’t even care if he did lie, that is how strongly they feel about that excerpt. That is scary in its own right.

I don’t know that Patterson is lying when he tells that story. All I know is that it strikes me as very improbable, at least in the way it is told. However, my BS detector isn’t perfect.

Here is the excerpt in question, for reference:

I had a woman who was in a church that I served, and she was being subject to some abuse, and I told her, I said, “All right, what I want you to do is, every evening I want you to get down by your bed just as he goes to sleep, get down by the bed, and when you think he’s just about asleep, you just pray and ask God to intervene, not out loud, quietly,” but I said, “You just pray there.” And I said, “Get ready because he may get a little more violent, you know, when he discovers this.”

And sure enough, he did. She came to church one morning with both eyes black. And she was angry at me and at God and the world, for that matter. And she said, “I hope you’re happy.”

And I said, “Yes ma’am, I am.” And I said, “I’m sorry about that, but I’m very happy.”

And what she didn’t know when we sat down in church that morning was that her husband had come in and was standing at the back, first time he ever came. And when I gave the invitation that morning, he was the first one down to the front. And his heart was broken, he said, “My wife’s praying for me, and I can’t believe what I did to her.” And he said, “Do you think God can forgive somebody like me?” And he’s a great husband today. And it all came about because she sought God on a regular basis.

And remember, when nobody else can help, God can. And in the meantime, you have to do what you can at home to be submissive in every way that you can and to elevate him.

There are a number of aspects to the story that cause me to wonder if it really happened as described. The biggest one is how glib Patterson seems when talking about a husband repeatedly punching his wife in the face when he found out she was kneeling in prayer. This
kind of thing creates a powerful visceral reaction in men, at least men in our culture. I find it very hard to believe that Patterson witnessed such a thing and yet feels so detached and glib about it. Along the same lines, there is (or was) a fairly common TV and film trope of using black eyes to represent off screen violence, very often in a glib or even humorous manner. The character appears in the scene, revealing a tell tale black circle around their eye. I assume it was used because it is easier to replicate effect wise than a busted lip, etc. And if one black eye is funny, two are hilarious. This seems to be much less common now than a few decades ago, but Patterson is older than I am so he would have been more exposed to it than I have been.

This glibness makes the charge more complex because I don’t think Patterson really feels so glib about wives being repeatedly punched in the face. I think it is more likely an embellishment, something to enhance the story. But I can understand why feminists would be disturbed by the glibness, even though I don’t think he really feels that way about real cases where women he knows are repeatedly punched in the face for kneeling in prayer.

Another part of the story that I find hard to swallow is the complicated machinations of the husband’s public-yet-unknown-to-his-wife repentance. Somehow the husband managed to show up at the same church the wife worshiped at on the same Sunday she showed up sporting two black eyes, and repent in front of the whole congregation, yet she was totally unaware of this. It is possible that she showed up late (or later), and didn’t notice that her husband was already there with a broken heart. Or perhaps he went to the early service and she went to the later one, and all of the ladies in the congregation didn’t want to seem like gossips by mentioning it to her on her way in. But either way a series of unlikely events had to have transpired to make this story into a humorous anecdote about how the wife didn’t know her husband had earlier that same morning publicly repented.
It is disturbing to watch the cowardly response of Dr. Paige Patterson’s colleagues as the SJW mob went after him. Patterson was a lion in Southern Baptist and complementarian circles. He was the president of two different Southern Baptist seminaries, a founding member of the Council of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (CBMW), and a coauthor of the CBMW’s founding book. As Thabiti Anyabwile wrote back in 2006, Patterson led “the grassroots resurgence that moved the Southern Baptist Convention to conservative theological grounding over two decades ago”.

More important than the man, however, is the theology that was on trial. Patterson was attacked primarily because he:

- Counseled separation and not divorce in cases of serious abuse.
- Acknowledged that “abuse” is an extremely broad term and argued that a pastoral response should vary depending on the risk of serious harm.

The goal of feminists wasn’t just to destroy the man, but to get complementarians to agree that all Christians should:

- Never counsel anything short of divorce if a husband is accused of abuse.
- Accept the full breadth of the Christian feminist definition of abuse, which is anything that a husband does or doesn’t do that upsets his wife.

I won’t say there aren’t any major figures in the complementarian movement who have pushed back against these two feminist demands as the SJW mob went after Patterson, but if they exist I have yet to locate them.

The first example I’ll offer is the absolutely hysterical response from Dr. Albert Mohler, President of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Mohler described the SJW lynch mob attacking Patterson as representing the wrath of God*

America’s largest evangelical denomination has been in the headlines day after day. The SBC is in the midst of its own horrifying #MeToo moment.

...The judgment of God has come.

Judgment has now come to the house of the Southern Baptist Convention. The terrible swift sword of public humiliation has come with a vengeance. There can be no doubt that this story is not over.

Mohler argued that the only possible response to SJW slander is to act as if the slander is legitimate. Any and every SJW accusation should hereafter result in a private third party investigation (emphasis mine):
A church, denomination, or Christian ministry must look outside of itself when confronted with a pattern of mishandling such responsibilities, or merely of being charged with such a pattern. We cannot vindicate ourselves. That is the advice I have given consistently for many years. I now must make this judgment a matter of public commitment. I believe that any public accusation concerning such a pattern requires an independent, third-party investigation. In making this judgment, I make public what I want to be held to do should, God forbid, such a responsibility arise.

Mohler closed with:

This is just a foretaste of the wrath of God poured out. This moment requires the very best of us. The Southern Baptist Convention is on trial and our public credibility is at stake. May God have mercy on us all.

But Mohler wasn’t alone in throwing Patterson under the bus for holding to a plain reading of Scripture. Three days after Beth Moore demanded that complementarians stop discouraging divorce if the wife claims abuse, CBMW President Denny Burke published an article titled What about divorce and abuse? While Burke didn’t mention Patterson by name in the article, at the time he maintained that this was a topic Evangelicals could disagree on in good faith:

Evangelicals have never been monolithic in their views about divorce. Some believe that the Bible disallows divorce altogether. Others believe that the Bible allows for divorce in certain situations (see Matt. 19 and 1 Cor. 7). There is no one view on divorce that has commanded the consensus of evangelicals. My view is the latter, and I suspect that it is the view held by the majority of evangelicals (though certainly not all).

Nevertheless, Burke explained that in his own view wives who accuse husbands of abuse should be counseled to first separate from their husband and then divorce him. This is in Burke’s words, a necessity:

In my 2013 book on sexual ethics, I argue that “abused spouses should separate from abusive situations in order to protect themselves and their children” (What Is the Meaning of Sex, p. 135). That separation is a necessity for the safety and welfare of the family. An abusive spouse has made choices that force a separation, and the abuse therefore can become tantamount to desertion. That is why I conclude that when the abuser “leaves” the marriage in this way, the “exception for desertion comes into play (1 Cor. 7:15).

This brings us to the other half of the SJW charge against Patterson; the question of the definition of abuse. Burke answers the question with a link to the CBMW’s recently revised statement on abuse:

*For more on the subject of abuse, see CBMW’s “Statement on Abuse.”

If you follow the link, you will find that practically speaking the CBMW statement defines abuse as anything a husband does or doesn’t do that upsets his wife:
We believe abuse can be defined as any act or failure to act resulting in imminent risk, serious injury, death, physical or emotional or sexual harm, or exploitation of another person.

We condemn all forms of physical, sexual and/or verbal abuse.

This was a near perfect victory for Beth Moore and the SJWs, but they still hadn’t managed to get Burke and the CBMW to agree that Patterson’s views were unacceptable. For that they would have to wait until Southwestern Seminary forced Patterson out. On that same day (May 23rd), Burke responded to Patterson’s dismissal with an article on the CBMW website titled *A Time for Moral Clarity*. In this article Burke repeatedly stated his agreement with Albert Mohler, implying that the SJW lynch mob against Patterson was sent from God:

Evangelicals have been facing a moment of truth concerning abuse and misconduct in our own ranks. Recently, attention has been focused on Southwestern Seminary and its president. The controversy centers on past remarks about pastoral counsel to an abuse victim and about the objectification of a teenage girl.

As Albert Mohler declared earlier today, it really does seem to be a time of reckoning. But it is not only that. It is also a time for moral clarity from all followers of the Lord Jesus Christ, especially as we consider the sobering words of 1 Peter 4:17: “It is time for judgment to begin with the household of God; and if it begins with us first, what will be the outcome for those who do not obey the gospel of God?”

Burke closed the article with:

If you still haven’t read the [essay](#) Mohler wrote, you need to. I resonate with it deeply and believe it to be a tremendous display of denominational statesmanship.

Note that while Burke doesn’t have the courage to say it outright, by agreeing with Mohler he left no room for good Christians to hold that separation and not divorce should be counseled in the case of abuse. Nor did he leave room for good Christians to disagree with the feminist definition of abuse, which is anything and everything that upsets a wife.

Along with the CBMW, the other big complementarian organization is The Gospel Coalition (TGC). TGC Council member Thabiti Anyabwile responded to the SJW mob’s ousting of Patterson with an article titled *Sin on CP Time*. Like Mohler and Burke, Anyabwile declared that the SJW mob victory was good and Patterson’s deviance from feminism was theologically unacceptable (emphasis mine):

…Consider the pastors whose sins have crawled out of dark secrecy recently to speak against them on spotlight stages. Praise God most of these pastors have not been as heinous as Cosby or Nasser, but that doesn’t mean their failings aren’t serious.

This morning the trustees at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary issued a statement announcing that Paige Patterson will no longer be president of that
institution. Though the statement doesn’t mention the swirling controversy over Patterson’s comments about a young girl’s body or unbiblical counsel to women in abusive situations, the decision is at least linked by timing. **Patterson’s comments were flat-out wrong and a pretty serious misrepresentation of the Bible he defended.** This marks the sad end to a long and at times valiant career in service to the church and the gospel.

Anyabwile says it would have been better for Patterson if his sins against feminism had been exposed at a young age. As it stands, Patterson’s long career has now ended in total disgrace:

> It’s also better to deal with these things while we are young. Older people fall harder and get up slower. We can spend our youth attempting to avoid these things, hoping they won’t shipwreck a ministry or a career. We can then spend our ministry ignoring these things, justifying them by pointing to our apparent “success.” Then when we’ve passed through middle age into retirement, we can justify continuing silence by saying, “Why ruin a good reputation?” Consequently, the weight of long life, perhaps the added weight of some success, gain crushing force when our sins come to light later and our good reputations are harmed.

As SJW’s like to say, there is *no room* in the world of complementarians for men or women who believe that separation, not divorce, is the biblical solution to serious abuse. Nor is there room for men or women who don’t wholly accept the feminist definition of abuse. Paige Patterson’s beliefs were thought crimes against feminism, and the leadership of the complementarian movement is proud to have made an example of him

*H/T Hmm

**Related:** [Step up, so they don’t have to.](#)

**Updates:**

- Reader TMAC pointed out a May 30th [Statement by the Southwestern Theological Seminary](#) announcing that the board decided to strip Patterson of all remaining status and benefits.
- [Deep Strength](#) linked to a post by Dr. Norman Geisler titled: **Why Firing Paige Patterson from the Presidency of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary was a Serious Mistake**
- Reader YS linked to a defense of Patterson titled **The untold truth: Facts surrounding Paige Patterson and his removal from SWBTS By Sharayah Colter**
Jordan Peterson can’t handle the truth.
by Dalrock | June 2, 2018 | Link

Jordan Peterson tries to morally condemn pickup artists without condemning fornication:

Peterson ends up twisting himself in knots, so it is possible that he had something profound in mind but wasn’t able to articulate it. The closest he comes to a reason that pickup artists are immoral is to claim that they aren’t communicating in an honest way.

Even this doesn’t work, because pickup artists are in fact quite honest in their communication with women. The women they are hoping to attract are looking for an exciting bad boy for no strings attached sex. Through both their words and nonverbal communications, pickup artists are very carefully signalling that they are aloof jerks offering no strings sex. If the pickup artists in question were really boring loyal dudes hoping to lure hos into matrimony, they would indeed be communicating in a dishonest way. But they aren’t.

What bothers Peterson is not that PUAs are dishonest, but that their honesty offends our cultural assumption that women find chivalry to be sexy.

H/T Nick Mgtow
The SWBTS Board of Trustees wasn’t reacting to #MeToo, they were merely proactively assessing Patterson’s current job performance.

by Dalrock | June 4, 2018 | Link

As Dr. Albert Mohler, President of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, explained in reaction to Paige Patterson being removed by the South Western Baptist Theological Seminary (SWBTS) Board of Trustees Southern Baptists have been in the grips of a #MeToo social justice mob (emphasis mine):

The last few weeks have been excruciating for the Southern Baptist Convention and for the larger evangelical movement. It is as if bombs are dropping and God alone knows how many will fall and where they will land.

America’s largest evangelical denomination has been in the headlines day after day. The SBC is in the midst of its own horrifying #MeToo moment.

At one of our seminaries, controversy has centered on a president (now former president) whose sermon illustration from years ago included advice that a battered wife remain in the home and the marriage in hope of the conversion of her abusive husband. Other comments represented the objectification of a teenage girl. The issues only grew more urgent with the sense that the dated statements represented ongoing advice and counsel.

The #MeToo moment Mohler described started when Southern Baptist women agitated on social media for Patterson to be fired based on past statements he had made. This culminated with a May 6th letter signed by thousands of angry Southern Baptist women demanding that Patterson be removed as head of SWBTS. The letter from the angry women was addressed to Pastor Ueckert and the Board of Trustees, and strongly suggested that if they didn’t fire Patterson, the world would think they were the kind of men who either abused and objectified women, or covered for men who did (emphasis mine):

Dear Pastor Ueckert and Board of Trustees,

We are concerned Southern Baptist women who affirm the Baptist Faith and Message 2000, including its statements on the roles of men and women in the family and in the church. We urge you to exercise the authority you have been given by the churches of the Southern Baptist Convention and to take a strong stand against unbiblical teaching regarding womanhood, sexuality, and domestic violence.

We are shocked by the video that has surfaced showing Dr. Paige Patterson objectify a teenage girl and then suggest this as behavior that is biblical. We are further grieved by the dangerous and unwise counsel given by Dr. Patterson to women in abusive situations. His recent remarks of clarification do not repudiate his unwise
counsel in the past; nor has he offered explanation or repentance for inappropriate comments regarding a teenage girl, the unbiblical teaching he offered on the biblical meaning of womanhood in that objectification, and the inappropriate nature of his own observations of her body.

...

The world is watching us all, brothers. They wonder how we could possibly be part of a denomination that counts Dr. Patterson as a leader. **They wonder if all Southern Baptist men believe that the biblical view of a sixteen-year-old girl is that she is “built” and “fine”—an object to be viewed sexually. They wonder if all Southern Baptist pastors believe it is acceptable to counsel an abused woman in the way that Dr. Patterson has done in the past.** They wonder if the Jesus of the Bible is like such men. We declare that Jesus is nothing like this and that our first duty as Southern Baptists is to present a true picture of Jesus to the world.

The day after the letter was published, The Washington Post picked up the story with the breathless headline ‘We are shocked’: Thousands of Southern Baptist women denounce leader’s ‘objectifying’ comments, advice to abused women. Just over two weeks later, the SWBTS Board of Trustees announced their decision to remove Patterson as President. Seven days after that, the SWBTS Board of Trustees Executive Committee released another letter announcing that it was stripping Patterson of all remaining honors and benefits based on his handling of a rape accusation while he was heading another seminary (Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary) in 2003 (emphasis mine):

> During the May 30, 2018, Executive Committee meeting of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary (SWBTS) Board of Trustees, new information confirmed this morning was presented regarding the **handling of an allegation of sexual abuse against a student during Dr. Paige Patterson’s presidency at another institution** and resulting issues connected with statements to the Board of Trustees that are inconsistent with SWBTS’s biblically informed core values.

**Deeming the information demanded immediate action and could not be deferred to a regular meeting of the Board, based on the details presented, the Executive Committee unanimously resolved to terminate Dr. Paige Patterson, effective immediately, removing all the benefits, rights and privileges provided by the May 22-23 board meeting, including the title of President Emeritus, the invitation to reside at the Baptist Heritage Center as theologian-in-residence and ongoing compensation.**

Under the leadership of Interim President Dr. Jeffrey Bingham, SWBTS remains committed to its calling to assist the churches of the Southern Baptist Convention by biblically educating God-called men and women for ministries that fulfill the Great Commission and glorify God.

Further, the Seminary stands against all forms of abuse and grieves for individuals
wounded by abuse. Today, Dr. Bingham made it clear that SWBTS denounces all abusive behavior, any behavior that enables abuse, any failure to protect the abused and any failure to safeguard those who are vulnerable to abuse. Additionally, Dr. Bingham called for the SWBTS community to join the Body of Christ in praying for healing for all individuals affected by abuse.

Note that the SWBTS board says it decided that the new information presented against Patterson stemming from 15 years prior, before Patterson was associated with SWBTS, was so urgent that they could not wait for a regular meeting of the board, and decided then and there to strip him of all honors and benefits. According to one defense of Patterson, this second meeting was conducted while Patterson was out of the country, and he therefore had no opportunity to defend his actions.

After midnight in Germany, while Patterson was sleeping, the chairman of the board of trustees, Kevin Ueckert, ordered Scott Colter to wake Patterson for a phone call. On the call, Ueckert told Patterson he was fired effective immediately, with no salary, no health insurance and no home. He then relayed that Patterson would receive instructions for vacating Pecan Manor upon returning to Fort Worth.

Before the phone call, both Pattersons’ and Colter’s email accounts, including personal contacts and calendar, were shut down without notice and while the three were traveling in Germany on behalf of Southwestern, leaving them without access to itineraries, train tickets, local contact information, hotel confirmation and flight boarding passes.

Two days later Kevin Ueckert, Chairman of the SWBTS Board of Trustees, released yet another press release explaining that he and the entire board were not reacting to the #MeToo hysteria, and their decisions were strictly made based on Patterson’s current performance (emphasis mine):

Based on a number of follow-up questions I have received this week, I am providing this additional statement related to our May 30, 2018 statement. The unanimous decision by the Executive Committee to immediately terminate Dr. Paige Patterson was prayerfully considered and warranted.

We confirmed this week through a student record, made available to me with permission, that an allegation of rape was indeed made by a female student at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary in 2003. This information contradicts a statement previously provided by Dr. Patterson in response to a direct question by a Board member regarding the incident referenced in our May 30 statement. The 2003 rape allegation was never reported to local law enforcement. SWBTS will not release the student record to the public without additional appropriate permissions.

... 

Ultimately, the decision of the Executive Committee to immediately terminate Dr. Patterson was clear and unanimous.
I also want to reiterate what SWBTS Interim President Dr. Jeffrey Bingham said earlier this week. SWBTS denounces all abusive behavior, any behavior that enables abuse, any failure to protect the abused, and any failure to safeguard those who are vulnerable to abuse.

In this difficult situation, the Executive Committee based its decision on the current performance of the president and did not allow the legacy of Dr. Patterson or the #MeToo pressure to steer the outcome. We did not react; rather, we decisively exercised our responsibility based on the Seminary’s biblically informed core values and integrity.

Note how Chairman Ueckert genuflects to the angry mob immediately before claiming that the decision was not in response to the angry mob. Note also that he first reiterates the claim that Patterson mishandled a rape allegation 15 years ago, before Patterson worked for SWBTS, before claiming that the board’s decision was based purely on Patterson’s current performance. Ueckert further claims the board wasn’t reacting to #MeToo pressure punish Patterson, but was being proactive.
I dare you.

From Profs say female STEM grades don’t reflect ‘perceived effort’:

Based on surveys of 828 STEM students, the professors conclude that female students believe they work harder than their male classmates for similar grades, indicating that “women’s higher perceived effort levels are not rewarded.”

... Female students’ sense of self-efficacy is strongly predicted by grades, the professors note, fretting that this may discourage students sense of motivation to stay in STEM.

“These findings support the notion that grade discouragement leads to within-semester motivational declines...

The solution is to stop the sexist policy of grading on actual achievement, and give women in STEM the high grades they feel entitled to (emphasis mine):

...they propose that “science educators could redistribute grades more akin to non-STEM disciplines to increase STEM retention.”

H/T Instapundit.

Related: Going through the motions.
It would be unchivalrous to tell her no.
by Dalrock | June 6, 2018 | Link

Pastor Tim Bayly shares a youtube video put out by the Presbyterian Church in America (PCA) in his post Try Saying “No.” I Dare You...

Note that the woman speaking has been teaching other women for many decades. We can get a sense of what she teaches other women by what she teaches in the youtube video:

- Complementarian rules are good because they feel good (to her).
- If men are good (nice) enough, women will want to be complementarians because it will feel good.
- Pastors who don’t lead the way she tells them to lead are sinning because they make her feel bad.
- Women in the PCA aren’t tempted to usurp the role of men. If they experienced such a temptation they would simply go to a different denomination and usurp the roles of men.
- Women who go to other denominations and usurp the roles of men are only doing so because men in those denominations have forced them to do so (they are playing golf instead of leading the church, etc).

Simply put, a woman’s feelings rule and there is no sin of feminist rebellion. If there is a problem, it is because men are sinning. If a woman feels bad about what the Bible says, it is proof that a man has somehow sinned.

As Pastor Bayly puts it:

Mrs. Mary Beth McGreevy’s leadership is needed at her church session meetings. Her pastor told her so. Now then dear fuddy-duddy going 40 miles per hour in front of her, pull over. She knows where God wants her and when she’s scheduled to be there, and you’re in her way.

These are the sorts of things on the heart of Covenant Seminary grad Mary Beth McGreevy which she “shares” in a video posted on the Presbyterian Church in America’s in-house promo publication titled byFaith. McGreevy is pretty and sweet and cheerful and puts a great face on the “women can do anything a non-ordained man can do” Kellerite feminism called “complementarianism” that now owns the PCA.

No pastor wants to criticize women like this. McGreevy tells us “you can’t put women in a box anymore” and who would want to? Women are pretty. If mother is happy, everyone’s happy.
If McGreevy’s pastor is terrified of telling her no in matters relating to his own church, imagine how her pastor would respond to *her husband* telling her no.

**Related:**

- *Why there is a controversy about women teaching/preaching Scripture and doctrine.*
- *She holds an authority you cannot hold.*
Father’s Day is a difficult day for modern Christians. While modern Christians have contempt for fathers 365 days a year, this is the day that makes the contempt for fatherhood most difficult to contain. For while the feeling of contempt for fathers (especially married fathers) is all but universal, it is also something which modern Christians still feel the need to deny. During the other 364 days of the year modern Christians can focus on singing the praises of single motherhood and chasing down (modern Christian) heretics who won’t tell women God wants them to divorce their husbands. But Father’s Day is a day set aside to honor fathers, something Christians are explicitly commanded to do.

Last June I wrote a series of posts about a group that tried to wrestle with this very problem. The group set out to do something radical for modern Christians, and honor fathers on Father’s day. As Stephen Kendrick explained (emphasis mine):

> It’s easy for us to honor our moms, but too oftentimes people don’t honor their fathers. And so this Father’s Day, and leading up to it, we want to encourage you to honor your father.

The Executive Director of the group put it similarly:

> As a pastor for over twenty years I used to get very nervous after Mother’s Day because, I always wonder now what, we’ve only got a few weeks, what are we going to do with Father’s Day?

While the idea was a noble one, the concept of honoring fathers was just too disgusting for modern Christians to accept. So instead of honoring fathers, they taught that we should not call God the Father, refocused the day to only apply to fathers honoring their own fathers, offered a list of cringe-worthy social media ideas, and generally focused on telling men to man up.

For those who are outside of modern Christian culture, this is no doubt difficult to process. Why would “the patriarchy” hate fathers so much? The standard assumption is that secular culture is hostile to fathers, but that Christians are fighting the culture in this regard. But modern Christians hate married fathers so much the depth of the usually concealed contempt is shocking when it comes out.

One way the concealed contempt comes out is in wildly popular Christians movies. The secular reviewer Matt Fagerholm at rogerebert.com noted that the villain in the movie War Room (the married father) lacked any positive qualities whatsoever:

> The film’s centerpiece sequence occurs early on, as Elizabeth sits weeping in her closet while pleading, “God, help him love me again.” This moment is heartbreaking for all the wrong reasons. Since the Kendricks have mistaken one-dimensional caricatures for people who exist in the real world, they forgot to provide
Tony with any redeeming qualities that would make us want to root for his marriage. As for the film’s advice to women who are beaten by their husbands, one of Elizabeth’s co-workers advises, “Learn to duck so God can hit him.”

Likewise the feminists at Dame were astonished by the anti-father message of Mom’s Night Out, as they explained in Manchildren Are Not Sexy, Neither Are Helpless Dads. This is a movie that Christians adored, yet feminists were made deeply uncomfortable by the anti father and anti family message it carried:

And that’s the biggest problem with Moms’ Night Out: The moral of the story isn’t that the women are supposed to stay home and not have fun, but that the men are totally hapless morons without them around—and that this lesson is still being drilled into our heads in 2014. We’re supposed to feel better about this “men are total idiots, the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world” philosophy (and that latter piece of wisdom was actually uttered in the movie in case you missed the point). But this story of the helpless manchild is a disservice to men—and families—everywhere.

But of all of the days of the year, Father’s Day is the day where the modern Christian contempt for fathers is most visible. To get a sense of this, do a web search on “Father’s Day Sermon” and read/listen through the results. I’ll go through this in more detail next week, but for today I’ll share the sermon that came first when I did a Google search on the term the other day. The sermon is titled A Few Good Men, and it starts off in a relatively positive way. While it follows the traditional Father’s Day pattern of telling the fathers in the congregation to man up, it suggests that at least a few of them actually are good men*:

Prerequisites to being a Good Father:

Being a man, functioning as a man, taking responsibility as a man, thinking like a man, acting like a man, working like a man, all of these are prerequisites to being a good Father!

You will not be a good Father until you are a good Man. It’s a dying art today...there are not many in our nation anymore. Thank God we DO have a few good men here...we can always use a few more!

With that out of the way, we get to the meat of the sermon, a long series of men are stupid jokes:

THE MEN’S THESAURUS

(men don’t always say what they mean) – ladies, please allow me to translate for your future benefit:

When a man says “IT WOULD TAKE TOO LONG TO EXPLAIN”

He means: “I have no idea how it works”

When a man says “TAKE A BREAK, HONEY. YOU ARE WORKING TOO HARD”
He means: “I can’t hear the game over the vacuum cleaner”

When a man says ‘THAT’S INTERESTING DEAR.’

He means: “Are you still talking?”

When a man says: “IT’S A GUY THING”

He means: “There is no rational thought pattern connected with this, and you have no chance at all of making it logical”

When a man says “CAN I HELP WITH DINNER”

He means: “Why isn’t it ready yet?”

When a man says “UH HUH, SURE HONEY,” or “YES, DEAR”

He means: Absolutely nothing – It’s a conditioned response.

When a man says “YOU KNOW HOW BAD MY MEMORY IS.”

He means: “I can remember the theme song to ‘Hogan’s Heroes’, the phone # of the first girl I ever kissed & the vehicle identification numbers of every car I ever owned – but yes, I forgot your birthday”

When a man says ‘OH, DON’T FUSS, I JUST CUT MYSELF. IT’S NO BIG DEAL”

He means: “I have probably severed a limb, but I will bleed to death before I admit I’m hurt, so get over here and help me!”

When a man says ‘I CAN’T FIND IT.’

He means: “It didn’t fall into my outstretched hand, so I’m completely clueless”

When a man says “I HEARD YOU.”

He means: “I haven’t the foggiest clue what you just said and I am hoping desperately that I can fake it well enough so that you’ll not spend the next 3 days yelling at me.”

When a man says “YOU KNOW I COULD NEVER LOVE ANYONE ELSE”

He means: “I am used to the way you yell at me and realize it could be worse.”

When a man says “YOU LOOK TERRIFIC!”

He means: “Oh please don’t try on one more outfit, we’re late and I’m starving.”
When a man says “I’M NOT LOST. I KNOW EXACTLY WHERE WE ARE.”

He means: “No one will ever see us alive again.”

When a man says “I don’t think I can go today.”

He means: Shopping is NOT a sport, and no, I am never going to think of it that way.

When a man says, “I don’t remember saying that.”

It’s because he means: “Anything I may have said 6 months ago is inadmissible in an argument. In fact, all past comments become null and void after 7 days.”

When a man says, “that’s not what I meant.”

He means: “If something I said can be interpreted two ways, and one of the ways makes you sad or angry, I meant the other one.

If your husband says, “honey, what color is this?”

He means: ALL men see in only 16 colors, like Windows default settings. Peach, for example, is a fruit, not a color. Pumpkin is also a fruit. I have no idea what “taupe” is.

We thank God today for the good men He’s sent us here.

Read the full text here, or better yet, listen to the audio.

*At the end of the sermon it clarifies that the men listening aren’t in the category of good men, and invites the men listening to become good men. The sermon reinforces that there are not actually any good men by quoting Ezekiel 22:30 twice, once in the beginning and again at the end of the sermon:

And I sought for a man among them, that should make up the hedge, and stand in the gap before me for the land, that I should not destroy it: but I found none.
Nancy Carol Hastings Sehested writes in An open letter to Paige Patterson:

Dear Brother Paige,

We now have something in common. We were both ousted. Mine happened so long ago that you may not remember me. It was 30 years ago. I was among the first casualties of the war against women in pastoral positions in the Southern Baptist Convention. The church that I was called to pastor was “disfellowshipped” in 1987 for “knowingly calling a woman as pastor.” You may recall that it was after the SBC resolution to exclude women from pastoring “to preserve a submission God requires because the man was first in creation and the woman was first in the Edenic fall.”

Feminists have not forgotten that Patterson is the man who led the effort Ms. Carol Hastings Sehested is recounting. In taking his scalp, they have won a long coveted victory.

Menwhile Dr. Jason K. Allen proposed a resolution to spike the football at the upcoming SBC convention:

WHEREAS, to the shame of the Southern Baptist Convention, and the very obscuring of the Glory of God, a number of Southern Baptist leaders, professors, and ministers have since our last annual gathering sinned against the Lord and against women by their ungodly behavior and language; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the messengers to the Southern Baptist Convention, meeting in Dallas, Texas, June 12-13th, 2018 repudiate in the strongest terms any comment that would objectify and dishonor a woman, and any behavior with a woman that would compromise the New Testament standard of a minister’s absolute purity and requirement to be “above reproach” (1 Timothy 3:1, 5:2)...

Dr. Allen as you might recall is the president of the Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Allan’s seminary publishes articles from the far left of the complementarian movement, including one which complains that church leaders are “maddeningly male” (emphasis mine):

In the 35 years or so since then, liberal churches grew more liberal and the conservative—heaven help us. McQuinn uses the term androcentrism to describe the shift in neo-reformed environments in particular. It means being dominated by or emphasizing masculine interests or a masculine point of view. It wasn’t that the theology was all wrong, it was that the voices of church leaders were maddeningly male, through the male perspective, with male interests paramount, and evaluated by males.

Imagine with me for a moment a room of chimps all chimping about how to be a better room of chimps and pandas.
Dr. Allen’s resolution will go to a formal vote at the upcoming convention, but it has already been affirmed by a long list of SBC leaders, including both candidates for SBC President as well as Dr. Albert Mohler.
Father’s Day sermons are the symptom, not the disease.

by Dalrock | June 12, 2018 | Link

Father’s Day is a day of tradition. In the secular world the tradition is to honor fathers on Father’s Day. In the modern Christian world, especially the conservative Christian world, the tradition is to mock fathers and expresses contempt for them on Father’s Day. But it is important to remember that the anti father Father’s Day sermon is a symptom, and not the disease.

The disease is a profound contempt for fathers, especially married fathers. This condition exists largely beneath the surface the other 364 days of the year. Father’s Day provokes the disease, often driving it to the surface. Father’s Day is the day the urge to hide the condition is overwhelmed by the disgust at the sight of the culture honoring fathers in even the smallest ways.

If you aren’t involved with conservative Christian culture, you are likely taken aback by the statements above. Everyone knows that conservative Christians are dyed in the wool patriarchs who treat every day as if it were a day to honor fathers. Likewise, if you are a part of conservative Christian culture, mocking and expressing contempt for fathers is so ingrained in the culture that you likely don’t even notice it.

Last year for Father’s Day I did a series on Honor Your Father Today, a group that recognized the problem (to a degree) and set out to try to honor fathers on Father’s Day. They failed miserably, but we should at least credit them with attempting.

This year I decided to search for Father’s Day sermons online and read through a sample to see if I could find any that went against the anti father grain*. I went through a total of 17 sermons in the process (16 on this page, the other one here). Out of the 17, I found two that broke with conservative Christian tradition. But before I share the details, I’ll outline the common anti father themes in Father’s Day sermons.

Common Anti-Father Father’s Day Sermon Themes:

- **Mock fathers**, following the lead of feminists who for decades have portrayed married fathers as (at best) useless oafs.
- Blame fathers for the single mother revolution and the host of social maladies feminism has wrought. More on this topic here.
- Blame fathers for children (and fathers) falling away from the anti-father church.
- Tell men to man up and/or accuse them of being bad fathers.
- Jokes about how Father’s Day is less important than Mother’s Day.

As I noted above, two of the sermons didn’t follow these common themes. The first was *Like Father, Like Son*, by Dr. Lewis W. Gregory. Gregory’s sermon contains none of the anti father messages above, and ends with the words “happy Father’s Day”. Admittedly this isn’t a high
hurdle to clear, especially since Gregory wasn’t (directly) wishing the fathers in the congregation a happy Father’s Day. But by not attacking fathers in a Father’s Day sermon Gregory is doing something radical.

Summary: Do you bear the family likeness? Whose image is expressed in your life? When you are born again of the Spirit of God, you have a new father. God is your Father! So, you are just like your Father God. You share His image in order to express His likeness.

D. Now that’s a happy Father’s Day everyday!

The other Father’s Day sermon I found that wasn’t anti-father was from Douglas Phillips**. Pastor Phillips’ sermon is titled Our Father In Heaven and opens with Phillips honoring his own father and concludes with a story featuring a father not as a joke but a protector:

CONCLUSION:

A FAMILY WENT TO A LAKE FOR A VACATION ALONG A LAKE. DAD WAS WORKING BY THE BOAT HOUSE WHILE HIS 12 YEAR OLD AND 3 YEAR OLD WERE PLAYING ON THE DOCK. OLDER BROTHER WAS SUPPOSED TO BE WATCHING YOUNGER BROTHER BUT GOT DISTRACTED SO LITTLE BILLY DECIDED TO CHECK OUT THE FISHING BOAT AT THE END OF THE DOCK.

BILLY PUT HIS FOOT IN THE BOAT BUT THE BOAT SHIFTED AND HE FELL IN. THE OLDER BROTHER SCREAMED AND DAD CAME RUNNING. HE JUMPED IN BUT COULDN’T FIND HIS SON. DAD TOOK ANOTHER GULP OF AIR AND WENT UNDER AGAIN FEELING EVERYWHERE FOR HIS SON.

ON HIS WAY UP FOR ANOTHER GULP OF AIR, BILLY’S FATHER FELT BILLY WITH HIS ARMS CLINGING TIGHTLY TO THE POSTS UNDER THE DOCK. HE PRYED BILLY LOOSE AND TOOK HIM UP FOR AIR.

WHEN EVERYONE HAD CALMED DOWN BILLY’S DAD ASKED HIM, WHAT HE WAS DOING CLINGING TO THE POST UNDERWATER. BILLY REPLIED, “I WAS JUST WAITING FOR YOU DAD, I WAS JUST WAITING FOR YOU.”

THAT LITTLE BOY TRUSTED HIS DAD, THE SAME WAY WE CAN TRUST OUR HEAVENLY FATHER.

The remaining 14 sermons are listed below. Many of the sermons included good parts along with the bad, but all of them fit with one or more of the bullet points listed above.

Father’s Day Let Us Be Transformed (Message With Humor) Sermon by J Jeffrey Smead

Let us Pray....
O’ Gracious Father - bless now the words of my lips and the meditations of our hearts. Breathe your Spirit into us and grant that we may hear and in hearing be led in the way ...... you want us to go. We ask this in the name of your son Jesus the Christ. Amen.

Someone noticed that the word “father” appears in the dictionary .....just before the word “fatigued” .....and just after the word “fathead.”

So to all us fatigued, fathead fathers, ......Happy Father’s Day! (Pause)

One time a little boy was asked to define Father’s Day and he said, ......“It’s just like Mother’s Day,....... only you don’t have to spend as much on the present.”

Father’s Day: Joseph Sermon by Scott Bayles. In addition to hitting several of the bulleted themes, this one also features a fascination with cuckoldry.

Well, let me start out today by saying “Happy Father’s Day” to all of our Dads. One little boy, when asked to explain about Father’s Day, said, “It’s just like Mother’s Day, only you don’t spend as much on the present.”

That’s a joke, of course, but really, Father’s Day never seems to be as big a deal as Mother’s Day, does it?

...

I’m glad there is a Father’s Day (not just because I’m a dad myself). Even though it may not be as significant or special as Mother’s Day, it still gives us a chance to honor those who stand at the helm, who gather their team in a huddle, and who lead their family through life’s battles. And, since my Mother’s Day message last month focused on Mary the mother of Jesus, I thought it would only be appropriate for us to take a thoughtful look at Joseph, the step-father of Jesus, for Father’s Day.

...

Joseph understood clearly what God expected of him, and was ready to obey! He would take Mary to be his wife and suffer the cutting remarks of a child conceived prior to their wedding. He would obey in spite of the fact that this child of divine promise would be born under a cloud of adultery. He called his adopted son “Jesus,” just as he was told to do. Joseph believed God, obeyed God, and accepted the responsibility that God had given him.

How much better would our world be if every father did the same thing?

In 1960, 17% of children in the United States were raised apart from their biological fathers. By 1990, that number had risen to 36%. Today, nearly half of all the children in the U.S. are raise without a father in their home. How could we have become so irresponsible? So caviler in our relationships with our own children?
Dads, we can’t leave the rearing and raising of our children to the television or the
daycare teacher or even to mom alone. It’s our responsibility too. We need to be
actively involved in our children’s lives. We need to take responsibility, especially in
their formative years. I once heard a psychologist say that whatever you plan on
teaching your children (values, morals, etc.) must be taught within the first five
years—after that, it’s just reinforcement. Do you know what an awesome
responsibility that it!? 

The Echo Sermon by Ken McKinley. This is a sermon on the lack of faith by young people. The
Father’s Day tie in is that fathers are to blame.

Now I don’t know if you all remember a few Sunday’s back when I read to you the
statistics from Lifeway and from the SBC, about the state of the church, but those
statistics tell us a story, and what we saw at Falls Creek tells us a story as well. If
you don’t remember what I quoted from LifeWay and the SBC I’ll remind you. They
state in their studies and research that there are over 16 million members in the
Southern Baptist denomination, but only about 6 million regularly attend church on
Sunday. They also state that if the Southern Baptist denomination does not begin to
replenish its numbers with younger people, ie: the next generation, we are going to
have some serious problems...

Church, we have got to be committed to getting our children and grandchildren to
be radically surrendered to Jesus and radically committed to His cause. Because if
we aren’t, where is the next generation of Christians going to come from? They
aren’t going to grow in our garden. Where are they going to come from?

...

Well dads, that’s where we come in to this picture. God’s ordinary way of shaping
children and youth into radically committed, wise, thinking, loving, mature Christians
is through parents who teach and model a God-centered, Bible-saturated worldview
into their children. Turn with me to Deuteronomy 6:4-7 (Read). Now turn to Psalm
78:5 – 7 and see what Asaph says about this (Read), and since we’ve been studying
Ephesians go ahead and turn to Ephesians chapter 6: 1-4 (Read). Keep your place in
Ephesians because we’re going to be coming back to it in a second.

You see, the Biblical pattern is for parents, especially fathers is to not relinquish their
role as the primary teachers of their children’s minds and hearts...

Burn A Hole In The Fire Sermon by Philip Harrelson

Men, we have to take the journey to the house of God! One of the reasons that our
nation is in the mess that it is in is because men are more concerned about
recreation than they are about worship. Leisure, sports, relaxation, and I will add in
work are very poor idols that will never get our kids out of the fire!

• Men in our day will smoke joints with their children but not take them to
  worship.
Men in our day will share alcohol with their children but not the Word of God.
Men in our day will take their kids to the movies but not to God’s House.
Men in our day will yell at a ballpark for their kid but never have a lick of emotion in their worship.

**Have You Seen My Daddy? Sermon by Charlie Roberts:**

I can remember, my dad would call and the first thing he would say would be, “Dad here” at the time I would think of course you’re there, and I’m here. But over the years, I came to realize that, when he said those words...it gave me comfort, knowing I could call anytime and he would come running to help me, no matter what the need was!

I could sense his presence was there, even though physically he wasn’t.

So many fathers nowadays, aren’t that way.

...

It’s no wonder why churches all over the globe are closing their doors, and are dropping in attendance.

Dads aren’t going, so why should the children. Fathers are supposed to be the spiritual leaders of their households. If we’re ever going to see revival in our church’s, it’s going to have to first start in our homes!

**Man Up Sermon by Anthony Zibolski**

Are you strong enough to be a man?

Churches filled mostly with women.

Women pulling the majority of weight in the families.

...

The world says:

I wear the pants,

The John Wayne type,

The Dirty Harry type. Make my day, don’t be a whimp. No crying allowed

But it has shifted gears:

They paint a picture today of men that have nothing to say.
They have given up their authority in the family.

They imply that women have by force taken the lead.

...

Today is Fathers day, a day of cologne, neck ties, long distance phone calls, but it also a reminder to the men to man up...

...10 things you’ll never hear Dad say

10. Well, how about that? I’m lost. Looks like I will have to stop and ask someone for directions

9. You know pumpkin, now that your thirteen, you’ll be ready for unchaperoned car dates.

8. I noticed that all your friends have a certain hostile attitude. I like that.

7. Here’s a credit card and the keys to my new car. Go crazy.

6. What do you mean you want to play football? Figure skating’s not good enough for you son.

5. Your mother and I are going away, you might want to consider having a party.

4. Well, I don’t know what’s wrong with your car. Probably one of those doo-hickey things. Tow it to the mechanic, whatever it costs, ‘ll pay for it.

3. No son of mine is going to live under this roof without an earring. Now quit you belly aching, and let’s go to the mall.

2. Whadda wanna go and get a job for ? I make plenty of money for you to spend.

1. What do I want for my birthday? Aahh, don’t worry about it. No big deal.

So God still needs to work on a few things in most men.

They say it is an age for women to rise up and be noticed. Amen.

Equal pay for equal work. Amen.

The problem today is not rebellious women. It is men who have not taken the rightful spot in leading their families. I know there are rebellious women. I’m sure none here. Some men are comfortable giving up the lead role.

...ladies, couldn’t you follow a man who is following after God’s heart? Pray for the
men in your life.

Fathers Day 2009 Sermon by Bruce Ball. This one wins the irony award.

TODAY IS THE ONE DAY EACH YEAR

* We set aside to honor our fathers.
* What a shame we don’t do this
* Every day of the year

... FOR THE MOST PART

* Men do a pretty good job
* Of being husbands and fathers,
* Even though we do tend to forget dates

[Tells a clueless husband joke]

THE MORAL IS:

* while men are not perfect,
* we need to be appreciated
* for trying so hard.

... A FATHER HAD 5 KIDS

* One day, he brought 1 present home.
* He told them he could only give it to one of them

HE SAID HE WOULD GIVE IT TO THE ONE WHO

* Had obeyed their mother,
* Did what she told them to do
* And never talked back to her
THEY WERE ALL SILENT,
* And then all of said
* 'You take it, Daddy!'
...

SOCIETY PORTRAYS FATHERS
* as being incompetents
* and as people who can’t do anything right
* so they don’t deserves any respect

A Praying And Concern Father Sermon by VAN WILLIAMS

**Summary:** It is a fact that in today’s time most children grow up and never serve the Lord after becoming adults. Ever notice that? Wonder why so many adults don’t serve the Lord? David’s son Absalom rebelled against him and tried to take the throne away from him

...

**CONCLUSION:**

1. The Old Sin Nature, our corrupt part that separates us from God is inherited from our father/dad. – If it is not changed by God’s divine grace, that Old Sin Nature will send us to hell.

2. One would think that every father/dad would be concerned that his children not go to hell and if concerned then that father is bound to pray for his children, correct them, bring them up in the ways of the Lord and never cease to be concerned for them even when they are grown.

3. What about that father who never warns his children about hell or fails to instruct them in the ways of the Lord that would lead to their salvation?

4. God expects the father to raise his children in the ways of the Lord and if he doesn’t and they go to hell because of his neglect, their blood will be on the father’s hand.

5. Fathers, impress upon your children their duty to God. Too often fathers try to express or show their love to their children but never tell their children about Jesus who loves them more.
6. Fathers, seeing your children saved is more important than anything else on this earth.

7. Fathers, do not rest until every one of your children know the Lord Jesus as Savior.

8. But, how can a father lead his children to the Lord if he is not saved himself?

**Fighters Vs. Flyers Sermon by Michael Catt**

Summary: We must fight against evil and against complacency and fear. We must flee from evil and protect our kids.

... 

Sadly, that is the case of 24 million children in this country. Their dads have simply left, opting for a life other than full-time care of the family they started. Many of these kids have been fathered in the foundation of a family where the mother and father exchanged vows and made promises that are now broken.

Regardless of the situation, fatherhood can be frightening, but it must never be flown. Our responsibility is too great, and the stakes are too high.

...

As a church, we cannot assume that just because a dad is in the home that he is being a dad. We cannot assume that his hand is on the heartbeat of the family. The church’s role is to support and encourage and equip.

...

Sometimes men, in the context of the flight, get distracted by their sin and neglect to consider how their sin so deeply affects their family. Some men need to stand up and fight against the sin in their lives and in the lives of their children. That fight begins and ends in repentance, perhaps the art of Christian living that requires the most skilled fighter.

**Fathers Day 2008 Lessons From A Famous Father**

Summary: Miles of distance and centuries of time separate us from King David. He was a king and we are commoners. Still, despite the distance and the differences we can learn much about being fathers in this present day by looking at this father of long ago.

...

A. David had been immensely successful in most of the things he had done.
1. He had been successful as a musician.
2. He had been successful as a soldier.
3. He had been successful as an administrator.
4. He had been successful as a politician.

B. David failed as a father and that outweighed all his successes.

1. In fact, David would gladly have given up his other successes if he could have traded them for success as a father.
2. Many today give up success as a father and trade it for success in business or a profession.

Illustration

Six year old Tommy came downstairs crying. “What’s the matter?” asked his Mother.

“Daddy just hit his thumb with a hammer,” the boy replied.

“A big boy like you shouldn’t cry over a thing like that,” said the Mother. “Why didn’t you laugh?”

“I did,” he replied.

Fathers Day – A Charge To Walk Worthy Of God sermon by William Akehurst. As far as man up Father’s Day sermons go, this one is pretty mild.

Summary: We have been trusted with the Gospel to bring it to others. AS A FATHER TO HIS CHILDREN, Exhort, Comfort, Charge and Implore, to Walk Worthy of God. To Walk: in Love, in Light, in Wisdom, and in Worship

Dad Talk Sermon by Michael McCartney. This one started out with great promise, and for the first three pages I thought I had found a third Father’s Day sermon that broke the anti father pattern. Then in page four it fell into the standard groove before taking a surprisingly dark turn:

Summary: Today we follow the teaching of the Bible and we honor our dads today. Dads are different from moms and they are to be honored for being who God created them to be.

...
a. Thanks to all you dad’s who have made this proclamation to serve the Lord.

b. Sad to say many women have made this statement. Many more mothers have made this commitment than fathers.

Conclusion:

Dad’s I want you to listen to a poem from a teenager in Chicago who expresses how important you are as fathers and fatherly figures:

Maggie’s Poem

...Do you know, do you understand

that when I hear you talk about arguments

And conflicts and scars

from the past, that I think,

“Maybe I am just a regular person

instead of a bad, no good little girl

who deserves abuse.”

If you care, I think maybe He cares.

And then there’s this flame of hope

that burns inside of me for a while

I am afraid to breathe because it might go out

and I will once again have nothing

But a God who mocks and laughs

and ignores me.

Do you know, do you understand

that your words are His words?

Your face, His face
to someone like me.

Please be who you say you are.

Please God, don’t let this be another trick.

Please let this be real

Please.

Do you know, do you understand

Who you are?

**Who Are You? Sermon by Anthony Zibolski**

Summary: Faking the presence of God in your life is not only foolish but unproductive for the kingdom of God. We must be honest with the Lord of where we are at in our journey of life.

**Introduction-**

This is not a direct at you Fathers day message. Fathers sitting here this morning will have the same opportunity as everyone else to take a look at their lives. Men, we don’t always communicate well. We don’t always listen 100 %. Some times that get us in trouble. Can some one say Amen Women, let me help you. When a man says- “it would take to long to explain’. He really means “ I have no clue how it works”. When a man says, “Take a break, honey, you are working too hard” He really means- “I can’t hear the game over the vacuum cleaner”. When a man says- “Can I help with dinner?” He really means, “Baby, I’m hungry, isn’t it done yet:” When a man says “I’m not lost, I know exactly where we are”. He really means- if you do not buy me a garman, we will never be seen alive again”.

**Love – Key Ingredient For Family Sermon by Bobby Stults**

Summary: Dads the family is our responsibility to lead, guide and protect. We are not called to “lord” over them, but to love them and lead them!

...

So many times we jump to the conclusion that because God placed the man as the head of the family that God believes the man to be superior to his wife or children. This could NOT be further from the truth. It is NOT that God believes men to be superior, but it is that God has called men to be the leaders of the family unit. It is the role God has chosen for men.

Likewise, in just the opposite direction, there are many who believe that because
God has chosen the woman to be in the support role and that Scripture instructs women to submit to their husbands... they jump to the conclusion that God is somehow ‘anti-woman’ and that women are somehow inferior to men in God’s eyes.

...

Let me ask you a question today. How long has it been since you tried a little kindness on your family? On your spouse? On your children? On your brother? On your sister? On your parents? When is the last time you put your love INTO action when it pertains to your family?

Kindness is a tangible expression of the LOVE in your heart... of the love you SAY you have... Love expressed through actions speaks loudly... We must bring ACTION to our love with our families... Men it is NOT enough for you to tell your wife that you love her, although that is very important... but words are empty if they are not back up by action!! Show your wife you love her!!

*I started with a Google Search of “father’s day sermons”. The first actual sermon to come up on the list was this one. At or near the top of the list was Sermons for Father’s Day at Sermon Central. All of the sermons I went through above were highly rated. My intent was to take the top 15-20 sermons listed on the site. However, for some reason I seemed to periodically get different results when I returned to the page. The sort order is fairly dynamic, so I pulled whatever was top of the list when I returned until I couldn’t bear to read any more sermons.

**Update: I originally believed that this was the same Pastor Douglas Phillips whom I wrote about here. However, after looking at more of his entries on the same site I am convinced I was in error and this is a different Baptist pastor by the same name.
Kickass single moms deserve Father’s Day gifts.
by Dalrock | June 15, 2018 | Link

From 5 Father’s Day Gifts for the Kick-Ass Single Mom in Your Life (emphasis mine):

Father’s Day is just around the corner, so the internet is rife with gift guides and ideas for the dads in your life. But, since this is Mommyish, we’re going to do things a bit differently. Now before you get your panties in a wad, I’m not suggesting we ignore Father’s Day. Celebrate your dads! But I also want to acknowledge that this day can be hard for families without a dad. It can be particularly hard for single moms. Those moms who are mom AND dad, and have to spend a whole day hearing about how great other fathers are. So if you’re a single mom, or know one or two, remember that this Father’s Day. And use the money you’ll save on a gift for a dad and get yourself one of these Father’s Day gifts for kick-ass single moms.

It is a toss up as to which of the five is the most hilarious gift, but I would say it is between the Proverbs 31 (you go girl!) notebook and the mug explaining that a mom has to be a badass to fail to provide her child with an intact family. Follow the link to see all of the Father’s Day gift ideas for single mothers.

It is also worth noting that this Sunday while millions of badass moms are patting themselves on the back for making good on the slogan a woman needs a man like a fish needs a bicycle, countless pastors will be doing their part in making broken homes possible by pretending that the feminist revolution in the family wasn’t a feminist revolution at all. Clearly these pastors providing moral cover are every bit as badass as the women who took our society up on its standing offer to kick dad out of the house.

From Father’s Day: Joseph Sermon by Scott Bayles (emphasis mine):

In 1960, 17% of children in the United States were raised apart from their biological fathers. By 1990, that number had risen to 36%. Today, nearly half of all the children in the U.S. are raise without a father in their home. How could we have become so irresponsible? So cavalier in our relationships with our own children?

Dads, we can’t leave the rearing and raising of our children to the television or the daycare teacher or even to mom alone. It’s our responsibility too. We need to be actively involved in our children’s lives. We need to take responsibility

From Fighters Vs. Flyers Sermon by Michael Catt (emphasis mine):

Sadly, that is the case of 24 million children in this country. Their dads have simply left, opting for a life other than full-time care of the family they started. Many of these kids have been fathered in the foundation of a family where the mother and father exchanged vows and made promises that are now broken.
See Also:

- Godly unashamed unwed mothers.
- The coward’s way out.
A picture of Southern Baptist marriage.
by Dalrock | June 15, 2018 | Link

If you’ve ever wondered what a “complementarian” Southern Baptist marriage looks like, wonder no more. Behold, the Servant Leader:

H/T Cane Caldo
Chivalry and the kickass conservative gal.

by Dalrock | June 19, 2018 | Link

While they may seem like an unlikely match at first, chivalry and the kickass conservative gal are a marriage made in modern conservative heaven. As commenter Mother_of_4_Original demonstrates in her response to the article Male Feminist Declares: ‘End Chivalry Now’ (emphasis mine):

I’m not the slightest bit worried that any of my 3 sons will ever harass or assault a woman.

**First, all of them have been taught that it’s the duty of the strong to protect the weak.**

Second, all of them have been taught to respect woman as a gentleman ought (both the oldest son and the “spare kid” who lived with us for a number of years were in high demand among our daughter’s friends at the community college when they wanted an escort through a part of campus they weren’t comfortable traversing alone).

Third, all of them have been raised in a Christian home and a Bible-believing, gospel-preaching church and have accepted Christ into their heart.

**Fourth, all of them are aware that having a concealed carry permit and a 9mm is normal female behavior — just like mom — and understand that a man who lays an aggressive hand on a woman deserves to suffer from acute lead poisoning.**

Men need to be traditional and help the poor defenseless (traditional) women. And if the menfolk get out of line, the kickass conservative gals will let them have it!

So open that door and pull out that chair, because the sistas are doin’ it for themselves.

Also note the implication that chivalry is sexy. All three of her chivalrous “sons” were in *high demand*, not as dates, but as escorts. The article Mother_of_4_Original was commenting on made the chivalry-is-sexy claim even more directly (emphasis mine):

...the moment when a womynist observes a frat boy who brings her a beer at a party: “It’s like, if you’re nice to them, they bring you things.” This act of subjugation was as much of a turn-on then as it is now.

H/T: Instapundit.

Related:

- Kickass conservative gals.
• Why Game is a threat to our values.
Killing her with chivalry.

by Dalrock | June 22, 2018 | Link

Over at Instapundit there is an article/discussion offering chivalry as the antidote to feminist charges of toxic masculinity. Specifically, the article points to the men on the Titanic as the gold standard for noble masculinity. Few conservatives would argue with this sentiment. One commenter approvingly offered a Heinlein quote:

Attempts to formulate a “perfect society” on any foundation other than “women and children first!” is not only witless, it is automatically genocidal.

I wasn’t familiar with the quote, but with a bit of searching found a more full version of it (all emphasis mine):

All societies are based on rules to protect pregnant women and young children. All else is surplusage, excrescence, adornment, luxury, or folly which can--and must--be dumped in emergency to preserve this prime function. As racial survival is the only universal morality, no other basic is possible. Attempts to formulate a “perfect society” on any foundation other than “Women and children first!” is no only witless, it is automatically genocidal. Nevertheless, starry-eyed idealists (all of them male) have tried endlessly--and no doubt will keep on trying.

Having not read the book, I don’t know if Heinlein meant the quote to be ironic or not. But either way, the claim that Women and Children First (WACF) is a practical philosophy in opposition to starry eyed idealists is deeply ironic. For WACF is the philosophy of the hopeless romantic. It stems directly out of the Medieval literary tradition of Courtly Love. Courtly Love is founded on the starry eyed idealism that men suffering for women is the ultimate masculine virtue. Moreover, the more unnecessary the man’s suffering, the greater the masculine virtue. The archetype of noble chivalrous manhood is Sir Lancelot in Chretien de Troyes’ late 1100s tale Sir Lancelot, Knight of the Cart. As you might guess from the title, the cart is central to the moral lesson of the tale. Joseph J. Duggan explains in The Romances of Chretien de Troyes:

Lancelot is also about shame, but a paradoxical shame inflicted in seemingly arbitrary fashion on Lancelot by Queen Guinevere. The scene of Lancelot in the cart, after which Chretien named his romance (Lancelot 24), and by which Godefroy de Lagny calls it (7103), is one of shaming.

Lancelot is searching for the queen and meets a dwarf who is driving a cart... The dwarf tells Lancelot that if he climbs into the vehicle, he will soon know the queen’s whereabouts. Understandably Lancelot is reluctant to ride in this nefarious conveyance in which felons are often transported. His hesitation is occasioned by his receiving contradictory interior advice from Reason and Love. Reason tells him not to do anything that will bring him shame or reproach. Reason, says Chretien, is not in the heart but only in the mouth... Love, however, which does dwell in the heart, advises him to jump into the cart... This is precisely the Lancelot’s problem and the
core problematic of Chretien’s romance...

Chivalry is a starry eyed glorification of men’s suffering, and the more capricious the suffering the better. Heinlein’s character makes chivalry out to be a matter of practicality, but as the originators of the genre fully understood it was precisely the opposite.

And it is not merely in fiction that we can see this truth. In the Titanic itself we learned that WACF is a terrible way to approach saving lives on a sinking ship. It is even a terrible way to save the lives of women and children. The reason for this is that women understandably don’t want to separate from their men in times of extreme danger. Their men are their protectors, yet WACF demands that women enter into the terrifying unknown of the life-raft without their men. As a result, women tend to refuse to enter the lifeboats under WACF. In the prototype for WACF, the sinking of the HMS Birkenhead, the women had to be forcibly picked up and dropped into the lifeboats. From the Daily Mail:

Some women did not want to go on their own — they had to be torn away from their husbands, carried over to the bulwark and dropped over the ship’s side. Most of the soldiers and sailors aboard drowned or were eaten by sharks, but all the women and children survived, and the chivalric ethos became known as the Birkenhead Drill...

The same problem came up on the Titanic. Women were too afraid to enter the lifeboats without their men, and as a result not just men, but women and children needlessly died:

All 14 lifeboats, the two emergency boats, and two of the Engelhardt boats were launched. These had a capacity of 1,084 passengers. Obviously, many boats were not loaded to full capacity. There were many reasons for this; at first, many women and children were simply unwilling to be lowered 65 feet from the boat deck to the water. Some of the men put in boats were put there simply to show it was safe, and allay the fears of other passengers.

...there was enough lifeboat capacity for ALL women and children (534 persons total), AND 550 men as well. (Total capacity of the boats launched was 1,084.) This explains why, especially as the situation became more urgent, more men were put in the boats. Indeed, if the boat crews had loaded one man for each woman or child loaded, they could have expected to save all women and children, plus as many men.

From an account of the last lifeboat launched from the Titanic:

Collapsible lifeboat D was the ninth and last boat to be lowered from the port side. Second Officer Lightoller had managed to fit the collapsible boat into the now-empty davits of boat 1. He tried to find women to fill it with, but had trouble in finding any. Finally, he said, he managed to fill the boat with 15-20 people...

Mrs. Hoyt gave a concise account of the tragedy to her father. She did not leave her husband’s side until the last boat was being lowered and then she was torn from him and thrown into a boat.
Another woman wasn’t so lucky. She wasn’t physically thrown into a lifeboat, and perished as a result:

On the night of the sinking, Isidor and Ida Straus were seen standing near Lifeboat No. 8 in the company of Mrs. Straus’s maid, Ellen Bird. Although the officer in charge of the lifeboat was willing to allow the elderly couple to board the lifeboat with Miss Bird, Isidor Straus refused to go while there were women and children still remaining on the ship. He urged his wife to board, but she refused, saying, “We have lived together for many years. Where you go, I go.” Her words were witnessed by those already in Lifeboat No. 8 as well as many others who were on the boat deck at the time. Isidor and Ida were last seen standing arm in arm on the deck.

We know from another account of the loading of Lifeboat No. 8 that there was plenty of room for Mr. and Mrs Strauss. We also learn of another woman who survived only because she was physically thrown into the lifeboat. From the Encyclopedia Titanica:

Only twenty women were near the boat, and these were put in. My daughter Ruth was among the first, but I said that I wouldn’t go if my husband did not accompany me. There was room for fourteen more after the last woman had found her place, and they all pleaded to let the men take the empty seats.

“But the Captain said that he would not allow it. I was frantic. There was that boat, ready to be lowered into the water and only half full. Then the order came to lower. The men were pleading for permission to step in, and one came forward to take a place next to his wife. I heard a shot and I am sure it was he that went down.

“Then the boat swung out from the deck. I was still with my husband, and Ruth had already disappeared below the deck. I gave a great cry—I remember perfectly calling out the name of my daughter—and two men tore me from my husband’s side, lifted me, one by the head and one by the feet, and dropped me over the side of the deck into the lowering boat. I struck on the back of my head, but I had furs on, and that fact probably saved me from greater injury.

“The terrible thing was that we had so much room left for the poor men who were snatched away...

The story of the death of Isador Strauss and her husband is indeed a romantic one, but it is not a story of practicality. Had Mr. Strauss not refused to enter the lifeboat, Mrs. Strauss would have been saved. The focus on romance over practicality costs lives, not just of men, but of women and children as well.
Fortunately they had a strong woman to row them to safety.

by Dalrock | June 26, 2018 | Link

In my last post I shared accounts from Lifeboat 8 on the Titanic demonstrating the chaos and loss of life the chivalrous WACF policy caused. Ida Strauss and her husband perished after Isidor chivalrously refused to enter the lifeboat, and his wife refused to be saved while he perished.

He urged his wife to board, but she refused, saying, “We have lived together for many years. Where you go, I go.” Her words were witnessed by those already in Lifeboat No. 8 as well as many others who were on the boat deck at the time. Isidor and Ida were last seen standing arm in arm on the deck.

Mrs. Emil Taussig was only saved because she was physically thrown into the lifeboat:

“Then the boat swung out from the deck. I was still with my husband, and Ruth had already disappeared below the deck. I gave a great cry—I remember perfectly calling out the name of my daughter—and two men tore me from my husband’s side, lifted me, one by the head and one by the feet, and dropped me over the side of the deck into the lowering boat. I struck on the back of my head, but I had furs on, and that fact probably saved me from greater injury.

There was yet another problem with refusing to allow able bodied men to accompany their families in the lifeboats. Someone needed to row the boats.

“When we came on deck,” said Mrs. Taussig, “Capt. Smith was preparing the eighth boat to be let down. There was only one seaman in sight, but a number of stewards had rushed up between the crowding men and women. The Captain turned to the stewards and asked them if they knew how to row. They answered ‘Yes’ hastily, and four of them were allowed to jump in.

“Only twenty women were near the boat, and these were put in. My daughter Ruth was among the first, but I said that I wouldn’t go if my husband did not accompany me. There was room for fourteen more after the last woman had found her place, and they all pleaded to let the men take the empty seats.

... 

[Mrs. Taussig] said that her husband, who was abandoned while the half-filled boat was lowered, was an expert oarsman and volunteered his services to the Captain.

But he was ordered back,” she said, while the four stewards who couldn’t row at all were permitted to jump in.
In another account this is spun as a feelgood story of girlpower coming to the rescue, filling in where feckless men were too incompetent to do the task:

The officers were strict on the port side of the ship and allowed only women passengers to enter the boats. Mrs. Penasco was persuaded to enter it together with her maid, Fermina Oliva. When the lifeboat was in the water, she realized her husband probably would not survived and had to be comforted by the Countess of Rothes. About 20 or 22 ladies had found seats in the boat, including Mrs. Straus’ maid and Mrs. Allison’s maid. There were four crew; two seamen, a steward and a kitchen hand. There were probably about 26 people in the boat. In the words of Mrs. Swift:

Slowly we dropped down, down and down until the keel of our tiny craft struck the sea and the captain shouted to pull over to a red light in the distance...we also began to realize that the seamen were not oarsmen. One was unable to pull the long heavy oar with any strength and Mrs. Swift took his place....the weak and unskilled steward and some of the other men sat quietly in one end of the boat. The countess of Rothes was an expert oarswoman.¹ (New York Herald, Friday, April 19, 1912)

It is interesting to see that over 100 years ago the narrative of strong women taking over for incompetent men was already firmly entrenched. Moreover, the speed with which the narrative changed is astounding. The memory of the chivalric sacrifice of the men left on deck disappeared in a matter of seconds. The instant the lifeboat hit the water, the new girlpower narrative suddenly sprung forth, fully grown.

Titanic’s lifeboats were designed to hold 65 people. Since there were only 26 people on board there was room for another 39 men on Lifeboat 8. But had these 39 men been allowed to board (and survive), we wouldn’t have nearly as romantic a story, and we also wouldn’t have an empowering story of women stepping in and saving the day where feckless men failed.
Sheila Gregoire has a post about a twitter fight she and another Christian feminist (Julie Anne) had with a complementarian Southern Baptist pastor (Steve Camp). Sheila and Julie Anne were defending an article denying headship and instead arguing for mutual submission in marriage. Pastor Camp started off boldly, saying that the women were being emotional, and suggesting he should speak to their husbands instead. In asking to speak to their husbands, Camp was no doubt making an allusion to 1 Cor 14:35 (ESV):

> If there is anything they desire to learn, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church.

Julie Anne immediately sensed the weakness of a complementarian pastor making this allusion, because the verse is despised by complementarians. When it comes to the topic of headship and submission, complementarians teach the opposite of 1 Cor 14:35, insisting that husbands must not instruct their wives. In what appears to be a deleted tweet, Julie Anne reminded Pastor Camp of the complementarian rejection of 1 Cor 14:35, and Camp had no choice but to immediately concede the point:

> **Julie Ann:** BTW, if a woman submits after you tell her to, it's not true submission. Submission comes from the heart. It is not prodded by someone else. It is a natural response when someone is treated lovingly. If your wife (in general) is not submitting, look at self first.

> **PastorSjCamp:** Straw man.

> I've never once said in my entire life that a man should tell a woman to submit- ever.

Shiela’s daughter Rebecca joined the fray and confronted Pastor Camp by asking if he thought women were more easily deceived than men. This was a brilliant strategy, because the complementarian position is that the Apostle Paul was not saying that women were more easily deceived in 1 Tim 2:14.

> Haha… good one!

> Not my wife...

— CAMPONTHIS (@PastorSjCamp) May 30, 2018

As Sheila accurately observed, Pastor Camp never managed to give a straight answer on the question:
At this point, my daughter Rebecca (@lifeasadare) jumped in, asking for a straight answer on one question: **Does Steve Camp believe that women are more easily deceived than men, since he used that as an excuse to end a debate?** The thread is quite illuminating—she keeps asking, he keeps dodging.

Elsewhere fellow complementarian Ron Henzel attempted to jump in and assist, but Julie Anne effortlessly forced Henzel to concede that complementarians don’t believe in hierarchy:

"Hierarchy" has acquired negative connotations in our society, & none of them belong in a marriage. Ideas like tyranny aren't part of the word's definition. In ancient Greece a ἱεράρχης (hierarchēs) was a high priest, a word denoting responsibility as much as authority.

— Ron Henzel (@ronhenzel) May 28, 2018

Sheila took a different tack in her post, and brought in her husband Keith to explain that he is an egalitarian and rejects the very idea of headship and submission:

At one point, Pastor Camp made a comment that he was glad Sheila was going to “allow me to speak”. **This strongly suggests to me that the mindset here is that if I, the husband, am not in charge than clearly she must be.** It is a sad a terrible thought to me that some people see the world this way. Unfortunately, my life experience – including hateful commentary directed at me on Sheila’s blog – has taught me that there really are people out there who think like that.

**For the record, Sheila and I are a team.**

We both submit to God as the Bible teaches. We both submit to each other as the Bible teaches (Eph 5:21). We make decisions together and when we disagree we keep talking, praying and seeking God’s will until we figure it out. If we ever got to the point where we were truly at an impasse, my natural reaction would be to seek Godly counsel from friends, mentors, parents or a pastor. The idea that I would make the decision because “I am the man” is just not in our DNA. I see no Biblical problems with holding this view.

... in what universe is it okay for someone to say, “I'd rather hear your husband’s opinion on this as women are prone to be deceived.”? The thought of saying that would never cross my mind, nor any of the men I know. If a man were to speak like this to a female colleague at work, he would certainly be disciplined and perhaps fired - and appropriately so. But a pastor can say this publicly and no one blinks. **This baffles me.** And it needs to stop

Keith’s insistence that he and Sheila have an egalitarian marriage is a fantasy that only exists
in Keith’s imagination. As Sheila explains in her signature book, she and Keith practice Pastor Doug Wilson’s *wife as despot* model of marriage. Sheila’s job is to give Keith lists of chores. Keith then twirls around the house cleaning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Often men feel superfluous at home, like they don’t even belong, because you manage everything. Make honest requests of him that allow him to help support you and feel involved in building your home...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you want your husband to take responsibility for certain chores on his own, without being asked, you need to find a delegation method that conveys to him what needs to be done without threatening him...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My husband is motivated by lists. If I just tell him I would like him to help clean up after dinner, he doesn’t know what to do. But if there is a list of daily and weekly chores on the fridge, and he can see what is left to be done, he’s like a Tasmanian devil whirling around the house, cleaning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More importantly, there is nothing Pastor Camp can say to rebut Keith’s endorsement of egalitarian marriage. *He* is the one who asked for Sheila’s submissive husband to give his perspective on marriage roles. Moreover, had it turned out that Keith was not submissive to Sheila, Pastor Camp would have to insist that Keith couldn’t weigh in on the topic in front of Sheila, since per complementarian theology husbands can’t instruct their wives on what the Bible says on the topic! But Camp’s problems don’t stop there. He pointed out that Sheila and Julie Anne were being emotional. From the complementarian perspective saying such a thing is *abuse*. Sheila understands this, and cleverly responded to him pointing out that she was being emotional with an emotional appeal to other women:
Sheila then followed up with an appeal to women to rebel against their husbands and pastors if the men don’t toe the Christian feminist line. She specifically invites the women in Pastor Camp’s congregation to rebel against him:
And now a word to my readers:

Steve Camp normally wouldn’t matter. He’s a pastor of a small church with very little influence.

But there are women in his congregation who need to know that they do not need to accept being spoken to like this.

And Steve Camp is part of the Southern Baptist Convention. The SBC obviously has no problem with having their pastors go on Twitter like this. To me, this is part of a larger issue within the SBC, which I’ll be talking about tomorrow in solidarity with those who will be holding a rally asking the SBC to take abuse issues seriously.

Finally, please hear me on this:

If anyone ever tries to silence you because you’re a woman, telling you that you’re emotional, that you’re deceived, that only your husband’s opinion counts—you don’t have to take it.

It is okay to speak up. It’s okay to have opinions. You matter dearly to God, and He created you with your intellect, your giftings, your brain. You are not someone that is to be easily dismissed.

And when you do speak up—know that even if your circle thinks of women that way, most in our culture do not. Many, many men would stand up for you. Many, many women would, too. And if you are in a circle where pastors think it’s okay to speak like this about women—then quite frankly, get out.

How can Camp possibly respond to this? Not only has Sheila called him abusive, but he can’t point out her rebellion because complementarians don’t believe feminism represents a rebellion by women. Complementarians believe that feminism is a logical reaction to patriarchal tyranny. Sheila called him a tyrant, and told the women in his congregation to rebel. There is simply no way a complementarian pastor like Camp can argue against that. If the women in Camp’s congregation take Sheila up on her invitation to rebel, the complementarian answer is for Camp to love and serve them so much that they no longer feel the need to rebel. As fellow complementarian pastor Matt Chandler explains in his sermon Women’s Hurdles, if Sheila can tempt the women in Pastor Camp’s congregation into rebellion, Pastor Camp owes the women an immediate apology:

Really, men, here is a great way to gauge how you’re serving, loving, and practicing your headship. If the most secularized feminist in the world showed up in your home and began to kind of coach your wife toward freedom and liberation from your tyranny, our wives should be so well cared for, so nourished, so sowed into and loved, they would say, “What you’re describing is actually tyranny. I love where I am. I am honored. I am
encouraged. My man sacrifices so that I might grow in my gifts. He will oftentimes lay down his own desires in order to serve me more. My husband goes to bed tired at night. He pours into our children. He encourages me. All that comes out of his mouth, sans a couple of little times here and there, is him building me up in love.”

Men, here is a good opportunity. If you’re like, “Well, gosh, I don’t think she would say that at all,” then, men, I think on the way home, you should probably repent and confess before the Lord to your wife.

H/T OKRickety
As I wrote back in 2015, Sheila Gregoire is clearly obsessed with sex and deeply conflicted about it. When it comes to sex she and her readers have one foot on the gas and the other on the brake. You can see this from her books as well as the posts on her blog. There is a great deal of energy on using sex as a weapon, including when, how, and why to deny sex. The other side to this is all of the energy coming from the deep fear that they will overplay this card and as I described in Frigidity and power, lose their power. What if he watches porn, or even Game of Thrones while I’m denying sex? Then my V will lose its power over him! How do I overcome my own frigidity? If I’m frigid, my V has no power!

They’ve turned having sex into a Rube Goldberg contraption. But all of this works because the audience is already there. They already know how to use sex as a weapon, and they already have deep fears that by doing this they risk losing the very power they are trying to wield.

Sheila has a recent post that touches on this deep seated fear; what if years of manipulation and nagging result in her readers’ husbands no longer desiring them sexually? The post is a guest post by a sex therapist, and it has clearly struck a nerve. Click through and check out the comments for a jarring look into the mindframe of the ugly feminist. Then remember that Sheila’s readers came to this place after deciding that they were wiser than the Bible:

3 Likewise, wives, be subject to your own husbands, so that even if some do not obey the word, they may be won without a word by the conduct of their wives, 2 when they see your respectful and pure conduct. 3 Do not let your adorning be external—the braiding of hair and the putting on of gold jewelry, or the clothing you wear— 4 but let your adorning be the hidden person of the heart with the imperishable beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which in God’s sight is very precious. 5 For this is how the holy women who hoped in God used to adorn themselves, by submitting to their own husbands, 6 as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord. And you are her children, if you do good and do not fear anything that is frightening.

–1 Pet 3 1-6, ESV

Sheila and her readers just knew that the Bible’s instruction to wives was the prescription for a miserable marriage. What they needed instead was a marriage built on carefully guarded feminist equality. If they only had equality, they would have a blissful marriage.
What to do when the tingles wane.
by Dalrock | July 5, 2018 | Link

In modern Christian theology, the wife’s vagina is God’s messenger. If a woman isn’t sexually attracted to her husband it is a sign of God’s displeasure in her husband.

Sheila Gregoire has adopted the same modern Christian teaching, and brings in Gary Thomas* to urge wives to listen to the voice of God that resides between their legs. The title of the post is Wifey Wednesday: When Your Marriage is in Trouble, Do Something! It closes with:

Initial romantic intensity is unearned; it seems to fall on us out of nowhere. But a solid, lasting marriage has to be built (and sometimes rebuilt) stone by stone. You married a fallen man and that means the time will come when you need to become an active woman to confront the weaknesses you see in yourself and your husband.

As daunting as this might seem, here’s the hope behind it: the current challenges in your marriage may well be God’s vehicle for you to become the strong woman he created you to be. Maybe you grew up with an overly passive view of being a woman. Maybe you’ve always let people run over you and allowed things to happen rather than to rise up and unleash the power that is yours as a woman not only created in the image of God, but filled with His Holy Spirit.

This challenge, as scary and painful as it might be, could be the doorway to new growth, new maturity and a new woman who more closely resembles the character of Jesus Christ.

Gregoire urges her readers to tweet:

The current challenges in your marriage may well be God’s vehicle for you to become the strong woman he created you to be. – Gary Thomas, Loving Him Well

While teaching wives to make an idol of their own vaginas, the post warns women that following the instruction of 1 Pet 3:1-6 would be a sin, as it would make an idol of marriage and their husbands.

God made you, as a woman, to rule in this world, to subdue it, to act according to his image.

*Readers may remember Thomas from this post.
Vashti’s daughters.
by Dalrock | July 6, 2018 | Link

3 Wives, likewise, be submissive to your own husbands, that even if some do not obey the word, they, without a word, may be won by the conduct of their wives, 2 when they observe your chaste conduct accompanied by fear. 3 Do not let your adornment be merely outward—arranging the hair, wearing gold, or putting on fine apparel— 4 rather let it be the hidden person of the heart, with the [a]incorruptible beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is very precious in the sight of God. 5 For in this manner, in former times, the holy women who trusted in God also adorned themselves, being submissive to their own husbands, 6 as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord, whose daughters you are if you do good and are not afraid with any terror.

— 1 Pet 3:1-6 NKJV

Sheila Gregoire’s latest post doubles down on the idea that wives who submit to their husbands are in sin for making their husband/marriage an idol. Gregoire holds up Vashti in the Book of Ester as a role model for Christian wives:

Just because the king and his nobles thought that encouraging discord among wives was evil does not mean that God thought encouraging discord among wives was evil...

I believe that the rush to demonize Vashti is rooted in an unhealthy view of marriage, where obedience to a husband is seen as the greatest good, and sowing discord among wives as the greatest evil.

No, the greatest evil is substituting something else in the place for God.

Sheila’s guest poster Gary Thomas made a similar case in Wifey Wednesday: When Your Marriage is in Trouble, Do Something! Thomas argued that wives who feared divorce were in sin, as they were guilty of making an idol of marriage and their husbands:

Let’s apply some simple theology here. Who does the Bible say is your refuge — God, or your husband? Deuteronomy 33:27 provides the answer: “The eternal God is your refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms.”

In whom does your hope lie? Your husband’s continuing affection? First Peter 1:21 says, “Your faith and hope are in God.”

Where will you find your security? You and your husband’s ability to earn a living and your husband’s commitment to stay married to you? Philippians 4:19 answers, “My God will meet all your needs according to his glorious riches in Christ Jesus.”
Where will you find supreme acceptance that will never fade or falter for all the days of your life? “As a bridegroom rejoices over his bride,” replies Isaiah 62:5, “so will your God rejoice over you.”

If you’re trying to find your primary refuge in your husband, if you’ve centered your hope on him, if your security depends on his approval, and if you will do almost anything to gain his acceptance, **then you’ve just given to a man what rightfully belongs to God alone.**

And that means you’ve turned marriage into idol worship.

This is a clever feminist reframe of Scripture, because it makes submission a sin and rebellion a virtue. As clever as the argument is, it is not valid. Despite modern Christians wanting to make Abigail or Vashti the role model for Christian wives, Peter tells us in 1 Pet 3 that Christian wives should emulate Sarah. Sarah is famous for submitting to her husband Abraham’s foolish instruction that she tell the Pharaoh she was Abraham’s sister. Sarah complied, and but for the direct intervention of God it would have lead to catastrophe (Gen 12:15-20, ESV):

> And the woman was taken into Pharaoh’s house. 16 And for her sake he dealt well with Abram; and he had sheep, oxen, male donkeys, male servants, female servants, female donkeys, and camels.

17 But the Lord afflicted Pharaoh and his house with great plagues because of Sarai, Abram’s wife. 18 So Pharaoh called Abram and said, “What is this you have done to me? Why did you not tell me that she was your wife? Why did you say, ‘She is my sister,’ so that I took her for my wife? Now then, here is your wife; take her, and go.” 20 And Pharaoh gave men orders concerning him, and they sent him away with his wife and all that he had.

Abraham did this not once, but twice! The same basic thing happened earlier in the same chapter:

> And Abraham said of Sarah his wife, “She is my sister.” And Abimelech king of Gerar sent and took Sarah. 3 But God came to Abimelech in a dream by night and said to him, “Behold, you are a dead man because of the woman whom you have taken, for she is a man’s wife.” 4 Now Abimelech had not approached her. So he said, “Lord, will you kill an innocent people? 5 Did he not himself say to me, ‘She is my sister’? And she herself said, ‘He is my brother.’ In the integrity of my heart and the innocence of my hands I have done this.” 6 Then God said to him in the dream, “Yes, I know that you have done this in the integrity of your heart, and it was I who kept you from sinning against me. Therefore I did not let you touch her. 7 Now then, return the man’s wife, for he is a prophet, so that he will pray for you, and you shall live. But if you do not return her, know that you shall surely die, you and all who are yours.”

Gen 20:10-11 tells us that Abraham told Sarah to do this because he he feared for his own
safety (when he should have trusted God):

10 And Abimelech said to Abraham, “What did you see, that you did this thing?” 11 Abraham said, “I did it because I thought, ‘There is no fear of God at all in this place, and they will kill me because of my wife.’

The Apostle Peter is clearly referencing these incidents when he tells Christian wives to submit to their husbands even when doing so is terrifying:

6 as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord, whose daughters you are if you do good and are not afraid with any terror.

Moreover, Scripture repeatedly instructs wives to submit to their husbands and view them with fear and reverence.

But the Apostle Peter’s clear instructions are detestable to modern Christians’ feminist sensibilities. Not only have modern Christians rebelled against Peter and Paul’s instruction, but they have created a new rule which says that instead of submitting to their husbands wives need to set and enforce boundaries. Setting and enforcing boundaries is incidentally only something that modern Christians believe wives should do to their husbands. You will never see a modern Christian insisting that husbands set and enforce boundaries for their wives.

Related:

- **Boundaries**
- **Abigail’s daughters**.

See also Cane Caldo’s You Bowed Up When You Should Have Bowed Down for a discussion of the application of submission when a husband instructs his wife to do evil.

H/T Hose_B
Who cares that Misty has a bigger dick than Colleen?

by Dalrock | July 9, 2018 | Link

I watched part of the first episode of the new season of Luke Cage the other day. Misty Knight and Colleen Wing were in the lead up to the obligatory one armed woman beats up a bar full of men scene, and were (as custom requires) verbally establishing their manhood. Misty establishes that she’s one of the boys via a try hard reference to the bolt pattern and water pump configuration she would have on her fantasy muscle car. Colleen, knowing that she’s been bested in the women pretending to be men contest, concedes that Misty has a bigger dick than she does.

If you have Netflix, I encourage you to scan through to the beginning of the bar scene just for laughs. If you do, you will see that the feminist writers are deadly serious in this. They really think that women talking about how they are like men (including having dicks) makes women like men.

The interesting thing is that we live in a culture where women claiming to have dicks isn’t really noteworthy. Feminism has been building up to this moment for decades, and the line between dressing Amelia Earhart like Lindbergh and having a man pilot her over the Atlantic and women bragging about the size of their dicks is an easy path to trace. You could even argue that feminists had no choice in the matter, as this is only congruent with a world where women must be included in our combat forces. Yet unlike with Earhart, the response is a yawn; feminists have been hinting at the size of their dicks for quite some time. This has to be a terrible let down, because a lot of work went into achieving a milestone practically no one will notice.

Meanwhile conservatives, especially Christian conservatives, spend all of their effort trying to figure out why men have suddenly and mysteriously changed, despite women behaving splendidly. This has to be extremely frustrating for feminists. Misty and Colleen could both whip out 10 inch phalluses, and while the feminists in the audience would squeal in delight, conservatives would either not notice or ask:

What happened to our men that our women are forced to have such big dicks?
How big was her dick?

by Dalrock | July 11, 2018 | Link

The Chicago Tribune has an article about a woman who stabbed a man on a city bus and then followed him (with her knife) when he got off the bus. It isn’t clear from the account if she was able to continue stabbing the man during her pursuit, or if she was only able to stab him while he was still on the bus. However, it does say that her attack left him in critical condition.

After he got off the bus (followed by his attacker), the man managed to wrestle the knife away from his attacker and fatally stab her. The headline reads: 2 stabbed, 1 fatally, after argument on CTA bus

A female was killed and a man critically injured after the two stabbed each other following an argument that began on a CTA bus on the South Side, Chicago police said.

A commenter at Second City Cop asked:

Who is the victim? ☹

This is an excellent question, because the Chicago Tribune has gone to torturous lengths to frame the attacker as a victim. We don’t know if the man she stabbed was a current or former romantic partner, but if he was according to the Duluth model (the model we train our police in) the man who was attacked, fled, and then ultimately fought back would be the aggressor.

Feminist doublethink would have us accept that women have dicks and are so tough that a one armed woman can easily beat up a bar full of men. It would simultaneously have us see a woman who stabs a man and then chases after him when he tries to get away as a victim and not an aggressor.
A tour through the twisted psyche of an ugly feminist.
by Dalrock | July 18, 2018 | Link

From The Seven Stages of a Woman's Scorn:

Speaking just for myself, I’m sure I was open-hearted at one point, but I can’t for the life of me remember when that was or when my heart started to harden. I do remember a defining moment in my development, circa 1998. I was broken and determined to never be dependent on a man for anything ever again—a feeling that was greatly aided by the release of the movie version of Great Expectations. Gwyneth Paltrow’s character instantly became my hero. I wanted to be an untouchable man-eater and kill my feelings, too.

Follow the link to take the full tour. Either way, don’t worry; she’s living well:

Yet, if I’m be completely honest (and not glib), my scorn isn’t something that flares up on a case-by-case basis. It’s cumulative, and if left unchecked, it will harden my heart over a lifetime. My scorn comes with baggage. It comes with my daddy issues. It comes with unreturned text messages, defiance and the idea that it’s “me against the world.”

At its core, my scorn comes with a deep-seated feeling of worthlessness that I’ve been running from my whole life. And it’s taken me 20 years of self-reflection and work to get to a point where I can detach—and not in an unhealthy “you’re dead to me” way, but in a loving way—because after all, the best revenge truly is a life well lived.

H/T Instapundit.

Related: Feminists are ugly.
Dreaming of being one of the guys.

by Dalrock | July 23, 2018 | Link

Advertisers often sell us aspirational views of ourselves. They sell us our own dreams. One of our greatest collective aspirations is for women to become like men. LaQuinta motels taps into this dream with the following ad:

Rival chain Motel 6 is selling the same dream. Women who stay here will be one of the guys!
Hysteria.
by Dalrock | July 23, 2018 | Link

Lori Alexander set the Christian Feminists clucking with her recent post Men Prefer Debt-Free Virgins Without Tattoos. The furious response was entirely predictable precisely because what Lori wrote is true. Feminists can’t stand the idea of giving young women good advice on how to compete for the best husbands, as this puts the feminist dream of having it all in jeopardy.

Sheila Gregoire was as mad as a wet hen when she read Lori’s post and responded with a post of her own:

- **Is it a good idea to wait until you’re married to have sex?** Yes, it is. It’s certainly what God wants, but I believe He wants that for our good, not because He’s just making a rule.

  That being said, **virginity is not the be all and end all**. And, in fact, ultimately virginity means nothing. It’s just a pile of horse manure.

  ...

  I’ve answered the question on the blog before about “is it wrong to want to marry a virgin?”, and I think if I were to answer that today I’d be even more adamant.

Sheila also objected to Lori warning young Christian women of the dangers of the secular university:

- Yesterday my daughter Rebecca and my son-in-law Connor celebrated their third anniversary. Here they are at Rebecca’s university graduation (Lori Alexander says women shouldn’t go to secular universities, either. Whoops. Guess Rebecca messed up there, too!)

  Yet Sheila knows all too well that what Lori is warning is true. As she explained back in 2011, her feminist education wreaked havoc on her marriage:

  ...I’ve done a Masters in Sociology with an emphasis on Women’s Studies, too. I’ve read all that feminist literature that calls all sex rape, and while it totally messed up my sex life in the early part of my marriage, I’ve thankfully been able to leave it behind and realize how great sex in marriage is.

Sheila went into more detail on this in one of her books:

- Whenever Keith wanted to make love, I felt rejected, because he wanted something that made me miserable. My frustration finally grew to the point where I wondered, Why can’t he just love me for me and not for what I can do for him? I accused him of selfishness. Of not loving me. Of being a Neanderthal who couldn’t control his
passions. The more we fought over sex, the more certain I became that he didn’t value me...

...how was I supposed to enjoy something so gross and uncomfortable?

...the only solution I could see was to make Keith want sex less. I threw my energy into that dead-end goal: I bought a wardrobe of long flannel nightgowns; I complained constantly about headaches; and I stopped kissing in all its forms.

Sheila says she did this for two years before she started working on her own mindset. A few more years later and she tells us that everything was fine. However, we know from her blog that it still wasn’t fine.

Sheila closes her post with:

Neither of my girls followed Lori’s advice. But they did follow mine. And they’re all doing great.

To emphasis how sensible and well adjusted her daughters are, Sheila included a youtube video of her daughter Katie having a full fledged meltdown:

H/T OKRickety

Related: If she can’t demand a husband then how do we expect her to demand salvation?
The Federalist is outraged at blatant Christian legalism when it comes to selecting a spouse:  
Women Prefer Physically Fit Men With Good Jobs And No Criminal Record

Recently, there have been a lot of objections in the evangelical blogosphere over a highly offensive article headlined “Men prefer debt free virgins without tattoos.” I agree with these criticisms of this poorly written and highly misogynistic diatribe.

When selecting a mate, Christian men have no right to consider how women have treated their bodies or bank accounts in the past. If they have repented, all of that is erased, along with the consequences. Jesus accepts these women just as they are, and potential suitors should, too.

Do you see that doughy 28-year-old who dropped out of community college a decade ago, whose reading forays petered out at Ayn Rand and “Starship Troopers,” and who cried all the way home from the county jail after his dad posted bail following last year’s grow-room incident? Christian ladies, if this man now confesses Jesus, he should be no lower on your list of potential husbands than the handsome architecture graduate with a well-used gym membership who just showed up at church. If he is, the problem is with you and the legalism that lives in your heart.

God accepts everyone who repents of past sins. Therefore, if a man squanders his young adult years on pizza, porn, and “Call of Duty” quickscoping matches, a woman has no right to take these behaviors or their lasting consequences into account when evaluating him as a potential mate. He has a clean slate with God, and that means he should have a clean slate on the dating market, too.

Grace means that the man who has shown years of sound work ethic, perseverance, financial wisdom, and spiritual maturity should be no better off in others’ estimation of attractiveness or husband-potential than the man who just gave his life to Christ after pouring his twenties down a black hole of intoxicated, masturbatory indolence.

H/T Instapundit.

Related: Hysteria
The cost of sluthood.
by Dalrock | July 26, 2018 | Link

Note: I don’t think I’ve ever reposted a previous blog post before, but with the Christian feminist outrage over Lori Alexander’s sensible advice to young Christian women on how to compete for the best husbands I think this post from April of 2011 is worth reposting. The post itself seems to have aged quite well, but I suspect this isn’t the case for some of the links.

——— Begin repost ————

Paige commented on the Doomed Harlot is a slut! post that sex positive feminists harm less attractive women by pointing out that the prettiest women don’t pay a price for promiscuity:

Alte has mentioned several times here and at her blog a very important truth when it comes to feminists and the sex-positive.

Not all women are as genetically privileged as other women. Woman A. maybe very pretty, very smart, very charming, and very accomplished. She can 1. be relatively content as a single woman and 2. probably get a man regardless of her behavior.

Woman B. is not very attractive, not very smart, and not very accomplished. Her only hope of a life outside of poverty (because she can only get a job in the service industry) is having a man to help take care of her. If she makes many poor choices it will take her out of the marriage market for all but the lowest quality men.

This is an interesting point, but I think it is even worse. Even a very pretty woman is likely to pay a price for being known as promiscuous. Commenter J mentioned how she met her husband on Susan Walsh’s post The Importance of Location in Relationship Strategy:

I was introduced to my husband in a bar at the b’day party of a friend of a friend. It was really kismet as I had never been in the bar before and hadn’t really wanted to go to the party. My husband checked out my previous history at the bar (or rather my lack thereof) with some of the regulars BEFORE he maneuvered an introduction to me.

I mentioned to J on that same thread that had her husband received a different answer, she could well be posting as an unmarried woman fully convinced that her promiscuity had nothing to do with her life’s outcome:

My point was you never know who you might turn away. Had your husband received a different answer, from what he told you you wouldn’t have ever met him. Instead of a happily married mother of two wonderful sons, you could theoretically be another single woman on this board telling young women that men don’t care about your number so they may as well slut while the slutting is good. And if we hooked this alternate universe you up to a lie detector she would pass because she would
have no idea that the man of her dreams had joined into another conversation instead of approaching her that otherwise uneventful day all of those years ago.

This is a point that I think nearly all sex positive feminists miss. This same topic came up in another post by Susan Walsh titled I Earned a Denunciation from NOW. Sex positive feminist commenter switchintoglide declared that her promiscuity hadn’t factored in her relationships with men (emphasis mine):

I’ve been with the same man for four years now in a mostly monogamous relationship, and I can tell you that our relationship was built on a negotiation of dreams, goals, lifestyles, cohabiting, non-monogamy/monogamy, sexual orientation/bisexuality, and all sorts of other things that arise in a long term relationship between equals. I don’t however, remember haggling over the price of my sluthood.

To explain the issue to her, I offered the following analogy:

When we bought our house it had really tacky wallpaper in the kitchen and master bath. It had been on the market for a year despite being reduced to a very attractive price compared to similar homes. My wife wouldn’t consider it at first until I explained that we could do what we wanted with those two rooms. Finally she imagined the home how we would change it and she started to really like the house. We got a great deal on the house, but we never haggled on the price of the tacky wallpaper. That would have been unkind of us. A year on the market with no offers forced the seller to first come down on the price all on their own and then accept our offer of a somewhat lower price than asking.

Women who pay a price for being perceived as promiscuous are highly unlikely to recognize that this is even happening. Furthermore, the idea that really beautiful women can get away with taking a hit to their marriage and/or relationship value only makes sense from the point of view of a less attractive woman. No matter how pretty a woman is, she is going to want the most attractive man she can get. A man whom a really pretty woman finds attractive is by definition a man with options. And men with options can afford to be choosy. As we have seen across the manosphere, alpha men are some of the most reluctant to commit to a promiscuous woman. They won’t turn down a pump and dump, but they typically don’t see promiscuous women as marriage material. The problem will seem to her that men are “afraid to commit” and need to man up. Whatever her perceived reason, a pretty woman who can’t attract the kind of man she yearns for is no less unhappy than a woman of average attractiveness in the same boat.

Clouding the issue further is the widespread misunderstanding of what drives attraction for women. The promiscuous pretty woman may ultimately settle for a guy who on paper looks perfect. He might be tall, handsome, have a great job... and be very beta. The fact that her mother and aunts all think she found a great catch doesn’t make the fact that she isn’t attracted to him any less painful. Even worse, by riding the alpha carousel she raised her required threshold for alpha much higher than it would have been. Where greater beta might have been sufficient for a woman of her beauty, she now has developed a taste for full alpha.
I thought about the phenomenon of the perfect on paper only man when reading the WSJ piece My Perfect Honeymoon (That I Spent Alone) (H/T Welmer). In that article author and feminist Jennifer Belle smugly brags about leaving her husband behind on their honeymoon:

But my passport wasn’t missing. I had wedding money and an airplane ticket. So while he stayed home and called his mother to see if she had his birth certificate and made desperate plans to join me as soon as possible, I flew to Venice.

Doing just a bit of research, I found that Ms. Belle was writing about an event which occurred nine years ago when she was 34. On paper her husband would have seemed to be a perfect catch. He had a high status job as an entertainment lawyer. Their combined status as a couple lead to the New York Times writing a two page article about their wedding. Her mother and aunts must have been proud! However, Mr. Kent’s faults from an attractiveness point of view are featured prominently in that same wedding announcement. They open the piece by poking fun at his height. He’s 5-foot-4, even when he’s claiming to be an inch taller, which he sometimes does. Even Aunt Edna must have cringed at that one. But still, a short man can do quite well if he has good enough game.

This is where it gets worse; the wedding announcement goes into detail about how he failed her shit testing on their very first date:

But when a playwright came by and offered “money” for her to kiss his ear, she negotiated for less money to kiss the writer’s neck — and did. “To make Andy jealous,” she said.

Mr. Krents, who friends say has always acted 20 years older than his age, became slightly unglued. “Here we were just getting to know each other,” he said, “and you don’t know if you’re even going to get to a second date, and here are people doing unspeakable things that you do on the fourth or fifth dates.”

That can’t have done anything good for her tingle, but it would seem she didn’t have any better options. They continued dating and then she brought him into her world:

A year later, Mr. Krents moved into Ms. Belle’s Greenwich Village apartment, where she freed the child within him, the boy who always wanted his own bulldog. They bought Sammy, a French bulldog.

I’m sure if you asked Ms. Belle, she would swear neither her sluthood nor her bitchy feminism had cost her anything when it came time to marry.

I’m also guessing she would change the subject and plug her new novel, The Seven Year Bitch.
Earlier this week Pastor Doug Wilson published a post titled: On a Wife Deciding to Leave Her Husband. What most readers likely won’t notice is that Wilson has created a truly novel reading of 1 Cor 7. Wilson explains that when the Apostle Paul commands wives not to leave their husbands, he was really telling wives they were free to leave their husbands if they felt justified in doing so (all emphasis mine):

It is interesting here that Paul advises a woman not to leave if she can help it—“the wife should not separate from her husband.” That is his apostolic counsel, but it is clear from the context that it is merely advice. If she sees that his generally good advice is not pertinent to her situation, she is left free to leave without being hassled about it by the apostle. So if he would leave you alone in this decision, then so should the elders of your church.

It is also interesting that Paul does not here get into the grounds for the separation. If there are not grounds for a divorce that allows for a subsequent remarriage, the church doesn’t adjudicate it. If the parties are willing, the church must provide pastoral counsel, but if there is simply a separation over intractable differences, Paul just allows for the separation, even though it may be one that has gone against his counsel—he did in fact urge the wife not to separate from her husband. Note also that it is the wife he is exhorting in this passage, meaning that in the larger scheme of things, he is assuming that wives could have plausible reasons for thinking they had to go. Husbands can be brutal, as the apostle knew.

For reference, here is the Scripture where Wilson says the Apostle Paul tells wives they are free to separate from their husbands if they see fit (NIV):

10 To the married I give this command (not I, but the Lord): A wife must not separate from her husband. 11 But if she does, she must remain unmarried or else be reconciled to her husband. And a husband must not divorce his wife.

It gets worse. Not only does Wilson claim that when Scripture says “Don’t do this” it really means “you are free to do this”, he then takes it a step further and claims that Scripture (and God) is urging wives to separate from their husbands if they feel their husband is sinning. Don’t do this becomes you are commanded to do this!

And so, given what you have described, my counsel would be for you to go. If you are concerned for your husband’s salvation—as you should be—you are far more likely to be used as an instrument to bring him to repentance as you pursue obedience to God this way. For the rest, leave the consequences to God. “For what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband” (1 Cor. 7:16).

Here is the relevant Scripture, in context (NIV):
12 To the rest I say this (I, not the Lord): If any brother has a wife who is not a believer and she is willing to live with him, he must not divorce her. 13 And if a woman has a husband who is not a believer and he is willing to live with her, she must not divorce him. 14 For the unbelieving husband has been sanctified through his wife, and the unbelieving wife has been sanctified through her believing husband. Otherwise your children would be unclean, but as it is, they are holy.

15 But if the unbeliever leaves, let it be so. The brother or the sister is not bound in such circumstances; God has called us to live in peace. 16 How do you know, wife, whether you will save your husband? Or, how do you know, husband, whether you will save your wife?

Wilson has taken an exhortation to remain together and twisted it to an exhortation to separate! As I wrote in the opening, very few of his readers are likely to notice this. A plain reading of Scripture is a dangerous thing for complementarians, so Wilson reversing the meaning of Scripture will be a welcome relief for many*. Holding to a plain reading of 1 Pet 3 (among other charges) recently caused Dr. Paige Patterson to be hounded from his position as president of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. Thankfully Pastor Wilson ignores 1 Pet 3 entirely in his analysis of a wife’s proper response to a sinning husband, and thereby limits his violence to 1 Cor 7 and a creative interpretation of Deut. 23:15.

*For those who weren’t already hungering for an interpretation that reversed the plain instructions of Scripture, Wilson is forced to rely on sheer volume of pretzel logic.

H/T JF & 7817
If she can’t demand a husband then how do we expect her to demand salvation?

by Dalrock | July 29, 2018 | Link

Lori Alexander quoted my post as well as many of the replies in her recent post What Men Thought of My Viral Post. One woman responded to this most recent post by explaining that since she deserves salvation even though she is a sinner, she likewise deserves the husband she desires regardless of how she has (or has not) prepared to become a wife (emphasis mine):

Whether I have or have not gone to college, had sex before marriage, acquired debt, gotten a tattoo, etc. does not make me any less worthy of the sacrificial love of Jesus Christ, so what right does any earthly man (or woman) have to call me less than worthy to simply be his wife due to the same criteria?! Christ > humanity. Be careful that you preach Christ and not your own ideals.

I had never put this together before. The modern Christian women who threw fits in response to Lori Alexander’s original post feel entitled to a husband because they see this as their birthright. They are daughters of the King most high. Consider how Wendy Griffith recounts her reaction to a man politely declining her romantic advance in her popular book You Are a Prize to be Won!: Don’t Settle for Less Than God’s Best

He was my age, handsome and a single Christian like I was, and after a whirl-wind day of interviews and a few laughs, I rationalized that it would be fine to ask him to have dinner with me instead of dining alone. His response was not what I had been expecting: “I have to go to the gym.”

I felt sick! It was as if someone had punched me in the stomach... Discouraged and a little mad at myself, I drove back to the hotel alone, when suddenly I heard the unmistakable voice of the Lord in my spirit. He whispered so clearly to me, Wendy, you are a prize to be won!

I knew the Lord’s voice, and I knew that He was speaking to me about my value. I didn’t need to be the one pursuing in a relationship or running around like a chicken with my head cut off, looking for love in all the wrong places. God has my man, and that man is going to recognize me as his prize! And the same goes for you.

Unfortunately, I have had to learn this lesson the hard way.

Pearl of Great Price

Ladies, the Lord wants you to know that you are a pearl of great price, a treasure worth pursuing and protecting. You are worth fighting for and, like the pearl in the parable at the head of this chapter, worth everything it might cost a guy to obtain you. You are worth someone sacrificing his time, his routine, his comfort, his money,
his whatever in order to have you. You are worth it! You are a prize to be won. Don’t settle for Crumbs.

Griffith’s and millions of other modern Christian women’s outrageous sense of entitlement stems from their fundamental misunderstanding of our relationship to Christ and the very nature of His sacrifice. We don’t deserve the sacrifice He made for us. We are utterly unworthy. If we deserved forgiveness for our sins Christ’s sacrifice would not have been needed. Nor would we have reason to forever thank and praise Him for what He has done for us, since He would have merely been treating us as we deserved.
Complementarian contempt for the servant’s heart.

by Dalrock | July 30, 2018 | Link

As I’ve noted before complementarians use an especially cynical term to deny headship. The term is *servant leader*, and while the individual words are right, the meaning of the phrase is **not headship**. But the cynicism of the term goes even farther. Complementarians use the term servant leader as a way to con men and women who have servant’s hearts into rejecting biblical roles in marriage. The reason this is so cynical is the complementarians themselves have disdain for men and women with servant’s hearts.

The term involves a subtle bait and switch that begins with the implication that anyone who objects to the term doesn’t believe that leaders can be servants. Complementarians know that would-be biblical husbands believe that there is no contradiction in a leader also being a servant. By coining this new term to replace biblical headship, complementarians are challenging traditional Christian men to affirm that leadership and service can coexist in the same role. The cynical brilliance of this strategy is that complementarians themselves *don’t* believe this. Complementarians don’t believe that leadership is a form of service. They see leadership and service as a zero sum game. They think at any given time a husband can either be leading or serving, but not both. This is why complementarians talk of a servant leader being **99% servant, 1% leader**. It is also why if anyone brings up the topic of leadership, they will say a husband needs to focus **instead** on service.

Less subtle is the complementarian disgust for Christians with a servant’s heart. Being *servile*, or being a *servant*, are disgusting things in the eyes of the complementarian. This may seem counter intuitive given the complementarian focus on husbands-as-servants, but this is due to complementarians adopting the mind frame of the ugly feminist. Complementarians want men to serve not because it is godly, but because they imagine that being a servant is *humiliating*, and they want to humiliate men. You can see the truth of this when complementarians use the same terms in reference to wives. Suddenly the mask slips, and complementarians admit their disgust for one who has a servant’s heart.

As Pastor Doug Wilson **likes to say**:

| If a wife is a servant or a dominatrix, the husband needs to confess his sin |

The same sentiment is expressed in the **CBMW founding statement**, albeit with slightly different terms. According to the Danvers Statement, a wife must forever be on her guard not to become *servile*.

**Related:** [It tastes better that way](http://www.thereadarchive.com).

www.TheRedArchive.com
What happened to our men that our women are forced to have such big dicks?

by Dalrock | July 31, 2018 | Link

As I noted the other day, the latest incarnation of ugly feminism is women claiming to have dicks. The BBC has jumped on this trend with an article titled Big D*ck Energy: one woman’s guide to getting it.

Challenging this ever more open rebellion by women is terrifying to Conservative Christians, who instead respond to women celebrating their (imagined) big dicks by asking:

| What happened to our men that our women are forced to have such big dicks?

Related:

- Fathers are jokes.
- Step up, so they don’t have to (part 1).
- Step up, so they don’t have to (part 2).
- Christian goddess worship: we are not worthy!
- Maybe in a thousand years.

H/T: S. Chan & Jones
Mad Dog Chandler on Toxic Masculinity.
by Dalrock | August 1, 2018 | Link

The #metoo era is dangerous because the rules of what is permissible are very quickly changing. This is especially dangerous for complementarians because complementarians earn their living in the margins of what feminists are trying to destroy. This June we saw Dr. Paige Patterson rejected and discredited in the complementarian world because of past statements he made in support of 1 Cor 7 and 1 Pet 3. Those statements were on the extreme edge of acceptable complementarian thought when he made them, but in 2018 they are entirely unacceptable. This has left complementarian leaders scrambling to signal that they aren’t like Dr. Patterson. Just last week we witnessed Pastor Doug Wilson engage in a major rewrite of 1 Cor 7.

The problem for complementarians is they have to live in the margins of feminism, because their whole point of existence is to serve as feminism’s loyal opposition. This forces complementarians to engage in a series of ridiculous contortions as feminists continue to advance their agenda. Complementarians can’t blame feminist rebellion, or even (for the most part) feminism itself for the radical changes we are observing, because they are terrified of angering the feminist Christian women who surround them. Thus when women insisted on entering all areas of our armed forces in the name of equality, complementarians were forced to pretend that women were reluctantly filling roles that men were refusing to fill.

One way complementarians were able to resolve the inherent conflict in their position just a few years ago was to engage in what I’ve referred to as cartoonish chivalry. Cartoonish chivalry involved a caricature of manhood that was carefully crafted to not offend the feminists in the pews. For example, see Pastor Chandler’s 2014 sermon A Beautiful Design (Part 3)–Man’s Purpose. Pastor Chandler explained that it wasn’t leadership that made men different, because women are designed to lead as men are.

When I was trying to draw up a sentence on the unique responsibility of men, I wanted to, as best I could, stay away from the word lead. I’ll tell you why. I think men do lead, and they do lead in a unique way. I also know women who can lead and who do lead. In fact, I’ve come across some women who are bosses. Do you know what I’m saying? I mean, they get stuff done. They lead. They put together teams. They help those teams function rightly, and they lead out. So saying that a man leads as a kind of attribute of manhood that is not true about women would be incorrect.

What made men different back in 2014 was men’s cartoonish hyper-macho love for violence in the protection of women. Anything less, and you aren’t a real man:

As a single man, you image headship with borrowed authority by serving and protecting women as sisters. Let me unpack that. I have an older sister and a younger sister. Here was a frequent conversation my daddy had with me. “Buddy, at school, you look out for your sisters. If some other guy is messing with your sisters, I
want you to tell a teacher. If that teacher will not listen, I want you to punch them in their face and keep punching and keep punching and keep punching until an adult drags you off of that little boy. When they drag you off, what I want you to do is be like, ‘Get off me! Get off me!’ You go back at them until they... There needs to be a healthy kind of fear of you when it comes to your sisters. You protect them.”

...

Our masculinity comes out in the fight, not in peacetime but in fight. Again, it’s why the lazy men are so destructive to human flourishing. They want it to be fair. It’s not fair. You don’t want fair. You haven’t been designed for it. Think of the movies we like to watch. We want the fight. We want our lives to matter. We want to lay it down. We love Saving Private Ryan, everybody getting shot up on the beach. We want to run up on that beach with them. It’s in us.

Brothers, you’ve been called to this. Anything less than this is outside of design and purpose.

But this was back in 2014. What was loved by complementarian women back then is now seen as toxic masculinity. This means that the definition of the timeless essence of manhood must yet again be changed. As Pastor Chandler explained in his February 2018 sermon Manhood Restored, the new timeless essence of manhood involves rejecting violence and machismo in all forms, and getting in touch with your feelings:

What we’re talking about today is extremely important, and I think it comes at a time in our culture where there are two predominate false narratives that are killing us. The first false narrative is what I’ll call the machismo narrative. If you’re my age or older, I would almost guarantee you grew up with this. Here’s what I wrote: “Machismo severs the emotions and sets up sexual conquest and athletic prowess as measures of masculinity.”

If you grew up with a dad who was like, “Quit crying! Suck it up! Be a man! Men don’t act like that. Quit acting like your sister,” all of that is machismo nonsense. Brothers, anybody grow up in that house? “Quit crying. Quit feeling what you feel. Men don’t feel; we do.” It’s machismo. It’s ridiculous. It’s toxic to the male soul, destroys human flourishing, and teaches that brute force and violence, as well as misogyny, are masculine. It’s a lie. It’s killing us.

...

Our dads aren’t evil men. They had given themselves over to a picture of masculinity
that's very, very popular and yet wrong. “Suck it up. Don’t feel. Quit crying. Men don’t cry.” Gosh, that cuts out Jesus. It cuts out King David. If you would like to go one-on-one with King David, manly man, all my cash is on him. It ain’t a lot, but I’m going to win. I’m going to double it up, even though the odds are not going to be in your favor. The dude killed a bear and a lion with his hands. I know you CrossFit, but my guess is you’re going to get yourself lit up.

This is one of those false narratives. When men embrace this narrative, you get Harvey Weinstein.

...

Brothers, quit being so hard on yourself. God knows. Love is the motivating force. If you want to say this phrase to your boys, “Be a man,” you’d better not be talking about their emotions. You’d better not be talking about their hobbies. You’d better not be talking about their feelings. You’d better not be talking about that stuff.
In Manhood Restored, Pastor Matt Chandler explains that toxic masculinity comes from male shame:

...men are prone to shame. If anyone knew how often men, without question, think they’re not good enough, think they’re failures, think they’ll never measure up, think they cannot win, it would blow their mind. This is one of the great ways the Enemy destroys biblical masculinity, because all we see is our failures, and most of us have in the back of our minds our dad telling us we’re never going to measure up.

...

What happens when you experience shame? Men always respond to shame either with withdrawal or aggression. Let a man feel shame, he’s going to withdraw and pout or get angry and lash out. And who gets lashed out on the most? Usually wives and children. So do you want to act like a man?

Don’t be silly. Stand firm in the faith.

Later in the sermon Chandler suggests that the modern Christian Father’s Day tradition of disrespecting fathers is one of the causes of Christian toxic masculinity:

Have you ever noticed that on Mother’s Day...? Mother’s Day sermons are always like, “Moms, you guys are so great. Where would we be without you guys? The whole world would fall apart if moms weren’t being moms.” Dads always get a different message. They’re like, “What’s wrong with you? Why are you the way you are? We don’t have any flowers for you today. Good God! Act like a man.” We always get this kind of drive-by shaming.

Yet at the same time Chandler seems to justify the practice. In the sentences that immediately follow, he appears to be saying that denigrating fathers on the day set aside to honor them is part of God’s good plan:

Sometimes in the Bible... Like, moms, have you ever exasperated your children to anger? Any mom go, “No, no, no. I have exasperated...” Why didn’t the Bible tell you guys not to exasperate your kids? It’s on us. It’s “Fathers, don’t do this.” He creates distinction, and it’s not something that is unequal or unjust; it’s God’s good design.

My guess is that while these two messages are contradictory, both are intended. This would fit with his closing prayer (emphasis mine):

I pray that even as we sing and consider and think that you would bring to our minds places where we have sinned against wife or daughter or children or others and there might be a holy compulsion in us, for the first time, to play the man through
confession and repentance.

I thank you that there is nothing behind us that has more power than the cross of Christ and no current struggle you cannot cover, heal, break, put back together, and make whole. I pray for my brothers in here...I wish not to shame them in any way...who internally are broken little boys. I ask for your healing power in their hearts for their joy, for the good of their wives and children, for the good of this church. Help us. We need you. Thank you that you have empowered us to step in and walk in what you have commanded us to walk in. It’s for your beautiful name we pray all these things, amen.
Complementarianism is distinguished from egalitarianism for the most part not by the feminist conclusions they draw, but by the method they use to get there. Both have adopted all (egalitarian) or nearly all (complementarian) tenets of modern feminist thought. The difference is complementarians claim to merely to be accurately interpreting the Bible, and it is a simple coincidence that what the Bible teaches fits perfectly with Tumblr Feminism and the Women’s Studies department at the local university.

Thus when Pastor Matt Chandler preaches on toxic masculinity, he presents this not as the latest SJW fad, but timeless wisdom from the Bible. Likewise when Pastor Doug Wilson overturns the meaning of 1 Cor 7, he doesn’t acknowledge that this makes him as woke as a blue haired feminist; he explains with a straight face that when the Apostle Paul wrote (NIV):

10 To the married I give this command (not I, but the Lord): A wife must not separate from her husband.

That he meant Not the Lord, but I, and A wife can separate from her husband if she thinks it is wise. The thing to keep in mind is that complementarians have been doing this from the very beginning, so when they do this it feels perfectly normal.

For today’s example I offer Sheila Gregoire’s post explaining the sin of body shaming women by defining modesty standards. Gregoire clearly has her work cut out for her in this regard. First she has to recast the meaning of Romans 14 and 1 Cor 8 (emphasis original):

In Romans 14 and 1 Corinthians 8, Paul is making the “weaker brother” argument. Paul says that once we’re in Christ, we have great freedom. We can eat meat sacrificed to idols, for instance, because we no longer have any idols. God is over all.

But if you have a brother or sister who thinks that it’s wrong to eat meat sacrificed to idols, and you glibly do eat meat like that, and they follow you–then you’ve now encouraged them to violate their own consciences. You’ve caused them to stumble.

In other words, the “stumbling” that Paul is talking about is not committing an actual sin, like lusting or stealing or lying, but violating your conscience and your vow to God. So the concern in this passage is that we cause someone to stumble when we undermine their faith.

Paul is not addressing the scenario where a woman may cause a man to lust

Next she explains that a woman only sins by this standard if the woman sets out to make the men around her sin:
So can a woman weaken a guy’s faith by what she wears?

Yes, I think she can. If a woman deliberately decides to exercise her freedom in Christ in front of her male brothers who are really struggling, and does so knowing that they are struggling (which is the scenario that Paul lays out here), she can make him think, “I really can’t get over this sin.”

Not surprisingly, it turns out that we’ve had it all wrong for two thousand years. Now, with the wisdom of the feminist revolution, we know that the Apostle Paul’s warnings in Romans 14 and 1 Corinthians 8 were warnings not to body shame women (emphasis original):

What do we do when a woman who is seeking walks into church wearing something really inappropriate, like a skimpy sundress? How do we tell her that she’s a stumbling block?

My response: You don’t! Because in this situation, SHE is the weaker brother. The men are more mature in the faith. It’s her faith that God is most concerned with. He leaves the 99 to find the 1.

What if setting a modesty dress code actually becomes a stumbling block for women because it weakens their faith?

She draws the same conclusion from Matthew 18:6-9 (emphasis original):

In everything, the state of our hearts matter. So if we are deliberately dressing in such a way that we are aiming to entice men to lust, then we are sinning. Period. Absolutely. We should not wear attire with the intention of causing men’s thoughts to wander or with trying to seduce anyone. In that scenario, it certainly is better to have a millstone placed around our necks and be thrown into the sea.

But what if that’s not our intention when we get dressed?

You have to admire Gregoire’s breathtaking ability to twist Scripture. This is up there with her claim that biblical submission means giving your husband lists of chores, and that 1 Cor 7:5 is a license to defraud your spouse:

Let’s assume that it’s the wife with the lower libido for a minute (though it certainly isn’t always) and look at it this way:

If her husband’s body belongs to her, then she has the ability to also say, “I do not want you using your body sexually right now with me.”

Getting back to her wacky explanation that it is sinful for churches to enact modesty codes, keep in mind that her logic doesn’t just work for a woman wearing a skimpy dress to church.
Imagine a woman at the local nudist colony who wanders into church one fine Sunday completely naked. She [un]dressed this way not to make the men in the church sin, but because this is how she always dresses. In this scenario if we adopt Gregoire’s interpretation, Matthew 18:6-9, Romans 14 and 1 Corinthians 8 all teach us that it would be sinful to ask the woman to cover up in any way, as this would be the feminist sin of body shaming.

But what about 1 Timothy 2:8-9? Not surprisingly, Gregoire teaches that it doesn’t apply here either:

Here’s what 1 Timothy 2:8-9 says:

I also want the women to dress modestly, with decency and propriety, adorning themselves, not with elaborate hairstyles or gold or pearls or expensive clothes, 10 but with good deeds, appropriate for women who profess to worship God.

Now, in that context, modesty wasn’t primarily about not being sexually alluring as much as it was about not flaunting one’s wealth. You can see that this is Paul’s primary concern because he goes on to talk about things which obviously cost a lot of money (jewelry, certain clothing, hairstylists) rather than about hiding a woman’s figure. This wasn’t about body shaming women; this was about ensuring that Christians were approachable, appropriate, and open to all, so that they were good witnesses for Christ.

Notice that whether you use Gregoire’s hypothetical (a woman in a skimpy dress), or my hypothetical (a nude woman), the message is the same; the Bible strictly prohibits us from asking her to cover up. After all, the nudist didn’t set out to make the men in church sin. Moreover, she spent absolutely nothing on her outfit*, and she is without a doubt approachable and open to all! The only remaining question is whether her outfit is “appropriate”, but as Gregoire has explained it would be sinful to suggest that what she is wearing isn’t appropriate.

Thus conclude’s Gregoire’s sermon on the topic:

And that’s it! The series on body shaming women is now over! It’s been a long week. But I’ve so appreciated your comments, and let me know what you think!

*Making her the most modest woman in the congregation!
What could possibly go wrong?
by Dalrock | August 6, 2018 | Link

I offered this as a comment over at Instapundit, in response to a post on the impending sexbot revolution.

Time is the modern woman’s real enemy here, with technology merely enhancing the effect. By continuously pushing out the age of marriage women are betting that their one day husband will still devote his teens and 20s preparing to be a provider, and not elect to either become the bad boy young women crave or settle for technologically enhanced masturbation. The problem is once a woman is 30(ish) and ready to marry, her male peers can no more go back and focus their 20s on education and career than she can go back and devote her youth and fertility to her husband.

Even worse, small mismatches between supply and demand can have a huge effect. If there are 100 30-something women demanding that men “man up” and put a ring on it, but only 80 men who spent the last 10-15 years preparing to man up, all of the women will find that good men are in short supply. Sure the 30 something unmarried woman can call the missing men losers, but she can’t change the fact that she’s competing with a glut of other marriage hunting women her own age.

And of course it isn’t just porn and sex dolls that risk derailing a young man from preparing for the day a decade hence when his peers will suddenly wish to marry. Legalized pot won’t help keep him on track either.
Secular historian Callum Brown investigated British Christian literature and found that around 1700 a new narrative appeared, where women were “the angel of the house”. As he explained in *The Death of Christian Britain*

...women’s spiritual destiny was virtually never portrayed as a battle with temptation or real sin; fallen women did not appear as central characters, and none of the usual temptations like drink or gambling ever seemed to be an issue with them. The problem is the man, sometimes the father, but more commonly the boyfriend, fiancé, or husband, who is a drinker, a gambler, keeps the ‘bad company’ of ‘rough lads’ and is commonly a womanizer. The man is the agency of the virtuous woman’s downfall; he does not make her bad, but does make her suffer and poor. She is not always portrayed as having undergone a major conversion experience, but to have emerged from childhood into a disciplined and natural ‘goodness.’

Brown explains that one of the most common literary structures regarding men was what he called “The Husband Structure”:

A. Husband lives with virtuous wife  
B. Husband is a drunkard/gambler/wife-beater  
C. Wife and children suffer in poverty  
D. Chance event (often an accident to husband)  
E. Wife nurses husband in Christian way.  
F. Husband converts  
G. Family happier, if not richer

This is of course the plot-line of *pretty much all Kendrick brothers movies*. But we can also see a modified version of this structure in movies that add on the fantasy of Christian women piously chasing after sexy bad boys:

Related:

- *[She was trying to fix* men.](http://example.com)  
- *[Bad boys, single moms, and the love of a strong independent woman.](http://example.com)  

H/T Nick Mgtow
In *The Death of Christian Britain* Callum Brown argues that contrary to the accepted narrative Christianity did not steadily decline in Britain as a result of urbanization and industrialization, but instead suddenly collapsed in the 1960s.

...women, rather than cities or social class, emerge as the principal source of explanation for the patterns of religiosity that were observable in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Most importantly, two other things will emerge. First, women were the bulwark to popular support for organized Christianity between 1800 and 1963, and second it was they who broke their relationship to Christian piety in the 1960s and thereby caused secularization.

Brown traces the collapse to a two stage phenomenon. First, British Christianity morphed into a veneration of women, viewing them as “the angel in the house”, and the earthly source of Christian virtue. Brown found that British literature of the 1800s contained a consistent theme of coarse, rough, sinful men being eventually tamed and brought to God by naturally good women.

...women’s spiritual destiny was virtually never portrayed as a battle with temptation or real sin; fallen women did not appear as central characters, and none of the usual temptations like drink or gambling ever seemed to be an issue with them. The problem is the man, sometimes the father, but more commonly the boyfriend, fiancé, or husband, who is a drinker, a gambler, keeps the ‘bad company’ of ‘rough lads’ and is commonly a womanizer. The man is the agency of the virtuous woman’s downfall; he does not make her bad, but does make her suffer and poor. She is not always portrayed as having undergone a major conversion experience, but to have emerged from childhood into a disciplined and natural ‘goodness.’

Second, in the 1960s women in Britain lost interest in playing the role of angel in the house, and the entire structure suddenly collapsed.

Women had previously been the heart of family piety, the moral restraint upon men and children. By the mid 1960s, domestic ideology was assailed on many fronts, putting the cultural revolution in collision with not just the Christian churches but with Christianity as a whole. The loss of domestic ideology to youth culture from c. 1958 meant that piety ‘lost’ its discursive home within femininity. Its last redoubt, the ‘angel in the house’ to use an historians cliché, was now negotiable and challenged discursive terrain...

The discursive death of pious femininity destroyed the evangelical narrative.

Brown doesn’t draw this connection in the book, but it is obvious that the view of women as beacons of natural virtue itself comes from the British literary tradition of Courtly Love (chivalry). As C.S. Lewis explains in *The Allegory of Love*, Courtly Love teaches that men
must look to women for moral guidance (emphasis mine):

The love which is to be the source of all that is beautiful in life and manners must be the reward freely given by the lady, and only our superiors can reward. But a wife is not a superior. As the wife of another, above all as the wife of a great lord, she may be queen of beauty and of love, the distributor of favours, the inspiration of all knightly virtues, and the bridle of ‘villany’; but as your own wife, for whom you have bargained with her father, she sinks at once from lady into mere woman. How can a woman, whose duty is to obey you, be the midons whose grace is the goal of all striving and whose displeasure is the restraining influence upon all uncourtly vices?

Courtly Love was created as a mockery of Christianity, but Christians were so tempted by the idea that eventually most Christians couldn’t distinguish between the two. This is certainly true in the US today. It shouldn’t be surprising that once the real deal had been replaced with an enticing substitute the stage was set for the whole facade to eventually come crashing down all at once. What isn’t clear is why the sudden collapse in Christian belief happened in Britain when it did, but not (yet?) in the US.
In *The Death of Christian Britain* Callum Brown explains that the evangelical narrative in Britain in from the 1800s until the collapse in the 1960s was that if a woman’s husband was godly she was sure to be in love and happy (emphasis mine):

In featuring women’s relationships with men, the evangelical narrative was invariably drawn into romance...

Romance was a test for all manner of virtues...

Finding the right Christian husband was the uppermost consideration rather than the age of engagement. The ending, as in all evangelical stories, was always happy — as in *Love’s Healing* in the 1920s which concludes with the heroine marrying ‘a splendid Christian man. *She is fortunate indeed and will be a happy wife.*’ By the 1930s and 1940s, scores of paperback religious novels appeared, aimed almost exclusively at teenage girls and young women. Love was the dominant theme, following a format familiar to Mills & Boon readers, but with a Christian ‘spin’, ending with lines like: ‘What are you thinking of, darling?’ whispered her husband. ‘I was thinking how good God is. I’ve never been so happy in my life.’ Romance was set within a tough system of moral values, but it was invariably the man’s moral values that were the criteria, making the women’s issue the arrival at the right judgment on the man’s worthiness.

Readers of this blog may recall that Pastor Douglas Wilson teaches this same theology in his book *Reforming Marriage*. Wilson explains in the introduction that this is in fact the foundation of the message of the book. Moreover, if the husband failed to make the wife happy by doing as the book instructed, Wilson explains that this is God’s sign that the man is a hypocrite and is not a Godly man (emphasis mine):

In other words, keeping God’s law with a whole heart (which is really what love is) is not only seen in overt acts of obedience. The collateral effect of obedience is the aroma of love. *This aroma is out of reach for those who have a hypocritical desire to be known by others as a keeper of God’s law.* Many can fake an attempt at keeping God’s standards in some external way. What we cannot fake is the resulting, distinctive aroma of pleasure to God...

Christ has loved the Church in the same the way He wants men to love their wives. He has done so as an example. The love and affection of Christ has been set upon His people alone. In the same way, husbands are to love their wives alone. *This is the duty I hope to explain and amplify throughout the course of this small book.*

But we should already know from all of this that such obedience is not exhausted by
the external conformity to God’s requirements. **Godly obedience will always bring in its train a host of intangibles.** These intangibles constitute the aroma of obedience, and this aspect of true obedience frustrates the paint-by-numbers approach to marriage enhancement. **This is why I am afraid that this book will be of little use to those who simply want a “formula” to follow that will build them a happy marriage.** When it comes to the externals, the mere copyist can always say of himself what the unregenerate Saul could say, “concerning the righteousness which is in the law, blameless” (Phil. 3:6). **However hard the externalist tries, he cannot produce the aroma of godliness.**

...In the same way, the love of the Christian husband does not proceed from reading the “right books,” including this one, or going to the right seminars. **God will not patch His grace onto some humanistic psychological nonsense**—even if that nonsense is couched and buried in Christian terminology. It proceeds from an obedient heart, and the greatest desire of an obedient heart is the glory of God...

...When a husband seeks to glorify God in his home, he will be equipped to love his wife as he is commanded. **And if he loves his wife as commanded, the aroma of his home will be pleasant indeed.**

This silly game must have seemed so harmless in the 1800s and early 1900s. But following the advent of second wave feminism and the divorce revolution we can see how immensely evil this game really is. In the era of “the problem with no name”, and divorce made moral by the death of women’s romantic feelings, telling women that if they aren’t happy, if they aren’t feeling the tingle, that these things are God’s message that their husband is to blame for their discontentment is truly, profoundly, evil.
Pastor Wilson doubles down.
by Dalrock | August 10, 2018 | Link

Back in July Pastor Doug Wilson published a post titled: On a Wife Deciding to Leave Her Husband. In this post Wilson referred to 1 Cor 7:10 (NIV):

10 To the married I give this command (not I, but the Lord): A wife must not separate from her husband.

Wilson explained that the verse meant the opposite of what the Apostle Paul wrote:

It is interesting here that Paul advises a woman not to leave if she can help it—“the wife should not separate from her husband.” That is his apostolic counsel, but it is clear from the context that it is merely advice. If she sees that his generally good advice is not pertinent to her situation, she is left free to leave without being hassled about it by the apostle. So if he would leave you alone in this decision, then so should the elders of your church.

I noted Wilson’s reversal of Scripture here, and another blogger (Bnonn) did the same in a post titled Straddling the stallion and the mare:

While I agree with Doug that there comes a time when a wife is justified in leaving her husband, I don’t believe he describes that time in this article. In fact, this piece straightforwardly reverses what God actually says. Doug’s counsel here is false teaching, because the very scriptures he appeals to say precisely the opposite of what he claims. This is brazen enough that it really gobsmacks me.

…

The verse literally starts with an explicit statement that this is not Paul’s opinion, but the Lord’s. That is the immediate context of the words Doug quotes—words whose context, he says, make it clear this is “merely advice.”

Pastor Wilson responded to Bnonn’s thoughtful post, doubling down on the same absurd claim (emphasis mine):

When I say that Paul is giving advice here, I am not referring to the restriction placed on any other relationship. That is not advice. The advice part is the where he says not to separate, but in the same breath does not require church discipline if she does separate. When Paul says “don’t do x, but if you do x, then you absolutely must not do y,” we are free to assume that the church would not intervene with discipline at point x, but would intervene at point y.

Wilson then tries to sneak this by:

This is why we would allow a woman in our congregation, if married to (an
extraordinarily) difficult man, to separate from him.

Wilson’s whole point in the original post was that the elders of a church are prohibited from questioning a wife who decides to leave her husband. According to Wilson, the choice is hers alone, and the elders can’t tell her she is wrong for doing so. Yet Wilson asserts that in his church they only allow women to leave their husbands if the woman is leaving an extraordinarily difficult man. From Wilson’s original post:

But let me include something else here that really needs to be emphasized. Because I am saying that a wife in your position can simply “go,” then it follows that all any woman needs to do is just say she is in your position (whether she is or not), and there she has her automatic “get out jail free card.” What is to prevent a woman from applying this principle in a way that grotesquely wrongs an innocent husband?

This is a fallen world, which means we must take risks. This is one of them.

…It is far better to let one lying wife go free without penalty than to keep an innocent wife in the penalty of living in a terrible situation. In the worst case scenario, an innocent man loses a wife, but keep in mind it was a lying wife.

Wilson is pretending in his follow up post that he didn’t claim in the original that elders need to mind their own business when wives separate from their husbands! As I already quoted in the beginning (emphasis mine):

If she sees that his generally good advice is not pertinent to her situation, she is left free to leave without being hassled about it by the apostle. So **if he would leave you alone in this decision, then so should the elders of your church.**

Bnonn also asked why Wilson avoided 1 Pet 3 altogether in his discussion of how a wife should respond to a sinning husband:

What is especially puzzling is that Doug goes only to 1 Corinthians 7, but studiously avoids 1 Peter 3, which explicitly covers this kind of situation, down to the bad behavior of the husband. Indeed, it even deals with examples of sexually degrading behavior, and of treating the wife like a slave; surely these apply to Sarah also, yet Scripture commends her for trusting God and remaining with Abraham through such trials.

Doug’s failure to even mention this more relevant passage makes me think he is not dealing forthrightly and boldly with a difficult situation for which Scripture has hard advice. He is trying to straddle two horses: the word of God, and the feelings of women. And when that gets too hard, he seems to prefer leading the former from the saddle of the latter.

Wilson quoted from the second paragraph in his response to Bnonn, but shrewdly continued to **studiously avoid** any reference to 1 Pet 3.

H/ T Hmm.
Mama ain’t happy.

by Dalrock | August 13, 2018 | Link

Sheila Gregoire and her fellow Christian Feminists are putting complementarians on notice. Recently she retweeted a call for male allies to fight the patriarchy:

This thread will break your heart. We need more men to be allies to push back against this virulent patriarchal misogyny coming from male “Christians.”
https://t.co/nB66SpxWDg

— Heather Hilscher (@HeatherHilscher) August 12, 2018

The specific context is a thread Sheila started in response to a number of people writing mean comments about her daughter’s histrionic reaction to a post by Lori Alexander:

My daughter made a video against the “men prefer debt-free virgins without tattoos.” https://t.co/mkr3CfE6TP

She was saying God loves us despite our pasts, and if people made mistakes (or, even worse, if they’re a sexual assault survivor), they should not be labelled unloveable.

— SheilaGregoire (@sheilagregoire) August 10, 2018

Sheila was especially offended that some of the commenters quoted 1-Tim 2:11-12:

(Please, male leaders, imagine what that is like for women. Whenever we say something that men disagree with, people use the Bible to try to silence us. Do you have any idea what that is like?)

— SheilaGregoire (@sheilagregoire) August 10, 2018

This is where it gets interesting. Sheila blames complementarians for the existence of mean
comments on the internet. Specifically, she blames Dr. John Piper’s Desiring God website.

Middle aged “Christian” men think this is okay because they are going to churches that do not actively preach against this. They are reading websites like @desiringgod that say wives need their husbands to get them ready for Jesus; that women can’t be police officers or bosses.

— SheilaGregoire (@sheilagregoire) August 10, 2018

Sheila has to know that Piper was one of a handful of men who spearheaded the movement to invent a new meaning for 1-Tim 2:14, and to thereby legitimize women like Sheila and her daughter taking on preaching roles contrary to 1-Tim 2:11-12. As Piper and Grudem wrote in their 1991 book Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism, they wanted to create a new reading of 1 Tim 2:14 that assumed that when the Apostle Paul wrote “and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor” he did not mean that women were more easily deceived than men (emphasis mine):

28. Do you think women are more gullible than men?

First Timothy 2:14 says, “Adam was not the one deceived; it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner.” Paul gives this as one of the reasons why he does not permit women “to teach or have authority over a man.” Historically this has usually been taken to mean that women are more gullible or deceivable than men and therefore less fit for the doctrinal oversight of the church. This may be true (see question 29). However, we are attracted to another understanding of Paul’s argument.

Later in the same book Dr. Douglass Moo explained why it is so important for complementarians to adopt this new feminist reading of 1-Tim 2:14. Without this new interpretation, complementarians can’t justify rewriting 1-Tim 2:11-12 (emphasis mine):

If the issue, then, is deception, it may be that Paul wants to imply that all women are, like Eve, more susceptible to being deceived than are men, and that this is why they should not be teaching men!

[But this] would have a serious and strange implication. After all, does Paul care only that the women not teach men false doctrines? Does he not care that they not teach them to other women?

Sheila is repaying Dr. Piper’s favor by calling him a sexist. This has immense power, because fear of being called a sexist is what drove Piper, Grudem, and the other men to make up a new meaning of 1 Tim 2:14 in the first place!
Sheila knows that after complementarian feminists took out Dr. Paige Patterson earlier this year, she and women like her are the new locus of power in the complementarian world:

They are going to churches where pastors have been taught in seminaries by the likes of Paige Patterson, who said that he would “beat down” a rape victim to see if he could get her to recant her story.

— SheilaGregoire (@sheilagregoire) August 10, 2018

Ask yourself: "If a person sat in my pews for a year, would they know that God values women? Would they know that women's opinions matter? Would they know that calling women names is ungodly—especially if those names have sexual overtones?"

— SheilaGregoire (@sheilagregoire) August 10, 2018

Because they will only know these things if you explicitly teach them. Even then, evil men will likely reject the Truth. But at least then their actions will not be on your head. Right now, they are. And as a mom, I am incensed. As a Christian, I am brokenhearted and lamenting.

— SheilaGregoire (@sheilagregoire) August 10, 2018

This brings us to the core of Sheila’s message. She and other women like her are now in charge, and the male leaders of the church had better recognize this and start obeying (mama ain’t happy):

And God will call down judgment on men like these commenters who blaspheme against His name in this horrible, wicked way.

— SheilaGregoire (@sheilagregoire) August 10, 2018
This of course fits with the overall SJW revolution. But what makes it noteworthy is Sheila and her SJW allies are now the force to be reckoned with within conservative/evangelical Christianity.

I agree. We need to listen to the #emptythepews and #Exvangelical people. They have a lot to say, and many are being prophets to this generation. https://t.co/IUoOyIPYcD

— SheilaGregoire (@sheilagregoire) August 11, 2018

As commenter Emperor Constantine pointed out, we know where this will eventually lead complementarians. It is merely a matter of how quickly they get there:

To Sheila & the feminists here: this is where your journey ends, when you can't tell if the pastor is Wicca or Lutheran, and your religion is clitoris worship.

Enjoy the ride, you pay at the last stop, where there will be hell to pay. @RationalMale https://t.co/eAHHN0fBHV

— Emperor Constantine (@TRPConstantine) August 11, 2018
Don’t chase the misdirection.

by Dalrock | August 14, 2018 | Link

Note: This started as a comment, but I think the point is worth making in a post so I’m doing so here.

Commenter Hmm wrote:

Wilson’s original post concerned a man that was difficult to his wife in the home, but presented a different, benign face to the church. There was no evidence that anyone but her saw that he was a cruel, abusive man. If she took recourse to the elders, they could do nothing without a second witness. There was no one lawfully to back her up, or take her side. So he encouraged her to separate herself from him. Move quietly out, into her sister’s home. Not divorce. Not call a lawyer. Just separate.

In doing this she would of course be enlisting her family in her defense. And it would certainly raise questions in the church about why she did this, which might bring her husband under closer scrutiny. It might even drive him to a chargeable offense. But she is not enlisting women to her side, not dividing the church over the issue, not doing anything chargeable as gossip or slander.

The controversy is over whether there is Biblical warrant for a Christian woman to separate from such a man (who also claims to be Christian).

The bolded part is not true. The controversy is over Pastor Wilson’s astounding twisting of very clear verses in 1 Cor 7. Where the Apostle Paul says “Not I, but the Lord”, Wilson tells us Paul is just giving his own friendly advice. Where Paul urges wives not to separate from their husbands, pointing out that by remaining they might save their husband’s soul, Wilson says Paul is urging wives to leave their husbands in order to save their souls. See my original post, as well as the post from Bnonn that Wilson responded to.

I think Hmm is reading this all backwards.Hmm is assuming Wilson set out to explain how to handle a hard case, but simply mangled it beyond all comprehension. Twice. This is theoretically possible. It could be that Wilson is just really, really bad at explaining Scripture. If so, he needs to immediately find a new line of work. But I don’t think Wilson is incompetent. I think he set out to teach that all wives can separate from their husbands whenever they feel it is right and church elders need to leave them alone*. From there, he crafted both a tangled backstory and a wacky interpretation of Scripture to achieve this goal. But the backstory was always only a distraction, a magician’s misdirection. He wants us tangled up in the backstory he spun so we don’t notice how putrid his interpretation of 1 Cor 7 is. Note that a few hours** after I wrote my post criticizing his interpretation of 1 Cor 7, Wilson dropped a bombshell via a postscript (emphasis mine):

Postscript: In this fictional scenario, the elder board of the church this woman is leaving is complicit in the sin of the husband. When the Westminster Confession says that the church can be part of the remedy in prevent marriages
from blowing up, I should add that I support a godly and judicious use of elder
authority in such cases.

Why did he do this? It doesn’t address the problem at all. We could assume that this is Wilson
just being really bad at his chosen profession. That is possible. But my hypothesis makes
more sense. Wilson desperately wanted to change the subject back to the backstory. Note
that his postscript doesn’t help anything. He already explained why such a wife should be
allowed to leave without being “hassled” by her church elders. Wilson told us that Scripture
commanded it, even if she is lying. If he believed that, why now change the backstory to
make the elders villains in order to explain why they don’t have the right to judge her?
Moreover, his sudden change of the backstory makes much of his original post absurd.
Remember the bit about her not wanting her elders to take disciplinary action against her
husband, because without the requisite witnesses it would be unjust? The postscript even
contradicts Hmm’s summary of the original story:

Wilson’s original post concerned a man that was difficult to his wife in the home, but
presented a different, benign face to the church. There was no evidence that anyone
but her saw that he was a cruel, abusive man.

Don’t get stuck on the backstory. It doesn’t matter, and Wilson is free to change it on the fly
as needed. Focus on what Wilson is teaching that Scripture says.

*Except for women in his church, who Wilson notes better be ready to explain themselves
and face discipline if he thinks they don’t have a valid reason to leave.

**Before. After.
And Now a Brief Word for the White Supremacists
by Dalrock | August 15, 2018 | Link

Bnonn writes in his most recent post:

Moreover, unlike Dalrock, I see exactly the analogy Doug draws from runaway slaves (Dt. 23:15), and I agree that its general equity applies here.

The statement I made that Bnonn is referencing is:

Thankfully Pastor Wilson ignores 1 Pet 3 entirely in his analysis of a wife’s proper response to a sinning husband, and thereby limits his violence to 1 Cor 7 and a creative interpretation of Deut. 23:15.

I made a deliberate choice not to expand on Wilson’s Deut. 23:15 argument, because while it is weak and used to avoid turning to much more relevant New Testament passages (like 1 Pet 3), it is a bit of a landmine. The weakness is easy to demonstrate. Wilson uses Deut. 23:15 to explain how the Apostle Paul would have us respond to an unhappy wife*. He says that per Deut. 23:15 Paul would not have us return an escaped slave. As a result, Wilson determines that the Christian course of action is to encourage unhappy wives to leave their husbands. The problem isn’t just in Wilson’s poor logic. The problem is also that we know that the Apostle Paul once faced this very question. The Book of Philemon is in fact Paul’s letter to a slave owner, wherein Paul explains that he is sending Philemon’s escaped slave back to him:

12 I am sending him—who is my very heart—back to you. 13 I would have liked to keep him with me so that he could take your place in helping me while I am in chains for the gospel.

But Wilson knows this. He knows his appeal to Deut. 23:15 is incredibly weak in this application, but it is nevertheless useful to him. If his critics point out his weak logic, they risk seeming like they support slavery. More specifically, they risk seeming like white supremacists who support American slavery. At the same time, this distracts from his truly abominable interpretation of 1 Cor 7, and also draws attention away from his inexplicable decision to ignore 1 Pet 3 entirely.

But there is something else that makes Wilson’s poor logic regarding Deut. 23:15 quite shrewd. He is encouraging all unhappy wives to see themselves as mistreated slaves. This fits perfectly with the feminist narrative that marriage is slavery for women, something they need to escape from. This is a supercharged emotional appeal, and Wilson knows this as well. Long after the dust has settled, the unhappy wives who read his post will remember his invitation to see their marriage as a form of slavery, and themselves as abused slaves.

How do I know that Wilson knows about Paul’s letter to Philemon? The Bible’s view of slavery is a subject that Wilson has studied in depth. A little over twenty years ago Wilson coauthored a pamphlet titled Southern Slavery As It Was. The book is no longer in print, but a
How could men have supported slavery? The question is especially difficult when we consider that these were men who lived in a pervasively Christian culture. We have all heard of the heartlessness — the brutalities, immoralities, and cruelties — that were supposedly inherent in the system of slavery. We have heard how slave families were broken up, of the forcible rape of slave women, of the brutal beatings that were a commonplace, about the horrible living conditions, and of the unrelenting work schedule and back-breaking routine — all of which go together to form our impression of the crushing oppression which was slavery in the South. The truthfulness of this description has seldom been challenged.

The point of this small booklet is to establish that this impression is largely false.

Wilson likened Christian slave holders in pre Civil War America to Philemon from the Bible:

It is obvious that in a fallen world, an institution like slavery will be accompanied by many attendant evils. Such evils existed with ancient Hebrew slavery, ancient Roman slavery, and with American slavery. The issue is not whether sinners will sin, but rather how Christians are commanded to respond to such abuses and evils. And nothing is clearer — the New Testament opposes anything like the abolitionism of our country prior to the War Between the States. The New Testament contains many instructions for Christian slave owners, and requires a respectful submissive demeanor for Christian slaves. See, for example, Ephesians 6:5–9, Colossians 3:22—4:1, and 1 Timothy 6:1–5.

... Remember that in ancient Rome the acquisition of slaves was not according to the law of God either. A Christian slave owner in that system, like Philemon, was duty-bound to oppose those features of that society, and at the same time was required to treat his slaves in a gracious and thoughtful manner. He was not required to release his individual slaves because of the general societal disobedience. He was not even required to release his slaves if they came into the Christian faith (1 Tim. 6:1–4). At the same time he should have acknowledged that his believing slaves were now Christ’s freemen, and they should take any opportunity for freedom provided for them (1 Cor. 7:20).

Near the end of the tract Wilson and his coauthor write (emphasis mine):

**Slavery produced in the South a genuine affection between the races that we believe we can say has never existed in any nation before the War or since.** Whatever its failures, slavery produced in the South a degree of mutual affection between the races which will never be achieved through any federally-mandated efforts. Listen to a few examples:

George Fleming of Laurens, South Carolina said: “I longed to see Marse Sam
Fleming. Lawd, chile, dat’s de best white man what ever breathed de good air. I still goes to see whar he buried every time I gits a chance to venture t’wards Laurens. As old as I is, I still draps a tear when I sees his grave, fer he sho’ was good to me and all his other niggers.”42 And, with this use of the word nigger, it is important for us to remember the mutable nature of human language. What today constitutes a gross insult did not have the same connotations a century ago.

Clara Davis of Alabama said this:

Dem was de good ole days. How I longs to be back dar wid my ole folks an’ a playin’ wid de chillun down by de creek. ‘Taint nothin’ lak it today, nawsuh. . . . Dey tells me dat when a pusson crosses dat ribber, de Lawd gives him whut he wants. I done tol’ de Lawd I don’t want nothin’ much . . . only my home, white folks. I don’t think dats much to ax’ for. I suppose he’ll send me back dar. I been a-waitin’ for him to call.43

Adeline Johnson, Winnsboro, South Carolina: “I hope and prays to get to heaven. I’ll be satisfied to see my Savior that my old marster worshiped and my husband preached about. I want to be in heaven with all my white folks, just to wait on them, and love them, and serve them, sorta like I did in slavery time. That will be enough heaven for Adeline.”44

I want to stress that by titling this post as I have done, and by quoting Wilson’s inflammatory writing on the subject of American slavery, I by no means wish to poison the well. I trust my readers will simply ignore such a naked emotional appeal to outrage, and instead remember the logical arguments I made in the rest of the post.

*Wilson has it both ways in his post, describing an unconfirmably mistreated wife, but then taking care to tell us that the actual existence of mistreatment isn’t relevant.

Related: Wife beaters and the prairie muffins who love them.
The women of Generation X came as close as humanly possible to having it all — careers, children, marriage on their terms, divorce on their terms. Since the incentives for divorce are so high, many wives divorced. People are rational.

The women of Generation Y are repeating this playbook. Most are succeeding, but they find fewer men are willing to marry. Men are condemned for this, as they are condemned for so many things these days. That does not make them more interested in marriage.

My guess is that Millennial women (Gen Y) will find far fewer men willing to marry. I believe that in the next ten or twenty years this evolution will pass a tipping point. Beyond that marriage will still exist, but not in its present form for most people. Nor will it serve the same function as it does in our society today. We will better understood what traditional marriage did for American when its gone.
What millionaire doesn’t dream of having children with a 47 year old divorcee with three kids?

by Dalrock | August 16, 2018 | Link

From where else but the Daily Mail:  Divorcée, 47, seeking romance on dating agency which promised the ‘crème de la crème of bachelors’ WINS £13,000 in court battle after it failed to provide a wealthy suitor (and £500 for her sadness)

The headline says she won £13,000, but the article explains that she had her fees refunded, was awarded £500 for suffering, and had to pay £5,000 for libel.
A shortage doesn’t indicate a buyer’s market.
by Dalrock | August 17, 2018 | Link

One comment I see from fathers with surprising regularity is that their unmarried daughter is in a great position to find a husband because she’s not remotely interested in the kind of men who express interest in her. Even worse, the longer this pattern persists the more pleased with their daughter’s marriage prospects the fathers become! I wrote a year and a half ago about the same basic topic in An attitude of abundance.

I still think my previous analysis applies, but something else struck me today. I also think this is tied into the erroneous idea that the Bible teaches that men should pursue and women should judge the performance. But it isn’t the Bible that teaches this ethic, it is the religion of Courtly Love that teaches this. Think of the only two women to have books of the Bible named after them. Both Ruth and Esther pursued their eventual husbands. Ruth’s pursuit of Boaz resulted in her being the grandmother of King David, which meant that Christ would come from her line. Esther’s pursuit of Ahasuerus allowed her to save the Jews.

But since very few Christians can separate Christianity from Courtly Love/Chivalry, there is a widespread belief that Courtly Love is God’s model. In the Courtly Love model a man selects a woman and sets out to prove his worth to her in the hope of winning her heart. The woman’s only job is to keep being awesome while deciding if the man’s performance is worth rewarding with a token of her favor. This is what so many unmarried women and their fathers are so loudly complaining is lacking today. It isn’t Christian, but it is a religious expectation.
Did an orphan girl from an exiled people dream of one day becoming queen of all Persia?

by Dalrock | August 18, 2018 | Link

8 When the king’s order and edict had been proclaimed, many young women were brought to the citadel of Susa and put under the care of Hegai. Esther also was taken to the king’s palace and entrusted to Hegai, who had charge of the harem. She pleased him and won his favor...

And Esther won the favor of everyone who saw her...

17 Now the king was attracted to Esther more than to any of the other women, and she won his favor and approval more than any of the other virgins. So he set a royal crown on her head and made her queen instead of Vashti.

—Excerpts from Esther 2, NIV

Commenter Robin Munn raised an interesting question in response to my last post:

I have to disagree with the Esther example, at least as an example of a woman pursuing a man for marriage. She didn’t pursue Ahasuerus for marriage; his “talent scouts” picked her out for his harem and she had no choice in the matter. She later pursued him to solicit his favor for her people, but that illustrates a different point than the one you’re going for here.

Ruth, OTOH, is a perfect example to illustrate your point.

This encouraged me to go back and read the beginning of the Book of Esther again. He is right that we aren’t told that Esther wanted to become the queen of the land. We also aren’t told that her “uncle” Mordecai instructed her to try to become queen of Persia. All we know is that she was found to be one of the most beautiful virgins in all of Persia, and was therefore brought to the palace to compete with all of the other beautiful virgins for the king’s favor.

What happens next depends on your worldview. Imagine the story from the perspective of a Hebrew woman. Right off the bat, Esther is declared one of the most beautiful women in the ancient world. Esther is then forced to undergo a full year of luxurious beauty treatments & pampering in order to compete in something similar to the reality series “The Bachelor”. She also has no choice but to wear the best fashion in the world and have sex with the most powerful (and therefore sexiest) man in the ancient world. Esther, the nobody from nowhere, beats all of the Persian bitches and becomes revered throughout the land. She was the it woman in the ancient world. Her status was so high that when she threw a dinner party, everyone wanted to be invited.

If you are familiar with the story you will remember Haman, the man who was so powerful he was able to have it decreed that the Jews would be killed and their wealth plundered. At the
height of Haman’s power and prestige his greatest boast was that Esther selected him and only him for the honor of attending her dinner party (Esther 5:10-13, NIV):

Calling together his friends and Zeresh, his wife, 11 Haman boasted to them about his vast wealth, his many sons, and all the ways the king had honored him and how he had elevated him above the other nobles and officials. 12 “And that’s not all,” Haman added. “I’m the only person Queen Esther invited to accompany the king to the banquet she gave. And she has invited me along with the king tomorrow. 13 But all this gives me no satisfaction as long as I see that Jew Mordecai sitting at the king’s gate.”

Lowly Esther won the women’s intrasexual competition jackpot. She was literally the world champion of the competition! And all of this was just setting the table for her to be forever remembered for saving her people.

But we see things differently in the modern world. If you are a women’s studies major you will view the same story through a bitter feminist lens:

I feel very, very sorry for Esther. I hate movies and books that portray her and Xerxes’ relationship as a love story. She had to “audition” for a night to be chosen by him, and that’s pretty darn ugly, no matter how you slice it. We need to stop romanticizing it. She was taken into a harem. It’s basically sex trafficking.

But the moral of the story, to me, is that God will use us even in our worst situations, and that God sees even in our worst situations, and sometimes allows things to happen for the greater good. But He always sees.

We don’t need to “pretty” things up. Life can be awfully ugly. But God still sees!

I should clarify here that I don’t think Robin Munn is a bitter feminist. But the bitter feminist lens has affected the way the Book of Esther is interpreted in our feminist age.

Either way, we aren’t told in the Book of Esther whether Esther wanted to have sex with the sexiest man in the world and become queen of all Persia. While I think it is fair to assume that the original audience of the book would expect that she did want this, the Bible is silent on the question. But regardless of how you answer the question, it doesn’t change the fact that it was Esther who had to win over the king, not the other way around. This is true not only when she has to beat the other women to become queen. It is also true (as Robin Munn notes) when she has to save the Jews. In fact, in order to even speak to the king Esther has to first risk death to win his favor. Where the Courtly Love rewrite of the story would have King Ahasuerus submitting to Esther in an effort to win a sign of her favor, Esther has to demonstrate her submission to King Ahasuerus in the hope that he will point his scepter in her direction. If she fails to win his favor, she and all of the Jews will die. Esther is so submissive that she tells the king she wouldn’t have even bothered asking him to intervene if she and her people were merely sold into slavery (Esther 7:2-4, NIV):

...the king again asked, “Queen Esther, what is your petition? It will be given you. What is your request? Even up to half the kingdom, it will be granted.”

www.TheRedArchive.com
3 Then Queen Esther answered, “If I have found favor with you, Your Majesty, and if it pleases you, grant me my life—this is my petition. And spare my people—this is my request. 4 For I and my people have been sold to be destroyed, killed and annihilated. **If we had merely been sold as male and female slaves, I would have kept quiet, because no such distress would justify disturbing the king.**[a]"

But even the question of whether Esther wanted to become queen of all Persia has a feminist root. In many ways Esther is like Daniel, another Jew who ended up in Persia after the Jews were carried away. Both Esther and Daniel found themselves and their people on the wrong end of a death decree by the king as a result of trickery by Persian enemies. Both found favor with the king, glorified God, and saved their people. We don’t ask if Daniel wanted to become an adviser to the king, because either way it was a tremendous honor, and more importantly it was a required part of God’s plan. Daniel was faithful to God and played the cards he was dealt. So did Esther. In Esther’s case this meant first winning the competition to become queen, and then winning the king over again to save the Jews.
A challenge to traditionalists.

by Dalrock | August 20, 2018 | Link

Commenter thedeti wrote in response to A shortage doesn’t indicate a buyer’s market.

I seem to remember Cane Caldo saying something like this.

I had Cane’s comments in mind when I wrote the post but didn’t have the link handy. Cane kindly pointed to his post from April of last year titled This Weekend on: What’s the Real Tradition? (emphasis mine):

According to traditionalists (and others): Men are supposed to chase, and women are supposed to be caught. Or they might say: Men are to initiate, and women are to respond. Imagine a party. There are single men and women. The traditionalist wants the men to pick a woman, and then woo her. Then he (the trad) wants her to respond with a Yes, or No, or Show me more. That traditional mating ritual is wrong and foolish. Roissy/Heartiste’s maxim that “Men display, women choose” is much more true. Go to a party and see for yourself.

The traditionalist might counter, “Well, that’s not how it’s supposed to work. A real man pursues what he wants.” I say that is half-assed crossdressing. It is the man acting like a woman while the woman smirks and presides.

If you fancy yourself a traditionalist and disagree, then here is an exercise for you: Search your Bible for a story about a man who woos a woman directly. If it’s traditional it should be easy to do, right? If or when you find it put it in the comments and let’s see how that story plays out, and how it compares to the others. Let us discover what is the real tradition.
*Real men* confess their love to the gas station attendant.
by Dalrock | August 21, 2018 | Link

Cane Caldo notes:

The rebuttals here are hilarious, and fall into two camps.

1. To some people the idea of “man pursues, woman responds” is so important to the arguer that he redefines woo to mean “bought”, and bride-price as “romantic overture”. Presumably these people have a very romantic life here in America; wooing gas out of the station attendant and seducing milk from the grocer with money.

2. Those who think the stories of: David and Bathsheba (adultery and murder), Samson and Delilah (never married), Hosea and Gomer (adultery, cuckoldry, polygyny) and Jacob and Rachel are instructive as Christian tradition.

See Cane’s related post regarding Leah and Rachel for more insight. I’ll add that David & Bathsheba and Hosea & Gomer don’t fit the pattern either.

I think part of the problem however is a misunderstanding of what Cane and I are referring to. Commenter sipcode responded with:

I cannot agree. OT scripture speaks of sons “taking” wives and not wives taking husbands. That reeks of the woman leading.

No one is saying women should formally propose to men. What Cane and I are responding to is the nearly universal false belief that the Bible teaches that men should follow the rules of Courtly Love regarding finding a wife. The Trad Con claim is that a man must pick a woman and boldly declare his intention to court her for marriage. The woman, who heretofore hasn’t considered the man one way or another, then proceeds to judge the man’s performance as he endeavors to win her heart* with acts of chivalry (like helping her move).

This is a highly unnatural way for men and women to pair off. It artificially raises the stakes and makes it harder for both men and women to assess their own marriage market value. A much more natural way is for women to first signal interest to the man by subtle (and therefore deniable) indicators of interest (IOIs). If the man gets the hint, and if he is interested, the path is open for the couple to get to know each other. This doesn’t mean men should never initiate contact or lead, but men should know how to read the signals and not waste their time on a woman who (given the chance) isn’t indicating interest. Ironically the Courtly Love model is presented as the man leading, but in fact it is all about the man chasing. Chasing isn’t leading, it is following. Moreover the rigid and artificial Courtly Love model is not only not effective, it is not (as widely believed) a biblical model.
*Winning her heart is considered the lifetime role of a Christian husband, including after the wedding. While the Bible teaches us that wives should win over their husbands, Courtly Love teaches us that a husband must forever re-win his wife’s heart. This is especially important for Christian husbands to do when their wives get bored of being married and start affairs with high status men at work. For the definitive guide on this, see the movie *Fireproof.*
Huffington Post had an article last week about Amy Schumer’s 6 month wedding anniversary:
Amy Schumer Celebrates Marriage Milestone With A Fart Joke, Of Course

“Married 6 months today,” she wrote on Instagram Monday. “I love you more every day. sorry my fart woke us up this morning.”

Farts are an odd obsession with ugly feminists*, so at first whiff you might think this is business as usual for Amy Schumer. However, it seems that in this case it might be a sign of alpha widowhood. The Huffington Post article closes with a strikingly similar quote from Schumer, but regarding a different man and with the roles reversed:

Prior to marrying Fischer, Schumer dated furniture designer Ben Hanisch for nearly two years.

“We went out with a couple who had been together a long time, we were trying to rush the intimacy,” she said at a charity show in New York in June. “Like I was trying to impress the girl and I was like, ‘Well, he woke me up this morning with a fart!’ And he just slowly turned to me and he goes, ‘Are we doing this?’”

In the E News story on Schumer’s wedding, much of the article focused on Hanisch, the one that got away:

Her reluctance to share more excitement about finding love again prior to saying “I do” was a lingering effect from her breakup with Ben Hanisch less than a year ago...

[In July of 2016] she admitted to having a little more anxiety about the whole thing. “Being in love [with Hanisch] is the scariest thing in the world,” she said. “You want to f-king cry and scream. I can’t handle it. Every time we say good-bye, I think, ‘This will have been a nice last week together.’ Or I tell myself nothing is real and he’s going to leave me and tell me he never loved me. I feel so bad for him. How exhausting it must be dating me.”

*See Also:

- Friday afternoon ugly feminists: Hot farts edition.
- She’s saving her farts for you.
- The ugly feminist secret weapon.
In my last post I offered an example of alpha widowhood. Marrying such a woman represents a real danger for men, and the risk of this is greatly increased by the mind frame of courtly love.

Infogalactic lists the stages of courtly love:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of courtly love</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Adapted from Barbara W. Tuchman)[41]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Attraction to the lady, usually via eyes/glance
- Worship of the lady from afar
- Declaration of passionate devotion
- Virtuous rejection by the lady
- Renewed wooing with oaths of virtue and eternal fealty
- Moans of approaching death from unsatisfied desire (and other physical manifestations of lovesickness)
- Heroic deeds of valor which win the lady’s heart
- Consummation of the secret love
- Endless adventures and subterfuges avoiding detection

This is the original version of courtly love. The modified version that we mistake for Christianity alters the script as follows:

1. Attraction to the lady, usually via eyes/glance
2. Worship of the lady from afar
3. Declaration of passionate devotion
4. Virtuous rejection by the lady
5. Renewed wooing with oaths of virtue and eternal fealty
6. Moans of approaching death from unsatisfied desire (and other physical manifestations of lovesickness)
7. Heroic deeds of housework which win the lady’s heart
8. Get married.
9. Repeat steps 1-7 in a continuous loop.

For those who practice courtly love in lieu of Christian marriage, the practical problem is that steps 1-7 won’t win a woman’s heart, and are in fact repulsive. She might however decide to settle, and marry you anyway. If she does, rest assured she will always resent you for it, and will always see herself as a victim.

See Also: Are the vast majority of women truly incapable of experiencing reciprocal love
and attraction?
I stumbled upon some new marital status data over at the US Census, and thought I’d share the charty goodness. First up is the median age of marriage, going back to 1890:

From the accompanying spreadsheet, you can see that the median age for women crossed into uncharted territory in 1979 at 22.1, breaking the 1890 record of 22. For men, the median age of marriage didn’t exceed the 1890 value of 26.1 until 1989 when it was 26.2. As of 2017 the median age of first marriage for men and women was 29.5 and 27.4, respectively.

But the median age of marriage only tells us about the men and women who do marry. The next two charts give a bit of a look at marital status trends overall.
Note that the top two lines on both charts (married and never married) are driven in part by the increase in age of first marriage. When men and women marry later they spend a smaller
percentage of their adult lives married, and a larger percentage counted as never married.

If they had the nevermarried data broken out by age bracket like I was able to do in the past, we’d have a better understanding of how much of the trend is delayed marriage vs not marrying:

The other limitation with the Census charts included above is that changing racial and ethnic demographics could be driving part of the changes we see. Marriage and divorce rates vary widely by race, so it could be that the changes we are seeing in recent decades are due more to racial and ethnic changes than due to an overall societal trend. Fortunately the Census offers a spreadsheet with the marital status data broken down by race and ethnicity. I didn’t take the time to chart this out for all races, but here is what it looks like for White* men and women:
U.S. White Men’s Marital Status Over Time

Source: https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/demo/tables/families/time-series/marital/ms1.xls

https://dalrock.wordpress.com/

- Married
- Never Married
- Widowed
- Divorced
I’d love to see the same breakdown for Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians, but for the sake of time I stopped where I did. If you decide to chart this out yourself please let me know so I can add a link to your charts.

*The data in the two charts I just created is different from the data I’ve charted out in the past because 1) It isn’t broken out by age. and 2) The former is for White, and the latter is White alone non Hispanic.

**Edit:** I updated the two new charts to show continuous lines.
I decided to take another crack at the marital status data by race and ethnicity that I shared on Friday. Instead of creating multiple charts for each group, I charted all groups at once, only tracking the percent married value. I still ended up with two different charts however, because for Blacks and Whites the data goes all the way back to 1950, while for Asians and Hispanics there is only data going back to 1990. Here is the Black and White data going back to 1950:

I had no idea that:

1. Black and White marriage rates started out so close. Note that in 1950 White men were...
only 4% more likely than Black men to be married, and the same was true for White vs Black women.
2. The deterioration of the Black family was already in full swing in the 1950s. It would be interesting to see what social policy changes were underway in the 1950s that might explain this. I suspect there were precursor changes to how illegitimacy was legally handled, as well as welfare policies encouraging single motherhood. It would also help to see the data on Black out of wedlock birth rates, but the data for Blacks is missing until 1969.

At any rate, it is clear that the modern view of marriage has been a catastrophe for Black families.

Here is the same chart, but starting from 1990 and including Asians and Hispanics:

![Percent of US population 15 and older who are married](https://dalrock.wordpress.com/)

Note that for Whites and Blacks, men are more likely to be married than women. Yet this is reversed for Asians and Hispanics. Notice also that Asian marriage rates are very nearly as high in 2017 as they were in 1990, while the same figures have dropped for all other races. Lastly, as I’ve pointed out before, the data for Hispanics is deceptive because first generation
Hispanics have very low divorce rates, but native born Hispanics have divorce rates comparable to Blacks. Given the pattern we’ve seen with marriage rates declining where the risk of divorce is highest, I would expect Hispanic marriage rates to fall dramatically over the coming decades.

Notes on the charts:

- When I broke out the races the lines for Black, Asian, and Hispanic looked like EKG lines. My assumption is the off census samples are too small to break out the data this way. For consistency I used only census year data* for all races, with the exception of 2017. To see what the charts would look like with off census year data included, see here and here.
- All of the data in the first chart is in line with Figure 2 on page 63 here, with the exception of 2010 data. I have no idea why the 2010 values differ.

*Edit: I see from the source data that the number of interviews appears roughly the same on census years as off census years. So the census year data appears to be just as noisy as off year data.
They’re her bros.
by Dalrock | August 28, 2018 | Link

Cane Caldo shared a video from a local newscast:

Notice how this story demonstrates the two primal feminist desires that work cross purpose:

1. Be (like) one of the guys (experience manly pride)
2. Mark all spaces as feminine (extinguish manly pride)

Ms. Martin is careful to present herself as one of the guys. They’re her bro’s after all. And she hasn’t yet demanded an expensive remodel to all of the high schools her team might play; she shows up for away games already dressed. Her father is also delighted that his daughter is officially one of the guys. Did you see her tackle that other boy?

But both the newscaster and her father are ecstatic that she is marking football as feminine. The newscaster expresses his hope that football will never be the same, and her father is eager to point out that her very presence has forced the coach to change the way he talks to the team.

The end goal is obvious, to make sure football is no longer seen as a way for young men to prove themselves as men. This won’t happen overnight, but just like with the military, it will happen over time.

Related: It would be petty to point out how petty it is.
The primary risk of the feminist strategy to delay marriage is that once a cohort of women finally reach their late twenties/early thirties and is ready to switch from Alpha F*cks to Beta Bucks, the the cohort of Beta men they are counting on may not follow the script. There are a number of ways this can happen. One is that a percentage of the Betas could decide they’ve become accustomed to remaining unmarried, and decide to pass on the suddenly reformed party girls demanding that they “put a ring on it”. But reformed party girls can be very persuasive, so they may be able to overcome this initial resistance.

However there is another way this can play out that soon-to-be-reformed party girls should take more seriously. The Betas they are counting on to focus on education and career during their teens and twenties (in order to be able to play the Beta Bucks role in their 30s) might elect to coast instead. If this happens, persuasion won’t help. The unprepared men can no more go back and focus their teens and 20s on education and career than the party girls can go back and focus their youth and fertility on a husband.

The thing about the delayed marriage trick is it works really well at first. Women can delay marriage but their male peers will tend to prepare to marry based on what they observe happening to the men 5-10 years older than them. By the time the younger men find out that their generation of women had other plans, for the most part they will already be solidly on the provider track. Given no other choice, waiting a few more years is what nearly all will do. But over time each new generation of men is going to see the delayed proof of what is going on. The signal that being a Beta provider pays off in the form of first a girlfriend, and then marriage weakens as fewer of the men 5-10 years older than them have this happen. Eventually you will have a group of teen men who see marriage as so far off that the future reward isn’t worth working so hard to prepare for. This won’t happen all at once, but over time more and more of the men who were less motivated to begin with will begin to coast more and more, or simply become distracted along the way. Many will begin to work like women.

I was able to pull a comparison of marriage rates by three year cohort in 2017 and 2003 using the Census CPS data tool. I’m showing the data for White Non Hispanic below which reduces potential shifts caused by immigration, but you can view the same data for all races as well. Since the bars represent the percent of men who had never married by the given age, higher bars indicate less marriage:
Note that the arrows point out the weakened signal for Generation Z men, because Gen Y men would have been looking at Gen X marriage trends when they were coming of age, just as Gen X men were looking at Boomer trends when they were young.

While it is obvious that women won’t be able to continue delaying marriage forever without a highly visible reaction from men, it isn’t clear how long such a response will take. Gen Z men, and indeed the generation that follows them, might continue preparing to be Beta providers while their peers spend over a decade riding the carousel. We shall have to wait and see.

**Edit:** Generation markers based on dates listed here. I originally calculated the generation dividing lines for 2017 using 2018 to calculate age. I’ve updated the charts to correct the error.
Evidence of a “marriage strike”?
by Dalrock | August 30, 2018 | Link

There are a few other points of interest in the chart I shared in my last post. First is that the early gap in never married rates closes starting in men’s early thirties until it reaches parity in the 41 to 43 cohort. This fits with women’s desire to delay marriage, not forgo it entirely. The goal is to not waste a day more of their youth and fertility on their husband than absolutely necessary. The goal is not to avoid marriage altogether, nor wait so long that their fertility window has entirely closed. I’ll share some charts later in the week on women’s never married rates by age, but for now I’ll note that a flurry of marriage for men in their early 30s to early 40s matches with a flurry of marriage for women in their late 20s to late 30s.

But what is surprising in the chart is that after rough parity with the past occurs (around age 38-43), a new gap opens up. I’m open to suggestions on what this new gap might mean, but it strikes me that this is the pattern we would expect to see if there were in fact men on a “marriage strike”*. Men refusing to marry wouldn’t necessarily show up in the 20-30 cohorts because women are the ones with the SMP/MMP power then. They also wouldn’t show up in the 30 something cohorts (when women are frantic to marry), so long as there are other men the women can still substitute for the “strikers”. But eventually the pool of substitutes will run out, and this is where a strike would show up in the data.

Another explanation would be that this represents a group of men who aren’t desirable for marriage, whether or not they would be willing to marry. Either way, the initial impact would have been felt by women ten years ago in the form of a shortage of prospective husbands for...
mid to late 30s women (just as they are scrambling to marry). This fits with the panic we saw in the Atlantic and other outlets starting in 2008.

For either explanation (men on strike, or men who didn’t prepare to take on the provider role), the obvious catalyst would be the divorce explosion of the late 1970s and early 1980s. We would expect that this would impact the view of marriage by Gen X and to a lesser degree, Boomer II men, which fits perfectly with the data.

*Strike is being used loosely in this case since the men are not boycotting something they want in an effort to negotiate a better deal at a societal level, but have decided that marriage isn’t something they want.
Meet the new Yiayia. Her name is Sheila.

by Dalrock | August 31, 2018 | Link

From Faith Moore at PJ Media:

A California school district recently announced that they are doing away with their dress code. Alameda Unified School District says that students may now wear whatever they want as long as it “covers genitals, buttocks, and areolae/nipples with opaque material” and doesn’t feature “images or language depicting violence, drugs, alcohol, hate speech, profanity and pornography.” The decision is being hailed as “feminist” — parenting site Scary Mommy, for example, called it “feminist AF” — for seeking to diminish “body shaming” and discrimination against girls.

The argument is that by having a dress code schools are guilty of the feminist sin of “body shaming” women. This is you might recall the same reason Sheila Gregoire explained that churches can’t have dress codes.

While Ms. Moore disagrees with the new standards, she is solidly on board with the feminist fears of “body shaming” women that birthed the standards:

When school dress codes make the news — as they frequently do — it is often because a teacher or school administrator has made a ridiculous comment about why the dress code is being enforced. A school principal in Missouri, for example, recently came under fire for saying that girls shouldn’t show their “boobs, bellies or butts so they don’t distract the boys.” A Florida high school student who came to school in a t-shirt but no bra was told she was too “distracting” and had to put band-aids on her nipples before going back to class. These comments — and others like them — have been criticized for sexualizing girls, and painting boys as “oversexualized creatures who will implode at the sight of an exposed shoulder.”

Obviously, shaming girls about their bodies in front of their peers, or assuming that boys are just sex monsters who can’t keep their hands off girls’ bodies, is not a good plan. Nor is implying that girls are somehow responsible for the bad behavior of boys. And school officials who make comments like the ones mentioned above should be called out for it. But instances like those don’t mean the dress code itself isn’t warranted — they only mean that its purpose needs clarification.

Ms. Moore has bought into the feminist logic but doesn’t want to live with the consequences. She argues that the only problem with girls showing up to school “wearing nothing but a pair of underpants and a set of pasties” is that panties and pasties aren’t formal enough for a serious environment like school. This is obviously a problem, but she is fundamentally denying what this is really about. Ms. Moore and Ms. Gregoire are in denial of why modesty standards for women are such a lightening rod issue while modesty standards for men are not. Both are denying women’s temptation to garner sexual attention from men. To them, there is only one kind of sexual temptation/sin involved when a woman shows all (or as much as she can get away with), and that is temptation of men to look. But there is another
complementary temptation, the temptation to be looked at.

The problem with the panties and pasties dress code isn't just that boys will pay undue attention to any girl who takes the school district up on its offer; the problem is the girls will be tempted to take the district up on its offer because they are competing with each other for that very attention.

The only thing that will inhibit the girls from taking full advantage of the new policy will be slut shaming (what both Gregoire and Moore call “body shaming”), and this is the very thing both hope to banish forever. This will come from the girls themselves, their teachers (unofficially), and their parents. But there will be much more confusion in the rules since the effective rules will be at odds with the official rules. This confusion will be all the more painful for the girls because matrons like Gregoire and Moore are so focused on feminist correct thought they are denying what the girls themselves will understand (at some level) is really going on. Instead of playing an anchor role for girls and young women as intended, our matrons have decided they would rather just stir the pot.

H/T Oscar.

See Also:

- Yiayia wouldn’t approve
- Yiayia and the empress’s new clothes
Nude selfies and the complementarian male gaze.

by Dalrock | August 31, 2018 | Link

While women like Faith Moore and Sheila Gregoire deny women’s temptation to compete for men’s sexual attention, some complementarian feminists admit that this is going on but blame it on the patriarchy. As complementarian feminist Wendy Alsup explains in her post On Nude Selfies (emphasis mine):

Kim Kardashian broke the internet last week with her nude selfie. She previously posted a nude selfie when pregnant with her son with a general explanation that it was to quiet the body shammers who regularly criticized her body. Last week’s nude selfie made her feel “empowered.”

... Kim operates in a power system run on the currency of big breasts, small waists, and sexy butt. She runs in a power system in which her primary power is her sexuality. She said she feels “empowered by her sexuality.” Though she has money, owns a business, and is famous, those don’t make her feel empowered in whatever power structure she perceives herself. The secondary powers of money or fame are based on the one thing that fuels her power, her sexuality. She does not bank alone in this power system. Many women do similarly though with lesser currency and lesser power. Kardashian and Beyonce are two of the most savvy women in our world at exploiting this currency for their own benefit.

The problem in this system is that women didn’t create this currency. They have, however, learned how to build their bank account and spend their earnings in it. If a dictator takes over your world and changes the form of money from euros to won, eventually the savvy are going to start operating in won if they want power or influence under the dictator. Satan changed the currency between men and women at the fall. Men oppress women, and women still desire men to the point that they sell their soul (or their body on the internet) to trade in their currency.

Alsup quotes another complementarian feminist (Hannah Anderson) to reinforce the point:

“Rather than dismantling male power structures, (nude selfies) are an attempt to gain power through them. They ARE a form of female empowerment but only because they buy into the established system. Feminine beauty is valuable because the people who want it the most (men) hold biological and sociological power. In other words, feminine sexuality is a commodity that can be leveraged to gain power because of the demand that already exists.

In a fallen world, men hold power, and sinful men hold onto it for their own benefit; women need to gain power both to protect themselves as well as desiring it out of...
their own sinfulness. The result? Women use the one thing they have that men want to shift power away from those men. The problem, though, is that it ends up harming other women. It becomes a form of competition for the limited resource of male attention, which is the means of gaining power.”

This is all standard feminist boilerplate with a dash of Christian seeming theology mixed in. What makes this noteworthy however is that it is coming from women who are taken seriously in complementarian circles. You can read Wendy Alsup’s contributions to Dr. John Piper’s Desiring God website here, and her contributions to The Gospel Coalition here. Likewise, you can read Desiring God’s endorsement of Hannah Anderson’s book here, and her contributions to The Gospel Coalition here. If one or both of their names sound familiar, it could be because of a quote I shared from another complementarian feminist in my post Androcentric chimps chimping.

Gary McQuinn, named so many of the issues friends like Jen Wilkin, Wendy Alsup, Hannah Anderson, and others—all complementarians paying particular attention to women’s involvement and leadership—had been talking about for years.

There is a direct pipeline from the women's studies department at your local university into the complementarian mind, and complementarians are entirely incapable of defending themselves from this.
2017 Never Married Data
by Dalrock | September 4, 2018 | Link

After several years of interruption I’m finally able to pull never married data by race and age again via the U.S. Census CPS data tool. This first chart uses three year averages to estimate the beginning, middle, and ending years in order to get the sample sizes up since it looks at specific ages instead of five year cohorts:

Percent of U.S. Women Never Married by Year & Select Ages (All Races)

Source: U.S. Census Current Population Survey
Values represent 3 year averages centered on the year listed

The chart above is for all races. As I’ve done in the past, I also broke it out just for White Non Hispanic women to minimize the impact that immigration and demographic changes might be having:
For both charts it is clear that nearly all women have married by age 45. This reconfirms two things:

1. There will always be thirsty men willing to marry even the staunchest holdout, even though we are seeing what may be a small but growing number of men electing not to marry.

2. Women still see marriage as an indispensable part of having it all, despite all of the talk about women no longer feeling the need to gain the status of wife. To understand how deep this need is, consider just how hard these women had to settle after assuring themselves for decades that they could do better. Choosing last sucks, and it sucks all the more if the reason you chose last is you were sure you could do better than the ever shrinking pool. These women didn’t get any younger, prettier, more fertile, or less entitled as they entered middle age. Their options didn’t get better as their 40th and 45th birthdays approached, they got much worse. What changed is the women decided to settle, and settle hard.

At the same time we can see that never married rates continue to increase dramatically for
women under 40. This breakdown by age is a far clearer picture than the much simpler **median age of first marriage**. Ever increasing numbers of women are turning 35 without having married. In 2004 roughly 12% of 35 year old White women had never married, but by 2016 this had increased to an incredible 18%! At the same time, the continued delay of marriage in the younger age brackets means that the 35 year old husband hunters will be competing with a glut of never married younger women. In 2004 roughly 22% of 30 year old White women had never married. By 2016 this had jumped up to 35%!

The thing to keep in mind as you look at all of the charts on this post is that women postponing marriage during their twenties is seen as empowerment. But **the goal isn’t to wait forever**. Around age 30 a never married woman starts to panic. If she still isn’t married by 35 her panic intensifies. This continues until the panic is so great nearly all of them find a willing man—**any** willing man—and march him down the aisle.

The risks of this plan should be obvious. As ever increasing numbers of women make it into the panic zone, the potential for catastrophe increases. Delayed marriage relies on men as a group responding as desired to an ultimatum. You’ll marry her when she tires of having sex with other men, **take it or leave it**! But as more and more women delay marriage past the age where the SMP power position has shifted from women to men, this strategy becomes ever more tenuous. The greatest risk here is a mass panic by 30 something never married women. If 30 something women flip from greed to fear, men in their 30s and 40s could flip from fear to greed. If men were to respond by merely deciding to delay marriage by 2-3 years (on average) and play the field a bit longer, this would push large numbers of 30 something women from the starts-to-panic zone to the full-fledged-settling zone. If a small number of men at the same time decide to adopt Marcos’ con, the panic would be further magnified. What would happen after that is more difficult to predict. We have spent decades undermining the foundations of marriage. So far, nearly all White men and women still marry, and it isn’t clear what (if anything) we could do to change that. But we are collectively doing our best to exhaust men’s seemingly inexhaustible good will and find out where this limit is, the point at which marriage as an institution loses it’s cachet. As Larry Kummer brilliantly observes we are like monkeys in the nuclear power plant control room, furiously spinning the knobs and pushing the buttons.

In addition to the two charts above I’ve also updated the White Non Hispanic never married charts by cohort that I’ve shared in the past. All of the following charts show the same data, but the latter views strip out the younger age brackets to zoom in on the older brackets in greater detail:
Note that the spectacular jump we saw in 2014 for the 35-39 age bracket appears to have been statistical noise. However, it is clear that we are witnessing a steady increase in never married 35-39 year old White women, moving from 11% in 1999 to roughly 17% in 2017:
Commenter constrainedlocus observes:

I’m still digesting all of this, but I think one question that I have is what are men really thinking in these commensurate age groups? Even if these 30-45 year old women are in panic mode (I agree that they really are), and even if they believe they have to compete with 18 to 27 year old women, the truth is they really don’t have to.

Why? Because American women age 18 to 27 ARE NOT THE LEAST BIT INTERESTED IN MARRIAGE.

What are they interested in then? College degrees. Starting careers. Online shopping for shoes and handbags with their new credit cards. And acts of fellatio among different men that they perceive as “hot”.

As for the first part of his comment (what are the men thinking?), I suspect part of the issue is perception catching up with a quickly changing reality. Back in 2004 over half of all 25 year old White women had already married. By 2016 less than 35% had done the same. That is a huge shift regarding what is considered normal for a 25 year old woman.

For the rest of the quoted comment the important thing to keep in mind is that all of the degrees, careers, shopping, and acts of fellatio are seen as mere prelude to the triumph of marriage and motherhood. All of that fellatio is (in her mind) something she must do to eventually meet the father of her children. It is seen as part of a decade plus of courtship. When she finally meets him (she rationalizes), he’ll be forever grateful that she was willing to suck so many dicks to find his.

This is why the 30 something ex party girl is under so much pressure to marry in time to start a family. It is required to rationalize over a decade of bad choices. And the worse the choices, the more it is required.

This was the perspective even when the woman was still young. Freewheeling promiscuity wasn’t seen by young women as an end unto itself, it was seen as a path to marriage. We know this because this is what the women were telling the media when they were younger. Back in 2013 the New York Times ran a piece titled Sex on Campus: She Can Play That Game, Too. As you might guess from the title it was a celebration of female promiscuity. But even in a piece on the triumph of the sluts, the slutty coeds framed their embrace of casual sex as part of a path to marriage:

Almost universally, the women said they did not plan to marry until their late 20s or early 30s.

In this context, some women, like A., seized the opportunity to have sex without relationships...
For those who haven’t read the article, it is important to note that “A” is a young woman who only has drunken sex because she wouldn’t want to be around her f*** buddy sober, and that she makes it a point to always do it in his bed so she won’t have to deal with the wetspot. This woman pictured her sluttiness as part of her path to marriage:

“’I’ve always heard this phrase, ‘Oh, marriage is great, or relationships are great — you get to go on this journey of change together,’ ” she said. “That sounds terrible.

“I don’t want to go through those changes with you. I want you to have changed and become enough of your own person so that when you meet me, we can have a stable life and be very happy.”

This is why she would only agree to be interviewed if they didn’t use her name:

Ten years from now, no one will remember — I will not remember — who I have slept with...

You can see the same thing in the famous Kate Bolick piece All the Single Ladies in the Atlantic back in 2011. Bolick interviewed the young women in Susan Walsh’s “focus group”. After explaining that these young women had a great deal of experience with casual sex, she tells us:

...when I asked if they wanted to get married when they grew up, and if so, at what age, to a one they answered “yes” and “27 or 28.”

She then reinforced this point:

“Take a look at me,” I said. “I’ve never been married, and I have no idea if I ever will be. There’s a good chance that this will be your reality, too. Does that freak you out?”

Again they nodded.

“I don’t think I can bear doing this for that long!” whispered one, with undisguised alarm.

When these women reach their 30s marriage and motherhood are essential in order to frame their previous choices. If they marry in time and have children, in their mind it was just part of a long, wacky adventure on their path to respectable married motherhood. But if they fail to marry and have children, if they wait too long, their wacky adventure, their decade plus of extended courtship, looks instead like a path of sad, slutty failure.

See Also: Someday we’ll laugh!
A thought experiment.
by Dalrock | September 6, 2018 | Link

3 Likewise, wives, be subject to your own husbands, so that even if some do not obey the word, they may be won without a word by the conduct of their wives, when they see your respectful and pure conduct. 

2 Do not let your adorning be external—the braiding of hair and the putting on of gold jewelry, or the clothing you wear— but let your adorning be the hidden person of the heart with the imperishable beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which in God’s sight is very precious. 

5 For this is how the holy women who hoped in God used to adorn themselves, by submitting to their own husbands, as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord. And you are her children, if you do good and do not fear anything that is frightening.

-1 Pet 3:1-6, ESV

Sheila Gregoire explains that in 1 Pet 3:1-6 by referencing Sarah Peter is warning wives that they must not obey their husbands, as doing so would be idolatry:

To Peter, we serve God and God only. We obey God, not men. He was absolutely adamant about this in the way that he lived his life and in the way that he taught the early church. And these two events were pivotal to the early believers. The readers of Peter’s letter, then, would not have taken his words to mean that women should just follow men and do whatever their husbands wanted. That’s putting the husband in the place of Jesus, and that’s idolatry!

Here is the thought experiment:

1. Read Sheila’s full post.
2. Assume you had to either defend or debunk Sheila’s argument using only previously published quotes from Pastor Doug Wilson to found your arguments. That is, assume Wilson’s writing, and not Scripture, was the governing authority. Moreover, as in academic debate competitions the goal isn’t to get it right, but merely to win the debate.

Which side would you want to be on, defending Sheila’s nutty post or disproving it, given the parameters I just noted?

It would be child’s play to defend Sheila’s argument, and a disaster for anyone foolish enough to try to debunk it under the defined parameters.

H/T theDeti

See Also: Defenseless
I’ve expressed this previously (most recently here), but it strikes me that this requires a separate post for reference purposes.

**Dalrock’s Law of Feminism:** Feminism is the assertion that men are evil and naturally want to harm women, followed by pleas to men to solve all of women’s problems.
Feminism is ironically founded on an unshakable faith in the benevolence of men. This is implicit in (as just one example*) the whole complaint about “rape culture”. Feminists have faith that men will solve all of their problems, which is why they loudly and regularly insist that only men can solve their problems. Any proposed solution to a feminist “problem” that involves women taking even the smallest of actions is immediately shouted down. They know that the more they falsely accuse men of lacking good will, the more men will strive to prove their good will. The more feminists act in bad faith, the more men will scramble to prove their good faith.

As absurd as it is it works beautifully so it is hard to argue with. At least in the West, men’s goodwill really does seem inexhaustible. An exchange I had with a commenter back in 2012 comes to mind. I had written a post with advice to unmarried women on how to avoid the marriage crunch so many of their sisters are already experiencing. Commenter Nas questioned my loyalty as a man:

> You know this one thing really bugs me about many in the manosphere, the desire and need to give females advice. What team are you playing for anyway?!

I asked Nas:

> Are you angry that I’m giving women good advice, or that they won’t take it?

He responded:

> - Both but especially the latter.

*See here and here for other examples.

**Related posts from other bloggers:**

- Adam Piggott: It turns out that men are the ones who can have it all.
- Cane Caldo: Treading While Muzzled

**See Also:** Why Game is a threat to our values.
The Other McCain has a post up about a woman (Julia Baugher) whose profession is giving life advice, even though her own life is an absolute train-wreck. The post titled Fame Whore Update: Relationship Expert Fails and Good-Bye, ‘Reasonable’ Man is worth reading for entertainment value alone. As one of McCain’s reader’s puts it, Baugher is:

The Comstock Load of feminist crazy!

One thing that struck me as I was reading his post is how often women who have failed miserably at finding a husband set themselves up as experts teaching other women how to find husbands. This isn’t just the case for witchcraft practicing feminists like Baugher, but for conservative Christian feminists as well. In the past I’ve written about never married Mandy Hale (age 39) and never married Wendy Griffith (age 54) teaching Christian women how to find a husband. The other day commenter JRob brought Lisa Anderson of Focus On The Family to my attention as well.

Like Hale and Griffith, Anderson (age 46*) has never married. From the stats I shared the other day this makes Anderson an extreme outlier even in our feminist era; only 8.6% of 45 year old White women in the U.S. have never married! But Anderson doesn’t allow her failure to do what nearly all women her age have done discourage her from giving other women advice on how to do what she has failed at. In 2015 Anderson published The Dating Manifesto: A Drama-Free Plan for Pursuing Marriage with Purpose. Focus On The Family also saw fit to make Anderson their Director of Young Adults and Host of The Boundless Show:

Lisa Anderson is director of young adults for Focus on the Family, the world’s leading Christian organization dedicated to helping families thrive. She manages Boundless, Focus’ ministry for young adults, with the goal of helping 20- and 30-somethings grow up, own their faith, date with purpose and prepare for marriage and family.

From what I have found, Anderson’s advice is not as bad as the advice of Wendy Griffith. Much of it is stock churchian platitudes like dating with intention and teaching a modern Christian adaptation of chivalry/courtly love. At times Anderson gets tantalizingly close to offering clear insight about how her own feminism led to her being 46 and single. When asked what she would say to her 28 year old self, Anderson replied (emphasis mine):

I’d say, “Dating takes effort for both men and women.” Dating was hardly on my radar in my 20s. I was too busy chasing a career and thinking I was too awesome to need a man. I didn’t make the effort to get to know men. I don’t remember ever saying I wanted to be married. I turned dates down because I found some miniscule flaw in the guys in question. And then I wondered why I was still single at 30. God puts people in our path for a reason. Many of them are probably good marriage candidates. But when we give all our attention elsewhere, we cheat ourselves out of a healthy pursuit of what is for most of us a God-given life goal. Marriage is a good thing, and biblical, intentional dating is a great way to get there.
But it takes work. And that work should start earlier rather than later. **Learn from my mistakes** on that one, folks.

But when asked in the same article why men are “intimidated” by strong confident women like herself, Anderson answered that men who aren’t attracted to women like her need to stop being so insecure:

3. **On The Boundless Show, in your writing, and in person, you come across as incredibly confident. What advice do you have for men who are intimidated by confident women?**

There are really only two reasons I’m confident: My salvation is secure, and I know I’m loved. The good news is both of these assurances are available to everyone, so it levels the playing field. Any other reason I appear confident is just personality and other lesser stuff. Our negative reactions toward others are usually a reflection of our own insecurities, so men who are “intimidated” by confident women need to examine why that is so. Dating the helpless and needy Damsel in Distress is appealing for only so long; she may initially make you feel strong and important, but eventually you’ll just feel smothered and used. Become secure in who you are, and you’ll be attracted to (and will attract) women who are also healthy and secure. That said, a word for the ladies: Being confident doesn’t mean being a rude, brash, belittling femi-Nazi. Nor does it mean taking everything on yourself and acting like you rule the world. Show that you need men, that men have value, and you’ll prove yourself inviting and attractive.

Likewise, in **dating with intention** Anderson complains that married women tell her she isn’t trying hard enough to find a husband:

Another area that exhausts me is when people assume that if I’m not husband-hunting 24/7, I’m not “trying hard enough.” If I join a women’s Bible study, it’s “why don’t you find a co-ed study?” If I go on a trip with my girlfriends, it’s “don’t you all hang out together a little too much?” Constantly having my motives and efforts questioned makes me feel like I’m not valued for who I am and how I’m currently living my life. Yes, I’m certainly open to marriage, but I’m also maximizing my singleness right now, so let me live my life boldly and with purpose while trusting God for the rest!

The criticism about her hanging out too much with her girlfriends and not leaving room for a husband sounds like it is on target. In **Single, But Not Alone** Anderson explains that she is in a season of making a commitment to her girlfriend in the form of building their dream home (emphasis mine):

And now I’m in a new season. **A season that’s calling me to even deeper commitment.**

As of one month ago, another close friend, **Julianna, and I decided to buy a**
...This buy/build/move idea was Julianna’s idea first. I had to be convinced of it. But now I’m on board. First of all, it’s financially wise (we’re going to rent out our current homes as investments). But bigger than that, God’s been teaching me that maybe for this season in my life, there’s something silly about rattling around in a home that I alone have to finance, repair, insure, furnish and protect (hello expensive security system).

Strip out the “season of singleness” nonsense and this isn’t necessarily a bad plan. As she hints at in the beginning of the article retirement age isn’t that far off, and as she notes this will also allow her to care for her aging mother. Her father has passed away, so if as a 46 year old career woman she is recognizing reality and effectively ruling out marriage it makes perfect sense. We don’t use the word spinster any more, but if we did, Anderson and her committed-roommate would be textbook examples. The problem is that she is not recognizing reality, and (even worse) is positioning herself as an expert on how young people should go about finding marriage.

*Per this article she was 43 in July of 2015.
The problem with conservationism is that it isn’t rooted in anything real, anything solid. This leaves conservatives grasping for anything they can claim as “traditional” in opposition to the current culture, while taking care not to do anything that would be considered offensive to current culture. One quite comical example of this is Dennis Prager’s pretzel logic on gender bending*. Prager isn’t a bigot, so he is all for a man deciding he is a woman, or vice versa. But Prager is a traditionalist, and tradition requires that men have men’s names, and women have women’s names. This applies equally to men who declare that they are women, and vice versa. You are whatever you say you are, so long as you choose a name that fits. To do otherwise would blur gender distinctions:

When Bruce Jenner came out as a woman, he/she took a female name, Caitlyn. Once he presented himself to the world as a woman, Jenner thought being called Bruce would be confusing and inappropriate. Rabbi Silverstein could have taken a male name — if only, for example, by shortening “Becky” to “Beck.” Had the rabbi done so, I would never have cited this example.

Retaining a distinctly female name while being called a man represents a desire to blur gender distinctions — which is all I care about in this matter,

Modern Christians do something similar with dating. The goal is to conserve something they are sure must be God’s plan, and must have been the way men and women met and married in times past. This doesn’t come from the Bible though, it comes from chivalry/courtly love. As I noted yesterday, Lisa Anderson’s book on finding a spouse is titled The Dating Manifesto: A Drama-Free Plan for Pursuing Marriage with Purpose. Dating is a key part of Anderson’s solution to delayed marriage. And this dating must be “intentional”, as the Bible commands (emphasis mine):

Marriage is a good thing, and biblical, intentional dating is a great way to get there. But it takes work. And that work should start earlier rather than later. Learn from my mistakes on that one, folks.

To Anderson, seeking marriage means men ask women out on paid dates, and women wait to be asked on paid dates (emphasis mine):

HOW DO YOU ENCOURAGE YOUNG ADULTS TO ACTIVELY PURSUE MARRIAGE, INSTEAD OF PASSIVELY ASSUMING THAT IT WILL JUST HAPPEN “SOMEDAY” OR “EVENTUALLY”?

I believe marriage is an intentional pursuit. It begins by praying boldly for marriage and your future spouse. It involves preparation and growing into mature adulthood so you’re in a position to marry. And finally, it’s an active search. For men, this means literally finding women of character (Prov. 18:22) and asking them out. For women, it means being open to marriage, talking about our desire for it,
and accepting offers of dates from eligible, godly men. For both sexes, this means getting out of our comfort zones, managing expectations while still holding high standards for the things that matter (walk with Jesus, maturity, emotional health), and building a community around us that will help us through the process.

Anderson reinforces the importance of the courtly love/paid date model in the following youtube video:

All of this is required if we are going to get back to the dating mores of the glorious 1950s, a time before hookup culture, when women sat around waiting for men to declare their intentions and take them out on paid dates!

I did a bit of skimming from the parts of her book that are available for preview on Amazon. She offers her mother’s experience at finding a husband in the 1950s in contrast to what she experienced. Except she doesn’t notice that her own parents “courtship” bore no resemblance to the myth. Instead, it happened the way that Cane Caldo and I have said this usually happens. As it turns out, her mother actively pursued her father, overcoming his initial rejection of her:

My mom’s story is something you’d expect from someone who got married in the 1950s. She met my dad in college, stalked him at a few basketball games, went to a senior banquet, and he popped the question. They got married, started out dirt poor, built a life together, started having kids, became dirt poor again, and before they knew it, they had fifty years together.

“I don’t know why it’s so difficult for you,” she tells me with a frown. “When I met your dad, I just knew.” Of course, she conveniently omits the fact that my dad wouldn’t even date her at first. She was from Conneticut; he was from a small farm town in northern Minnesota. She arrived as the new girl on their Chicago campus with her powdered face, red lips, and kitten heels. My dad was convinced she was unsaved and didn’t give her a second look except to hope that she would attend the next citywide revival and meet the Lord. Her friend did the requisite reconnaissance to determine my dad’s misgivings, and within a week my mom was makeup-free and looking substantially more spiritual and demure. With that minor issue resolved, her road to the altar was blissfully unencumbered.

To clarify, I’m not against dating. I’m also not against a culture defining traditional rules of courtship. What I’m against is declaring something essential, and from God that is neither. Moreover, what modern Christians are doing with the dating myth is erecting unneeded barriers to men and women who are already struggling to meet and marry. We are adding a false level of formality that only gets in the way. We may as well teach that women who want to marry need to wear poodle skirts, and men must slick their hair back, don leather jackets and play a neato doo wop song on the jukebox to show they are serious about marriage.

Related:

- A challenge to traditionalists
• *Real men* confess their love to the gas station attendant.
• The wages of wooing.
• Weak men screwing the sexual revolution up.
• What a setup looks like.
• She isn’t getting enough dates.

*H/T Red Pill Latecomer
In her book *The Dating Manifesto: A Drama-Free Plan for Pursuing Marriage with Purpose*, Lisa Anderson explains why she didn’t start considering marriage until she was 30. As she recognizes (to a degree), her story is a feminist cliché. As a girl she was “intoxicated” with the idea of being a woman on her own, living a life of “freedom and joie de vivre”. Moreover, her feminist mindset was repeatedly encouraged by the adults around her: Sadly, as I immersed myself in girl power at school, I received little at church and beyond to counter it. Most of the well-meaning couples in my parent’s circle saw no reason to question my trajectory toward worldly success; many of them outright supported it. I was told... to focus on my education and career. Here are a few of the mantras I commonly received—see if any of them sound familiar:

“Make sure you can support yourself; it’s a tough world out there!”

“You’re so smart; you don’t want to waste your intelligence [implied: by getting married too soon].”

“We’re expecting big things from you.”

You have your whole life ahead of you—have fun while you can!”

“Relax; marriage will happen when it happens.”

“I wish I’d had all the opportunities you have.”

As she was taught, she expected marriage to “just happen” for her, and her only focus was making sure it didn’t happen too soon. She contrasts this with her mother’s mindset:

…my mom finished college, but marriage was a next step. It was always a priority. It was talked about, planned for, and expected. She didn’t mess around when she spotted my dad; she got busy.

She is right, the difference is stark. She was empowered to focus on everything but marriage. This empowerment depended on the pretense that she wasn’t responsible for finding a husband. This would “just happen”, and her greatest fear was allowing it to happen too soon. Her mother on the other hand felt responsible to make it happen.
This is where the modern Christian obsession with an idealized form of dating comes in. It reinforces the same feminist message Anderson received as a girl and young woman, but it sounds traditional. As I quoted before from an interview with Anderson on the topic (emphasis mine):

**HOW DO YOU ENCOURAGE YOUNG ADULTS TO ACTIVELY PURSUE MARRIAGE, INSTEAD OF PASSIVELY ASSUMING THAT IT WILL JUST HAPPEN “SOMEDAY” OR “EVENTUALLY”?**

I believe marriage is an intentional pursuit. It begins by praying boldly for marriage and your future spouse. It involves preparation and growing into mature adulthood so you’re in a position to marry. And finally, it’s an active search. For men, this means literally finding women of character (Prov. 18:22) and asking them out. For women, it means being open to marriage, talking about our desire for it, and accepting offers of dates from eligible, godly men.

This is what Focus On The Family’s expert on the subject is telling Christian women!

Notice that for modern Christian women, women who are awash in the same feminist temptations and mantras that Anderson was, being proactive about marriage means talking about wanting to marry, and waiting to be asked out and won over by her future husband. Unlike Anderson’s mother, the modern Christian woman is told that her job isn’t to try to find a husband. It is the man’s job to find her and win her over. This of course is what we see in practice from young Christian women as they follow the same feminist script Anderson followed. They talk about wanting marriage while waiting for the man of their dreams to make it happen (but only once they have achieved all of their feminist credentials). Of course this naturally devolves into complaining about men:

Where have all of the good men gone?

What is wrong with men?

Why won’t they step up, state their intention to court me for marriage, and ask me on a paid date?

But some women are sharper than others, and sooner or later they figure out that if they want a particular man they need to do something other than sit around and bitch about not being married. They do like Anderson’s mother did and use their feminine wiles to snag their man before another woman beats them to it.

Internalizing a sense of responsibility for finding a husband helps women in other ways, beyond just out competing the clueless complaining squad. Much of the problem is that the women don’t have an accurate sense of their own marriage market value, or league. They have been told repeatedly by Christian leaders that they are incredibly beautiful, and their moxie and girlpower makes them a catch. The problem (they are repeatedly told) is that the men they deserve are failing to man up and ask them out. As a result they typically have a greatly inflated sense of their own prospects with no way to get real world feedback. The lack of fantasy dates isn’t taken as unrealistic standards, but yet more proof that something is
mysteriously wrong with men.

If on the other hand a woman goes against modern Christian teaching and thinks like Anderson’s mother did, she has a way to get real world feedback on her own attractiveness. She can subtly indicate interest to the kind of men she thinks would be a match for her, men she is attracted to. If her standards are too high and the man isn’t interested, or is only interested if fornication is on the table, her ego is bruised but she has retained deniability in her expression of interest. As her over inflated ego is reduced to reality, eventually she will be able to feel attraction for the kind of man who wants to marry her. Internalizing responsibility creates a mechanism for her to both get real world feedback on her self perception, and for her to be able to become attracted to the kind of man she can attract for marriage.

See Also: Feminine wiles
She did her part, but the man didn’t man up.

by Dalrock | September 12, 2018 | Link

As I’ve noted in my last two posts, Lisa Anderson of Focus on the Family teaches modern Christian women that “actively pursuing marriage” means:

- Praying for a husband.
- Talking about wanting a husband.
- Waiting for her godly man to show up and answer her prayers.

HOW DO YOU ENCOURAGE YOUNG ADULTS TO ACTIVELY PURSUE MARRIAGE, INSTEAD OF PASSIVELY ASSUMING THAT IT WILL JUST HAPPEN “SOMEDAY” OR “EVENTUALLY”?

I believe marriage is an intentional pursuit. It begins by praying boldly for marriage and your future spouse. It involves preparation and growing into mature adulthood so you’re in a position to marry. And finally, it’s an active search. For men, this means literally finding women of character (Prov. 18:22) and asking them out. For women, it means being open to marriage, talking about our desire for it, and accepting offers of dates from eligible, godly men.

Of course, in their “season of singleness” while waiting for God to send them Mr. Right, modern Christian women are forced to focus on becoming independent career women. And who can blame them if they find themselves riding the carousel to pass the time? They don’t want to follow the feminist script, mind you, they just have no choice. They have to wait for God to send them their husband. They are simply too traditional to do anything else.

This reminded me of a story I shared a little over a year ago about Gladys Aylward. After converting in her late twenties, Aylward decided to travel from Britain to China as a missionary*. Some time after she followed Focus on the Family’s advice to Christian women who want to marry. She started praying for a British husband, and no doubt talked about how much she wanted one. Then she waited for the man to travel from England to China to find her. But as Dr. John Piper explains, the problem with the plan was the man she prayed for failed to man up:

“Miss Aylward talked to the Lord about her singleness. She was a no-nonsense woman in very direct and straightforward ways and she asked God to call a man from England, send him straight out to China, straight to where she was, and have him propose to me.” I can’t forget the next line. Elisabeth Elliot said, “With a look of even deeper intensity, she shook her little bony finger in my face and said, ‘Elisabeth, I believe God answers prayer. And he called him.’” And here there was a brief pause of intense whisper. She said, “‘He called him, and he never came.’”

Now, that experience, I would guess, is not unique to Gladys Aylward.

*You can read more about Aylward’s story here and here.
Raising her right
by Dalrock | September 13, 2018 | Link

Football is clearly one of the main areas of focus in feminist mopping up activities. It was one of the final socially acceptable male spaces, so it is only natural that feminists feel compelled to fully mark it as feminine. The Pizza Hut ad below combines territory marking with ban bossy. Forget a gentle and quiet spirit. *Good* parents raise their daughters to be as loud and cartoonishly masculine as possible. From the *Ispot description* of the ad embedded below:

> When a family of Steelers fans sits down to watch the game, the daughter gets a little too into it, screaming and ripping up a pizza box after an Antonio Brown touchdown. Pizza Hut says it’s more than just pizza, it’s that moment you realize you’ve raised your daughter right.
Commenter Joe describes how his wife used her feminine wiles to get his attention 32 years ago:

[I went] to a singles class thinking that I’d find a girl to my liking to marry. And I did. Actually, she found me there. Even though she remembers her first day sitting next to me, I’ve no recollection of that. I just remember her butting into one of my conversations. Her first words to me were “I’ll help you”. This was another month or two after her first day. Until she spoke to me, I didn’t know she existed. Bottom line: she showed an interest. So I let her help me. She painted the inside of my rent house all day with me. She specifically pointed out how she was dressed that day (old T-shirt and jogging shorts) as if to apologize for looking so scruffy. Buy hey, we were just painting. And I found her little shorts and tight old t-shirt quite fetching LOL. Still do 32 years later!

The thing is, if one hot woman in the group had noticed what a catch Joe was, all of the women in the group had to have noticed the same thing. This was a Christian singles class, so all of the women there were ostensibly looking for a husband. Fortunately for Joe’s wife, the other women were waiting for him to boldly declare his desire to take them on a paid date with the hope of courting them for marriage. Joe’s (now) wife wasn’t about to stand back and let one of those bitches steal her man.

The reality of course is that all but the most clueless Christian women eventually figure this out, which is why we see so many women suddenly marrying in their 30s and even early 40s. The women who marry late in life didn’t suddenly get thinner, prettier, or sweeter. Nor did their options suddenly improve. Their options in fact got worse over time, as smart women like Joe’s wife poached all of the best prospects, leaving the slowpokes to duke it out for the leftovers.

I had NO IDEA who she was! Never laid eyes on her before. All I could see was that she was a 5’10” brown eyed 125lb stunner. So “yeah sure you can come help”!! Turns out she was and still is a VERY hard worker.

We still laugh about that day and how she showed herself off to me so obviously and the tension between us.

As obvious as it was, it was also deniable had nothing come of it. Here was a Christian sister offering to help a brother in Christ. It would be different if she made a habit of doing this for all of the attractive men in the group, which is why it is important for a woman to learn her SMV/MMV as quickly as possible so she can aim high, but not too high.
When “traditional” means socially awkward.

by Dalrock | September 14, 2018 | Link

As I’ve covered in recent posts*, Focus on the Family (FotF) teaches that in order for men and women to marry men must first approach women and boldly state their romantic intentions. The woman’s job is to wait around for men to formally approach her and declare their intentions, and then decide which men she wants to allow to take her on a date. As FotF’s Director of Family Formation studies complains, this isn’t happening (emphasis mine):

At lunch with some colleagues the other day, some of the women—ladies in their 20s—were discussing how rare it is for men their age to step up, approach any feminine peers, and ask for a date, much less show any interest that could be seen as a move toward romance...

It’s passivity, not toxicity, that is the real male problem today. Ask any young woman how she vets all the nice young men who approach to decide who will advance to the bonus round of an actual date. She will ask if you rewind your VHS tapes before returning them to Blockbuster, or just pay the fee.

The problem with this obsession is not only is it totally out of step with current culture, it isn’t in line with how social interactions work in the first place. Every day we interact with the people around us in subtle but meaningful ways. Think about your best friends. How did you come to meet them and become friends? Did they boldly approach you and declare their intention to become your best friend?

Hi I’m Glenn Stanton, and I want to be your best friend! Don’t worry if you don’t want to be my friend right away, I just know I’ll win you over! Will you have dinner with me tonight?

This is the epitome of terrible social skills. If someone approaches you this way chances are you will feel initially repulsed, although that may change to compassion as you recognize the nature of their affliction. Other times it won’t come off as awkward, but as suspicious. What is this weirdo after? Is he trying to rob or con me?

There are of course exceptional situations where the approach wouldn’t feel awkward or creepy. If the man introducing himself as your new best friend is effortlessly cool, owns a great boat and has access to the best hunting and fishing land around, chances are you will think to yourself what a genuinely friendly fellow! But this is a corner case, an exception to the rule.

In real life we are constantly meeting and evaluating people in a multitude of ways. There is no formal path to friendship because it isn’t how real social interactions work. We meet people and strike up conversations, and if there are common interests we learn that organically. Most of these interactions aren’t particularly consequential, and very few turn into true friendships. But the ones that matter end up mattering a great deal. We just don’t tend to know that up front when we are making a first impression. The women complaining to
Stanton are being evaluated by potential husbands on a regular basis, but either aren’t making much of an impression on these men or are being quietly rejected by the men as not a good candidate for marriage. Stanton pretends the women are all fabulous potential wives, and that there is nothing they could do or change to make themselves more attractive to the men they are failing to attract. He says the problem with the women who are failing to attract husbands is they are just so awesome that men are too intimidated by their perfection:

The social opportunities open to women today are making them better catches and thus increasingly intimidating to too many young adult males, who approximate a mole.

This is a cruel lie.

This doesn’t mean that a society can’t have accepted rules about courtship, but that isn’t what is going on. Modern Christians are pretending that a specific set of social conventions are in place, with the implicit claim that these conventions are from God. Neither is true, and as a result they are throwing stumbling blocks between men and women at a time when it is already difficult for them to meet and marry.

This isn’t about the Bible or an agreed upon social convention. It is about a group of people trying to rework the culture to the conventions of a stunted love-struck teenager. For what else is the courtly love model that they are basing this “tradition” upon? Consider the first 7 stages of courtly love:

Stages of courtly love
(Adapted from Barbara W. Tuchman)[41]

- Attraction to the lady, usually via eyes/glance
- Worship of the lady from afar
- Declaration of passionate devotion
- Virtuous rejection by the lady
- Renewed wooing with oaths of virtue and eternal fealty
- Moans of approaching death from unsatisfied desire (and other physical manifestations of lovesickness)
- Heroic deeds of valor which win the lady’s heart

I don’t mean to be cruel to stunted teenagers. They are suffering as it is, and hopefully they will go on to live happy well adjusted lives. But we can’t mine their fantasies for wisdom on how Christian men and women should meet and marry. To do this is cruel to everyone, especially the stunted teenagers who are most taken in by the fantasy.

H/T Novaseeker

*See Also:

- Returning to a past that never was.
- Empowered to avoid responsibility.
- She did her part, but the man didn’t man up.
Several readers pointed out the anachronism in the Stanton quote I included in my last post:

> Ask any young woman how she vets all the nice young men who approach to decide who will advance to the bonus round of an actual date. She will ask if you rewind your VHS tapes before returning them to Blockbuster, or just pay the fee.

The 1990s VHS/Blockbuster reference however is deliberate by Stanton. Stanton is showing off how with the times he is, that he knows what is happening now. He may as well have written:

> Unlike you squares I know what the hep cats are doing today! They aren’t going to the malt shop to sock hop like we did in the 1990s!

I write that because the 1950s dating norms Stanton assumes his audience will be shocked to find are no longer practiced weren’t practiced in the 1990s either. Even worse than that, what he is describing wasn’t really what was going on in the 1950s. Stanton’s dream of a world where unmarried women are queens holding court, deciding which gallant suitor to bestow her favors on exists only in his imagination.

Stanton knows this, but the lie is too tempting because by telling it he can puff himself up in comparison to the loser men of today. The implication is that in his day, men were men and women were glad. Something mysterious has happened to men, while women have only become more fabulous! Stanton closes his essay with a claim that young men today are different than young men in the past, because older men have failed to mold them into real men (men like he was at their age):

> Rest assured, our problem today is not raising toxic males. It’s raising passive males. Those are males who are not even sure what the right thing to do is, much less possess the courage and assertiveness to know when to demonstrate it or how. Masculinity can only be taught, encouraged, and even demanded by the previous generation of both men and women. Men teach and call younger boys up into it, and women set before the young male what he must do if he wants a shot at them.

> The culture that says, “We don’t know how to turn these boys today into men” is tragically passive as well. We need to be men, all of us, to hitch up our collective trousers and teach our boys what manliness is and what it is not and demand they act on it. If nothing else, there’s a whole generation of young women hoping someone will step up and do so.

But Stanton isn’t consistent with this narrative. In his lecture *Marriage is a feminist institution* Stanton claims that men have always been shiftless losers, and it is only due to women marrying shiftless losers and making them man up that anything ever got done in the world. He offers the example of *Jamestown in 1611*, which he says was foundering until
women came over and married the passive colonists and made them into men:

In Jamestown the mother country sent men over to start the colonies in America as an economic venture. They expected the colonizers to come over here and start creating and start growing stuff, making stuff, sending it back to the mother country, and riches would happen. Well they sent this guy Sir Thomas Dale in 1611 to go over to Jamestown because no checks were coming to the mother country from the colonies...

He reported back to the mother country: The men are involved in their usual daily work, which is bowling in the street...

What happened was the mother country said we know how we can get the men working. We’re not going to send drivers, you know crack the whip and get them working, we’re going to send women. And the women, the men will be interested in the women, and the women will set the tone for what the men should do. You know what, before you have access to me, I want a nice cabin, and I want to be able to cook stew, tomorrow. So the men have to start doing, and that’s what they did. And one thing led to another, the women got men to work, they got them to buckle down, and 200 years later, boom. We have America, one of the greatest nations, the greatest nation in the world. Why? Because women showed up, and got men doing what men are supposed to do. That is what marriage does.

So which is it? Did something mysteriously happen to men in the last few decades that made them (in Stanton’s mind) shiftless losers? Or have men always been shiftless losers, and Stanton’s recent screed is just a long winded way of yelling get off my lawn?

It gets worse, because Stanton offers himself as an example of a shiftless loser that had to be made into a man by his wife:

My situation, I grew up as a skateboarder in the panhandle of Florida. Surfer. I was a good kid, didn’t get involved in drugs, didn’t do bad things. But that was my life. School, I didn’t spend a whole lot of time in that. So I continued in that, after I got married and Jackie said, “you know what Glenn, here’s how it’s going to be” and what did I do? Okay, I guess I’m going to have to go to college. I was scared to death of college. Didn’t think I could survive there. Didn’t think I could compete there. But this woman was making me do something, this either or, so I went and did it and I became a better person.

Again, I would have never imagined that I get to do the things that I get to do today. Written a number of books, things like that. But I am who I am because Jackie said not you can do it, you will do it. And every man here knows that that’s true. So the bargaining chip for the man is, it’s going to work out better for me if I be what she wants me to be.

It’s quieter at home, she’s more likely to make the kind of food I like, I’m going to get physical access to her more often, and that sound simplistic, but there are those
things. So the guy’s bargaining chip is to be a guy, and guess what he finds out it works pretty well for him. And that he’s happier than his “free” bachelor friends.

Here is the video segment the quote above is transcribed from:

Stanton regularly refers to himself as a passive loser in need of constant direction of his mommy-wife. In his brief bio at Boundless Stanton says that he never picked out and bought an item of clothing for himself until he was 28. This is one of the most important things Stanton wants you to know about himself:

Glenn T. Stanton is the director for family formation studies at Focus on the Family. He debates and lectures extensively on the issues of gender, sexuality, marriage and parenting at universities and churches around the country. Glenn is the author of four books and a contributor to nine others. He’s a huge Bob Dylan fan, loves quirky movies, and picked out and bought the first piece of clothing for himself when he was 28. Glenn and his wife, Jacqueline, have five children and live in Colorado Springs, Colo.

Although his narrative changes whenever expedient, there is at least some consistency to Stanton’s message. While Stanton wants to pose as the only real man in the room, he clearly has deep feelings of inadequacy as a man, something he projects onto other men of all eras.

Related:  Stanton’s dilemma
It turns out they *both* want a tall man.

by Dalrock | September 16, 2018 | Link

What are the odds?*

**Update Sept 17:** The video was deleted some time yesterday evening, but the youtube channel is still available for context. See also Larry Kummer’s slightly edited transcript snips in the discussion below.

This demonstrates the cruelty of Focus on the Family/Glenn Stanton’s message to Christian women looking to marry. Neither of the two women give any indication in the nine and a half minute video that they understand they aren’t the only ones choosing, that they are being silently rejected by men just as they are silently ruling nearly all men out. Clearly there is something wrong with men if these two young Christian women aren’t forced to choose from a long line of 6 ft 1 (or taller) sexy Christian men who declare their desire to court them for marriage.

H/T: Red Pill Latecomer

*Their shock when they realize they both are looking for a man 6 ft 1 and above reminds me of the line in idiocracy where the two men realize they share common interests: *So you like money and sex? You’re trippin’ me out!*
If Christianity isn’t feminism and courtly love, what is it?

by Dalrock | September 17, 2018 | Link

New commenter Tim asks:

I’ve come to really enjoy your writing since I first found it about six months ago. I appreciate how you’ve expanded my thinking on many issues.

However, although I’ve read many of your archived articles, I struggle to understand your actual positions on issues.

Because you’re so skilled with pointing out the various errors you see in modern Christian perspectives (such as the errors with complementarianism, courtly love, etc.) I think I understand your alternatives, but I’m never quite sure.

In short, you frequently oppose a position but I can rarely figure out what your actual position is. I’m interested in the positive principles and positions that you teach your children.

Will you please consider writing a series of positive articles, stating as clearly as you’re able what you actually believe and why? This would be very helpful for me as I consider your work.

I very much appreciate Tim’s kind words, and if he has a specific topic he wants me to provide more detail on I’ll do my best either via a comment, a reference to an existing post, or by writing a new post.

However, I think the question itself is telling. If I’m reading Tim correctly, he agrees that modern Christians have unwittingly adopted courtly love in place of Christianity, and he agrees that courtly love is a perverse mockery of Christianity. But (again, if I understand correctly) he struggles to imagine what Christianity would look like if we removed the adulterant.

While I think I get where he is coming from, the very fact that it is hard to imagine Christianity without courtly love (not to mention feminism) is the fundamental problem. Imagine a time in the not too distant future where Christians have adopted homosexuality as if it were Christianity. A blogger who regularly pointed this out might receive a similar question:

I’ve been reading your blog for some time, and have begun to see what you are getting at. After reading here I can now see what a bad idea our monthly bathhouse night was, and that the unfortunate incidents we experienced there weren’t random as I had once believed. I’ve even begun to accept that our church’s weekly beefcake review is likewise ill conceived. I’m still grappling with whether or not we should
continue our customary *fruity dance* during the offertory, although as some have pointed out you might be overly sensitive on this particular item.

But I struggle with your focus on what we should stop doing, and am looking for specific advice beyond things like “cancel the men’s naked hot-tub event” and “stop having gay sex”. What would we be as Christians without homosexuality? What could possibly be left once we rule all of these gay things out? We need positive direction, not just warnings to stop being gay.

This hopefully seems absurd, because today at least Christianity doesn’t face the same widespread corruption regarding homosexuality that we do with feminism and courtly love. The question is absurd because we don’t (yet) struggle to imagine Christianity without homosexuality. However, this isn’t the case when it comes to Christianity and courtly love (or feminism). The corruption is so endemic that we struggle to recall what was corrupted in the first place.

This isn’t a simple question to answer because the Bible and/or the church (if Orthodox or RCC) doesn’t always offer specific scripts we should follow on (for one example) how Christians should court for marriage. We know that fornication is prohibited, and that if a person burns with passion they should marry and not deny each other sex. Likewise the Bible tells us to honor our father and our mother, so adopting a secular holiday set aside to honor fathers and using that time to disparage fathers is a problem, but this doesn’t tell us exactly how we should go about honoring fathers.

Other times the Bible is quite clear on what we should do (for example headship and submission), but because of the corruption we are repulsed by what it clearly tells us we should do. Either way, the crucial first step is to recognize the corruption both in general and in specific, and root out the specific false teachings we have unknowingly adopted. As we do this, the specific expressions of non cucked Christianity will vary, but this doesn’t mean we shouldn’t bother working to root out the corruption in the first place.

Once you identify the corruption, follow this detailed plan:
I happened to stumble upon this 1920 anti suffrage broadside while looking for something else (source).
Interestingly the broadside was created by a group of women who opposed suffrage, the Southern Women’s League.

The More a Politician Allows Himself to be Henpecked The More Henpecking We Will Have in Politics.

Indeed (H/T Instapundit):

“We need to judge Brett Kavanaugh, not just by what he may or may not have done, but how he treats a woman’s pain. Will he take her pain seriously? Do the people interrogating her take her pain seriously?” https://t.co/LGDdKqR73I

— ana marie cox (@anamariecox) September 18, 2018
How chivalry (and mamma’s boys) brought us women’s suffrage and feminism.

by Dalrock | September 20, 2018 | Link

On the Moral Superiority of Women explains how suffragists turned traditional conservatives’ chivalrous arguments against them. Chivalry/courtly love teaches that women are the source of manners and morality, and that men are made moral by becoming enslaved by romantic love for their moral betters. Traditional conservatives thought in the past just as they do now, that they can fight feminism with chivalry. But chivalry is the foundation of feminism, so the move reliably backfires:

Traditionally suffragists based their case for the right to vote principally on equal rights and attempted to embarrass men into giving them the vote by pointing out how shameful it was for a purported democracy to deprive half of its citizens of the right to vote. In response, opponents of women’s suffrage often argued, among other things, that women were morally superior, finer beings, who would be debased and degraded by participating in the tough hurly-burly world of politics. In the progressive era, women now readily agreed. Women were indeed morally superior. Men had control of society for too long and had made a mess of it. America’s politicians were scoundrels and corruption was the order of the day. An infusion of moral superiority was just what was needed and it was women voters who would supply it.

The suffragettes’ argument was logically bulletproof. If you assume women are more moral than men, then giving them the vote will clearly increase the nation’s virtue. Better yet, if you care about virtue you should take the vote away from men and give it to their betters.

But despite the fact that fighting feminism with chivalry is a reliable way to empower feminism, traditional conservatives aren’t about to change tactics. Thus we have complementarians who are convinced that women won’t rebel against headship and submission, if only men are chivalrous enough.

No amount of facts and logic will persuade the traditional conservative that chivalry (once deployed correctly) won’t defeat feminism. Facts and logic don’t matter, because the love for chivalry doesn’t come from a logical place. It comes from the beating heart of the mamma’s boy, way down inside. If these men were to unchivalrously not enable feminism, their mothers might scold them!

As History.com explains, this is how the 19th Amendment came to be ratified. A legislator who had previously voted against the amendment received a note from his mother, imploring him to be a good boy and vote for it (emphasis mine):

The speaker called the measure to a ratification vote. To the dismay of the many suffragists who had packed into the capitol with their yellow roses, sashes and signs, it seemed certain that the final roll call would maintain the deadlock. But that
morning, Harry Burn—who until that time had fallen squarely in the anti-suffrage camp—received a note from his mother, Phoebe Ensminger Burn, known to her family and friends as Miss Febb. In it, she had written, “Hurrah, and vote for suffrage! Don’t keep them in doubt. I notice some of the speeches against. They were bitter. I have been watching to see how you stood, but have not noticed anything yet.” She ended the missive with a rousing endorsement of the great suffragist leader Carrie Chapman Catt, imploring her son to “be a good boy and help Mrs. Catt put the ‘rat’ in ratification.”

Still sporting his red boutonniere but clutching his mother’s letter, Burn said “aye” so quickly that it took his fellow legislators a few moments to register his unexpected response. With that single syllable he extended the vote to the women of America and ended half a century of tireless campaigning by generations of suffragists...

Related: Tackling the patriarchy, holding the door open for trannies.
RIP Zippy
by Dalrock | September 21, 2018 | Link

Zippy’s son Gabriel advised readers of Zippy Catholic that Zippy was killed in a car accident:

Hello all.

Though I have no way to offer any proof at the moment, I am Zippy’s son. My real name, which he gave to me, is Gabriel.

My father, whose real name is Matthew, was indeed killed in an accident on the road two days ago. My family and I are still reeling at the loss.

I am currently in the midst of trying to make funeral arrangements while also caring for my family. While I don’t have the time or energy to give him a proper send off now, I plan on writing something of an obituary for him and posting it to this blog later. For now, all I will say is that no one who knew him could possibly doubt his powerful love for God and his family. To have that man as my father is the greatest blessing God has ever given me.

I would ask you all to pray for the repose of his soul and the peace of his widow, my mother.

Thank you all.

Pax Christi.

Zippy (Matthew) greatly inspired me with his faith and he taught me more than I can express, both through his explanations as well as how he conducted himself. I know that I’m just one of many who will miss him terribly. If you follow the link at the top of the post you will see comments and condolences from some of his readers.

I will be praying for the repose of his soul as his son asked, as well as for God’s comfort to his widow and children. I ask my readers to do the same.
**Stepping away for a bit.**

by Dalrock | September 21, 2018 | [Link](#)

I'll be turning on moderation later in the day, and will turn it back off on or around Sunday Sept 30th.

**Edit:** Moderation is now on.
You can’t argue with the boy.
by Dalrock | October 1, 2018 | Link

Somewhere in Texas, on a Dalrock family road trip, my wife and children were having breakfast at the motel breakfast bar while I caught a few extra minutes of sleep. An elderly couple asked a family with three girls what the girls wanted to do when they grew up. All three girls indicated that they planned on joining the military. My son offered helpfully (as little boys are wont to do):

The military is for chicks.

The mother of the girls retorted back:

That’s right, the military is for chicks!

But the girls’ father wasn’t sure what to say. According to my wife, for about 10 seconds he frowned and looked very much like he was going to say something, but ultimately remained silent.

Who knows what the father considered saying but ultimately held back on. He was in a tough spot, as he would have had to correct both his wife as well as my son (who was talking out of turn). But even under different circumstances this would have been very difficult for a conservative man supporting women in the military. My son and the man’s wife both spoke the ugly truth about the feminist enterprise, a truth conservatives need to deny. The fundamental goal is to mark the military as a feminine space, to make it impossible for men to associate the military with manly pride. But how can a man take pride in his daughters invading a male space once other men’s daughters have already made it a place for women? Such a father needs other men’s sons to still believe that the military is a male space, so his daughters can prove them wrong. Otherwise, what is the point?

See Also:

- The Long March of Envy.
- Sticking it to the (little) man.
They mean no offense to the Red Guards by claiming their innocence.

by Dalrock | October 2, 2018 | Link

Fox News has a story on four men who were accused of rape but had the charges dropped after video evidence contradicted the accusation.

Prosecutors dropped the charges against Poria Edalat, 30, Saman Edalat, 39, Sina Edalat, 34, and Ali Badkoobehi, 30, after the defendants presented the video to the district attorney’s office, KVVU-TV reported.

What struck me about the story was how careful the falsely accused men were to pay homage to the very hysteria they were caught up in. Three of the men are brothers, and their statement included their pledge of loyalty to the real #MeToo movement:

At this sensitive moment in our history, we believe that women should be respected and heard and believed. But as this case shows, it is also important to keep a critical eye on those willing to use the (#MeToo) movement for their own selfish motives and remember that innocent until proven guilty is one of our country’s bedrock principles.
The standard assumption is that #MeToo is purely a feminist phenomenon. But while its most visible and vocal proponents are feminist, the bedrock of #MeToo is not feminist, but chivalrous. It is chivalry that teaches us that women are more virtuous than men, and that it is noble and *ennobling* for a man to suffer due to the capriciousness of a woman. Despite ostensibly being on opposing sides, neither feminists nor chivalrists care much whether Dr. Blasey Ford is telling the truth in her accusations against Judge Kavanaugh. Both are primed to believe her as a matter of course, but even if she is lying it is still better if we take her at her word. Whether they call it victim blaming or unchivalrous, both agree that it would be monstrous to presume a man accused by a woman is innocent until proven guilty.

Interestingly it has been a few mothers of sons who have been willing to break the feminist/chivalrous spell and speak the unspeakable. Megan Fox dealt chivalry a grievous blow in her post *How to ‘Christine Blasey Ford-Proof’ Your Son* (HT Instapundit):

> **4. Don’t trust women**

Sorry to say it, but my sex offends and horrifies me. Between Stormy Daniels and Ford, women are a disgrace. Contrary to the saccharine platitude that “women don’t lie,” women lie all the time. They lie like crazy. The younger they are, the more they lie and scheme. It’s probably the rage of hormones and insecurity that contribute to it, but most women lie and scheme. Teach your sons to search out morally upstanding girls and to avoid drama queens.

Likewise, Sarah Hoyt indicts the chivalrous mindset in *When Every Boy Is Guilty, Every Girl Becomes a Monster* (HT Instapundit):

> All [the girls] know is that he’s doing socially unapproved things and that this is doubleplus ungood. In the way of middle school girls, they want to enforce conformity. And everyone knows if you accuse someone of sexually harassing you, that gets them removed, and people treat you as a victim and are nice to you.

> I can’t begin to express my horror and disgust at this. I have no words, just a profound depression.

> This is not just wrong. This is evil. Straight up evil.

See Hoyt’s full post for the gory details of how the chivalrous view of young girls harmed her own sons as well as another innocent boy in the same town. As she points out, our assumptions about the innate goodness of girls is not only unfounded, it is evil.
Cane Caldo explains in *I Am Not Called to “Lead” in the Bible*:

Our age’s focus on a husband’s leadership is a clever redirect away from the Biblical command for wives to submit and obey. Every instance of Biblical instruction to husbands and wives say the same thing: **Wives submit to and obey your husbands. Husbands love and care for your wives.** That’s the instruction in 1 Peter 3, Titus 2, Ephesians 5, and Colossians 3; in every instance where the Christian home life is addressed.

The wisdom here is simple, but deep and powerful. If she follows then she is able to fulfill her God-given design. Through Christ she is empowered to be godly even if her husband is a fool; even if he tries to lose her. Likewise, a husband cannot be thwarted from loving his wife. Even if she does not obey him that is no bar to his God-given ability to love and care her despite her wickedness. If he loves and cares for her, and she refuses to obey he is clean. He did not fail to lead.

I’ve written many posts and comments about a husband leading his wife, and I was fundamentally wrong.

When I first read this it was obvious that Cane is right. But I initially struggled to put all of the pieces together. Scripture says the husband is the head of the wife. We can then deduce from this that if he is the head, then he has an obligation to lead. The Bible doesn’t state that husbands have this obligation, the husband’s stated obligation is to love his wife, and the wife’s stated obligation is to submit to her husband. But leaders clearly have an obligation to lead. The specific nature of this obligation is another question, but the basic deduction is solid. However, modern Christians don’t stop there. Next they turn the deduction around and run it backwards:

- If the husband leads, he will be the head.

The reversed deduction is then substituted for the plain meaning of Scripture. This is a masterful sleight of hand. From here, submission is likewise reworked:

- If the husband leads well, the wife will submit.

Here is the full progression:
Modern Christian Headship
Logic Progression

The husband is the head; the wife is to submit to him.

Becomes

Leaders have an obligation to lead.

Becomes

If the husband leads, he will be the head.

Becomes

If the husband leads well, the wife will submit.

http://dalrock.wordpress.com/
How should a Christian husband go about instilling fear in his wife?*

by Dalrock | October 8, 2018 | Link

Pastor Doug Wilson writes** in The Great Servant Leadership Mistake (emphasis mine):

So what would a genuine servant leadership result in? If it were the real deal, the result would be a greater likelihood of the wife being willing to refer to her husband as a lord, and not choking on it. But the moment anyone suggests that we might want to take such a thing seriously, we rush to the abuses, we rush to the caricatures, we rush to the extremes, we rush to the cartoons, and we rush to the barricades. A contemporary evangelical wife, trained in the jargon of soft complementarianism, is more than willing to call her husband her “best friend,” “wisest of counselors,” “true companion,” or someone who “has my back,” who is “there for me.” And actually, those are all good things. Great. Do so more and more. But why the insistence that something like 1 Pet. 3:5-6 cannot be seriously entertained as an option? Why such a demand?

Why do we call it servant leadership? Why not servant lordship?

We should have no trouble with the concept of rulers giving themselves away through service. That is preeminently biblical. True authority bleeds. The problem is that we are dealing with a counterfeit service, not the real thing. We are dealing with widespread abdication that wants to call itself servant leadership. Calling it that makes the painful sensations of having been castrated more manageable. The tag servant leadership is spiritual hydrocodone for the freshly fixed.

The reason we can know we are not dealing with real service in what goes under the heading of servant leadership is that real service results in what? It results in authority, and authority is the great enemy of this generation. Authority is the one thing we cannot abide.

“But Jesus called them to him and said, “You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. It shall not be so among you. But whoever would be great among you must be your servant” (Matt. 20:25–26, ESV).(if available)

Those who are great in the kingdom are those who have given themselves away like this. So a man who wants his authority to be recognized in his home—whoever would “be great”—must pursue that authority the way Jesus says to do it. But when he pursues the role of servant, he is pursuing genuine authority. He is not pursuing the status of “nullity” or “milquetoast.” And when he pursue this under the blessing of God, the very first person to see it will be his wife.

This is you will notice the very same reversal I wrote about in Headship sleight of hand. The
Bible tells us that the husband is the head, and instructs wives to submit to their husbands and husbands to love their wives. One can from there deduce that if the husband is the leader, if he has authority (which Scripture tells us he does), that he has a responsibility (of some sort) to lead. Modern complementarian thought has however taken this logical deduction and run it backwards, concluding that a husband is the head (has authority) if he leads properly. Read the quote above again to see how naturally this deception flows.

But if we were foolish enough to take this line of thinking seriously, this would mean that a husband not only has the obligation to cause his wife to wish to submit to him and call him lord, but to fear him as well. For in the very same passage that wives are told to call their husbands lord, they are likewise told to demonstrate fear of their husbands (1 Pet 3:1-6, NKJV):

3 Wives, likewise, be submissive to your own husbands, that even if some do not obey the word, they, without a word, may be won by the conduct of their wives, 2 when they observe your chaste conduct accompanied by fear. 3 Do not let your adornment be merely outward—arranging the hair, wearing gold, or putting on fine apparel—rather let it be the hidden person of the heart, with the incorruptible beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is very precious in the sight of God. 4 For in this manner, in former times, the holy women who trusted in God also adorned themselves, being submissive to their own husbands, 5 as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord, whose daughters you are if you do good and are not afraid with any terror.

Not all modern translations choose the English word fear in 1 Pet 3:2, but as you can see from Bible Hub this is a common translation, including both the King James Version and Douay-Rheims. Many other translations choose the English word reverence instead of fear.

We see the same Greek word in Eph 5:21 (KJV):

21 Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God.

We also see a derivative (Strongs 5399) of the same word in Eph 5:23. The KJV translates the derivative as reverence and Douay-Rheims translates it as fear:

Nevertheless let every one of you in particular love his wife as himself: and let the
wife fear her husband.

But nowhere in the Bible are husbands told to make their wives fear them, just as they are not told they have the obligation to make their wives want to call them lord. To the contrary, husbands are repeatedly instructed to love their wives. Moreover, while husbands aren’t told to win their wives over through their leadership, wives are told they should hope to win their husbands over through their demonstration of fear and submission!***** Complementarians have turned the whole teaching on husbands and wives upside down.

*The question in the title is a rhetorical question. A Christian husband is not called to instill fear in his wife. He is called to love her.

**For the sake of time and peace I will stipulate that Pastor Wilson does not mean what I have quoted from his blog post above, but means something else entirely, something that is correct. I therefore ask my readers to imagine if someone else had written the quote above and actually meant it, as the ideas expressed in the quote are entirely common in complementarian thought.

***In Eph 5:26 husbands are instructed to sanctify their wives and cleanse them by the washing of water with the word (ESV). This fits with other NT instruction to wives to ask their husbands for biblical instruction. This is clearly an instruction for husbands to actively lead, but this is the one kind of leadership complementarians are certain husbands must not do.

****I have given more examples of the same word being translated alternately as fear and reverence in this post.

*****But even here the Bible does not state that the true test for a wife’s submission is whether she wins her husband over without a word. The claim that we can tell if a husband’s love is authentic by the wife’s response is wholly unbiblical.

H/T Hmm
He knelt like a true gentleman.

by Dalrock | October 9, 2018 | Link

Pulpit & Pen writes in Beth Moore Has Man Get on His Knees, Apologize on Behalf of All Men (emphasis mine):

Moore started her career as a teacher for women, but now preaches to both genders. Evangelical leaders like John Piper have encouraged men to listen to her violations of 1 Timothy 2:12. Not deterred by Scriptural admonitions against women teaching doctrine or preaching to men, Moore has gradually become a chief proponent of evangelical feminism.

Note that Pulpit & Pen has (probably unknowingly) accepted Piper and Grudem’s innovation even while criticizing Piper. Piper and Grudem were so successful in twisting 1 Tim 2:12 that no one remembers a time before their innovation was adopted. I would encourage the Pulpit & Pen authors to revisit what Piper and Grudem have done here. Even though their novel reading of 1 Tim 2:12 is all but universally accepted today, I’ve yet to encounter someone who accepted the twisted logic they used to arrive at their feminist conclusion. In a nutshell, if you want to say the Apostle Paul only restricted women from preaching to men, you have to determine as Piper, Grudem, and Moo did that when Paul writes in 1 Tim 2:14 (ESV):

14 and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor.

that Paul was not saying that women are more easily deceived, as Christians believed until second wave feminism. Instead, you have to decide that Paul was merely repeating what he wrote in verse 13, that men were created before women:

First Timothy 2:14 says, “Adam was not the one deceived; it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner.” Paul gives this as one of the reasons why he does not permit women “to teach or have authority over a man.” Historically this has usually been taken to mean that women are more gullible or deceitful than men and therefore less fit for the doctrinal oversight of the church. This may be true (see question 29). However, we are attracted to another understanding of Paul’s argument. We think that Satan’s main target was not Eve’s peculiar gullibility (if she had one), but rather Adam’s headship as the one ordained by God to be responsible for the life of the garden...

If this is the proper understanding, then what Paul meant in 1 Timothy 2:14 was this: “Adam was not deceived (that is, Adam was not approached by the deceiver and did not carry on direct dealings with the deceiver), but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor (that is, she was the one who took up dealings with the deceiver and was led through her direct interaction with him into deception and transgression).”

This is nonsense, but it is absolutely required if you are going to claim that 1 Tim 2:12
permits women to preach to women. Otherwise, as Dr. Moo explains women preaching to women is a prescription for disaster:

But a statement about the nature of women per se would move the discussion away from this central issue [women having authority over men], and it would have a serious and strange implication. **After all, does Paul care only that the women not teach men false doctrines? Does he not care that they not teach them to other women?**

Getting back to Pulpit & Pen’s main point in the article:

Beth Moore is fully “woke” and fully feminist, and to prove it, she had a man literally get on his knees before a crowd of women and apologize for the male gender.

The idea that Kevin Jones – who Moore acknowledges is a “gentleman” – should apologize for those guilty of abuse, is asinine. Kevin Jones did nothing wrong, supposedly, and he is not imputed with the sin of abusers by virtue of his genitalia.

Beth Moore is a dangerous woman whose influence far surpasses her capability as a Bible teacher. She is ignorant and unlearned, and has become a useful idiot for the political Left.

Note how naturally chivalry complements feminism here. Far from being the “antidote” for feminism, chivalry is the foundation for feminism. Men kneeling and pleading to women is central to the imagery of courtly love, so as a good gentleman it isn’t at all surprising that Kevin Jones was eager to act out his role in Beth Moore’s feminist skit.

HT purge187
A disgrace to the garter?
by Dalrock | October 10, 2018 | Link

From The Telegraph (paywall warning*): Scotland Yard deputy commissioner tells inquest he locked himself in a car as he watched Westminster terrorist stab colleague.

[Sir Craig Mackey] locked himself in his car as he watched terrorist Khalid Masood kill one of his colleagues in Westminster because he had “no protective equipment and no radio,” he has told an inquest.

I should note that Sir Mackey is not a knight of the garter belt. The chivalrous Order of the Garter is the highest level of chivalry and Sir Mackey is of the lowest rank of knighthood, Knight Bachelor.

An article from The Telegraph titled No armed officers present to protect murdered PC during Westminster terror attack, inquest hears sheds more light on the incident. An officer armed only with CS spray (tear gas) was bravely running toward the murderer, when the armed bodyguard of a powerful man intervened and killed the terrorist:

“The attacker was walking towards me. He had the knives in his hands. I had a moment at that time I have never been able to remember from when he was walking towards me. I still have no recollection of it.”

Referring to what he has since seen on CCTV footage, PC Ross added: “I have run to the gate, then stopped, turned around, then (I was) running at the suspect with some kind of plan in my head to try and tackle him before he got anyone else.”

Seconds later, Masood was shot dead by a plainclothes officer – understood to be the then Defence Secretary Michael Fallon’s personal bodyguard.

HT Instapundit.

*Here is an article on the same topic from the BBC without a paywall.
I know this is old news, but the video by Moms for Kavanaugh/CatholicVote.org stood out for doing something very uncommon in our culture.

Prachi Gupta at Jezebel was beside herself at the thought of humanizing men in her post Well This Is a Truly Deranged Ad From ‘Moms for Kavanaugh’

These men are good men. Many manly men do manly things, but never rape, only honorable things. If you are a man and came from a mother’s womb, you are not capable of rape. Because mothers. Because God. Because men good.

I’ve seen some criticism of women during the whole debacle for only being able to empathize with men when they considered their own sons, brothers, fathers, etc. Yet overall men showed even less empathy for good men being falsely accused than women have.

As a society we have nothing but contempt for good, respectable men, and this is most evident in our churches on Father’s Day. Obviously there was a political goal at stake, but nevertheless it was refreshing to see a group so thoroughly fight the culture (especially Christian culture) and for a brief moment honor respectable men.
One of the ideas feminists have been floating is a curfew for men. Most recently this made the news as a viral series of tweets. From This is What Women Would Do if There Were No Men On The Streets Post 9 PM:

- Don’t go out late at night. Don’t dress in short clothes. Don’t walk down deserted roads. Don’t go into dark corners...

- No, these are not rules for an entry into some prison. If you are a woman, you probably have been taught all of these as a child.

- We are told that outside spaces are unsafe. That going out late at night is a risk. That you cannot stroll down at 2 A.M at night without fearing for your life. As much as you choose to, or not choose to believe in these, society conditions you to these factors. It becomes so normalized that you don’t think about why it is a problem.

This feminist idea goes back many years. Back in 2014 Vice.com ran an article titled Would a Curfew for Men Be Good for Society? The Vice article referenced a Colombian city that was “experimenting” with the idea:

- Bars and clubs are being encouraged to host women-only events, while men who have to be out and about in the evening will need to carry a safe-conduct permit issued by the mayor’s office, explaining why they are out during the curfew.

But according to Vice, the idea itself dates back at least to the early 1970s:

- Back in the early 70s, Golda Meir, the then prime minister of Israel, was faced with a government cabinet full of men discussing how best to curb a wave of violent rapes. The idea of banning women from the streets after dark was floated. Meir made a counteroffer.

  “Men are attacking women,” she said. “Not the other way around. If there is going to be a curfew, let the men be locked up, not the women.”

One thing to keep in mind is that the idea of a curfew for men is not about stopping crime or protecting women. This is about feminist envy of men. In order to protect women, such a scheme would not only have to keep good law abiding men off the streets, it would have to keep murderers, rapists, etc. off the streets as well. The feminists themselves understand that such a law would only keep the good men off the streets, and they are fine with that. As the promoter of the Colombian scheme acknowledged in the Vice article, such a rule would depend upon the goodwill of men:

- Any fines handed out are likely to be symbolic, however. The success of the scheme will rest on whether men choose to go along with the campaign. As Beltrán
conceded, “We can only hope men accept the challenge [to stay at home],” which is far from a certainty.

But why would feminists want a rule to keep good men at home at night in response to crimes committed by bad men? Not only would this not make women safer, but removing good men would make women even more vulnerable to the small number of bad ones. The answer is that this isn’t about crime or safety, but envy. This is about feminists envying good men, and wanting to punish them for having something they covet.

This isn’t about feminists being angry with rapists and murderers, this is about them resenting the good men who unhesitatingly go out of their way to keep women safe. The proposal is the response to the feminist question:

Why do men get to protect women? Why isn’t it the other way around?

In a satirical piece in the Sydney Morning Herald this July, Melinda Houston captured this envy perfectly. After acknowledging that truly bad men would not be deterred by the curfew, she described the real benefit of the law; good men would be afraid and need to turn to women for protection:

But how about when I want to, say, go out and have dinner or a few drinks with male friends? Well, right now, at the conclusion of an evening’s festivities one or more of my male companions see me safely into a taxi. But under the new regime any men out after dark would have to be accompanied by a responsible female, and escorted in person to appropriate transport. It’s completely do-able. I can attest to it. I’ve been doing it for decades.

Same rules for any chap who works nights.

And if you can’t afford a taxi or an Uber or arrange for a friend to collect you? Well, gentlemen, you’d have to take your chances, just as the ladies currently do.

This is of course the same impulse driving the insistence of forcing women into every unit in the military, no matter the cost. Rape and murder they can tolerate, but feeling gratitude is absolutely unbearable.
Feminists resent his chivalry even as he chivalrously supports feminism.

by Dalrock | October 12, 2018 | Link

Country star Chris Janson has a song climbing the charts titled Drunk Girl, teaching that the difference between a man and a boy is that real men seek out sloppy drunk women in bars so they can take them safely into their beds:

Take a drunk girl home
Let her sleep all alone
Leave her keys on the counter your number by her phone
Pick up her life she threw on the floor
Leave the hall lights on walk out and lock the door
That’s how she knows the difference between a boy and man
Take a drunk girl home

Kathryn Schulz at The New Yorker wrote about the song in The Kavanaugh Hearing, Chris Janson’s “Drunk Girl,” and Country Music’s #MeToo Misfire. Schulz notes that Janson is promoting a message of feminist empowerment:

To its credit, the song gets one thing mostly right, which is the woman at the heart of it. She is an uncomfortable figure, but a real enough one, and Janson does her the rare courtesy of not chastising her for drinking. On the contrary, he makes it the man’s responsibility to behave appropriately...

...he implicitly endorses the Drunk Girl’s right to [drink with impunity] without devastating consequences.

But despite the fact that the song promotes feminist thought, the song is not intended as a feminist song. It is a chivalrous song. Not surprisingly, Schulz deeply resents the idea that men protecting women is noble. Hilariously, she can’t even bring herself to admit the issue:

A month ago, when I first heard “Drunk Girl,” I was struck by the contrast between its good intentions and its dazzling cluelessness. Much as the man in the song doesn’t deserve credit for not raping a woman, the man who sings it doesn’t deserve credit for his allegedly bold stand against rape. Now, though, because “Drunk Girl” criticizes exactly the kinds of acts that Kavanaugh stands accused of committing, it has become abruptly, improbably pointed. By articulating the unbelievably low bar to which men are held, it accidentally condemns the specific man who, according to multiple credible allegations, fails to pass even that miserable standard.

Schulz is pretending that the only two choices men have are between taking drunk girls
home to have sex with them, and taking drunk girls home to protect them. But the inclination of the vast majority of men is to do neither. Most men understand that taking a drunk woman home invites being seen as a predator either way. Janson isn’t trying to get rapists to stop raping; he is trying to convince good men that they should take drunk women home as an act of chivalry, so that the drunk woman doesn’t wind up having sex she might later regret. Janson also wants men to leave a note with their name and number, so the woman can wake up the next morning and express what he foolishly expects will be her gratitude:

Took a drunk girl home  
In the sober light of dawn  
She left you a message she thanked you on the phone  
Cause you picked up her life she threw on the floor  
You left the hall lights on walked out and locked the door  
That’s how she knows the difference between a boy and man  
Take a drunk girl home

But Schulz can’t stand the idea of feeling grateful to Janson and his followers for their chivalry. She loves that the song tells men they have the obligation to facilitate feminist debauchery, to make sure it is safe and pleasurable. But the cost of simple gratitude is too much for her to bear. Luckily for her and feminists everywhere, chivalrous men are eager to facilitate feminism whether feminists are thankful or not. When clueless men follow the lesson of the song and find they trigger not gratitude but resentment* supporters of chivalry will respond that this only shows that we need even more chivalry, with even higher risks to well meaning men. In fact, the less thankful feminists are, the more eager chivalrous men will be to facilitate feminism. Everybody wins. Well, almost everybody.

*Ranging from being called a creep to being charged and convicted of rape. This is made worse because only the most socially clueless (creepy) men would actually take the message of the song seriously enough to act it out, and a jury of chivalrous men and feminist women will be eager to convict any man who is accused of harming a woman.
Anonymous Reader just linked to a [new piece at the Washington Post](https://www.washingtonpost.com/) that opens with:

A flood of rage is rushing through women’s brains. Why can’t men organize to change themselves?

The author brags about going on an extended hysterical tirade against her husband, describing wave after wave of uncontrollable rage. She closes the piece with a warning. Men had better do what she wants, or there will be hell to pay:

Pay attention people: If we do not raise boys to walk humbly and care deeply, if we do not demand that men do more than just listen, we will all drown in the flood [of women’s rage]. And there is no patriarchal Noah to save us.

Earlier today gdgm+ linked to a different piece from earlier this year where a feminist warned that women’s rage was tearing apart liberal men’s marriages:

...a phrase I’ve heard most frequently by women who have found themselves rightly riled, women who have perhaps never before—until recently—cited themselves as feminists report the fury, the frustration, the foundational shift as it’s occurring in the men they love so fiercely and the relationships that hold them as a consequence to the male gaze gazing now at their woman, riled.

This isn’t a coincidence. Feminists in the media are high on rage right now. It has given them power, and they want more. The Nation has a new piece out today on [The Politics of Women’s Anger](https://www.thenation.com/article/the-politics-of-womens-anger/). NBC News has a video out titled [It’s time for women to embrace their rage](https://www.nbcnews.com/). Not to be outdone, The Atlantic has it’s own video out titled [The Seismic Power of Women’s Rage](https://www.theatlantic.com/)

In America today, women are angry. But this isn’t a modern phenomenon, argues the author Rebecca Traister. In her new book, *Good and Mad: The Revolutionary Power of Women’s Anger*, Traister details how female rage has long been the country’s political fuel.

I think the feminists are (in the near term) overplaying their hand here, but it is easy to understand how they got there. Men’s desire to appease women’s anger and complaining has been an enormous source of power for decades (and will continue to be moving forward). Recently, turning up the rage turned up the power. But there is an ugliness threshold where most men will check out and large numbers of women will be repelled. We are at or near that threshold. This isn’t the kind of anger that makes chivalrous men salivate in anticipation of out groveling the other men in the room. This is the kind of anger that makes the women complaining look flat out crazy, hysterical.

But feminists shouldn’t worry. My guess is this won’t do much (if any) lasting harm to the
movement. In the meantime, brace yourself for a series of articles and videos about the rage that is being spawned by the fact that women’s rage isn’t working like it should.
The day chivalry killed chivalry.
by Dalrock | October 15, 2018 | Link

Back in January of 2016, Mr. Gabe Jones of Those Catholic Men declared in Women Don’t Deserve Combat that chivalry died on Dec 3, 2015:

December 3, 2015 ought to be remembered as the date that any remaining vestiges of our country’s collective sense of chivalry died a tragic death. It was on this day that Secretary of Defense Ash Carter announced his decision to require combat positions in every branch of the United States military – including the Marine Corps – be opened to women. Despite being one of the most significant news items in recent memory, if you did not pay close attention to the world affairs during the past few weeks the announcement may have been lost in the commotion of the other issues in the news, such as the presidential campaign, ISIS, refugees and immigration, not to mention gun and racial issues. One more thump in the constant drumbeat of political correctness can easily be overlooked.

The great irony is that Secretary of Defense Ash Carter killed chivalry by holding the door open for women! Like Sir Gawain, Sec. Def. Carter acted chivalrously and decided to let women decide for themselves. Moreover, the only chivalrous response to women demanding to be allowed into combat is the only chivalrous response to anything a woman asks*. As Laura Ashe explains in Love and chivalry in the Middle Ages (emphasis mine):

Malory’s ideal of chivalry has love at its heart: ‘thy quarrel must come of thy lady’, he says, ‘and such love I call virtuous love’. Each knight is to fight for the sake of his lady; with his victories he earns her love, and defends her honour. He is absolutely loyal to her and will follow her every command, whatever happens – whether she sends him on an impossible quest, banishes him from her company, or stands accused of some terrible crime, in desperate need of his help.

Sec. Def. Carter responded to women demanding entry into combat with a chivalrous Yes, M’lady! It would have been unchivalrous to say no, as Jones himself clearly understands from the very title of his piece. Jones makes it a point to clarify that he would never “denounce” women serving in the military in any capacity, as he is in awe of their gallant knightly virtues:

But first, a clarification is necessary. Nothing written here is intended to detract from the courage and patriotism of the women who have already served, are serving, and will serve in combat roles. Nor should what follows be taken as a denunciation of women serving in the military in any capacity. We owe these women a debt of gratitude for their sacrifice. Anyone – male or female – who has volunteered to serve our country deserves our respect and admiration. That being said, we can and should question the philosophy of allowing women into combat and whether or not it’s a good idea.

Just like Sec. Def. Carter, Jones can’t bring himself to say no to feminist demands. All he can do is protest that women are too strong and virtuous to go into combat. He closes the piece...
with a call to pedestalize women, including the very feminists who are demanding to serve in combat. Like Doug Phillips and the men of the CBMW, Jones pretends that feminists aren’t really demanding to go into combat, but that mysterious unseen cowardly men must be somehow forcing ladylike women to usurp the roles of men (emphasis mine):

War is brutal. The front lines of combat are a disgusting, abhorrent, crude, and destructive place. This may sound very old fashioned or even chauvinistic to a non-Catholic, but it’s not. It’s chivalrous because the simple fact is that combat is no place for women. They deserve so much better. As men, we should protect and uphold the dignity of women, and one very important way we can do that is to raise our daughters to be strong, virtuous, and holy, with Mary as their ultimate role model. Women deserve to be placed on a pedestal, not shoved in a foxhole.

See Also:

- How chivalry (and mamma’s boys) brought us women’s suffrage and feminism.
- Tackling the patriarchy, holding the door open for trannies.
- Chivalry and the kickass conservative gal.

*There is one exception in the rules of courtly love. A lover who is ordered by his lady to stop loving her must not and should not assent.
How can men help girls see her and be her?

by Dalrock | October 15, 2018 | Link

Back in June of 2016 The Association of National Advertisers and its Alliance for Family Entertainment launched an initiative titled #SeeHer, to boost girls’ self esteem by making sure women are portrayed correctly in commercials. As AdAge explains:

The Association of National Advertisers and its Alliance for Family Entertainment are out to eliminate bias against women from advertising and media, launching #SeeHer in an effort backed by the White House and tracked by ongoing consumer surveys.

...The White House is particularly concerned about under-representation of women in the fields of science, technology, engineering and medicine, or STEM, which it believes is tied to how women are portrayed in media, said AFE Chairman and former Walmart CMO Stephen Quinn.

Viacom created its own commercial dedicated to the topic, titled It isn’t rocket science. As is noted in the commercial’s title, the point is that women don’t actually have to do STEM for young girls to see women doing STEM. Offering girls pretend examples is just as good, so long as they see women doing the activity in question:

A female scientist at The Pentagon is working frantically to fix an emergency computer. Once she figures out the problem, she races to let the president know that it wasn’t an attack, but rather a mainframe failure, and saves the day just in time. The scene flashes back to a young girl learning about computers at school, seemingly imagining the previous situation as her future. Viacom says that portraying a strong, intelligent female character isn’t rocket science. If a young girl sees her, she can be her.

This feminist preference for make believe over real achievement is nothing new. As soon as Charles Lindbergh completed his historic solo transatlantic flight in May of 1927, the race was on to find a woman whom girls could look up to as a female version of Lindbergh. After multiple failed attempts, finally a woman was found who could cut her hair, dress up like a man, and allow men to fly her across the Atlantic! On June 17 1928, Lady Lindy was born when Wilmer Stultz and Louis Gordon successfully transported Amelia Earhart across the Atlantic via airplane.

Ninety years have passed, but the objective hasn’t changed:

How can we show girls pretend examples of women’s achievement?

However with new times come new methods. In the past women had to cut their hair and dress like men to accomplish this goal. Today however we aren’t confined to the old ways. Now men can grow out their hair and dress as women to do the same thing.
First transgender woman world champion...ever.*

UCI Masters Track Cycling Women 35-44 Sprint@outsports @TheAdvocateMag @CofC @PinkNews @TheChrisMosier @BicyclingMag @velonews @gcntweet @glaad @TransMediaWatch @TransEquality @TransgenderNews @equalitynetwork pic.twitter.com/SD0HuS1Crv

— Dr. Rachel McKinnon (@rachelvmckinnon) October 14, 2018

H/T Oscar.
She’s saving for her daughter’s special day.

by Dalrock | October 16, 2018 | Link

Jenny Erikson’s colleague Wendy Robinson at Cafe Mom has created a savings account preparing for her daughter’s special day. No, not her wedding, her divorce:

I’m so convinced that every woman should have money that would give her the freedom to walk away from a bad relationship, that I’m already starting to save for my daughter. She’s no where near needing it yet, but some day she might.

On a related note, from The Political HEAT (H/T Red Pill Latecomer): Proud Single Mom January Jones: Father Figure Would Be Toxic For My Son

It’s good to have strong women around a man. To teach him to respect women. He doesn’t have a male person in his life saying ‘don’t cry’ or ‘you throw like a girl.’ All those sh**ty things dads accidentally do.

...

I just don’t feel I need a partner. Do I want one? Maybe. But I don’t feel unhappy or lonely. It would have to be someone so amazing that I would want to make room. Someone who would contribute to my happiness and not take away from it.

...

I want a manly man in flannel, with a beard and an axe. But then there’s always something wrong with him. Like he’s a Republican.

Where have all of the good men gone? Don’t their fathers raise them to be real men? All she wants is an old school manly lumberjack who is a sensitive new age guy, a man who chops down trees with his bare hands and then cries at sunsets while eating dolphin safe tuna. Is that too much to ask?

Edit: I think I’ve found her ideal man. H/T Instapundit.
Larry Kummer, Editor of Fabius Maximus caught an example of Dalrock’s Law of Feminism that I had missed.

Dalrock’s Law of Feminism: “Feminism is the assertion that men are evil and naturally want to harm women, followed by pleas to men to solve all of women’s problems.” {Example here.} But this is taking it to a mad extreme. What lays this responsibility on men to protect women from the consequences of their actions? Do they at least get cab fare at Uber rates for this service?

“Taking a drunk girl home, not to have sex with her but to make sure she gets there safely, is not the difference between a boy and a man; it is the difference between the perpetrator of a violent crime and an averagely decent, law-abiding human being.”

No, it is the difference between a criminal and a saint. Few people, men or women, go to such lengths to help strangers. Especially as this involves the risk of a sexual assault charge from the drunk, perhaps crazy or criminal, woman (such false accusations are common) – whose home he has entered while she was drunk.
Do what she asks, but know in advance that she will take great care to protect herself from feeling gratitude.

by Dalrock | October 16, 2018 | Link

From: This viral airport ‘mansplaining’ story shows what male allyship can look like.

1. A feminist endures the unbearable experience of a stranger in an airport telling her his opinion on a topic she is highly credentialed in.
2. A white knight gallops in and scolds the stranger for *mansplaining*.
3. The stranger makes the mistake of apologizing in order to make the feminist happy.
4. The white knight responds by going full melodrama: “No, man, you gotta live with the consequences of your mistake. Time’s up.”

The feminist closes with a call for men (who are evil and naturally want to harm women) to solve women’s problems:

**Finally, she left men with a call to action.** “Menfolk, will you please make this happen more often?” she wrote. “I could get by on half the energy it currently takes me to exist in the world if y’all would each take on one or two airport guys a month.”

Men may not realize how much energy dealing with sexism on a regular basis actually takes. If more did what Scarsella’s colleague did—speak up for a woman without speaking over her when a man exhibits sexist behavior—it would make life so much easier for half the population.

But know in advance chivalrous men that since she is an ugly feminist she carefully rejects ever feeling gratitude. She clarifies that her post is strictly focused on nagging men, and should not be mistaken as praise for men who do as she demands (emphasis mine):

**The ease with which my new friend expressed his priorities signaled a long term, practiced commitment to not only holding them in his mind but to embodying them as well. I wish I encountered this more often.** *My new friend shouldn’t get accolades. I’m not writing this to praise him* or put him in some kind of weird male savior position. His priorities should be normal and interrupting sexism should be mundane. But they’re not, so. Here we are.
The ugly feminist and the chivalrous man are a perfect match.* Nothing terrifies her more than the thought of suffering feelings of love or gratitude. Nothing excites him more than the privilege of proving his superior manhood by doing the bidding of a cruel unfeeling woman. She is certain that all men are evil and naturally want to harm women, yet is equally confident that men will be eager solve all of women’s problems. He awaits his midons’ next demand with great anticipation.

As Roger Boase explained, summarizing Gaston Paris (the man who coined the term courtly love):

...the lover continually fears lest he should, by some misfortune, displease his mistress or cease to be worthy of her; the lover’s position is one of inferiority; even the hardened warrior trembles in his lady’s presence; she, on her part, makes her suitor acutely aware of his insecurity by deliberately acting in a capricious and haughty manner; love is a source of courage and refinement; the lady’s apparent cruelty serves to test her lover’s valour

*This match does not originate in heaven.

Correction: I originally attributed the quote to Gaston Paris, but it is Roger Boase summarzing Paris.
I’ll be taking a blogging break over the next few days. I’ll turn moderation on in a bit and will take it back off on Monday.

**Edit:** Moderation is now on.

**Edit Monday Oct 22:** Moderation is now off.
Defending chivalry’s honor.

by Dalrock | October 23, 2018 | Link

Commenter J. J. Griffing disagrees with my use of the term chivalry:

Just call it “Courtly Love,” already, @Dalrock. You seem to have no idea what ACTUAL “chivalry” consists of beyond that, but what you call “chivalry” repeatedly is to the real thing what the Book of Mormon is to the Gospel. By defining the whole by one cancerous outgrowth (through a single book about said growth), you demonstrate gross ignorance of your topic and of the serious scholarship even your one abused source represents.

You’re usually RIGHT about feminism. But your persistent ignorance of chivalry is appalling. (Yes, I am still working on the promised rebuttal, but Real Life often interferes.)

I have no doubt that Griffing and other readers have much they could teach me about chivalry, and I look forward to the instruction. But nevertheless I don’t agree that we can draw the clear distinction he claims between chivalry and courtly love. While there are multiple aspects to what we commonly call chivalry, in popular usage chivalry is largely if not entirely about service and deference to women. If a parent tells you they are raising their son to be chivalrous, they almost never mean they are raising their boy to say go on armed adventures, or **fight duels** to defend his honor. What they most commonly will mean is they are raising their boy to look for ways to be of service to the women around him (carrying heavy loads, offering his coat, opening doors, etc). They often will also mean they are training their boy to court chivalrously by **boldly declaring his romantic intentions**, always paying for dates, and (when the time comes to propose marriage) kneel in submission before his lady.

Moreover, it isn’t just in modern usage that chivalry is associated with what the men’s sphere calls **white knighting** for women. The most famous real life act of chivalry (according to **legend**) is arguably when King Edward III gallantly came to the aid of a woman with a suspiciously timed wardrobe malfunction:

While she was dancing at a court ball at Calais, her garter is said to have slipped from her leg. When the surrounding courtiers sniggered, the king picked it up and returned it to her, exclaiming, “**Honi soit qui mal y pense**” (“Shame on him who thinks evil of it.”), the phrase that has become the motto of the Order.

This legendary act of chivalry led to the founding the oldest order of chivalry in the world, the Order Of The Garter. This is the **most prestigious order of chivalry in the UK**:

**Order Of The Garter**

This is the highest ranking order of chivalry in the United Kingdom, it is entirely
within the personal gift of the Monarch and is very exclusive. Only The Queen, The Prince Of Wales and 24 knights may be in the order at any one time. When one Knight dies, another is appointed. It is also, the oldest order of chivalry in the world, going back to 1348.

The phrase the king uttered when the woman dropped her underwear was thought to be so gallant, so perfect an act of chivalry, that it along with a depiction of the garter itself was prominently incorporated into the Royal coat of arms of the United Kingdom. As a result, this glorious example of the chivalric ideal is to this day embossed in gold on the front of British Passports.

Neither is it just C.S. Lewis who observed that tales of the Knights of the Round Table are steeped in the morality of courtly love, nor is this morality limited to works like Chrétien de Troyes’ Lancelot, the Knight of the Cart. As Associate Professor of English Laura Ashe at Worcester College, Oxford explains, Malory is likewise steeped in courtly love:

Malory’s ideal of chivalry has love at its heart: ‘thy quarrel must come of thy lady’, he says, ‘and such love I call virtuous love’. Each knight is to fight for the sake of his lady; with his victories he earns her love, and defends her honour. He is absolutely loyal to her and will follow her every command, whatever happens – whether she sends him on an impossible quest, banishes him from her company, or stands accused of some terrible crime, in desperate need of his help. Here, tragedy enters the picture. Lancelot’s love of Guinevere can never have a happy ending, for she is King Arthur’s queen. This is the epitome of ‘courtly love’ in literature: a commitment which binds the lovers until their deaths, but is never fulfilled in happy union.

Lastly, the very term courtly love Griffing wants me to exclusively use is relatively new. While there is some controversy, it is generally attributed to Gaston Paris in an article from 1883. It is a term coined by literary critics hundreds of years later to describe a common characteristic of literary chivalry in the Late Middle Ages. Courtly love was always a common component of chivalric tales starting around the late 1100s. There were not two separate literary genres, chivalry and courtly love. Courtly love was part of the Late Middle Ages concept of chivalry, so much so that a separate name wasn’t required.
Chivalry was re-purposed by women, for women.

by Dalrock | October 24, 2018 | Link

Reader ‘Reality’ Doug writes (emphasis mine):

Dalrock, very educational. Your thesis may be no less irrefutable than Alex Jones’ certain theory, but your ‘evidence’ from the lips of a woman who earns a living as a college professor...you should know better. **You did not address the potential for female spin to sell ‘chivalry’ as (re)defined by Team Woman.** It’s not like I will come up with my own expert opinion on C.S. Lewis or Thomas Malory, but I must be suspicious of the sex so fair and so artful at rewriting the history of men not just past but present and even future.

Reality Doug has hit on the core of the issue. Women **did** redefine chivalry for Team Woman. But this didn’t happen in modern times. It happened in the 1100s! The chivalry we love wasn’t corrupted, it is the corruption. The women who redefined chivalry to serve team woman were not professors at Oxford, but Eleanor of Aquitaine and her daughter Marie de Champagne.

If your chivalry comes from the Arthurian universe that includes Sir Lancelot, then your chivalry is fully corrupted with the ideology of courtly love, leading back to Chrétien de Troyes’ *Lancelot, the Knight of the Cart* circa 1177. As Infogalactic explains (emphasis mine):

The story is an Arthurian legend, and one of the first to feature Lancelot as a prominent character. The narrative tells about the abduction of Queen Guinevere, and is the first text to feature the love affair between Lancelot and Guinevere. While little is known about the life of Chrétien de Troyes, it can be said that his writings impacted the Arthurian canon, establishing Lancelot’s subsequent prominence in English literature. Chrétien was the first writer to deal with the Arthurian themes of the lineage of Lancelot, his relationship to Guinevere, and the idea of courtly love.

... Courtly love was coined by the medievalist Gaston Paris in 1883 to help understand the relationship between Lancelot and Guinevere in *Lancelot, The Knight of the Cart*. Alexander J. Denomy describes courtly love as, “...a type of sensual love and what distinguishes it from other forms of sexual love, from mere passion... is its purpose or motive, its formal object, namely, the lover’s progress and growth in natural goodness, merit, and worth”(44). In the Knight of the Cart, Lancelot has become entranced by Guinevere and in more ways than one, is ruled by her. As the queen, Guinevere maintains power over the kingdom as well as Lancelot. When Meleagant questions their love and her adultery to the king, Lancelot challenges Meleagant to a battle to protect Guinevere’s honor. Lancelot has no shame in showing his affair with the queen, “Lancelot’s love
explodes into romance without any beginning revealed or end foretold, fully formed and symbolized by the extraordinary fullness of his heart” (Lacy). This introduction of the love affair between Guinevere and Lancelot appears in many other stories after this poem was written.

Chrétien de Troyes included the theme of (as we now call it) courtly love at the specific direction of Marie de Champagne:

It is believed that in the production of The Knight of the Cart, Chrétien was provided with source material (or matiere), as well as a san, or a derivation of the material. The matiere in this case would refer to the story of Lancelot, and the san would be his affair with Guinevere. Marie de Champagne was well known for her interest in affairs of courtly love, and is believed to have suggested the inclusion of this theme into the story. For this reason, it is said that Chrétien could not finish the story himself because he did not support the adulterous themes.

Chrétien makes this clear in the very beginning of the tale. The very act of writing the story was an act of chivalry as we know the term (of the courtly love variety):

Since my lady of Champagne wishes me to undertake to write a romance, I shall very gladly do so, being so devoted to her service as to do anything in the world for her, without any intention of flattery. But if one were to introduce any flattery upon such an occasion, he might say, and I would subscribe to it, that this lady surpasses all others who are alive, just as the south wind which blows in May or April is more lovely than any other wind. But upon my word, I am not one to wish to flatter my lady. I will simply say: “The Countess is worth as many queens as a gem is worth of pearls and sards.” Nay I shall make no comparison, and yet it is true in spite of me; I will say, however, that her command has more to do with this work than any thought or pains that I may expend upon it. Here Chretien begins his book about the Knight of the Cart. The material and the treatment of it are given and furnished to him by the Countess, and he is simply trying to carry out her concern and intention. Here he begins the story.

Again, chivalry was corrupted, but the corruption happened much sooner than the defenders of Arthurian chivalry are willing to admit. Arthurian legends predate Lancelot and the Cart, but the Arthurian universe as we know it was redefined way back in the 1100s by powerful noblewomen who wanted to transform chivalry into a glorification of romantic love and subservience to women.
Chivalry’s mortal enemy: Toxic masculinity.
by Dalrock | October 24, 2018 | Link

George Yancy at the New York Times confesses his sin:

I am a failed and broken feminist. More pointedly, I am sexist. There are times when
I fear for the “loss” of my own “entitlement” as a male.

Chief among his sins was his failure to give his wife sovereignty:

For example, before I got married, I insisted that my wife take my last name. After
all, she was to become my wife. So, why not take my name, and become part of me?
She refused. She wanted to keep her own last name, arguing that a woman taking
her husband’s name was a patriarchal practice. I was not happy...

…I dropped the ball. That day I learned something about me. I didn’t respect her
autonomy, her legal standing and personhood. As pathetic as this may sound, I saw
her as my property, to be defined by my name and according to my legal standing.
(She kept her name.) While this was not sexual assault, my insistence was a
violation of her independence. I had inherited a subtle, yet still violent, form of toxic
masculinity.

To repent of his sin, he now realizes that he needs to put himself in service of women,
seeking out every opportunity to be their champion:

[My toxic masculinity] still raises its ugly head — I should be thanked when I clean
the house, cook, sacrifice my time. These are deep and troubling expectations that
are shaped by male privilege, male power and toxic masculinity.

If you are a woman reading this, I have failed you. Through my silence and an
uninterrogated collective misogyny, I have failed you.

Yancy mistakenly believes the virtuous way of life he extols is feminism, but what he
describes as feminism is really chivalry. If he were a chivalrous man, he would have known to
give his wife sovereignty from stories like The Wedding of Sir Gawain, and he would have
likewise known it was his obligation to be women’s champion.

It is not merely Yancy who is mistaken however. Chivalrous men erroneously believe that
their chivalry is the natural antidote to Yancy’s feminism. Neither side realizes they are on
the same team, with the same values and goals.

H/T Instapundit
She joined the feminist brotherhood.

by Dalrock | October 26, 2018 | Link

The Seattle Times has a new article up today about a girl playing high school football: A battle for respect, then in the trenches: For Newport’s Jenna Martz, football is feminism.

Off the bat there is the obligatory territory marking, asking the question we all are dying to have answered. What kind of nail polish should football players paint their nails with?

Pro tip: When playing football, use shellac nail polish.

It took losing whole fingernails at practice before Newport senior Jenna Martz found a coating as tough and innovative as she is on the football field.

The article exemplifies the dichotomy of feminist territory marking, with the competing objectives to:

1. Be (like) one of the guys (experience manly pride)
2. Mark all spaces as feminine (extinguish manly pride)

Martz wants to be treated like one of the guys, which means that other players can’t talk smack to her since that makes her feel like crying:

“… I just want to play football, man,” Martz said, not wanting to cry then or now in reliving the moment. “Can’t we just hit like that? If I get knocked down, I’m going to get back up. But if you’re going to be talking smack like that, what is the point?”

Some of the incidences were anonymously reported to Newport administration. Those players are no longer on the team...

In addition to having any boys who talk smack kicked off the team, a bit of chivalry makes sure she is treated like a lady:

Now, if people start targeting me or they say something, I just tell my teammates and either they help me handle it, or they go handle it. Because you just don’t let that happen to a teammate — whether they’re a girl or boy."

But make no mistake, this lady is one of the guys:

Brotherhood and family

...

But what about the “Brotherhood” chant?
“I say ‘Brotherhood,’” Martz admitted. “But when they talk about me, they say ‘sister.’ You take it a little bit at a time and my players, my coaches are really respectful about that.”

And as one of the guys, she is there to mark the space as feminine, to make sure there is no place where men can be proud to be men:

“It was a big change for everybody and a learning experience,” Martz said. “We have some signs in the locker room that say, ‘I leave a place a better player, a better man,’ and I usually shrug it off, but with other things the staff says ‘person’ or ‘men and women.’ I don’t necessarily go out of my way to change it, but just my presence and having them know that it’s important to me, they change it and they talk about it to make it all-inclusive.”

Interestingly, Martz isn’t the only trailblazer in the family. While Martz was breaking barriers in her quest to become one of the guys, her brother was doing the same in his quest to become one of the girls:

Around that time, their middle sibling was also in the process of transitioning from male to female and finding her identity.

H/T The Question

**Related:**

- They’re her bros.
- It would be petty to point out how petty it is.
It has been over five years since I’ve posted new data on this, so I found the latest publication of Custodial Mothers and Fathers and Their Child Support (cached) from the US Census and updated the charts below. The basic narrative is unchanged:

It starts with who is granted custody. This has been moving slightly in recent years, but 80% of the time custody goes to a parent* it is the mother and not the father:

For those few fathers granted custody, they are less likely than mothers who are granted custody to be awarded support, although interestingly mothers are slightly less likely to be awarded child support now than in the past:
When I first posted data on this the few fathers who were awarded support were awarded less on average than mothers who were awarded support. This now appears to be a wash:

![Average Child Support Due by Sex](https://dalrock.wordpress.com/)

Percent received also looks to be a wash:

![Percent of Child Support Due Actually Received](https://dalrock.wordpress.com/)

As a result of the bias against fathers when it comes to getting custody and being awarded support, the percentage of all child support dollars paid is extremely biased, but is trending slightly less so:
See Also: Debtors prisons are an essential tool of our new public policy.

*According to this Census data, only 4% of children live with neither parent, which is the same percent that live with only their fathers.*
The wake-up call saves the day yet again.
by Dalrock | October 30, 2018 | Link

3 Likewise, wives, be subject to your own husbands, so that even if some do not obey the word, they may be won without a word by the conduct of their wives, 2 when they see your respectful and pure conduct. 3 Do not let your adorning be external—the braiding of hair and the putting on of gold jewelry, or the clothing you wear— 4 but let your adorning be the hidden person of the heart with the imperishable beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which in God’s sight is very precious. 5 For this is how the holy women who hoped in God used to adorn themselves, by submitting to their own husbands, 6 as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord. And you are her children, if you do good and do not fear anything that is frightening.

-1 Pet 3:1-6 (ESV)

The Bible’s teaching on marriage is hard for modern Christians to accept. In 1 Pet 3:1-6 the Apostle Peter tells wives to submit to their husband, even if he is failing as a Christian husband. Peter tells wives of failing husbands to call them lord and win them over without a word. Because submission to a failing husband is something we find difficult to accept, modern Christians have substituted the exact opposite in its place. In the new narrative what failing Christian husbands need is a wake-up call from their wives, and Christian husbands need to respond by winning their wife’s hearts.

Darren and Heather Turner lived the story of the wake-up call, and now their story is the latest Christian movie on marriage. When Army Chaplain Darren Turner came home after deployment in a war zone, he wasn’t “communicating” with his wife and she became unhappy. In her interview with CBN she explains that she knew her only chance of saving her marriage was to trust God’s plan by kicking her husband out of the house:

“I was fighting against him, for our marriage. And he was just running away.”

“She was just my wife,” says Darren, “and she wasn’t in the deployment. I didn’t think she understood who I was or where I was coming from.”

The animosity continued to get worse over the next six months. Heather told Darren he had to leave.

“I knew something deeper, something supernatural, that we could not manufacture, had to happen, or else this was going to go nowhere,” says Heather. “It was going to get worse. So that was my hope in the separation, that God would do something deeper in both of us.”

This was just the wake-up call her husband needed, and after four months he broke down and came to her crying:
Four months into the separation, Darren met Heather to drop off the kids.

“That was the first time that we had a public exchange of the children, and that hit me like a ton of bricks when I let my kids go into the arms of their Mom, and that broke me. I was just devastated, crying out ‘God, what is going on? How can we ever survive this? Please, if you’ve ever done anything, heal us. Fix us.’”

Christian moviemaker Dr. David Evans learned of their story and immediately knew he wanted to turn it into a movie:

Dr. Evans learned our full story. After the deployment, I came home and almost lost my marriage. I was a wreck and did not handle that homecoming well. I got out of the Army for a year, we patched things up and I went back in the Army. When David called us, we had just returned to the military. He said, “Oh, my gosh. It’s not just the online articles in your blog, but now you’re telling me this whole cycle of crisis and redemption.”

That’s when he said, “I’ve gotta get your life rights, I’m gonna make a film about it.

Their story was the perfect vehicle to preach the modern Christian message of the wake-up call model of marriage. Christian men need to know that the wake-up call is real, and if they don’t keep their wives happy they will end up divorced:

Based on a true story, David G. Evans’ film follows Army chaplain Darren Turner (Justin Bruening) and his wife Heather (Sarah Drew), who wrestle to keep their marriage together through Darren’s first deployment and its unexpected aftermath.

Shortly after arriving in Iraq as part of the 2007 surge, Darren’s commanding officer presents the rookie chaplain with a generous stack of divorce proceedings from the men in the camp, along with a not-so-subtle warning that he could be next.

The most disturbing thing is that modern Christians won’t question this message for a heartbeat. They love the wake-up call message of marriage just as much as they hate the biblical instruction to wives to submit to their husbands. Finally, this is a “Christian” message on marriage modern Christians can get behind with enthusiasm.
As I showed in my last post the movie *Indivisible* teaches a well worn and well loved modern Christian message that God wants wives not to submit to their husbands, but to threaten their husbands to make them change.

The movie follows modern Christian traditions in other ways. While the message of the movie includes the same anti husband/married father message that pastors deliver on Father's Day, it is important to keep the appearance that it is traditional. This means tearing down not just any husband/father, but tearing down the most archetypally masculine husbands and fathers. This leaves little room for diversity in the Christian husband’s profession when making a movie about marriage. He has to be both a good man and over the top masculine so that when the movie tears him down the audience knows that all married fathers are failures. Fireproof featured a fireman who was blowing it. Courageous featured police officers who were blowing it. Indivisible does the same for combat veterans. As Heather Turner explains at 1:50 in the clip below:

 THEM seeing the chaplain, kinda get it wrong, and mess up, gives them permission to be willing to say “you know I might need help.”

And yet we live in a feminist age where any time you present men as masculine you have to show that women are part of the club. So if Indivisible is going to show masculine men, even just as a way to tear them down, it has to also show a woman who is one of the guys. 10 seconds in to the trailer the soldiers all shout out a manly *hooah*! And the face of the manly *hooah*? It is of course a woman.

It could be no other way. The face of the *hooah* is a kickass single mother, an ex-SWAT team member:

 TESTING that conviction has to wait as Darren gets to know the soldiers at Forward Operating Base Falcon — including a young father named Lance Bradley (Tanner Stine), single mother and ex-SWAT team member Sgt. Shonda Peterson (Skye P. Marshall) and a bitter, alienated soldier named Michael Lewis (Jason George). In an awkward twist, Lewis also happens to be Darren’s not-so-friendly neighbor at home in Georgia.
How the Kendricks, Rainey, and Lepine see the married fathers they go to church with.

by Dalrock | October 31, 2018 | Link

Family Life and the Kendrick brothers set out to make a movie to teach about biblical parenting. The title of the movie is *Like Arrows*, and they describe it at Family Life as portraying the typical Christian family (emphasis mine):

The film centers on the joys and trials of parenting and the power of family to shape the next generation. More than just an entertaining movie, the goal of *Like Arrows* is to honestly show a couple journeying through every phase of parenting. The film opens with Alice telling her boyfriend Charlie she is pregnant. As they are married and begin growing their family, they face typical parenting struggles and become aware of their need to be intentional and to cling to God’s blueprints for marriage and family.

“The parenting journey is both incredibly challenging and incredibly rewarding at the same time,” says FamilyLife’s Bob Lepine, who served as one of the executive producers for the project. “We wanted to take viewers on what we hope will be a very relatable journey. And in the process, we hope they’ll be inspired to make their faith more core to how they function as a family. That’s the goal.”

But like the larger modern Christian culture they are selling to, they are filled with contempt for the kind of man who marries and takes his children to church. Naturally, this feeling came out in the movie they made.

How do they see the married fathers they sit next to on Sunday, the men who buy their products? In their minds the men they sit next to on Sundays only married their wives after an unintended pregnancy, and are failures as husbands and fathers. From the movieguide review *(Warning: plot spoilers ahead)*:

The movie opens very powerfully with Alice telling Charlie she’s pregnant. She thinks she’s messed up and remembers all the times her mother told her she was a mess. After some argumentation, Charlie decides to do the right thing and proposes to Alice.

Alice is overwhelmed by the prospect of parenting. The nurse who helps her deliver her baby invites her to church. Alice convinces Charlie they might find support in church, but life is still not easy when they have their first child, Ron. When they have their second child, Alice is told that Kate won’t be able to go to preschool at church because she keeps hitting the other children. Alice tries to talk to Charlie about it, but he’s too busy.

The movie skips ahead, and Charlie is still too busy, but he’s losing his children. Kate is going out with all the wrong guys and was thrown out of one guy’s car. Now, Alice...
and Charlie have four children, another boy named Joshua and an adopted Asian girl named Faith.

Finally, they go to the church to seek help. They learn children need direction. They are arrows in the quiver of the parents, gifts from God, and they need a target. Now, Charlie decides to devote his life to his family.

The reviewer at Dove describes the plot very similarly. The typical married churchgoing father portrayed in the movie is clueless and detached:

With a spontaneous proposal and a quickie wedding, the couple begins the lifelong journey of parenthood.

Viewers watch as Charlie and Alice navigate parenting through the course of their lives, pausing to focus on specific times in their journey. It’s clear from the start that they’re flying blind, and out of anxiety Alice decides that they need all the help they can get, which means raising their children in church. Alice quickly realizes that she is in over her head, but after five years and two children, she has no idea how to correct the issues she sees.

Meanwhile, Charlie appears distant and uninterested in his family, leaving Alice isolated and overwhelmed. As the years wax on, more children—and more issues—are added to the family’s life. They’ve already done all they could, right? Raising the kids in church and providing a nice life for them should produce happy, well-behaved children, right? Or at least that’s what they thought.

When their eldest son, Ronnie, leaves for college, Alice discovers that he has not only abandoned their shared faith, but apparently any love or respect for his parents. Kate follows in her brother’s waning footsteps, seeking attention and acting out. It is Kate’s safety that ignites a fire in Charlie. He realizes that he must take his role as father more seriously, and Alice is relieved to finally be working toward a solution.

The irony is that Alex Kendrick, one of the creators of the film, has spoken out against the secular anti father message that he amplifies in this and other movies. He knows exactly what is going on here, he just can’t bring himself to do something different.

**Interviewer:** As Stephen [Kendrick] was saying this morning, you can start holding up *Courageous* as the antidote to the popular culture, which now denigrates the role of the male—which rarely prevents viable, positive role models. As a critic, I can point to that as a very unique and special thing that comes out of your work. Do you feel that’s something that’s naturally come out of your work as something God-given, or is that something you’ve really focused on—honed and developed?

**Alex Kendrick:** I would say that we’re driven to do that. That’s the heartbeat behind what we’re doing, other than the general desire to please the Lord. When I turn on the TV—and we don’t watch TV much any more at all—every other
character, every other commercial, demeans and devalues the role of the man. It’s terrible. Just take note of the commercials that you see when you’re watching TV. How many of them make the woman look like, “Well, I’m the smart one. The man can’t figure this out, but I can.” And while there’s plenty of demeaning behavior spread around to both sexes, it does seem heavily biased to be anti-father, anti-man. And in movies, when parents are having problems with their children, things get resolved by the parents saying to the children, “Oh, I’m sorry. I was wrong all along. You were right.” I mean, even look at Finding Nemo. I love the movie! It’s very well done. But at the end, the father says, “I’m sorry, Nemo. You were right—I was too hard on you.” That seems to be a running theme.

In a separate interview with CBN Alex leveled the same criticism against secular entertainment:

**Alex:** Look at how media is portraying fathers today. You look at almost any commercial, and the father figure is the idiot, the goober, the guy who doesn’t get it. The wife or mother is the one who really knows what’s going on, the smarter one. And you can’t name one TV show right now that has a really good, honorable father. This generation is growing up with anti-heroes rather than heroes. Rather than Superman, truth, justice, and the American way, it’s now Bart Simpson and his dad, Homer.

Alex made those remarks promoting his and Stephen’s 2011 movie Courageous. Yet Courageous had a far darker anti married father message than Nemo or the typical secular movie. Alex then went on to help create another Christian movie titled Mom’s Night Out. That movie was so anti father that it shocked the secular feminists at Dame:

‘Moms’ Night Out’ may be a Christian movie, but it’s part of a long cinematic tradition portraying men as useless louts. And that’s not good for anyone.

... And that’s the biggest problem with Moms’ Night Out: The moral of the story isn’t that the women are supposed to stay home and not have fun, but that the men are totally hapless morons without them around—and that this lesson is still being drilled into our heads in 2014. We’re supposed to feel better about this “men are total idiots, the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world” philosophy (and that latter piece of wisdom was actually uttered in the movie in case you missed the point). But this story of the helpless manchild is a disservice to men—and families—everywhere.

After Mom’s Night Out in 2014, Alex and his brother Stephen released their next anti married father movie War Room in 2015. Like Mom’s Night Out, War Room was so conspicuously anti married father that it confounded a secular reviewer. In his review on rogerebert.com, Matt Fagerholm complained that the movie portrays the Christian husband and father as lacking any redeeming qualities (emphasis mine):

The film’s centerpiece sequence occurs early on, as Elizabeth sits weeping in her closet while pleading, “God, help him love me again.” This moment is heartbreaking
for all the wrong reasons. **Since the Kendricks have mistaken one-dimensional caricatures for people who exist in the real world, they forgot to provide Tony with any redeeming qualities** that would make us want to root for his marriage. As for the film’s advice to women who are beaten by their husbands, one of Elizabeth’s co-workers advises, “Learn to duck so God can hit him."

What is most striking however is not that Christian movies like *Fireproof, Courageous, Mom’s Night Out, War Room, Indivisible* and *Like Arrows* are so reliably contemptuous of Christian husbands and fathers. What is most striking is that conservative Christians find this contempt for respectable men so normal that they are entirely unaware of the trend.
Fathers, do not exasperate your children, so that they will not lose heart.

by Dalrock | November 1, 2018 | Link

Scott commented describing his response to a struggling father he witnessed the other day.

A few days ago, I was at the store picking up a few items on my way home, and saw another dad, apparently doing the same thing. He had one very small child in his arms—throwing a tantrum, and two more in the shopping cart, equally acting out. Trying to push the cart with the hand/arm he was holding the baby with (and trying to bounce her to cheer her up) in his other hand was his phone. His wife was yelling so loud at him about how he screwed something up that we could all hear it.

I approached and said the only thing I could think of, being totally overwhelmed with my own feelings of agitation, disgust, compassion and empathy. “You are doing OK, dad.” He looked like a PTSD sufferer. I don’t even think he registered my comment.

The Kendrick brothers would have us believe that he probably deserved that.

I feel differently.

The Kendrick/Rainey/Driscoll model would resemble R. Lee Ermey in Full Metal Jacket. Yet as a father himself Scott knows there is a time and place for harsh correction, and a time and place where encouragement is needed. As Colossians 3:21 commands (NASB):

Fathers, do not exasperate your children, so that they will not lose heart.

It is ironic that the men who are most eager to tell the rest of us how to be Christian fathers have no concept of that whatsoever.

You can visit Scott’s blog here.
We can no longer ignore that voice within women that says: ‘I want something more than my husband and my children and my home.’

–Betty Friedan, The Feminine Mystique

Women are especially prone to falling into discontentment and disrupting the lives of everyone around them when they do. The Book of Proverbs warns repeatedly of this tendency:

- Proverbs 21-9 (ISV): It’s better to live in a corner on the roof than to share a house with a contentious woman.
- Proverbs 21-19 (KJV): It is better to dwell in the wilderness, than with a contentious and an angry woman.
- Proverbs 25-24 (ISV): It’s better to live in a corner on the roof than in a house with a contentious woman.
- Proverbs 27-15 (NKJV): A continual dripping on a very rainy day And a contentious woman are alike;
- Proverbs 14:1 (NIV): The wise woman builds her house, but with her own hands the foolish one tears hers down.

Betty Friedan called this tendency of women toward discontentment “the problem that has no name” in her 1963 book The Feminine Mystique. The book is commonly credited with identifying the problem (the mysterious discontentment of women) and thereby kicking off second wave feminism.

This understanding isn’t limited to feminism or the Bible. This is something that aside from some strategic amnesia, everyone knows. We are constantly being reminded that women are prone to becoming discontent for mysterious reasons, and that husbands need to forever be on their guard against this. The other day Heidi at Lazy Mother Musings expertly dissected a warning for husbands, a chaplain she knows posted on Facebook.

Wife: I’m not doing okay.

Translation: …She’s referring to the condition of her heart. If she says this, stop what you’re doing and clear space for a deep conversation. She might need counseling. Don’t ignore or dismiss this!

…

Husbands, these are not polite recommendations from overly-sensitive wives. Our wives are generally more emotionally intelligent than we are and can read the temperature of the marriage better than we can. If they say it’s time to see a counselor, do it without questioning.
Over the years, I’ve learned these lessons the hard way. [My wife] knows that I’ll go see a counselor if she suggests it (and we do see our counselor-pastor about once a month). Our marriage is stronger than ever, by God’s grace. At the same time, I watch countless marriages fail because husbands didn’t heed their wives until it was too late (or wives simply didn’t say anything until it was too late).

According to the chaplain, women’s tendency to become discontented and destroy their homes is proof that women are superior to men, especially when it comes to marriage and commitment. Women being prone to becoming unhappy honoring their marriage vows means that they are more “emotionally intelligent” than men. This is a common belief, along with the belief that husbands can stave off this discontentment by giving their money to marriage counselors and doing as they are told.

Like Heidi’s chaplain friend, Dr. David Clarke at Focus on the Family (FotF) explains that women being discontented in marriage and men being happy is a sign that God made women better at marriage than men. According to Clarke a wife’s discontentment isn’t something she needs to overcome, it is a virtue, and proof that she is better at marriage than her clueless husband:

Well, these little stories we heard just a few minutes ago from these ladies, I have heard a million times at my seminars, in my therapy office, oh, just one after the other, good solid Christian women... There’s no real intimacy. I’m dying inside. And the key is, they’re not letting the husband know that. The guy has no clue. He’s perfectly happy. So, when that woman hits the wall and leaves him, he is the most stunned guy on earth.

Clarke explains that God has a master plan, and God’s plan involves the wife becoming unhappy so she can threaten to destroy the family as a way to take control:

Now [God]’s got a master plan, because if we work together and let the woman actually teach us, ’cause she has many more skills interpersonally that we will ... ever will have. She’s got a Ph.D. in emotional intimacy and spiritual intimacy very often. We have like a third-grade education.

But according to Clarke God’s plan often fails because modern women aren’t contentious enough:

You gotta get a man with a shovel to the head, metaphorically speaking, of course.

Pastor Doug Wilson discusses the same basic issue slightly differently in his book Reforming Marriage. Wilson explains that the way a man can tell if he is pleasing God is by his wife’s happiness (or lack thereof):

...the key is found in how the husband is treating his wife. Or, put another way, when mamma ain’t happy, ain’t nobody happy.

...
The collateral effect of obedience is the aroma of love. **This aroma is out of reach for those who have a hypocritical desire to be known by others as a keeper of God’s law.** Many can fake an attempt at keeping God’s standards in some external way. What we cannot fake is the resulting, distinctive aroma of pleasure to God...

When a husband seeks to glorify God in his home, he will be equipped to love his wife as he is commanded. And **if he loves his wife as commanded, the aroma of his home will be pleasant indeed.**

Another Pastor Wilson (Pastor Dave Wilson) teaches in FamilyLife’s Art of Marriage that if a wife isn’t sexually attracted to her husband, it is **God speaking to the husband** through his wife’s (non) burning bush:

Dave: Yes. Here’s **all you need to know about that night**—the thing that changed our marriage is when Ann was sharing with me what she felt—I had a pretty unique encounter with God. I sensed **God was speaking to me, through Ann**;

This type of advice is everywhere, because it is the prevailing wisdom of our feminist era. But while the Bible does agree that women are prone to becoming discontented and destroying their homes, it doesn’t present this as a **virtue**, it presents it as a **vice**. Discontentment is not part of God’s plan for women to improve men, it is a temptation women need to overcome. The Bible also doesn’t place the onus on the husband (or men in general) to prevent the woman from becoming unhappy. Contrary to feminists and modern Christian thought, the onus for keeping Christian women from lapsing into discontentment and familial destruction is on women, not men.

Nevertheless, this idea that a husband’s job is to prevent his wife from becoming unhappy and blowing up the marriage is widespread. Even in the Men’s Sphere this is a common perspective. I’ve written about this topic **before**, but a recent post by fellow sphere blogger Adam Piggott made me want to revisit it. Adam shared that his wife had succumbed to discontentment and decided to move out and divorce. Consistent with Adam’s admirably self reliant character, he blames himself for allowing mama to become unhappy:

It’s very tempting and all too easy in moments like these to convince yourself that you are a victim. But the truth is that I failed to keep her. And the truth hurts. In the first 9 years of our relationship she was dependent on me more than I was on her. There were a few reasons for that but primarily it was down to the fact that she was in my worlds; Italy and then Australia.

But the move to Holland last year reversed that position. And our marriage wasn’t able to withstand it.

I hope it is clear that I don’t mean this as a criticism of Adam*. I have great respect for his self reliant attitude and the high standards he holds himself to. I also enjoy reading his blog. But in this case he is mistaken. If it were true that husbands are responsible not only for upholding their own vows, but also for making sure their wives always wanted to uphold their vows, then marriage vows would be a profoundly foolish thing. They are **not** foolish, but there
is no denying that they would be foolish if you accept conventional wisdom, including the teaching of modern Christian leaders like Heidi’s chaplain friend, FotF, FamilyLife, and Pastors Dave and Doug Wilson. If a man doesn’t believe in biblical marriage, then not only does marriage have no moral meaning, but the very idea of marriage is downright absurd.

Ironically Adam uses a phrase that echoes how we used to understand the issue in the past. He says “the truth is that I failed to keep her”. In the past we (especially women) would say she can’t keep a man of a woman who wasn’t able to marry and stay married. This was a brilliant term, because while on the surface it was technically misstating the issue, it accurately captured the fundamental problem as well as pointed to the solution. Discontentment tends to come from a lack of thankfulness, and this is true in men and women. But this is true in a specific way for women when it comes to feelings of sexual attraction and romantic love. Women who fear they are going to lose the best man they can get tend to automatically become attracted to him. As Heartiste puts it, female tingles are born in a defensive crouch. Even if the woman the phrase was used to describe wasn’t able to straighten out her own course, other women on the road to discontentment would hear the term and see the larger truth that such women aren’t typically trading up, and especially in the long run tend to fare very badly compared to what they foolishly discarded. This fear of losing what she had both helped her be generally thankful for the good man she was tempted to discard, as well as tended to cause her to feel greater sexual attraction to him.

Telling a woman she can’t keep a man simultaneously acknowledges that something is broken in her and helps her work on fixing that problem! Telling her it is her husband’s fault if she is unhappy reinforces the problem and blocks the solution. Yet since we made the mistake of following Friedan’s lead and assuming women’s sins are men’s fault, we have reworked the old phrase to the version Adam used. Even worse, pastors like Dave and Doug Wilson have come along and declared that a wife’s discontentment is God’s sign that He is unhappy with her husband! This is evil, and cruel to men, women, and children.

H/T Anonymous Reader

*I should also note that he offers excellent insight in his two followup posts here and here.
The U.S. and our allies won the Cold War in part because we had a far superior economic system. The Soviets relied on a quota system enforced by threats of imprisonment. The U.S. and its allies on the other hand relied on an incentive based system. The quota based system works to a degree, but it creates a disincentive for increased productivity. Under a quota based system if you work harder or smarter and produce more, you will find that your quota is quickly raised. No good deed goes unpunished, as your own hard work will always be used against you.

Ironically even as the U.S. was winning the Cold War it was in the process of moving to a quota based system itself. This change happened not on the factory floor, but in the family. In the past our families were marriage based. Men married and lived with their families, and this created an incentive for men to work hard first to signal provider status (to attract a wife) and then to provide for their own families. That men respond to the marriage based system by working harder and smarter is well known, even while economists miss the point. See for example the endless supply of academic papers scratching their heads to figure out why marriage is associated with greater earnings for men but not for women. What is the cause of this mysterious male marriage premium?

Yet while academics are baffled, our family court judges know the answer. They know from experience that when you take away a man’s family you take away much of his incentive to work hard to support that family. When you tell him it isn’t his family anymore, he feels less of a sense of responsibility. Likewise, when you kick a man out of his home, he feels less incentive to work hard to keep paying the mortgage or rent. This is why judges are careful when stripping a man’s family away to assign the man an earnings quota in the form of imputed income. Otherwise, the man is likely to respond to having his home and family ripped away by working like a single man without a mortgage. Like the old Soviet system, the man’s quota is established by his own record of production. If he produces more, his quota will be increased.

I mention this in preface to a post by Dr. Helen titled ‘About 500,000 Young Men Are Missing, and It Isn’t Clear Why ‘. The title is a quote from a Bloomberg article that wonders why young millennial men aren’t working harder:

> Though employment rates have been climbing back from the abyss, young men never caught up again. Millennial males remain less likely to hold down a job than the generation before them, even as women their age work at higher rates.

The Bloomberg article uses a familiar trick to personify the trend they are asserting. They introduce Nathan Butcher, who is 25 and not working. Nathan has job opportunities, but isn’t motivated to either start at the bottom and work his way up or to improve his career prospects through education/training, although he talks about wanting to do the latter.

Perhaps not coincidentally, Nathan isn’t a product of our old (marriage based) family model
that gave young men an incentive to work hard. As the article explains, he is a product of the new family model, headed by single mothers:

His choosiness could be a generational trait, he allows. His mother worked to support her three kids, whether she liked her job or not.

The implication is that the golden age of responsible single motherhood has passed us by:

“That was the template for that generation: you were either working and unhappy, or you were a mooch,” he said. “People feel that they have choice nowadays, and they do.”

It is more likely that such a golden age never existed. But either way, it is clear that Nathan isn’t motivated to do what it takes to signal provider status and thereby attract a wife:

He’s being selective as he searches for new work because he doesn’t want to grind out unhappy hours for unsatisfying compensation.

“I’m very quick to get frustrated when people refuse to pay me what I’m worth,” he said.

But should we be surprised that Nathan isn’t motivated? We’ve removed the incentives and prestige that once motivated men to work hard to support their families as husbands and fathers. We’ve spent decades teaching men that husbands and fathers are despicable at worst, and at best jokes. All of our entertainment, even product commercials, continuously hammers this message. It isn’t just secular culture either. Christian movies are even worse than secular entertainment in this regard, and Father’s Day is now a day to disparage married fathers in churches across the land. It isn’t just our culture that sends this message. We send the same message with even greater potency with our family courts.

The message is: Men who marry and have children are despicable and deserve the harshest punishments we can mete out.

Now we are scratching our heads asking “Hey, why aren’t these young men knocking themselves out preparing to become husbands and fathers? What is wrong with these losers?” I don’t think Nathan himself knows what is really going on. This new system that dishonors the honorable and discourages men from working hard is the only system he knows. It will also be the only system his children will know. For at the end of the Bloomberg article we learn that 25 year old unemployed Nathan is already a father twice over under our new family model:

He wants to earn enough to provide security for his son and daughter, who live with their mother.

Predictably older conservatives will respond to the failure of our new family model by patting themselves on the back for working harder than young men like Nathan. We are after all the generation that won the Cold War.
An invitation to Pastor Wilson’s defenders.

by Dalrock | November 6, 2018 | Link

I have been accused by at least one reader of treating Pastor Doug Wilson unfairly, and think it is only fair that I dedicate a post to allowing Wilson’s defenders to defend the positions I’ve criticized. Commenter BJ says I have labeled Pastor Wilson “a raging left wing feminist”. I am certain that I have written no such thing, but if I have I would greatly appreciate the opportunity to correct such an obvious misstatement.

More broadly, I would appreciate it if readers would point me to a post where I have either criticized him without specifically quoting what I was criticizing, or where I have misquoted him or misrepresented what he wrote. If you find an example of this, please provide a link to the post along with quotes of what Wilson and I both wrote, along with your explanation. To make the search easier, here is a list of all posts related to Pastor Wilson.

Lastly, I would encourage defenders of Pastor Wilson to point out the times I criticized what he wrote when they feel he was right. For example, if like Wilson you believe it would be morally wrong to pass a law that punished a woman in any way for deliberately killing her unborn child or enlisting someone else to help her do this, please respond in the comments saying something to the effect of “Wilson is right. Such a law would be morally wrong because even after the law was passed, women couldn’t possibly understand that it was wrong unless they are an abortion doctor”. Likewise, if you agree with Wilson after further consideration that it is possible to imagine a scenario say 1,000 years from now where it might be moral to pass such a law, please state so in the comments.

Here are some other examples where you may disagree with me and agree with Wilson:

- You think it was right for Wilson to criticize men who listened to their pastor when their pastor told them they needed to keep mama happy, and you don’t think it was right for me to point out that Pastor Wilson teaches in his book Reforming Marriage that the way to tell if a husband obeys God is if mama is happy.
- You don’t think it was inflammatory when Pastor Wilson titled his post “And Now A Brief Word to the Wife Beaters”, nor do you think it was inflammatory when he compared unhappy wives with abused slaves. But you think it was unfair when I quoted Wilson’s inflammatory comments on American slavery.
- You agree with Wilson in his book How to Exasperate Your Wife that “The wife is to be the ruler or despot of the home.”
- You agree with Wilson that in 1 Cor 7:10 when the Apostle Paul wrote “A wife must not separate from her husband” that this was merely friendly advice, and not pastoral instruction. Specifically, you agree with Wilson when he wrote: That is his apostolic counsel, but it is clear from the context that it is merely advice. If she sees that his generally good advice is not pertinent to her situation, she is left free to leave without being hassled about it by the apostle. So if he would leave you alone in this decision, then so should the elders of your church.
- You agree with Wilson that when women sin sexually, it is because a man has somehow
failed them causing them to crave security.

- You agree with Wilson that if a Christian husband is not obeying the word, Christian wives need to follow the example not of Sarah, but Abigail, and “need to learn how to bring things to a head“.
- You agree with Pastor Wilson when he writes regarding a wife denying sex to her husband: The most common way this happens in marriage is that a man does not treat his wife right, they start to quarrel and drift apart, and this naturally includes their sex life...
I stumbled across this shirt at Ranger Up the other day, and it struck me that the men we are most likely to associate with modern day knights, SEALs, SAS, etc. are distinctively unchivalrous. That is to say that the military aspect of chivalry (separate from the kneeling and picking up women’s underwear aspect of chivalry) no longer describes our concept of an elite warrior. From the description:

A lot of people forget that there was a time when archaic codes of warfare lived on modern battlefields. It’s hard to believe, in our time, when unconventional warfare has become a very conventional concept, that soldiers used to operate with this mentality. Many WWII leaders, both allies and axis, fought with overly-romantic notions of frontline chivalry. It can be tough to win when you’ve created rules that work against you. Enter the Special Operations Executive AKA The Baker Street Irregulars, AKA The Ministry of Ungentlemanly Warfare.
Don’t confuse entertainment with history.

by Dalrock | November 7, 2018 | Link

In the 1999 movie *Galaxy Quest* aliens come to earth seeking the actors from a Sci Fi TV series to lead them to victory against their enemies. They had watched the TV show and had mistaken make-believe for “historical documents”.

This came to mind when Oscar pointed out in the comments to *The Ministry of Ungentlemanly Warfare* that medieval manuals taught all kinds of dirty fighting tricks, offering [this image](#) and [this one](#) as examples. One of the problems with chivalry is it comes from literature. It is make-believe presented as faux history. But somewhere along the way we, like the clueless aliens in *Galaxy Quest*, have mistaken entertainment for history and began to take it seriously.
Fabius Maximus looks at post marriage America.
by Dalrock | November 8, 2018 | Link

Larry Kummer at Fabius Maximus further explores the trend I described here in *Becoming a post-marriage America: see the stories!*

Check out the excellent discussion at the bottom of Larry’s post as well.
Lori Alexander warns wives in her excellent post *Discontentment is a Marriage Killer*:

Eve stopped being thankful for the position that God put her into in the garden and seeds of discontentment were placed in her mind that reaped tragic consequences. Satan beguiled her with the question: “Hath God said....?” His desire is to kill, steal, and destroy. He wants women asking, “Hath God really said that young women are to marry, bear children, and guide the home? Hath God said that women should be keepers at home and silent in the churches? Hath God said that wives are to be submissive to their husbands in everything?” Feminism is simply acting as Satan’s agent of destruction.

If a woman believes she is “dying inside” and blames it on her husband, she has made her husband an idol instead of finding her satisfaction and fulfillment in Christ. Women naturally rebel against their husbands (Genesis 3:16) so we must always be on guard against doing this. God wouldn’t have had to tell us so many times in His Word for us to submit to our husbands if it came naturally and easy for us.

Discontentment among women in marriage is a common malady today since 70 – 80% of divorces are initiated by women. We must constantly be aware of this in us, women. We must do everything we can to fight against Satan’s questions and doubts he tries to plant in our minds and put on the full armor of God every day.

Part of the problem is our whole culture has lined up to do Satan’s work here and whisper discontentment into women’s ears. It isn’t just secular culture either. Christian pastors, including conservative pastors, regularly encourage Christian wives to embrace discontentment.

In *Where Men Blow It* Pastor Raymond Force teaches wives that not only is it essential that they complain, he teaches that there is something wrong with a woman’s husband if he discourages her from complaining (emphasis mine):

> What I love about scriptures as such is they teach us that it is okay to reverentially offer our concerns, fears, worries, and even complaints before the Lord. What I also feel is fascinating is that one never finds God taking these complaints as though they are an attack against his person, nor do they find God getting defensive or taking things personally.

> A woman needs a place to express, complain, vent, et cetera without condemnation. But, if a man is too wrapped up in his own sensitivities, he will fail to provide that which Christ offers to him on a daily basis.

Force cites Numbers 11 as the primary supporting Scripture for this absurd claim. Yet Numbers 11 is all about *God’s wrath at the Israelites for complaining*. Numbers 11 opens with
God burning Israelites alive because they complained (KJV):

11 And when the people complained, it displeased the Lord: and the Lord heard it; and his anger was kindled; and the fire of the Lord burnt among them, and consumed them that were in the uttermost parts of the camp.

As the chapter continues, the Israelites keep complaining. When they complain about not having meat to eat, God punishes them by making them eat meat until it comes out of their nostrils. The Israelites keep complaining, so God smites them with a great plague. When the complaining continues, God declares that he will wipe all of them out and make a new, better people for Moses to head!

I will smite them with the pestilence, and disinherit them, and will make of thee a greater nation and mightier than they.

-Numbers 14:12, KJV

Moses convinces God to show them mercy they don’t deserve, and God relents. But the message of Numbers 11-14 is clear; God despises discontentment and lack of thankfulness. Pastor Force wanted to encourage women to complain so much that he took this Scripture and used it to teach the opposite of what it plainly says. Force gambled that he would get away with this because other pastors regularly teach the same message.

For another example of this, in his sermon Women’s Hurdles Acts 29 president Pastor Matt Chandler explains that if a wife is susceptible to being tempted to feminist discontentment it is proof that her husband is oppressing her!

If the most secularized feminist in the world showed up in your home and began to kind of coach your wife toward freedom and liberation from your tyranny, our wives should be so well cared for, so nourished, so sowed into and loved, they would say, “What you’re describing is actually tyranny. I love where I am...

Men, here is a good opportunity. If you’re like, “Well, gosh, I don’t think she would say that at all,” then, men, I think on the way home, you should probably repent and confess before the Lord to your wife.

Likewise, Pastor Doug Wilson teaches in Reforming Marriage that the way to tell if a man is good is if his wife is happy. He explains that very often husbands seem to be doing everything right. The husband goes to marriage seminars, reads books on marriage, and does everything he is told to do to make his wife happy. But very often despite the husband doing everything right, his wife is still unhappy. Wilson tells us this is common, and the reason it happens is God isn’t happy with her husband. He tells us that her discontentment is actually God’s voice, pronouncing divine judgement upon her hypocrite husband (emphasis mine):

In other words, keeping God’s law with a whole heart (which is really what love is) is not only seen in overt acts of obedience. The collateral effect of obedience is the aroma of love. This aroma is out of reach for those who have a hypocritical
desire to be known by others as a keeper of God’s law. Many can fake an attempt at keeping God’s standards in some external way. What we cannot fake is the resulting, distinctive aroma of pleasure to God.

...This is why I am afraid that this book will be of little use to those who simply want a “formula” to follow that will build them a happy marriage. When it comes to the externals, the mere copyist can always say of himself what the unregenerate Saul could say, “concerning the righteousness which is in the law, blameless” (Phil. 3:6). However hard the externalist tries, he cannot produce the aroma of godliness. This is why so many people attend marriage seminars and read marriage books with so little result. The obedience of the Christian man is not limited to new actions—actions which, after all, can be copied mechanically. This does not appear to be a rare or unusual error; many people who are miserable in their marriages are also those who have read all the books on how not to be. Of course, certain actions—godly obedience in externals—must be present in all healthy marriages; but in order to produce this distinctive aroma, the externals must proceed from new hearts.

...the love of the Christian husband does not proceed from reading the “right books,” including this one, or going to the right seminars. God will not patch His grace onto some humanistic psychological nonsense—even if that nonsense is couched and buried in Christian terminology.

...

When a husband seeks to glorify God in his home, he will be equipped to love his wife as he is commanded. And if he loves his wife as commanded, the aroma of his home will be pleasant indeed.

H/T Heidi

*Edit: I originally wrote that God’s declaration in Numbers 14:12 was in response to Moses pleading to God. This was incorrect. God was directly responding to the complaining of the Israelites at that time.

See Also: Whose job is it to keep mama happy?
Sure his theology is bad, but he has great taste in TV!
by Dalrock | November 10, 2018 | Link

In my recent post An invitation to Pastor Wilson’s defenders I challenged Wilson’s defenders to do any of the following:

1. Point out any instances where I criticized Wilson without providing a direct quote.
2. Point out any time that I have misquoted Wilson or misrepresented what he wrote.
3. Defend any of Wilson’s positions that I had criticized.

There were no takers.

This was true even though I provided 8 different examples of Wilson’s bad teaching for his defenders to back him up on. All 8 examples were so bad that none of Wilson’s defenders wanted to even try to defend them.

What I received instead were calls for me to become friends with Wilson. Presumably once I did that, I, like his defenders, would become comfortable overlooking his bad teaching.

When the call for friendship didn’t convince me, next his defenders offered his taste in black and white TV shows as a reason to overlook his bad teaching. MKT wrote:

Like Wilson or not, he posted this on a recent blog. It’s one of the finest moments in TV history, and would make everyone from radical feminists to self-proclaimed conservative complimentarians hysterical if they saw it. If you can’t watch the whole thing, just watch the first minute and last 2-3 minutes.

This is the kind of misdirection Wilson’s defenders love most. Here is Wilson, supporting headship for a make-believe man! Surely one day soon this will translate into Wilson supporting headship for real life men. But it doesn’t work that way.

Again, Wilson’s defenders can’t bring themselves to even try to defend his bad teaching. What they want is for me (and you) to pretend the bad teaching doesn’t exist, or at least pretend that it doesn’t matter.

Likewise, in response to Every Woman’s Battle, commenter Warthog wrote:

To be fair, Wilson wrote that over 20 years ago. He has moved substantially in your direction since then.


In the post Warthog was responding to I quoted Lori Alexander where she rightly pointed out that Satan tempts women into blaming their husbands for their feelings of discontentment. I agreed with her and added that our entire culture is doing Satan’s work here, including Christian pastors. To prove this point I gave three examples of pastors doing just that. Wilson
was one of the three. Note that Warthog doesn’t even try to defend Wilson’s bad teaching. He merely wants us to ignore it and assume that Wilson has stopped teaching women their husband is the source of their discontentment, referencing the same recent *Lone Ranger* post from Wilson that MKT did.

Yet Wilson’s much loved *Lone Ranger* post includes reinforcements for his past bad teaching. As Wilson explained, the message of the *Lone Ranger* episode he shared was that the woman’s pathetic husband was responsible for her discontentment:

> On this privileged occasion, I recall taking in an episode of *The Lone Ranger*. The theme of this particular show was about that time when there was this mousy little man, hen-pecked to the outer limits of human endurance, and through a series of circumstances, the Lone Ranger adopted this poor man and made him something of a protégé. The end result of this crash course in masculinity was that the little man headed on home, and the happy ending to the whole saga was him pulling out his revolver and shooting his wife’s dishes off her shelves. It makes me happy just thinking about it. Fade to black, and with her thinking something along the lines of *finally!*

For reference, here is the opening of Lori Alexander’s post:

> Divorce always begins with seeds of discontentment planted in our minds by ourselves or others. Feminism flourished because it appealed to wives’, mothers’, and homemakers’ discontentment. “We can no longer ignore that voice within women that says: ‘I want something more than my husband and my children and my home.’” (Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique*)

Lori Alexander wants wives to remember that the discontentment comes from within. Despite what the Serpent is telling them, it isn’t men’s fault they are discontented.

Wilson on the other hand wants us to know that women’s discontentment really does come from men, and besides, it is only the hairy legged feminists who are currently in rebellion. Women who have children aren’t in rebellion and long for the patriarchy:

> So whatever is happening, we are not actually being ruled by fruitful women (a state of affairs that *fruitful* women actually detest), but rather by men with a homosexual ethos who have recruited a horde of childless and gullible women to serve as their honey-trap shock troops. Such women are those who have accepted the flattering vanities of career “advancement” in place of a truly satisfying life as the active mother of a teeming and energetic pack of yard apes. These duped women have somehow been persuaded that the good opinion of the bureaucrats in HR is somehow far more valuable than the good opinion of the yard apes. It isn’t, by the way.

Moreover, Wilson never stopped teaching what Warthog assures us Wilson no longer believes. He wrote the book decades ago, but he still sells it today. Warthog didn’t offer his opinion on why he thinks Wilson still sells a book teaching something Wilson now believes to be wrong*. But any defense in this matter would really be an *indictment*. Does Warthog think
Wilson is too proud to admit that what he taught was wrong? Or could it be that Warthog is accusing Wilson of being too corrupted by the desire for money to stop selling the book?

I’ll try to rescue Wilson from his defenders here and note that I don’t think he has changed his (relevant) theology since he first wrote Reforming Marriage. I don’t have the link handy, but I have seen a video online where he uses the introduction to the book almost entirely verbatim as a sermon, and the sermon was dated just a few years ago. However, Wilson could help his defenders stop indicting him in this regard by clarifying if he still stands by what he wrote in Reforming Marriage or if he no longer believes that a woman’s discontentment is proof that God is displeased with her husband.

*And not just wrong in one small part. The introduction explains that the entire book is based on the premise that if a husband loves his wife as he should, the wife will be happy.
A marriage isn’t a military unit.

by Dalrock | November 12, 2018 | Link

Commenter Warthog wrote that I have missed Pastor Doug Wilson’s point when he claimed that a husband is like a captain of a ship, and therefore “the man is completely responsible for all the problems [in the marriage]”:

Not defending Wilson here, but you have failed to comprehend what he meant in the military analogy. There is a difference between being at fault and being responsible. To take the example of a ship captain, the USS Stark was hit by an Iraqi missile in 1986 or so. Due to a mistake by the gunnery sergeant, the Phalanx missile defense system had not been turned back on after the last maintenance. Due to this error, the ship was defenseless against the missile, resulting as I recall in the deaths of about 17 men.

The captain was held responsible, as was the gunnery sergeant. It ended both of their careers. The captain was indeed responsible, even though it was the gunnery sergeant’s fault. Simply said, when you have command you are responsible for both the good and bad that happens under your command.

In marriage this would mean that if the wife starts misbehaving, the husband is responsible for the marriage, and should take corrective action on the wife. If the misbehavior metastasizes it is usually because it wasn’t nipped in the bud, just like cancer...

However, I did understand Wilson’s point here. The problem is twofold:

1. Wilson’s theology of the family as a military unit is deeply flawed.
2. Wilson himself doesn’t actually believe in this model.

Problem #2 is what I was focused on in Headship tomorrow and headship yesterday, but never headship today. Wilson is merely using headship as a handy club to beat husbands with. That club appears in an instant when it is needed, and disappears the moment it is no longer needed. In Reforming Marriage Wilson writes (emphasis mine):

...men, whether through tyranny or abdication, are responsible for any problems in the home. If Christian men had loved their wives as Christ loved the Church, if they had given direction to their wives, if husbands had accepted their wives’ necessary help with their God-ordained vocation, there never would have been room for any kind of feminist thinking within the Church.

But in the same book Wilson explains that headship doesn’t mean the husband tells the wife what to do (that is after all the house despot’s role). Husbands aren’t to tell their wives what to do. They are merely to love and cherish their wives so much the wife will naturally do the right thing:
Not only is he responsible before God to do his job, he is responsible before God to see that she does hers. And of course, this is not done by bossing her around. It is done through nourishing and cherishing her.

Having established that Wilson doesn’t believe this model himself, there is still the question of the bad theology he trotted out in the process of blaming men for women’s sins. The problem is that not only is there no biblical backing for this theology, there is plenty of Scripture that contradicts it.

As I referenced the other day, the Israelites were ungrateful when God had Moses lead them out of Egypt. If Wilson and Warthog’s theology is correct, Moses (as the captain of the metaphorical ship) would be to blame for not nipping the issue in the bud. But God doesn’t blame Moses. He tells Moses he is going to wipe the unworthy people out and give Moses a more deserving “crew” for his “ship”:

I will smite them with the pestilence, and disinherit them, and will make of thee a greater nation and mightier than they.

-Numbers 14:12, KJV

Likewise see the story of Job. Job’s wife urged him to curse God and die when he was suffering. Yet Job is presented as the most godly man alive in the whole world. There is incredible hubris in men thinking that the reason their wives are submissive and obedient is that they are better than other men. Clearly they see themselves as better than Job!

We can see another example of how God views the authority of husbands and fathers in Numbers 30. There we learn that a man is responsible for his own vows. A woman is responsible for her own vows too, unless she is under the authority of her husband or father and he nullifies the vow as soon as he first learns of it. Note that the husband/father isn’t responsible for making sure she doesn’t utter foolish vows. Nor is he required to nullify the vow once he hears of it. Where a husband would become culpable is if he failed to nullify the vow once he heard of it and later tried to intervene (Numbers 30:13-15, KJV):

13 Every vow, and every binding oath to afflict the soul, her husband may establish it, or her husband may make it void.

14 But if her husband altogether hold his peace at her from day to day; then he establisheth all her vows, or all her bonds, which are upon her: he confirmeth them, because he held his peace at her in the day that he heard them.

15 But if he shall any ways make them void after that he hath heard them; then he shall bear her iniquity.

One Scriptural backing often given for the false marriage is a military unit theology is the qualification for a bishop (elder) in 1 Tim 3:2-5 (KJV):

2 A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach;
3 Not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous;

4 One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity;

5 (For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?)

This is the strongest case for the argument. But if we are to take this passage so far as to declare husbands will be judged as the captain of a ship we have made a grave error. A naval captain’s mission is different than the mission of a husband and father. As Wilson and other complementarians repeatedly remind us, a husband can’t make his wife submit. This is technically true, even though it is being used to create the false impression that husbands don’t have authority. Yet if you assume that 1 Tim 3 means that Christian husbands are like naval captains, you will find that in your zeal to twist 1 Tim 3:4 into your service you have to disregard 1 Tim 3:3, as Warthog does in a separate comment:

@Dalrock you’ve stated the problem, but not the solution. What sanctions do husbands biblically have when their wives rebel?
When children or slaves rebel, the head of the house clearly has the biblical sanction of the rod. Non-destructive spanking/beatings.
Does the patriarch’s power of the rod also apply to his wife?

For if we are foolish enough to look for biblical instruction from the navy, there is plenty to back Warthog’s beat them into submission theology. See for example Brief History of Punishment by Flogging in the US Navy.

Contrast this with 1 Tim 3:3. The KJV says the man shall not be a “striker”. The ESV translates this to “not violent but gentle”:

not a drunkard, not violent but gentle, not quarrelsome, not a lover of money.

Not only does the marriage as military unit model not fit with Scripture as a whole, it goes against the very passage that would best support it. For a practical look at this, consider Hmm’s enlightening comment about the history of the movement Pastor Wilson comes out of:

Theonomy went off the rails in the early 90’s, and Wilson began backing off from it, especially the hard patriarchy. This was about the time he started publishing books.
As nearly as I can understand, he also began to find truly cruel patriarchal homes among the families of his church, and this has shaped some of his subsequent screeds about wife-beating men and “prairie muffin” women. So when he writes about some men being hard-hearted husbands, he knows whereof he speaks, and it is not a trivial number. In my gentler area of the Midwest, I have seen only a couple such in my twenty years as an elder.

The irony here is that if Hmm is right, Wilson refuses to teach the plain meaning of Scripture
on headship and submission because his false teaching that families are a military unit resulted in abuse. That Wilson himself twisted Scripture in a way that predictably will lead to abuse isn’t a defense of his other twisting of Scripture to deny the authority of husbands. Take away one false teaching and the other is no longer required.
A few weeks back I noted that fellow men’s sphere blogger Adam Piggott’s wife caught the discontentment bug and declared their marriage to be over. Adam’s tagline is Gentleman Adventurer, and Pushing Rubber Downhill is the name of both his blog and one of his books. From the book’s description on his blog:

Always order a witchdoctor from the eastern part of Uganda if you want to get the best results, a predicament that Adam Piggott was not expecting to find himself in when he accepted a job as a rafting guide in deepest darkest Africa. But the unexpected becomes the new normal when he chucks away his life to ride across Australia on a motorbike chasing a girl, and in the process winds up in situations that he never imagined.

From the tropical rainforests of Northern Australia, to the mountain rivers of British Columbia, the mighty Ugandan White Nile, and finally the cultural wonderland of the Italian Alps, Pushing Rubber Downhill explores one young man’s desire to make something of his life by doing the unbelievable.

Intrigued by the description and wanting to do a brother blogger a solid during what has to be a difficult time, I decided to buy the book on Kindle.

I’m very glad I did.

I won’t give away any spoilers, but the book starts off with Adam on an adventure right out of the chute as he rides an aging motorcycle across the outback, camping along the way. There is a fairly subtle “red pill” message included in the book, as Adam learns the hard way that pursuing a woman is a prescription for disaster. At times it is also funny, especially a hilarious police chase in Uganda. But mainly the book is about the adventures young Adam throws himself into as he leaps before he looks. Adam is an excellent writer and the book held my attention the whole way through.

If Adam’s adventures sound interesting to you, you can buy the book on Amazon here.
You’ll have to buy a few dinners on the road to finding your 53 year old dream girl.

by Dalrock | November 13, 2018 | Link

As 53 year old never married Wendy Griffith explains in her book on how to find a husband, it is important for women to only date men who are willing to buy them dinner and dessert.

God wants you to know that you are worth the price of dinner and dessert—and so much more! You are worth someone being “extravagant,” even lavish, over. After all, you are a daughter of the Most High King, a royal treasure, a beautiful masterpiece, a pearl of great price. You are a lady, and a true gentleman will recognize your value and act accordingly. Don’t settle and don’t forget to order dessert.

This way they know the man is chivalrous and old fashioned. And if he has to wait a few years (or decades) while the woman pursues her career and savors her “season of singleness”, surely she is worth the wait.

Plus, the longer he waits, the more practice he will get at being chivalrous. From the New York Post ‘Sneating’ is the online dating trend that feeds on chivalrous men

I could get used to hanging out with strangers for a decent meal. I’m hardly the first person to think of this — it even has its own dating term, “sneating,” which means sneakily chatting someone up solely for the purposes of a free meal — but I’m committed.

I started being more strategic about the guys whom I matched with on Tinder. Guys who said they were old-fashioned or knew how to treat a lady were in. They were the ones who were likely to pay on a first date.

H/T: Nick Mgtow
Our family policy is designed to terrify married fathers.

by Dalrock | November 13, 2018 | Link

While the claim is that our family courts are primarily driven by the best interest of children, in reality they tend to focus instead on transferring power and wealth from men to women. When considering the family courts, it is critical to understand that they don’t just impact the unfortunate families they destroy. The goal is to undermine all married fathers, who see that the family courts stand ready to take their children away from them and send them a bill for the pleasure.

The term social scientists use for this is *bargaining in the shadow of the law*, and the use of the family courts to weaken married fathers is an open secret. Economists Stevenson and Wolfers describe this in their paper *Bargaining in the Shadow of the Law: Divorce Laws and Family Distress* (emphasis mine).

In the literature on the economics of the family there has been growing consensus on the need to take bargaining and distribution within marriage seriously. Such models of the family rely on a threat point to determine distribution within the household. The switch to a unilateral divorce regime redistributes power in a marriage, giving power to the person who wants out, and reducing the power previously held by the partner interested in preserving the marriage.

For an example of this see the paper *Do joint custody laws improve family well-being?* by Martin Halla, a professor of economics at the Johannes Kepler University Linz. The paper opens with:

Joint child custody laws affect not only divorced families but intact families as well.

Halla focuses on the implications of moving towards a joint custody model. For the purpose of this post, I’m more interested in the perspective of the author than I am in the paper’s findings*. Number one in the “cons” of joint custody is that it weakens the threatpoint wives can use to gain power over their husbands:

The introduction of joint custody reforms reinforces the traditional division of labor within the family and gives men greater bargaining power over the intrahousehold allocation of resources.

Another “con” that stands out is the fact that the study didn’t find an effect on women’s suicide rates:

Joint custody reforms have had no robust, long-term effect on female suicide rates.

I’m assuming Halla isn’t expressing disappointment that women’s suicide rates didn’t increase. What I think this bizarre statement boils down to is a complaint that joint custody decreases men’s suicide rate (listed as a pro) without decreasing women’s suicide rate (listed
as a con). In a sane world that would be seen as a positive without a corresponding downside, not a pro and a con.

At any rate, the takeaway from both items is the same. When the family courts crush men it is according to plan, and they fully understand the devastation they are meting out to men in the process. They don’t want men to commit suicide, but they know that in order to generate the kind of fear they want to instill they have to inflict extreme brutality on the men who are made examples of.

In closing his Author’s Main Message Halla advises policy makers to be careful when changing custody laws to avoid the negative consequences he found in the study (number one being lessening the coercive power of wives by reducing men’s fear of losing their children):

- Policymakers should acknowledge that regulating families’ post-divorce life may affect intact families and try to minimize any unintended negative consequences.

He further elaborates in Summary and Policy Advice (emphasis mine):

- Joint custody laws affect both intact and non-intact families in substantial ways. A very crude description is that joint custody improves men’s bargaining position within marriage, enforces traditional gender roles, and leads on average to worse outcomes for children. A more detailed account would contrast these clearly negative and unintended effects with positive effects on other outcome variables (such as lower male suicide rates and less domestic violence)...

Despite the negative effects of joint custody on some family outcomes, abolishing it may not be a desirable policy option....

To predict the effects of a planned reform, it would be important to assess how the relative bargaining positions of spouses will be affected. This can be approximated by checking how the reform affects the well-being of each partner in the case of a potential divorce. The party who will benefit from the reform will gain power within the marriage.

*See Larry Kummer’s caution on papers like this [here](http://www.theredarchive.com).

**Related:** [Debtors prisons are an essential tool of our new public policy](http://www.theredarchive.com).
The US Census has released the median age of marriage stats for 2018.

Here is the data for the last 19 years in table form (source has data back to 1890):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014s</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011r</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/demo/tables/families/time-series/marital/ms2.xls](https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/demo/tables/families/time-series/marital/ms2.xls)

**Note:** I removed the duplicate for 2011 and just included the revised figure.

H/T Emperor Constantine
The Washington Post has an opinion piece up by a law professor named Irina D. Manta. The title of the piece is *The case for cracking down on Tinder lies*, and her thesis is:

| There should be a legal penalty for obtaining sex through fraud. |

This is an interesting claim, since the basis of our sexual morality is that no one should be expected to do anything they don’t want to do. Our moral paradigm is that sex is for pleasure, and nothing should get in the way of women and men having sex when and with whom they want to, and nothing should compel a man or woman to have sex if they don’t desire it.

Manta isn’t arguing that women are coerced into sex they didn’t want (at the time). She is arguing that women of a certain age stop engaging in sex for pleasure and start trading sex for the hope of obtaining financial security. This is why she is calling it *fraud* and not rape, not unlike a prostitute willingly trading sex for money only to find out later that her John’s check bounced.

| New laws in the dating area should focus on lies that are clearly false, are not easily discoverable before sex takes place, and have a potentially large dignitary or emotional impact. Lies related to physical appearance would thus typically not be punishable, while ones about marital status, fertility circumstances (say, existing children or the ability to have future children) or employment may lead to sanctions. |

Not surprisingly, all of the examples she offers of sexual *fraud* involve older women having sex with men they were mislead into believing were attractive as potential future husbands. As Manta notes, she understands this situation well. She points to her own *wedding announcement* at the NY Times. The announcement explains that she met her husband in 2017 via online dating, and was 37 when they married in May of 2018. While I’m confident that Ms. Manta didn’t hit her late 30s and set out to use sex with men she wasn’t attracted to and barely knew as an enticement to bag a husband, no doubt she encountered many women who were doing just that. I can only assume that her empathy for women who chose a different sexual strategy than she did has lead her to nobly fight to enshrine the Alpha F***s and Beta Bucks (AF/BB) strategy into law on their behalf.

| …we punish low-level shoplifting, or false claims in commercial advertising, more harshly than we punish most forms of sexual deception, despite the suffering and harm to one’s dignity the latter brings. For a woman in her late 30s or early 40s who wants to marry and have children, the opportunity cost of a fraudulent relationship can add another dimension to the pain in the form of diminished fertility. |

Manta argues that such a law is needed to make it safe for women to have transactional sex with men they know next to nothing about, men who are well outside their own social circles:
There have always been people who tell lies to get sex, but apps make it easy to deceive victims on an unprecedented scale, and in relative anonymity, well outside the perpetrators’ social circles.

Ironically, her complaint is that men making themselves appear more attractive for marriage (vs men making themselves appear more sexually attractive) increases women’s search costs for a husband. Yet the very women she claims are being victimized will (as a group) have spent a decade and a half raising men’s search costs for wives.

The male sexual strategy she wants to criminalize is what I dubbed Revenge of the Nerds back in 2010, and is a rational response to women’s AF/BB strategy:

But salmon face a unique problem. Their route and timing are known in advance, and this makes them easy prey.

If I were a bitter beta I might decide I had a different choice other than “Take it or leave it”. He knows women of a certain age and a history of promiscuity are going to be looking for a sucker nice guy like him to marry and settle down with. What if he decides to con the conwoman? All he has to do is what comes naturally to him. He may want to learn a little game to make him seem more interesting, but he doesn’t have to move to full alpha status.

All he has to do is put himself out there in places where these women are looking for marks, and look like a better mark than the others. Since some of the remaining betas will be manning the picket line and the alphas are busy with the new crop of carousel riders, this probably won’t be too hard. Then he just strings her along for a while, or maybe strings several along all the while talking the provider talk and enjoying the ride. And since she is in full blown (pardon the pun) bag a husband mode, she’s going to be giving him the best sex she can to seal the deal. After a while she’s bound to get wise to the jig, but then another salmon carouseler
should be jumping into his mouth bed to fill the void.

Novaseeker noted that Manta is getting eviscerated in the comments section, and this isn’t surprising. To start with, she is trying to formalize the AF/BB strategy into law, but the strategy relies on denial. Key to the AF/BB strategy is pretending that the woman didn’t shift sexual strategies once her youth and fertility were all but gone. Such women can’t come out and say they are shifting from having sex with the kind of men they are sexually attracted to (sex for pleasure) into a strategy of having sex with men they don’t want to have sex with but think would make a good husband. Otherwise, the man who mans up and marries a woman in her late thirties after she tires of having sex with other men looks like a chump and his bride looks like a whore!

Imagine if Bumble and Tinder created checkboxes for women to indicate that they only will have sex with men they hope to entice into marriage, and they have a strict one penis at a time policy. This would make enforcing Manta’s law much easier, but none of the “victims” would want to check such a box.

Even worse, Manta is saying that a man’s marriage vow has substantial financial value to a woman. Otherwise, why would she argue that a woman should be able to sue a man for $10,000 for giving her the false impression that he would be a good man to use sex to extract such a vow? And if a fertile successful man’s potential marriage vow is worth $10,000 in sexual favors, imagine what his actual vows are worth, especially once his fertility is converted into children! In the unimaginable event that Manta has children with her new husband and then decides to divorce him and take his assets, children and part of his income, this logic would mean that she has defrauded him and owes him a phenomenal amount of money! He after all gave her something of great value, something she would pay $10,000 just to hope to create the opportunity for him to make such a vow. In that case she would have defrauded him of what he hoped to receive in exchange for his vows, and she would have used her own formal vow to do so.

Related:

- Losing control of the narrative.
- Is Marcos evil for conning women looking to trade sex for financial security?
- SMP searching costs and the unmourned death of courtship.

H/T Novaseeker.

Bear photo licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 Unported by Dmitry Azovtsev.
Does romantic love sanctify married sex?
by Dalrock | November 20, 2018 | Link

Hence Xystus in his Sentences tells us that “He who too ardently loves his own wife is an adulterer.” It is disgraceful to love another man’s wife at all, or one’s own too much. A wise man ought to love his wife with judgment, not with passion. Let a man govern his voluptuous impulses, and not rush headlong into intercourse. There is nothing blacker than to love a wife as if she were an adulteress.

— St Jerome, Against Jovinianus (Book I)

I’ve written before about the difficulty Christians past and present have had with the Apostle Paul’s instruction regarding sex in marriage in 1 Cor 7:1-5 (ESV):

7 Now concerning the matters about which you wrote: “It is good for a man not to have sexual relations with a woman.” 2 But because of the temptation to sexual immorality, each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband. 3 The husband should give to his wife her conjugal rights, and likewise the wife to her husband. 4 For the wife does not have authority over her own body, but the husband does. Likewise the husband does not have authority over his own body, but the wife does. 5 Do not deprive one another, except perhaps by agreement for a limited time, that you may devote yourselves to prayer; but then come together again, so that Satan may not tempt you because of your lack of self-control.

In the fourth century St. Jerome was convinced that the Apostle Paul was saying sex within marriage was something dirty but better than the alternative:

“It is good,” he says, “for a man not to touch a woman.” If it is good not to touch a woman, it is bad to touch one: for there is no opposite to goodness but badness. But if it be bad and the evil is pardoned, the reason for the concession is to prevent worse evil. But surely a thing which is only allowed because there may be something worse has only a slight degree of goodness.

St. Augustine was more generous to married Christians, and allowed that it wasn’t a sin to have sex in marriage so long as it was passionless duty sex. Sex with the goal of conceiving a child, or sex to pay the marital debt Paul describes were not sinful in St. Augustine’s view.

But because that Continence is of larger desert, but to pay the due of marriage is no crime, but to demand it beyond the necessity of begetting is a venial fault, but to commit fornication or adultery is a crime to be punished...

But both Augustine and Jerome were in agreement that passionate sex in marriage was a disgrace.

Later Christians took this in the opposite direction, replacing biblical teaching with the courtly love idea that romantic love sanctified sex. The Puritan poet John Milton wrote
in *Tetrachordon* (1645) that sex without romantic love in marriage was brutish, the act of animals, and therefore sinful:

> And although copulation be considered among the ends of marriage, yet the act thereof in a right esteem can no longer be matrimonial, than it is an effect of conjugal love. When love finds itself utterly unmatched, and justly vanishes, nay rather cannot but vanish, the fleshly act indeed may continue, but not holy, not pure, not beseeming the sacred bond of marriage; being at best but an animal excretion...

Recently Pastor Tim Bayly wrote a post titled *Authority and submission: muscles needing exercise*. Shortly after he published the post he wrote a clarifying note at his wife’s request (emphasis mine):

**ADDED AFTER POSTING:**

At dinner tonight, Mary Lee suggested I add the note that this is not a post on loving your wife or living with her in an understanding way. This post is not inimical to those things, but don’t expect this post specifically to address those separate, but related, questions.

In that connection, one person tweeted in response to this post, “What do you suggest when a husband exercises his authority muscles and commands his wife to do X (put the kids to bed on time, get ready to have sex) and she disobeys him? How does a Christian husband proceed?”

I responded: “**Sex is a matter of love—not command. If your wife doesn’t want to love you, that’s a fundamental problem unlikely to yield to command without becoming brutish and degraded.** As for command in other areas, it’s an art—not a science. Any counsel coming from a stranger is useless.”

I add here that sex is the one case in Scripture that actually qualifies as mutual submission in that the Bible speaks explicitly of the authority the husband has over his wife’s body and the authority the wife has over her husband’s body (1Corinthians 7:4). So although I abhor the talk of “marital rape,” **sex that is not mutual is not sex as God designed and commands it. As Mary Lee and I agreed when we discussed it a few minutes ago, that means an awful lot of sex down through history has not risen to the level of true intimacy and love, and therefore violated God’s design, sexually.**

Note that according to Pastor Bayly’s argument the only married sex that St. Augustine considered truly sinless is sinful because it lacks the sanctification of romantic love. According to Bayly’s rules, a married couple that doesn’t feel romantic love or sexual attraction is violating God’s sexual design if they have sex with the goal of conceiving a child! Likewise, if a couple doesn’t feel mutual romantic love but has sex to be faithful to the Apostle Peter’s instruction in 1 Cor 7:1-5 they are sinning!
Both sets of teachings are wrong, and you won’t find them in the Bible:

1. That sex with passion in marriage is a sin. (Jerome and Augustine)
2. That sex without romantic passion in marriage is a sin. (Milton and Bayly)

For as Augustine notes, 1 Cor 7 instructs husbands and wives not to deny (defraud) the other of sex. Interestingly the Apostle Paul describes sex not as “romantic”, but physical:

4 For the wife does not have authority over her own body, but the husband does. Likewise the husband does not have authority over his own body, but the wife does.

But this does not mean that passion in marriage is sinful. Husbands are encouraged in Proverbs 5 to be intoxicated with desire for their wives. This is not the romantic love that Milton and Bayly argue sanctifies married sex though. This is a passion like a rutting buck has for a doe in heat:

19 A loving doe, a graceful deer—
may her breasts satisfy you always,
may you ever be intoxicated with her love.
20 Why, my son, be intoxicated with another man’s wife?
Why embrace the bosom of a wayward woman?

This isn’t to say that romantic love in marriage is bad. To the contrary, it is truly wonderful! But it isn’t sanctifying. It is marriage that sanctifies romantic love and sex, but in our modern rebellion we have twisted this around and assert that romantic love sanctifies marriage and sex.

Pastor Bayly has much company in his assertion that romantic love sanctifies sex. This is the overwhelming consensus in the secular world, and is the moral basis for both gay marriage and no fault divorce. Moreover, this perversion is the overwhelming consensus in the complementarian Christian world as well, even as they deny the logical conclusions of the perversion.

**Moderator’s Note:** Feel free to vigorously disagree with either me or Pastor Bayly. However, any comments that are unkind to his wife will be deleted and the commenter will be placed in moderation status for future comments.

**See Also:**

- Lovestruck
- Rubbing body parts together.
- Embracing no fault divorce is the natural result of elevating romantic love to a moral force.
- Don’t blame Heartiste for the equation of Alpha with virtue.

H/T: PrinceAsbel
Weak men really *are* screwing feminism up.

by Dalrock | November 22, 2018 | Link

I have recently had the benefit of multiple email exchanges with Larry Kummer, Editor of the Fabius Maximus website. What follows is an edited version of one such exchange, with Larry’s gracious permission. Larry will be posting the same discussion on Fabius Maximus as well. Larry’s comments are in blockquotes and my responses are in normal typeface:

I describe fourth wave feminism as women seeking superiority over men. They’re quite open about it. Here’s a fun example, showing how far the idea has spread. The author is not fully on board with the program, giving clear statements about the Matriarchy with assurances that it won’t be a matriarchy. But clear thinking has seldom been a characteristic of feminists (unlike women physicists and doctors).

“How To Prepare Our Sons for the Matriarchy” by Jenny Hoople at The Good Men Project – “We must not leave our boys behind even as we raise up our girls.” “The Matriarchy doesn’t mean women over men, it means strong women leading all of us in rebuilding a society …”

Here is the image that goes with it (shutterstock_10800637). It captures the nature of the article quite well, and the intent of those pushing for a Matriarchy.

That pic really does say it all. On the other side we have conservatives responding that weak men are screwing feminism up.

The “cuckservatives” are part of the problem. It is more accurate to say that weak men are screwing up society. I’ve wanted to write about this, but it’s too complex and I don’t understand it sufficiently. Here is how I see it.

Strong societies devote a lot of energy to producing strong boys. We’ve found how to produce something worse for society then feral men (who are destructive but strong): hordes of weak men. Withdrawal from dating and marriage is a natural response of weak men.

How did this happen? Disasters (excluding natural disasters) usually result from multiple and reinforcing errors. Feminists produce weak sons. Dads subservient or acquiescing to their feminist wives produce weak sons. Families too busy to raise sons, especially with few larger institutions doing so, produce weak sons. Single mothers produce weak sons. Feminist-dominated institutions – such as our schools, churches and youth groups – produce weak boys. Institutions that train boys to be strong, such as Boy Scouts and male-only sports programs, are under attack.

Worse, we’ve stopped raising girls. So they grow with their core programming, their base nature. What we thought was their natural state was in fact the result of intense indoctrination (e.g. pronatalism). Modern girls, as often seen in music videos,
are somewhat feral girls. Like feral men, they are disruptive to society.

Right. The problem is not the observation, but the frame. The observation is accurate. The problem is the implicit desire to change men so that feminism will finally work. It can't be done, and conservatives shouldn't be trying to make feminism work anyway.

Like so much of your work, that's a brutal but accurate observation. Obvious, once you point it out to us. It's a sign of the ultimate victory when your opponents adopt your goals. It's a commonplace in history.

[Note: I created the title of the post intending to limit posting our conversation to this point, as it provides context into how I use the expression “weak men screwing feminism up”. But at Larry's suggestion I also include the rest of the exchange below:]

It is imperative, imo, that we break the debate out of the current two channels: despair (Aquinas: “To commit a crime is to kill the soul, but to despair is to fall into hell.”) and MGTOW (fantasies of being Tarzan: Me strong & self-sufficient, live in jungle alone with my animal friends).

I'm in general agreement I think, but MGTOW men aren't the problem, they are a logical reaction to the problem. I made an analogy a number of years ago regarding seats at a restaurant that ended up taking a life of its own. In a nutshell, I wish the MGTOW men well and hope they have fulfilling lives. My focus isn't on trying to convince them to come dine in the restaurant (marriage), but to find a way to make more seats available for them to do so.

Now we're getting to the core of the situation. Under your prodding, this is becoming a bit clearer to me.

“but MGTOW men aren’t the problem ...”

I fully agree, looking at this on an individual level. More broadly, men bailing on the current system will be (guessing) a major force blowing it down. But – again guessing – I think most are kidding themselves. I’ve seen a lot of this, by age 63, and imo GAME and MGTOW are the equivalent of Fantasy Football for most men. They can be played but not won in real life.

But young women aren’t the problem, either (neither side has much empathy for or understanding of the other - which is part of the problem). They’re doing as they have been told, acting on the values the Boomers and Gen X taught them. They are like young women playing at being Wonder Women (vainly seeking to have it all).

Both young men and women are on courses that will end badly for many of them. Their damaged lives are pushing the system to its destruction. But not, as often described, as collateral damage. More like involuntary sacrifices. I can’t think of the right metaphor for them.

That’s why I refer to this current debate – 4th wave feminism vs. GAME/MGTOW – as a doomed fight from which we must break free from. This is a common situation in
History, in which societies fall into conflicts in which there can be no winners.  
{Fourth wave feminism is women seeking superiority, not equality. Take a feminist’s speech and reverse the genders. If it sounds sexist, then she is in the fourth wave.}

End of email exchange.

This page lists all Larry’s posts about the gender wars, sorted by subject, including A surprise end to the gender wars: men stand together.
He almost had a masculine thought.

by Dalrock | November 23, 2018 | Link

After seeing How To Prepare Our Sons for the Matriarchy over at The Good Men Project, I decided to poke around a bit and see what else they offered. While the nameplate declares that it is “The conversation no one else is having”, it is standard issue SJW content. Most of the pieces are by women, for women, and about women. It is a truly breathtaking example of feminist territory marking.

But even worse, the odd piece that is written by a man is effeminate melodrama. In My Tribute to Mount Washing Machine, Shannon Carpenter writes about his fears of laundry inadequacy:

We have just begun, and the journey is long. I think of the fathers before me and hope I stack up....

I drop my load and grab Carl, a white plush polar bear. I tell him my laundry issues as I stroke his comforting polyester fur. Carl gets me.

He reminds me that my climb is not yet over. I must hurry. The toddler is almost done not napping.

In another post author Stuart Motola describes a horrifying experience, where for a very brief moment he stopped emoting like a woman and started to feel a strange temptation to think like a man. He writes in Guns and Consciousness that the day started off like any other, with him clutching his pearls:

The questions came at me. How do I stay safe? How do I keep my son safe? Is it time to move abroad? When will this stop? What can I do? How can I...? And on and on...

I felt a rupture in my chest. A deep split in myself.

... I looked around my home and then out my window. I am safe, here and now, I told myself. No shooters anywhere in sight.

I took a deep breath. I could land in my breath. Only there, for now. Nowhere else.

This was when the bad, no good, masculine thoughts started to creep into his head. He was terrified. This had never happened before!

...foreign thoughts had infiltrated my psyche. Thoughts of getting a gun...

I knew better. To imagine being “the good guy with a gun” was more of an attempt to stay safe than a reality of being in the right place at the right time with the right...
training to shoot down “a bad guy with a gun.” If I was serious, I would need to train consistently, shoot weekly, maintain a firearm, and even then, I’d likely never come to this imagined moment.

Luckily the thought of having to master something manly jarred him back into his senses, and he realized the whole thing was just another example of him getting worked up over nothing.

**Related:** Shooting an AR 15 made him emotional, and then the internet was mean to him.
A Crypto Fashion T Shirt suggestion.
by Dalrock | November 23, 2018 | Link

Vox Day’s Crypto Fashion is having a sale this weekend: Crypto.Fashion is having a post-Thanksgiving sale this weekend. Everything, including Arkhaven and Dark Lord Designs, is 15-20 percent off.

Vox and I aren’t known for sharing common tastes in T shirts, but I’ll offer a suggestion on the odd chance that he likes it. Last week my wife was reading about a black feminist blaming white women for being footsoldiers of the patriarchy. She commented that she would love a T shirt declaring that she was proud to be one of said footsoldiers.
Giving thanks for fathers.
by Dalrock | November 24, 2018 | Link

Honor your father and your mother, that your days may be long in the land that the LORD your God is giving you.

–Exodus 20:12, ESV

In Fathers, teach your sons Adam Piggott describes fond memories learning from his father, and stresses the importance of fathers teaching their sons masculine practical skills:

Boys love it when their dads teach them. The earliest memory that I have is from when I was about 4 years old. We lived in a cool old house in Bayswater, Perth, and out the back was a ramshackle yard, perfect for little kids to have adventures. My father was remodeling the house and there was a large pile of scrap lumber and other assorted cast-offs and bits and pieces. I turned it into my own scrap lumber yard, complete with a small counter where I could “sell” my goods to all of my customers, (my dad).

In my little yard I would categorize and set into order all my precious inventory. I remember in particular my large box of nails, each twisted lump of metal painstakingly removed from a length of 4 x 2 with my own small tool kit, my most precious possession.

...

So to all those fathers out there of boys and teenagers, make sure that you teach your sons. Show them how to fix a leaky tap, or change out an electrical fuse, or do basic maintenance on the family car. Not only are these skills critical for any man, but it is an excellent way to mold the boy into the solid man that hopefully one day he can become. While teaching him some solid practical skills there can also be a seemingly casual discussion where certain red pill knowledge is imparted as well.

I too have fond memories first of being around my father in a masculine space, and later him teaching me how to build and fix things. When I was around 7 I rode with my father as he drove out to stranded motorists that called him for help. I was in little boy heaven, riding to the rescue with my dad in his small old pickup that he had modified with a V8 and glasspacks. I could hear him draw out a shift from a mile away. Back at his shop his mechanics would sometimes let me pull the trigger on the pneumatic impact wrench to take off lug nuts. Aside from a small block V8 with glasspacks, I can’t imagine a more glorious sound. One time he even let my sister and me “ride” on the hydraulic lift they used to raise up the customer’s cars.

By the time I was in my early teens my father had traded his car repair business for something else, but he still worked on our own cars and helped out friends. I watched and
sometimes helped my father pull out entire engines and transmissions to have them rebuilt before putting them back. I also watched him take apart carburetors to repair them and pull off valve covers to replace broken pushrods, etc. Those aren’t jobs I have tackled on my own since, nor am I likely to do so in the future. But I’ve been surprised at how many smaller/easier jobs I’ve been able to do on my own*, and when I needed to have a clutch replaced or a transmission rebuilt, understanding the job helped me discuss the job with a mechanic.

Looking back at it decades later, it is obvious to me now that what my father really taught me was a combination of attitude and how to use tools. Even living over a thousand miles apart, his is the voice in my head reminding me “if it doesn’t come apart (or go back together) easy, don’t just push/pull harder, figure out why“. If I understand why and more force really is needed, the voice says “get a bigger hammer” (and a block of wood), or “get a longer wrench”. A few month’s back I bought a 24 inch breaker bar, and while it only cost me around $20 it was immediately a prized possession.

There is something else my father imparted in the process, and that is a sense of who I am. He taught me that I come from men who help others and know how to solve problems when they come up. That is after all why tools like my new breaker bar ultimately have the meaning they do to me. These are the kind of tools that he used and (even in his 70s) still uses.

My son is still young, but anything traditionally masculine I do is absolutely fascinating to him. In the summer I helped a neighbor do the brakes on his work truck. He didn’t need my help (I hadn’t worked on brakes for decades) but my driveway is more level so he brought it over and we did the job here. Plus, it is always more enjoyable working on something with a buddy around. I placed a small chair safely out of the way for my son to sit in and watch. The main thing I wanted to teach him had nothing to do with brakes, but how to safely raise a vehicle to work on it. My dad taught me that if you are using anything less than a floor jack something has already gone wrong. And always block the wheels and use jack stands in addition to the jack. My son never tired of watching us as we worked our way around all four wheels, and my neighbor even let him loosen the lug nuts with his electric impact wrench.

I don’t think my son will ever forget pulling the trigger on the impact wrench, but his fascination persists even when what I’m doing or teaching him is mundane. When I swapped out our smoke detectors a while back smoke detectors were all he would talk about for weeks. When he’s a bit more mature I’ll be able to take him shooting, hunting, and fishing. I’m not sure which of us looks forward to that with greater anticipation.

Feminism is founded in envy of men, and the sense of identity that men get from our fathers is high up on the list of things feminists covet. Sadly we’ve created a family system designed to separate children from their fathers, and our Christian leaders have responded by doing everything they can to morally justify this as well as further break this bond. But what feminists and conservative Christians won’t ever be able to do is remove the importance of fathers. They can break families apart, but they can’t erase the importance of fathers. Moreover, they can’t prevent us from being thankful for our fathers, and thankful for the other men who have taught us as fathers do.
*Haynes and Chilton manuals are good, but youtube is *great.*
One of the core strategies of complementarians is downplaying the importance of the feminist rebellion that defines our age, if not outright pretending that it isn’t happening. This is so common no one notices it, but once you spot the pattern it is truly striking.

For an example of this in practice see Pastor Tim Bayly’s post Revoice and faithful pastoral care (3): is it really about sex, or marriage… Bayly makes a forceful argument that Christian men and women with same sex attraction should nevertheless marry and focus their sexual desire within (heterosexual) marriage. After making this case, he asks why Christian leaders aren’t encouraging this:

Why are pastors and elders not regularly saying to gays and lesbians who burn what the Apostle Paul said to gays and lesbians who burned in his own time, that it is better to marry than to burn. In other words, why aren’t pastors and church officers commanding those men and women who talk about their homosexual lusts to marry and raise up a godly seed for the Lord?

His conclusion is that this isn’t happening because Christian leaders aren’t willing to hold anyone to account (emphasis original):

Why don’t we repeat the Apostle Paul’s command to them, telling them to marry?

Pastoral care is dead...

I’m not sure about this, but I suspect the reason we avoid these conversations is that we never have any conversations like this with anyone in the church. We never warn from house to house, day and night with tears as the Apostle Paul did. If we don’t probe into heterosexual softness and laziness and irresponsibility, why would we probe into, let alone admonish, homosexual softness and laziness and irresponsibility.

So far, Pastor Bayly’s argument is truly counter-cultural. But then he shifts gears into complementarian orthodoxy. The real problem he explains is we aren’t willing to call out Christian men (emphasis mine):

In the church today, it is allee-allee-in-free with every form of sin, but no sin as much as effeminacy. Guys refuse to work. Guys change jobs all the time. Guys play video games in their parents’ basement, refusing to court anyone or leave home. Guys who are married use condoms or get snipped. Guys buy toys they go off and play with on weekends. Guys don’t love their wives or children. Guys aren’t intimate with their wives and children. Guys look at strange flesh and masturbate. Guys primp in front of the mirror. Guys spend their wealth and time primping their hair. Guys work out in the gym, then parade their obviously artificial muscles. Guys
are narcissists and avoid responsibility like the plague.

Guys are effeminate—we’re all gay.

This is the complementarian lie. It is pure nonsense. Aside from his complaints about men pumping iron to create “artificial” muscles, and men using contraception, everything on his list is boilerplate. These are the sins nearly every Christian movie focuses on, because criticizing these sins is an easy crowd pleaser.

Moreover, everyone but complementarians acknowledges that our society has been transformed to allow and encourage women to dress like and act like men, but we still have (relatively) tight restrictions on what is appropriate for a man. For women this transformation has been so complete it is truly difficult for a woman to cross the line. Even conservatives cheer on ball busting butch women. But thankfully we still discourage men from being effeminate, despite a concerted push to change the way we think about the topic.

Why are feminists honest about the topic while complementarians pretend the opposite has happened? The reason is complementarians are terrified of telling women no. Calling out a fellow man feels good, and is easy. Calling out women is hard and feels awful. It is human nature to shirk what is painful and difficult, and instead do what is easy and enjoyable.

The disturbing thing is Pastor Bayly knows what is going on here. Back in 2002 he was a principle author of a PCA statement on women in combat. The committee couldn’t bring itself to tell Christian women that they should not put on the garb of a warrior, nor could it bring itself to tell women there were any combat roles they should not seek. Instead, the committee declared that the real problem was men forcing women into combat:

**AREAS OF AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT**

The dearth of men ready to serve their country in defense of their wives and children is a concern shared by our entire committee.

There is no other way to put this: The statement quoted above is a bald faced lie. What was really happening was feminists were pushing for all male fields to be opened to women, with a liberal application of affirmative action. This was entirely open, over the course of decades. The same thing was happening in the military that happened in NFL locker rooms and police and fire departments. Women weren’t reluctantly filling the slots men refused to fill. They were shoving their way into male spaces. No one but complementarians denies this, and all but the most rabid complementarians have to be ashamed to have uttered this lie. They may as well claim that the recent feminist movies *Wonder Woman* and *Ghost Busters* aren’t feminist propaganda, but proof that male actors are refusing to play lead roles.

But the lie is common, which is the whole point. When women sinned in an unavoidably public way complementarians responded by:

1. Not calling it sin. Women who serve are after all heroic.
2. Blaming men for the sin complementarians weren’t even willing to acknowledge was a sin!
The irony is that in his post on encouraging gays to marry, Pastor Bayly complained about Christians being too squeamish to confront sin; to prove the point he then followed the exact same pattern!

Pastor Bayly does not always shy away from calling out women who take on men’s roles. As I’ve noted previously he recognizes that women are trying to push their way into leadership in the church, and no one wants to tell them no. Likewise, in this post he encouraged women to wear headcoverings in church, and wrote of the problem of:

…masculinity in women (taking leadership and authority, working out, getting ripped, teaching men, playing soldier, playing cop, playing pastor, being brash).

Pastor Bayly is all but alone when he does this, and this is the problem with his claim that Christian leaders are (of all sins) most unwilling to confront Christian men becoming effeminate. It simply isn’t true. Christian leaders do this all the time, even when the charge is false. What Christian leaders are (as a group) unwilling to confront is the very spirit of our age, women coveting to become men.
Gamers vs THOTs.
by Dalrock | November 26, 2018 | Link

A group of gamers has started tax trolling THOTs, and as you might imagine the whole thing is hilarious.

Not quite as funny, but still worth noting is Megan Fox’s moral analysis:

As a mother of daughters, this campaign strikes me as morally good. If this can dissuade young girls from using their genitals to make money off men who are betraying their wives, I’m all for it. Girls also need to learn that they are worth more than their boobs and using them to make money is a last resort born out of desperation, not a life goal, but if they do use their bodies to make a living, they must also pay taxes on that income.

H/T Oscar and Larry Kummer.
Weak men are screwing #MeToo up.
by Dalrock | November 27, 2018 | Link

Dalrock’s Law of Feminism: Feminism is the assertion that men are evil and naturally want to harm women, followed by pleas to men to solve all of women’s problems.

Via Larry Kummer at Fabius Maximus: More triumphs of feminism. Are male executives scared?

3x as many male managers are now uncomfortable mentoring women in the wake of #MeToo. This is a huge step in the wrong direction. We need more men to #MentorHer. https://t.co/RyPo0PBz7N

— Arianna Huffington (@ariannahuff) February 6, 2018

A few weeks ago Instapundit reader TDW best captured the feminist outrage at the entirely predictable consequences of #MeToo:

“How dare you protect yourself against our future unjustified allegations!”
THOTs are slooty.

by Dalrock | November 29, 2018 | Link

Feminists have been incredibly successful at banning words like whore and slut. But banning the label doesn’t ban the reality, and therefore the idea. As a result, new labels have popped up that circumvent the SJW shaming police. These new terms are derivatives of the banned terms, and have an element of humor that strikes at the heart of the SJW scold. THOT is an acronym, meaning:

1. That
2. Ho (whore)
3. Over
4. There

But the real meaning is just *ho*, or *whore*. It is slut shaming with a built in smirk. Likewise the words slooty and sloot. They are a funny take on slut, and therefore can effectively sneak past the thought police. Eventually these terms themselves will become unspeakable. But once that happens, newer and funnier words for whore and slut will mischievously find their way into the vernacular.
The golden calf monologues.
by Dalrock | November 30, 2018 | Link

For God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God... (Gen 3:5, ESV)

6 For among them are those who creep into households and capture weak women, burdened with sins and led astray by various passions, 7 always learning and never able to arrive at a knowledge of the truth. (2 Tim 3:6-7, ESV)

From the Christian Post: Liberal Lutheran pastor to melt purity rings into vagina sculpture to ‘take down’ church teachings about sex

“This thing about women that the church has tried to hide and control and that is a canvas on which other people can write their own righteousness — it’s actually ours,” Bolz-Weber told HuffPost. “This part of me is mine and I get to determine what is good for it and if it’s beautiful and how I use it in the world.”

This is how complementarians hide their Christian feminism in plain sight. It is hard not to seem at least somewhat traditional when the mainstream protestant denominations are ordaining women as pastors and those women are making golden idols of their vaginas. Complementarians are in this sense counter-cultural when they do the same things as overt feminists, only in a much more subtle way. Where feminists were honest in their outright rejection of 1 Tim 2:12 and ordained women as pastors, complementarians came up with a plan to set women up as unordained preachers by pushing a new and absurd twisted reading of the scripture:

First Timothy 2:14 says, “Adam was not the one deceived; it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner.” Paul gives this as one of the reasons why he does not permit women “to teach or have authority over a man.” Historically this has usually been taken to mean that women are more gullible or deceived than men and therefore less fit for the doctrinal oversight of the church. This may be true (see question 29). However, we are attracted to another understanding of Paul’s argument.

Where feminist Christians openly make idols of women’s vaginas, complementarians again choose the more subtle and deceptive path and declare that a woman’s romantic love & desire sanctifies married sex, and that God speaks to a husband through his wife’s holy vagina.

Dave: Yes. Here’s all you need to know about that night—the thing that changed our marriage is when Ann was sharing with me [that she didn’t feel sexual desire towards me]—I had a pretty unique encounter with God. I sensed God was speaking to me, through Ann;

Where feminist Christians openly reject headship and submission, complementarians have
kept (theoretical) headship around as a club to hit husbands with. The cardinal rule of complementarian headship is a husband must never tell his wife she has an obligation to submit to him. In its most muscular form the essence of complementarian headship is pleading.

Where feminist Christians openly encourage women to usurp the roles of men, complementarians are careful to not tell women no while shamelessly blaming men for women usurping their roles.

What complementarians have been able to achieve is do in the conservative churches what feminists did in the liberal churches, only with much more deception. Not surprisingly, now that liberal churches have fully accepted LGBTQ, a group of prominent complementarians are doing the same for that issue that they did for feminism. I’ll cover this new development in a future post.

H/T Emperor Constantine
The smirk is the defense.

by Dalrock | November 30, 2018 | Link

Commenter Roger wrote:

THOT has the connotation of a woman who appears to be a whore, but is not necessarily a whore. The phrase “over there” suggests that she is being judged on her appearance and public behavior, rather than her bedroom practices.

The practical consequence of this distinction is that calling a woman a whore is potential slander, unless you have some actual knowledge of her sexual practices. But you can call a woman a THOT based on her appearance and outward behavior.

The practical appeal of THOT over ho isn’t legal protection from a slander suit. The benefit is the smirk. If challenged you aren’t calling the woman or women in front of you a ho, you are talking about that ho over there. And if you can say that without a smirk, you don’t understand the humor of the situation.

The same is true for sloot and slooty. A few years back my wife told me about hearing the term (neither of us had heard it before) in a retail clothing store. A 19 year old salesman had used the term slooty to describe a piece of clothing his female manager picked up off the rack. His manager objected; he wasn’t slut shaming, was he? He replied with a smirk that no, he said it was slooty, not slutty. With that his manager’s expression changed from a frown to a smile.
Loud and proud complementarians: John Piper and Nick Roen.

by Dalrock | December 1, 2018 | Link

Yesterday I described how complementarians used deception to replicate in conservative churches what feminists had already accomplished in liberal churches. With their feminist victory in the final mopping up stages, several prominent complementarians have started switching their focus to pushing LGBT acceptance in conservative churches. Key to the complementarian approach in both cases is to pretend they are really there to protect the church from the assaults of the culture war. Complementarians know that if they become the defenders of conservative christian culture they can use their trusted position to dismantle the defenses.

Dr. John Piper was one of the two primary leaders in creating the complementarian movement. In 1991 Dr. Piper and Dr. Wayne Grudem edited the book that spelled out the theological position of the newly formed Council for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (CBMW): Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism. The book was critical to achieving the goal of convincing conservative Christians to accept a watered down version of the feminism that had already devastated the liberal church. Arguably their biggest achievement was convincing nearly all conservative Christians to reject the traditional (and obvious) reading of 1 Tim 2:12 in order to promote women as non ordained preachers.

Dr. Piper is still an influential figure in the complementarian world, and is a Council member of The Gospel Coalition (TGC). Piper’s website Desiring God regularly includes posts on the subject of Same Sex Attraction (SSA). The overt message in these posts is that Christians need to get with the times while remaining true to what the Bible teaches us. More subtly they push the same gay agenda that has overcome our larger society (including liberal churches) in a form that is perfectly tuned to deceive conservative Christians.

For example, see Pastor Nick Roen’s Desiring God article titled Homophobia Has No Place in the Church. Roen is an assistant to the pastor for Piper’s Bethlehem Baptist Church* and alternately identifies as gay and SSA, but generally prefers the term SSA. Roen explains in his homophobia post that unlike gay activists in the larger culture, he isn’t using the term to advance acceptance of the homosexual lifestyle:

...my fear is that homophobia is all too common, not just in society, but even within the church. Some may object to my use of the word homophobia. It can sometimes be used as a politically loaded term wielded to silence any and all opposition to same-sex sexual activity. However, this is not the root definition of the term.

Roen then proceeds to chastise conservative Christians in the same way gay activists have chastised the rest of the culture for decades, but his push for acceptance is couched as a concern that conservative Christians aren’t staying true to the teachings of the Bible. Roen challenges his readers to search their hearts, asking rhetorically if their disgust at the gay
lifestyle is biblical, or are they merely hateful bigots?

Is your belief that same-sex sexual activity is sin based finally on solid biblical exegesis? Or is it really based on the fact that you don’t understand how someone could be attracted to the same sex, and this unknown seems to you just plain creepy?

Roen continues, rhetorically scolding conservative Christians for the sin of homophobia for not wanting gays to change the culture:

Is your opposition to so-called same-sex marriage based on a principled biblical definition of marriage? Or is it more influenced by a fear that same-sex couples might signal the unraveling of comfortable cultural norms and usher in the end of a once-pristine “Judeo-Christian society”? Or maybe your fear is more that one such couple might move in next door, and you might actually be pressured to befriend them?

Roen challenges conservative Christians to make sure their church is gay friendly:

Does your opposition to homosexual practice include the ability to lovingly welcome LGBT people into a Sunday service or other gathering with other Christians? Or does opposition for you mean that you wish they would just stay away so you aren’t made uncomfortable by their very presence?

Note that Roen is performing a bait and switch here. He is leading with a challenge to accept repentant sinners into the church. But he can’t be talking about private homosexual sin in this regard. For how would the congregation know a stranger’s sexual sin unless the stranger was also “loud and proud”, and so outwardly engaged in the gay lifestyle that it is unmistakable when you first meet them? This is not about accepting other sinners, just as we have been accepted. This is about normalizing the gay lifestyle for conservative Christians.

But then Roen goes a step further, and chastises conservative Christians who feel that it wouldn’t be wise to put gay men such as himself in leadership positions, or give him trusted access to the congregation’s children.

In standing for Christian sexual ethics, do you encourage and support those SSA believers within the church who are striving to remain faithful to biblical teaching by welcoming them into full participation in church life? Or does standing for biblical sexuality mean that they can come to church, but they can’t grow in influence or serve the body through teaching, and they should probably stay away from the youth group?

This is not about redemption at all, it is about power and accepting the gay lifestyle. Roen is suggesting that mere salvation isn’t enough!

The truly insidious nature of this becomes more clear when you consider another aspect of the push to get conservative Christians to accept homosexuality. The push is to get conservative Christians to accept gay Christians forming public and ostensibly chaste same
sex relationships called “spiritual friendships”. Pastor Roen didn’t participate in the recent Revoice** conference pushing spiritual friendships, but he is a regular contributor to the Spiritual Friendship website.

For an idea on Pastor Roen’s position here, see his response to the Supreme Court decision legalizeing gay marriage (emphasis mine). What Roen wants is to take the push for gay “civil unions” and re-purpose it for conservative Christianity. He wants society and the church to formally recognize his (supposedly chaste) relationship with his gay life partner:

3. Speaking of the civil benefits of marriage, the reason that there are tax breaks and insurance benefits and the like is because marriage is a recognized good in society. But why is marriage the only committed relationship that the state recognizes in these ways as beneficial to societal flourishing? It seems to me that many types of deep, committed, mutual relationships are beneficial to society in similar-but-not-identical ways to marriage; whether it is a marriage, a celibate partnership, a committed friendship, or a chosen kinship, all of these bonds have the potential to be sites of sacrificial love, selfless service, and others-oriented hospitality. All of these things are societal goods.

So what if—regardless of the label one puts on the relationship—two people who have chosen a life of celibacy decide to commit to serve and support and do life with one another? Shouldn’t they be able to visit each other in the hospital? If they can decide to have a joint bank account, why shouldn’t they be able to have joint health insurance benefits? Why is their relationship not worthy of the types of societal privileges that marriage affords? I understand that these perks were put in place to encourage marriage in the first place. But I want to say, “Let’s encourage deep, committed, service-oriented relationships in many forms!”

4. Because those rights are at the moment reserved for marriage, isn’t it easier to understand at least some of the motivation for the legalization of gay marriage? I understand what it is like to not have visitation rights or joint insurance, and I also understand why gay people want those things. So if the state will continue to refuse those goods to other types of relationships (which I don’t think it should), then even if we disagree with gay “marriage”, let’s be quick to understand what is at stake. It isn’t only competing moralities and conflicting ideologies and religious freedom and all that. It is those things. But it’s more also. It’s being able to visit your dying partner in the ICU. It’s being able to list the person you love as inheritor of your estate. It’s being able to file taxes with the person you are doing life with. Right now, marriage is the only way those things are possible. I am not advocating for wholesale support of gay marriage. Don’t hear me saying that! (see point 1 above). But I am saying that maybe lets be slow to throw stones at those “radical gays” who are pushing for civil benefits for their commitment to one another. I would like those same benefits, TBH...so I get it.

Put all of this together and you end up with conservative churches welcoming loud and proud gays to join in worship. So long as gays assure the church they are committed to remaining
chaste, they must be promoted into leadership and given trusted access to the children. Gay Christians, including those in leadership, must be allowed to publicly declare their life partner, so long as they maintain the fiction that there is nothing sexual or romantic about this gay relationship. Conservative Christians also need to stop thinking of homosexuality as “yucky”, and bring the gay couple next door into their social circle.

It would do us well to humbly examine our hearts to reveal the motives and fears behind our attitudes toward people who identify as “gay.” Happily upholding Christian sexual ethics is not the same as harboring animosity toward an entire group of people simply because you find them yucky.

Again, this is a movement aimed at and being accepted by conservative Christians. The liberal churches already fully and openly accept the homosexual lifestyle. Not all complementarians are on board with this new push. A number of them want to stop with the progress they made regarding feminism. Some like Pastor Tim Bayly and Pastor Doug Wilson are actively fighting the new movement. But even if all complementarians were fighting the movement, they paved the way when they collectively created the script that Pastor Nick Roen and the Revoice/Spiritual Friendship crowd are following. Conservative churches will find it very difficult to resist this latest onslaught, because they have already accepted the methods and arguments that are being used.

*The Desiring God article identifies Roen as “Pastor, Albert Lea, Minnesota”. However, Roen’s Twitter page says “Assistant TO the Lead Pastor @hopeinGod South Campus”. @hopeinGod is the Twitter name for Bethlehem Baptist Church. Pastor John Piper was senior pastor of Bethlehem Baptist Church from 1980 to January 2013, and is the chancellor of the affiliated Bethlehem College & Seminary. Roen was a student at Bethlehem College & Seminary.

**For an insider defense of the subject, see In Defense of Spiritual Friendship and Revoice by Ron Belgau. See also Belgau’s follow up post Thinking Deeply about Christian Love: Same-Sex Attraction, Sin, and Spiritual Friendship. Note that Belgau identifies Nick Roen as someone his thoughts are aligned with.
Best to leave it to the experts.

by Dalrock | December 3, 2018 | Link

In response to Loud and proud complementarians: John Piper and Nick Roen, commenter Crude wrote:

I used to accept a version of what Piper and Roen talked about re: homophobia. That idea that you had to criticize gay marriage and sodomy for the *right* reasons – have all your philosophical and biblical t’s crossed and i’s dotted immaculately – or else your motivations were wrong and your position hard to defend.

Then I realized I had been had.

For one thing: no one ever demands that we scrupulously, with abundant biblical references, justify our giving to charity, helping the poor, being courteous and kind. No one ever says that if you help someone just because it feels nice to then you’re a wicked, poorly motivated person, and what you REALLY need is a plethora of biblical references and some philosophical grounding in Aquinas to even THINK about helping the poor. No one demands this for our inveighing against alcoholism, drug use, etc, etc, etc.

In fact, those are seen as just-plain-right views to have, admirable acts to engage in when they’re good acts, or proper things to condemn when they’re bad ones.

It’s only for very specific (and trendy!) sins that we had damn well better have all of our motivations in perfect accord, on pain of our entire motivation being wrong.

What a horror. Some people may find anal sex to be repulsive *without* an exhaustive biblical rationale to back them up*. How wicked. It sure SEEMS like a natural inclination to regard sin as sin, but no, it’s wicked!

...Yeah, for that and other reasons I finally realized it was all a pantload, cooked up by Christian cowards.

While it is true that our heart matters in all things, the goal is clearly to tie traditional Christians up in a web of a thousand legalistic details in order to prove that they aren’t being legalistic. The goal is to make it so complex to confront the sin of homosexuality that ordinary Christians become exhausted and decide to leave it to the experts. Conveniently, complementarians have a team of Christian gay rights experts standing by for just such an occasion!

This is the same model complementarians followed for feminism, and it is a devastatingly effective tactic. When dealing with activist charges of sexism/abuse, you need a Christian women’s studies major or professor to take on the highly technical job of fighting feminism by explaining that the Bible was coincidentally feminist all along! We just didn’t discover this
fact until the 60s came along and enlightened us. Likewise, when dealing with charges of homophobia and how intersectional theory should be incorporated into your biblical worldview, you need a Christian gay activist who knows how to navigate this byzantine landscape.

For an example of this, see Rosaria Butterfield’s Desiring God article Gay Rights, Hate Speech, and Hospitality (LONGINGS OF A FORMER LESBIAN)

Originally, intersectionality dealt with material, structural oppressions — highlighting how race and class and the glass ceiling of sexism weigh heavy in a society made up of sinners. But when feminism shifted allegiance from Marx to Freud, when it turned from numbers to feelings, sexual orientation and gender identity took on new forms.

When ideas like “dignitary harm” (the harm accrued to your dignity by someone’s refusal to approve of your sin) found its place in civil law, intersectionality unleashed a monster. And with that monster came a message: homosexuality is not a sin; it is an aesthetic, an erotic orientation or way of looking at the world and everything in it.

Today, the gospel is on a collision course with this message.

So sit back, put your feet up, and let our gay rights activists handle the culture war against their gay rights activists. Just be sure to support God’s team in this exciting contest, as you cheer them on from the sidelines!

See Also: She holds an authority you cannot hold.
Loud and proud complementarians: Tim and Kathy Keller.

by Dalrock | December 4, 2018 | Link

I’ve been asked in the comments section of recent posts why I’m linking the gay Christian activist movement in the conservative church and complementarians. These would seem to be entirely separate issues. But there is astonishing overlap between the two movements. The big players using deception to promote feminism in the conservative church are by and large the same big players using deception to push the gay agenda in the conservative church.

Today’s topic is Tim and Kathy Keller and their promotion of Pastor Sam Allberry and his Living Out ministry. Allberry is an editor at Tim Keller’s The Gospel Coalition (TGC), which along with the CBMW* is one of the twin flagship complementarian organizations.

Allberry promotes what he calls The Living Out Church Audit, which answers the question “How biblically inclusive is your Church?” By biblically he means “LGBTQ”. Allberry explains that Tim and Kathy Keller were instrumental in launching the audit (all emphasis mine):

At our Identity in Christ conference with Tim & Kathy Keller in June 2018 we launched our Living Out Church Audit – a tool to help church leadership teams answer this key question: how biblically inclusive is your church? Unsurprisingly our focus is on those who might identify as LGBTQ+ same-sex attracted: Jesus included all in a counter-cultural way and we hope this audit will help our churches follow his lead.

While it is presented as an “audit” to see if a church is biblical, really it is a list of demands by and for gay Christians. I’ll only cover some of the demands, but you can check out the full list here.

The first demand is that every church include LGTB members, reading from the SJW diversity is our strength script. Homosexuality is to my knowledge the only sin that ostensibly makes a church better, the only sin that a congregation would be embarrassed if they couldn’t show proof of. I certainly can’t imagine a group of gambling addicts demanding that every congregation contain compulsive gamblers:

1) Your church family meetings include people who could be labelled LGBTQI+ same-sex attracted.

Readers might be tempted to assume that Allbery and the Kellers are merely demanding that every congregation include repentant homosexuals. But not only does the audit remain silent in this regard, the Living Out what we believe page clarifies that it expects churches to include unrepentant homosexuals:

All those who contribute to Living Out are asked to assent to the Evangelical Alliance’s Basis of Faith (see below) and their Affirmations – found in their 2012
Item 10 in the Affirmations list is:

10. **We encourage evangelical congregations to welcome and accept sexually active lesbians and gay men.** However, they should do so in the expectation that they, like all of us who are living outside God’s purposes, will come in due course to see the need to be transformed and live in accordance with biblical revelation and orthodox church teaching. We urge gentleness, patience and ongoing pastoral care during this process and after a person renounces same-sex sexual relations.

Getting back to the audit, demand number 4 is a restriction on how pastors are permitted to preach on homosexuality:

**Same-sex sexual relationships are never mentioned in isolation from other sinful patterns** of behaviour, or from the forgiveness offered to all through faith in Christ crucified.

Demand number 7 is to put gays into all leadership positions:

**A godly Christian’s sexual orientation would never prevent them from exercising their spiritual gifts or serving in leadership** in your church.

Demand number 8 is to not promote marriage over singleness:

**God’s gifts of either singleness or marriage are equally promoted,** valued and practically supported in your church family’s life together.

Demand number 9 is to provide gays access to the homes of the congregation:

Church family members instinctively share meals, homes, holidays, festivals, money, family life with others from different backgrounds and life situations to them.

Living Out provides more detail on this in The Church and Same-Sex Attraction. The demand is access to the congregation’s children:

Nuclear families within the church need the input and involvement of the wider church family; they are not designed to be self-contained. Those that open up their family life to others find that it is a great two-way blessing. Single people get to experience some of the joys of family life, **children get to benefit from the influence of other older Christians**, parents get to have the encouragement of others supporting them, and families as a whole get to learn something of what it means to serve and be outward-looking as a family.

Allbery goes into more detail into what he is demanding in a speech he gave to ERLC 2018 titled The Church as the Family of God: Singleness, Same-sex Attraction, and the Hope of Hospitality**. He explains that Jesus promises gay men that if they leave their partners they
will receive access to the church’s children in return. As examples of how this should work, Allbery describes driving congregants’ children to and from school and putting their children to bed at night. Keep in mind this isn’t gays offering hospitality to families with children, it is gays demanding hospitality from families with children. Allbery isn’t saying these are nice things gays might be able to do for families who are interested, he is demanding that gays be provided this kind of access to children and accusing those families who don’t comply of being unchristian.

Demand number 10 is that churches won’t ever pressure gays to attempt to change their sexual orientation:

_No-one would be pressurised into expecting or seeking any “healing” or change that God has not promised any of us until the renewal of all things_

*The CBMW promotes one of Allbery’s books here.*

**H/T Thirty Pieces of Silver.**
The guard in the tower shouts “Lower the drawbridge and unbolt the door!”

by Dalrock | December 5, 2018 | Link

As I noted in the first post in this series, complementarians used their trusted position as defenders of conservative christian culture to dismantle the defenses against the feminist attack. This is the same strategy Christian gay activists are using as well. On their face they seem to be protecting conservative Christianity from the charges of hate and bigotry, but their real focus is on dismantling the defenses. This is true for both the defenses protecting theology and the church as well as defenses of the family, with a special emphasis on children.

Rev Thomas Littleton at the blog Thirty Pieces of Silver describes this in ERLC Family Conference Redefines Family As The Inclusive Church:

ERLC and Russell Moore advocate redefining family and promote gay priest who wants to babysit your children.

Littleton is referring to Pastor Sam Allberry and his Living Out ministry (see my post from yesterday). Littleton notes that Allberry wants Christian families to lower the drawbridge that protects the family (emphasis mine):

Here is where the ERLC Cross Shaped Family Conference comes into full step, not only with Allberry’s Living Out “Church Audit,” but also with one of the most disturbing messages of the Revoice Conference last July. **According to Allberry, the Christian mentality of family is akin to creating a nuclear family with marriage, kids and the family dog and then going into a fortress or castle and “pulling up the drawbridge.”** So, whether Nate Collins, the founder of Revoice, uses the term “idolatry of family” or Sam Allberry refers to the nuclear family as a “closed fortress” of only biological members, BOTH draw the same conclusion as Russell Moore — that Christians **must redefine family** as the broader (LGBT+ Inclusive) church. Moore even asserts in his book that the local church is not a collection of families but **is the family.** The biological family as God made it appears to be a problem for them, as are conservative faith and family values which resonate with generations of conservative Christians...

Not surprisingly, Allberry isn’t alone in pushing this message. His fellow gay Christian activist Rosaria Butterfield preaches a stunningly similar message. I’ve been told by multiple commenters that Butterfield is one of the good Christian gay activists. For example, commenter David J wrote:

If you think Butterfield hasn’t sufficiently shown concern to protect the church and Christian families from gay activism, you either haven’t read much of her material or you’re determined to see her words (and mine) through a particular spin that you want to force her into.
Yet like Allberry, Butterfield is on a crusade to break down what she sees as unbiblical defenses for families with children. Like Allberry Butterfield is a contributor for Russell Moore’s ERLC, and their messages are so well aligned that is obvious that they are collaborating. Where Allberry commands that families lower the drawbridge so gay men like him can put our children to bed at night, Butterfield commands us to give gays the keys to our front doors. From Butterfield’s ERLC article Why the gospel comes with a house key:

Take, for example, our Christian brothers and sisters who struggle with unchosen homosexual desires and longings, sensibilities and affections, temptations and capacities. Our brothers and sisters need the church to function as the Lord has called it to—as a family. Because Christian conversion always comes in exchange for the life you once loved, not in addition to it, people have much to lose in coming to Christ—and some people have more to lose than others. Some people have one cross, and others have ten to carry. People who live daily with unchosen homosexual desires also live with a host of unanswered questions and unfulfilled life dreams. What is your responsibility to those brothers and sisters who are in this position in life?

Our Christian responsibility includes a house key

One answer is this: the gospel comes with a house key. Mark 10:28–31 reads:

Peter began to say to [Jesus], “See, we have left everything and followed you.”

Jesus said, “Truly, I say to you, there is no one who has left house or brothers or sisters or mother or father or children or lands, for my sake and for the gospel, who will not receive a hundredfold now in this time, houses and brothers and sisters and mothers and children and lands, with persecutions, and in the age to come eternal life.”

Please note what Jesus says about how to love anyone who responds to the gospel in faith and obedience and who must lose everything in order to gain the kingdom’s promises. Jesus says that he expects we will lose partners and children and houses in the process of conversion, that conversion calls everyone to lose everything. God’s people need to wake up to something. If you want to share the gospel with the LGBTQ community or anyone who will lose family and homes, the gospel must come with a house key. This hundredfold blessing promised here in these verses is not going to fall from the sky. It is going to come from the church. It is going to come from the people of God acting like the family of God. God intends this blessing to come from you.

If you watch the Allberry video embedded in my previous post, you will see that this is the same exact argument Allberry gives for Christian families to provide gay Christians with access to their children. I encourage you to read the Butterfield quote above and then watch
the beginning of the Allberry video to see what I mean.

Lest you think this isn’t a major theme of Butterfield, at the bottom of her ERLC post it says that the content is taken from her new book The Gospel Comes with a House Key: Practicing Radically Ordinary Hospitality in Our Post-Christian World

Butterfield writes on the same subject at Piper’s Desiring God in an article titled The Best Weapon Is an Open Door. Notice how she echoes Allberry in chastising Christian parents for seeing our homes as a fortress to protect our children, using the very same language:

If you believe that these are dangerous times, then you are right...

How tempting it is to withdraw. How easy it is to let fear rule our hearts as we shelter ourselves and our children from evil...

...Christians must be intentional about seeking the stranger. We must think of our homes as hospitals, embassies, and incubators, not castles, fortresses, or museums...

Here is what this looks like. Singles from the church and neighborhood come over after work and help get dinner going. We have fun doing this. Sometimes there is laundry on my table that needs to be folded and put away (or stuffed back in the dryer). Sometimes there is a child still struggling with a math lesson. And we all behave better when it is not just us dealing with the messiness of unfolded laundry and unfinished math sheets.

Other neighbors start to show up. People with secret lives — people with secret drug addictions or dangerous relationships — cannot make plans easily. Christians need to be sensitive to this. They don’t know if they will be sober or safe three Tuesdays from yesterday. But if the invitation is open and regular, they can make it to your table on the fly. All people — believers and unbelievers — need to see transparent, Christian lives lived out in the real-time of tears and mess.

...

3. Give Away Your House Key

Not surprisingly, Russell Moore (president of ERLC) and Sam Allberry both endorse Butterfield’s book on the inside cover:

“One cannot spend any time at all with Rosaria Butterfield without a renewed sense of how good the good news really is. This book is a needed call to the church to model the hospitality of our Lord. As our culture faces a crisis of loneliness, this is the book we need. The book will inspire you and leave you with a notebook filled with ideas for how to practically engage your neighbors with the welcome of the gospel.”
Russell D. Moore, President, The Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention

“The biblical call to show hospitality is one of the most overlooked or misunderstood commands in Scripture. We either ignore it or mistake it for what our culture calls ‘entertaining.’ Rosaria Butterfield gives us a vision of hospitality that pulses with the beating heart of the gospel itself. We know a God who sought us out, took us in, made us family, and seated us at his table. It’s a vision that is bracing and attractive. It daunts us, but it shouldn’t. I wonder how different our homes, churches, and culture would look if we took it to heart.”

Sam Allberry, Speaker, Ravi Zacharias International Ministries; author, Is God Anti-Gay? and 7 Myths about Singleness

Note that while Butterfield and Allberry agree that as Christian parents we must open our homes and expose our children to gays, their reasoning is at times contradictory. Allberry says we must do this as a reward for gays after they convert, as a substitute for the intimacy they gave up when they left the gay lifestyle. Butterfield says the same thing, but she also says we must do this to witness to gays who are still in the lifestyle with the hope of converting them. So giving gays access to our kids is both how we must witness to them, and the reward we must offer them while witnessing to entice them into converting. But the reason you need to provide gays access to your children doesn’t matter. What matters is that you lower the drawbridge and unbolt the door.
A month ago in An invitation to Pastor Wilson’s defenders I challenged Wilson’s defenders to do any of the following:

1. Point out any instances where I criticized Wilson without providing a direct quote.
2. Point out any time that I have misquoted Wilson or misrepresented what he wrote.
3. Defend any of Wilson’s positions that I had criticized.

Challenges 1&2 were to identify any cheap shots I might have taken against Wilson. The hallmark of a weasely blog post is to make vague statements about another blogger while being careful to not actually quote their words so your readers don’t notice when you fail to get the job done. A similar problem occurs if a blogger misquotes or mischaracterizes another writer’s arguments. None of Wilson’s defenders could find any examples of my having done this.

Challenge #3 wasn’t focused on fairness, but a challenge to his defenders to argue against my criticisms of Wilson. It was a challenge for his defenders to defend Wilson’s ideas. In making this challenge I asked Wilson’s defenders to quote what I actually wrote, giving me the same courtesy I have consistently extended to Wilson. Anything less would be weasely:

Lastly, I would encourage defenders of Pastor Wilson to point out the times I criticized what he wrote when they feel he was right. For example, if like Wilson you believe it would be morally wrong to pass a law that punished a woman in any way for deliberately killing her unborn child or enlisting someone else to help her do this, please respond in the comments saying something to the effect of “Wilson is right. Such a law would be morally wrong because even after the law was passed, women couldn’t possibly understand that it was wrong unless they are an abortion doctor”. Likewise, if you agree with Wilson after further consideration that it is possible to imagine a scenario say 1,000 years from now where it might be moral to pass such a law, please state so in the comments.

To make this as easy as possible for Wilson’s defenders I offered a link to all of my posts related to Wilson and a list of his teachings that they might want to defend. There were no takers.

That had to be incredibly embarrassing for Wilson’s defenders. Surely if I was unfairly criticizing Wilson they should be able to find a single case of me failing to quote him or misquoting him. Barring that, surely they should have been able to find a single example where they agreed with a point by Wilson that I criticized!

I see that Pastor Wilson has now responded, and the good news is his defenders should feel less embarrassed. The reason they couldn’t defend Wilson wasn’t due to a failure on their part, but due to the simple fact that even Wilson can’t defend Wilson. Like his defenders he has no interest in quoting where he disagrees with me and then explaining where he thinks
I’m wrong. In fact, all Wilson can bring himself to do is mention my name with a vague insinuation that I’m wrong:

**THE DALROCKIAN COMPLICATION:**

We live in a time that blames men by default. Our generation blames boys for being boys, it faults men for being men, and it scorns males simply for being males. Resentment of masculinity, and even resentment of residual forms of masculinity, is one of the characteristic sins of our time. So if a marriage melts down, and both husband and wife come out from it telling a horror story about what happened, the wife will get the kind of sympathetic hearing that the husband will almost never get. This is particularly true in vast stretches of the feminized evangelical church.

Now you can’t do that for extended periods of time before a significant number of men begin to kick. *They do this in various ways, some godly and some ungodly.* Some resort to pornography, others to the MGTOW movement, some muse that sexbots will never become part of the #MeToo movement, others go on marriage strike (*Matt. 19:10*), and *others go the Dalrock route.* And countless others imitate B’rer Rabbit—“he lay low.”

I won’t disagree with Wilson that “others go the Dalrock route” which Wilson explains may be either godly or ungodly, because of course there is nothing to argue with. There is an *implied* argument there, a suggestion that Wilson has handily defeated my arguments, if only in his head. But Wilson is careful not to divulge what argument of mine is in error, and for good measure he is careful not to even link to or name whatever post contains the argument he imagines he has just defeated.

It is possible however that I’ve misread Wilson’s point. It could be that he doesn’t really imagine that he just secretly defeated one of my arguments, and instead he is offering himself to bear the embarrassment in place of his demoralized defenders. This would explain the title of his post: *Take Me Instead.* It could be that by taking the weasely way out Wilson actually is deliberately attempting to transfer his defender’s immense embarrassment onto himself. If so, that would be the noblest of weasely moves, and my hat is off to him.

**Update:** Pastor Tim Bayly has weighed in on the topic (HT princeasbel)

Some man in bondage to the root of bitterness which corrupts many thinks he's Trumped my dear brother Doug Wilson. Uh no. The reason no one responded to the guy's challenge is that trying to correct the root of bitterness is like trying to water the Sahara [https://t.co/IYEW5u8qae](https://t.co/IYEW5u8qae)

— Tim Bayly (@tbayly) [December 5, 2018]
H/T Heidi
The right has capitulated in the culture wars.
by Dalrock | December 6, 2018 | Link

Larry Kummer of Fabius Maximus has a new post up today about a transgender Miss Universe contestant. Click through to see the details, but I’ll share this bit of his analysis since it is spot on and relevant to recent posts:

The Left has broken all substantial opposition to its vision of a new society. Even resistance of the evangelicals has broken. This is the pursuit phase of battle: pursuit to crush a foe in full retreat.

Know that after Rights for Transgenders there will be a fourth wave. And a fifth. Until our society has changed beyond recognition.
Pastor Matt Chandler is at the nexus of the modern complementarian movement. He is a contributor to The Gospel Coalition (TGC), the president of the Acts 29 church planting network and a council member of the ERLC. In the video below Chandler explains to Vice TV why so many evangelicals support President Trump. Chandler argues that as great as President Obama and our recent social justice advances are, the social progress has been too fast for evangelicals to accept:

I think people are frightened. I think people are frightened at the speed at which things are changing culturally. So I think they begin to grasp for something that might help. The Obama presidency, great man, some of his policies and the way he rolled out his policies really really scared evangelicals. And without any kind of real help from Pastors and ministers to help us understand, the news media just whipped us into a frenzy and made people feel desperate.

According to Chandler the problem with the modern church is that it isn’t on the social justice bandwagon, and this is leading to declining membership:

My experience with the de-churched, thats what I would call them, those who grew up in the church and have left, is that it is a sense of hypocrisy they have picked up on, a kind of cowardice among the church to address things that are serious and significant pains of our day. So whether that be domestic violence that the church has been just painfully quiet on or even things like racial reconciliation. Which means that if you step into these spaces you are going to draw a lot of flack from the evangelical world.

He is especially concerned that Christians are sinning in their opposition to the gay and trans agendas:

But I think especially around topics like homosexuality where we are quick to say it’s a sin. Which I’m not going to disagree that I would think from the scriptures that it’s not ultimately what God intends, but to pretend like we’re not talking about human beings with souls, who sometimes are deeply conflicted it’s just a great error. And to be right the wrong way is to be wrong.

...
and I know all of arguments around that, but I’m using the language that I think would make sense to most conservatives, that made them go “whoever the opposition is to that I’m voting for” and then they lost their soul on that, many of them did.

Chandler looks back and sees Christianity as having been on the wrong side of history when it comes to the culture wars. But oddly he doesn’t see the accelerating social justice movements of the last 50 years as an assault on Christian morality. He sees the church as having suddenly and mysteriously started to mistreat women, gays, and transsexuals over the last 50 years:

I think you are going to see what we’ve already seen probably three or four times in Christian history. There are going to be those that try to reach the world by becoming like the world. And then there are going to be those that try to by the grace of God hold fast to orthodox Christian faith in a way that’s compassionate and kind, and they are going to have to weather the backlash of all of the wrong that has been done in the name of Jesus in the last 50 years.

This is the complementarian frame in a nutshell. Christianity existed for 2,000 years, and then a group of social justice reformers decided that Christianity was anti woman. Complementarians responded by agreeing with nearly everything the anti Christian “reformers” had argued, but kept just enough of the old teaching to be able to point to themselves as theoretically different from the reformers, even though in practice there is virtually no difference. Then immediately after praising the reformers, complementarians denied that the reformers ever existed. This way they can deny that they are at war with 2,000 years of Christian doctrine, because the only thing that changed was the church suddenly started mistreating women (and gays, and transexuals) 50 years ago and complementarians are restoring the old order. This kind of doublethink is farcical, but it really is baked into the complementarian view.

H/T Darwinian Arminian
Chandler: Every Christian should have a gay friend.
by Dalrock | December 10, 2018 | Link

Complementarianism is about bringing the “progress” of the culture wars into the conservative church while pretending to retain orthodoxy. Complementarians started with feminism, but many of the biggest names are now doing the same for the LGBT agenda. Much of the battle here is to overcome Christians’ feeling of disgust at homosexuality. Conservative Christians need to be taught what the rest of the culture has already accepted:

1. Being disgusted by homosexuality is a grave sin and a sign of hateful bigotry.
2. Gays are special people, and due to the virtue of diversity every organization must include gays and every person should demonstrate their lack of bigotry by having gay friends.

Pastor Matt Chandler does an outstanding job with both in his speech to Equip Austin, an event produced by the Southern Baptist Convention’s (SBC) Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission (ERLC) in 2015. For a partial transcript of the speech see “The Church Must Be a Place Where It’s Okay Not To Be Okay.” Matt Chandler on Homosexuality & the Church. Chandler explains that conservative Christians are hateful bigots who need to overcome their disgust of homosexuality (emphasis mine):

One of the things I’ve seen is that some people are very terrified of homosexuality. The accusation that Christians are homophobic actually is true about certain Christians I’ve been around. They are mortified of homosexuals; they are grossed out by [them]. And the gospel (really on any subject) reshapes us to a place of compassion, it reshapes us to a place of love, and it reshapes us back to an eager hope for reconciliation in all things.

Later in the speech Chandler explains that every Christian should have a gay friend (emphasis mine):

All of us are going to have gay friends, family or co-workers. That’s a giant umbrella. And listen I want to push that you should have someone in that umbrella in your life. If you’ve so withdrawn from these types of relationships then I think honestly when all’s said and done you’re not really helping in the relationship between what appears to be two warring factions although I would argue that we’re really not at war. There is a war going on, it’s not between us right.

There are some other bits in Chandler’s speech that will ring familiar to my readers. This speech is from 2015, and even then Chandler was laying the foundation for Allberry and Butterfield’s hospitality message that Christian families need to give gays access to our children:

Here’s how I want to encourage you. One, this is the place where genuine friendship and hospitality pays dividends. I have found that where I disagree with someone on theology, life and practice, those disagreements can remain and there be genuine
friendship — if a relationship has been built. So come into my home. Sit at my table. Let’s hang out. Let’s go see this movie. Let’s go grab a drink. I’ve got a party at my house on labor day weekend. Come over to my house, bring your friends, and let’s just hang out, swim and barbecue...

Allberry and Butterfield argue that gays deserve access to our children because intimacy with our children is the reward Jesus promised them for following Him, to make up for the intimacy they are giving up by leaving the gay lifestyle. Back in 2015 Chandler laid the foundation for this as well. He says that gay Christians are special because by giving up the gay lifestyle they have given up more than the rest of us:

There’s no question that the invitation to come and follow Christ is the invitation to come and die (Dietrich Bonhoeffer). And yet there are some crosses that are heavier than others. Scott Sauls (a pastor in Nashville) one time talked about having this yearning for companionship while fighting for sexual purity as a single man. It was difficult, but should never be compared with those who earnestly desire that kind of companionship and sexual companionship for whom that’s simply not coming in this lifetime.

This is subtle because it twists the idea of repentance. Instead of Christians being grateful to God for being delivered from sin (something awful), the idea is that non gay Christians should be grateful to gay Christians for giving up their life of sin (something of great value).
Deti asked me to clarify what I meant in my last post about complementarian gay activists twisting the idea of repentance and being freed from sin. Instead of framing being freed from sin as something gays should be thankful to God for, they frame gays repenting from sin as something straight Christians should be thankful to gays for. What complementarians are doing here is framing perversion as something good, something gays deserve compensation for giving up. Rosaria Butterfield does this in her ERLC article and concludes that non gay Christians owe it to gay Christians to compensate them for the great things they left behind in the gay lifestyle (emphasis mine):

Take, for example, our Christian brothers and sisters who struggle with unchosen homosexual desires and longings, sensibilities and affections, temptations and capacities. Our brothers and sisters need the church to function as the Lord has called it to—as a family. Because Christian conversion always comes in exchange for the life you once loved, not in addition to it, people have much to lose in coming to Christ—and some people have more to lose than others. Some people have one cross, and others have ten to carry. People who live daily with unchosen homosexual desires also live with a host of unanswered questions and unfulfilled life dreams. What is your responsibility to those brothers and sisters who are in this position in life?

... 

God’s people need to wake up to something. If you want to share the gospel with the LGBTQ community or anyone who will lose family and homes, the gospel must come with a house key.

The problem here is not the coordinated ERLC claim that we as members of the church are to form a new kind of family that all of us can benefit from. The problem is the twisted way it looks at perversion, at sin. From a Christian point of view gays are ensnared, trapped, in something awful. Being freed from that trap is in and of itself a profound gift. But Butterfield and her colleagues at the ERLC don’t see it that way. They see being freed from the trap as a loss, at least in our earthly lives.

Pastor Sam Allberry has the same frame of mind in his ERLC speech The Church as the Family of God: Singleness, Same-Sex Attraction, and the Hope of Hospitality. Allberry describes a gay man who is highly satisfied with his current gay relationship. The satisfied-with-being-gay man asked Allberry what would be the benefit of leaving his gay relationship and following Jesus. Allberry says he really struggled to think of a here and now answer to this question. Unspoken is his view that the man’s gay relationship is something of real value, not something terrible to be freed from:

He said to me, listen this partnership I’m in has by far been the best thing that’s
happened to me. What could possibly be worth giving that up for? And I sat there for a moment and thought “Yeah that’s a good question”. And I looked at him and said “that’s a very good question.” And I remember praying “Lord that’s a really good question. A bit of air cover here would be useful”. And I could have answered it by saying “Well you get heaven. You get a relationship with God you get forgiveness of sins, those things are gloriously true. But it was a ground level here and now question, that was looking for a ground level here and now answer.

I can understand why Allberry might choose not to lead with being freed from the trap of sin and perversion right off the bat in the conversation. But Allberry speaks at length as if the happy gay man has a great point. The reality is the man doesn’t have a point at all, his conscience is seared so he can’t feel the pain that comes with his depravity. Yet Allberry never recognizes this in the speech. More importantly, what Allberry and his ERLC colleagues are doing (along with Piper and Roen) is trying to sear the consciences of non gay Christians on the subject.

Pastor Matt Chandler touched on the same theme in his own ERLC speech:

All of us have to die to ourselves. There’s no question that the invitation to come and follow Christ is the invitation to come and die (Dietrich Bonhoeffer). And yet there are some crosses that are heavier than others. Scott Sauls (a pastor in Nashville) one time talked about having this yearning for companionship while fighting for sexual purity as a single man. It was difficult, but should never be compared with those who earnestly desire that kind of companionship and sexual companionship for whom that’s simply not coming in this lifetime.

Imagine another group of Christians forming a sort of sin lobby for their favorite perversion, and claiming that they were better than other Christians because they gave up their wonderful perversion for Jesus! This is absurd, but it is the frame the ERLC is promoting.

For another example of this twisted perspective, see the conversation below between Rosaria Butterfield and ERLC President Russell Moore. Listen closely to Butterfield to try to spot any sense that she is fortunate to have been freed from her wicked life of lesbianism and gay activism. I will confess that I’ve only watched the first 15 minutes, so it is possible that Butterfield eventually recognizes that her conscience had been seared. I’ll ask my braver readers to take one for the team and listen all the way through and report back in the comments.
Will trans acceptance push women to look more feminine?

by Dalrock | December 10, 2018 | Link

In his post The Left pushes America down a slippery slope Larry Kummer contemplates the implications of the latest round of the culture wars with the inclusion of a “transgender woman” in the current Miss Universe contest:

If he – or she, as you prefer – wins, it will be a milestone. That is, a meaningless even by itself but marking progress on a path going somewhere. We can see only a few of the implications.

• As the guys at 4Chan said long ago, this shows that men are better at everything than women – including being women.
• It shows the glitterati is hard-left, contemptuously poking in the eye their mostly traditional and mostly male audience.
• It shows that the far Left is winning, remaking our society in a form more pleasing to their ideology. Almost uncontested.
• It means the West is going full Weimar. That didn’t end well last time.
• It probably means other things. Things of great significance but beyond my pay grade to see.

I’ll add a speculation of my own to the list. I suspect that as men dressing as women becomes more and more common, we are going to see women start to fear being mistaken for men. For many decades the trend has been for women to ape men, starting at least in the 1920s with Amelia Earhart and her peers. This has progressed so far that today we have two kinds of clothing and styles:

1. Clothing and styles everyone can wear.
2. Clothing and styles men must not wear.

For a woman to be seen as “crossdressing” she has to not only put on the apparel and hairstyle of a man, but she has to make a concerted effort to pass herself off as a man. This isn’t true for men. If we see a dude with a full beard but with a woman’s haircut and wearing a dress, we still recognize this as crossdressing. We would in fact recognize it instantly if he were merely wearing women’s shoes. But a woman not wearing any women’s clothing (there is no longer men’s clothing) with a butch haircut isn’t seen as crossdressing unless she goes by a man’s name and speaks with a false deep voice. It is possible for a woman to crossdress in our society, but it takes extreme effort.

Yet as men are pushing the envelope from the other direction this creates an entirely new problem for feminists. While they want to be like men, they don’t want to be mistaken for a man, or at least for a transvestite. They may applaud Jenner, but they don’t want to be mistaken for him. Making this all the worse is that transvestites very often do want to be mistaken for women. This can create very uncomfortable situations for women who just a
few years ago would have been seen as having great moxy; now they aren’t seen as women dabbling at being men but the reverse!

For an admittedly extreme example of this, see the NY Post story Grandma sent to all-male jail after mistaken for transgender man. In that case, a woman who doesn’t look that out of the ordinary was mistaken for a transvestite. She does have a very manish expression about her, but this is commonplace for women in this age. Tragically her jailers refused to believe her when she assured them she was a woman, and she spent a harrowing 10 hours locked up in a holding cell with 40 men.

When a corrections officer asked the nurse if she had physically examined de Veloz, she brushed her off, firing back, “She’s a man” — and then walked away, the Miami Herald reported.

... “You are a woman. Good luck if you’re alive tomorrow,” a corrections officer told her, according to the suit.

It may seem obvious that the nurse should have physically checked to see what kind of bits de Veloz has, but we live in a complicated world. While de Veloz is suing her jailers for not checking her bits, The NY Post has another story about an inmate suing jailers for doing just that: Transgender woman forced to show genitals in jail, called a ‘he-she’: suit

A transgender woman in Texas was forced to show her genitalia to jailers who questioned her sex in Dallas County after she was arrested on a weapons charge, an explosive lawsuit claims.

... “Ms. Jackson has suffered trauma, felt demoralized, anxious, stressed, a loss of dignity, and fear,” the lawsuit states, adding that county officials violated the federal Prison Rape Elimination Act, which prohibits jails from examining transgender or intersex detainees solely to determine their gender.

But it isn’t just jailers who face confusion on the issue. As crossdressing becomes more and more accepted, even promoted, we will all face this quandary. After all, if you looked at both women in the respective news stories (here and here), the man dressing like a woman looks more feminine than the manish woman.

I suspect that just as we have seen men responding to women trying to look like men by growing beards and lifting weights, we are likely to see women’s fashions similarly react to men encroaching on women’s territory. If I’m right, this won’t just show up as a resurgent appreciation for skirts, dresses, and non-sensible shoes. I suspect this will show up in women’s facial expressions as well. Today nearly all women are terrified of presenting a quiet, gentle spirit. But as men continue to get better at looking like women, women are going to find themselves more and more afraid of being mistaken for men.
Must a father teach his son to fix things?
by Dalrock | December 12, 2018 | Link

In response to Giving thanks for fathers commenter Oratorian wrote:

Coming to this a little late, but does anyone have any insight about how the father-son passing on of masculine roles works among men who are NOT interested in or capable at things like car maintenance and DIY?

Without wishing to criticise any of Dalrock’s points, it’s a fact that not all fathers are particularly practical (mine wasn’t), and being hugely practical can’t be an essential masculine trait, so whenever the discussions becomes centered around this kind of activity I feel as though part of the conversation’s been missed out.

I wanted to respond to this in a post instead of a comment because it is an excellent question. On top of that, the rest of his comment is also outstanding. Not only does he go a long way towards answering the question he poses, but he demonstrates thankfulness for his own father, which was the primary point of the post:

My father was an intellectual type, and I rather take after him. He introduced me to what you might call intellectual masculinity. We debated things in depth and he expected me to read widely and make strong arguments with him, and he would have considered it feeble (not necessarily feminine) if I’d taken easy options and accepted received opinions without examining them.

We chopped logs together and unblocked our drains, and he involved me in odd jobs around the house sometimes, but there wasn’t the level of intense mechanical or otherwise practical work going on as so many commentators here describe.

I’m not hugely practical myself and I’ve got very limited experience of using tools and doing DIY, and now that I’m a father (one son so far) I want to know how I can present a good model of masculinity to my son without excelling at that kind of thing.

The short answer I would offer is to focus first on teaching your son what you know as a man. Skills are very important, but you are also teaching your son about manhood in general and who you are as a man in the process (even if you aren’t really trying to). If you can honestly say “This is what my father taught me” this will imbue it with additional meaning, even if it doesn’t register with him immediately. It will be a connection he has not only with you, but with your father as well.

From there I would think about any other skills you want him to learn even if you haven’t mastered them yourself. Here in the sphere we could quickly come up with an extensive list of things it is good for a man to know or be able to do. With the exception of faithfully and seriously worshiping Christ, most if not all of these aren’t essential to be a Christian man, but they are still manly things and good things to have. It isn’t that a “real man” should be able
to do all of them or even any one of them, but it would be good if he can do some of them. I’m sure others will have much to add in the comments, but off the top of my head:

- Lifting weights.
- Sports.
- Martial arts.
- DIY/maintenance/repair.
- Shooting (including gun safety and maintenance/cleaning).
- Hunting.
- Fishing
- Basic outdoor skills like building a fire.
- Cooking with fire (grilling and smoking).

Part of what I would consider here is that as the distinction between the sexes is continuously blurred, showing mastery of more manly traits (especially hands on manly traits) helps a man stand out as a man. So just from that frame alone you may want to consider how you can strategically expand your son’s horizons. There is also the idea of contrast Game that could work in your son’s favor. If he has mastered the intellectual world and also is the only man in his peer group who can with confidence change a tire, start a fire, shoot and break down an AR 15, and clean a fish he will have a leg up when competing for a wife. He’ll get bonus points if he can manage to be a bit mysterious about how much he knows and how exactly he came to know how to do all of these things.

As you come to your own conclusion on what additional things you would like him to learn, the question turns to how to make this happen. My father taught me how to shoot, but has never had any interest or skill in fishing or hunting. When I was growing up and interested in these things my father made it possible for me to go fishing with men he knew who had an interest in it, and he got me started as best as he could by taking me to a trout farm when I was little. When I was in high school he also took me and a few of my friends on a deep sea fishing charter trip. Later friends in college and after that my father in law taught me how to hunt and dress out deer and elk.

Some skills you might want to master yourself first before teaching. Others you might want to learn together. And some you might look for others who can teach your son directly. But while skills are good and important, the most important things you will teach your son is who he is as a man. This you will end up doing to one degree or another no matter what specific skills you are teaching him.
Dr. Russell Moore took over as president of the Southern Baptist Convention’s (SBC) Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission (ERLC) in June of 2013. By April of 2014 his new direction on homosexuality was already visible. From the NPR story Southern Baptist Leaders Seek Softer Approach To Homosexuality

The Southern Baptist Convention held a gathering of pastors at its Nashville headquarters in April. For an organization that has previously used opposition to gay marriage as a rallying point, statements here from church leaders, like Kevin Smith of Kentucky, shocked the auditorium of pastors into silence.

“If you spent 20 years and you’ve never said anything about divorce in the church culture, then shut up about gay marriage,” Smith said.

Pastor Jimmy Scroggins warned Southern Baptist pastors that the culture war was over, and mocking gay marriage was “redneck theology” and no longer acceptable:

“We’re all in agreement that the cultural war is over when it comes to homosexuality, especially when it comes to gay marriage...

“Let’s stop telling Adam and Steve jokes and let’s be compassionate, because these are people that are in our community,” he said at the convention. “These are people that are in our churches.”

NPR contrasts Moore’s progressive stance on homosexuality to that of Richard Land, Moore’s predecessor as president of the ERLC:

[Land] can still be heard from time to time on Christian talk radio saying things like this:

“I know that the dirty little secret that nobody wants to talk about is that a high percentage of adult male homosexuals in America were sexually molested when they were children.”

The man chosen to replace Land, Russell Moore, is trying to rein in the flame-throwing.

“When I hear people who are simply screaming in outrage right now, let me tell you what I hear,” he says, “I hear losers.”
In June of 2015 Dr. Russell Moore wrote in the Washington Post: Why the church should neither cave nor panic about the decision on gay marriage.

As I write this, the Supreme Court has handed down what will be the “Roe v. Wade” of marriage, redefining marriage in all 50 states. This is a sober moment, and I am a conscientious dissenter from this ruling. The Court now has disregarded thousands of years of definition of the most foundational unit of society, and the cultural changes here will be broad and deep. So how should the church respond?

Moore explains that Christians have lost the culture war regarding marriage and asserts that in this regard our new reality bears some resemblance to the early persecuted church:

Moreover, while this decision will, I believe, ultimately hurt many people and families and civilization itself, the gospel doesn’t need “family values” to flourish. In fact, the church often thrives when it is in sharp contrast to the cultures around it. That was the case in Ephesus and Philippi and Corinth and Rome, which held to marriage views out of step with the Scriptures.

Moore then acknowledges that conservative Christians have already caved to the culture wars regarding divorce:

...we must embody a gospel marriage culture. We have done a poor job of that in the past. Too many of our marriages have been ravaged by divorce.

Too often we've neglected church discipline in the cases of those who have unrepentantly destroyed their marriages. We must repent of our failings and picture to the world what marriage is meant to be, and keep the light lit to the old paths.

In short, Moore describes modern families as being under grave attack and churches as having failed miserably so far to protect them. So far, Moore and I are in agreement.

But then Moore gets to his main point, which is how we should respond to this dire circumstance. According to Moore our focus should not be to find ways to better protect Christian families living in a truly hostile culture. He argues that our focus should be on welcoming what he expects will be a flood of gays and lesbians who may seem hostile but in reality will be eager to become allies and help us strengthen Christian families. Our biggest fear according to Moore should not be the coordinated assault on our own families, but missing the opportunity to swell our ranks with seemingly hostile gays and lesbians (emphasis mine).

Let’s also recognize that if we’re right about marriage, and I believe we are, many people will be disappointed in getting what they want. Many of our neighbors believe
that a redefined concept of marriage will simply expand the institution (and, let’s be honest, many will want it to keep on expanding). This will not do so, because sexual complementarity is not ancillary to marriage. The church must prepare for the refugees from the sexual revolution.

We must prepare for those, like the sexually wayward Woman at the Well of Samaria, who will be thirsting for water of which they don’t even know.

There are two sorts of churches that will not be able to reach the sexual revolution’s refugees. A church that has given up on the truth of the Scriptures, including on marriage and sexuality, and has nothing to say to a fallen world. And a church that screams with outrage at those who disagree will have nothing to say to those who are looking for a new birth.

Moore is just one man, but as the president of the ERLC he is one of the primary leaders in the conservative Christian response to the culture wars. Moore defined the strategy, and his followers are dutifully executing on the plan. Tim Keller and Pastor Sam Allberry launched The Living Out Church Audit focusing on accommodating the SJW mopping up operation in conservative churches. Allberry is a regular contributor to the ERLC and is an editor at The Gospel Coalition (TGC). Allberry praises a children’s book* that normalizes gay marriage and teaches children not to have their guards up (emphasis mine).

Homosexuality is presented through a human lens. Archer encounters homosexuality in the same way the vast majority of us encounter it: through people close to him telling him they’re gay. This is welcome. In our own assessment of human sexuality, and especially in our talking through such things with children, we must keep at the forefront the fact we’re talking about real people. For some Christians, this humanizing of homosexuals may be an important corrective. The two gay characters in the book come across as real, not as stereotypes. They’re not activists or pushing an agenda; they’re normal people who happen to be gay. (The only stereotyping is with the student from England, who’s inevitably eccentric and posh.)

Here is Christian gay activist Allberry praising a book by a secular gay activist that indoctrinates children to the belief that gays aren’t activists and aren’t pushing an agenda!

Pastor Matt Chandler reinforces the message that we shouldn’t be on guard for gay activism now that we’ve lost the culture war in an ERLC video (emphasis mine):

All of us are going to have gay friends, family or co-workers. That’s a giant umbrella. And listen I want to push that you should have someone in that umbrella in your life. If you’ve so withdrawn from these types of relationships then I think honestly when all’s said and done you’re not really helping in the relationship between what appears to be two warring factions although I would argue that we’re really not at war. There is a war going on, it’s not between us right.

The Family Research Council echoes this message in a pamphlet titled How to Respond to the LGBT Movement** (emphasis mine):
It should also be noted that in the context of the political debates over LGBT issues, social conservatives do not consider people who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender to be their adversaries. **We recognize that most people who identify as LGBT are content to keep their sex lives private rather than demand official government affirmation of their sexual identity or conduct.**

Sam Allberry and Rosaria Butterfield (also of the ERLC) take this a step further and insist that Christians now have an obligation to give gays access to our children. Allberry chides Christians for keeping gays away from our children by raising the drawbridge, and Butterfield says that the best way to protect our children is to overcome our fears and give gays the keys to our front doors.

All of this is madness, but it is precisely the kind of madness modern conservative Christians are most hungry for. This is exactly how conservative Christians responded to the feminist attack on marriage; they pretended to courageously fight against the culture while eagerly capitulating. This is a form of cowardice that feels brave, and that is what conservative Christians (as a group) have been looking for all along. As Pastor Matt Chandler writes at the ERLC in *How the church can respond to a post-Christian culture* what conservative Christians need to do is strike a courageous pose:

> A Courageous Posture: You may have guessed by now that I will not encourage you to convert, condemn, or consume the culture. I want to give you something else, a fourth option. And I don’t want to offer you a strategy so much as a posture. I want to address the fears that grip our hearts and that drive so much of the Christian response to the age of unbelief.

> ...

> I’m convinced that if we have a God-sized, God-given courage, then we will be freed up to be the people of God, living out the mission of God, marked by the joy of God. With courage, this season of history can be viewed not with fear and trepidation, but instead with hope and a sense of opportunity. With courage, our perspectives turn, and we can be excited and encouraged about this cultural moment and not intimidated, angered, or paralyzed by it.

> Welcome to the age of unbelief. The church can thrive here. All we need is Christian courage. Take heart.

*H/T Shawn

**The FRC pamphlet is written by Peter Sprigg. Sprigg is on the conservative side of the response to the culture wars, and disagrees with the recent push to capitulate on key areas such as Christian gay identity and the merits of reparative therapy.**
First she wanted a wedding, then she wanted a divorce.

by Dalrock | December 16, 2018 | Link

Her story would be cliché if her now ex husband wasn’t a pirate ghost. From People Magazine Woman Who Married 300-Year-Old Pirate Ghost Announces Their ‘Marriage Is Over’

Eventually, Teague said the two even started having a sexual relationship—but she wanted more.

“Growing up in Ireland in my era, you were taught that if a man bedded you, he should wed you,” she said. “I knew from my research that spiritual marriage was a thing, so it was more me that wanted to get married than him—he would have been happy like most men with just sex.”
Not tired enough to stop.
by Dalrock | December 17, 2018 | Link

Feminism is the assertion that men are evil and naturally want to harm women, followed by pleas to men to solve all of women’s problems.

-Dalrock’s Law of Feminism

Jessica Valenti writes in Dear Men, Feminism Needs You that she is tired of nagging men to do what she wants them to do.

Stop waiting for us to explain everything, and start doing the work

She explains that her desire to nag men is yet one more burden men have placed upon her:

...someone asked a question I’ve been asked a hundred times before: How can feminists do a better job of reaching men?

...I answered that I don’t really care about reaching men anymore. It’s too exhausting, too demeaning. It’s absurd that a woman should have to persuade someone else of her humanity (which is, remember, what feminism is actually about).

That’s not to say I don’t think men’s support is necessary for women to make real progress. It is. But men can and should figure out for themselves how to be a true ally to women—without creating more work for us.

Yet Valenti is tireless in her selfless willingness to nag. Despite what is an unbearable burden, she manages to summon the will to nag, if only to nag men into not making her want to nag them. But this comes with a stern warning. If men don’t stop making her want to nag them, Valenti will feel the desire to reject us instead of nagging us. Who would nag us then?

Men, if you see all of this and still require convincing—why in the world would we want you on our side? How can we trust a person who can look at the victim blaming and backlash, the discrimination and bigotry, and still not be sure that feminism is necessary?

We should not have to persuade you or try to “bring you along”; you should be outraged already. And not just because we are your “wives, daughters, or mothers”—but because we are people.

Consider yourselves warned men. If we don’t shape up and do what she wants, she’ll be angry with us. Almost too angry to nag us. But not quite, for she is a gracious nag. Let this be a warning to all of us either way.

H/T mgtowhorseman
Gone fishin’
by Dalrock | December 18, 2018 | Link

I’ll be out of pocket for a few days so I’m turning on moderation. I’ll be back towards the end of the week.

**Update:** Moderation is now off.
Secular gay activists have worked for decades to remove the taboo from homosexuality. “Loud and Proud” is their motto, and now Christian gay activists are doing the same work in conservative churches. Eve Tushnet writes in There’s a Place for Us: Revoice and Gay Christian Futures

There is a future for you in the Church which is not isolated, silent, and shamed, but rich in love and fruitfulness. Whereas almost all the advice and theology I’d heard up until that point had two components: 1) Here’s what you can’t do; and 2) Have you tried being straight? Have better desires!

Rachel Gilson at The Gospel Coalition is preparing a space for loud and proud gays in the conservative church. The first step of course is to give gays trusted access to our children:

Lily was crushed. She’d told just a member of her church her secret, and the member warned her that if anyone else found out, she would probably lose her position teaching the youth. What was this secret so deadly that she would be warned to hide it?

Lily is same-sex attracted.

Neither the struggle nor the terror is uncommon. How, then, do we create an environment in our churches, small groups, and families where we can even have this conversation, where Lily can share her struggle without fear?

We must also repent of seeing homosexuality as taboo:

Ask the Spirit of God to help you identify false stereotypes you may hold. Read a good book like Messy Grace by Caleb Kaltenbach [read TGC’s review], or check out the excellent materials at Living Out. Repent and confess anything the Lord brings to mind.

...You may be the key to helping other Christians recognize ways they’ve been (wrongly) off-putting while trying to (rightly) hold to Scripture’s truth about sexual morality.

Notice that she is linking to familiar names. The Living Out organization is run by Pastor Sam Allberry, and the book review she links to is by Rosaria Butterfield:

Messy Grace threw me back to another time and place. After the first paragraph, I realized I am a stakeholder in this story. Many years ago, if my lesbian partner and I had adopted or given birth to a son, we would’ve raised him the same way Caleb’s mom and partner raised him. We would’ve wanted the best for our son, and we would’ve committed ourselves to raising him in the egalitarian norms of the LGBT
community, teaching him to keep a wide and watchful distance from Christians, those people who despised us. We would’ve taken him to gay pride marches so that he could’ve experienced the fun, humor, culture, and political commitments of those who attend. And if our teenage son had “come out” to us as a Bible-believing Christian, we would’ve feared for his life and ours. Our sense of rejection and betrayal would’ve been acute. How could the child we raised turn against us like this? How could he become the worst of our enemies?

The unspoken assumption in all of this is that taboos are unChristian, and if we destroy them nothing bad will happen. As Larry Kummer says, social justice warriors are like monkeys at the controls of a nuclear power plant, furiously spinning the dials with little understanding of the machinery. But are Christians really forbidden to treat homosexuality as a taboo and shameful? Ephesians 5:3-12 tells us that it is shameful to even speak* of sexual immorality (ESV):

3 But sexual immorality and all impurity or covetousness must not even be named among you, as is proper among saints. 4 Let there be no filthiness nor foolish talk nor crude joking, which are out of place, but instead let there be thanksgiving. 5 For you may be sure of this, that everyone who is sexually immoral or impure, or who is covetous (that is, an idolater), has no inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God. 6 Let no one deceive you with empty words, for because of these things the wrath of God comes upon the sons of disobedience. 7 Therefore do not become partners with them; 8 for at one time you were darkness, but now you are light in the Lord. Walk as children of light 9 (for the fruit of light is found in all that is good and right and true), 10 and try to discern what is pleasing to the Lord. 11 Take no part in the unfruitful works of darkness, but instead expose them. 12 For it is shameful even to speak of the things that they do in secret.

Romans 1:21-27 makes this even clearer (ESV):

21 For although they knew God, they did not honor him as God or give thanks to him, but they became futile in their thinking, and their foolish hearts were darkened. 22 Claiming to be wise, they became fools, 23 and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man and birds and animals and creeping things.

24 Therefore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, to the dishonoring of their bodies among themselves, 25 because they exchanged the truth about God for a lie and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever! Amen.

26 For this reason God gave them up to dishonorable passions. For their women exchanged natural relations for those that are contrary to nature; 27 and the men likewise gave up natural relations with women and were consumed with passion for one another, men committing shameless acts with men and receiving in themselves the due penalty for their error.
The other unspoken assumption is that taboos don’t serve any useful purpose so we can safely dispense with them. But this is foolish. Taboos aren’t just punitive, they are protective. I think the real assumption is that we can pretend to destroy the taboo but young people will know we aren’t really serious. Either way, this foolishness is compounded by our foolishness in encouraging women to delay marriage. We expect young men to patiently prepare a decade or more for their daughter of the king. Most probably will, but in the internet age with both secular and Christian culture in agreement that homosexuality isn’t taboo, there is a great deal of mischief that will snare at least some of them (NSFW).

It is worth noting as well that homosexuality isn’t the only taboo Christians will be pushed to erase. In our new world the only taboo is the idea of a taboo. Today the push for conservative Christians is to be more open minded regarding Same Sex Attraction (SSA), but as we’ve seen each SJW victory sets the stage for the next one. If gays need a safe space to be “not ok” in our churches, clearly those who experience other unchosen attractions will deserve this as well. How long before conservative Christians need to apologize to the GSA community for our current hatefulness?

A taboo too far?

This phenomenon is known as GSA – Genetic Sexual Attraction Syndrome...

Some of the public conversations now turn to whether incestuous unions – where they are consensual and between adults – should be tolerated and decriminalised. Indeed, in Sweden half-sibling marriage is already legal and the jurisdictions of some other countries, too, do not penalise such acts.

Media stories only portray heterosexual familial partnerships, however, so there’s precious little coverage on brothers or male close family relations who’ve experienced GSA after a period of separation. That’s not to say it hasn’t happened, of course, but the coverage says a great deal about such being a cultural “taboo too far” for us. By contrast, popular cultural representations of heterosexual sibling incest is often eroticised, with the woman frequently portrayed as a feminine ideal: beautiful and sexy. In such story lines, incestuous relationships function to add an extra thrill of the illicit.

H/T Ace of Spades.

*As commenter Paul notes, this doesn’t mean we shouldn’t rebuke such immorality.
Merry Christmas
by Dalrock | December 25, 2018 | Link

I want to wish everyone a merry Christmas. Also, thanks to everyone who has offered words of encouragement over the year. I’ll leave comments open tomorrow but will probably turn moderation back on for a few days starting the morning of Dec 26th.

Edit: Moderation is now on.

Edit: Moderation is back off.
Blogger Bnonn recently took a catty swipe at this blog and the larger Christian men’s sphere in a sixteen part tweet.

1/16 There are lots of folks calling themselves red pill Christians. This is no better than feminist Christians, or social justice Christians, or gay-affirming Christians, or whatever other idol of wokeness someone has discovered in the world and then attached Christianity to.

...  

5/16 The red pill acolyte is inducted into an elect group, gains hidden wisdom & secret doctrines, becomes part of a justified minority. So the red pill is a modern mystery cult; pairing it with Christianity just produces a Christian knockoff of that cult...

12/16 Many RP Christians are those of whom Peter warns us: “they speak loud boasts of folly, enticing by sensual passions of the flesh those who are barely escaping from those who live in error. They promise them freedom, but they themselves are slaves of corruption.”

13/16 This is obvious if you read discussions on blogs like Dalrock; the eagerness with which they violate the principles of Eph 5 is startling to behold. There is as much contempt for women there as for men on feminist forums, and as little fear of God before their eyes.

For the purpose of this post I’ll set aside the absurdity of Bnonn claiming open discussions on public forums involves secret knowledge, and the more embarrassing problem with him using gossipy Queen B* tactics to promote his upcoming website on masculinity. I’ll merely note that if he ever takes issue with anything I’ve written I would urge him to man up and quote it and kindly explain my error.

What I want to focus on for this post is what I believe is Bnonn’s difficulty understanding precisely what the Christian “red pill” is. The term itself has never been my preference, but I’ll work with the metaphor he and others have adopted. One bit that Bnonn has right in essence is that:

Red pill is a reactionary, negative movement...

This is true, and the difficulty with defining the red pill begins with defining what it is reacting against. This is where the confusion begins even within the men’s sphere. To explain this we need to start with Christianity, even if like Heartiste your choice is to lounge poolside and enjoy the decline. This is the case because the red pill isn’t the original reaction. **What we call chivalry** is the original reaction, and chivalry was reacting to/against Christian sexual
morality. Chivalry/courtly love was originally a parody of Christianity, ostensibly a game of reversing Christian teachings regarding men, women, and sex. Where Christianity taught that it was marriage that made sex and sexual desire moral, courtly love taught that the only pure expression of sexual passion occurred within adultery. Where Christianity taught that wives were to submit to their own husbands in fear and reverence, courtly love taught men to submit to other men’s wives in fear and reverence. What was pure was portrayed as perverse, and what was bawdy was portrayed as pure. It was a truly devious joke.

But quite quickly Christians started seeing the parody not as a devious joke, but as the real deal. Here we are over 800 years later, and conservative Christians regularly present the morality of courtly love as if it were legitimate Christianity. This pops up in the most astounding ways, including Pastor Doug Wilson teaching that if a husband properly loves his wife she will become more physically beautiful (all emphasis mine):

> When husbands undertake the assigned responsibility of loving their wives in such a way that they grow in loveliness, they need to understand that the results will be visible. This does not mean that, with the right husband, all women could be equally beautiful. Some women have the advantage of a greater natural beauty, and others had exceptional fathers—men who treated their daughters right. But it does mean that a man who marries biblically should expect his wife to be visibly lovelier on their tenth anniversary—and if she is not, he knows that he is the one responsible. But as the one responsible, he has to know where true beauty begins. Every husband should learn how to ask, “What will living with a man like me do to this woman’s appearance?”

This weird bit of doctrine doesn’t come from the Bible, it comes from Arthurian chivalry and The Wedding of Sir Gawain.

Likewise there is Dr. R. Albert Mohler Jr. (President of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary), claiming that by God’s design a wife’s sexual attraction for her husband is a barometer of the man’s righteousness:

> Put most bluntly, I believe that God means for a man to be civilized, directed, and stimulated toward marital faithfulness by the fact that his wife will freely give herself to him sexually only when he presents himself as worthy of her attention and desire.

Pastor Doug Wilson discusses the same basic issue slightly differently in his book Reforming Marriage. Wilson explains that the way a man can tell if he is pleasing God is by his wife’s happiness (or lack thereof):

...the key is found in how the husband is treating his wife. Or, put another way, when mamma ain’t happy, ain’t nobody happy.

... The collateral effect of obedience is the aroma of love. This aroma is out of reach for those who have a hypocritical desire to be known by others as a keeper of God’s law. Many can fake an attempt at keeping God’s standards in some
external way. What we cannot fake is the resulting, distinctive aroma of pleasure to God...

When a husband seeks to glorify God in his home, he will be equipped to love his wife as he is commanded. And if he loves his wife as commanded, the aroma of his home will be pleasant indeed.

Another Pastor Wilson (Pastor Dave Wilson) teaches in FamilyLife’s Art of Marriage that if a wife isn’t sexually attracted to her husband, it is God speaking to the husband through his wife’s (non) burning bush:

**Dave:** Yes. Here’s all you need to know about that night—the thing that changed our marriage is when Ann was sharing with me what she felt—I had a pretty unique encounter with God. I sensed God was speaking to me, through Ann;

But while Christians adopted chivalry’s parody of Christianity as if it were the real deal, feminists used chivalry to do the heavy lifting for their own rebellion against Christianity. This gives us not two philosophies (or pills), it gives us three. One is the real deal, and two are in rebellion against the original. This is where it gets even more confusing, because there is a fourth perspective which is *Game*:
Game came about as a reaction to the practical reality created by chivalry and chivalry’s
spawn feminism. Game is a logical response to chivalry and feminism’s joint rebellion
against Christian sexual morality. Game is a reaction to the chivalrous and feminist lie that
women are sexually attracted to masculine virtue, and that the way a man can seduce a
woman (or otherwise please her) is to submit to her. Game is a practical rejection of the
obvious lie regarding what sexually arouses women. Rejecting a lie is in itself virtuous, but
the most learned practitioners of Game employ it to take full advantage of the feminist and
(modern) Christian rejection of Christian sexual morality.

For some Game itself is the red pill. For most in the men’s sphere I would however argue that
discussion of Game was the catalyst for the red pill reaction. As the combox discussions regularly prove, there is no orthodoxy in the sphere regarding exactly what Game is, if it works, and if it is good, bad, or neutral. I won’t try to resolve those questions in this post. What I want to focus on with this post is what the Christian red pill is or should be in reaction to; what is the blue pill? As I noted earlier there is confusion on this even within the sphere. When I first started blogging I probably would have tentatively answered feminism. But fairly recently it has become clear to me that chivalry is a much more precise answer. As Christians we should oppose the lesbian feminist “pastor” who is melting down purity rings to create a golden vagina. But at least her rejection of Christian sexual morality is overt. The far more insidious rejection of Christian sexual morality comes not from liberal Christians but from conservative Christians, and it comes not as feminism but as chivalry posing as Christianity. The problem is compounded by the desire of Christian men to strike a mock courageous pose by proposing to fight feminism with chivalry, which in their mind is the real Christianity anyway.

In retrospect I should have understood very early on that white knighting was not a modern corruption of something that was once good. I should have understood that the perversion came with Sir Lancelot, the original white knight:

White Knight is a title which the famed Arthurian knight, Sir Lancelot, used until he discovered his actual name. According to legends, he was one of the most important knights among the Knights of the Round Table. He has been variously regarded as the bravest knight of King Arthur as well as the closest friend of the King. The White Knight, Sir Lancelot, was also the one who fell in love with Queen Guinevere and had an affair with her.

That this simple observation took me eight years of blogging to achieve is something that astonds and humbles me in retrospect. The evidence was always at my fingertips, but I couldn’t see the simple pattern.

Bnonn says that he has benefited from the discussion in the sphere, and plans to “integrate that knowledge into a biblical theology of man, woman, and how we’re to work together to extend the dominion of God’s house.”

16/16 If you'd like to join us in this effort, we're launching It's Good To Be A Man in 2019. Get on the mailing list here in case we're deplatformed: https://t.co/t7kzSyGCh4.

— D Bnonn Tennant (@bnonn) December 27, 2018

I fervently pray that Bnonn and Pastor Michael Foster are wildly successful in this endeavor. However, if they are to be successful they will need to avoid the snare of adopting chivalry/courty love as if it were Christian and therefore the proper antidote to Christian
feminism. They must avoid this snare themselves in order to help other Christian men learn to do the same.

*I am told the “B” is silent.

**Later this was further twisted to the modern Christian assertion that romantic love sanctifies married sex and the logical follow on case for no fault divorce. We can trace this same perversion in the modern cuckoldry movement.

***Later this was modified to teaching men to submit to their own wives in fear and reverence and call it servant leadership.

H/T Emperor Constantine

**Related:** *Why Game is a threat to our values.*
Where most see girl power, Larry Kummer sees Dalrock’s Law of Feminism.

by Dalrock | January 2, 2019 | Link

Feminism is the assertion that men are evil and naturally want to harm women, followed by pleas to men to solve all of women’s problems.

— Dalrock’s Law of Feminism

Larry Kummer describes the movie Mad Max: Fury Road

Fury Road tells of a strong woman (Charlize Theron as Imperator Furiosa). She is a modern kick-ass heroine with “a shaved head and a fierce leather outfit ... in a fiery feminist” parable. She leads a rebellion, aided by five angelic women (also kick-ass heroines), a group of kick-ass motorcycle-riding grandmas, and two men (Max and Nux) – against an evil tyrant and his army of monstrous men. The numbers of bad guys mean nothing against their grrl-power...

But Kummer sees something else in the film belying the depiction of angelic girlpower:

Let’s take off our ideological glasses, so like the green glasses worn in the Emerald City of the The Wizard of Oz. Clearly seen, Fury Road is a two hour demonstration of Dalrock’s Law. The men are evil. The five pretty angels are imprisoned by their evil leader. The women wish to escape. Only the sacrifices by Max and Nux make this possible.

Imperator Furiosa is the central character. Her judgement is awful. Her two key decisions are suicidal. Her initial escape would have quickly ended without Max’s aid. Her Plan B was to lead everyone on motorcycles off to endless salt flats.
Feminism is the parasitic passenger chivalry longs for.

by Dalrock | January 2, 2019 | Link

In my previous post I noted that it took me many years of blogging before I recognized that chivalry and not feminism is the primary corrupter of modern conservative Christianity. This understanding is essential, because conservative Christians are laboring under the assumption that chivalry is a tool to fight feminism. Part of what makes this so confusing is that chivalry and feminism are often quite difficult to tease apart. Feminism is fundamentally an appeal to chivalry, which is the essential truth of Dalrock’s Law of Feminism:

Feminism is the assertion that men are evil and naturally want to harm women, followed by pleas to men to solve all of women’s problems.

The fatal conservative error is to assume that doing feminists’ bidding will eventually lead to feminist gratitude. Conservatives foolishly believe that one more act of valiant chivalry will finally win the feminists over. Chivalry is a way to strike a heroic pose while cravenly avoiding the terrifying prospect of opposing feminism. It is cowardice posing as bravery.

Even worse, in the chivalrous mindset feminist expressions of ingratitude are only proof that the chivalrous man is on the right and heroic path. Persistence in the face of cruel scorching by his lady is the very essence of chivalrous manhood. As Roger Boase explained (summarizing Gaston Paris, the man who coined the term courtly love):

…the lover continually fears lest he should, by some misfortune, displease his mistress or cease to be worthy of her; the lover’s position is one of inferiority; even the hardened warrior trembles in his lady’s presence; she, on her part, makes her suitor acutely aware of his insecurity by deliberately acting in a capricious and haughty manner; love is a source of courage and refinement; the lady’s apparent cruelty serves to test her lover’s valour.

Feminist tantrums are in the mind of conservative men actually positive signs that everything is in order. Professor Laura Ashe explains in Love and chivalry in the Middle Ages that the chivalrous man’s only response to women expressing ingratitude and irrational demands is to do his lady’s bidding (emphasis mine):

Malory’s ideal of chivalry has love at its heart: ‘thy quarrel must come of thy lady’, he says, ‘and such love I call virtuous love’. Each knight is to fight for the sake of his lady; with his victories he earns her love, and defends her honour. He is absolutely loyal to her and will follow her every command, whatever happens – whether she sends him on an impossible quest, banishes him from her company, or stands accused of some terrible crime, in desperate need of his help.

The pattern for chivalrous manhood was set in the epic that introduced us to Sir Lancelot, the original White Knight. As the title suggests, central to the plot of Lancelot, the Knight of the Cart is the symbolism of the cart. Early in his quest Lancelot is forced to ride in a cart of shame in order rescue the kidnapped Queen Guinevere. Lancelot’s noble romantic love for
another man’s wife was so strong that he chose humiliation after only the briefest hesitation. From C.S. Lewis in *The Allegory of Love*:

[Lancelot] hesitates for a moment before mounting the cart of shame and thus appearing as a common criminal; a moment later he obeys. He is driven through the streets where the rabble cry out upon him and ask what he has done and whether he is to be flayed or hanged. He is brought to a castle where he is shown a bed that he must not lie in because he is a knight disgraced. He comes to the bridge that crosses into the land of Gorre—the sword-bridge, made of a single blade of steel—and is warned that the high enterprise of crossing it is not for one so dishonored as he. ‘Remember your ride on the cart’, says the keeper of the bridge. Even his friends acknowledge that he will never be rid of the disgrace.

But the moral of Lancelot, the Knight of the Cart isn’t just that the noblest of knights would gladly humiliate himself in the service of adultery. This kind of debasement is essential for chivalry, but not sufficient. A true chivalrous man will not only gladly dishonor himself for his lady, he will do so expecting not gratitude but scorn in return. Lewis continues:

When he has crossed the bridge, wounded in hands, knees, and feet, he comes at last into the presence of the Queen. She will not speak to him. An old king, moved with pity, presses on her the merits of his service...

It is only later that [Lancelot] learns the cause of all this cruelty. The Queen has heard of his momentary hesitation in stepping on to the trumbril, and his lukewarmness in the service of love has been held by her sufficient to annihilate all the merit of his subsequent labours and humiliations.

This is merely the beginning, setting the stage for the right and appropriate relationship between the chivalrous man and his lady. Lancelot further humiliates himself when she instructs him to do so, and then fights valiantly when she demands valiance. Our hero’s eagerness to bear his lady’s capriciousness is eventually rewarded with glorious adultery (purified by romantic love). When Guinevere is then rightly accused of being an adulteress, Lancelot gladly fights for her honor.

This is chivalry’s lesson of virtuous manhood, modeled by the original White Knight himself, and it is why every round of feminist demands is so eagerly accepted by conservative men. Chivalrous men know in their hearts that they are secretly winning. Sure they are currently humiliated at every turn, but they know that with just a bit more chivalry they will ultimately triumph and finally become recognized as the epitome of virtuous manhood.
Tucker Carlson moves in the right direction.
by Dalrock | January 3, 2019 | Link

Two years ago when Dr. Helen pointed out that our anti father family courts are our society’s formal legal expression of our contempt for respectable men, Tucker Carlson responded with an emphatic “Who cares”?

**Dr. Helen:** [The] new world order is a place where men are discriminated against, forced into a hostile environment in school and later in college, and **held in contempt by society.** Maybe there is no incentive to grow up anymore. **It used to be that being a grown-up, responsible man was rewarded with respect, power and deference.** Now, not so much.

**Tucker Carlson:** Every word of that is true, and let me say **who cares?** If you’re a man, stop whining and reclaim your birthright which is masculinity, and masculinity and male power derive from responsibility. You don’t embrace responsibility, you have no power.

Last night however Carlson detoured away from the **weak men are screwing feminism up** party line. Instead he took conservative and liberal elites/policy makers to task for their **failure to care** about the legal, social, and economic forces that are destroying marriage:

- Male wages declined. Manufacturing, a male-dominated industry all but disappeared over the course of a generation. All that remained in many places were the schools and the hospitals, and both of them are traditional employers of women.

  In many areas, women suddenly made more than men.

  Now, before you applaud that as a victory for feminism, consider some of the effects.

  Study after study has shown that when men make less than women, women generally don’t want to marry them. Maybe they should want to marry them, but they don’t. Over big populations this causes a drop in marriage, a spike in out-of-wedlock births and all the familiar disasters that inevitably follow.

  More drug and alcohol abuse, higher incarceration rates, fewer families formed in the next generation. This is not speculation, it’s not propaganda from the evangelicals. It’s social science. We know it’s true. Rich people know it best of all, that’s why they get married before they have kids. That model works.

Here is the **full video** for reference. I haven’t watched all 15 minutes of it, but from the parts I watched he stopped short of directly addressing the disrespect of respectability that Dr. Helen so frequently points out. Yet even indirectly challenging this by challenging our elites...
to focus on policies that work for working class families and not just the elites themselves is a huge step:

Predictably, feminist outlets had kittens over Carlson criticizing the destruction of families. Huffington Post’s response is titled Tucker Carlson Blames Higher-Earning Women For ‘Men In Decline’:

Carlson... proclaimed “all that remained in many places” following the decline of “manufacturing and male-dominated” industry were the schools and hospitals that “traditionally” employ women, which meant that “in many areas, women suddenly made more than men.”

But rather than applaud it as “a victory for feminism,” Carlson asked viewers to “consider some of the effects.” He then cited unnamed studies that claimed women “generally don’t want to marry” men who earn less than them.

“Over big populations this causes a drop in marriage, a spike in out-of-wedlock births and all the familiar disasters that inevitably follow. More drug and alcohol abuse, higher incarceration rates, fewer families formed in the next generation,” he added in the clip shared online by Media Matters
As I wrote in *What is the blue pill?* chivalry is a mockery of Christian sexual morality. What was pure was portrayed as perverse, and what was bawdy was portrayed as pure. It was a truly devious joke. We can’t see its wickedness because we have mistaken the parody of Christianity for the real deal.

Whenever I read chivalrous tales the two target audiences are painfully in the room. Each scene is carefully tailored to provide pure delight to both lovesick adolescent boys and the strong independent women who devour romance novels like *50 Shades of Grey*.

Today I’ll share a small episode from *Lancelot, the Knight of the Cart*, the epic that not only introduced Lancelot but is generally seen as launching the genre that we call chivalry. In today’s episode Lancelot meets a slutty maiden, and Chrétien de Troyes uses this encounter to teach chivalry’s view of sexual morality. The slutty maiden offers Lancelot information he badly needs if he is going to rescue King Arthur’s slutty wife, Queen Guinevere. But in return the slutty maiden insists that the studly Lancelot have sex with her. Lancelot declines the offer, not because of Christian sexual morality, but because of the morality of romantic love. As chivalry demands, he takes great pains not to slut shame her or otherwise judge the sexual immorality she wears on her sleeve:

> Then the damsel said to him: “Sire, my house is prepared for you, if you will accept my hospitality, but you shall find shelter there only on condition that you will lie with me; upon these terms I propose and make the offer.” Not a few there are who would have thanked her five hundred times for such a gift; but he is much displeased, and made a very different answer: “Damsel, I thank you for the offer of your house, and esteem it highly, but, if you please, I should be very sorry to lie with you.”

The slutty damsel then declares that she will not give the studly Lancelot the information he needs, so Lancelot relents. However, he is distressed at the thought of fornicating without the sanctification of romantic love, and he also fears that the slutty maiden will become an alpha widow in the process:

> “By my eyes,” the damsel says, “then I retract my offer.” And he, since it is unavoidable, lets her have her way, though his heart grieves to give consent. He feels only reluctance now; but greater distress will be his when it is time to go to bed. The damsel, too, who leads him away, will pass through sorrow and heaviness. For it is possible that she will love him so that she will not wish to part with him.

It is here that we learn that the slutty maiden is a strong independent woman. She leads studly Lancelot into the magnificent castle she has built, a place without men:

> As soon as he had granted her wish and desire, she escorts him to a fortified place, than which there was none fairer in Thessaly; for it was entirely enclosed by a high wall and a deep moat, and there was no man within except him whom she...
brought with her.  

(Vv. 983-1042.) Here she had constructed for her residence a quantity of handsome rooms, and a large and roomy hall.

When the time comes to dismount their horses, we are again reminded that the slutty damsel is a strong independent woman. Her moxie greatly pleases Lancelot!

Then he dismounts from his horse, as does the damsel from hers. The knight, for his part, was pleased that she did not care to wait for him to help her to dismount.

Lancelot removes his armor and stows his weapons, and they have a meal. Next the slutty damsel tells Lancelot to wait outside a bit while she gets into bed, and then come join her in bed. But when Lancelot returns, suddenly the strong independent damsel is at imminent risk of being raped. What follows is a bodice ripping scene where Lancelot is called upon to rescue the slutty damsel from a group of armed knights:

Entering one of the rooms, he hears a damsel cry aloud, and it was the very one with whom he was about to lie. At the same time, he sees the door of another room standing open, and stepping toward it, he sees right before his eyes a knight who had thrown her down, and was holding her naked and prostrate upon the bed. She, thinking that he had come of course to help her, cried aloud: “Help, help, thou knight, who art my guest. If thou dost not take this man away from me, I shall find no one to do so; if thou dost not succour me speedily, he will wrong me before thy eyes. Thou art the one to lie with me, in accordance with thy promise; and shall this man by force accomplish his wish before thy eyes? Gentle knight, exert thyself, and make haste to bear me aid.” He sees that the other man held the damsel brutally uncovered to the waist, and he is ashamed and angered to see him assault her so;

Here we are assured that Lancelot’s motivation for rescuing the slutty damsel is purely noble. She is a strong independent woman after all, and he doesn’t own her:

yet it is not jealousy he feels, nor will he be made a cuckold by him. At the door there stood as guards two knights completely armed and with swords drawn. Behind them there stood four men-at-arms, each armed with an axe the sort with which you could split a cow down the back as easily as a root of juniper or broom.

Lancelot briefly considers whether he should intervene against such odds, and quickly conquers his fears. Being a white knight isn’t easy, after all:

The knight hesitated at the door, and thought: “God, what can I do? I am engaged in no less an affair than the quest of Queen Guinevere. I ought not to have the heart of a hare, when for her sake I have engaged in such a quest. If cowardice puts its heart in me, and if I follow its dictates, I shall never attain what I seek. I am disgraced, if I stand here; indeed, I am ashamed even to have thought of holding back. My heart is very sad and oppressed: now I am so ashamed and distressed that I would gladly die...
for having hesitated here so long. I say it not in pride: but may God have mercy on me if I do not prefer to die honourably rather than live a life of shame! If my path were unobstructed, and if these men gave me leave to pass through without restraint, what honour would I gain? Truly, in that case the greatest coward alive would pass through; and all the while I hear this poor creature calling for help constantly, and reminding me of my promise, and reproaching me with bitter taunts."

Except, for Lancelot, being a white knight really is easy. Although unarmed and unarmored, he handily defeats the room full of armed knights! He is wounded in the process, but that only makes him fiercer. Lancelot declares that he can easily take them all in battle, and as many others as they might bring:

Then the knight seizes the axe, wresting it quickly from him who holds it; then he lets go the knight whom he still held, and looks to his own defence; for the knights from the door, and the three men with axes are all attacking him fiercely. So he leaped quickly between the bed and the wall, and called to them: "Come on now, all of you. If there were thirty-seven of you, you would have all the fight you wish, with me so favourably placed; I shall never be overcome by you."

This proves to the slutty damsel that Lancelot is indeed the studliest alpha of them all! She calls off the hoax, for she is a strong independent woman who doesn’t need a man to save her. She was just testing Lancelot, to see if he was chivalrous.

And the damsel watching him, exclaimed: “By my eyes, you need have no thought of that henceforth where I am.” Then at once she dismisses the knights and the men-at-arms, who retire from there at once, without delay or objection. And the damsel continues: “Sire you have well defended me against the men of my household. Come now, and I’ll lead you on.” Hand in hand they enter the hall, but he was not at all pleased, and would have willingly dispensed with her.

Then the slutty damsel calls studly Lancelot into bed with her. He complies, but since the fornication would not be sanctified by romantic love he lays on the bed with no sexual desire for her. The sexual morality lesson of courtly love is heavy handed and unmistakable. Lancelot loves another man’s wife, so adultery is perfectly moral. But he doesn’t love the slutty maiden, and besides he would be cheating on Arthur’s wife:

Not once does he look at her, nor show her any courtesy. Why not? Because his heart does not go out to her. She was certainly very fair and winsome, but not every one is pleased and touched by what is fair and winsome. The knight has only one heart, and this one is really no longer his, but has been entrusted to some one else, so that he cannot bestow it elsewhere. Love, which holds all hearts beneath its sway, requires it to be lodged in a single place. All hearts? No, only those which it esteems. And he whom love deigns to control ought to prize himself the more. Love prized his heart so highly that it constrained it in a
special manner, and made him so proud of this distinction that I am not inclined to find fault with him, if he lets alone what love forbids, and remains fixed where it desires.

This of course proves to the slutty damsel that Lancelot is the greatest of knights, having first demonstrated his prowess in battle, and then demonstrated his perfect devotion to the holy entity that is romantic love.

The maiden clearly sees and knows that he dislikes her company and would gladly dispense with it, and that, having no desire to win her love, he would not attempt to woo her. So she said: “My lord, if you will not feel hurt, I will leave and return to bed in my own room, and you will be more comfortable. I do not believe that you are pleased with my company and society. Do not esteem me less if I tell you what I think. Now take your rest all night, for you have so well kept your promise that I have no right to make further request of you. So I commend you to God; and shall go away.” Thereupon she arises: the knight does not object, but rather gladly lets her go, like one who is the devoted lover of some one else; the damsel clearly perceived this, and went to her room, where she undressed completely and retired, saying to herself: “Of all the knights I have ever known, I never knew a single knight whom I would value the third part of an angevin in comparison with this one. As I understand the case, he has on hand a more perilous and grave affair than any ever undertaken by a knight; and may God grant that he succeed in it.”
Reader Oscar wrote:

I finally got around to watching the History Channel’s “Knightfall” fictional series about the final days of the Knights Templar, and imagine my surprise when one of the central plot points is that the Paris Temple Master has an affair with the Queen of France, and gets her pregnant.

Their justification for their illicit (on multiple levels) affair? “We’re in love!” What else could it be?

The “best” part? At one point, the knight is kneeling before the altar, asking God for guidance, when he has a vision in which the Queen is standing in front of him (where the altar was), and he’s kneeling before her with his forehead on her belly. I’ve never seen a more literal depiction of a man worshiping a vagina.

This stuff really is striking, and once you know how to spot it, it is everywhere.

In fact, the very reason we don’t tend to spot this is it really is everywhere. It is commonplace, and more importantly it is what we fundamentally believe. It is fairly easy to spot when it takes on the Old Testament form of idol worship, as was recently reported on by the Christian Post: Liberal Lutheran pastor to melt purity rings into vagina sculpture to ‘take down’ church teachings about sex

“Beginning November 12th, until December 17th, you’ll have the opportunity to send in your purity rings to be melted down and recast into a golden vagina,”

...those who send in their rings will then receive a “certificate of Impurity as well as a SHAMELESS, impurity ring.”

..."This thing about women that the church has tried to hide and control and that is a canvas on which other people can write their own righteousness — it’s actually ours,” Bolz-Weber told HuffPost. “This part of me is mine and I get to determine what is good for it and if it’s beautiful and how I use it in the world.”

We can easily spot the problem in the case of creating a golden vagina idol because this departs from the narrative we are so comfortable with, the sexual morality that comes from what we call chivalry. However when Pastor Doug Wilson describes the distinct aroma of love that God uses to signal when a man pleases God by pleasing his wife, we don’t recognize the “Hail to the V” inherent in this new chivalrous (and not Christian) doctrine. The same goes for Wilson’s invention of the wife as house despot. While the Bible tells wives to submit to their
husbands and call them lord, chivalry inverts the pattern.

Poets adopted the terminology of feudalism, declaring themselves the vassal of the lady and addressing her as midons (my lord), a sort of code name so that the poet did not have to reveal the lady’s name, but which was flattering by addressing her as his lord.

Modern day chivalrists are unlikely to call their wife midons, and instead simply call her the boss. But either way it is the chivalrous pattern that feels right to modern Christians, not the biblical pattern. The image of a husband kneeling (genuflecting) before his wife fits the chivalrous model, and is pleasing to our sensibilities. The image of a wife kneeling before her husband feels flat out wrong.

As I’ve covered before it isn’t merely Pastor Doug Wilson who has strikingly incorporated chivalry into his Christian theology. When Pastor Dave Wilson teaches husbands in Family Life’s Art of Marriage program that God speaks to husbands through their wife’s (non) burning bush, this is the religion of chivalry, not Christianity:

Dave: Yes. Here’s all you need to know about that night—the thing that changed our marriage is when Ann was sharing with me [that she wasn’t sexually attracted to me]—I had a pretty unique encounter with God. I sensed God was speaking to me, through Ann;

I could go on, including the explanation of why porn is immoral* by Dr. R. Albert Mohler Jr. (President of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary), Pastor Tim Bayly’s assertion that romantic love sanctifies married sex, and Stoeker and Arterburn teaching that a wife’s sexuality is her soul essence, which is her husband’s master. But for today I will leave the list of examples of current day chivalrous vagina worship and take us back to the source of our modern day religion of love.

It all goes back to what we know as chivalry. As C.S. Lewis explains in The Allegory of Love, the original proponents of this new religion claimed to be advancing Christianity while worshiping something other than Christ:

The submission which Lancelot shows in his actions is accompanied, on the subjective side, by a feeling that deliberately apes religious devotion. Although his love is by no means supersensual and is indeed carnally rewarded in this very poem, he is represented as treating Guinevere with saintly, if not divine, honours. When he comes before the bed where she lies he kneels and adores her: as Chrétien explicitly tells us, there is no corseynit in whom he has greater faith. When he leaves her chamber he makes a genuflexion as if he were before a shrine.54 The irreligion of the religion of love could hardly go further. Yet Chrétien—whether he is completely unconscious of the paradox, or whether he wishes, clumsily enough, to make some amends for these revolting passages—represents his Lancelot as a pious man and goes out of his way to show him dismounting when he passes a church, and entering to make his prayer; by which, according to Chrétien, he proves both his courtesy and wisdom.55
The problem is not Mohler’s conclusion that porn is immoral (it is), but his use of unchristian theology to arrive at this conclusion.
Pastor Michael Foster tweets:

One of the most common questions I get asked is:

How do I attract a woman?

I asked a wise older pastor how'd he answer it concisely. He said:

"You'll attract a woman by getting men to respect you. You'll get men to respect you by working hard."

I agree.

— Michael Foster (@thisisfoster) January 7, 2019

This is a partial picture. We might call this plan Beta, where plan Alpha is to exhibit dark triad traits. Plan Beta is the Christian path to attracting a wife, but there are two huge challenges facing a Christian man trying to follow this path.

The first challenge is that Christian women are being taught they are a prize to be won, and they are the pearl of great price. This leads many Christian women to delay marriage while giving them an immense sense of entitlement that makes them more attracted to men who follow plan Alpha. This is a relatively new phenomenon. Not long ago a woman who became eligible to join AARP without marrying would be seen as having failed at finding a husband. She would be a cautionary tale. Now a never married woman in her 50s is seen as a wise role model young Christian women should follow:

In this Spirit Connection podcast episode, my special guest is a good friend of mine—Wendy Griffith. She is a co-host of The 700 Club, an anchor/senior reporter for the Christian Broadcasting Network and co-anchors Christian World News on TBN. She’s traveled internationally, reporting on revival and has a powerful gift of the word of knowledge for healing. Wendy authored You Are A Prize To Be Won! Don’t Settle for Less Than God’s Best...

“You know I am 53 and I’ve been single all my life and never married ... and you said, ‘you’re going to need strength to wait.’ Honestly that was not the word I wanted to hear.”
“God is going to give you the desires of your heart. Don’t settle. It’s so easy to settle during the waiting ... God promises His best to His children. He’s not capable of giving us anything but His best.”

But as big as this challenge is, there is an even bigger challenge for Christian men following plan Beta. The bigger problem is not with young Christian women, but with older Christian men. The bigger problem is that Christian men don’t respect respectable men, especially the married fathers they go to church with. This is readily visible in Christian movies, as well as on Father’s Day. While there is plenty of detail in the previous two links, you can see this just as well by comparing two pictures. Here is how modern Christians view badboy biker tattoo artists (plan Alpha). Here is how modern Christians view married Christian fathers (plan Beta). Anyone who tells you modern Christians think the plan Beta man is the sexier option is fooling themselves. For context and to see both images at once, see this post by Larry Kummer at Fabius Maximus.

Obviously none of this changes the fact that the moral path for a Christian man is plan Beta. However, that path is much harder than it should be due to the modern Christian fear of telling women no and our contempt for respectable men. This is cruel to both young men and young women, as well as the children who grow up in the anti family modern Christian culture.

Edit: Pastor Foster posted a follow up tweet including the comment he left below.

Mr. Man-O-Sphere himself had a critique (kind of) of something I tweeted: https://t.co/YMWlWNnVij

My comment: pic.twitter.com/IFzkw3OcV7

— Michael Foster (@thisisfoster) January 7, 2019

See Also:

- Bad boys, single moms, and the love of a strong independent woman.
- The wake-up call saves the day yet again.
- Won’t someone call out the weight lifters?
“Quality Time”
by Dalrock | January 8, 2019 | Link

The Other McCain writes about the history of the term *quality time* in *Living Well Is the Best Revenge*:

The cliché of “quality time” was invented by Baby Boomer yuppies in the 1980s to rationalize the way their lifestyles deprived their children of so many traditional childhood experiences. Whereas most Baby Boomers grew up in traditional families — perhaps our parents were not as perfect as Ward and June Cleaver, but we still had the basic security of a stable home life — many of the Boomers sadly failed their children in this regard. If you’ve read Barbara Dafoe Whitehead’s book *The Divorce Culture*, you understand how the cliché of “quality time” insinuated itself into the vocabulary of parenting. The working mother might not be able to give her children the kind of daily supervision and care she’d like to give them, but she could take them on a three-day vacation to Disney World and say they’d had *quality time* together. The divorced father might only see his kids one weekend a month, but he could take them out jet-skiing at the lake and tell himself that this *quality time* made up for the absence enforced by the custody settlement.

Rationalizations are a psychological defense mechanism — the ego defending itself against negative feedback — and everybody has to do whatever it takes to stay sane in difficult circumstances. Even if we have been able to avoid the worst impacts of cultural decadence in our own lives, most of us have friends and relatives who’ve been directly affected by the unraveling of our social social fabric. Divorce, suicide, drug addiction, criminal violence — the kind of stuff Tucker Carlson was talking about *Wednesday night* — are both cause and effect of the downward spiral that has been destroying American culture for the past 50 years.

I didn’t notice the link back here until I caught up on his posts yesterday, so that was a pleasant surprise. I would argue however that the term wasn’t generally a rationalization by the fathers who were kicked out of their homes, but was instead a rationalization by the people who assisted with or advocated kicking fathers out of the home.
Tucker Carlson’s dangerous wedge.
by Dalrock | January 9, 2019 | Link

Last week Tucker Carlson broke a carefully guarded conservative taboo and called out our elites for their role in destroying American families. Much of the reaction has been a predictable demand to stop holding our elites accountable and get back to blaming the working class, especially white working class men, for not being elite. At National Review David Bahnsen* complained in Tucker Carlson Is on the Wrong Side of the Crisis of Responsibility that the real problem is that weak men are screwing feminism up:

Carlson seems to suggest that our system itself is to blame for individual shortcomings, and that collective restructuring of free institutions will alleviate and cure those shortcomings. This is simply not reflective of conservatism, or of founding ideology.

... I do my own argument no good to try to set the record straight about those barbs Tucker launched: His motive was to set the tone rhetorically and emotionally, and he did so effectively, even if dishonestly.

... Our happiness was not taken away by a bad trade deal or a policy shortcoming, as bad as some policies and laws surely are. The pursuit of happiness is necessarily integrated with character, and the demoralization of our country has been a vicious cycle for a generation now. It does us no good to sit and play “chicken or egg” about this when our communities are in such disarray. No one who cares deeply for American families, blue-collar workers, and those who are on the outside looking in in today’s globalized and changing economy can plausibly claim that it is NAFTA’s fault that those young men playing Fortnite for eleven hours a day do not have shining neighborhoods. If we say that NAFTA hurt their desire to spend time more productively, we must discuss labor dynamism, not accept basement-dwelling and video-game addiction as the logical outcomes to changing economic circumstances. There has been a social deterioration in much of working-class white America—one that is not Wall Street’s fault, not private equity’s fault, not China’s fault, and not Washington, D.C.’s fault.

It is because I care for the plight of families in America, as Tucker no doubt does as well, that I cannot tell the disenfranchised: “Someone did this to you, and someone else will have to make it right.” Pretending that cultural deterioration was merely the byproduct of a disinterested or malignant ruling class is disingenuous and dangerous. Tucker appears to declare illegitimate the suggestion that those who are flourishing in the modern economy, which includes himself and myself, care for those who do not. Yet while it is patently false that
those who are succeeding are always and forever aloof, I appreciate Tucker’s call that decision-makers should focus on expanding opportunity for those who have been left behind.

National Review’s Jim Geraghty wrote in Tucker Carlson’s Populist Cri de Cœur:

On any given weeknight, Tucker Carlson will sit down in front of the cameras at Fox News and say some bizarre or silly things (Beware the Gypsies!) or downright repugnant things, like that poor immigrants “make our own country poorer, and dirtier, and more divided.” But a lot of people are buzzing about Carlson’s opening monologue from Thursday night, a long and winding journey through what troubles the United States of America as 2019 dawns. Our Kyle Smith calls it “galvanizing” and a “populist cry of dissatisfaction that is underlain by certain grave truths.”

Leaders may want those things for us, but we should have no illusion that they can provide those things for us. Dignity, purpose, self-control, independence, and deep relationships have to come from within, and get cultivated and developed by our own actions. Good parents and relatives, teachers and communities can all help cultivate that, but it all starts with the individual — and if the individual isn’t willing to try to cultivate that, no one else can cultivate it for him.

But not all of our conservative elites chose to double down on blaming the masses for the results their own policies had created. Brad Wilcox went to The Atlantic and concluded in What Tucker Carlson Gets Right:

Just as Carlson suggested in his monologue, conservatives need to think more seriously about the role that contemporary capitalism, public policy, and culture have played in eroding the strength and stability of working-class family life. Americans share a collective responsibility for solving some of our most pressing social problems—and elites need to come to acknowledge their personal responsibility for bridging the class divide that has emerged on so many fronts.

This is significant because Wilcox is one of the elites shaping national policy on marriage. In the past he has been (mostly) reliable in blaming men and arguing that what we need is not to discard the new legal and social model of marriage that works only for the elites, but for the working class to become elite so the new model will work for them too. For Wilcox to end up even halfheartedly on the wrong side of the wedge Carlson is driving between conservative elites is very dangerous for the status quo.

This may seem like a tempest in a teapot, and it is certainly possible that it will blow over before it becomes too powerful to disperse. So far the discussion is only whether elite economic policy and cultural mores are driving the destruction of the american family. So far, no one is openly questioning the wisdom of the legal mechanisms we’ve put in place to actually destroy families, or the legal incentives we’ve put in place to encourage women to destroy (or never form) their own families. We replaced marriage with a new central family
model, the child support model, without discussing the wisdom of this change, or even acknowledging that we did so. So far no one, not even Carlson and Wilcox, has had the poor taste to bring this up. But this is the real danger of the discussion. If we are allowed to discuss the responsibility our elites have in destroying the family, and are allowed to proceed with the assumption that public policy should encourage stable marriages, sooner or later we will get around to the eight hundred pound gorilla in the room. Our elites need to shut this conversation down, and they need to shut it down fast. So far they haven’t been able to do so.

On a related note, large corporations are trying to silence Carlson by boycotting his program. As Vox Day notes, we should respond to this by boycotting the corporations who are trying to punish Carlson.

*Correction: the original version of this post incorrectly named David French as the author of the David Bahnsen article Tucker Carlson Is on the Wrong Side of the Crisis of Responsibility.

See Also:

- Why aren’t men responding to economic signals?
- Jim Geraghty on the beauty of the threatpoint.
- Will Wilcox and the men of National Review respect you in the morning?
- America is destroying the Hispanic family.
- Let them become elite.
- Our family policy is designed to terrify married fathers.
- Debtors prisons are an essential tool of our new public policy.
- NY Times Happy Talk About Divorce & Doubling Down
- How we came to embrace illegitimacy.
- Does Shaunti Feldhahn’s rosy divorce data prove that no fault divorce is working out pretty well after all?
- How to close the gender pay gap once and for all.
John Zmirak is mostly right.
by Dalrock | January 10, 2019 | Link

John Zmirak at The Stream writes in Tucker Carlson is Half Right that Carlson is right about the destruction of the family:

Carlson’s central complaint is serious. The family is collapsing in America, except among the upper and upper middle class. Marriage rates, birth rates, you name it — they’re all trending badly. The crisis of single parenthood that Daniel Patrick Moynihan identified in 1965 among black Americans? Working class white Americans now repeat the same pathology, and it’s far, far worse among blacks.

Kudos to Carlson for speaking truth to power.

The End of Fatherhood

As a rule, boys raised without fathers don’t do well. Many end up in prison. Neither do fatherless girls thrive, in fact. Much of the sexual abuse in America stems from stepfathers and transient boyfriends. Girls without stable father figures get pregnant much younger, and often end up trapped in the welfare system.

The decline of marriage is real. And one of the factors is the decline in male income relative to female. Survey after survey shows that women don’t tend to marry men who earn less (or even the same) as they do. Why? Part of it’s surely grounded in that horror, mammalian biology. Women far more than men are willing to sacrifice career advancement to spend time raising their children. Imagine that, giving up valuable hours spent in a cubicle to ensure your children’s safety, happiness, and avoid the lifelong, IQ-dimming effects of dismal daycare.

But if men can’t earn more to take up the slack, will women feel safe doing that? Since they can’t, lower-income men get locked out of the one institution that makes men healthier, happier, more virtuous and productive: marriage.

Instead they sow seed to the wind, producing more fatherless kids primed for social dysfunction. The welfare system, as George Gilder noticed back in the 1970s, has stepped in and replaced male providers. That makes it “safe” for young girls to get pregnant and bear children while still young, unmarried teens.

This conversation is a catastrophe for our conservative elites, who until Carlson upset the balance had clung to the liberal party line that nothing serious was wrong with our new family policy. Compare Zmirak’s assertion that we have a serious problem to the 2014 NY Times article complaining about misguided “hand wringing” regarding the state of marriage. From The Divorce Surge Is Over, but the Myth Lives On

Despite hand-wringing about the institution of marriage, marriages in this country
are stronger today than they have been in a long time. The divorce rate peaked in the 1970s and early 1980s and has been declining for the three decades since.

But it wasn’t just liberals at the NY Times trumpeting the “all is well” message. Conservative Christians were in lock step. The Christian Post declared in *Author Debunks Myths About Divorce Rates, Including of Churchgoers*

Many of the most demoralizing beliefs about marriage, especially when it comes to discouraging statistics commonly passed around, are just not true, says social researcher and best-selling author Shaunti Feldhahn.

“A subconscious sense of futility about marriage is everywhere, as everything we hear says marriage is ‘in trouble,’” states Feldhahn. “And while some of the bad news is accurate (for example, 41% of children are born out of wedlock), many of the most demoralizing beliefs just aren’t true. For example, the notion that half of all marriages end in divorce or that the divorce rate is the same in the church... neither are anywhere close to true.”

Moreover, Feldhan and the Christian Post were merely following in Glenn Stanton’s footsteps in this regard.

Carlson has dramatically changed the very nature of the discussion, from one of condescension for the “hand wringers” who are supposedly misinformed about the real state of the American family, to a conversation about the dire threat the destruction of marriage poses to our social fabric. Under the pre-Carlson regime, conservatives were free to focus on blaming men for not manning up and reaping the wondrous benefits of our new family model. Now we have conservatives openly speaking dangerous truths.

Yet while Zmirak is boldly laying out the problem, his analysis isn’t entirely correct. Zmirak argues that the 1964 Equal Pay Act* is at the root of the problem:

**What Carlson’s Too Smart to Say (But I’m Not)**

Defenders of the free market such as Ben Shapiro and David French have chimed in to criticize Carlson for blaming these phenomena on the free market, and proposing government action. J.D. Vance offered an eloquent, qualified defense. But I don’t think many commentators are cutting to the dark heart of the issue. And for good reason: it’s radioactive.

The problem isn’t a genuinely free market, but the unfree market that now prevails in America. That’s been a problem at least since 1964. That’s when Southern Democrats, trying to kill the Civil Rights Act, added “sex” to “race” discrimination as part of what we were outlawing. But Republicans went ahead and championed the bill, and it passed. Suddenly, private businesses that used to routinely pay more to attract that desirable quantity — a stable, reliable married man with mouths to feed — could no longer do so.
Quite rightly, defenders of the free market opposed laws mandating a “family wage.” But if private businesses, churches, or others concerned about family stability and promoting marriage wanted to offer it, the state wouldn’t prosecute them. And many did offer it. Beyond social concern, many saw the advantage in hiring and keeping “established” fathers of families rather than rootless single men or women.

**Outlawing the American Family**

In 1964, that private market choice became illegal sex discrimination. The explosion of radical feminism, of course, went much further, and effectively declared war on “male privilege,” wherever it existed.

The problem with this claim is that after the law was passed, 17 years went by before women’s wages as a percentage of men’s started to climb. Ironically what the feminist law ended up proving was not that businesses were favoring married men, but that businesses were claiming to favor married men in an altruistic effort to help families but were in fact paying individual men and women based on the value they brought to the table:

![Graph showing US Women's Earnings as a Percentage of Men's Earnings, 1960-2013](http://www.pay-equity.org/info-time.html)

Something clearly did change the balance between men’s and women’s earnings, but whatever happened didn’t start until the early 1980s. Yet the destruction of the family started much earlier:
Divorce rates only show a partial picture. What we’ve seen is a combination of delayed marriage, a decline in the percentage of the population that ever marries, increased divorce rates, and a reduction in remarriage following divorce. Fortunately there is a single metric that captures the impact of all of these changes combined:
This doesn’t mean that Carlson and Zmirak are incorrect in asserting that men’s falling relative wages is an important factor in the destruction of the American family. I’m convinced they are correct in this regard. But it does mean that the Equal Pay Act of 1964* can’t have been what kicked the problem off.

At any rate, the most important thing is the genie is out of the bottle. Our conservative elites will have a very difficult time getting back to the good old days when they could ignore the destruction of the family and pretend that if men would merely put a ring on it everything would be just fine. Like Carlson, Zmirak is bravely telling the truth, and is to be commended for his courage.

H/T Oratorian

*The act was passed in June of 1963 but did not come into effect until 1964.
Is Christian marriage only for elite women?
by Dalrock | January 14, 2019 | Link

Love one another with brotherly affection. **Outdo one another in showing honor.**

–Romans 12:10, ESV

Last week Pastor Michael Foster and I had an excellent exchange in the comments of my post *Unless the men are *Christian*.*

The discussion was around what it takes for Christian young men to gain the respect of older Christian men, as we both agree that this is very important for a Christian man who hopes to attract a Christian wife. Pastor Foster explained that for a Christian man to be respected by other Christian men he needed to prove himself to be exceptional:

In general, men gain status through diligent work. They outwork their peers in efforts and/or wisdom. That is what he meant by, “You’ll get men to respect you by working hard.”

I pointed out that only elite Christian men would be able to marry under this model, since he had also argued that earning the respect of other men was essential to finding a wife. We can’t make the average man extraordinary, we can only improve the average. Pastor Foster responded graciously and said he will consider the issue. This is as much as I would ask for. In the meantime I wanted to explore the question further in a post.

The larger issue is that modern Christian men tend to outdo one another in withholding honor. This isn’t true just for young men looking to marry, it is true for married Christian fathers who *bring their families to church*. This is why Christians have turned a secular holiday dedicated to honoring fathers into a day to dishonor fathers. It is also why the much loved movie *Courageous* modeled discussing our fathers with contempt:

I wonder where all the good fathers went.
Ain’t that the truth?
What? I remember you talking about your dad.
Wasn’t he an usher at your church?
Yeah, but that doesn’t mean anything.
Soon as the church service started, he’d step out back for a smoke.
You know, one time he says to me, “I better not catch you drinking. ”
Had a beer in his hand when he said it.
My mom used to nag him.
That is, till they got divorced.
Look, it’s not like I don’t love the guy, but it’s hard to respect a hypocrite.
What about you, David?
Um...
I had a good dad.
I guess.
I mean, the guy wasn’t perfect. My parents split after he had an affair. But I think he regretted it.

Part of the temptation here is pride, but another part is finding a way to seem traditional without offending our feminist and chivalrous sensibilities. Surely Christian women deserve only the best husbands; they are after all the daughters of the King most high, the pearl of great price. Non exceptional men don’t deserve a wife. This last part is technically true. No man deserves a wife. But we should keep in mind that just like men half of all women are below average, and the vast majority of women are unexceptional. Most women can’t attract an exceptional man. All of those women who are married to the poor excuses for men that we look down on? They are every bit the losers their husbands are! If they had better options they would have taken them. Even if a woman had better options but chose a poor slob for a husband, this generally tells us the woman was gifted with attractiveness but blew it due to being below average in wisdom. Granted there will be a handful of true exceptions, but these aren’t the rule.

So when we look down on unexceptional men as unworthy, we are implicitly looking down on the loser women who can’t do any better. But as Romans 12:10 reminds us, this isn’t a Christian way of looking at things. It also sets marriage up as something only for elite men and women. For if we take the non elite men out of the marriage market, who will their counterpart women marry?

And it isn’t just weddings we are saying unexceptional Christian women should be shut out of. For those who are married, we strongly tend to deny them the hallmarks of Christian marriage. We may be willing to hold our nose and go against chivalry and tell a woman married to an exceptional man to submit to him with fear and reverence, but we draw the line at the wives of those other slobs. This is framed as an act of love for these women, with the implicit claim that God’s design for wives isn’t good. For we would never deprive a Christian man of his obligation to love his wife and wash her in water with the word simply because he couldn’t attract an exceptional wife.

None of this is to say that we shouldn’t challenge fellow Christian men to excellence. It is good for a man to demand excellence of himself and of his brothers (according to their individual capabilities). It is not good to expect men in general to be extraordinary.
What it would look like if the Kendrick brothers made razor blade commercials.
by Dalrock | January 16, 2019 | Link

From Forbes Why Gillette’s New Ad Campaign Is Toxic:

The 1:48 length video starts out with images of remarkably troubled looking men as a narrator makes reference to bullying, sexual harassment, and toxic masculinity. It then poses the question “Is This the Best a Man Can Get.” The viewer then sees depictions of a series of very ugly and negative behaviors, including bullying, fighting, sexual harassment, and blatantly interfering with a woman speaking in the workplace. The ad goes on to state it is time for men to stop making excuses and to renounce the idea that “boys will be boys.” Gillette concludes that by calling for and showing images of men holding other men accountable and emphasizing that the boys of today will be the men of tomorrow.

As the article notes, this comes as Gillette is losing market share to lower cost alternatives. The whole idea of a cash cow is to milk it, but Gillette’s marketing managers prefer to shoot the cash cow for the purpose of virtue signaling.

Derek Ramsey pointed out that this commercial slamming men is an example of Dalrock’s Law of Feminism

“At P&G, we believe that the requisite skills to succeed as leaders in 2018 and beyond include the ability to be empathetic and inclusive. Given the critical role men play in advancing women and in achieving gender equality“

Men are evil. Fix our problems.

It is also an example of the attitude of abundance. The commercial assumes that the vast majority of men are so committed to (SJW) virtue that Gillette can safely denigrate the average man.

Edit: This is hilarious. You may have to open the image to see Gillette’s clueless reply to being trolled.

The #1 comment on YouTube video and @Gillette is clueless…

pic.twitter.com/s3P9mlezMh
— Joe Petri (@JoeyPetri) January 14, 2019

H/T: Dylan Sexton
The Best Women Can Be.
by Dalrock | January 17, 2019 | Link

Related:

- The Duluth model is working as designed; you won’t smart mouth her again.
- What it would look like if the Kendrick brothers made razor blade commercials.

Hat Tip Feministhater.
Worse than a boycott.
by Dalrock | January 18, 2019 | Link

While I think a boycott of Gillette is an excellent idea, there is something that should frighten Gillette’s management team even more. Their brand could become shorthand for SJW weenie. From Roger Kimball’s US Spectator article Trump’s burger fête was a masterpiece:

The president joked that he had thought about having the First and Second Ladies prepare salad, but he knew that the Clemson athletes did not use Gillette products (in about a month no man who is not an interior decorator will) and that they would prefer burgers to tofu and spouts.

It is too early to say if this will catch on, but I saw at least one internet commenter yesterday referring to “the kind of man who shaves with Gillette”. If this does catch on it won’t just lower Gillette sales for a quarter or two; it could very well damage the brand long term.

Edit: Something else I’ve seen making the rounds is ostensibly a Schick ad. It might be a real ad, but it strikes me as much more likely a clever meme. Either way, notice that both men in the “ad” have beards (one partial and one full). Whoever made it obviously thinks the culture believes that real men have beards.

H/T Instapundit.
They see the good in men.
by Dalrock | January 19, 2019 | Link

H/T Elizabeth
DC Larson at American Thinker notes that the creator of the Gillette ad takes a different approach when marketing products to women. Instead of telling them how awful they are (but she hopes they will do better), she urges them to worship themselves:

She’d previously made the bizarre “Viva La Vulva” spot for Swedish feminine hygiene company Libresse. In that surreal ad, objects that included a conch shell, sliced orange, papaya, and coin purse stood in as ersatz female intimate parts. For the ad’s nearly three-minute duration, these items were manipulated as unnatural “singers” of Camille Yarbrough’s “Take Yo Praise.”

If you are in a position to watch a commercial featuring singing vaginas it is worth clicking through for comedic value, especially at 1:17 when the overweight woman looks into her underwear and confirms that she still has a vagina which gives her the self esteem every woman must have.

Note also the difference between this ad and the Egard Watches ad which praises virtues of manhood, not the virtue of having a penis.

See Also: Hail to the V.

H/T Nick Mgtow
Call me unchivalrous.
by Dalrock | January 21, 2019 | Link

After due consideration I have decided to adopt the label unchivalrous Christian. The label is more accurate than anti-feminist Christian, or traditional Christian, because antifeminist and traditional Christians almost always stress chivalry as their strategy for fighting against feminism. Yet chivalry is at the core of the problem and is the crucial enabler of feminism. It is chivalry far more than feminism that has corrupted modern conservative Christianity.

Worst of all nearly all conservative Christians mistakenly believe that unchivalrous Christian is a contradiction in terms, when the reality is that chivalry as we know it is and was created as the antithesis of Christianity. Adopting this term both identifies where my stance radically differs from other conservatives, and invites a much needed discussion on the astounding differences between Christianity and chivalry.

What am I rejecting by rejecting chivalry?

In both Christianity and chivalry we are redeemed and sanctified by love. However, where Christianity teaches that Christ’s love (agape) and sacrifice/suffering is what saves and sanctifies us, chivalry teaches us that romantic love (eros), especially the romantic love of a woman, is what saves and sanctifies us. In Christianity Christ suffered undeservedly on the cross to sanctify us. In chivalry sanctification is achieved by the man suffering undeservedly at the whim of the woman.

Where Christianity teaches that marriage makes sex and sexual desire moral, chivalry originally taught that the only pure expression of sexual passion occurred within adultery. Later this was further twisted to the modern Christian assertion that romantic love sanctifies married sex and this in turn created the logical case for no fault divorce.

Where Christianity teaches that wives are to submit to their own husbands in fear and reverence, chivalry originally taught men to submit to other men’s wives in fear and reverence. Later this was modified to teaching men to submit to their own wives in fear and reverence (AKA servant leadership).

Where Christianity commends raw sexual passion between a husband and his wife, and even uses animal imagery to describe how this should look, chivalry teaches that romantic love is superior to the Bible’s sexual passion because it is focused on emotion.

Where Christianity teaches that sex outside of marriage is sinful and shameful, chivalry teaches that it is more noble than married sex so long as it is sanctified by romantic love. Chivalry also teaches that women’s sexual desires are inherently moral, that a woman’s sexual desire for a man is proof of the man’s virtue, and that a good man will not slut shame.

What about our courtship rituals?

There are also a number of chivalrous courtship customs which are commonly mistaken as being Christian in origin. This includes the custom of men picking a woman to pursue and
boldly declaring their romantic intentions, men giving women gifts and taking them on paid dates, and men kneeling when proposing marriage. Even where these rituals are in themselves morally neutral, like meat sacrificed to idols they carry the risk of leading us back into familiar patterns of sin. As a result, we should be very careful about which of these we choose to embrace and must always be clear that they are not Christian rituals and at best carry no moral significance.

**Does rejecting chivalry mean I have to slam doors in women’s faces and shove past them on the way to the lifeboats?**

Chivalry has so warped our perspective to that of a 12 year old boy seeking grand romantic gestures that many struggle to understand how an adult man should think. The doctrine of Women And Children First (WACF) is a prime example. If you are ever on a sinking ship, your wife needs you to keep her calm and lead her to safety. She doesn’t need you to abandon her and your children to the great unknown so that you can imagine yourself a dashing hero. WACF has only rarely been utilized in practice, and for very good reason. WACF injects chaos into a terrifying, difficult, and dangerous situation. In the few times that it has been used women had to be forcibly thrown into lifeboats in order to get them to abandon the men who protected them, the men that they loved.

What healthy grown men understand is that at times men will have to make very difficult decisions in order to protect others. This is noble, and we should not do anything to disrespect the memory of men who have done this or cheapen what they have done. Yet this is precisely what we do when we romanticize WACF. When the Costa Concordia sank, despite the captain going to great lengths to delay both evacuation and rescue, all but 32 of the 4,252 souls on board survived. 12 year old boys may look at that and imagine that the women and children banded together to overcome the chaos of a cruise ship sinking at night, despite several thousand selfish men who gave no thought to their safety. But grown men know that the only possible way over 99% of the souls survived is if the men on board worked together to keep the women and children calm and get them safely off the ship.

But 12 year old boys, including grown men stunted in the thinking of a 12 year old boy, want more than to save over 99% of the lives involved. They want a grand romantic gesture, the Full Titanic Experience. This requires large numbers of men to die, even if this means more women and children have to die in the process. After Concordia sank, Rich Lowry of *National Review* complained that the rescue of over 4,000 souls was terribly dissatisfying because it lacked chivalric flair, a “grace note”. Where were the grand romantic gestures?*

The Titanic went down, they say, to the strains of the hymn “Nearer, My God, to Thee,” as the band courageously played on. It lent a final grace note to the tragedy. Today, we don’t do grace notes.

Lowry fantasizes that the men on board Concordia were cowards who left the women and children to fend for themselves:

A century ago this spring, as the *Titanic* entered its death throes and all its lifeboats had been launched, Capt. Edward Smith told his crew: “Men, you have done your full duty. You can do no more. Now it’s every man for himself.”...
“Every man for himself” is a phrase associated with the deadly Costa Concordia disaster, but not as a last-minute expedient. It appears to have been the natural order of things...

Guys aboard the Costa Concordia apparently made sure the age of chivalry was good and dead by pushing it over and trampling on it in their heedless rush for the exits. The grounded cruise ship has its heroes, of course, just as the Titanic had its cowards. But the discipline of the Titanic’s crew and the self-enforced chivalric ethic that prevailed among its men largely trumped the natural urge toward panicked self-preservation.

Grown men know this is nonsense. If men (as a group) had done anything of the sort there is no way that over 99% of the souls would have survived a night time shipwreck in cold waters, when the captain of the ship told local rescue teams they weren’t needed and waited until the ship was badly listing to order the launch of the lifeboats.

More Questions and Answers:

- **Q:** Sure chivalry was corrupted in the later part of the twentieth century, but wasn’t the original form pure and good?
  
  **A:** No. From the very beginning chivalry’s teaching on men and women was a parody of Christianity. All of the worst parts of chivalry (as we know it) go back to the twelfth century seminal works, including Lancelot, the Knight of the Cart and De Amore.

- **Q:** Sure the literary genre of chivalry sold sexual perversion from the beginning. But in historical practice in the UK wasn’t chivalry primarily about masculine virtues such as valor, and not obsessing over women’s sexuality or currying favor with women?
  
  **A:** No. The oldest and highest order of chivalry in the UK is the Order of the Garter. The order was established in the mid 1300s, and commemorates the time a woman dropped an undergarment in front of the king and the king graciously returned it to her with a warning to observers not to judge her. This wardrobe malfunction and the king’s response was deemed so important that to this day all British passports have an image of the garter on the cover along with the king’s admonition not to judge.

- **Q:** By “chivalry”, do you mean Song of Roland or Japanese Bushido?
  
  **A:** No. I mean chivalry as we know it, as the term is all but universally used.

- **Q:** Do you reject all virtues that chivalry promotes?
  
  **A:** No. Chivalry claims to promote Christianity even though it is a parody of Christianity. I also don’t reject the virtues of courage, keeping your word, being polite, and protecting the weak.

- **Q:** Why don’t you use the term courtly love instead of chivalry?
  
  **A:** Courtly love is a term academics invented to describe the core teachings of what we call chivalry hundreds of years after the fact, and most people wouldn’t recognize the term. Moreover, what academics call courtly love is what nearly everyone today thinks of as chivalry. Lastly, unchivalrous is an existing term that accurately communicates a rejection of the morality of courtly love.
Q: Is there a problem with men kneeling to propose marriage?
A: This tradition flows from chivalry’s inversion of the role of man and woman in marriage. In this ritual the man kneels (submits) to his lady, replacing and mocking the biblical image of a wife submitting to her husband and calling him lord (1 Pet 3:1-6).

*It is worth noting that the Concordia sank because it ran aground after its captain changed course in order to make a grand romantic gesture, although he denies that it was to impress his lady fair.
Cane Caldo described the difference between white knights and churls in the discussion of *Call me unchivalrous*:

**Proverbs 30:29-31 (ESV)**

29 Three things are stately in their tread;  
four are stately in their stride:  
30 the lion, which is mightiest among beasts  
and does not turn back before any;  
31 the strutting rooster, the he-goat,  
and a king whose army is with him.

Before chivalry, an English king’s army was made up of churls; free men who were called up to fight. Most men were free in this time; perhaps 10% or less were slaves. It is cognate with the names Charles and Carl, which mean manly. I bet they walked like a strutting rooster, or a he-goat. We see bright colors of this idea in our Second Amendment. They have been watered-down as we refuse to give men authority and hold them to account for it, and so trust them less.

... 

I forgot to add above: Now *churl*, which means *man* and is still the root of many of our names (Charles, Carl, etc.) is now used to communicate someone *rude*, or *uncivilized*. To be manly is to be unchivalrous or uncivilized.

Churls can keep Biblical instruction for men and women. Chivalrous men cannot.

**Chivalrous men**

**Churls**

*Edit:* Sharkly warns that Google images included a NSFW image in the results for the second link (searching for “leg cling”). I don’t see the offending image but I suspect our Google settings are different.
I wonder who he has in mind?
by Dalrock | January 24, 2019 | Link

As I’ve noted before Pastor Sam Allberry has pushed for Christian families to give gay Christians like himself trusted access to our children. Via his Living Out Church Audit he and The Gospel Coalition’s (TGC) Tim Keller insist that every Christian church should have gay members. At TGC he also praises a children’s book that normalizes gay marriage and teaches children not to have their guards up (emphasis mine).

Homosexuality is presented through a human lens. Archer encounters homosexuality in the same way the vast majority of us encounter it: through people close to him telling him they’re gay. This is welcome. In our own assessment of human sexuality, and especially in our talking through such things with children, we must keep at the forefront the fact we’re talking about real people. For some Christians, this humanizing of homosexuals may be an important corrective. The two gay characters in the book come across as real, not as stereotypes. They're not activists or pushing an agenda; they're normal people who happen to be gay. (The only stereotyping is with the student from England, who’s inevitably eccentric and posh.)

The goal is to have no more taboos.

But this is all old news. Today’s new news is that Allberry and TGC want Christian “singles” to be encouraged to adopt children:

New video: @SamAllberry explains the urgency not only of adoption and foster care but for churches to come alongside singles who feel called to adopt or foster. #SanctityOfLife pic.twitter.com/equq7ljq5X

— The Gospel Coalition (@TGC) January 20, 2019

So why did TGC choose Pastor Allberry, their frontman for gay Christian activism, to deliver this particular message? If they didn’t mean to suggest that they are pushing for gay singles to adopt children, they failed miserably. Even worse, Allberry is using the same arguments in the video regarding adoption that he makes elsewhere to claim that in order to be faithful to Christ we must invite gay Christians to babysit our kids, take them to and from school, and put them to bed at night.

Keep in mind that gay “singles” is a flexible term. I’ve mentioned the Spiritual Friendship movement before, and Allberry’s site Living Out is a big proponent of the movement. Spiritual Friendship is where gay Christians have a same sex “special friend” that they live with whom
everyone knows is their (non sexual, they swear) life partner. As Allberry’s *Living Out* explains, navigating this special friendship can be tricky. From *Celibate Same Sex Couples* (all emphasis mine):

People want to know: if we stop the sexual side of our relationship, **how far is it OK to go in terms of physical affection for one another? If sex as such is off the agenda, what about stuff that isn’t sex but expresses the love between them, like kissing?** In the terms of the age-old youth group question, how far can you go before it ‘counts’ as sex?

Living Out is on the conservative side of the Christian gay rights movement, so the author explains that gays making out and fondling each other while living together is off the table. But *holy* kissing is fine, as is lots of hugging and non sexual physical affection. Indeed, such a relationship between two gay men (or women) is actually honoring God:

But, and this takes me back to my first point, holding back from sexual intimacy doesn’t spell an end to *physical* intimacy, not for a moment. Our culture finds it hard to distinguish between the two. But there are wonderful ways to be physically close to other people without being sexually close to them. We hug and kiss our friends and relatives in non-sexual ways. We hold hands with children. Some people (especially guys?) love to play fight (my sons love to do this with me – personally, I would prefer to cuddle them, but I have to play fight with them, because it is a way they give and receive physical affection!). None of these things necessarily have anything to do with sex, but they have much to do with physical affection and intimacy – as St Paul puts it, greet one another with a holy kiss (2 Corinthians 13:12). We need both bits of his description – it is a *holy* kiss, and it is a *holy* kiss.

Of course, it may take time and a bit of trial and error for a couple to redefine the boundaries and work out how they can best remain physically close to one another, without crossing the line again into sexual intimacy. But I believe this is worth working at, in order both to **honour God by not crossing that line, and to honour him by sharing healthy physical affection with the people he has given you to and to you.**

Hat Tip: Pulpet & Pen
The chivalric rules of love.

by Dalrock | January 25, 2019 | Link

French poets, in the eleventh century, discovered or invented, or were the first to express, that romantic species of passion which English poets were still writing about in the nineteenth. They effected a change which has left no corner of our ethics, our imagination, or our daily life untouched, and they erected impassable barriers between us and the classical past or the Oriental present. Compared with this revolution the Renaissance is a mere ripple on the surface of literature.

— C.S. Lewis, The Allegory of Love

Harvard University has a page with excerpts from De Amore (1184-86), a poem with a list of rules for what we commonly know as chivalry and what literary scholars call courtly love. The English translation of the title is A Treatise on Courtly Love.

What is the Effect of Love

This is the effect of love: that the true lover can not be corrupted by avarice; love makes an ugly and rude person shine with all beauty, knows how to endow with nobility even one of humble birth, can even lend humility to the proud; he who loves is accustomed humbly to serve others. Oh, what a marvelous thing is love, which makes a man shine with so many virtues and which teaches everyone to abound in good customs. . . .

As C.S. Lewis notes in the opening quote, we can’t imagine a period when romantic love wasn’t thought of as ennobling and sanctifying. As a result, we assume this is a Christian perspective even though it comes from a parody of Christianity invented over a thousand years after Christ. While the concepts have been expanded and tuned over the centuries, much of De Amore is strangely familiar:

The Rules of Love

1. Marriage is no excuse for not loving.
2. He who is not jealous can not love.
   No one can be bound by two loves.
4. Love is always growing or diminishing.
5. It is not good for one lover to take anything against the will of the other.
   6. A male cannot love until he has fully reached puberty.
7. Two years of mourning for a dead lover are prescribed for surviving lovers.
   8. No one should be deprived of love without a valid reason.
9. No one can love who is not driven to do so by the power of love.
   10. Love always departs from the dwelling place of avarice.
11. It is not proper to love one whom one would be ashamed to marry.
12. The true lover never desires the embraces of any save his lover.
13. Love rarely lasts when it is revealed.
14. An easy attainment makes love contemptible; a difficult one makes it more dear.
15. Every lover turns pale in the presence of his beloved.
16. When a lover suddenly has sight of his beloved, his heart beats wildly.
17. A new love expells an old one.
18. Moral integrity alone makes one worthy of love.
19. If love diminishes, it quickly leaves and rarely revives.
20. A lover is always fearful.
21. True jealousy always increases the effects of love.
22. If a lover suspects another, jealousy and the effects of love increase.
23. He who is vexed by the thoughts of love eats little and seldom sleeps.
24. Every action of a lover ends in the thought of his beloved.
25. The true lover believes only that which he thinks will please his beloved.
26. Love can deny nothing to love.
27. A lover can never have enough of the embraces of his beloved.
28. The slightest suspicion incites the lover to suspect the worse of his beloved.
29. He who suffers from an excess of passion is not suited to love.
30. The true lover is continuously obsessed with the image of his beloved.
31. Nothing prevents a woman from being loved by two men, or a man from being loved by two women.

However, in some cases we still hold the rule but with a different meaning. For example:

1. Marriage is no excuse for not loving.

We believe that romantic love is the only moral context for marriage and marital sex. This is sacred to us as a society, and as a result we have made it the foundation of our laws on marriage. But the original meaning was a glorification of adultery, as this “ruling” from De Amore illuminates:

XVII. A Knight was in love with a lady who was already in love with another; he received some hope to be loved in the following manner — that if she was ever deprived of the love of her present lover, then certainly this knight would have her love. After a brief time the lady married her lover. The aforesaid knight then demanded that she grant him the fruit of the hope granted to him, but she refused, saying that she had not lost the love of her lover. In this case the queen answered thus: “We do not dare oppose the decision of the Countess of Champagne, who in her decision decreed that love can exercise no power over husband and wife. Therefore we recommend that the aforesaid women grant the love that she has promised.”

Once we moved our worship of romantic love from adultery into marriage in a misguided effort to tame courtly love, removing the permanence of marriage was a foregone (if unforeseen) conclusion. As C.S. Lewis explains:
...where marriage does not depend upon the free will of the married, any theory which takes love for a noble form of experience must be a theory of adultery.

I must add the caveat that rejecting the idea that romantic love has moral force, that it is sanctifying, doesn’t imply having an aversion to romantic love. To not revere romantic love is not to hate it. We don’t need to eschew romantic love, we just need to stop worshiping it.

Several other rules of love are now articles of faith for modern Christians:

18. Moral integrity alone makes one worthy of love.

20. A lover is always fearful.

As Roger Boase clarifies* the fear in rule 20 only goes in one direction:

...the lover continually fears lest he should, by some misfortune, displease his mistress or cease to be worthy of her; the lover’s position is one of inferiority; even the hardened warrior trembles in his lady’s presence; she, on her part, makes her suitor acutely aware of his insecurity by deliberately acting in a capricious and haughty manner; love is a source of courage and refinement; the lady’s apparent cruelty serves to test her lover’s valour

We’ve rolled rules 18 & 20 together to create a sacred obligation for husbands (servant leaders) to always make their wives happy. This is the foundation of Pastor Doug Wilson’s theology of the aroma of love, and Fred Stoeker & Stephen Arterburn’s theology of the wife’s “soul essence” as her husband’s “master” in Every Man’s Marriage:

What I’m trying to say is that the “master” defines your rights (and remember again that though we refer to your wife as your “master,” it’s our shorthand for the fact that becoming one with her essence is actually your God-given master). Why? Because you’re called to oneness and her essence sets the terms.

... Oneness has terms. Comply with the terms and emotional closeness follows. If you don’t comply, the emotions will die. We need to act right, or more precisely, act righteously. If we do, the feelings will follow.

... Who sets the terms [for our relationship with God]? Christ. More accurately, Christ’s essence. What is Christ’s essence? Holiness.

... Who sets the terms for oneness in marriage? Your wife. More accurately, your wife’s
essence.

Related:

- Call me unchivalrous.
- Fifty shades of Lancelot.

*Summarizing Gaston Paris, the man who coined the term courtly love.*
Barbara Kay at *The Post Millennial* puts her finger on what is so disturbing about the central image of the Gillette ad. The line of worthless men manning their grills symbolizes hard working married fathers. From “Toxic masculinity” in advertising: keeping women scared and men shamed:

For what does a neatly-dressed man standing behind a barbecue signify? Think of every Father’s Day ad you have ever seen. How many of them feature barbecue tools? Maybe 50%? Why? Because when men barbecue, they are usually in a back yard. If men have a back yard, it means they live in a house. If they have a house, they are generally married with children. When men barbecue, they are usually feeding their families and friends and having fun doing it. In other words, barbecue men are deeply invested in family life.

They are, in short, fathers. And what is the easiest way to produce boys who do not understand or respect the boundaries between positive and negative masculinity? Take away their fathers.

...

The barbecue men are the reason most boys with loving fathers grow up to be strong, productive men: men who will never be a threat to anyone—except to bad guys who never learned the boundaries for—or how to positively channel—aggression, because so many of them had no fathers to teach them.

Kay says that after realizing this she finally understood why the ad prompted such a visceral reaction for her. I think she is dead on here. Gillette’s ad isn’t just garden variety misandry, it is an attack aimed primarily at respectable men. I understood that at some level, which you can see from the title of my original post on the ad, but I didn’t put my finger on the meaning of the men grilling. It is the masculine equivalent of women baking apple pies.

It is interesting to see that while Christian culture has been going after married fathers for years both via sermons and films with no complaint, when Gillette crossed that same line secular culture was outraged. I also think it wasn’t a coincidence that the central theme of the movie Courageous was expressed by the Christian men complaining about their fathers while sitting in Adam’s backyard, eating the steaks he had just grilled for them. The symbolism of the barbecue is important enough in Courageous that the scene appears prominently twice in the movie’s trailer. The first time is immediately after the words “Fathers Struggling to Connect”, and the second time is when Adam hands the other men his resolution and announces “I don’t want to be a good enough father.”
Related: How the Kendricks, Rainey, and Lepine see the married fathers they go to church with.
Grill envy
by Dalrock | January 28, 2019 | Link

Since feminists are obsessed with invading all male spaces, it isn’t surprising that men grilling is a source of feminist envy. Back in 2015 Jacob Brogan confessed his manly transgression at Slate:

I’m a feminist. I’m a dude. And I hate that I love to grill.

I hate how much I love to grill. It’s not that I’m inclined to vegetarianism or that I otherwise object to the practice itself. But I’m uncomfortable with the pleasure I take in something so conventionally masculine. Looming over the coals, tongs in hand, I feel estranged from myself, recast in the role of suburban dad. At such moments, I get the sense that I’ve fallen into a societal trap, one that reaffirms gender roles I’ve spent years trying to undo. The whole business feels retrograde, a relic of some earlier, less inclusive era.

Brogan describes finding an old photo of him grilling in grad school. He explains that after looking at the old photo he realized that he fell into the trap every feminist fears of enjoying an act of service for others even though he assured himself at the time that he was only doing it ironically:

Though my eyes are downcast in the image, I’m not sad. Instead, I’m studying the burgers in front of me, and I’m happy.

...

This picture captures so much of what delights me about grilling and so much of what embarrasses me about that delight. On the one hand, there’s the peculiar alchemy of sun and smoke that makes summer days sprawl. On the other hand, it bears the stain of unintentional masculine cliché. Gathered around the coals with beers slung low, we’re all but enacting a myth of the American man, telling a story in postures and poses...

It’s not that I think we’re doing anything consciously sexist. Friends who were there that day remind me that we were actively making light of cookout customs even as we were participating in them. I suspect that everyone in the photograph identifies as a feminist. Yet the three of us look suspiciously like characters in a commercial, one where masculinity itself seems to be for sale.

Brogan isn’t alone in his male feminist angst about men grilling. Mike Power laments at The Guardian that grilling is a way for men to be men and care for others in Why do normal men turn sexist when they get in front of a barbecue?

...the mythology of meat is well marbled with machismo. But, as several thousand years have passed since men had to kill our protein, make a fire, cook it and eat it,
why is barbecuing seen as something women don’t or can’t – or, more accurately, shouldn’t – do? How – and why – do men continue to claim this sacred fire-space as a male-owned sanctuary where women are not permitted?

…it’s time to call time on the blokey barbecue huddle, that sizzling scrum, this grim last resort of acceptable sexism. Women of the world, unite. Burn their aprons, light the flames and cook. And men, drop the Bear Grylls pretensions and make a bloody salad.

Likewise, The Metro asks Why do barbecues bring out our inner sexists?

It’s a siren call from evolution, a chance to pretend to be a cave man, a way of reconnecting with all that manly hunter-gatherer power that gets sacrificed because you spend your days pushing papers around a desk rather than spearing a woolly mammoth.

But it’s a bit of an indulgence of masculinity, isn’t it?

The worst part is that men enjoy their act of service while women are forced to resent their own!

At every barbecue I’ve ever been to, it’s ended with the women clearing the plates, doing the washing up, making the salads, topping up the glasses and keeping the whole operation running, while the man cooks the meat, which is clearly the easier and more enjoyable job.

Obviously it is time for women to mark this last remaining space as feminine. But who will empower women to grill?

Grill Master Christie Vanover Is Empowering Other Women To Grill

The feminist goal of course is not for women to grill for the reason men grill, as a way to serve and nourish their families. The goal is to empower women to grill, so they can empower other women to grill, etc. This is the patriarchy brilliantly keeping feminists out. No matter how hard they try, they can’t do something simple, something effortless for men. They can’t grill with the aim of caring for others. If they can’t have what men have, then they have to tear it all down.

Related:

- It tastes better that way.
- Must a father teach his son to fix things?
- Feminist: Men don’t complain enough when taking over tasks from women.

H/T Keith Waffle
No true Lancelot.
by Dalrock | January 29, 2019 | Link

Glenn Reynolds at Instapundit very kindly linked* to my recent post Call me unchivalrous:

THE RISE OF THE UNCHIVALROUS CHRISTIAN. “From the very beginning chivalry’s teaching on men and women was a parody of Christianity.”

Glenn’s interest in the subject would be well known to his readers. His wife Dr. Helen wrote a book titled Men on Strike a few years back, and it is a common theme for him. Moreover, the single sentence he quoted would remove any doubt.

From the very beginning chivalry’s teaching on men and women was a parody of Christianity.

However, the discussion is predictably filled with readers who are sure Glenn and I are talking about chivalry on the battlefield, and therefore have the whole thing terribly confused. It is very much like any discussion during the cold war regarding the nature of communism. Criticize communism and you would be in for a lengthy dissertation regarding the Soviet Union and China having nothing to do with communism. It was an effective tactic in the short term, but history was not on their side. The same will prove true for what laymen most commonly call chivalry, and what literature professors call courtly love. For the reality of the foolishness of courtly love becomes more obvious with each passing day. White knight is now a pejorative even white knights recoil from, and it will only get worse. Yet in a moment of desperation a white knight might offer in their defense:

Yes, modern white knights are creepy pedestalizers, but the original white knight was Lancelot, a most brave and noble man!

Indeed Lancelot was brave. And indeed he is the archetype for the white knight, as this was the moniker Lancelot went by before he learned his real name. But Lancelot was not noble when it came to women. He creepily obsessed over another man’s wife (Guinevere), and when he famously fought for her honor after she was accused of adultery it was with full knowledge that she was guilty as charged. Look up pathetic white knight and you will find a picture of Lancelot.

Moreover, when people say what we need is more chivalry, 99% of the time they are not talking about fighting duels, holding prisoners for ransom, or going on armed adventures. What they mean is men need to become like Lancelot. Indeed C.S. Lewis made this very point in his essay The Necessity of Chivalry.

The word Chivalry has meant at different times a good many different things—from heavy cavalry to giving a woman a seat in a train. But if we want to understand chivalry as an ideal distinct from other ideals—if we want to isolate that particular conception of the man comme il faut which was the special contribution of the Middle Ages to our culture—we cannot do better than turn to the words
addressed to the greatest of all imaginary knights in Malory’s Morte
D’Arthur. Thou wert the meekest man, says Sir Ector to the dead Launcelot. Thou wert the meekest man that ever ate in hall among ladies; and thou wert the sternest knight to thy mortal foe that ever put spear at rest 1.

Lewis understood that not many men could become like Lancelot, but still, Lancelot is the ideal he was arguing for when he called for a return to chivalry:

…the Middle Ages fixed on the one hope of the world. It may or may not be possible to produce by the thousand men who combine the two sides of Launcelot’s character. But if it is not possible, then all talk of lasting happiness or dignity in human society is pure moonshine.

If we cannot produce Launcelots, humanity falls into two sections—those who can deal in blood and iron but cannot be “meek in hall,” and those who are “meek in hall” but useless in battle—for the third class, who are both brutal in peace and cowardly in war, need not here be discussed.

Lewis concludes the essay with (emphasis mine):

I have tried to show that this old tradition is practical and vital. The ideal embodied in Launcelot is “escapism” in a sense never dreamed of by those who use that word; it offers the only possible escape form a world divided between wolves who do not understand, and sheep who cannot defend, the things which make life desirable. There was, to be sure, a rumour in the last century that wolves would gradually become extinct by some natural process; but that seems to have been an exaggeration.

Related: Wilson, Lewis, and Pseudo-Christian Pedestalization Game

*For a more sympathetic response to Glenn linking to my post see this post by blogger Bill Quick.
What we commonly know as chivalry and what literary scholars call courtly love has two aspects. One is a religious/moral philosophy, and the other is a method of seduction (game). To date I’ve been focusing on the religious/moral side, but today I’ll touch on the game side. On the game side chivalry is all about what Rollo calls negotiating desire (LSFW). From Harvard’s page on De Amore (1184-86):

First Dialogue
A plebian (gentleman) speaks with a woman of the same class.

[Since love is often acquired by fluency in speech, Andreas next provides his readers with a series of sample dialogues, suitable to the various classes — plebian (gentry), noble, and most noble.]

[He greets his lady and praises her beauty; she replies that he is trying to flatter her, since she is not beautiful:]
The woman says: Your words seem to be false, since I do not have a beautiful figure. Yet you extol me as more beautiful than other women.

The man says: The custom of the wise is never to praise their own beauty . . . And if you think yourself not beautiful, then you should consider me a true lover, since your beauty seems to me to be greater than that of all other women; love makes even an ugly woman seem beautiful to her lover. . .

The woman says: Although, your virtue is greatly to be praised, I am young and I shudder at the thought of the embraces of old men.

The man says: Certainly old age is not to be blamed . . . [ he explains that his many years have enabled him to do more noble deeds than would be possible for a young man.]

Third Dialogue
A plebian (gentleman) speaks with a woman of the higher nobility

The man says: If a man of the middle class seeks to join himself in love with a woman of the higher nobility, he ought to have a multitude of good qualities, for in order for a lower-born man to be worthy to seek the love of a higher born woman, he should be filled with inumerable good qualities, and an infinite number of good deeds should extol him. . .
Thus if, after a long period of proof, he is found worthy of love, a woman of the higher nobility may choose a plebian (gentlemen) as her lover. . . 

[A sample dialogue is given; the man begs the lady to accept his service as a lover. The lady says that she is not pleased that he ranks so far beneath her.]

See the rest at the link above.

See Also:

- Why he won’t hear it.
- The chivalric rules of love.
Amazon deplatforms Castalia House from Kindle.
by Dalrock | January 31, 2019 | Link

Update: Amazon has reinstated Castalia House ebooks.

Thank you all for your support. This is not a fight we wanted or sought, and we’re pleased to be able to put it behind us. I’ll be discussing the matter on the Darkstream. And if you want to know what all the fuss was all about, you can now buy *CORROSION: The Corroding Empire, Book One*, at Arkhaven. It’s actually a good SF novel, a lot better than the book it was originally published to parody.

 Readers may recall last year when Christian comic artist Will Caligan was fired after not toeing the transgender line. In response, Vox Day and Castalia House rallied around Caligan and raised funds to get him working again. See my previous posts Help for a Christian brother and Not tired of the winning for details.

Now the SJWs are swarming on Castalia house:

You may have noticed that you can’t find any Castalia House ebooks on Amazon right now. That’s because Amazon shut down our KDP account on the basis of a wildly spurious claim of publishing material to which we do not have the necessary rights. We happen to have some VERY bad news for them on that subject....

The book in question? You guessed it, *Corrosion: The Collapsing Empire* again. This is the second attack on that book this month, as ten days ago, they pulled the book itself down for the sixth or seventh time due to claims that it was “misleading”.

If you are interested in helping out, there are two ways Vox says you can assist (emphasis mine):

Of course, this is precisely why we established the Arkhaven and Catalia Direct stores, because we knew better than to trust Amazon’s assurances that it would keep its SJWs under control. If you want to show support for Castalia and its authors, you can either write to Amazon and complain about this unwarranted action or pick up a print, ebook, or audiobook from one of our direct stores.

This is precisely why it is so important to a) build your own platforms and b) support the alternative platforms. This isn’t just about Castalia House because the same thing can be done overnight to any author or independent publisher who utilizes KDP.

From a followup post by Vox, it sounds like there is internal confusion at Amazon as to what is going on.
I’ve been receiving a number of these exchanges today. Be sure to use the customer service chat so you can catch them lying on the record. Go ahead and email them to us, these exchanges could prove useful if Amazon is inclined to get defensive and stonewall instead of simply rectifying the situation.
Coming soon: Interview with Warhorn Media.
by Dalrock | February 1, 2019 | Link

A few weeks ago Nathan Alberson reached out asking if I would be willing to join his podcast Sound of Sanity for an interview. I declined the request to join the podcast, but offered instead to do an interview via email. Nathan agreed, and we are nearing completion of the interview. I’ve responded to all of Nathan’s original questions as well as his followup questions to date. Once we are done Nathan will create a podcast regarding the exchange and I’ll publish the discussions as a series of posts lightly edited for clarity.

Nathan is the Creative Director of Warhorn Media, a media ministry of Clearnote Church, Bloomington, In. Clearnote Church is Pastor Tim Bayly’s church.

Nathan describes Sound of Sanity as:

...a podcast combining discussion, satire, and storytelling to examine where we are as a culture today and remind Christians we’re the sane ones, not them.

My guess is I will start posting our exchanges either next week or the week after. I doubt the exchange will change many (if any) minds on either side, but at least it will help us better understand where we disagree. I appreciate that Nathan was curious enough to reach out to me and I have enjoyed our exchange. More to follow once we wrap it up.

Update: Click here to see the whole series.
Reader 7817 shared what I believe to be a newsletter from Bnonn and Pastor Foster. Whoever is the author, they mistakenly claim that women are powerless to create patriarchy (emphasis mine):

...a much more serious error is implied in the second—that women have the power to achieve the biblical ideal of patriarchy. **The reason we don’t have patriarchy now, in other words, or the reason the church (not to speak of society) is imploding under feminism, is that women are not submitting. If they would only return to their proper place, patriarchy would be restored.**

This relocates the locus of control from its biblical center in men exercising their innate father-rule on behalf of God, to an ironically feminist-sounding and entirely false center in women’s virtue. It is a functional denial that patriarchy is actually built into creation; that **men are always the ones with the power, even when that power is being bent toward the aims of women.**

In this way, many of those fighting feminism fall into a mirror image of it. Just as genuine gender equality is most useful to feminism when it remains an ideal that is never realized—let alone lived out—the same becomes true for patriarchy under those fighting feminism. Claiming to believe in patriarchy, to paraphrase Paul, they nonetheless deny its power.

This self-contradiction is especially obvious if one suggests that **men need to take responsibility for women submitting to them.** How often will this be glossed as blaming men for women’s faults (which is indeed a common problem in the church among those afraid to criticize women). But holding men accountable to the role God gave them is not equivalent to winking at women’s sins. On the contrary, **calling men to require women’s submission is exactly to hold women accountable to submit!**

Parts of what they argue above are correct. The last bolded part is mostly correct. It is right to expect pastors to teach wives to submit to their husbands, and to exercise church discipline when required. Long time readers of this blog know that I’ve focused probably 10-1 on challenging men vs women in this regard.

But it is false to claim that Christian wives lack the power to create patriarchy in their own marriages. For this is exactly what the Apostle Peter tells wives to do in 1 Pet 3:1-6 (ESV):

> Likewise, wives, be subject to your own husbands, so that even if some do not obey the word, they may be won without a word by the conduct of their wives, 2 when they see your respectful and pure conduct. 3 Do not let your adorning be external—the braiding of hair and the putting on of gold jewelry, or the clothing you
wear— 4 but let your adorning be the hidden person of the heart with the
imperishable beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which in God’s sight is very
precious. 5 For this is how the holy women who hoped in God used to adorn
themselves, by submitting to their own husbands, 6 as Sarah obeyed Abraham,
calling him lord. And you are her children, if you do good and do not fear anything
that is frightening.

Note that what Peter is telling wives to do is take unilateral action and make their husband
their ruler. Peter follows up in 1 Pet 3:7 telling husbands to love their wives, but neither
instruction (to wives or husbands) is conditional upon the other. Peter even specifically states
that Christian wives are to create patriarchy in their own homes even if their husband doesn’t
obey the word. The hope of course is that the wife will win her husband over without a word
through her submission and demonstration of fear and reverence, but this doesn’t change
the fact that Peter is telling wives (like husbands) to take unilateral action*.

And wives aren’t the only women with the power to create patriarchy. In Titus 2 the Apostle
Paul instructs Titus to have older women teach younger women to submit to their husbands
(ESV):

2 But as for you, teach what accords with sound[a] doctrine. 2 Older men are to be
sober-minded, dignified, self-controlled, sound in faith, in love, and in steadfastness.
3 Older women likewise are to be reverent in behavior, not slanderers or slaves to
much wine. They are to teach what is good, 4 and so train the young women
to love their husbands and children, 5 to be self-controlled, pure, working
at home, kind, and submissive to their own husbands, that the word of God
may not be reviled.

This brings us to every complementarian’s favorite biblical fact: neither husbands nor pastors
are instructed to tell wives to submit. This is true but beside the point, because both
husbands (1 Cor 14:35, Eph 5:26) and pastors are instructed to teach the word, and the word
repeatedly tells wives to submit to their husbands. Moreover, the Apostles Peter and Paul
both set examples in their epistles by directly telling wives to submit to their husbands.

Nevertheless, complementarians persist in claiming that husbands especially must not tell
their wives to submit**. This is a fundamental tenet of complementarian theology. When
accused of violating this tenet, Pastor Steve Camp was outraged at the charge:

I’ve never once said in my entire life that a man should tell a woman to submit- ever.

So while Bnonn and Pastor Foster are incorrect in stating that wives don’t have the ability to
create patriarchy in their own marriages, they are right that Christian leaders need to be
rebuked for decades of false teaching on the matter.

*That husbands can do things to make submitting to them easier and wives can do things to
make loving them easier doesn’t change the fact that each is assigned a specific task.
Neither can accomplish (or be responsible for) the other’s task, but it is loving for us to try to
make each other’s burdens lighter as we focus in patience on doing what we are respectively
called to do.
**What could be more unchivalrous?**

**Update:** Cane Caldo has written his own excellent response to the newsletter: *When All Else Fails Read the Instructions*
It is funny to think that if feminism is successful, newspapers will be printing quotes like the one below a hundred years from now (and two hundred, etc). From the Daily Mail Female college football player Toni Harris dreams of being first woman to play in the NFL:

‘Being a role model, it’s an honor, but it’s also a privilege because not every day everybody can stand up and be a role model for other people. And it’s kind of hard. It’s a lot of pressure, but I mean, I’m just paving the way for the next little girl that’s gonna come along and be a role model as well.’

See Also: She’s number one.

H/T Nick Mgtow
Good news about abortion!
by Dalrock | February 6, 2019 | Link

One aspect of the men’s sphere that greatly frustrates traditional conservatives is what they see as an unhealthy negativity about our new model of marriage. While the statistics they use to back this view up are generally dodgy, I have no doubt that their optimism is sincere.

Taking a page from Trad Con optimism, I decided to look for good news on the abortion front. The data I found at Abort 73 is a bit dated, but even so it is exciting. Most of my readers have only been given a “doom and gloom” view of abortion, but the real data is quite pleasing.

For example, Abort 73 takes the pessimistic view that only nine countries have a higher abortion rate than the U.S.

According to the United Nations’ 2013 report, only nine countries in the world have a higher reported abortion rate than the United States. They are: Bulgaria, Cuba, Estonia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Romania, Russia, Sweden, and Ukraine.*

If Abort 73 could learn to look for the positive in U.S. abortions, they would realize that we are doing better than all of the countries listed above! The good news doesn’t end there. You’ve probably been told that while the specific count varies over time, around a million babies are aborted in the US each year. If we were pessimists, we could latch on to a million dead babies and miss the truly encouraging news; most babies aren’t killed in the womb! You’ve probably never seen the positive data, but in 2014 only 19% of all U.S. pregnancies (excluding spontaneous miscarriages) were ended by abortion. If you are a fetus in the US, you have to be excited about those odds! Sure we could do better, but we need not blow the issue out of proportion.

Another fact that abortion doom and gloomers won’t tell you is that depending on the age of the mother, a US fetus’ likelihood of being aborted can be much lower than the overall average of 19%. From the CDC:

FIGURE 2. Percentage of total abortions, abortion rate,* and abortion ratio,† by age group of women who obtained a legal abortion — selected reporting areas,§ United States, 2015
* Number of abortions per 1,000 women aged 15–44 years.
† Number of abortions per 1,000 live births.

Unless your mother is in her “season of singleness” years, your odds of survival are much better than the doomsters will tell you! Other factors can make your odds of escaping the vacuum even better! Did you know that:

- Among white women, 10% of pregnancies currently end in abortion. Among black women, 28% of pregnancies end in abortion (CDC).
- Black women were more than 3.5 times more likely to have an abortion in 2015 than white women (CDC).
- The abortion rate of non-metropolitan women is about half that of women who live in metropolitan counties (NAF).

So don’t be a downer. Sure nearly a million babies were aborted last year, but a much larger number survived, and if a fetus plays their cards right the odds really are in their favor.

**Edit:** Commenter Robin pointed out that the table I originally included with abortion breakdown by women’s age didn’t measure abortions per pregnancy. I substituted Figure 2 from this CDC publication in its place.
Warhorn interview: Who am I and why do I blog?
by Dalrock | February 7, 2019 | Link

For context see this post. You can also see the whole series. Nathan’s comments are in blockquotes and my responses are in normal typeface:

Nathan’s question:

1. Who are you and why do you talk about the things you talk about? How did you get into it? Why do you chose to do it pseudonymously?

I’ll tackle the last part first. Social justice warriors are in the process of consolidating their victory in the culture wars. One of their favorite tactics is to swarm anyone who disagrees with them and try to destroy them personally, since they know they would lose an open debate. I assume this is obvious with all of the examples we have seen, but if you aren’t already familiar with this Brendan Eich and Paige Patterson would be examples you could look into.

I’ve seen arguments that when faced with social justice warrior silencing tactics Christians should either shut up (as nearly all Christians have done) or volunteer for the punishment/harassment SJW swarms stand ready to mete out to dissenters. For example, fellow Christian blogger Bnonn recently tweeted:

1. Don’t be anonymous. The prophets, the apostles, Jesus himself risked a great deal by open discourse. Everyone knew their names. Everyone knew their faces. Have you yet resisted to the point of shedding blood? Don’t be weak. Don’t be a coward. Don’t be anonymous.

— D Bnonn Tennant (@bnonn) January 2, 2019

I disagree. I see writing pseudonymously as a prudent measure to help protect my family from evil. I’ll take it a step further and return the question; do you think it is critical for the sake of the culture war for me to expose my family to SJW assault? I won’t put my family at risk to show Bnonn I’m a “real man”, but if there is a serious argument as to why I should put my family at (greater) risk I’d love to hear it. I’ll add that if you have read my blog you already know that I meticulously link to and quote my sources for what I write, so everything is right there for anyone who is interested to cross check. In fact, I urge you and your listeners to do so.

One of the interesting facets of the discussion is that I challenge other writers to defend what they write. As a general rule, the “other side” responds by refusing to defend their writing and challenging me to defend what others (commenters, etc) write, or explain who I am that I
would ask another to defend their ideas. It could be that there are great rebuttals to what I write, but we won’t ever know until the topic of conversation changes. I’ll go into this in more detail on other questions, but I think this is relevant here.

As for the remainder of the question, I’m a happily married (over 20 years) father of two, and I started blogging because of my passion about marriage. My passion is twofold.

1) I strongly believe that marriage is truly beautiful. Marriage has been under attack for decades, and most conservatives, including conservative Christians are in denial here (more on this in later answers). I grieve for young people who won’t have the opportunity for something so beautiful, something my wife and I enjoy, because previous generations stood by in denial as it was under assault. Even in cases where marriages technically exist, much violence has been deliberately done to transform the reality of marriage away from its beautiful design.

2) Children deserve the benefits of an intact family. Our cultural abandonment of marriage as the primary family structure is causing immeasurable pain to children. I’m astounded by the apathy I experience daily on this topic. Whenever anyone asks me why I care, my first thought is “why don’t you”?

I’ll stop here and let you get a word in edgewise, and if more comes to mind I’ll also add it as a reply.

Nathan’s reply:

I’m not sure what to think about your arguments for remaining pseudonymous. I understand your desire to protect your family and I don’t think there’s anything innately manly about offering yourself or your family for punishment by the mob.

It does trouble me that you are denying your readers the chance to examine your life—what sort of man you are, how you practice what you preach, and what authority you speak from. These are not insignificant question, and they’re not inappropriate to ask. Jesus and the Apostle Paul was never afraid to engage in “ad hominem.” Who a person is does matter. Not just their arguments taken in the abstract. That being said, I’m not sure I disagree with your choice. I just question it. However, I haven’t spent a lot of time thinking it through.

Look forward to your answers to the next questions!
Warhorn interview: Male responsibility and female agency.

by Dalrock | February 8, 2019 | Link

For context see this post. You can also see the whole series.

This is I believe our longest exchange, and I’ll apologize in advance for any difficulty my readers have keeping track of who wrote what. However, I think at the end we got to the meat of the issue. I’ve separated our emails by marking the boundaries between them. Nathan’s comments are in blockquotes. My responses are in normal typeface with quotes that I use to bolster my argument in blockquotes. Where I’m re-quoting Nathan in my response or he is re-quoting me in his response I precede the quote with “@Nathan” and “@Dalrock”.

Unlike the rest of the series, this discussion wasn’t a response to a specific question Nathan asked. Instead it is in response to a comment he made when proposing the interview. I chose to add it to the exchange because it captures what I think is core to our disagreement:

[———————————Begin my email to Nathan———————————]

@Nathan

If I’m not mistaken, you see the work of my pastor and others like him as somehow undercutting the concept of female moral agency. I see your work as needlessly undercutting male responsibility in the name of establishing female moral agency.

The problem is that the most ridiculous things are being claimed as male responsibility in order to deny reality and therefore shirk responsibility. Feminists openly and methodically marched through all of our institutions for decades. Conservative Christians responded to this by simply denying that it was happening. Changing the subject to men, no matter how ridiculous, is the go-to coping mechanism here. This is why we have Pastor Doug Wilson teaching that a Christian husband is responsible for making his wife more physically attractive. Wilson starts by parroting the very feminists he fears confronting:

A common assumption in the world is that women must “keep themselves up” in order to keep a man. In the world of attracting and being attracted, women are taught to view themselves as being primarily responsible for their own attractiveness or loveliness. This viewpoint is inculcated early. Once young girls used to play with baby dolls, seeing themselves in the role of the nurturing mother; now they can be seen playing with Barbie dolls, seeing themselves in the place of the doll. And of course, the doll is both pretty and stacked. The pressure is on and stays on.

But Wilson has a solution to the feminist condemnation of the evil patriarchy. Christian men are shirking their God given responsibility!
The Bible teaches that a Christian husband is responsible for the loveliness of his wife.

I’ll note that this isn’t a dumb comment Wilson made off the cuff. This particular dumb comment is from his book *Reforming Marriage*. I’ll also note that Wilson clarifies that he doesn’t mean this metaphorically:

> When husbands undertake the assigned responsibility of loving their wives in such a way that they grow in loveliness, they need to understand that the results will be visible.

It isn’t just Wilson who makes up this kind of zany stuff to avoid confronting feminism. Feminists, like gays, have been pushing for decades to fully integrate the armed forces, including front line combat and submarines. If conservative Christians were ever going to find the courage to confront the feminists, it would be on this topic. This is at most a secondary issue for the average conservative Christian woman. Very few conservative Christian women want to don combat boots and go to war. Moreover, what these women are doing is the Old Testament definition of *cross dressing.* But still, even here the thought of confronting the rebellion of a handful of butch feminists in the pews was simply too much. So conservative Christians invented a fiction that women weren’t coveting men’s roles, and instead men were forcing women to push their way into combat by shirking their responsibility. Can you imagine historians a few decades from now coming across resolutions like this, or the statements I quote here, here, and here? No one outside the rarefied world of conservative Christians believes this is what is happening. Try telling this to someone on the street; they will laugh at you, and rightly so!

Examples of this are everywhere. One common claim is that feminism is the logical reaction to Christian men shirking their responsibilities. In one sense they are acknowledging feminism, but at the same time they deny what is really happening. The CBMW asked Mary Kassian:

> In practical ways in your marriage relationship, how do you balance gender equality with male headship?

If you aren’t familiar with her Kassian is a Woman’s Studies professor at Southern Baptist Seminary, and was with the CBMW founders when they created the name *complementarian.* Kassian replies explaining that because her husband fulfills his responsibility she doesn’t feel the temptation of feminist rebellion (emphasis mine):

> …the question of male-female equality has not been an issue in my mind. I am secure and confident in who God has made me as a woman. Brent upholds and guards my “equality” so I do not feel the need to do so.

Pastor Matt Chandler makes the same argument in his sermon Women’s Hurdles (transcript). Chandler explains that if a Christian husband fulfills his responsibility to love his wife, she can’t be tempted into feminist rebellion:

> Really, men, here is a great way to gauge how you’re serving, loving, and practicing
your headship. If the most secularized feminist in the world showed up in your home and began to kind of coach your wife toward freedom and liberation from your tyranny, our wives should be so well cared for, so nourished, so sowed into and loved, they would say, “What you’re describing is actually tyranny. I love where I am. I am honored. I am encouraged. My man sacrifices so that I might grow in my gifts. He will oftentimes lay down his own desires in order to serve me more. My husband goes to bed tired at night. He pours into our children. He encourages me. All that comes out of his mouth, sans a couple of little times here and there, is him building me up in love.”

... 

Men, here is a good opportunity. If you’re like, “Well, gosh, I don’t think she would say that at all,” then, men, I think on the way home, you should probably repent and confess before the Lord to your wife.

This stuff is flat out nuts, but no one notices within conservative Christianity because it is so common and it has been going on for so long. I could offer more examples, but instead I’ll pose some questions to you. Do you believe any of the following:

1. The Bible teaches that a Christian husband is responsible for the loveliness of his wife.
2. The reason feminists are pushing to open combat for women is because men are refusing to fight.
3. Women can’t be tempted into feminist rebellion if their husbands love them sufficiently.

The irony of all of this is men really are abdicating their responsibility. These absurd lies are used by cowardly men to avoid manning up and challenging the feminist rebellion. In this sense I hope we are aligned. You want men to man up. I want men to man up. But manning up doesn’t mean cowering in fear while striking a heroic pose. Manning up means doing what is difficult. We are failing Christian women, and women in general. But we aren’t failing them by not making them pretty, or forcing them to insist on taking on the roles of men, or making it possible for them to feel the temptation to sin.

Again I’ll stop here to let you get a word in edgewise.

*For more context of the quotes, see [this post](#).

[-------------Nathan Replied-------------]

To answer your questions:

@Dalrock

1. The Bible teaches that a Christian husband is responsible for the loveliness of his wife.

In one sense, a Christian husband is responsible for everything about his wife. He is her head. This is not mutually exclusive with her being a moral agent fully capable of
making her own choices, and responsible for the ramifications of said choices. Do I think that a husband can magically make his wife more physically attractive by caring for her? No. Do I understand, in a general sort of way, what people who make those claims are getting at—that a loved woman is a lovely woman? Yes. Do I think the rhetoric on that point can be overwrought, even misleading, especially among pansy complementariness like Chandler? 100% yes.

@Dalrock

2. The reason feminists are pushing to open combat for women is because men are refusing to fight.

Again it seems fairly obvious that both things are true. Women are moral agents who are tempted to rebel. And men are moral agents who are tempted to abdicate. Adam abdicates in Genesis 3, and Eve is straight up told by God she will rebel. We can parse the rhetoric or this or that public figure, but any doctrine that denies men’s temptation to abdicate, or women’s temptation to rebel is wrong.

@Dalrock

3. Women can’t be tempted into feminist rebellion if their husbands love them sufficiently.

No. Their husbands must also rule over them and discipline them. And even then, women are moral agents. Some of them will harden their hearts against God. Some of them will fall away from the faith. Some of them will remain submissive and pure-hearted and feminine even if their husbands are jerks who don’t love them at all. There are a lot of women in this world that will do a lot of different things.

But very generally, if a husband loves his wife and rules over her well, she will be less likely to be tempted to rebel, just the same as if a king loves his subjects and rules over them well, they will be less tempted to rebel. That’s just common sense. We can’t throw that out just because many people use that kind of language to deny female moral agency.

[---------------My reply to Nathan-----------------]

@Nathan

@Dalrock

2. The reason feminists are pushing to open combat for women is because men are refusing to fight.
Again it seems fairly obvious that both things are true. Women are moral agents who are tempted to rebel. And men are moral agents who are tempted to abdicate. Adam abdicates in Genesis 3, and Eve is straight up told by God she will rebel. We can parse the rhetoric or this or that public figure, but any doctrine that denies men’s temptation to abdicate, or women’s temptation to rebel is wrong.

I’ll circle back on the other two**, but for now want to probe you on this. I don’t think you understood what I’m saying. Conservative Christians are saying the reason women are pushing to integrate all parts of the armed forces is because men are unwilling to fight. Do you really believe that is what is going on, even though feminists tell us they are doing it to advance feminism? If so, do you feel the same way about gays pushing into the military? Are they doing so because straight men are refusing to fight, regardless of what gay activists tell us? Likewise, are cis men refusing to fight, which led to transgendereds insisting on being admitted into the military? The other day I heard (second hand) about a man making the same excuse for women pushing to be ordained as pastors; a Christian man said they had to, because men were refusing to become pastors.

[**Given the length of the thread I ended up not circling back on those two topics in this part of the discussion.]

[----------------------------------Nathan Replied----------------------------------]

Of course there are rebellious feminist women out there who are pushing for rebellious feminist agendas. When feminists tell me that’s what they’re doing, I believe them. They are culpable, they are wicked, they should be called to repent.

To use the military example, if every lazy man in America repented and said he was willing to work hard in defense of this country, we would still have to contend with rebellious feminist women who want to usurp their bounds.

That said, it seems obvious that these things tend to grow in an environment where men are evading responsibility. To admit that is not to deny the other things.

[----------------------------------My reply to Nathan----------------------------------]

@Nathan:

Of course there are rebellious feminist women out there who are pushing for rebellious feminist agendas. When feminists tell me that’s what they’re doing, I believe them. They are culpable, they are wicked, they should be called to repent.

But they haven’t been called to repent, and won’t be, because complementarians insist on changing the subject to men. This is exactly what has happened and continues to happen on the subject of women pushing into combat. Complementarians form consensus with feminists that men are bad and women should be cherished, and the matter is left there. In theory someone, somewhere will hold women accountable for crossdressing. But never complementarians, and never today. See the PCA resolution on the subject that Pastor Bayly
led. Women rebelled by demanding to take on men’s roles, so the PCA drafted a resolution condemning men for not fulfilling their roles (a lie), and then stressed the importance of cherishing and protecting women (a non sequitur at best). This is cruel to women and girls. Imagine if we did the same thing to boys. Imagine if we responded to [men] cross dressing by declaring that we are appalled that men feel the need to be feminine because women won’t do it, and men deserve more than they currently get from women. This would ironically be more true than the claim for women and the military. But it would still be a lie, and it would be cruel to men and boys who are tempted to sin in the way [crossdressing men] are sinning, because we would be sending the most confusing message imaginable to them in order to avoid offending [crossdressers].

@Nathan:

To use the military example, if every lazy man in America repented and said he was willing to work hard in defense of this country, we would still have to contend with rebellious feminist women who want to usurp their bounds.

This misses the point. You may as well change the statement to:

If every rude man in America covered his mouth when he coughed, we would still have to contend with rebellious feminist women who want to usurp their bounds.

Because one has nothing to do with the other. Even worse, we don’t have a problem with men being unwilling to work hard in the defense of the country. This implies that Christian men like myself and Pastor Bayly who have never joined the military sinned by not having done so. It is a lie.

@Nathan

That said, it seems obvious that these things tend to grow in an environment where men are evading responsibility. To admit that is not to deny the other things.

Of course it is to deny the other things. As I pointed out with multiple links, this is what is being done regarding women in the military. I urge you to go check the sources and see what I mean. Bayly’s PCA resolution blamed men for non existent sins and didn’t confront women’s real sins. The same is true for the examples I provided by John Piper, Joe Carter, Denny Burk and Owen Strachan here. The same is true for the quotes I provided from Doug Phillips’ Vision Forum here. The same is true for the other example I provided by CBMW Executive Director Owen Strachan here. In all of these cases the sin of women demanding to crossdress and usurp the roles of men was not addressed. Making up sins for men absolutely is being used to avoid holding women responsible. If I’m wrong, it should be trivially easy for you to prove it to me since the links are all there. I urge you, please show me where any of these examples state that a woman wanting to go into combat is sinning.

[----------Nathan Replied----------]

I can see that it will take a lot more discussion and shifting through the sources for us to come to any terms on this point. I wouldn’t be surprised if this ends up being
the crux of our discussion, and it may be the crux of our eventual podcast on the subject.

However, it would be helpful to me if we could address the broader spectrum of questions I’ve sent you. And then we can circle back around and dig down as we need to. That would help give me the context I need. As we have the deeper discussions, I want to make sure I understand fully where you’re coming from. Hope that makes sense.

[-------------My reply to Nathan-------------]

I’m fine with that. Hopefully I’ll have more for you shortly.

[I then followed up with:]

FYI,

I just went through these myself to make sure I hadn’t missed anything the first time around. I count ten separate references nested the links I provided above.

1. Pastor Bayly: [PCA report on women in combat](#).
2. John Piper: [Co-ed Combat and Cultural Cowardice](#).
3. John Piper: [More on women in combat](#).
5. Denny Burk: [Women in Combat and the Undoing of Civilization](#).
6. Owen Strachan: [Women Should Not Be in Combat (Says a Female Marine Captain)](#).
7. Owen Strachan: [Women in combat: A complementarian perspective](#).
8. Vision Forum [issues page](#).

I reviewed all of them and they are 10 for 10 in blaming men, and 10 for 10 in avoiding the issue of women’s rebellion. As Dr. Jason K. Allen, President of Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary puts it:

Biblical complementarity is not fundamentally about what opportunities women must forgo, but what responsibilities men must take up.

[--------------End of Exchange--------------]

**Note:** Nathan reiterated at the end of our process that he may be adding further replies in the podcast. Also, in our email exchange I referred to a famous crossdressing man. I’ve changed those references to generic terms given the WordPress rules on “deadnaming”.
Is it a sin to go against God’s command?
by Dalrock | February 10, 2019 | Link

In Sex and the Straw Man—an Exercise in Logic David Gudeman at Brain Legions charges that I relied on straw man arguments in my post Does romantic love sanctify married sex? Gudeman writes:

It would be pretty ridiculous if Bayly said that for a married couple to have sex without romantic love or sexual attraction is sinful, but he didn’t say that. Bayly said sex that is not mutual is not as God designed and commands. It is not at all clear that “mutual” means “with romantic love” or “with sexual attraction”. From context, “mutual” seems to mean that both spouses freely agree to engage in sex; that neither spouse feels forced or coerced.

It is Gudeman who is missing the context though. Pastor Bayly’s claim that:

sex that is not mutual is not sex as God designed and commands it.

came after he wrote (emphasis mine):

I responded: “Sex is a matter of love—not command. If your wife doesn’t want to love you, that’s a fundamental problem unlikely to yield to command without becoming brutish and degraded.

So Bayly was talking about love. This leaves the question what kind of love? Romantic (eros)? Familial? Agape? Keep in mind that Bayly is talking about the wife not feeling love. So perhaps he meant the wife is in violation of Titus 2:4. But if the wife is sinning in this way, why would one sin require that she also commit the sin of defrauding her husband (1 Cor 7:5)?

Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer; and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency.

Pastor Bayly is of course free to clarify this. Perhaps he really meant one sin by a wife demanded that she commit another, but I don’t think that is what he meant. I also don’t think he meant a husband shouldn’t have sex with his wife if she isn’t showing agape love for him.

Given the context, romantic love is the obvious choice. But again, Bayly could easily clear up any misunderstanding, either on his own blog, as a comment at Brain Legions, or in the comments section here.

Gudeman continues:

Also, and just as importantly, there is no talk of sin. Bayly seems to be quite deliberately making a weaker statement that does not imply sin. God’s design and command is for us to enjoy food. If you have to go on a diet that you do not enjoy
This is terrible logic coming from a post that sets out to teach logic. Bayly wrote:

...sex that is not mutual is not sex as God designed and commands it.

If God commands that we have sex a certain way, and we have sex a different way, this would be a sin. A proper food analogy would be if God commanded us to have meat with every meal. Going vegan would be a sin, but dieting would not.

Grudeman continues, switching to my characterization of Milton’s argument:

First, note that word “brutish” which does not appear in the quote by Milton. Second, it would be pretty ridiculous if Milton said that X is the act of animals and therefore sinful. We do all kinds of things that animals do, and not only bodily functions. Animals play, enjoy the company of others, explore, and build homes, so it would be ridiculous to say that since something is an act of animals it is “therefore” sinful, but Milton didn’t say that either. The word “sinful” appears nowhere in the Milton quote, nor does any equivalent word. Like Bayly, Milton seems to be deliberately choosing a weaker way to say “not the best you could do” rather than “sinful”. It is a straw man to strengthen this deliberately weakened statement to something that makes it ridiculous.

I agree that Milton’s argument is ridiculous, but it is still the argument Milton is making. If Grudeman had followed the link I provided when quoting Milton he would have found this out for himself. However, the text/font in the link I provided was somewhat difficult to follow, so perhaps it will help Grudeman if I quote this source instead. I’ll also expand the quote out slightly (emphasis mine):

And although copulation be considered among the ends of marriage, yet the act thereof in a right esteem can no longer be matrimonial, than it is an effect of conjugal love. When love finds itself utterly unmatched, and justly vanishes, nay rather cannot but vanish, the fleshly act indeed may continue, but not holy, not pure, not beseeming the sacred bond of marriage; being at best but an animal excretion, but more truly worse and more ignoble than that mute kindliness among the herds and flocks; in that proceeding as it ought from intellective principles, it participates of nothing rational, but that which the field and the fold equals. For in human actions the soul is the agent, the body in a manner passive. If then the body do out of sensitive force, what the soul complies not with how can man, and not rather something beneath man, be thought the doer?

Note that while “brutish” isn’t included in the quote, this really is what Milton is saying sex without romantic love is.

Next Grudeman follows up with a straw man of his own:

Both quotes he is discussing are about what makes sex good, not what
sanctifies marriage. Bayly cannot reasonably be said to be talking about sanctification at all. Milton could arguably be paraphrased as saying that conjugal love sanctifies sex (not marriage), but that is a very implausible reading. A better reading is that sex without conjugal love is a violation of what is already sanctified.

I didn’t claim that Milton argued that romantic love sanctified marriage. I do however have a guess at why he is confused in this way*. What I wrote was:

The Puritan poet John Milton wrote in *Tetrachordon* (1645) that sex without romantic love in marriage was brutish, the act of animals, and therefore sinful:

Grudeman continues:

But even given Dalrock’s hostile reading—that conjugal love sanctified sex—it is not at all clear that Milton would therefore deny that marriage sanctifies sex because these are not contrary statements.

Again it is Grudeman who is twisting my arguments. I didn’t say Milton denied that marriage sanctified sex. What I said was that Milton argued that romantic love was required to sanctify married sex. Normally I wouldn’t split hairs here, but it is appropriate in this case. Milton is very clearly arguing that married sex without romantic love is brutish, and not befitting Christian marriage. He argues that without romantic love:

the fleshly act indeed may continue, but not holy, not pure, not beseeming the sacred bond of marriage

Note that Milton asserts that without romantic love marital sex is “not holy, not pure”. This is another way of saying that romantic love sanctifies marital sex.

*Milton makes his argument that married sex requires the sanctification of romantic love in the context of a piece he wrote to Parliament urging them to permit an early form of no fault divorce. So Milton’s argument that if romantic love disappears marital sex is no longer sanctified is intended to bolster his argument that once romantic love disappears the marriage is no longer binding.
Fitting for our times, I saw the following Valentines Day cards at a local supermarket:

https://dalrock.wordpress.com/
Dump that zero and get yourself a hero!

I also saw this card, which is a sign of our full acceptance of the Duluth model:

https://dailrock.wordpress.com/
SOMETIMES I WANNA KARATE KICK YOU IN THE FACE, BUT MOST OF THE TIME I LOVE YOU.

https://dalrock.wordpress.com/
How to woo a peasant woman.

by Dalrock | February 11, 2019 | Link

With Valentines Day fast approaching I thought I’d offer a refresher on the manners of chivalry. As before we turn to De Amore (1184-86), a poem with a list of rules for what we commonly know as chivalry and what literary scholars call courtly love. The English translation of the title is A Treatise on Courtly Love.

From the Infogalactic page on De Amore:

Courtly love is reserved for the middle and upper classes in De Amore. Attractive peasant girls are to be shunned or, failing this, “embraced by force”:

If you should, by some chance, fall in love with a peasant woman, be careful to puff her up with lots of praise and then, when you find a convenient opportunity, do not hold back but take your pleasure and embrace her by force. For you can hardly soften their outward inflexibility so far that they will grant you their embraces quietly or permit you to have the solaces you desire unless you first use a little compulsion as a convenient cure for their shyness. We do not say these things, however, because we want to persuade you to love such women, but only so that, if through lack of caution you should be driven to love them, you may know, in brief compass, what to do. (Parry, p. 150, adapted).

In a similar vein, Andreas describes nuns as easy to seduce, although he condemns anyone who does so as a “disgusting animal.” (This caution does not apply to monks or priests.)

The logic here is obvious. Courtly love (what we call chivalry) was created by powerful noblewomen to upend Christian teaching on men, women, and sexual morality. What it does is justify noble women going feral sexually by claiming that women’s sexual desire is virtuous, even sanctifying. That noble women would prefer to maximize their own sexual opportunity while restricting their competition isn’t surprising in the least. I can think of no more effective way for the Countess of Champagne and her clique to keep those common bitches in their place than to declare them open season for noblemen to rape.

What should surprise us is that over 800 years later nearly all modern Christians mistake this for something virtuous, the lens to look through when interpreting Scripture.

See Also: Fifty shades of Lancelot.
Warhorn interview: Define red pill, Game, and MGTOW.
by Dalrock | February 12, 2019 | Link

For context regarding this series see this post. You can also see the whole series.

[———Begin my email to Nathan———]

@Nathan

7. Define red pill, Game, and MGTOW. How do these things relate to your work? Or do they? What do people need to understand about them? What label would you give yourself?

Red pill is a metaphor from The Matrix, and represents a conscious choice to reject lies that we have accepted without even knowing we had accepted them. As you may already know I’m not really a fan of the metaphor. One of the problems with the term is it is applied across divergent perspectives. The 2017 documentary The Red Pill for example represented the Mens Rights Activist (MRA) perspective, which (probably oversimplifying) is a push to make feminists live up to the stated ideals of feminism (true equality). Another group is the MGTOWs (Men Going Their Own Way). From what I’ve seen MGTOWs argue passionately amongst themselves about what this really means, with one of the arguments being if married MGTOWs are true MGTOWs. As the argument goes, who is to tell a man if he really is going his own way? I won’t try to resolve that argument, as I’m not a stakeholder.

The label I would apply to myself is Unchivalrous Christian, and I have a post in the works on this [since published]. Nearly all conservative Christians would I believe consider this a contradiction in terms, and this is the real problem with chivalry. It is a parody of Christianity that was eventually accepted as if it were the real deal. When I first started writing I mistakenly believed that what we call chivalry started off noble and was perverted in or around the 20th century. But the more I have looked at it the more obvious it became that it was perversion from the beginning.

I would define Game as a form of applied psychology, with the primary application being seduction (specifically a man seducing a woman)*. Game is profoundly disruptive because not only are men highly motivated to be sexually successful to satisfy sexual desire, but as a society we equate the ability to attract/seduce women with virtue in men. And it isn’t just secular culture that makes this equation. If anything, Christians are worse in this regard. Women’s arousal is seen as anything from a holy sanctifying force needed to purify marital sex to the very words of God by modern Christians. This near universal belief that women’s sexual desires point to male virtue is rooted in chivalry, which explains why Christians have this bug the worst of all. It also explains why Game is such a threat to our values.

There is another group you didn’t mention that is often called red pill, and that is the pickup artists. Their focus is seduction purely for the sake of sexual success. They are by and large the ones who discovered/developed/spread Game, for obvious reasons. One way to look at it is that chivalry is both a system of moral values and a form of Game (set of tools to seduce
women). In both regards it is false. Pickup artists by and large aren’t interested in the moral question and reject chivalry because it isn’t an effective way to seduce women (it is an attraction killer). If it worked as advertised, they would happily employ it. My rejection of chivalry on the other hand is focused on the fact that it is a parody of Christianity, a false religion. I would reject it even if it did work.

*The one true definition of Game is a matter of enduring passionate disagreement in the men’s sphere, along with whether it works, and if it works, whether it can be learned/taught.

I’ll stop here for now. I’ve kept this high level without quotes or links, but I’m sure you will have questions and/or challenges. I don’t want to try to anticipate them all and overwhelm you with unrequested details/evidence/clarification.

[----------Nathan Replied----------]

Is Game good or bad or just an observation of how things work, whether we want them to work that way or not? How is it connected to biblical ethics, if at all?

[----------My Reply to Nathan----------]

Game is knowledge, but potentially dangerous knowledge. So it depends on who you are and how/why you are using it. As I noted above, the serious practitioners and teachers of Game are using it for “pickup”, so the moral problem there is obvious. And there is also the problem of temptation, not unlike meat sacrificed to idols.

But Game also has value within marriage, especially since we have decided that romantic love is the place for sex and marriage, instead of marriage being the place for sex and romantic love. I can cite many more examples, but consider the movie Fireproof. The scene that sets up the conflict is when Caleb makes a fist and warns the man his wife is starting an affair with that he is going to fight him for his wife’s heart. This conflict persists until Catherine finally realizes she (romantically) loves Caleb, and not the doctor. In the movie her romantic love suddenly returned because Caleb had submitted to her in all things and outspent the doctor on items she wanted for her mother (winning her over without a word). Game teaches what the Love Dare sets out to teach; how to generate romantic love from your wife. If you think that romantic love is a good thing in marriage (which I do), then a husband using Game can certainly use it for good.

I don’t write a lot about Game itself, but I have written a number of posts exploring the morality of Game within marriage. I’m probably missing some but these are at least a start:

1. She felt unloved.
2. Headship Game.
3. Radio Silence and Dread.
4. Slow your roll
5. Is fear of women the beginning of wisdom?

One thing I think we need to be very careful of is not to try to create a theology of Game
This would be replicating what we did with chivalry. The Bible doesn’t tell us to Game our wives, just like it doesn’t tell us to buy them flowers and propose on one knee or speak their love language. The Bible also needs to be the lens we view Game through, not the other way around. If we are clear on that, however, Game can make it easier to stop rejecting what the Bible plainly tells us. We reject the bulk of what the NT teaches us about men, women, and marriage because it offends our primary religion (chivalry). If Game helps us recognize the error of worshiping chivalry then it is beneficial, but we shouldn’t then make the same mistake and confuse Game for Christianity. Wives should submit to their husbands in fear and reverence not because it generates “tingles” (sexual attraction), but because this is what the Bible tells us. Husbands should see themselves as the head not because this makes them sexy, but because it is what the Bible tells us. And if someone outright rejects Game but chooses to follow biblical teaching on marriage anyway, they are doing the right thing for the right reason and any disagreement on Game is akin to two Christians disagreeing about the proper way to forecast the weather.

--- Nathan Replied ---

My elves and me will have to read the links for further elucidation, but I don’t think I have further questions on the topic just yet.

--- My Reply to Nathan ---

Ha! My apologies for burdening your elves with what must feel like a homework assignment. This is a very important subject, and I have tried to treat it with the care it deserves. If it helps, you can just skim the first one, skip #3 and only read the first half of #4. #2 and 5 are probably most relevant, but #1 covers my own experience so I think it will be of interest as well.

--- Nathan Replied ---

Cool, that’s helpful. 1 sounds interesting to me ...

--- My Reply to Nathan ---

One thing I want to add regarding Game is that while I generally agree with Heartiste’s definition of Alpha/Beta, etc., (language warning) I disagree with the common acceptance that Alpha is good and Beta is bad. Heartiste may mock Betas (especially lesser Betas) for being sexual losers, but he understands what nearly all moderns fail to grasp; being sexy isn’t a sign of virtue in a man. Betas are careful and loyal and this makes them boring and less sexy than exciting badboys. Marriage is fundamentally Beta, it is a public and legal declaration of “oneitis”. I write this as perhaps the men’s sphere’s only self identified Beta.

I am seeing Christians outside the men’s sphere use the term Alpha to represent good husbands, and Betas to represent losers. This is an anti marriage perspective. The allure here is that for decades conservative Christians have responded to feminist rebellion by declaring that if men were good enough, women wouldn’t be tempted to rebel. The implied solution is
that we can create an elite squad of crack husbands who will be so irresistible that their wives won’t rebel. This has a number of glaring problems. One is that if we say only elite men are fit for Christian marriage, we are saying the same for women. The other is that the way you create a crack squad of anything is by ruthlessly cutting out the men who can’t hack it. How do you weed out the loser husbands who somehow made it into the program of Christian marriage? You wash them out via the divorce courts. And in fact this is exactly what we have embraced, without so much as a “sorry, sucks to be you” to the children who will thereby grow up without their father in the home.
For context regarding this series see this post. You can also see the whole series.

4. What does a man need to do to live a satisfying and productive life in today’s culture?
5. What does a woman need to do to live a satisfying and productive life in today’s culture?
6. How do these answers relate to God and the Bible?

I’ll also share some thoughts related to your previous question:

What are the problems facing men today?

Answering questions 4 and 5 would take the wisdom of Solomon, which I don’t possess. What we have in the temporal world is vanity compared to the eternal, and yet we should live our lives under the sun with wisdom. Luckily I do have access to Solomon’s wisdom on the subject along with the rest of the Bible.

With the exception of a few men with the gift the Apostle Paul describes in 1 Cor 7, God’s plan is for men to marry. Ecclesiastes tells us to rejoice in our work, our food, our drink, and our wives, as these are our portion in this world (Ecc 9:9, ESV):

Enjoy life with the wife whom you love, all the days of your vain life that he has given you under the sun, because that is your portion in life and in your toil at which you toil under the sun.

God’s plan for us hasn’t changed just because we have decided that Christian marriage should only be for the elite. However, there is a common perspective of Christian married men today towards unmarried men which I reject, and it goes something like: “If I had to marry then you should have to marry too!” I think this is precisely backwards. I see marriage not as a punishment or burden, but as something truly wonderful. I understand that I’ve been profoundly fortunate, but I still see it as a gift from God, not a curse*. I want marriage for men not because I object to men remaining single, but because for a Christian man eschewing marriage means foregoing sex, romantic love, and children—for life.

When you think about it that way, what we’ve done to marriage is unconscionable. We took a gift from God, something profoundly beautiful, and mangled it to suit our own perverse tastes. In the process we’ve ground up innocent men, women, and children. Think of the magnitude of the evil that our current and recent generations have done. We inherited a
flawed implementation of Christian marriage, where marriage for life was by far the norm and was the recognized family model. We rejected that model and replaced it with the child support model (keeping legal marriage around as a purely ceremonial relic). If our consciences weren’t so thoroughly seared we would be like King Josia in 2 Kings 22:11-13 (ESV):

11 When the king heard the words of the Book of the Law, he tore his clothes. 12 And the king commanded Hilkiah the priest, and Ahikam the son of Shaphan, and Achbor the son of Micaiah, and Shaphan the secretary, and Asaiah the king’s servant, saying, 13 “Go, inquire of the Lord for me, and for the people, and for all Judah, concerning the words of this book that has been found. For great is the wrath of the Lord that is kindled against us, because our fathers have not obeyed the words of this book, to do according to all that is written concerning us.”

We’ve weaponized marriage as a tool for women to steal from men. The goals are to both facilitate sexual liberation & single motherhood and to provide a threatpoint to dis-empower husbands (destroy headship) within marriage. Economists Stevenson and Wolfers describe the threatpoint of divorce in their paper *Bargaining in the Shadow of the Law: Divorce Laws and Family Distress* (emphasis mine).

In the literature on the economics of the family there has been growing consensus on the need to take *bargaining and distribution within marriage* seriously. Such models of the family rely on a threat point to determine distribution within the household. The switch to a unilateral divorce regime redistributes power in a marriage, giving power to the person who wants out, and reducing the power previously held by the partner interested in preserving the marriage.

But while the goals are feminist goals and the intent is to merely destroy respectable men, the changes are unintentionally cruel to women as well. Offering women cash and prizes to betray their marriage vows is cruelty to them, not kindness. This isn’t just true spiritually. It is true temporally too. All of the women married to loser husbands married the best man they could attract for marriage. The idea that women can (generally) find a better husband once they are older, have a history of divorce, and another man’s children is absurd on the face of it. Real life isn’t like the movies.

The other thing that we’ve done is labor to remove a path to respectability for men. Our culture has a deep seated contempt for married fathers, and Christian culture outdoes secular culture in this regard. This is why Christian movies so regularly express contempt for married men and (especially) married fathers. It is also why Christians have taken a day secular culture set aside to honor fathers and have instead made it into a day to denigrate fathers. The feeble defense for things like the ritual of tearing into fathers in Father’s Day sermons is that the goal is to make terrible fathers better. The lie of this is proven by the lengths Christian films like *Courageous* go to show that faithful hard working churchgoing fathers are failing miserably. Society is telling young men that married fathers are either villains or buffoons, and modern Christians are all too eager to reinforce this message. Imagine a young man who watches the Christian movie *Mom’s Night Out*. What kind of man
does he want to be? Does he want to be the sexy badboy biker tattoo artist, or the married Christian fathers?

Ironically, the very people we claim to be helping by making a habit of denigrating married fathers are the ones we are harming most. Wives with good husbands can most easily overcome the temptation we dangle to not respect and submit to them. Likewise for children of good fathers. It is the wives and children of marginal and failing fathers who will be most susceptible to the temptation we gleefully and consistently put in front of them.

For women specifically, just as with men I believe that marriage is the blessing God intends for nearly all. One of the cruel things we do to women in this regard is discourage them from seeking a husband when they are young and most attractive. We fear that if they marry young they might submit to their husband. So we urge them to delay marriage while pretending we aren’t sending them out for an extended ride on the cock carousel**. Not only does this make it harder for them to be satisfied later in life in Christian marriage, but it makes it harder for women to understand what their “marriage market value” (MMV) is. In the past when the bulk of women married around the same age, women could much more easily understand what their real options for marriage were. When the clear goal is marriage, women compete for signs of commitment from men who (generally speaking) have good qualities for marriage. This means the AF/BB (sex with alphas, marry a beta) strategy isn’t in play, so the marriage minded woman has access to much more information as her peers start to make their selections. Now we have delayed marriage for women so that AF/BB is the predominant strategy, and we have also greatly spread out the process. This both confuses marriage minded women and greatly dilutes the information they have available.

*I don’t think Paul is contradicting this in 1 Cor 7:6-9. I think he is saying that he views his gift as a different kind of blessing.

**The term is vulgar but it expresses a vulgar truth that no other term quite captures.

[----------Nathan Replied----------]

Thanks for continuing to work through my questions. You do a great job of thoroughly articulating your viewpoint. And thank you for providing links for further reading—I’ve followed more than one of them. I don’t think I have many follow-up questions on this particular email. The brunt of our response of course will come in the podcast, so right now I’m just trying to get a clear picture of what you believe.

[----------My Reply to Nathan----------]

Here are a couple of old posts that show the cruelty of selling women divorce:

- She lost her best friend
- Her husband was her best friend
Revolving door chivalry.

by Dalrock | February 14, 2019 | Link

The Daily Mail has a post up for Valentines Day titled The new rules of chivalry: From who pays the bill to paying compliments etiquette expert William Hanson reveals the dos and don’ts for the confused modern man (and woman).

The goal is to update chivalry “with women earning more or less the same as men and same sex and trans couples”. As funny as that idea is, the chivalry it described from the past was hilarious (emphasis mine):

The classic chivalrous act was a man holding open a door for a woman so she didn’t have to break a sweat.

This was especially true in Victorian England when a couple arrived at an hotel with revolving push-doors, the man would enter first but go round twice to push the door round completely for the lady, and so she emerged into the room first.

Slightly less ridiculous was the ritual of men standing up whenever a woman arrived or left:

Traditionally, date or no date, when a woman left the dining table to freshen up, any men immediately around her would stand up or slightly rise from their chairs to acknowledge her departure – and then do the same when she returned.

But it was the comments that had the most humorous description of modern day chivalry. Commenter Amensis described how her boyfriend opens the car door for her so she can drive him wherever they are going:

Most of this is simple courtesy. I do like that my guy still opens my car door after 2 years. I misinterpreted it the first time and laughed “What, you think you’re driving?” (I take my driving and my cars seriously, lol.) So now, he holds the door open and jokes saying he thought he was driving.

She went on to explain that her current boyfriend is so special, she lets him pay. Before she changed lanes, she never allowed the men she was “dating” to do this beyond the initial date:

Funny thing is...I just told him this weekend...when I was “dating”, I would allow a guy to pay for the first date, but anything after that I would insist on paying or splitting. Letting a guy pay feels like he thinks there’s a “relationship”. I told my guy he should feel special that I’ve allowed him to pay my way on things (I pay for him at times). Weird, but I guess it’s a trust thing, or that I am comfortable with being “his” and he should feel special that I’ve selected him. I’m sure I’ll get blasted for that, but I’m an adult. I pay my own way through life, mortgage, cars, children, etc. I’m proud and I don’t need anyone’s money. He knows that.
I wonder if she saved any other special treats just for him?
Why bother identifying the reason the gate was erected?

by Dalrock | February 15, 2019 | Link

The whole modern world has divided itself into Conservatives and Progressives. The business of Progressives is to go on making mistakes. The business of Conservatives is to prevent mistakes from being corrected.

-G. K. Chesterton

Commenter seventiesjason wrote:

as for this Chivalry thing Dalrock is stuck on........I never knew a medieval code that was for warfare somehow in 1324 or whatever ruined marriage in 2019. I still fail to see the connection

There is a famous G. K. Chesterton quote where he warns of the danger of removing laws or customs that we don’t understand the purpose of:

In the matter of reforming things, as distinct from deforming them, there is one plain and simple principle; a principle which will probably be called a paradox. There exists in such a case a certain institution or law; let us say, for the sake of simplicity, a fence or gate erected across a road. The more modern type of reformer goes gaily up to it and says, “I don’t see the use of this; let us clear it away.” To which the more intelligent type of reformer will do well to answer: “If you don’t see the use of it, I certainly won’t let you clear it away. Go away and think. Then, when you can come back and tell me that you do see the use of it, I may allow you to destroy it.”[1]

In the case of chivalry*, we now know why and when a host of related anti Christian concepts have been adopted as if they were Christianity. Chivalry is the answer to:

1. Why Christians instinctively invert the roles of husband and wife.
2. Why Christians believe that romantic love is sanctifying, and that women’s sexual desire is both virtuous and points to male virtue.
3. Why Christians see no fault divorce and other sins by wives as God’s plan to improve men.
4. Why Christian men are extremely uncomfortable with the idea of calling out women’s sins.
5. Why Christians believe that men must boldly declare their romantic intentions at the beginning of the “Christian” courtship ritual, and why once married we are told that Christian men must pursue their wives.

We only need Scripture to see that bullets 1-4 are contrary to Christianity, and bullet 5 doesn’t come from Christianity. But without understanding the root of these false teachings it is more difficult to convince our fellow Christians to reject them. This is especially true since
these are conservative errors, and what Chesterton is describing in the gate quote above is a core aspect of the conservative thought process.

*Chivalry as commonly used refers to what academics call courtly love. When I use the term chivalry in this post I’m referring to the common usage.

See also: Call me unchivalrous.
Warhorn interview: Have you stopped beating your wife?

by Dalrock | February 15, 2019 | Link

For context regarding this series see this post. You can also see the whole series. We are now down to the final two questions. I’ve separated my final response into two parts, one (this post) for question 8, and another (already sent and coming soon in post form) for question 9. However, for context I’m including both questions here as well as Nathan’s note about the questions:

8. I’ve seen more than one commenter in your archives say that a woman needs a good old fashioned spanking (or words to that effect). I see in your “comments policy” you ask people to refrain from discussing marital corporal punishment. I have several questions about that. First (just to get it out of the way): do you or any of your more serious followers support marital corporal punishment? Why or why not?

9. Related to question 8, does work like yours attract misogynists? Why or why not? If so, is there anything that can be done to avoid it? If not, is there something an outsider like me isn’t understanding about the people that it does attract? Is it fair for me to ask the spanking question and the misogyny questions right next to each other? Are my biases making me see misogyny (for example, in the wife spanking crowd) where I should see something else? If so, what am I (and others like me) missing?

I hope those questions (particularly 8 and 9) don’t seem leading. I’d like to sincerely understand and present your point of view, even where our camp diverges.

Below is my answer to question 8. Nathan didn’t ask any followup questions and aside from some corrections of errors in the original text I only sent the one message.

[-----------------Begin my email to Nathan-----------------]

@Nathan

8. I’ve seen more than one commenter in your archives say that a woman needs a good old fashioned spanking (or words to that effect). I see in your “comments policy” you ask people to refrain from discussing marital corporal punishment. I have several questions about that. First (just to get it out of the way): do you or any of your more serious followers support marital corporal punishment? Why or why not?

I don’t support marital corporal punishment. I don’t think it is needed, and I also don’t see it as consistent with the instructions to husbands in the NT. I’m not sure exactly who my “serious followers” are, but I think the vast majority of my readers would be horrified if you told them they had an obligation to practice marital corporal punishment.
I added the comment rule because while the number of commenters who brought up the topic was small, when they did so it tended to derail all other discussion. This makes it both off topic and highly disruptive. Also, if I were going to troll the Christian men’s sphere this is exactly how I would troll it. It would be a twofer, as it would fit the stereotype and also be disruptive.

I don’t recall the specific comments you are referring to, but I do recall someone posting links to scenes from old John Wayne movies where the Duke spanked women. I don’t think they meant it as a how-to video, but more of an example of how radically cultural views of a husband’s authority had changed. In this regard, I don’t think the movies were advocating spanking, but using an outrageous scene to make a humorous point.

Along the same lines, I did include a youtube clip of “Lone Ranger, Man of the house” in a post a few months back. In that video a husband draws his gun and shoots his wife’s favorite china when she gives him sass. Then when she isn’t responding to his order to make him dinner, he pulls his gun again and tells her she’s going to look mighty funny without any ears. One of my readers (MKT) brought the clip to my attention, describing it as “one of the finest moments in TV history”:

It’s one of the finest moments in TV history, and would make everyone from radical feminists to self-proclaimed conservative complimentarians hysterical if they saw it.
If you can’t watch the whole thing, just watch the first minute and last 2-3 minutes.

I don’t share MKT’s enthusiasm for the clip, but I don’t think he is advocating gunplay as a form of headship. My reader in turn had come across the clip on another Christian man’s blog. The blogger described it as a fond memory from his childhood:

On this privileged occasion, I recall taking in an episode of The Lone Ranger. The theme of this particular show was about that time when there was this mousy little man, hen-pecked to the outer limits of human endurance, and through a series of circumstances, the Lone Ranger adopted this poor man and made him something of a protégé. The end result of this crash course in masculinity was that the little man headed on home, and the happy ending to the whole saga was him pulling out his revolver and shooting his wife’s dishes off her shelves. It makes me happy just thinking about it. Fade to black, and with her thinking something along the lines of finally!

I don’t think the other Christian blogger really advocates gunplay as headship, either. However, if my opinion on the matter isn’t sufficient you could ask him. His name is Pastor Doug Wilson.

Like I said, I don’t think Wilson advocates gunplay, and he has stated that he doesn’t advocate marital corporal punishment. However, one reader we have in common does seem to advocate it, and I think Wilson’s presentation of marriage as a military unit helped lead my reader to that conclusion. Commenter Warthog wrote in response to my criticism of Wilson:

@Dalrock you’ve stated the problem, but not the solution. What sanctions do husbands biblically have when their wives rebel?
When children or slaves rebel, the head of the house clearly has the biblical sanction of the rod. Non-destructive spanking/beating. Does the patriarch’s power of the rod also apply to his wife? If not, why not?

Not defending Wilson here, but you have failed to comprehend what he meant in the military analogy. There is a difference between being at fault and being responsible. To take the example of a ship captain, the USS Stark was hit by an Iraqi missile in 1986 or so. Due to a mistake by the gunnery sergeant, the Phalanx missile defense system had not been turned back on after the last maintenance. Due to this error, the ship was defenseless against the missile, resulting as I recall in the deaths of about 17 men.

The captain was held responsible, as was the gunnery sergeant. It ended both of their careers. The captain was indeed responsible, even though it was the gunnery sergeant’s fault. Simply said, when you have command you are responsible for both the good and bad that happens under your command.

In marriage this would mean that if the wife starts misbehaving, the husband is responsible for the marriage, and should take corrective action on the wife. If the misbehavior metastasizes it is usually because it wasn’t nipped in the bud, just like cancer.

Wilson’s problem is not his recognition that the husband is responsible for the ship of the family. The problem is that Wilson does not acknowledge that the husband has sanctions over the wife for disobedience. Without sanctions you are not a covenant head. All covenants have sanctions.

A man who is held responsible, but has no power to make the people under his headship obey should walk away from that job.

I disagree with Warthog’s conclusion but there is something to his logic. If husbands are to be measured as if they were military leaders, then should they not practice military discipline? As I wrote in response to Warthog’s comment, A naval captain’s mission is different than the mission of a Christian husband and father. Likewise the husband’s role is different than the role of a military commander. Part of the problem here comes from our twisting what Scripture teaches. Scripture doesn’t tell husbands they must lead, it tells wives to submit and declares that the husband is the head. But if the husband is in charge, we reason (properly in my opinion) that the husband must have some obligation to lead. So far, so good, but then we take that and run it backwards, erroneously declaring “If the husband leads well, the wife will submit”. Therefore a wife who is in rebellion is proof that a husband didn’t do enough to make her comply. And if the husband is responsible for making his wife comply, then you can see where some would start seriously considering corporal punishment.

But like I stated, I don’t think the husband is responsible for making his wife comply. There is another bit here that gets at the insincerity of the complementarian position. The same folks who claim the husband is responsible if his wife does something wrong also are adamant that husbands must never tell their wives to submit. This is especially strange because husbands
are to wash their wives with the water of the word, but here we are telling husbands they are forbidden from telling their wives what Scripture plainly says. For example, in Wilson’s 21 Theses on Submission in Marriage thesis 11 is:

| The Bible does not teach husbands to enforce the requirement that was given to their wives. Since true submission is a matter of the heart, rendered by grace through faith, a husband does not have the capacity to make this happen. His first task is therefore to love his wife as Christ loved the church. He is to lead by example. |

This is a complementarian article of faith, and you will get the same basic message from Mary Kassian and Kathy Keller. My personal favorite however is Pastor Camp:

| I’ve never once said in my entire life that a man should tell a woman to submit- ever. |

We don’t need marital corporal punishment, we need to take away the tools the church and state have put in place to weaken the position of husbands (divorce, etc). We also need to stop blaming men for women’s sins because we are too uncomfortable holding women accountable.

**Note:** This takes us back to the ten examples I provided in the other thread of conservative Christians blaming men for women pushing to take over men’s roles.
This is the final post in the series. For context regarding this series see this post. You can also see the whole series.

[Begin my email to Nathan]

@Nathan

9. Related to question 8, does work like yours attract misogynists? Why or why not? If so, is there anything that can be done to avoid it? If not, is there something an outsider like me isn’t understanding about the people that it does attract? Is it fair for me to ask the spanking question and the misogyny questions right next to each other? Are my biases making me see misogyny (for example, in the wife spanking crowd) where I should see something else? If so, what am I (and others like me) missing?

I think this primarily breaks down to two things:

1) “Normal” for conservative Christian culture is to pedestalize, really to idolize, women. This ties back to chivalry, which is why this is worse in conservative Christian culture than even feminist Christian culture. When “normal” is idolizing women, anything short of that will seem like misogyny. I’ll use two books as examples, but keep in mind the books themselves aren’t what is telling, it is the reaction by conservative Christian culture that is telling.

The authors of *Every Man’s Battle* wrote a follow on book on marriage titled *Every Man’s Marriage*. The thesis of the book is that a man’s wife is his “master”:

What I’m trying to say is that the “master” defines your rights (and remember again that though we refer to your wife as your “master,” it’s our shorthand for the fact that becoming one with her essence is actually your God-given master). Why? Because you’re called to oneness and her essence sets the terms.

The whole book is shot through with ridiculous quotes like that. See my series on the book for more examples. Outside of conservative Christian culture people would laugh at such tripe. But check out the Amazon.com reviews. Conservative Christians *love* this stuff.

Another book (and set of Amazon reviews) to consider is Wendy Griffith’s *You Are a Prize to be Won! Don’t Settle for Less Than God’s Best*. Griffith is in her mid 50s and is so entitled/picky she has yet to meet a man who is worthy of marrying her! This should make her a cautionary tale to young Christian women not to be overly proud. But in conservative Christian culture Griffith’s massive entitlement makes her a role model. Griffith explains to young women that as entitled as she was, God wanted her to be *more entitled*:
...I heard the unmistakable voice of the Lord in my spirit. He whispered so clearly to me, Wendy, you are a prize to be won!

I knew the Lord’s voice, and I knew that He was speaking to me about my value. I didn’t need to be the one pursuing in a relationship or running around like a chicken with my head cut off, looking for love in all the wrong places. God has my man, and that man is going to recognize me as his prize! And the same goes for you.

Unfortunately, I have had to learn this lesson the hard way.

Pearl of Great Price

Ladies, the Lord wants you to know that you are a pearl of great price, a treasure worth pursuing and protecting. You are worth fighting for...

I don’t know if you saw the hilarious bit of trolling of feminist academia by a group that submitted the most absurd feminist papers they could dream up to academic journals. My personal favorite is their assertion that feminist interpretive dance would improve the study of Astronomy, but others prefer their paper about rape culture among dogs. The thing is, nothing is too absurd for academic feminists, and the journals couldn’t tell the hoax papers were satire because that is what real feminist submissions look like. If I were going to troll conservative Christianity, I’d write books like the two I just mentioned. I’d say headship means you are your wife’s slave and that the pearl of great price was not salvation, but women, and I’d present the advice on finding a husband as coming from a woman in her 50s who never managed to find a husband. But these folks beat me to it. How could I possibly make a parody more absurd than the real thing?

So just like anything short of the craziest things you can imagine feels like misogyny to feminists, the same is true (with a different flavor) for conservative Christians. The thing is, while lying to women makes both the liar and the women feel good, it is still cruel to women. Christian women have heard this message their whole lives, and many don’t know it isn’t true. Who really hates women, the men who offend them by telling the truth, or the men who remain silent while women are being lied to?

2) With that said, there is another aspect to this. Since pedestalization is so deeply rooted in our culture, learning that women sin too is very painful for many men. Upon learning that chivalry is a lie, many men initially react with what I call red pill bitterness. Most men either reject the truth outright or make it to the other side with an appreciation for women as they really are. But some men get stuck in the bitterness phase. It is like the “red pill” gets lodged in their throat; they neither fully swallow or spit it out. They see the truth (or at least part of it), but they hate it and therefore hate women for the fact that it is true. Christian former blogger Samson’s Jawbone described his own feelings in this regard:

Roissy is fond of saying that he’s not a “misogynist”; no, learning the unvarnished truth about female psychology has given him a *higher* appreciation for women. Not so for me. Sociosexual philosophy has disillusioned me beyond all reckoning. Peering
deep into the psyche of woman has rendered me grievously scornful in feeling and mercilessly unscrupulous in behaviour towards these unholy, ungodly beings. I venture to say that... I hate them. Yes, I hate them! And how could I not?

Not surprisingly Samson eventually left the men’s sphere. In general there is a good deal of patience for men who are working their way through this stage, but if a man gets stuck here and wallows in it eventually that patience runs out. As commenter Leap of Beta put it:

Samson doesn’t seem like he ever stopped grieving for the old him. He’s still stuck on himself and seems to think that he deserves better treatment from women, and seems to forget that God made women the way they are. He simply doesn’t seem to accept that on an emotional level even if he acts upon it on a rational level. So he goes through life acting on the facts, but never seeing the beauty of how women function when they follow the path God gave them.

Then he blames the manosphere for his unhappiness instead of just owning it. We’re degenerates. We’re cynical. We’re angry. Blah. Blah. Blah. We’re individual men in various states of grieving, acceptance, learning, growing, and teaching. You’ll get from the manosphere what you go looking for as well as what you put in. Samson has found what he’s wanted.

[--------------------------Nathan Replied--------------------------]

Interesting. I’ll have some follow-up questions, but I’ll let you answer question 8 first, and then we can hit a few things in more depth as needed.

[--------------------------End of Exchange--------------------------]

**Note:** Nathan reiterated at the end of our process that he may be adding further replies in the podcast. Also, I answered this question (question 9) before question 8, which is why Nathan notes that he will wait for that answer before asking any follow up questions on this one.
A real life example of the power of a Christian wife.
by Dalrock | February 21, 2019 | Link

Following up from my post two weeks ago on the power of Christian women, here is an example from commenter Carlotta. Carlotta shared this story back in March of 2016:

What about women with unbelieving spouses? I was one. I read my Bible and prayed and lived my faith. Took 18 years and he is saved. I would even ask him questions. I showed him in the Bible that I had to ask him and asked him to please help me. He did. It wasn’t until I stopped listening to all women preachers, going to Bible studies and just followed Yahweh that he even took me serious. Masculine men are not interested in watching their wives follow other people. Yahweh knows what he is about. I lived my faith, I took my questions to him and put him in charge. He took it seriously and it became a match between him and the Holy one instead of him and me or him and my Teacher.

Some would no doubt differ with her understanding of 1 Corinthians 14:35 applying to a non believing husband (ESV):

If there is anything they desire to learn, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church.

But none could deny the beauty and awesome power of her obedience to 1 Pet 3:1-6 (ESV):

3 Likewise, wives, be subject to your own husbands, so that even if some do not obey the word, they may be won without a word by the conduct of their wives, 2 when they see your respectful and pure conduct. 3 Do not let your adorning be external—the braiding of hair and the putting on of gold jewelry, or the clothing you wear— 4 but let your adorning be the hidden person of the heart with the imperishable beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which in God’s sight is very precious. 5 For this is how the holy women who hoped in God used to adorn themselves, by submitting to their own husbands, 6 as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord. And you are her children, if you do good and do not fear anything that is frightening.

However, following the instructions of Scripture is terribly unsatisfying from the modern Christian perspective. Wives winning their husbands over via submission lacks feminist moxie. Moreover, it doesn’t fit the modern conservative Christian model either. In the conservative model the desired process is to declare oneself the only real man in the room and invite Christian wives to order their husbands to attend the latest iteration of Christian Man Up Academy, where the real men can teach the clueless bastards everything they need to know.

See Also:

- God’s Drill Instructors (language warning)
• The biblical case for women teaching women.
A change of focus?
by Dalrock | February 22, 2019 | Link

After five movies in a row denigrating husbands and fathers*, it looks like the upcoming Kendrick brother’s movie might have a different focus. It is still in post production but there is a trailer:

From The Christian Post in August of 2018:

COLUMBUS, Ga. — The Kendrick Brothers wrapped up filming their new movie “Overcomer” last week and the faith-based drama will feature strong female lead characters played by Priscilla Shirer and Shari Rigby.

*Fireproof, Courageous, Mom’s Night Out, War Room, and Like Arrows. The Kendrick brothers didn’t create Mom’s Night Out, but Alex Kendrick played the role of Pastor Ray.
Warhorn responds.
by Dalrock | February 26, 2019 | Link

Note: For context regarding the Warhorn interview see this post. You can also see the whole series.

Nathan sent me a note this morning letting me know the podcast response is up. The podcast is titled Into The Manosphere:

[Our heroes ventured into the manosphere and maybe went a little too far down the rabbit hole.]

Here is the link Nathan provided, but from the link I posted above you can see his posting of the whole exchange*. I haven’t listened to the podcast yet, but from Nathan’s mail and the description of the podcast it appears Warhorn has decided to avoid trying to respond to my arguments and instead point and shriek about me, my readers, and the men’s sphere in general. This is unfortunate, but not entirely unforeseen. Since their arguments are indefensible their two options were to concede or change the subject.

Logic isn’t a strong point at Warhorn, and as you may recall when blogger David Gudeman at Brain Legions saw Pastor Bayly’s arguments on marital sex and romantic love he originally thought I had created a straw man. This was an understandable first take, as Bayly’s argument is so bad it it hard to imagine that he would make it. After I wrote a post proving that I had correctly stated Bayly’s argument, Gudeman replied:

[Thank you for the reply, Dalrock. I will have to read it more carefully to see if I can improve my logic on the issue.]

That was on February 10th. I originally thought Gudeman might respond further, but since over two weeks have passed without further response I now read it as a concession. Moreover, Bayly’s response to the whole thing has been the blogging equivalent to lawyering up and taking the 5th. Despite having his own media organization, Bayly’s only response has been to thank Gudeman for serving as his defense.

I may write a followup post after listening to the podcast.

Update: Commenter EL quoted a comment Nathan made on the discussion of the podcast. Nathan closed his comment with:

[To be perfectly clear, however: Dalrock is bad news and we recommend you stay away from him. We seriously considered canning this episode because it might inspire a greater interest in Dalrockian writing and philosophy. If it does, frankly I’ll be sorry we did it.]

I can think of no more thorough concession that they have no logical response to my arguments. On the flip side, I strongly encourage my readers to listen to not only the podcast
linked above, but to their regular podcasts and the discussions of each one.

*I asked Nathan to make a correction regarding which reader had shared the Lone Ranger, and he has since made the correction.
Nathan Alberson of Warhorn Media has made some surprising claims in the discussion of his podcast. When I responded to his description of the podcast with disappointment that he had chosen to avoid focusing on ideas and instead point and shriek, Nathan accused me of doing exactly what he expected me to do:

One of his readers asked why he made this charge, and asked if there was further history he should know of. I’m not sure if Nathan’s next comment was in direct response to that question or not, but Nathan then claimed that we never set out to have a back and forth discussion via email:

What Nathan is saying here simply isn’t true. Nathan approached me via a comment on the
blog some time around the second week of January, explaining that he was with Warhorn Media, the site that Pastory Bayly is on. He wanted to know how to contact me. On January 12th I sent him the following email titled “What can I do for you?”:

Dal Rock [redacted]
Jan 12, 2019, 11:12 PM

to nathanalberson
Hi Nathan,

I received your message. What can I do for you?

Best Regards,

Dalrock

Nathan replied:

Nathan Alberson [redacted]
Jan 14, 2019, 12:02 PM

to me
Hi,

We’re putting together an episode of our podcast Sound of Sanity on Red Pill, Game, MGTOW, all that good stuff. I wanted to see if you would consent to a phone interview sometime in the near future. I’d like to get as clear an articulation of your views as I can, and present it to the world. The questions would be quite simple (I prefer simple questions that allow for more elaborate answers, as needed):

1. Who are you and why do you talk about the things you talk about?
2. What are the problems facing men today?
3. How do you address these problems on your website and in your writing?
4. What does a man need to do to live a satisfying and productive life in today’s culture?
5. What does a woman need to do to live a satisfying and productive life in today’s culture?
6. How do these answers relate to God and the Bible?
7. Define red pill. Define game. Define MGTOW. How do these things relate to your work?

Full disclosure: as you probably know, we don’t agree on everything. If I’m not mistaken, you see the work of my pastor and others like him as somehow undercutting the concept of female moral agency. I see your work as needlessly undercutting male responsibility in the name of establishing female moral agency.
The podcast may ultimately reflect these differences, but I’d like to give you a fair chance to say your piece. This won’t be “gotcha journalism.” Actually, in that spirit, I’ll warn you about the potential “gotchas” right now:

I would like to press you a bit on the misogynists that work like yours seems to attract. I’ve seen more than one commenter in your archives say that a woman needs a good old fashioned spanking. I see in your “comments policy” you ask people to refrain from discussing marital corporal punishment. It seems to me that if you have to ask people to refrain from that topic, you may be attracting the wrong sort of people. I’d like to ask you frankly about that and let you answer however you choose.

I hope that sounds amenable to you.

Thanks,

Nathan

I declined Nathan’s offer, and suggested that Rollo might be interested, and also suggested that I might answer his questions in writing. Here is my full reply to Nathan:

Dal Rock [redacted]
Mon, Jan 14, 3:00 PM

to Nathan

Hi Nathan,

I very much appreciate the spirit that you are engaging with. I will decline, because podcast isn’t my medium. Rollo Tomassi has been asking me to do the same for some time now. Incidentally, he might be open to a joint podcast with you.

With that said, your questions are good. I’m not sure I will have answers that do all of them justice, but if you are interested we might still cover the same material in a written format. If you are interested let me know. We could keep it very simple and I could respond to your questions and comments in your email in a post.

Nathan replied:

Nathan Alberson [redacted]
Mon, Jan 14, 7:58 PM

to me

Yes, I would very much appreciate a response to my questions in written form, in an email or a post or however you see fit. As I said, we will be using them in a podcast.

I’ve expanded the questions a bit since this will be the brunt of our exchange.
Thanks in advance!

1. Who are you and why do you talk about the things you talk about? How did you get into it? Why do you chose to do it pseudonymously? (I assume Dal Rock is a pseudonym; if I’m being presumptuous there please forgive me.)

2. What are the problems facing men today?

3. How do you address these problems on your website and in your writing?

4. What does a man need to do to live a satisfying and productive life in today’s culture?

5. What does a woman need to do to live a satisfying and productive life in today’s culture?

6. How do these answers relate to God and the Bible?

7. Define red pill, game, and MGTOW. How do these things relate to your work? Or do they? What do people need to understand about them? What label would you give yourself?

8. I’ve seen more than one commenter in your archives say that a woman needs a good old fashioned spanking (or words to that effect). I see in your “comments policy” you ask people to refrain from discussing marital corporal punishment. I have several questions about that. First (just to get it out of the way): do you or any of your more serious followers support marital corporal punishment? Why or why not?

9. Related to question 8, does work like yours attract misogynists? Why or why not? If so, is there anything that can be done to avoid it? If not, is there something an outsider like me isn’t understanding about the people that it does attract? Is it fair for me to ask the spanking question and the misogyny questions right next to each other? Are my biases making me see misogyny (for example, in the wife spanking crowd) where I should see something else? If so, what am I (and others like me) missing?

I hope those questions (particularly 8 and 9) don’t seem leading. I’d like to sincerely understand and present your point of view, even where our camp diverges.

Cordially,

Nathan

I responded proposing that we have a discussion via email which I would then turn into a series of posts and he could use for his podcast. This would be more work for me than simply writing a series of posts, but I offered it because I believed that part of what Nathan wanted for the podcast was to have a back and forth exchange.
Dal Rock [redacted]
Jan 15, 2019, 11:34 AM
to Nathan

Yes, I would very much appreciate a response to my questions in written form, in an email or a post or however you see fit. As I said, we will be using them in a podcast.

Let's at least start via email, and if we find it takes too much time we can reconsider and I'll respond to any remaining items in post form. But this way we get some of the back and forth that I think you are looking for. This should give you good content for your podcast, and I'll find a way to format/edit it suitable for a blog post (or posts). Larry Kummer and I did something similar back in November, although we only considered sharing the discussion once we were already knee deep.

I'll grab a question or two at a time and send you a separate email on each. This way we can parallel process the discussion and it should make it (somewhat) less difficult to track by topic. I'll probably be inconsistent in the timing of my responses due to my schedule, etc. but I'm ok with that (for you as well) so long as you are.

Nathan accepted my proposal:

Nathan Alberson [redacted]
Tue, Jan 15, 11:42 AM
to me
Sounds great. I look forward to your responses. You have my questions, so you can get us started. Thanks again!

As you can see, when Nathan claims we never set out to have a back and forth exchange, this isn't true. I proposed exactly that, and he accepted my proposal. It was only part way into the process that Nathan started pushing back on offering responses, first asking to delay his responses, and eventually stating that he would save all responses for the podcast. If I had known this upfront I would still have answered his questions, but I would have saved a great deal of time by simply writing my responses as posts.

This morning Nathan sent me the following message advising me that the podcast was now up:

Nathan Alberson

7:29 AM (11 hours ago)
to me
Our podcast came out today: https://simplecast.com/s/793c8cb6

It’s brutal, as you’ll see. But after much thought and prayer, we decided what you’re doing is not just misguided but harmful, and we wanted to inoculate people against it.

I hope you don’t think yourself ill-used. I did ask the questions in good faith, despite what your followers say about me. And then we took a long time to weigh our options and craft a response.

And I hope you consider seriously what we say in the podcast. I hope you stop or radically change your method of operation. I hope you really are the considerate and thoughtful man you present yourself as.

I have my doubts, for the reasons enumerated in the podcast. And because your followers are thoroughly nasty people. The way they treated me in the comments was without charity, dignity, or kindness. Yes, I’m generalizing. And no, I’m not personally offended. But I do want you to see that, no matter how reasonably you present yourself, a man like me is not going to take you seriously. Not with a rabble like that validating you.

So consider this a personal exhortation: drop the pseudonym, and place yourself under the authority of men who can discipline what you write and help you discipline your followers. That or get out of the business altogether.

Your followers who validate you are are not really loving you.

I am.

Sincerely,

Nathan

For the record I never expected the podcast to be friendly to my ideas. I also didn’t expect to win Nathan, Bayly, and the others over in the exchange, although I did my best to answer as persuasively as I could. But I did expect Nathan to honor the original agreement of a back and forth exchange of ideas via email. When he backed out of that mid process I continued and tried to frame it as kindly in my posts as I could, but I was disappointed. I wasn’t going to make an issue out of it, but now that Nathan is stating we never set out to have such an exchange I want to clarify that it is not true. I also expected Nathan to do as he originally promised:

I’d like to get as clear an articulation of your views as I can, and present it to the world.

...
The podcast may ultimately reflect these differences, but I’d like to give you a fair chance to say your piece. This won’t be “gotcha journalism.”

...

I’d like to sincerely understand and present your point of view, even where our camp diverges.
Why Warhorn Media’s duplicity matters.
by Dalrock | February 28, 2019 | Link

Larry Kummer asked me a question in an email exchange that I want to discuss as a stand alone post:

Reading your last post, I don’t understand your objection. They posted your content in full, and gave a comprehensive reply. That fulfills the agreement. It presented your most thoughtful work to a new audience.

As many commenters said, expecting a useful exchange was (to be kind) wishful thinking.

You could make this a back and forth by giving a response, which I strongly urge you to do.

Since there is little substantive content to their reply, it should be easy to write. Listening to their podcast is the difficult part.

They do make some points requiring a reply.

I wanted to focus on substance from the beginning, but they changed the subject to character. So be it. Warhorn is on untenable ground here. As I shared yesterday, back in January Nathan approached me claiming Warhorn wanted their audience to understand my perspective, even if we disagreed:

I’d like to get as clear an articulation of your views as I can, and present it to the world.

... The podcast may ultimately reflect these differences, but I’d like to give you a fair chance to say your piece. This won’t be “gotcha journalism.”

... I’d like to sincerely understand and present your point of view, even where our camp diverges.

Now Nathan writes that this was never their intent:

To be perfectly clear, however: Dalrock is bad news and we recommend you stay away from him. We seriously considered canning this episode because it might inspire a greater interest in Dalrockian writing and philosophy. If it does, frankly I’ll be sorry we did it.
He then reiterated the point:

We didn’t want to get too far into the weeds of Dalrock’s philosophy. To do that was to risk validating a dishonest and uncharitable man.

Even worse, in his final private email to me Nathan wrapped himself in Christianity as he went back on his word, matching the worst stereotype of the sanctimonious Christian hypocrite:

It’s brutal, as you’ll see. But after much thought and prayer, we decided what you’re doing is not just misguided but harmful, and we wanted to inoculate people against it.

I hope you don’t think yourself ill-used. I did ask the questions in good faith, despite what your followers say about me. And then we took a long time to weigh our options and craft a response.

... Your followers who validate you are not really loving you.

I am.

I don’t feel that I owe Warhorn any further substantive discussion on the issue. I might decide that I really want to address something for the sake of my readers, but this would be elective on my part*. I took quite a bit of my time to write thoughtful answers to Warhorn’s questions, but Warhorn was never interested in the substance. They wanted to make it an issue about character, yet from their own words they never acted in good faith! I’m not crying about it, but I will shine a light on Warhorn’s duplicity.

Keep in mind that Warhorn isn’t just another blog, it is a ministry of Pastor Tim Bayly’s Clearnote Church. Here is how Nathan described his position at Warhorn Media when I asked:

I’m the creative director of Warhorn Media, a media ministry of Clearnote Church, Bloomington, In.

Moreover, Pastor Tim Bayly claims he had no idea the men who work for him were engaged in this duplicitous enterprise, as they evidently did it without his approval or knowledge. But bizarrely, instead of apologizing to me and my readers for how terribly his ministry behaved, he is angry with me for what his underlings have done behind his back:

After putting up three posts and a tweet about Nadia Bolz-Weber and Glorian Steinem, I come to Sanity to see if there are any questions directed to me and find this thread. Which leads me to go to the podcast itself and read the stuff between Nathan and Mr. Anonymous Dalrock. Let me say here that I never knew Mr. Anonymous would be addressed, let alone interviewed on Warhorn, and when I found out I was not pleased. This for a number of reasons I won’t go into here, but not in one iota because I think Mr. Anonymous is right or has drawn blood with his
critique of me or what I’ve written. I like good back-and-forth, but not ever anonymously—particularly when for fifteen years I have suffered much for the Name of the Lord Jesus and His Words and know how privileged I am for doing so and how much strength it lends to the work to which all believers are called.

But just a couple comments about Mr. Anonymous’s arguments, such as they are. Reports of a General Assembly are all written with an eye to getting the majority to sign on. That Mr. Anonymous is ignorant of this is excusable, but now he knows and needs to stop repeating himself that the report is worded and argued by Tim Bayly. I was its principle author, and I wrote in such a way to win the majority of the committee and to give the report the greatest possibility of being approved, some or all, by the Assembly. Which they did and they did.

That said, at the same time as I was writing, a student at IU decided to go into the Navy as an officer responsible for nuclear reactors. I loved her and told her she should not do so. We’re still friends and she’s always known I think she was not obeying God in this. Full stop.

This is just one of many, many examples of my fulfilling my responsibility as husband, father, and pastor to say “no” to women, and rebuke them. That Mr. Anonymous spreads his false accusations otherwise is disgusting to me. False charge after false charge after false charge. Long ago I decided not to answer him, and then I find out Warhorn is providing him a platform, so now I’m having to do what I determined wasn’t worthwhile, or even right.

One last thing: for fifteen years I’ve been online saying that the only thing the feminists have given men is the right to cry, and Jesus already gave us this right. For fifteen years I’ve also been saying that feminists’ chief gift to women has been removing any moral agency from them, most especially their moral agency in the slaughter of their unborn children. Look at my Warhorn posts the past three days alone and see if it isn’t true that Mr. Anonymous bears false witness against me and us. Look at my tweet yesterday about the stories of unborn children being “ripped apart” by their mothers. Does that sound like a man who denies women moral agency and places all the blame on men?

Ridiculous.

Between Nathan’s spiteful underhanded behavior and Bayly’s claim of oblivion, this paints a picture of Warhorn Media as a ministry out of control. But I would remind Bayly that it was his ministry that approached me with a proposal to help Warhorn’s audience understand my views. That his men acted behind his back, and were duplicitous in the process is not my fault. Someone is responsible for Warhorn, but it isn’t me. When Bayly learned his team was out of control and dragging the Warhorn name through the mud, he should have apologized to me and my readers for their duplicity. Perhaps he still will, but after I shared the email exchanges I had with Nathan last night, Warhorn tweeted today advertising the podcast:
This makes it look like either Pastor Bayly is still oblivious, or he approves of what the men of Warhorn did behind his back. I’m not sure which would be worse.

With that in mind, looking through my own comments and the (now locked) comments at Warhorn, I want to address what seems to be Bayly’s and Warhorn’s core complaint:

Their chief complaint with this regard is my discussion of the PCA resolution in the exchange Male responsibility and female agency. What Nathan is saying is he (and presumably the other “elves”) objected to what I wrote in the discussion, but kept it to themselves for over a month so they could complain about me being disingenuous in the podcast. The whole benefit of an email exchange is that you can call each other out if you feel like the other side is missing something or misrepresenting something. As I demonstrated yesterday, I proposed an email exchange to Nathan and he accepted the proposal. This was one of our first exchanges, and at this point Nathan hadn’t started backing out of the deal. Warhorn manufactured a crisis so they could exploit it a month later. They were disingenuous so they could accuse me of being disingenuous.

But this still leaves the question. What if the Warhorn media ministry wasn’t disingenuous and Nathan had raised this concern when I was prodding him for responses to this very argument? What if instead of manufacturing offense, Nathan had challenged me during our discussion with the argument Warhorn moderator Ben Sulser challenged commenter Nereus:
Then I would have had the opportunity to respond pointing out that while the resolution quotes Calvin and a heathen poet disapproving of women dressing as men, it very carefully does not tell women they are sinning if they become warriors. This in fact is what commenter Nereus went on to do quite well (comment, first link, second link):
In his comment Joseph Bayly expands the same argument, that if you delve deeply into the document you will find that there is some commentary against women joining the military. However, this is discussion of what the authors of the resolution didn't agree on. Nereus quoted the final recommendation presented to the assembly, and we can see the same thing from this section from the larger document as well:

**AREAS OF AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT**

The dearth of men ready to serve their country in defense of their wives and children is a concern shared by our entire committee. Further, we rejoice that the Holy Spirit brought us to consensus in these statements:
The history of the Church’s views on women serving in the military reveals that the Church has stood opposed; this was never a significant issue because warfare was a male duty.[10]

***

By eating the fruit, Adam betrayed his duty to protect his wife, the race, and all creation. ...By calling the woman a weaker vessel, Scripture indicates that there is a greater vulnerability attendant to womanhood, and calls upon her husband to be considerate of this fact. This vulnerability of the woman and the duty of the man are further confirmed by Scripture’s command that a husband serve and lay down his life for his wife. (We) have come to unanimous agreement that women ought not to be conscripted. [11]

Still, our Committee remains divided over whether the Word of God speaks with clarity concerning the meaning and purpose of sexuality as it bears on the normal practice of women serving in military combat roles. Thus our consensus report states:

We confess that, while we also are unanimous in stating that the above doctrine of sexuality gives guidance to the Church concerning the inadvisability of women serving in offensive combat, some among us believe that such guidance should be limited to pastoral counsel that does not bind the conscience while others among us believe that this counsel rises to the level of duty.[12]

I’ll take Bayly at his word that he wanted to pass a resolution that called out women’s sin, but was forced to accept one that called out men’s sin instead. But this was my point in the exchange. It wasn’t about Bayly’s desire to hold women accountable, but the fact that blaming invented sins of men is used to avoid calling out real sins by women. This is exactly what happened in the PCA resolution. If Bayly is frustrated that this happened, this is something we both can agree on. And if his organization weren’t sneaky and duplicitous, we could have had that very agreement a month and a half ago** instead of him wrongly directing his outrage at me today.

*I still haven’t gone through the podcast, and probably won’t have time to go through it until this weekend. I’m tiring of the subject as it is, but if I see something further I really want to address I’ll probably roll a post out on it some time next week.

**I sent my first message to Nathan in the referenced exchange on January 16th. Nathan sent his message asking to delay further comment on January 17th. At the time I took him at his word that he would reengage after I answered other questions, but given what he has now publicly stated I see that he never intended to reengage in the email discussion and was merely fishing for more items for Warhorn to suddenly become outraged over once it suited
their purpose to be outraged (a month and a half later).
I see that I missed a snarky tweet from Warhorn the other day:

Dalrock postures and bristles before even listening to our podcast.  
[link](https://twitter.com/warhornmedia/status/1097334771607710721)

— Warhorn Media [] (@warhornmedia) [February 26, 2019](https://twitter.com/warhornmedia/status/1097334771607710721)

It is true that I have said I haven’t listened to the podcast yet (although I did make it somewhere between 5 and 10 min in last night). But as I explained in the very post Warhorn is referencing, at that point I had already read Nathan Alberson’s email to me telling me about the podcast. I published that email and others on a subsequent post, but I’ll re-post it here for reference:

Nathan Alberson

7:29 AM (11 hours ago)

to me
Our podcast came out today: [https://simplecast.com/s/793c8cb6](https://simplecast.com/s/793c8cb6)

It’s brutal, as you’ll see. But after much thought and prayer, we decided what you’re doing is not just misguided but harmful, and we wanted to inoculate people against it.

I hope you don’t think yourself ill-used. I did ask the questions in good faith, despite what your followers say about me. And then we took a long time to weigh our options and craft a response.

And I hope you consider seriously what we say in the podcast. I hope you stop or radically change your method of operation. I hope you really are the considerate and thoughtful man you present yourself as.

I have my doubts, for the reasons enumerated in the podcast. And because your followers are thoroughly nasty people. The way they treated me in the comments was without charity, dignity, or kindness. Yes, I’m generalizing. And no, I’m not personally offended. But I do want you to see that, no matter how reasonably you present yourself, a man like me is not going to take you seriously. Not with a rabble like that validating you.
So consider this a personal exhortation: drop the pseudonym, and place yourself under the authority of men who can discipline what you write and help you discipline your followers. That or get out of the business altogether.

Your followers who validate you are not really loving you.

I am.

Sincerely,

Nathan

So yes, I feel very comfortable assuming the podcast is brutal. And yes, I was ill used by Nathan, as he publicly admitted he went against what he had assured me multiple times in private. I don’t need to listen to the podcast to know that Nathan and Warhorn were duplicitous. They told me they were. And the closest I’ve received to an apology to date from Pastor Tim Bayly is his outrage at me upon finding out the men of his team were communicating with me behind his back for a month and a half. How was I to know his team had gone rogue if he didn’t? Their greatest point of pride is that everything they do at Warhorn is under his authority! And given all of their boasting about his authority, why has Pastor Bayly still not taken responsibility for the dumpster fire at Warhorn? The world wonders.

Another Warhorn tweet that makes me wonder who is in charge of the show over there is this thoughtful entry:

Men: stop sucking.
— Warhorn Media [] (@warhornmedia) February 27, 2019

While I’m rounding up odds and ends, part of Pastor Bayly’s complaint was that I didn’t give him credit for saying “no” to a woman in his church who wanted to become a naval officer:

That said, at the same time as I was writing, a student at IU decided to go into the Navy as an officer responsible for nuclear reactors. I loved her and told her she should not do so. We’re still friends and she’s always known I think she was not obeying God in this. Full stop.

This is just one of many, many examples of my fulfilling my responsibility as husband, father, and pastor to say “no” to women, and rebuke them. That Mr. Anonymous spreads his false accusations otherwise is disgusting to me. False charge after false charge after false charge. Long ago I decided not to answer him, and then I find out Warhorn is providing him a platform, so now I’m having to do
what I determined wasn’t worthwhile, or even right.

One commenter asked how I was supposed to know Bayly had told her no, since he hadn’t to their knowledge written about the incident. However, I actually had read what I believe is his account of the same incident in his 2011 blog post Would I support our daughters enlisting in the military... (emphasis mine):

But that begs the question whether today’s Armed Forces are a place any man, let alone a Christian man, wants his daughters to serve, and I say “no.” I don’t want my own son serving in the military, let alone my daughter. We have a bunch of men in our congregation who are in the military and one officer in the Navy from our congregation who is a woman. We tried to discourage most of these men (and certainly the woman) from enlisting, but they chose to proceed and we’re proud of them and support their work, praying for them when they are deployed and loving them when they get home.

Why then to did we oppose their enlistment?

Because of many factors, including the gross immorality that permeates the military bases, the purposes Washington’s pols make of our Armed Forces which often are not only unconstitutional, but contrary to historic Christian just war criteria (NB Vern Poythress’ footnoted comment in our report); because of the continuing degradation of the distinction between soldiers and civilians in modern warfare; and on it goes.

The majority of our men serve in the Marines, and if I had to acquiesce to one of my sons going into the military (which I don’t ever want to do), I would hope it’s the Marines since they’re the branch of the military least corrupted by sexual perversions and the loss of military discipline that is its inevitable result.

There’s much more to be said, but I’m off and running, dear sisters. The long and short of it is that I don’t’ want my sons to go into the military because historic just war criteria have been trampled by our Armed Forces this past century, and one criteria still hanging on is almost dead: namely, that men should bear arms in defense of their mothers because those mothers shed blood to give birth to their children.

Please read the full post at the link and correct me if I’ve overlooked it, but I can’t find any reference to him telling her she was sinning. I see him saying that he is proud of and supports the work of his church members in the military, and I don’t see this as excluding the woman who joined the Navy. I also see him closing with a reference to the canard of men not being willing to serve forcing women to do so in their place, even while explaining in the same breath that he discourages the men in his church from serving.

One final miscellaneous bit (for today at least).

As you may recall Bayly was outraged at my characterizing the PCA resolution he chaired as failing to call women serving in combat sinful. This was the manufactured outrage from the
underhanded Warhorn Media team. Part of why I didn’t expect him to be outraged was his
description of the process in his post Republican candidates want their daughters drafted...

Fifteen years ago, even the feminist pastors on the Ad Interim Study Committee on
Women in the Military of the PCA’s General Assembly were opposed to women being
drafted. They were in favor of women serving as combatants and they ridiculed
committee members who were opposed, saying our view of women was to keep
them “barefoot and pregnant.” Still, none of them wanted their daughters drafted.
Was chivalry the origin of Christian manhood?

by Dalrock | March 1, 2019 | Link

In Why Chivalry Is the Catholic Solution to Toxic Masculinity John Horvat II teaches us that Christian manhood wasn’t invented until the Middle Ages. This would mean that for roughly the first 1,000 years after Christ, Christian men had no rulebook to follow (emphasis mine):

The Church Proposed Chivalry

The problem of toxic masculinity is not new. When men are given over to their passions, it will always create toxic situations of savagery and barbarity. What is new is the depths to which postmodernity plunges men deeper into sin. The new solutions not only go against man’s true nature; they annihilate it.

It was the Church that tamed the human passions and proposed models for men that elevated them to unimaginable heights. The Church proposed chivalry giving men an ideal to channel ill-regulated passions. That ideal would capture the imagination of countless men throughout history that persists even today. Moreover, the Church provides the means of grace which makes the practice of these high ideals possible.

For the first time in history, being a man meant admiring and striving for virtues such as mercy, courage, valor, chastity, fairness, protection of the weak and the poor. Being a man meant adopting an attitude of gentleness and graciousness to all women, a practice unknown to the ancient pagan world that often treated them as chattels. It introduced the idea of honor, service and abnegation even to the point of giving one’s life.

If this were true, imagine how much better the Apostles could have been had they only known chivalry. But then again, I don’t think they were nobility. Does this mean they weren’t suited to Christian manhood?

The link to the Catholic Encyclopedia article on chivalry in the quote above describes chivalry as evolving in form across four periods. The version of chivalry modern readers will naturally think of is the modern remnant of the later two periods, which the encyclopedia explains were not Christian:

Third period: secular chivalry

After the Crusades chivalry gradually lost its religious aspect...

The amorous character of the new literature had contributed not a little to deflect chivalry from its original ideal. Under the influence of the romances love now became the mainspring of chivalry. As a consequence there arose a new type of chevalier, vowed to the service of some noble lady, who could even
be another man’s wife. This idol of his heart was to be worshipped at a
distance. Unfortunately, notwithstanding the obligations imposed upon the
knightly lover, these extravagant fancies often led to lamentable results.

Fourth period: court chivalry

In its last stages, chivalry became a mere court service. The Order of the Garter,
founded in 1348 by Edward III of England, the Order of the Golden Fleece
(Toison d’or) of Philip of Burgundy, dating from 1430, formed a brotherhood, not of
crusaders, but of courtiers, with no other aim than to contribute to the splendor of
the sovereign. Their most serious business was the sport of jousts and tournaments.
They made their vows not in chapels, but in banquet halls, not on the cross, but on
some emblematic bird...

Note that the Catholic Encyclopedia article tells us that idolatry of women is good to the
extent that it imposes obligations on men:

...vowed to the service of some noble lady, who could even be another man’s wife.
This idol of his heart was to be worshipped at a distance. Unfortunately,
notwithstanding the obligations imposed upon the knightly lover, these
extravagant fancies often led to lamentable results.

Horvat doesn’t even bother offering a hint regarding which model of chivalry he has in mind
to stop weak men from screwing feminism up. But surely the modern incarnation of the
courtly love model must be the one he has in mind, where Christian men are taught to
submit to their wives in fear and reverence, and where romantic love sanctifies sex and
marriage. For it would be absurd if he were proposing to tame modern men by reinstating the
feudal system and anchoring our society on the martial customs of Medieval heavy cavalry
(but this time making all men knights).

H/T Adam Piggott
He lived it.
by Dalrock | March 1, 2019 | Link

3 Older women likewise are to be reverent in behavior, not slanderers or slaves to much wine. They are to teach what is good, 4 and so train the young women to love their husbands and children, 5 to be self-controlled, pure, working at home, kind, and submissive to their own husbands, that the word of God may not be reviled.

–Titus 2:3-5 (ESV)

In *I Lived It*, country singer Blake Shelton sings about a time so different younger listeners are likely to find it hard to fathom. One of the differences between now and our recent past is back then some older women were still policing modesty:

Granny said the dress that my sister wore to church wasn’t long enough
...

[Chorus]
Oh, you think I’m talking crazy

In a different language you might not understand...

Today Granny would be guilty of the sin of body shaming if she said such a thing. As Sheila Gregoire explains:

What if setting a modesty dress code actually becomes a stumbling block for women because it weakens their faith?

Moreover, today Granny (Gregoire) is too busy policing other women making sure they aren’t committing the sin of body shaming (or the sin of being a doormat) to tell her granddaughter a dress is too short for church.

See Also:

* Meet the new Yiayia. Her name is Sheila.
* Yiayia wouldn’t approve
* Yiayia and the empress’s new clothes
**Transcripts of Warhorn podcast.**

by Dalrock | March 4, 2019 | Link

A couple of other bloggers were kind enough to put together transcripts of the Warhorn podcast for those who don’t want to listen to the silliness but want to understand what was said. OKRickety put together what looks like a very complete transcript. I have only read about half way through, but it looks very thorough.

Larry Kummer, Editor of Fabius Maximus put together a more brief transcript, including his own notes. I am publishing it here with his gracious permission:

---

**Transcript of “Into the Manosphere” at Warhorn, 26 February 2019.**

Begins at the one-hour mark. Which appears to be roughly where they begin the summary of this 1 hr. 13-minute broadcast.

Note: I am not a stenographer, and did not review this for accuracy. It is a best-efforts transcript.

There are two speakers, I did not note who was speaking, or transitions.
“D” means Dalrock. I omit many of the verbal ticks (e.g., beginning many sentences with “and”).

My comments are preceded by asterisks (*).

My note: This is the most obvious case of mirroring I’ve seen in a long time. Many of their accusations about you refer – quite obviously, imo – to themselves. It’s also pretty much gibberish.

Let’s talk about that. D does link to and quote sources meticulously. Then he regularly mischaracterizes what he quotes. He gets away with it among his followers. Why? There is only one real answer. That’s the fact that he relies on the appearance of honest to get his work done.

Or more accurately. He relies on the laziness of his followers and their desire for validation. {High pitched funny voice} “Will someone please validate me.”

I picture all his followers as angry 20-somethings in their moms’ basements or a 40 or 50-year-old guy that just got a divorce and he’s mad and just wants someone to validate him and tell him he’s right. D relies on that because those guys aren’t going to follow the links.

Just be clear here. You’re accusing all of D’s followers of being dumb internet trolls.
No. I’m sure there is a wide variety of people who read D for all kinds of reasons. You read him. I read him. But when he gets away with the kind of blatant mischaracterizations that he gets away with regularly, one begins to wonder.

Why all this in response to his pseudonymous, Jake?

Because it’s a diversionary tactic. He wants to bluster about it being the arguments and about the truth. He wants to posture himself as the honest one and the victim of character assignation. He want to control the conversation by asserting from the top that anyone who questions his character in this process simply doesn’t have the chops to handle his arguments. That is all bluster and bravado and it is a diversionary tactic that is dishonest in his arguments from the top.

How do we respond?

First, has this guy even met a real SJW in his life? We’ve met SJWs ... I don’t want to be self-aggrandizing, but Jake and I have had these public things transpire where large groups of so-called progressives were really really {sic} angry at us ...

{examples given}

Or you can go to the abortion clinic or the courthouse. ... {discussing where to find progressives}. We deal with these people all the time ... {examples}

My point. No SJW comes to Dalrock thinking {said with silly voice; both laugh often during this, which they appear to consider hilarious}:

“I have to find away around this guy because I know I’d lose against him in open debate. Because I’m really stupid. I’m a random minion unable to find his way around Conan the Barbarian because he scares me so much. He’d just kill me. So I’d better find a way to shoot arrows at him.”

Please. Anyone who has actually engaged with these people knows that they are completely confident that they’ll take you in open debate. {series of silly statements about SWJs} ...

{Said in silly voice} “I know I can’t win in open debate so I need to assassinate your character.” Character assignation is a matter of {unclear: “pride in this case”}. They are happy to assassinate your character. {more discussion about this} ...

So we’ve demonstrated that D has a fundamentally dishonest way of handling arguments and sources. So, can we talk about his character?

What kind of man props himself up as a teacher of men {funny voice} “about the nature of masculinity?” But without the courage to put his name behind what he signs? A coward. That’s the kind. {music begins} The kind of man who would never say to someone’s face what he says on the internet. That’s the kind of man that can’t be trusted.
**** My note: just like the writers of the Federalist Papers.

He can’t be examined by Jesus’ rule for teachers “You will know them by their fruit.” … If he says his fruit is in his teaching and his followers, fine. Take a look at his comment threads. That’s all you need to know.

**** IMO, this is a valid point.

And if he says his teaching o the Internet is not exercising authority, not claiming any kind of authority, and does not subject him to any kind of scrutiny – that’s just a feminist argument. …That’s the argument they use to have women deacons, for women elders, for women teaching mixed groups. They’re not exercising authority.

{change of voice} Jake, ad hominem much? Can we talk about ad hominin please?

{Jake} Knowledge is never divorced from character. Knowledge is never divorced from character. If I propound an idea it is completely legit to ask why and how I’m propounding it. Ad hominin is a perfectly reasonable form of argument.

**** This is nuts. The personal lives of philosophers, scientists, and leaders of all kinds are often of low character. We judge them by their deeds and their words. Often evil leaders have excellent characters.

{change of voice} I learned that’s not true. In high school debate class I learned that it is a fallacious form of argument. You’re attacking your opponent instead of his ideas. You can’t do that.

{Long discussion of ad hominin arguments follow. Both then agree this is a great thing to do.”

And D himself, the great philosopher, is not afraid to call out feminists for the unhappy fruits of their ideas.

**** That’s the opposite of an ad hominem argument.

But you ask too many questions about D, you ask how he presents his ideas, or how his followers behave. Both D and his followers want to say “stop picking on us.” He is about the ideas.

Oh, yes. Yes. And ideas are connected to people. And Christ said of teachers, “You shall know them by their fruits.”

**** What are they saying about D? This makes no sense.

Right. The noting that ideas exist in this intellectual vacuum where they can be studied like some sort of museum exhibit just under glass. You go and look at the idea and look at the other angles of the idea and we all stay outside of the idea. Thumbs down!
Thumbs down!

**** This makes no sense. Also, what is the relevance to Dalrock?

Some it up in a sentence, Jake.

D is a man who cannot be trusted. You cannot trust his argumentation. You cannot trust his portrayal of his own honest and integrity. And you cannot trust his character. He hides behind weak arguments and he blusters about and postures himself as some hero of the manosphere. He would deny that. {funny voice} “I am just trafficking in ideas.”

That not how his followers threat him. They treat him like a founding father of some kind.

They call him that.

Yes. He’s bad. I’m thinking of Psalm 1. “Blessed is one who does not walk in the way of the scoffer, a mocker, the wicked.

You cannot engage with people of bad character and not be infected by it. This guy is poison. I don’t care if he says some correct things. A stopped clock is right twice a day. Lots of horrible people have said good things. But you do not want to hand out with bad people.

I learned some of my best theology from a serial predator that we based season one of The Ville on. So there you go.

**** Does this contradict the point they just made a length?

{more discussion about D in funny voices saying silly things.”

{music slowly swelling in strength} The mad is fundamentally dishonest about his character. He is not somebody who can be trusted to teach good theology no matter how many good things he says. No matter how God uses him.

Judas preached the true gospel. He preached repent for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand. He healed people and he cast out demons. Then he betrayed Jesus for 30 pieces of silver. And hung himself. ...

{More over-the-top denunciations of D}

D should shut up and give himself to his church. The people who follow him, who are out on the internet looking to him as a father, need to find a real father figure ...

{The last 3 minutes is them saying silly things in funny voices, intending - I believe - to mock D. A lame attempt at humor.}
As Larry Kummer has noted, the Warhorn podcast is a blatant example of projection. Note that after I called Nathan out for misrepresenting our agreement, Nathan has now added part of our initial email exchange to the page with the podcast. However, Nathan has selectively edited the messages so that it looks like we agreed to have an email interview without agreeing to a back and forth. However, because he left out an important segment of the exchange, it looks like we agreed to use his first set of seven questions instead of the revised set of 9 questions we agreed to. But Nathan was too clever by half, because while he masks part of his deception he still leaves enough to prove that he ultimately went back on his word:

I’d like to get as clear an articulation of your views as I can, and present it to the world.

...

The podcast may ultimately reflect these differences, but I’d like to give you a fair chance to say your piece. This won’t be “gotcha journalism.”

After the podcast was published Nathan wrote that if somehow he managed to inadvertently keep his word to me, he would regret doing so:

To be perfectly clear, however: Dalrock is bad news and we recommend you stay away from him. We seriously considered canning this episode because it might inspire a greater interest in Dalrockian writing and philosophy. If it does, frankly I’ll be sorry we did it.

He later reiterated that his intent was not to keep his original promises to me:

We didn’t want to get too far into the weeds of Dalrock’s philosophy. To do that was to risk validating a dishonest and uncharitable man.

And while he hides the part of the exchange where I proposed a back and forth via email and he agreed, the nature of the medium and the fact that we were having a very polite back and forth when he claims I caused such great offense is enough to prove that Nathan had every opportunity to challenge me when (as he claims) he thought I was misrepresenting his pastor. Even with his omission of that part of the agreement, it is clear that Warhorn manufactured a crisis so they could exploit it a month later. They were disingenuous so they could accuse me of being disingenuous.

In omitting whole segments of our mail thread defining the terms of the proposed exchange, Nathan is clearly counting on his readers not noticing the discrepancy between the questions he claims I was answering and the ones I actually answered. Fortunately I published all of my responses including the question numbers before they put out the podcast, so my readers
already knew we were using a set of 9, not as Nathan makes it appear his initial set of 7. Also, note from OKRickety’s transcript that the Warhorn men agreed on the podcast that I had accurately published the exchanges (emphasis mine):

[26:10] – Okay. Let me get started here. Dalrock also refused to actually come on the show and do like a real argument where we could address the …. like Dalrock could be talking to us right now. He could be discussing these things with us in real-time, but he preferred instead to do an email interview which he published on his blog. This was before we had a chance to do this podcast so he got in ahead of us. He controlled the narrative with his followers.

- Well I mean didn’t you agree to that ahead of the interview?

- and didn’t he also publish the straight e-mail exchange with no alterations? Like, he didn’t take anything out of context. He didn’t remove anything. He didn’t change anything to make himself look better. It was pretty much word-for-word?

- Yeah. It was word-for-word. I mean you just got what he said to you unchanged.

[26:51] – Okay here’s the point I want to make about Dalrock. This is actually part of a larger pattern with Dalrock of being disingenuous with the way he argues...

Nathan implies that I pulled a fast one by publishing the interviews before they published the podcast. I acknowledge that I did want to get them out first, partly on the outside chance that the men of Pastor Tim Bayly’s Clearnote Church turned out to be deceitful. As it turns out I was wise to do so. However, I only published the exchanges (his questions and my answers) after asking for and receiving Nathan’s permission to do so. Here is our full exchange on the topic in an email chain titled “Questions yet unanswered”:

Nathan Albersen [redacted]

Jan 21, 2019, 2:29 PM

to me

I appreciate what you’ve given me so far. I’m discussing it with my team (of two other men, I’m not pretending to lead an army), and we’re working on our response, some of which will come in podcast form. For my own benefit as well as yours, I believe these are the questions that you have not yet answered. 4-6 are somewhat implicit in what you’ve given me, but it would be nice to have the explicit versions. And no journalist worth his salt could let you get away without speaking to 8-9.  

Thanks!

4. What does a man need to do to live a satisfying and productive life in today’s
5. What does a woman need to do to live a satisfying and productive life in today’s culture?

6. How do these answers relate to God and the Bible?

8. I’ve seen more than one commenter in your archives say that a woman needs a good old fashioned spanking (or words to that effect). I see in your “comments policy” you ask people to refrain from discussing marital corporal punishment. I have several questions about that. First (just to get it out of the way): do you or any of your more serious followers support marital corporal punishment? Why or why not?

9. Related to question 8, does work like yours attract misogynists? Why or why not? If so, is there anything that can be done to avoid it? If not, is there something an outsider like me isn’t understanding about the people that it does attract? Is it fair for me to ask the spanking question and the misogyny questions right next to each other? Are my biases making me see misogyny (for example, in the wife spanking crowd) where I should see something else? If so, what am I (and others like me) missing?

I responded:

Dal Rock [redacted]

Jan 21, 2019, 11:00 PM

to Nathan
I agree that these are the remaining questions. I intend to cover them in two mails, one for 4-6 and another for 8-9. I’m not sure exactly when I’ll get to them but my plan is this week.

Also, I finished up the post I mentioned that I in the works on the label I’m adopting: https://dalrock.wordpress.com/2019/01/21/call-me-unchivalrous/

Nathan replied:

Nathan Alberson [redacted]

Jan 22, 2019, 7:23 AM

to me
I saw that and read it. Very helpful. Inspired me to do some more research on chivalry myself.

I replied:

Dal Rock [redacted]
Jan 22, 2019, 1:19 PM

to Nathan
Excellent! I should warn you that it it pretty sick stuff.

On January 31st I sent Nathan another mail (as a response to the same thread) asking Nathan several questions in preparation to start posting on the interview:

Dal Rock [redacted]

Jan 31, 2019, 9:29 AM

to Nathan
While we are finalizing any followup questions/comments you have I want to let my readers know this is coming and we are wrapping it up. With this in mind:

1. How do you want me to refer to you. Do you want me to give your full name first, and then subsequently refer to you as Nathan?
2. What link would you like me to use to your podcast.
3. Is Pastor Tim Bayly your pastor?
4. Is there anything else you want me to tell my readers about you?

Nathan replied:

Nathan Alberson

Feb 1, 2019, 11:36 AM

to me
1. Nathan is fine. I’m the creative director of Warhorn Media, a media ministry of Clearnote Church, Bloomington, In.
2. iTunes link is fine: https://itunes.apple.com/us/podcast/sound-of-sanity/id1270775226?mt=2
3. Yes, he is.
4. Sound of Sanity is a podcast combining discussion, satire, and storytelling to examine where we are as a culture today and remind Christians we’re the sane ones, not them.

I responded to Nathan:

Dal Rock [redacted]

Feb 1, 2019, 3:41 PM

to Nathan
Thanks. I’ve put a teaser post up: https://dalrock.wordpress.com/2019/02/01/coming-soon-interview-with-warhorn-med
Nathan replied:

Nathan Alberson
Feb 1, 2019, 4:04 PM
to me
Awesome, thanks! I may not have the final follow questions until Monday. I want to see if my other teammates have anything they want to contribute. I appreciate everything so far!

I replied a week later, asking if there were any topics I could start to roll out as posts:

Dal Rock [redacted]
Feb 6, 2019, 7:27 AM
to Nathan
Hi Nathan,

Are there any topics that I can start sharing with my readers? Are you considering any followup questions for “who am I and why do I blog”, for example? If not, I’ll post that one while we finish up on the rest.

Nathan replied giving me the green light to roll all of them out:

Nathan Alberson
Feb 6, 2019, 4:49 PM
to me
You can share whatever you like with your readers. Our next response will come in the form of the podcast, which should hopefully drop sometime this month (you’ll have more info when I do). I’m sure there will be things you will want to respond to in that, and there may be need for more email conversation then (not just for my sake, but for yours, in case you want to have things to share with your readers).

But I think I have what I need for now in order to craft a more comprehensive reply to you in audio form.

I replied letting Nathan know I was going to start rolling the posts out. This is the last message in the email chain:

Dal Rock [redacted]
Feb 7, 2019, 8:32 AM
to Nathan
Thanks. I’ll roll them out one at a time probably starting today. But I’ll probably intersperse them with other topics so it could take a while to do them all.
This is the most obvious case of mirroring I’ve seen in a long time. Many of their accusations about you refer – quite obviously, imo – to themselves.

--Larry Kummer, Editor of Fabius Maximus

In OKRickety’s transcript, the men of Pastor Bayly’s Clearnote Church accuse me of lying by misquoting Pastor Matt Chandler:

[47:14] – Look, nobody in this room has any great respect for Matt Chandler. Nope. Correct. But, come on, you can accuse Chandler at all kinds of things. You can accuse him of all kinds of things. You can accuse him of not going far enough, you can accuse him of playing strictly to women of the crowd, you can accuse him of all kinds of things. You can accuse him of not asserting a woman’s own responsibility to resist temptation but to say that he somehow in this specific quote asserts anything more than a good husband is a good protection against temptation” is just a lie. It’s just a lie.

- Well. You know, I’m guessing the Chandler in the rest of the sermon probably doesn’t go far enough. I mean, if I had to guess, I don’t know, nothing on Earth could compel me to bother to actually listen and find out honestly, but probably he doesn’t.

Note that after calling me a liar, Nathan says he couldn’t be bothered to actually check to see if my characterization was accurate! They were referring to this quote (see the full exchange). Note that I provided a link not only to the audio, but the transcript:

Pastor Matt Chandler makes the same argument in his sermon Women’s Hurdles (transcript). Chandler explains that if a Christian husband fulfills his responsibility to love his wife, she can’t be tempted into feminist rebellion:

Really, men, here is a great way to gauge how you’re serving, loving, and practicing your headship. If the most secularized feminist in the world showed up in your home and began to kind of coach your wife toward freedom and liberation from your tyranny, our wives should be so well cared for, so nourished, so sowed into and loved, they would say, “What you’re describing is actually tyranny. I love where I am. I am honored. I am encouraged. My man sacrifices so that I might grow in my gifts. He will oftentimes lay down his own desires in order to serve me more. My husband goes to bed tired at night. He pours into our children. He encourages me. All that comes out of his mouth, sans a couple of little times here and there, is him building me up in love.”
Men, here is a good opportunity. If you’re like, “Well, gosh, I don’t think she would say that at all,” then, men, I think on the way home, you should probably repent and confess before the Lord to your wife.

This stuff is flat out nuts, but no one notices within conservative Christianity because it is so common and it has been going on for so long.

I urge anyone who is interested to click on the link Nathan and company couldn’t be bothered to click. The way I characterized Pastor Matt Chandler’s argument was not a lie. He really did tell men that they way they should gauge their performance as a husband was if their wife could be tempted into resentment by secular feminism. He didn’t just say as Nathan asserts:

- a good husband is a good protection against temptation

Chandler went so far as to tell husbands that if they thought their wives could be tempted into feminist resentment, they should apologize to their wives. Moreover, he said this in a sermon on women’s sins! I included Chandler’s line about husbands needing to apologize if their wife feels tempted by feminism in the quote I shared with Nathan, but Nathan and the Warhorn crew left it out when pretending that I had misrepresented Chandler. Here is the extended quote from OKRickety’s transcript:

[44:25] – All right guys welcome back from the break. End of Devil’s advocacy. We’re all on the same page here. So let’s talk about Dalrock’s methods, because there’s a larger point we want to make about this guy. You can read the whole interview with Dalrock for yourself Warhornmedia.com to get the full context. But we’re going to pull a few quotes, talk through how Dalrock does what he does. And what it says about him. To do that let’s play a little game I call “Who said it?” Matt Chandler. You guys know Matt Chandler, right?

- Oh, he’s famous. He’s the lead pastor of teaching at Village Church in Flower Mound, Texas. He’s the president of the Acts 29 network of churches.

- The very same Matt Chandler. Now Matt Chandler can be, I don’t know, lame, pretty weak sauce about some things, lots of things. But, that being put to the side, let’s play “Who said it?” Matt Chandler, Dalrock, or me, Nathan Albertson? Ben, read the first quote if you will.

- Sure.

- We’re going to read three quotes. One of them was said by Dalrock, one of them was said by Nathan, one of them was said by Pastor Chandler. Go ahead.

- Okay. “If the most secularized feminist in the world showed up in your home and began to try to coach your wife toward freedom and liberation from tyranny, our wives should be so well cared for, so nourished, so sowed into and loved, they would
say what you are describing is actually tyranny.”


- “If a husband loves his wife and rules over her well, she will be less likely to be tempted to rebel just the same as if a king loves his subjects and rules over them well, they’ll be less tempted to rebel.”

- And, Ben, read the third quote please.

- “Wives with good husbands can most easily overcome the temptation we dangle to not respect and submit to them. Likewise for children of good fathers.”

- Hmmm. Those all sound kind of similar but alright who said it, fellas?

- Kaiser Skulzi said them all. It’s a trick.

- Nope!

- Big twist! Nathan really is Dalrock and he’s working with Matt Chandler.

- Nope. Also gross.

- Okay okay. Ben. Real answer for your first one.

- The first one is Chandler.

- Second one?

- Nathan.

- Oh, interesting. And third?

- Dalrock.

- I am the meat in this truth sandwich, guys. Delicious! Wow. All right but those quotes do all kind of sound the same, especially if you read them with any degree of charity.

- Yeah. You guys would think so. Okay, so in our interview Dalrock characterizes this stuff as follows: “Chandler explains that if a Christian husband fulfills his responsibility to love his wife, she can’t be tempted into feminist rebellion” and again “women can’t be tempted into feminist rebellion if their husbands love them sufficiently” So that’s his characterization of what Chandler is saying.

- I just can’t believe that. That’s completely dishonest.
- What? Dishonest? Jake, Whatever can you mean?

[47:14] – Look, nobody in this room has any great respect for Matt Chandler. Nope. Correct. But, come on, you can accuse Chandler at all kinds of things. You can accuse him of all kinds of things. You can accuse him of not going far enough, you can accuse him of playing strictly to women of the crowd, you can accuse him of all kinds of things. You can accuse him of not asserting a woman’s own responsibility to resist temptation but to say that he somehow in this specific quote asserts anything more than a good husband is a good protection against temptation” is just a lie. It’s just a lie.

– Well. You know, I’m guessing the Chandler in the rest of the sermon probably doesn’t go far enough. I mean, if I had to guess, I don’t know, nothing on Earth could compel me to bother to actually listen and find out honestly, but probably he doesn’t.

– Duh. There’s lots of pastors who don’t... they won’t call women moral agents. And these are women who...they are in simple rebellion against God against their husbands, and their pastors are not going to call them out.

[48:08] – Yeah, and we have to deal with those guys in real-life situations all the time. So that gives Dalrock license to lie about Matt Chandler. Duh. Right?
The latest installment of Dear Prudence features a woman who fears the state won’t offer her a sufficient reward for not honoring her wedding vows. She wants to know how she can reap the benefits of marriage without having to stay married.

I want to leave my husband; I cannot. I have no job and no support. He has made it clear that he will not pay me child support or alimony. I know a court could compel him, but if I banked on this and he was late on paying, I would be in a very desperate position with my children. We attend a church, and he has told a few people—mostly women—a deep tale of marital woe that spread, and now I am treated like a pariah. One such person is a woman with whom he is having an emotional affair. We have gone to marriage counseling, but it didn’t heal anything; he was charming and won the therapist over.

I am happy to be a mother and grateful I can take the kids to their various appointments and therapies. I adore my children; they are everything to me. I know this is a privileged place. I don’t know what to do. I am miserable and lonely. Are there any resources for people like me? Is there anything for me, save for “wait and just survive”?
Revisiting the subject of women and the draft.
by Dalrock | March 5, 2019 | Link

The recent court ruling on women and selective service caused me to revisit my 2015 post on the subject, The fantasy of drafting women:

We may see selective service changed to include women as well as men. We may even see a situation where women are drafted alongside of men. What we won’t see, ever, is a situation where women have high or even significant pressure applied to motivate them to pass physical requirements if they don’t personally want to be there.

What this is about, and what this always has been about, is envy of men. It is about eradicating the idea of masculine virtues, and more importantly, erasing all sentiment of gratitude for what the men in the military do. To a feminist feeling gratitude to men is unbearable. This is why every unit, especially elite forces and combat infantry, must include women. When Seal Team Six took out Bin Ladin feminists were forced to bear the unbearable; public officials expressed gratitude for the “men who risked their lives to accomplish the mission”, and feminists couldn’t chime in with “and women too!”

Never again.

Since the goal is to erase the concept of masculine virtues, the new bargain the introduction of women into combat represents isn’t to have women join equally or even seriously in the fighting and dying. The new bargain is that men will continue to be the ones who fight and die, but they must not feel a sense of masculine pride in either doing this or having this obligation. Registering women for selective service alongside men serves this goal, as does drafting women and letting those who don’t want to be there fail out. The imagined downside for feminists is only a fantasy.

I still see this as mostly correct, but I would no longer be so adamant regarding never. After seeing how the deep state responded to Trump’s election, and the cultural sea change we’ve experienced on transgender acceptance, I can now imagine a scenario where women would not only be drafted, but face pressure to meet the physical standards. I still don’t see this as likely, but instead of being a 0% chance I would now put this as maybe a 5% or 10% chance. The vast majority of feminists (which includes nearly all women) still think the way I described above, and conservatives still hold chivalrous views that would facilitate the option to opt out that nearly all feminists expect. But given that lesbian feminists are now the conservatives when it comes to the culture war, and given that they appear to be losing, a truly radical scenario is at least conceivable now.

For men and women with daughters concerned about the possibility of a draft, my advice would be to consider the issue as it relates to the popular push to have daughters prove their athletic prowess. A girl who went through school trying to prove she is like one of the guys
will naturally feel much more pressure to prove herself physically if drafted, even if she doesn’t want to serve. Also, instructors are going to pick up on which young women have “moxie”, and press them much harder to pass military physical fitness requirements than they will a young woman who has a truly traditional vibe. Should we ever find ourselves drafting women, kick ass conservative gals are going to feel much more internal and external pressure to not wash out, and women with a quiet and gentle spirit are far more likely to be permitted to fail out.
Hilarious.
by Dalrock | March 6, 2019 | Link

Courtesy of Instapundit, Jim Treacher explains that Some Critics Like Captain Marvel, and Some Critics Hate Women:

I mean, did these morons see the same Captain Marvel I saw? (No, I haven’t seen it yet, and that’s hardly the point.) This is a scary time for women, and they need this movie right now. Stop politicizing this important event in feminist history, and start praising women for having the courage to play flying people in uncomfortable-looking leatherette jumpsuits with lasers coming out of their hands.

*********

I don’t plan to see Captain Marvel on opening weekend, because Marvel Studios and this movie’s target audience don’t need me stinking up the place with my toxic masculinity and disposable income. I am not welcome, and that’s the way it should be.

Ace of Spades is being even more respectful:

I am calling for all men to avoid seeing Captain Marvel, at least for the first four weeks of its theatrical distribution, to permit the legions of the ‘Carol Corps’ fans to see the film in a positive, Sacred Feminine, female-only space.”

But you really can’t be too careful with this kind of thing, as Instapundit commenter They Call Me Mister reminds us:

I’m not sure that’s long enough. There are four billion women on this planet and every single one of them deserves to see this POS (“perfectly ossum superheroine”) before any man does.

Given the difficulties of getting movies to females of such isolated populations as lost tribes of the Amazon, or on Indian Ocean islands where they kill and eat intruders, we could be talking decades.

I’ll wait.
Complementarianism on women in the military.

by Dalrock | March 7, 2019 | Link

Biblical complementarity is not fundamentally about what opportunities women must forgo, but what responsibilities men must take up.

— Dr. Jason K. Allen, President of Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

As I’ve noted before, Complementarians live in a fantasy land where feminist rebellion doesn’t exist. According to Complementarians, women aren’t coveting the roles of men, men are forcing women to take on their roles by abdicating them. This is ludicrous, but it is how Complementarians have coped with the feminist rebellion. The best example of this I’ve seen to date comes from the PCA’s Ad Interim Study Committee on Women in the Military (June 2002):

Through this committee’s study, it has become apparent that the sin of our present circumstances is not that of women who have taken on the role of warrior-defender, but that of brothers, fathers, and husbands who have abandoned their daughters, wives, and mothers to the androgyne and sexual anarchy which has been the seed-bed of this violation of God’s creation order. It is this sin which must come under the discipline of the church.

The report puts to rest any fears that by blaming men for a non existent sin, women who really are sinning will be called to account (emphasis mine):

If the Church Adopts the Language of Duty, Will Not Women Come Under Discipline?

It has been argued that the adoption of any statement by this assembly declaring it the biblical duty of man to defend woman will have the unintended result of placing women of the PCA serving in direct combat military positions under session censure. This charge is groundless, flying in the face of the practice of the church and the teaching of Scripture concerning church discipline. Rather than protecting the women of the PCA, it serves only to cloud the issue, leading gentlemen to fear that, by voting in favor of the man’s duty to defend woman, they may inadvertently place women at the center of battles in the session meetings of their home church.

Oddly, the same report assures us that it is highly unlikely that men will be disciplined either. This makes sense because if you were to take seriously the claim that men are the ones who are forcing women to sin, aren’t all men guilty? Men who don’t serve (or don’t serve in combat roles) would be guilty for leaving an empty slot that ostensibly has to be filled by a woman. Men who do serve on the other hand could also be guilty of not doing so well enough, thus causing women to have no choice but to join and carry the weight the existing men ostensibly are refusing to carry. The report assures us that it would be absurd to act as if men were really sinning in the way the report claims they are.
Were the assembly to adopt this committee’s recommendations, the fear of the courts of the church being filled with cases of men being excommunicated for their refusal to defend their daughters, mothers, and wives is rather comical. By the assembly’s action, this sin would not somehow be raised above the sins of greed, lust, or envy. Discipline moves to censure, temporary suspension, or excommunication only rarely, and even then, only after preaching, teaching, and pastoral counsel have failed to produce the fruit of repentance, and the offense is so egregious that both the souls of the flock and the honor of Christ are placed in jeopardy.

H/T Nereus
Larry Kummer writes in *Captain Marvel* – fun for kids, swill for adults

The cat – “Goose” – is a major character in *Captain Marvel*. It’s a weird extraneous element in the plot, sloppily written by writers desperate to fill its two hour running time with its sketchy content. I doubt they anticipated the impact it would have.

As the number of unmarried and divorced middle-aged cat ladies increases, they become an attractive market for Hollywood. They love all mentions of cats, as seen in the ecstatic mentions of “Goose” by reviewers. Cats to women desperate for affectionate relationships. It has over 7 million hits on Google.

Expect to see many more cats at in future films, in larger roles.

Indeed.
A reader was kind enough to listen to the second Warhorn podcast and transcribe it. This kind of thing takes a great deal of work, and I very much appreciate the time that clearly went into it. He said that after listening through a few times he could identify Nathan’s voice from the others, so he noted it in the transcript. Also, he said he left out the skits.

What strikes me after reading it is how difficult the men of Pastor Bayly’s Clearnote Church find it to state things plainly. Their natural inclination is clearly a kind of circle talk, where they carefully skirt around an issue. This is what makes their communication style so painful (beyond the skits and funny voices). For example, I published the entire original exchange I had with Nathan Alberson to show that he had gone back on his word. Nathan never acknowledged or directly challenged this, and instead published select excerpts of the exchange as if they were the whole. The implication here is that I’m lying, that I made up the latter half of our exchange. But why is he being so careful not to say what he is implying? It can’t be that he doesn’t want to call me a liar, because that is his and Warhorn’s charge against me (aside from my anonymity). Clearly he knows calling me a liar in that case wouldn’t stand up to even moderate scrutiny. So he hopes no one will notice that we did the interview with the revised list of 9 questions Nathan sent me and not his original list of 7.

But this kind of slipperiness takes a great deal of effort, and you can see how hard they had to work to achieve this in the podcast. It also makes it painful to listen to, or even read.

March 10th Update: The reader notified me that a section was missing. This was due to my error, not his. I’ve added the missing section along with notes indicating where it was added back. Search for “previously missing section” to see the segment.

——— Begin Transcript ————

Nathan – Hey everybody welcome to Sound of Sanity. My name is Nathan Alberson. I’m your humble and obedient host. We’re back. Let me introduce you to our fine crew of panelists. We’ve got Benjamin Sulser, associate producer Benjamin J Sulser over there. How ya doin Ben?

– I’m doing fine Nathan.

Nathan – I’m glad to hear it sir, and of course, Pastor Jacob Mentzel. How are ya doin Jake?

-Little under the weather, but otherwise pretty good.

Nathan – Yeah I’m also a little under the weather Ben?

– Well, me too.

Nathan – Three for three baby.
- Three for three.

Nathan – Guys, we are doing a follow up episode to last week's episode which was entitled Into the Manosphere. Ben would you like to summarize that episode?

- We wanted to give our listeners a rundown of the manosphere since I had started reading one voice in the manosphere who happened to be the best representative of the Christian manosphere that any of us knows of. I just think it’s an interesting place. It’s interesting to see how men have begun to react to the feminism of our culture, what they say, and what a Christian guy who’s kind of part of a broader reaction against feminism says. Anyway, we tried to give our listeners an overview of things. And then we honed in on the specific guy we interviewed, a man named Dalrock, who is actually not named Dalrock, that’s a pseudonym. And we took apart his arguments, since he’s critical of our pastor.

Nathan – That is a thing that happened Jake, true or false?

- More or less true, yeah.

Nathan – Yeah more or less true, it’s kind of a hard episode to describe. It was a hard episode to do. We spent a lot of time putting it together, and I think it’s probably good to say off the bat the episode ended up being a little dense and maybe a little, uh not dense in the sense of stupid, but dense in the sense of packed with a lot of information without a really clear through line for people who maybe weren’t as familiar with the format of the show. It was our first one back after a little hiatus, or people maybe just not familiar with the manosphere or familiar particularly with the philosophy of one Dalrock. So I apologize if anyone lost their way in that episode, I could see how that could have happened. This week we’re going to come back and hopefully give you a few footholds to think about this a little bit further. Let’s start with a story of, a little bit broader, the story of what happened last week and why. We were going to do an episode on the manosphere. That was our intention right?

- That’s right, we wanted to do an episode on the manosphere and everything that entails, so these terms that you see and that you heard us throw around last week

Nathan – Red pill, MGTOW, MRM, MRA, whatever it is, men’s rights movement yeah MRM...  

- Yeah Game.

Nathan – all that wonderful stuff

- And we didn’t want to be the ones defining our own terms. And so we decided the best thing to do would be to interview somebody who’s representative of the manosphere and somebody preferably who’s a Christian and one of the best and most reasonable voices in the manosphere.

Nathan – So we reached out to a pseudonymous blogger who goes by the handle of Dalrock. He writes on Christian manhood, sexuality,

- That sort of thing.
Nathan – that sort of thing. Ben you were familiar with his work, I think you were the one that first brought him to me and Jake’s attention.

-I was and I appreciated the way he took certain things apart like that book Every Man’s Marriage which is really gross and...

-I think maybe that was the first time I had heard of Dalrock was from you positively praising that book, or, not the book but his takedown of the book.

– Praising his takedown of the book, yes.

Nathan – Right, and Dalrock can be fun to read and insightful when he’s eviscerating a target that deserves it, more about that in a minute. Um, If you listen to last week’s episode you know we don’t, I guess its worth saying, we don’t like Dalrock, we don’t support Dalrock, we don’t think people should read Dalrock. But just to get the story done, because we wanted to just kind of get an overview of the manosphere, what was going on there, I sent an email to Dalrock, I got ahold of him. He responded with an email directly to me, and then I emailed him. I’m going to go ahead and read this email, because it’s been the subject of some controversy and some confusion. I’m just going to read this entire email.

Hi, this is an email to Dalrock from me, Nathan Alberson.

Hi, We’re putting together an episode of our podcast Sound of Sanity on Red Pill, Game, MGTOW, all that good stuff. I wanted to see if you would consent to a phone interview sometime in the near future. I’d like to get as clear an articulation of your views as I can, and present it to the world. The questions would be quite simple I prefer simple questions that allow for more elaborate answers, as needed.

And then I listed seven questions. These are the same questions that you can actually see if you read the transcript of our email exchange, who are you, what are the problems facing men today, basic questions about who he was, what he was doing, how his work interacted with the manosphere, and what the manosphere was, which was what the episode was going to be about.

– Yeah, what we were going to be able to do with that hopefully would be to have a couple of audio clips for you guys of someone in the manosphere saying this is what it is, this is what red pill is, this is what mgtow is, this is who I am, this is what I’m concerned about, this is why I do what I do, and then be able to go with that, build off of that, into explaining to you something of this world.

Nathan – Uh, so just to finish the email, I said, after I listed those questions I said full disclosure: as you probably know, we don’t agree on everything. If I’m not mistaken... which, given where we’ve landed on Dalrock now it might sound like I’m being a little soft on him. But I actually didn’t know him that well at the time, and so I was really just wanting to understand his point of views. But I did know that he had said some negative things about my pastor, so here I say quote If I’m not mistaken, you see the work of my pastor and others like him as somehow undercutting the concept of female moral agency. I see your work as needlessly undercutting male responsibility in the name of establishing female moral agency. The podcast may ultimately reflect these differences, but I’d like to give you a fair chance to say your piece. This won’t be “gotcha journalism.” Actually, in that spirit, I’ll warn you about
the potential “gotchas” right now: I would like to press you a bit on the misogynists that work like yours seems to attract. I’ve seen more than one commenter in your archives say that a woman needs a good old fashioned spanking. I see in your “comments policy” you ask people to refrain from discussing marital corporal punishment. It seems to me that if you have to ask people to refrain from that topic, you may be attracting the wrong sort of people. I’d like to ask you frankly about that and let you answer however you choose. I hope that sounds amenable to you. Thanks, Nathan

- You could, if you pull that quote out of context, “I want to present your views to the world” you could get the idea that we want to do a whole episode on Dalrock and on promoting his views and giving him a chance to speak and use our platform to promote his views.

[Music stops]

But that’s not what the podcast was ever supposed to be about, it was clear from the beginning. And, when Nathan said “I want to present your views to the world” he was talking about his simple perspective on these definitions, what he’s doing and why he’s doing it, in the manosphere at large.

Nathan – He’s presented it as if I came along and said Mr. Dalrock, I’d like to give you a platform to expound your entire philosophy and to have a long form debate with me and my crowd about that. I never said that or...

- No, it was an interview, and it was simply a way for us to have a credible entry point into dealing with the manosphere and what it represents.

Nathan – Right.

- But the point is, it was clearly an interview, and it was meant to be an interview from the top. And why Dalrock, again, because he seemed to us to be the best, maybe not the best representative of the whole of the manosphere but maybe the most Christian, the one that Christian men would be most likely to be attracted to and even helped by.

-Yeah, the one that they’d have the best reason to read, I mean, the voice that would be most useful.

Nathan – Now, I do want to say though before we move forward, just so everything’s out on the table in terms of what was and wasn’t said, I did agree that he could post these things, post our exchange on his blog if he thought it would be helpful. In the back of my mind I kind of thought, well, it’s going to be pretty simple, like simpler maybe than...

- Yeah, I saw that email and I thought well ok he’s going to put up one post and it’s going to be him defining red pill and mgtow for his audience...

Nathan – Right, maybe as long as he’s defining these terms maybe he wants to use them as a primer, as long as he is giving a solid defense of his views on marital corporal punishment for example it might be nice for him to just make that into one post, which is fine, you know, which I said was fine. I did also offer at a certain point to provide written material you know if
he needed a more clear articulation of our point of view in order to engage with it, but we never went into this thinking it was going to be a debate or going to be a chance for him to have a full platform.

[Funeral music starts]

- Yeah but then one we got into the email exchange, for one, and saw how he was running with the questions and using them as jumping off points for him talking about his hobby horses... so then we have all... these big long responses to deal with. And then we start looking more deeply into what he actually says, and it’s just deception and lies, all through it.

Nathan – Right.

- Just complete dishonesty. And the way that he hijacks and diverts things, Nathan says I think that rebellious women should be rebuked, and called to repentance, and he says no you don’t, you’re a pastor, and now I’m going to talk about women in the military and the PCA report from 2002 for, you know, three pages...

Nathan – Yeah, he really...

- Of email exchange, and, in that, I’m going to lie about your pastor and about other people. And it’s like what? Come on man. You can’t accept that we think that rebellious women should be called to repentance? Your response to that is to then lie about our pastor, and to do it publicly as if we now have an obligation to deal with all of this garbage that you’re putting out there, it’s like, that was never the intention, it was clear from the beginning, and so ok, now we have a decision to make. Has this gotten out of hand, do we need to deal with Dalrock, or do we need to ignore it, and we decided to lean in, and just go ahead and deal with Dalrock and his dishonesty.

Nathan – And we had this 17 page transcript, 17 single spaced page transcript of our email exchange to deal with, which is what we, basically last episode, just to understand what was going on in our minds if it was a little unclear for you to follow it dear listener, we decided to do some skits and stuff like we normally do, do the devil's advocate segment...

- open up the question of the manosphere, and some of the people in it, and there’s no question that some of the things that we did, like we were talking about, were manosphere stuff, these are all, like that conference that we were talking about, the 21 whatever its called, these are the guys, like, Rollo Tomassi is the guy, and he’s kind of a father of the whole thing. And he has Dalrock on his blogroll and Dalrock has him on his blogroll, and [inaudible] these are the guys, this is what they represent, and they have these conferences, and they promote BDSM and all kinds of stuff like that. And, they talk about wife spanking, and all this stuff you can find in the manosphere.

Nathan – You can also find people who, disclaimer, you can find people that don’t like BDSM. You can find people that don’t like wife spanking, you can find all kinds of things in the manosphere.

- It’s a broad broad movement which is why, you know, we talked about the mens rights
movement vs the mgtows, right?

Nathan – Right, so just from our point of view if you understand what was happening last episode, just imagine, we barrel through talking about the manosphere, trying to give people some footholds to even understand any of this, and then, we have the 17 page thing from Dalrock which he’s already published on his blog that we have to deal with, so we attempted to deal with... I think we could have been more clear.

- I think we should have been more clear

Nathan – And should have been more clear, as far as what we were doing last episode, and why, so that’s what we’re doing now. Let’s just make sure everybody’s on the same page. Ben, explain everything that I just talked about in the simplest terms possible.

Ben – We wanted to do an episode on the manosphere, and we wanted the help of someone in the manosphere that we thought could give us clear definitions and would be worth quoting, and worth in some measure I suppose referring people to.

Nathan – Or engaging with at the very least.

Ben – Engaging with as an authority on certain definitions and questions.

Nathan – In other words you’ve got Rollo Tomassi who’s a pick up artist, you’ve got texas dom who’s, you know, texas dom, BDSM, you’ve got people that as Christians in good conscience we cannot engage with, and then you have Dalrock, who does at least present himself as the most reasonable, biblical voice that we’re aware of in the movement.

-And he’s been called by other Christians in his comment section like a kind of founding father of the Christian men’s sphere, Christian manosphere.

Nathan – Well and the thing about people who are, look I’m not sure what other word to use, the thing about people who are slimy, is that they don’t actually come like Uriah Heap, wringing their hands and cackling, and being nasty. They present themselves as reasonable, and if they’re good at it,

-On the surface.

Nathan – you know some one who is duplicitous isn’t someone who says, hey, I’ve got something to tell you, that’s what someone who’s bad at being duplicitous because they sound like someone duplicitous. Somebody that’s good at being duplicitous Is somebody that seems normal, stable, reasonable, [soft organ music continues in background] which is how Dalrock presents himself.

- Yeah, and listeners have said, in various places to us, hey I used to think Dalrock was great, until I saw what he said about Doug Wilson and reforming marriage. And I thought, wait, I’ve read that book, I love that book, I know that book, I was helped by that book. What he says about Doug Wilson and reforming marriage is not at all what Doug Wilson and reforming marriage say. And one listener in particular was saying was look, I was prepared to believe all
his criticisms of the evangelicals I already didn’t like, that I was prejudiced against, then he picked on Doug in a way that i knew was wrong, and realised suddenly, wait I can’t trust this guy to be honest.
A lot of people have had or been having that experience. We even in our last episode said you know, ok he might be right about Chandler, right, and we’re not going to even bother looking because he probably is right about Chandler.

Nathan – Yeah, i bothered looking, for whatever reason, followed the link...

- Yeah, after you said nothing could compel you...

Nathan – Nothing could compel me. Well, one point for Dalrock, you compelled me sir. Yeah i actually went to Chandler’s sermon. Let me just read a quote, this is from Matt Chandler’s sermon, quote you see women with their words, brutalizing each other, emasculating men, gossipping, slandering, even the Bible will say this is a real issue specifically for how women brutalise men with their words. Men can intimidate and use size. Women will most often use their words. And then he quotes the scripture a wife’s quarreling is a continual dripping of rain, and he says waterboarding. You live with a quarrelsome wife, you might as well put a sheet over your face and then just pour water on you forever.

- Yeah. Matt Chandler doesn’t believe that...

- Women sin...

- Women sin...

- Have moral agency...

- Or have moral agency...

- It’s only about like if their husbands...

- In the very sermon that Dalrock quotes!

Nathan – right

- It’s just like, come on guys.

- Well, let’s be charitable to Dalrock, maybe he’s not.. as I’m listening to this stuff I wonder what’s the most gracious we can be to Dalrock. Dalrock, maybe you’re not being deceptive in an intentional sense, but guess what, we decevie ourselves and it looks like you’ve definitely deceived yourself. You’ve become willfully obtuse. Like, you are unable to read.

-I mean, this is going to sound edgy. I don’t actually mean for it to be. I think the most charitable reading is that he’s stupid. Honestly. If he just doesn’t know how to read...

-He either is masterfully deceptive or he’s dumb. And those are your two options. And if he were to just respond and say ok you’ve made a point and I’m dumb, then all could be well and good in the world [laughter]
and we could be moved towards something...

-But there’s got to be some more gracious construction, like here, let’s try this: his bitterness at Christian leaders failures has made him stupid. So it’s not a comment on your natural intelligence Dalrock, it’s about how your bitterness leads you to be unable to read at this point in time. And if you repented of your bitterness you could become able to read again and maybe...

- Maybe even useful to the church.

[soft organ music continues]

-And I consider myself qualified to speak on this point since I know what it is to be bitter and unable to deal with someone’s words fairly. I know that for myself, so it’s not like I’m spouting off about what I don’t know.

Nathan – Well the weird thing about this whole thing is that I’ve wanted to believe him. You know know, when somebody says like, I’m trying to be reasonable you want to believe that they are trying to be reasonable. Even if they are not doing a good job you want to believe that’s what they want. And so when Dalrock turned around, published several private emails that I had sent him, emails that he actually calls, quote/ unquote private emails, and was just very spiteful in saying I didn’t listen to the podcast but obviously Warhorn media is incapable of logic, obviously blah blah blah... When he just got nastier with us than I’ve seen him get nasty with anyone maybe, I was a little surprised.

- Well, isn’t that one of the chief things going on here, is his supreme belief in his own reasonableness. Isn’t that what comes out?

Nathan – It’s interesting to contemplate the idea of, he hasn’t listened to our podcasts.

-Mmmhmm

Nathan – If somebody published something like that about me, and then sent me an email like I sent him, saying this is brutal, and you need to repent, and we talked about how you need to repent, I think I’d want to listen to the podcast. What kind of a man doesn’t listen to that podcast? Even if he just thinks it’s a nasty hit piece...

- I’ll tell you what kind of a man, a man who doesn’t want to face up to the possibility that he’s wrong, who doesn’t want to think about the possibility that he’s wrong, who wants to posture himself to his followers as being above that sort of thing.

Nathan – Right.

-And so, you know what, criticism hurts, and it cuts, especially if it’s on the mark.

Nathan – Well, we’ll get back to Dalrock, but I want to talk maybe bigger picture here. Another reason that we actually dealt with this stuff in the first place, that we wanted to talk about the manosphere, that we wanted to ask questions of Dalrock was what Jake?
Jake – Well it’s just increasingly attractive to men in our church who have been hurt by their mothers, by their wives or ex wives, and who are very tempted to go down the rabbit hole into bitterness... and the kids that are affected by this sort of thing. So I meet every week with a couple of boys whose mom left and is strung out on drugs. Dad has custody and they have a stepmom. They are tempted to be bitter and angry with God, with their mom, with everything. And this is something I’m always working with them and talking with them about, helping them try to acknowledge the sinfulness of their mom, and also to understand the forgiveness of God, to deal with their anger and their bitterness in a way that’s healthy, right? This is like, what we talk about, every week. I talk all the time with a man who’s going through a nasty divorce right now, whose wife up and left and took the kids. And the thing is, when you get into these situations it’s not clear and clean. You don’t get to say man good woman bad or woman good man bad when you’re dealing with actual real people. Because it’s complicated. And the responsibility is carried differently. Is a man responsible for his house and what happens in his house, and outside of his house? Yes, he is. Is a woman who leaves her husband or who commits adultery or who gives herself over to drugs, is she responsible before God for her personal behavior? Yeah, she is. And she’s responsible for the consequences. And those consequences have far reaching implications, not just to her husband and not just to her kids but to everybody that she comes into contact with. And we deal with it, exactly the kind of pastor that Dalrock is going to be critical of. The pastor that takes in the woman who has ran off, who has sinned against her house and her husband, and says you know it’s the mans job to love her back and win her heart and pursue her and if he had just done a good job of that then she wouldn’t ever and his job’s to go and to win her back and she’s just free to fly off the handle, fly off the rails until she’s just loved enough. And that’s just like, that’s the kind of garbage that we’re always dealing with.

Nathan – And so you have to rebuke that pastor. You have to rebuke that woman. That woman was excommunicated, I think we can say. At the same time, does the fella in the situation have responsibility? Is it possible that...

-Of course he does!

Nathan – sin has tendrils and is sticky and sticks to all kinds of people in a situation like that?

- Of course he does and that’s, I mean that’s something that we’ve been setting up in our storyline podcasts, right?

Nathan – Oh yeah it’s hilarious in the Ville with Matt and Erica Rosebloom right, our characters, people always...

- Listen, before you say anything, you listener are tempted to do this one way or another and a good test for which side you’re on is how you respond to Matt and Erica Rosebloom.

Nathan – Yeah and people it’s hilarious, nobody ever wants to say it’s complicated, which if theres any moral to our podcast I think the moral is probably something along the lines of it’s complicated.
- it’s complicated.

- Some of our listeners may not have heard any of our story podcasts yet but that’s what we’re talking about is two of our main characters, Matt and Erica Rosebloom and their really messed up marriage which features in a number of the episodes.

Nathan – Right and so people always want to say it’s the husband’s fault, he, if he was just willing to discipline his wife, if he was just strong...

- Or, they want to flip and be on the other side and say Matt’s actually a pretty good guy, he just married a horrible nasty shrew of a woman, an emasculating woman. And so it’s not really Matt’s fault, Matt could’ve been a great guy, Matt could’ve been a great husband and father but Erica won’t let him.

Nathan – And it’s like: they’re both true. Maybe there’s even some external factors that are outside of both of their [inaudible] I mean it’s, sin is complicated. Responsibility is complicated. I mean, there are heroes, there are villains, there are good guys, there are bad guys, there are people that are following the devil and people that are following the Lord, that’s not what I’m saying. But ultimately, parsing these things, you just can’t do it simp... you can do it sometimes simply, you can never do it simplistically.

- I’ll tell you how you can do it simplistically. If the only way that you’re doing it is on the internet, in paper, behind a mask. Then you can be as simplistic as you want to be. And, in your simplisticness, I think that’s right, in your simplisticness you will attract exactly the crowd that is bitter, and that wants to see it as a one sided thing and that doesn’t want to face up to their own responsibilities.

Nathan – About that crowd, people will hear us be pretty sarcastic, some of our skits have been very sarcastic about Dalrock’s followers in particular, and the bitter, nasty, verbally abusive kind of people that they are. We all three of us come from broken homes, right guys?

-Yep.

-It’s true.

Nathan – We are all three children of divorce. Jake, your mom left when you were how old?

Jake – My mom left when I was 5 or 6 years old.

Nathan – And Ben?

Ben – Uh, my parents got divorced in, just as I was starting college.

Nathan – My parents relationship fell apart in slow motion and I got to watch it all through my childhood, and then I think I was 17 or 18 when they finally divorced but they’d been living apart and things had been terrible for a long long time. And and and I feel the pain, I feel the impotence of a system that wasn’t in place, of a church in some respect that wasn’t in place, of a society that allowed this to happen. I understand that, it’s one of the reasons we do what we do. It’s one of the reasons Sound of Sanity exists or Warhorn media exists is because we
care about something besides trying to reform ourselves because there were real ramifications and there are real ramifications and feminism did put my mom in a nasty position and it [inaudible] make it easy for my dad to do the wicked things that he did, and I understand that, I feel...

-It also encouraged my mom to believe a whole lot of lies.

Nathan – Yeah. The kinds of lies...

-And my mom too.

Nathan – Yeah yeah yeah. Um, so we feel that...

-And it’s interesting, the Bible says that women are easily deceived, did you know that?

-Uh, I think I heard that once.

- And that they’re weak, and that they need to be protected by men from false teaching and that’s why women shouldn’t be teachers.

-Hmm, it’s almost like we should come back to that and make more of a point of that later in the podcast.

-I think we should come back to that point later.

Nathan – Yeah, well, we’re also going to come back to the point about our own pasts, but I just wanted to get that out of the way here. We, we get it, right? Even the most angry, nasty, horrible caricature of a Dalrock commenter who’s just being gross...

-I’ve said those things in my heart.

Nathan – I get it. I’ve said those things in my heart, I’ve probably said them out loud.

-And so, the temptation, to be bitter is real and a real one that we’ve all felt. And not just that we have felt but that we have worked with other people, and I’m the pastor in the room, uh I’ve got more experience with that sort of thing but it’s not like you guys don’t either.

-You know, Nathan you’ve got, in your small group, this very issue, that you lead.

Nathan – Yeah yeah yeah, I mean...

- And people that you care for and are actively helping to fight their bitterness and to be there for their kids, because the reality is, man you can be bitter, and then you’re just going to recreate the problem for your kids, or you can [with emphasis:] man up.

-And to be fair to Dalrock, he often talks about not giving into the temptation to bitterness, from what I’ve seen. He’s willing to bring that up and acknowledge it’s a point.

Nathan – You know his words say one thing...
- But his actions say another.

Nathan – and his actions say another, and his followers...

- Heh, display another.

Nathan – display something completely different. Guys, let’s find out what, uh, you know it occurred to me last time, probably the reason that episode didn’t quite work is because we didn’t bring in the number one manliness experts in sanityville...

-How did we not think of it?

Nathan – I don’t know what we were thinking. The hemanologists of course, they’re going to have good things to say about this.

-Dude. Those guys are awesome.

Nathan – Yeah [laughter] those guys are awesome. So let’s listen to the hemanologists and we’ll be right back after this to get more into the meat of this issue.

[Skit]

Nathan – And we’re back, thank you hemanologists. Alright guys, let’s reiterate what’s wrong with Dalrock. I hope everyone’s been able to follow what we’ve been talking about so far, the reasons we engaged with him, what happened, why. I want to come back though. Last week we tried to really sort of get into the weeds with some specific quotes and things got really dense and I’m just afraid it was a little bit hard for people to follow. So let’s talk more generally about what’s wrong with Dalrock, why people shouldn’t read this guy. Once again just in case anyone’s not tracking Dalrock is a popular Christian manosphere blogger. We are warning people to stay away from him. That’s become the purpose of an episode, of two episodes that initially started to as just an overview of the manosphere. What’s wrong with Dalrock. I think we figured out 3 fallacies right? 3 Dalrock fallacies. So Dalrock fallacy number one, Jake, what is Dalrock fallacy number one?

[Slow serious piano music starts]

Jake – The first fallacy is that he reduces male authority and responsibility. The easiest way to demonstrate that is his lack of understanding about the Fall. Now he thinks he understands the Fall because he thinks that he’s saying something if he says that women are fallen and sinful. He thinks he’s saying something that nobody else is saying and the reason that he thinks that is because the Bible emphasizes male authority and responsibility in every place and at every turn. And there’s something called federal responsibility or covenantal responsibility that comes to just being a man.

Nathan – Yeah we referred to this without quite explaining it last time, so...
Yeah and so here’s the thing: God places Adam and Eve in the garden. God gives his commands to Adam. Eve listens to the voice of the serpent, is deceived. Adam listens to the voice of his wife and rebels, right? All of that God comes to and calls Adam to account for, and in Adam we’ve all sinned. In Adam we have all fallen. So God comes and He talks to and addresses Adam first! Why? Because Adam was responsible for everything that happened. Responsible. Did Eve sin? Yes. And yeah Adam was responsible for Eve and responsible for himself. Scripture always addresses masculine authority and responsibility. The Scripture says in 1st Timothy 2 that because Adam was made first and then Eve, and because the woman was deceived, the Apostle Paul does not permit a woman to teach. He tells this to a man and it [inaudible] that man’s job to tell women that they’re not to teach and to forbid women to teach or have authority in the church. Why? Because women are easily deceived. And so you can’t have people who are easily deceived teaching. And so women are weak, they’re easily deceived and so the antidote to women being deceived and teaching bad things and believing bad things is for men to stand up and say no and to lead and to exercise authority, preaching and teaching. It’s for fathers to have responsibility over what happens with their wives and their daughters.

Right. And the irony here is that that’s like what Dalrock’s whole life mission is, to it’s it’s like to, it’s related to this anyway, it’s to tell all the Christian men on the internet that hey, that no one will tell women no. And we’re like, hey, one of our churches purposes is teach men [laughter] to tell women no, and he’s like: Stop it. You’re reducing women’s moral agency. It’s like: dude, like, are you blind? And then we answer our own question, we’re like, yes, you’re blind.

[Laughter]

Well that’s the, that is the thing, that is how Scripture approaches it. And all throughout Scripture if you look at Numbers 30 where it gives a father the ability to invalidate the vows that his wife or daughter took without his approval... Why? Because he’s responsible for them. He can say no, he has authority to say no. In 1st Corinthians we were talking last week there churches out there to go to. “Well there are no good churches out there.” Well the Church of Corinth was a church, right even though it, the Apostle Paul says a man has his father’s wife. That struck me after the fact. Hey, that’s interesting, a man has his father’s wife. Huh. It doesn’t say a woman has her husband’s son even though the son is... the son

- and presumably younger than

- younger, right, presumably, at least than the Father. No, a man has his father’s wife. Well Scripture always approaches sin first, just like God came first to Adam in the garden through the man. And it is a man’s responsibility to step up and to correct and deal with it. Which is why the answer to all of this is not really on the internet but teaching fathers to love and discipline their wives and their daughters...

- Right, which is not to say that Scripture...

- and to therefore protect them from the lies of feminism.
- Which is not to say that Scripture doesn’t ever directly address women, of course it does.

- It does all the time, it directs women, it addresses women. It addresses women’s sin and rebellion. It calls women to repent and it lays out how women are to behave, through the voice of a man. And so, what’s the model? The model is men teaching men and women how to behave and men teaching other men how to be good husbands and fathers and to lead and discipline and love and guide and protect their wives and their daughters. That’s how this problem gets solved, right? Even in the place like in Titus Chapter 2 where Paul’s exhorting the older women to teach the younger women, he’s actually telling Titus to tell the older women what they ought to be teaching to the younger women.

- That’s right.

- And how they ought to be serving the other women by teaching these specific things. And so yes, it’s so profoundly ignorant of all of Scripture and Scriptures emphasis on fatherhood and the fatherhood of God that is reflected down into all of humanity to simply say that calling men to take responsibility for their wives and daughters and pastor’s to take responsibility for the families in their churches is somehow denying feminine responsibil… It’s not what it’s doing, what it’s doing, yeah what it’s doing is our second fallacy which is Dalrock underestimating feminine weakness and dependence on men.

- Which is not, it’s not the same thing as underestimating feminine moral agency which is what we’re actually not doing.

Nathan – Yeah let me read a Scripture. This is Paul talking to Timothy. Second Timothy 3: But understand that in the last days there will come times of difficulty, for people will be lovers of self, lovers of money, proud, arrogant, abusive, disobedient to their parents, ungrateful, unholy, heartless, unappeasable, slanderous, without self-control, brutal, not loving good, treacherous, reckless, swollen with conceit, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God, having the appearance of godliness but denying its power. Avoid such people. For among them are those who creep into households and capture weak women burdened with sins and led astray by various passions. Now why did the Apostle Paul in talking to Timothy single out women as the ones that would be led astray by these wicked men?

- Because women are weak, just like the Apostle Peter says. Live with your wives in an understanding way as with the weaker vessel. Which isn’t to say that women are weak in all ways, but that they are weak in very specific ways.

- Including a liability to deception.

- Which is just clear Bible.

- And so to say that if we, if we understand feminine weakness, and dependence, that we’re undercutting their moral agency is just...

- Again it’s to have a very narrow, rigid, small minded view of authority, responsibility, strength, weakness, masculinity and femininity. It’s just so small minded.
- And it’s the only kind of small minded that I really truly believe can only happen in a world of ideas where you’re not actually living with and working with real people.

Nathan – Yeah you watch like my, your parents go through a divorce, now Dalrock’s going to come back and say oh well I’ve had real experience, I have a wife, I have a blah blah blah... But, I mean, come on. You watch anyone go through a divorce for example, you’re going to see there’s sins on both sides. You are going to see it’s not that easy always to parce, and there is no simplistic... I keep thinking of, I keep thinking of the Garden of Eden and I keep thinking of Satan saying to Eve has God really said you may not eat of any tree of the garden, and I just think the devil, the real devil, always exaggerates and distorts and makes more rigid and dichotomous than it actually is, the position of God.

- The nature of deception can be seen by examining the deception of the devil.

Nathan – Am I comparing Dalrock to the devil? No, but I am saying deception, duplicity of his sort does take a certain form and it is very often exaggerating and making much more rigid and confining the roles and the things that God has put in place, right? And so Dalrock says you know: has Warhorn Media, has Tim Bayly really said that women have no moral agency? And it’s like, no we just said that men were... responsible, and that fatherhood’s a real thing and that it has ramifications and that maybe in order to reform a culture you start by talking to the fathers, and to the men. It doesn’t mean you don’t talk to the women. It means your emphasis, though, is on the men, because the men will [inaudible]. It's reaganomics, it’s trickle down theology, right?

- Yeah, which brings us to fallacy number 3 actually, which is that Dalrock doesn’t understand God’s fatherhood and this we infer from what we have said so far.

-Yeah and it is just essentially what follows. God’s printed His fatherhood onto mankind. And it’s everywhere. To pretend, again, like this is just about women, is not just to deny the problem, it’s to deny the way God made the world and the way God governs the world. The world that we live in is patriarchal by nature because it is founded and rooted and grounded in the fatherhood of God. And it’s a good and benevolent patriarchy. But that’s not something, it’s just again, it’s like talking to a brick wall. Like the man really does need to study the Bible and study the authority that men have and responsibility that men have in Scripture, and the way that corporate responsibility is connected to headship. So whether it’s a king being responsible for his people and a king’s and God visiting a people for the sins of his king, or visiting a king for the sins of his people, and holding that King accountable, or a priest, or a father, it’s just all over Scripture. Achan sins and puts the stuff in his tent: his entire family: dead. He’s responsible and everybody under his headship suffers. What if one of his children had taken it and hidden it? Achan is going to be held accountable for that.

Nathan – [Sarcastic voice] But Jake the levitical law also says that a son shall not be held responsible for the sins of his father and a father shall not be held responsible for the sense of his son...

- Yeah...

- Well, I think, I think actually in the, in the Achan passage what you see is that the entire
nation of Israel is already held responsible for Achan's sin. Now they aren't all put to death, but they are held responsible. They do fail in battle, they [inaudible] suffer.

- They lose 36 men or something like that.

Nathan – Yeah my only point in bringing up that argument or that caveat was just to say it’s not simple, again and we ain’t going to in this podcast solve every question you might have about corporate responsibility in federal headship. That’s not our design. But that doesn’t mean that there aren’t good answers to those questions and ways to think them through.

- Yeah, and part of what these, but part of what you have to understand is that people who want to isolate original sin, the salvific work of Christ to just Adam and Jesus and pretend it’s not of a fabric, the idea of corporate responsibility and of federal headship is not of a fabric with the way everything else in the world works? They’ve not begun to understand the Scriptures on sexuality, or on headship, or on covenant. Ya’ll got a lot of Bible to read.

Nathan – You better hope that there’s corporate responsibility because that is the hope, that, that is why you’re stuck with original sin in the first place and that is the hope that comes through Christ. If you want to deny it in every particular and then just magically believe in it when it comes to Jesus because yay, Jesus...

- And see this is, again, this is so ridiculous to have to say: the church is the bride of Christ. And so Christ as its head imputes his righteousness to the church. When God looks at the head, at the church, he sees the head, which is Jesus. That’s just like...

Nathan – You know, maybe it’s not ridiculous to say because, okay, sure, you had to learn it sometime. Maybe some of our listeners are learning it for the first time. I want to have sympathy for them, and I want to...

- We are clothed in the righteousness of Christ. Jesus came to save his bride, his people.

Nathan – If it’s just, if it’s something that you’ve never thought about that’s fine, but start thinking about it now.

Hey guys, those are Dalrock’s fallacies. Why don’t we go to another break and we’ll come back and clean this all up. I understand that old Chip and Lance are up to some kind of an adventure right now.

- They usually are.

Nathan – They usually are. Why don’t we find out what’s going on with them? Okay?

- Sounds good.

Nathan – All right.

[Skit]

Nathan – Ok thank you for that Chip and Lance. That was enlightening. Guys, what do we want to say? Just to reiterate one more time last episode we attempted to
expose Dalrock’s dishonesty. We tried to do it as straightforwardly and honestly as possible. An interesting thing that happened is that Dalrock’s commenters and Dalrock himself really seized on some things. I’d like to just take a minute to talk about this. They really seized on some things I said in last week’s podcast during, I think part of it was in the Devil’s Advocate... and so to be charitable part of it was in the devil’s advocate segment and if it was your first time hitting the podcast and you don’t understand how that worked I can see how that might have been a little confusing, who was representing what point of view and which ones we actually believed.

- We made it doubly confusing by switching roles.

[Talking over one another]

- Which I think was my idea. I apologize for that. Here’s the way that our show works. Our show is we come out of the gate and we lay something down and then we fight with ourselves about it and somebody plays the role of devil’s advocate and tries to put us in a corner. That devil’s advocate’s not always fair or honest in the characterizations but does try to deal with us the way that we are, we think people might deal with us.

Nathan – Well it’s also a good segment to deal with any prejudices or biases we might have and I admitted to some last week. I admitted that I smelled a rat with Dalrock, that I thought this guy’s doing something wrong. I mean I didn’t put it like this but what I was getting at last week was that ever since I first encountered Dalrock I’ve felt instinctually bad about him like as if he’s doing something wrong. And I haven’t always been able to articulate it like I can now thanks to working through it but I always felt bad and I expected or suspected that when I engaged with him he might trip up. He might say something bad, which he in fact did. I think I can admit to those things and I think I should admit to those things. You know, me and Jake sometimes have conversations between the two of us when we’re calibrating on Warhorn Media stuff, trying to decide what to do. I might say for example to Jake, I really don’t, this is actually not a real example but this is the kind of conversation: well Jake, I really don’t think that you should take this interview on this other podcast. I’m not sure though, it might be that I’m jealous of the attention that you’re getting. I’ll actually throw that out. And then, we can argue about it and we can figure out maybe that that wasn’t my motivation, maybe that it was. But I just think it’s always a hundred percent helpful for me to say: here’s my prejudices, here’s my biases, here’s the bad things that might be influencing. Let’s put those on the table. Let’s be honest about them, so then we can talk. Like it doesn’t do us any good for me to pretend like I’m an unprejudiced, objective guy who is just floating in the, in the world of ideas...

- Yeah, the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, who can know it. First step to being able to have an honest conversation about anything is to acknowledge that, right? We don’t come to anything unbiased or unprejudiced. So, we like to lay it out. And you laid it out actually in your first email to Dalrock. You said in the same email, I want to represent your views fairly but these are the biases that I’m coming with to this discussion. And, simple-minded people are going to take that and say, you said you did it in good faith and then you said you were biased.

Nathan – I’m going to be a little hard on them here. They seized on that and they roundly
mocked it, and they just made me, that was one of the things, places where they painted me the most nastily. Like, well he says, he said he wasn’t, didn’t even have an open mind. No. That’s stupid. That’s just wrongheaded. That’s not what I did. I admitted to where I’m coming from which is a good thing to do...

- And a helpful thing for our listeners to know coming into anything that we’re saying.

Nathan – Hey here’s an idea: maybe, just maybe, it would be easier to get something of value or nutrition from Dalrock if he told you where he was coming from and why, how that might be affecting his point of view...

- [Mocking voice] No, it’s just pure ideas.

Nathan – Here’s why I might feel tense about these guys seeming to take away from female agence... moral agency. Here’s, here’s why I’m so hard on those ideas. Actually knowing those things about Dalrock would go a long way towards making his position palatable and understandable. Here’s why I balk when you Mr. Warhorn Media argue this. Here’s why it’s hard for me to even begin to wrap my head around it. If he just admitted to some of those things... I’m not saying it would solve the problems that we’ve been talking about with him. But I think it would go a long way towards making his point of view understandable and sympathetic. So that’s one thing. We were honest about our biases in the podcast.

- And that’s what the whole devil’s advocate segment is about. Not just being honest about our biases, but honest about our argumentation, right? We are trying to put ourself in the corner, and fight our way back out of it, and prove to ourselves, and to the listener that we have a point to make. But our goal with that is always, as we say over and over and over again, not always even to convince everybody that we’re right, but to help people think Biblically for themselves.

Nathan – Right. It would be completely disingenuous for us, for example, not to say he went after our senior pastor, a man who we love, a man who is like a father to us. Dalrock attacked him.

- And so what do we do when we go, when we are preparing to defend our senior pastor, we say...

Nathan – This time it’s personal.

- This time it’s personal. Right, we’re tipping our hand. We are letting you know, hey, this is a place where, we’re coming at this, and it is in fact personal for us but we also think that we’re right.

- Yeah we, we actually have a loyalty. So you should spit on us [laughter] because that’s, that’s certainly Biblical.

- I just find it so ironic when there’s some anonymous, of course anonymous commentator who came to the Warhorn forum, Sanityville to talk about this issue and he said, uh you guys did a bad job in your conversation about Dalrock. I’m a regular reader of Dalrock. Of course, I
don’t have any loyalty to him, but...

Nathan – Dalrock followers as a general rule, I’m generalizing here, Dalrock followers will be very quick we found to disclaim any sort of loyalty to Dalrock...

- As they show up all over the place to defend...

Nathan – To defend Dalrock. Just so you know I’m an objective guy, and you suck because you went after Dalrock!

[laughter]

-I also have a pseudonym.

- I signed up anonymously to be a member of your forum just so I could say this. Not because of any personal...

- Just come on.

Nathan – Any personal animus. It’s like, admit to your personal animus, it’s fine.

- Yeah then we can be honest.

Nathan – You love Dalrock. Dalrock is a father to you. You feel like he helped you understand your marriage or something like that. You feel like things were bad...

- He helped you talk to your kids about a movie you watch.

Nathan – Right, just uh, just uh...

- Ok fine.

Nathan – Great! That helps us, you know?

- Admit it, and now we can have a conversation about it.

Nathan – Now we can talk. A lot of having arguments, good arguments with people, is just simply a...

-Is just self disclosing but the problem is, and the problem has been in this case is that every aspect of self-disclosure has been trotted out as an example of disingenuousness.

Nathan – Not just trotted out but seized upon with extreme rancor and just used to...

- Yeah, well, you know what, again, that, this is exactly the kind of deception that we were talking about. Why we said in last week’s episode if he would simply be honest in his characterization of Tim and that PCA report we could have a conversation about the emphasis placed on male responsibility versus female responsibility in that report.

Nathan – And there’s real criticisms you could make of Tim. There’s real criticisms you could
make of Doug Wilson. There’s definitely real criticisms you can make of Matt Chandler.

- Yeah, there, well there is truth to the fact... and we’ve acknowledged all these points in the last episode, but there is all kinds of truth to the fact that evangelical complementarian pivot is to just blame men for everything.

Nathan – Oh sure.

- And to, and to let women off the hook, right? Yeah there’s truth to that. Yeah. Even as, as you move, as you move from the feminist position that has been inculcated in you from your youth, there are steps along the way, and it is easy to jump, once you discover the Biblical doctrine of that is real of male responsibility, to just lay right there because it’s easy, and it is a coward’s move. He’s right about that. But the fact is you can’t talk with him about that because he’s not going to allow you to admit, unless you just lay down and say, you’re right about everything. I’m wrong about everything. I always have been. Please teach me. He’s not going to allow you to say anything about female moral agency in the context of masculine responsibility. He’s not going to let you do that.

Nathan – It’s just so immature.

- If you insist on male responsibility as a principle, no matter how abused, or misused, then he is not going to let you say female responsibility. He is going to undercut you and he’s going to lie about you, which is what we demonstrated last week he does. He just lies.

- Yeah and that kind of echo chamber way of dealing with things, I mean, it showed up immediately in his response to first blog post on the podcast which was: I didn’t listen to it, but they are stridently against me, and that shows that they can’t handle my arguments. Well, dude, like grow up, no it doesn’t.

- Again, again this is something that Dalrock...

- So I can take your logic, you are stridently opposed to us, that shows that you can’t handle our arguments. You see how easy that was Dalrock, like come on dude.

[laughter]

Nathan – You want to paint someone that way all you’ve got to do is paint them that way.

- Yeah and if you’ve got an army of, of people just ready to swallow everything you say...

Nathan – Disclaimer, are there two or three people in Dalrock’s comment boards that do call the others to be more reasonable? Yes.

- Sure.

Nathan – Do I feel completely fine making broad generalizations about the rest of the 9,000 people in his comments board? Yes. [laughter] I actually had to learn this lesson and it was really hard for me. Jake remembers this. When I was first working around the church and working with people I really thought that in order to be a man, I needed to box people into a
complete corner with every argument, and just destroy their argument and demolish it, and show how they were stupid, and show how, you know the worst possible characterization of them and their argument was true. I just thought that’s what it was to be a man. Guess what, that was just immaturity. It was just something I needed to, it was just something very simple that I needed to grow out of it, and praise Lord, I think I did. And the way that I did was just simply by being around people and interacting with them and being tempered by them. You know, not being pseudonymous on the internet but having friends, and people that I had to have real arguments, and I realized, hey, you know, maybe if I accept a charitable view of this guy’s argument we might get somewhere. Maybe if I don’t mischaracterize him, he’ll like me better. Maybe if I give him an inch, I can take the mile. Maybe, actually a good strategy for winning an argument is give and take.

- Is give and take. But to engage in give and take you have to be capable of living with tension. You have to be capable of living and dealing with nuances, and that’s the problem with, with Dalrock. He doesn’t want any of that work. You see this sort of thing so much in young men what which... what we always see is that a young man discovers masculinity or whatever, right?

And then what does he want to do? Or even reformed theo... whatever it is, right? What does he want to do? Well he wants to pop off on Facebook about it in memes, or he comes alive to the horror of abortion. He wants to go down to Planned Parenthood and yell at the doctors, or at the women that are going in.

Nathan – And if you for example plead with the women, please don’t do this, instead of saying, you are sinning against the Lord! he might judge you.

- That’s right. If you say, you don’t have to do this...

Nathan – They’re about to go kill their baby. How dare you appeal to anything but...

- God’s vengeance.

Nathan – God’s vengeance.

- Yeah, but the reality is what he’s doing is he’s overcompensating for the fact that he’s lived as a coward so it’s another cowards move. And it’s not that you don’t go down to Planned Parenthood or whatever and call people to repent and to not murder their babies. That’s not what I’m saying. And it’s not that you don’t, say, engage with, uh, arguments on social media firmly and directly and it’s not that you don’t do all kinds of things but you have to...

Nathan – It’s not that you don’t bring God’s Wrath into a discussion of guilt and sin.

- No you have to do all of those, there’s a time and place for all of those things. But, if you’re not willing and able to look somebody in the eyes and to have those conversations and to call them to repentance... uh... you’re probably, you’re probably just reacting immaturely and your real goal here is not to be helpful to anybody but to abso
As I noted the other day, after I posted the exchange I had with Nathan Alberson where we set the terms of the interview Nathan responded by posting excerpts of the exchange designed to make it appear that we had come to a different agreement (see internet archive for snapshots of the page). Nathan’s edited version of the exchange leaves out our agreement to have a back and forth exchange, and it leaves out the part where Nathan wrote:

I’d like to sincerely understand and present your point of view, even where our camp diverges.

These are critical omissions on his part, because Nathan has persistently claimed that I’ve misrepresented our agreement in these regards. By leaving out carefully selected portions of our agreement Nathan is deceiving his listeners. Yet at the same time Nathan hasn’t been so bold as to outright accuse me of making up the parts he strategically omitted. Either way, what he is doing here is deceptive. Here is Nathan presenting this deception under the guise of setting the record straight in the *second podcast* (emphasis mine)**:

I’m going to go ahead and read this email, because it’s been the subject of some controversy and some confusion. I’m just going to read this entire email.

Hi, this is an email to Dalrock from me, Nathan Alberson.

Hi, We’re putting together an episode of our podcast Sound of Sanity on Red Pill, Game, MGTOW, all that good stuff. I wanted to see if you would consent to a phone interview sometime in the near future. I’d like to get as clear an articulation of your views as I can, and present it to the world. The questions would be quite simple I prefer simple questions that allow for more elaborate answers, as needed.
And then I listed seven questions. These are the same questions that you can actually see if you read the transcript of our email exchange, who are you, what are the problems facing men today, basic questions about who he was, what he was doing, how his work interacted with the manosphere, and what the manosphere was, which was what the episode was going to be about.

- Yeah, what we were going to be able to do with that hopefully would be to have a couple of audio clips for you guys of someone in the manosphere saying this is what it is, this is what red pill is, this is what mgtow is, this is who I am, this is what I’m concerned about, this is why I do what I do, and then be able to go with that, build off of that, into explaining to you something of this world.

Nathan – Uh, so just to finish the email, I said, after I listed those questions I said full disclosure: as you probably know, we don’t agree on everything. If I’m not mistaken... which, given where we’ve landed on Dalrock now it might sound like I’m being a little soft on him. But I actually didn’t know him that well at the time, and so I was really just wanting to understand his point of views. But I did know that he had said some negative things about my pastor, so here I say quote If I’m not mistaken, you see the work of my pastor and others like him as somehow undercutting the concept of female moral agency. I see your work as needlessly undercutting male responsibility in the name of establishing female moral agency. The podcast may ultimately reflect these differences, but I’d like to give you a fair chance to say your piece. This won’t be “gotcha journalism.” Actually, in that spirit, I’ll warn you about the potential “gotchas” right now: I would like to press you a bit on the misogynists that work like yours seems to attract. I’ve seen more than one commenter in your archives say that a woman needs a good old fashioned spanking. I see in your “comments policy” you ask people to refrain from discussing marital corporal punishment. It seems to me that if you have to ask people to refrain from that topic, you may be attracting the wrong sort of people. I’d like to ask you frankly about that and let you answer however you choose. I hope that sounds amenable to you.

Thanks, Nathan

- You could, if you pull that quote out of context, “I want to present your views to the world” you could get the idea that we want to do a whole episode on Dalrock and on promoting his views and giving him a chance to speak and use our platform to promote his views.

What Nathan has to know is that if his listeners look at this closely they will see that in fact we didn’t agree to use his original list of seven questions like he claims. In the part of the exchange that he strategically edits out Nathan reworked the list into nine questions. If his readers look at this post for example, they will see where I listed questions 8 and 9. If they look at this post, they will see that Larry Kummer of Fabius Maximus suggested I add a note clarifying why Nathan was referencing question 8 in his reply to my answer to question 9.

Nathan: “I’ll have some follow-up questions, but I’ll let you answer question 8 first, and then we can hit a few things in more depth as needed.”
You might add a link to the previous post (the answer to his question 8), for people not reading these posts sequentially. They might wonder why you didn’t answer Nathan’s question 8.

Nathan edited his comment referencing question eight out of his presentation of the interview, and in fact omits the question numbers altogether in his version. But as clever as he was in this regard, he forgot that it wasn’t just the numbering that he changed when he reworked the questions. He reworked the wording as well. And while Nathan was careful to leave out the question numbers, he presents the revised wording of his question in his edited version of the interview. See the bold section in this snapshot from the Warhorn page taken today (archived here):

*I don't think Paul is contradicting this in 1 Cor 7:6-9. I think he is saying that he views his gift as a different kind of blessing.

**The term is vulgar but it expresses a vulgar truth that no other term quite captures.

NATHAN: Does work like yours attract misogynists? Why or why not? If so, is there anything that can be done to avoid it? If not, is there something an outsider like me isn’t understanding about the people that it does attract? Is it fair for me to ask the spanking question and the misogyny questions right next to each other? Are my biases making me see misogyny (for example, in the wife spanking crowd) where I should see something else? If so, what am I (and others like me) missing?

DALROCK: I think this primarily breaks down to two things:

1) “Normal” for conservative Christian culture is to pedestalize, really to idolize, women. This ties back to

Note that his wording of the question here can only be found in the parts of the email exchange that he implies never happened. He was careful to edit out the question numbers, but he forgot that he also changed his wording as we were coming to our agreement on the interview. Also note that this isn’t an innocent mistake, as the parts of our agreement that he is omitting here show that my characterization of our agreement is in fact correct, and refute his claims about our agreement.

Related:

- Did I lie about Matt Chandler?
- Warhorn's projection
- Why Warhorn Media’s duplicity matters.

Note: Unless something unexpected comes up I plan on this being my final post on the subject. My readers already see Warhorn’s deception, but I wanted to clearly spell this out for anyone coming across the question in the future before closing it out.

*However, Nathan did make two similar statements in the original email, so even without the third promise it is clear that he did not keep his word.

**Part of Warhorn’s deception here is pretending that my objection was that they didn’t dedicate their entire podcast to presenting my views. But that isn’t true. My objection was that in the lead up to the interview Nathan repeatedly told me he wanted to present my
views to his audience, even if they also explained why they disagreed. Yet after the podcast Nathan stated to his readers that their goal was to avoid presenting my views in the podcast. See his comments here and here. I never expected my views to go unchallenged, I merely expected Nathan to keep his word.
“Patriarchy Chicken”, a microcosm of feminism.
by Dalrock | March 11, 2019 | Link

From Instapundit

HIGHER EDUCATION BUBBLE UPDATE: Professor says she plays “chicken” with men while walking to empower women. “The idea of patriarchy chicken is as follows: by refusing to move out of the way to avoid collision with men going in the opposite direction, women are somehow empowering themselves.”

It might be more aptly renamed “presuming on chivalry.” But then, “feminists” do that a lot.

The irony is that the feminist is displaying her unshakable faith in the goodness of men here, even strangers on the street. This is very similar to Dalrock’s Law of Feminism, although instead of pleading with men to come to her rescue she is banking on men’s goodwill even as she accuses them of oppressing her.

See Also:

- The ugly feminist’s secret weapon.
- “I have always depended on the sexual kindness of strangers.”
Commenter Junkyard Dawg described his own response to Patriarchy Chicken (emphasis mine):

That actually happened to me a number of years ago. I was in a park where there is a wide walking path. People walking toward one another from opposite directions usually each moved to the right (like on the roads) to let one another pass. I saw a woman coming my way and moved all the way to the right, to the edge of the path. I soon saw that she had no intention of moving and she also was all the way over on the right (in her case, the left), and for sure, I was not going to step off onto the grass to let her pass, nor move to the center of the path – why should I?

I didn’t know how I was going to handle it, as she was almost face to face and I didn’t have much time to consider. But just seconds before, I stopped, put on a big spontaneous smile and said, “Good morning, how are you?” (We were now both standing still, face-to-face, about a foot apart.) This apparently was unexpected and she seemed to come to her senses, said, “OK,” and then moved over and kept going, and I resumed walking.

This is perfect, because it defeats the passive aggressive intent of the “empowerment” and forces the ugly feminist to choose one of three responses:

1. State outright that she is playing childish power games.
2. Go around.

If she chooses option 1, you can then respond with appropriate amusement. But chances are she will do as the ugly feminist did in Junkyard Dawg’s experience and move out of the way. Option three isn’t ideal, but keep in mind that being friendly is pure torture to an ugly feminist, so no matter how much you would prefer not to talk to one, she is far more bothered by being polite than you are.

It is also possible that she wasn’t actually an ugly feminist at all, but instead just not paying attention. Note that this response is perfect for that scenario as well.
A beer fit for an ugly feminist*
by Dalrock | March 12, 2019 | Link

Ad Age explains that Budweiser has reworked old ads to make them more empowering for women:

The campaign, released today in conjunction with International Women’s Day, features full-page color ads in The New York Times, Chicago Tribune and Los Angeles Times that juxtapose sexist Bud print ads from the 1950s and 60s with updated versions portraying women in empowered roles.

But the new ads have a pathos to them. Where the women in the old ads were serving and loving, with one exception the women in the new ads are ugly feminists* with no men in the picture. Out is a picture of a woman proudly preparing a delicious dinner for her and her husband with the caption:

Big appetite... dinner is almost ready and it sure smells good. Loosen your tie and enjoy your Budweiser.

In is a woman drinking alone on a Friday night eating takeout with only her dog as company. Table for one?

Time to unwind... It’s Friday, your favorite takeout just got here. Crack open a cold Bud and enjoy some time to yourself.
See the other “updated” ads in the campaign in the article linked above or at the New York Post. According to Ad Age women now dominate the Budweiser marketing team, so it is only natural that the focus of Budweiser advertising has moved from selling beer to selling feminist empowerment:

...women now comprise more than 80 percent of the brand’s marketing team.

...Budweiser announced it is joining the Association of National Advertisers’ “#SeeHer” effort, which aims for a more accurate portrayal of women in media and advertising. Rustgi confirmed that the brand will begin running its ads through the ANA-backed Gender Equality Measure testing. The so-called GEM tests score ads on how prominently they depict women.

*Note: Long time readers are probably familiar with how I am using the term ugly feminists, but others may not be. I defined the term here, and followed up a year later with a post on the power of the term. I don’t mean the term in the superficial sense of ugly, but am referring to the ugliness of the feminist mindset.
No respect for men who marry single mothers.

by Dalrock | March 13, 2019 | Link

Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary has a 2016 article by Sam Parkison excoriating Christian men for not marrying single mothers. Parkison calls Christian men’s preferences in this regard vanity, and repeats the charge three times:

But functionally, marriage is still idealized to be something vainer than what Scripture calls it.

...

1. Single Christian moms are as pure as the sinless Son of God, which is more than you deserve in a wife.

“He who finds a wife finds a good thing.” (Proverbs 18:22) Period. A wife is a gift of God’s grace, and grace is undeserved. If this is the case, then having the vain expectation of marrying a childless virgin is unwarranted.

...

We are not told in Ephesians 5:22-31 that marriage is intended to satisfy vain expectations, or that it’s the entitled reward of a virgin for a virgin...

Parkison opens with a lengthy criticism of the Evangelical purity movement. What he gets wrong however is the problem with the movement is not that it stresses purity while delaying marriage, but that it focuses on waiting instead of marrying. His frame is that the sin of single mothers is that they failed to keep themselves pure during what modern Christians euphemistically call “the wait”. The biblical perspective however is that they chose fornication instead of marriage. As the Apostle Paul explains in 1 Cor 7:8-9 (ESV):

8 To the unmarried and the widows I say that it is good for them to remain single, as I am. 9 But if they cannot exercise self-control, they should marry. For it is better to marry than to burn with passion.

Parkison assures us that all of the single mothers in the church know they sinned (facts not in evidence), but he is oddly silent regarding repentance:

Many of the single moms in our churches became single moms by virtue of having sex out of wedlock. As a Christian, I make no bones about the fact that such an act was sinful. In fact, the Christian single mom also acknowledges that her act of sex outside of marriage was a sin.

In fairness to the unrepentant single mothers, men like Parkison stressing what a gift their out of wedlock child is to their future husband, and what a boon it will be to their marriage has to make repentance seem unnecessary. The fruits of her past sin will make their
marriage (and therefore her husband) more holy! (emphasis mine)

...a biblical understanding of children leads us to conclude that the baby produced by this sinful act is an unimaginably grand and beautiful gift!

...such a marriage also has the potential of reflecting the gospel to an even greater degree, since it reflects not only Christ’s love for his Bride, but also the Father’s love for his adopted children! Far from being a burden, marriage to a single mom is brimming with gospel-displaying potential.

None of this is to say that single mothers don’t repent, or that Christian men should never marry a repentant single mother (I respect another man’s personal decision on this). But what Parkison and Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary are doing here is cruel to all involved. It is cruel to single mothers for encouraging them to count their past sin as a gift to their future husband, instead of helping them see that while our sins are forgiven in Christ, the temporal consequences of our sins remains. Instead of encouraging humility regarding their past sins, he encourages them to see themselves as a more attractive prospect as a Christian wife. It is cruel to the Christian men reading as well, because it teaches them to deny the sins of women and therefore sets them and their families up for even more misery.

Lastly, the whole perspective betrays a contempt for Christian married fathers, especially the Christian men who marry repentant single mothers with full understanding of what they are taking on. Instead of treating these men with respect, Parkison dismisses their graciousness by pretending it wasn’t gracious at all! Parkison is stealing other men’s graciousness for himself.

H/T Okrahead

See Also:

- If she can’t demand a husband then how do we expect her to demand salvation?
- Will Wilcox and the men of National Review respect you in the morning?
What if we acknowledged repentance and respected Christian men who married single mothers?

by Dalrock | March 15, 2019 | Link

Commenter Bee proposed that Christians should encourage single mothers to adopt their children out at birth, instead of shaming Christian men for having a “vain expectation of marrying a childless virgin”:

Mark Driscoll is another Christian Leader that has encouraged Christian men to marry single moms.

I think a better policy for Churches and Leaders would be to go go back to encouraging single moms to put their kids up for immediate adoption.

This is an interesting proposal. I can’t imagine modern Christians having that kind of will*. I’m also not sure it is needed.

Imagine if we simply made a public note in the wedding ceremony, and in the run-up to the wedding, that the single mother understood the seriousness of her sin and was repentant of it, and was deeply grateful that her husband-to-be was willing to be so gracious as to marry her despite the extra burden she has placed on their marriage?

We wouldn’t have to be cruel about it, just honest, humble, loving, and sincere. This would be incredibly powerful, and would set the couple (and therefore the children) up for a much greater chance of success. It would also go a long way to reducing any shortage (if there really is one) of Christian men willing to marry Christian single mothers.

This would send the right message all the way around. Young women would have an opportunity to learn from the mistakes of others, steering them away from both sin and pain. Women who today are being discouraged from repenting (cruelty) would be encouraged to repent (kindness). This repentance would prompt the congregation to respond with Christian love. And instead of disrespecting Christian men who marry single mothers, we would be treating them with respect.

*I can’t imagine us having the will to do what I’m proposing, either, but in theory it should be easier for us to work our way up to it.
Christian hospitality requires accommodating gay sex.

by Dalrock | March 19, 2019 | Link

Hospitality is the buzzword complementarians use to normalize homosexuality and demand that Christian parents provide gays with special access to our children. I’ve previously shared where Rosaria Butterfield and Pastor Sam Allberry (both of the ERLC) make this case. Pastor Matt Chandler (also of ERLC) likewise recently discovered that Christian hospitality requires that Christian parents bring gays into their homes.

But the wonders of Christian hospitality’s accommodation of homosexuality don’t stop there. Pastor Sam Allberry’s Living Out website explains that Christian hospitality requires that parents must not forbid their adult children from spending the night with their gay lovers. From How should I respond if my child comes out to me? (emphasis mine):

If your child is an adult and not living at home, then it is important to recognise that they are already making their own decisions and living their own life. Some people feel very uncomfortable with the idea, for example, of their adult children having a sexual partner to stay overnight in the same room. In my view, Christ’s call to show hospitality and acceptance in such a situation outweighs the need to send a message about whether a sexual relationship is right or not. Church discipline is precisely that – church discipline. It can only be exercised by the church, not individuals. Of course, you may want to talk through your beliefs with your child (provided you also listen to them explain theirs). But that can be done through an adult to adult conversation in which each person is able to share their opinions and accept that the other person may not agree. (Remember: if you disagree with their point of view, then by definition they disagree with yours, so grace is needed on both sides!)

This is an odd application of the term hospitality, because they appear to be talking about an adult child having their gay lover over in their own place, not in the parent’s home. However, this ambiguity may be intentional, and it may be designed to discourage parents from refusing to accommodate adult children who want to bring their gay lovers into their parents’ home to stay the night.

Either way, hospitality is the term conservative Christian gay activists are using to normalize homosexuality. The same article on children coming out as gay explains that normalizing homosexuality is in fact the goal:

Normalise it

I mentioned just now that you have temptations and sins too. We are all fallen, and almost all of us struggle with sexual temptation. If you do not experience same-sex attraction, you probably experience opposite-sex attraction to people to whom you are not married instead! So, reassure them that you don’t see yourself on any moral high ground above them. If appropriate, even mention (without details!) that you
struggle with sexual temptation too and that you don’t regard their feelings as any different to yours – we are all tempted and we all need grace and forgiveness.

What is interesting about this claim is that if it is true, the same would apply to necrophilia, pedophilia, bestiality, and incest. The same would be true for this claim as well (emphasis mine):

Whilst their sexuality is an important part of them that you must accept and not deny, it is not the whole of who they are.

See Also:

- Loud and proud complementarians: No more taboos.
- I wonder who he has in mind?
Loud and proud complementarians: Holy homosexuality.
by Dalrock | March 20, 2019 | Link

On the fringes of complementarian homosexual activism is the idea that while gay sex is sinful, gayness as an orientation is holy. Dr. Albert Mohler describes this sentiment coming out of the Revoice conference last year:

In one of the more astounding moments of Revoice, Nate Collins read from Jeremiah 15 and then asked:

“Is it possible that gay people today are being sent by God, like Jeremiah, to find God’s words for the church, to eat them and make them our own? To shed light on contemporary false teachings and even idolatries, not just the false teaching of the progressive sexual ethic, but other more subtle forms of false teaching? Is it possible that gender and sexual minorities who have lived lives of costly obedience are themselves a prophetic call to the church to abandon idolatrous attitudes toward the nuclear family, toward sexual pleasure? If so, we are prophets.”

Keep in mind that this movement is designed to transform conservative Christianity. This is on the fringes (today) of the complementarian movement to accept homosexuality, but it is far closer than all but a handful of observers understand. Rev Thomas Littleton explained this back in June of 2018 in his post Revoice Response: Albert Mohler and the Missing Link:

The highly controversial Revoice conference is about a month away. We broke the story over six weeks ago, exposing Revoice and its stated goal of “Promoting LGBT+ Flourishing in historic Christian tradition.” Today the machinery of The Gospel Coalition and the Ethics and Religious Liberties Commission is in full swing attempting to “cover” the story in a way any trained media savvy believer would find disturbing. What IS NOW being said by TGC and ERLC is coordinated and calculated. What is NOT being said is intentional and dishonest.

First, little, if anything, was said in the weeks after our initial exposure of the conference on May 10. The first major outlet promoting Revoice was Living Out, the ministry of TGC editor and ERLC writer and speaker, Sam Allberry. His ministry is a collective of Same Sex Attracted gay priests from the UK / Church of England. Sam Allberry’s endorsement of Revoice was a massive red flag that signaled a broadening of the message of “SSA/ Gay Christianity” to the radical “LGBT+, Sexual Minority, Queer Christian” language of Revoice.

What none of these responders do, including Albert Mohler, is ADMIT that the reason REVOICE was and remains controversial is that it is in CLOSE PROXIMITY to the heart
of their own camp! Do not miss that fact, of which they are attempting feverishly to keep you ignorant in the “comprehensive article” published by Colin Smothers.

Littleton also connects the dots between Revoice and CBMW president Denny Burk:

Denny Burk works at Boyce College and is an ERLC/TGC speaker on issues related to sexuality and LGBT as head of the Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood. Collin Smothers, who compiles the articles and provides the critique above, also works for CBMW. Both are disciples of Dr. Albert Mohler of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Burk’s article was among the first responses posted on May 30th—almost 3 weeks after the story broke. It recommends a “wait and see” attitude regarding the Revoice Conference despite its radical language of “Queer Christianity” and “LGBT+ Christian.” In the Burk piece, he has the screen shot of a workshop titled “Redeeming Queer Culture an Adventure” which he inserted 24 hours BEFORE it appeared on the official Revoice website. During a Twitter exchange, Burk was asked about the timing—how he had the new workshop screen shot in advance—after which he blocked the author of the question. In the days following, in Twitter streams among Revoice leaders and Burk, Denny messaged to one of the Revoice leaders that they should talk but not in the open Twitter stream. However, this issue should not have back room communications given its goal of changing the conversation (and teaching) of the Church and all conservative denominations impacted by it. Denny Burk echoes what Dr. Mohler has said on the topic of homosexuality in years past, as if sexual orientation, is the topic of Revoice. However, the language of Revoice—LGBT+ (sexual minorities) Christians / Queer Christianity—is radical, unheard of in the Church and represents uncharted waters for the Church.

Another example of the argument that being gay is holy is from Gregory Coles. As Littleton notes, Coles wrote this in a book endorsed by D.A. Carson (president of The Gospel Coalition):

Mohler quotes from Gregory Coles’ (worship leaders for Revoice) Book, “Single Gay Christian,” which is heartily endorsed by D.A. Carson, and then tosses in the statement “That is an astounding question.”

“One of the individuals involved in the conference and a book published just last year asked the question: ‘Is it too dangerous, too unorthodox, to believe that I am uniquely designed to reflect the glory of God? That my orientation, before the fall, was meant to be a gift in appreciating the beauty of my own sex as I celebrated the friendship of the opposite sex?’ That’s an astounding question.”

Is it really, Dr. Mohler? Coles’ academic specialty is Minority Rhetoric and racial, feminist and gender theory. Either you just got played by Coles or you are using Coles’ quote to PLAY US!
Here is D.A. Carson’s endorsement of the book:

“To say this book is important is a painful understatement. It is the candid, moving, intensely personal story of a gay young man who wants to live his life under the authority of King Jesus and who refuses to accept the comforting answers proffered by different parts of the culture. Superbly written, this book stands athwart the shibboleths of our day and reminds us what submission to King Jesus looks like, what it feels like. This book needs to be thoughtfully read by straight people and by gay people, by unbelievers and by Christians. It is not to be read with a condescending smirk, but with humility.”

As I’ve outlined my series on Loud and Proud Complementarians there is a striking connection between the complementarian movement and activism for conservative churches to accept homosexuality. In a nutshell, complementarians are now doing regarding homosexuality what they have done regarding feminism for decades.

Consider Dr. Denny Burk, the current president of the CBMW. Burk announced his book *Transforming Homosexuality: What the Bible Says about Sexual Orientation and Change* in October of 2015. He became president of the CBMW eight months later. Burk’s focus on homosexuality may make him seem like an odd candidate to lead what most would assume is an organization focused only on feminism, but the CBMW has positioned itself in recent years as the center of conservative Christian response to homosexual activism. The 2017 Nashville Statement regarding gay marriage is now featured alongside the CBMW founding Danvers Statement on the organization’s website:

True to complementarian form Burk’s focus has been to give the appearance of orthodoxy on homosexuality while cutting off anyone whom he deems is too traditional on the subject. In *Transforming Homosexuality*, Burk and his coauthor Dr. Heath Lambert affirm that both homosexual acts and homosexual desire are sinful, but at the same time argue against reparative therapy (emphasis mine):

The Bible teaches that God’s plan for all Christians is to *transform* them into the image of Christ. It’s a process that takes a lifetime to complete. But this transformation is nevertheless what the Holy Spirit is doing inside of all Christians—not just some of them—including those who experience same-sex attraction. The change that God wishes to accomplish in same-sex attracted individuals is not necessarily *heterosexuality but holiness*. For this reason, our book opposes reparative therapy as a Christian approach to change.

*Holiness, not heterosexuality* is a catchphrase among conservative Christian gay activists, and Burk literally wrote the book on the subject. To see how core this idea is to conservative Christian homosexual activism, try searching on the term. Not surprisingly, the top editorial
reviews for the book on Amazon are from Pastor Sam Allberry and Rosaria Butterfield:

“Denny Burk and Heath Lambert have written a clear, compassionate, and thought-provoking book on how the gospel brings transformation to those struggling with homosexuality. Our hope is not the heterosexuality-or-bust shtick of reparative therapy, but the wondrous prospect of growing in holiness and Christlikeness that comes through repentance and faith. This is essential reading for every pastor and for any seeking to bless and minister to those with same-sex attraction in our churches.” —Sam Allberry, Associate Minister of St Mary’s Church, Maidenhead UK; author of Is God Anti-Gay? and James For You

“In Principles of Conduct, John Murray reminds us that ‘the line of demarcation between virtue and vice is not a chasm but a razor’s edge.’ In Transforming Homosexuality, Denny Burk and Heath Lambert shine scholarly and pastoral light on that razor’s edge, helping Christians to discern the difference between sexual temptation and sexual lust as it bears on same-sex attraction. This is a bold and provocative book. It will also likely be a controversial book. But it is predominantly a loving book that seeks to help people with unwanted homosexual desires be transformed by the full knowledge that God’s grace for us in Christ is sufficient for all our various struggles and sins.” —Rosaria Butterfield

Another example of Burk skirting the line is his review of Gregory Coles’ Book, Single Gay Christian. In the run up to Revoice, Burk explained why he hadn’t written about the (then planned) event:

1. I’ve already written extensively about the celibate gay identity movement. For starters, you can check-out the book that Heath Lambert and I co-authored Transforming Homosexuality in which we argue that same-sex attraction and sexual orientation are morally implicated in scripture. I make a similar case in an article I wrote for The Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society titled “Is Homosexual Orientation Sinful?” More recently, I wrote a review of Gregory Coles’s book that takes a critical look at his version of celibate gay identity.

Burk says he was critical in his review of Revoice worship leader Gregory Coles’ book Single, Gay, Christian, which is technically true. For reference, here is how Coles describes the book on his website:

Is it possible to be gay and still follow Jesus? And if so, what happens next? If you believe the Bible calls you to celibacy, is it possible to embrace that calling without feeling like a divine typo?

Single, Gay, Christian is the story of one person’s journey through these questions. It’s about acting like your own alter ego, about getting epiphanies from mosquitoes, about singing happy birthday to yourself while literally hiding in a closet. It’s about being gay, loving Jesus, and choosing singleness in a world that fears all three.

After opening with two full paragraphs praising the book, Burk does reject Coles’ embrace of a gay identity:
So there is much that I resonate with in Coles’ story. In the end, however, I share the same concerns about the book that Rachel Gilson expressed in her review at TGC.

First, this book falls squarely within the celibate gay identity genre, in which the author rejects gay sexual behavior and gay marriage but embraces a gay identity.

Burk then quotes a truly blasphemous section from the book, and instead of soundly condemning it responds tepidly that he doesn't know how to reconcile this perspective with scripture or natural law:

Is it too dangerous, too unorthodox, to believe that I am uniquely designed to reflect the glory of God? That my orientation, before the fall, was meant to be a gift in appreciating the beauty of my own sex as I celebrated the friendship of the opposite sex? That perhaps within God’s flawless original design there might have been eunuchs, people called to lives of holy singleness?

We in the church recoil from the word gay, from the very notion of same-sex orientation, because we know what it looks like only outside of Eden, where everything has gone wrong. But what if there’s goodness hiding within the ruins? What if the calling to gay Christian celibacy is more than just a failure of straightness? What if God dreamed it for me, wove it into the fabric of my being as he knit be together and sang life into me? (pp. 46-47)

Coles suggests that same-sex orientation may be a part of God’s original creation design and that homosexual orientation within Eden is an ideal that exceeds that which people experience outside of Eden.

I do not know how to reconcile this perspective with scripture or with the natural law. Same-sex orientation is not simply a “creational variance” (as Nicholas Wolterstorff has described it). Scripture teaches explicitly that homosexual desire and behavior are “against nature”—meaning against God’s original creation design (Rom. 1:26-27). Nor can I reconcile this perspective with what Coles says elsewhere about same-sex orientation being a “thorn in the flesh,” which suggests that same-sex orientation is not a part of God’s original design. Which is it? A thorn in the flesh or something God “dreamed” for people as a part of his original design?

After pointing out other instances of terrible theology in the book, Burk concludes his review with:

I really enjoyed getting to know Coles’s story. I can’t help but admire his continuing commitment to celibacy and traditional marriage. I want to cheer him on in that and say “amen.” Still, I am concerned that the celibate gay identity perspective he represents is not biblically faithful or pastorally helpful. And the issue is important enough to flag in a review like this one. Evangelicals need to think their way through
to biblical clarity on sexuality and gender issues, but the celibate gay identity view is muddying the waters.

Burk does just enough to separate himself from Coles' radical gay activism while praising Coles for living as a faithful Christian. It is also worth noting that while Burk disagrees with Coles embracing his “Christian” gay identity, Burk went a long way to create room for just that by declaring that heterosexuality isn’t God’s plan for Christians.

But while Burk has weak kneed criticism for Coles, he is effusive in his praise of Christian gay activist Pastor Sam Allberry (emphasis mine):

Sam is a same-sex attracted Christian, and a faithful brother. I cannot overstate how grateful I am for his life and testimony. The Lord has raised him up for our time. If you haven’t yet read Sam’s book, you need to. It’s titled Is God Anti-Gay? (Questions Christians Ask).
To see where the complementarian argument of Not heterosexuality but holiness is headed, see the 2015 article at The Gospel Coalition (TGC) titled Godliness Is Not Heterosexuality. In the article Pastor Ed Shaw complains that Christian parents don’t want their children to become gay like he is:

- I was recently on a panel talking about same-sex attraction at a large Christian conference. One of the questions I was asked was a thinly veiled version of the one question many Christian parents most want to ask me: “How can I stop my children from being same-sex attracted?” or (as no one has really had the courage to put it) “How I can I stop my child from becoming like you?”

- It’s a revealing question. The number of times I’ve been asked it (always in roundabout ways) demonstrates how great a fear it is for many Christian parents—to raise a child who might be sexually attracted to their own sex. It’s not something they want to have to share in the Christmas letter in years to come—either openly or by what’s clearly left unsaid.

- The great hope is that they’ll be able to write of happy marriages, numerous grandchildren, and continued involvement in a good evangelical church. They don’t want to have to say instead that a child is gay, that there won’t be any grandchildren (at least, not in the conventional way), and that their son or daughter is now part of some LGBT-affirming church (if any church at all).

- What they want from me is a few simple steps they can take to stop that from happening—ban their young son from playing with his sister’s dollhouse and discourage that sister from playing football when she’s older.

Shaw explains that Christian parents shouldn’t be concerned with such things. What they should be concerned about is that their children grow up to be holy, and being gay can make them holy. He quotes another pastor whom he says gave the right answer when asked how to help prevent children from being gay:

- So I was helped enormously—hopefully like everybody else listening—by the reply of another panel member at that conference. A heterosexual minister, he runs his church’s support group for same-sex attracted church members. He’s also the married father of two sons. He said something like this: “We, most of all, want our boys to grow up as godly and mature Christians. Some of the most godly and mature Christians we know are same-sex attracted. So why should we be so afraid of them growing up as same-sex attracted?”

- I was flabbergasted by this reply. It finally blew apart my wrong presumption that same-sex attraction and godliness, like oil and water, don’t ever mix. It made me
recall that some of the most godly people that I’ve ever known have also experienced same-sex attraction. In fact, one of the Christian leaders I most respect as godly has been made so through his struggle with same-sex attraction.

...that panel member is a parent whose main ambition for his children is the right one—godliness, not heterosexuality. I’m sure it doesn’t mean he’s praying his boys will grow up to be same-sex attracted. But his reply showed he has what we should all care about in our response to the gospel of grace—Christlikeness. Being like Jesus is the true biblical definition of godliness.

Shaw is one of three gay Christians who run the site Living Out (along with Pastor Sam Allberry and Sean Doherty). This is relevant because while Shaw isn’t speaking for Allberry in the TGC article, posts on the Living Out website speak on behalf of the three of them. The article Does Living Out support ‘gay cure’ or ‘conversion therapy’? makes it clear that Living Out has the same objection to the idea that being straight is somehow better than being gay:

**Why we do not support the idea of ‘gay cure’**

1) **Homosexuality is not an illness.** But using the language of ‘cure’ makes it sound like it is, which could be very damaging to vulnerable people (such as a young person coming to terms with their sexuality), making them feel ashamed of who they are at a very deep and fundamental level, and perhaps in some cases even contributing to suicidal feelings. Thankfully, we are not aware of any organisations in the UK which do support the idea of a ‘gay cure’. Our belief is that all of us have fallen sexual desires (whether heterosexual or homosexual), and that what we need isn’t more heterosexuality or less homosexuality, but the holiness found in Jesus Christ.

2) **Attempting to change someone’s sexual orientation assumes that being gay is somehow more problematic than being straight.** We believe that heterosexuality as we encounter it in this world is just as fallen as homosexuality. If a person changes from lustful desire towards people of the same sex to lustful desire towards people of the opposite sex, that is in no sense an improvement. So, attempts to change sexual orientation could be a distraction from the real goal, which is sexual purity expressed either in fulfilled marriage or in fulfilled singleness...

Keep in mind that Denny Burk, the president of the CBMW, co-wrote a book arguing against conversion therapy because the goal should be holiness, not heterosexuality. At the same time Burk asserts that homosexual desire is sinful, and that the idea of a gay Christian identity is wrong. Yet he also has declared that Pastor Sam Allberry of Living Out is a man the Lord has raised up for our time. This kind of pretzel logic is exactly what complementarians have traded in for decades regarding feminism, and they are now doing the same thing regarding homosexuality.
It was time to settle for a boring loyal dude.

by Dalrock | March 25, 2019 | Link

Filed under the category of Losing control of the narrative, I bring you Why It’s OK To Settle In Romantic Relationships – Refinery29

When I met my now soon-to-be fiancé, five years ago, I didn’t really think much of him – or us, as a thing. There was no magic or butterflies. We were in the same group of friends at uni and we had flirted a bit, but he was way more interested in me than I was in him. So I was just kind of messing around and seeing where that would go, when we ended up sleeping together.

He was not my usual type, to be honest. On a dating app, he wouldn’t have stood a chance, with his serious tone and all. Also, I was 25...

[Now] I’m okay with trading some passion for support, for showing up for someone who’s there for me when I need them. I’m done with the fantasy, with chasing a spark that would disappear anyway. I’m much more invested in building a sustainable future with someone who I trust and can come home to after a bad day and just be myself, even my tired-looking, annoying self. But I had to learn this, I had to rewire my brain into separating emotional rollercoasters and actual feelings.

The most highly rated comments demonstrate that the ugliness of the AF/BB model is becoming more and more recognized. The top rated comment (with 221 upvotes) notes that the intended endorsement for settling fell flat:

OP almost sounds like she’s trying to convince herself she wants this relationship... nowhere does she mention attraction, sexual attraction, spark, or the chemistry that makes long term relationships successful – even if that initial honeymoon period really does fade. Her relationship sounds exactly like the relationship that I just ended because it was lacking attraction and devolved into friendship.

Commenter Slickshoe responded by pointing out how brutal the post was to the boring loyal dude, drawing 118 upvotes:

I’d be devastated if I was her partner and read this............ I feel like OP had all these grand delusions of herself when she was younger and thought she deserved all the hotties or whatever until she finally grew up and realized that she’s not all that and probably isn’t going to land all these guys who are out of her league so she took whatever she could get. That is so sad.
Tragedy of the feminist commons.

by Dalrock | March 26, 2019 | Link

Dalrock’s Law of Feminism: Feminism is the assertion that men are evil and naturally want to harm women, followed by pleas to men to solve all of women’s problems.

Reader The Question found an example of Dalrock’s Law of Feminism at The Age:

Groups of men harassed me to tears in the street – and no one acted

Intrepid feminist Jill Stark went to an event where she had been uncomfortable for her safety before, and found that it happened again. Surely the good men in the area should have learned from the last time this happened to her!

We’ve been conditioned since childhood to believe it’s our responsibility to change our behaviour and minimise our risk in public spaces but it’s not our actions that need to be policed.

If you are a bystander to the mistreatment of women, you are part of the problem.

What made my experience last week particularly deflating was that exactly the same thing happened to me a few years ago after exactly the same AFL opening round fixture.

What Stark doesn’t understand is that this is a case of tragedy of the commons. The men around her knew she wasn’t their woman. This is true in both the specific sense, and in the more general/societal sense. In the specific sense, Stark tells us a male friend offered to walk with her, and she declined.

At first I was annoyed at myself for not being tougher, and for not taking my friend up on his offer to walk with me.

Oddly she doesn’t say why she declined his help, especially given that she had a bad experience the last time she was alone with the same crowd. But in general feminists resent men’s offers to help in these kinds of situations because accepting help implies not only that they aren’t as strong as men, but it also risks creating a situation where gratitude is appropriate. Since surely women are as strong as men, and since ugly feminists live in fear of feeling gratitude, the offer can’t be accepted. Besides, she should be just fine, since all of the men she doesn’t know, the men who didn’t offer to help, owe her protection on demand.

But her expectation that unknown men owe her protection from even feeling uncomfortable is a poor assumption. For starters in most of the West good samaritans are seen as dangerous threats to good order, and frequently derided as “playing hero”. As the most respected comment to the piece explained:

I can tell you why no-one (read: good men) helped: Being a good samaritan is not
worth it. There was a similar situation where when a woman was harassed on the train and the men in the same carriage stood up and changed carriages. Looking at the motives, the journalist who was told about the incident did some investigating as to the lack of help.

Turns out men who tried to help women in distress recently were either killed or badly injured assisting, went to jail for assault or murder themselves because they used excessive force in defending the woman, or hurt the assailant enough that he successfully sued the good samaritan. In all three cases the (good) man and his family suffered greatly.

So most people don’t want to risk their own families security and livelihood for some stranger. That’s why. They would prefer to protect their own.

There is another problem with her expectation, and it comes from social dynamics of groups of rowdy strange men. If her friend were walking her to a car or another safe place the catcallers would have shown less interest. It is highly unlikely that her friend is strong enough to overcome a group of rowdy football fans, but his presence would cause her not to stand out as (for lack of a better term) an unclaimed woman. In her gut she surely understands this, and this reality will have any feminist reading mad enough to tear out her leg hair. On the other hand, once she placed herself standing alone in the vicinity of rowdy fans, she was in their minds unclaimed. Moreover, if a random stranger challenges a group of men who are catcalling her he will be seen as challenging them personally. A man protecting a woman or women he is with will be (generally speaking) respected, unless he acts to challenge the group and/or unless the group is especially unruly. But a white knight who steps forward will be seen as challenging the men to a fight, and there is a good chance they are looking for such a volunteer.

The feminist response to this reality is that no one owns them, and they are of course right.
I’ll be turning on moderation around 9:00 PM this evening and won’t be turning it off until Sunday evening or Monday. I’ll probably do the same for the latter part of next week as well.

In the meantime you may be interested in the fact that Deep Strength has a book that will soon be available. Click here to see the table of contents. I’ve asked him to let me know once it is available so I can help get the word out.

Also, after a bit of a pause I see that Larry Kummer of Fabius Maximus has been very productive lately, including:

- The next chapter of RussiaGate: more hysteria!
- Prepare for the coming changes. Changes in everything.
- James Kunstler: the coming collapse of universities
- A new book with unexpected good news about polar bears
- America isn’t falling like the Roman Empire. It’s worse.

Lastly, from Pushing Rubber Downhill: Low trust societies.

4-1 Update: Moderation is now off.
Larry Kummer writes in *Sexbots are coming. Society will never be the same.*

This month’s news about falling rates of sexual activity should remind us about one of the next big things in tech – sexbots. They’re coming. We’re not ready.

Several of Larry’s readers struggled to see this catching on. This is understandable, but we should consider sexbots not as an isolated threat to a healthy society, but as part of a *slew of distractions* young men could turn to in their formative years while they wait for their future wives to tire of having sex with other men.

What we’ve done as a society is radically rework both sexual morality and our family model under the slogan *What could possibly go wrong?* As sickening as the idea of men turning to sexbots is, our foolishness in this regard is what should most disgust us.

In my comment on Larry’s post I included a link to the video I shared in *Time and Fantasy*, as this kind of product could serve as a gateway drug to sexbots. Looking at Youtube I see there is a new development:

Note how difficult the aging feminist in the video finds it to respond to a young man marrying a hologram. Despite her revulsion at the idea, she is compelled to note that she still sees herself as too young to settle down with a boring loyal dude, and she reflexively assures her audience that she would never judge someone for their sexual preferences.

Conservatives are *equally uncompelling* in their arguments for modern sexual morality. The part of all of this that is most shocking is how long we’ve been able to coast by on inertia. We rejected marriage and real sexual morality decades ago, and so far most men are still playing by the old rules. I don’t think sexbots will radically change the equation in the near future, but it is truly foolish of us to reject marriage and sexual morality and expect young men to never take this rejection seriously, or even get distracted along the way.

**Related:**

- [Loud and proud complementarians: No more taboos.](#)
- [More ominous than a strike.](#)
This may or may not become a regular part of the blog, but I present to you the Ugly Feminist candidates for April of 2019. Only two of the entries are recent stories, but all deserve to be noted for excellence in feminist ugliness.

Candidate #1 is mommyblogger Karen Alpert (Baby Sideburns). From Wife Gets Best Revenge on 'Lazy' Husband By Sending Him to Grocery Store With a Fake List:

“OMG my hubby has been lying on the couch all morning while I’m doing sooooo much stuff,” she wrote to her 339K Facebook fans. “So I finally got super annoyed and send him to the grocery store with a special shopping list. And yes I turned my ringer off.”

G-E-N-I-U-S.

The list included such choice products as “unsour cream,” “fat-free hummus,” and “3% milk.” It also was sure to give super specific instructions like getting the Wheat Thins “in the blue box” and something called Diet Diet Coke, which “you might have to ask for because it’s new.”

Based on this ugly feminists’ about page, her husband would make an excellent candidate for Heartiste’s Beta of the Month:

Hi, I’m Karen Alpert, aka Baby Sideburns. I’m a mom who likes to wear fat pants and drink Hershey’s syrup straight from the bottle while I cook dinner every night. And by cook dinner, I mean nuke chicken nuggets in the microwave. Thanks for checking out my page!

Here are some other things I do besides guzzle liquid chocolate:

Use fake words like gonna and anyways
Write sponsored posts so I can buy chicken nuggets and Hershey’s syrup
Raise two awesome kiddos...
Make fun of my very helpful, hot, amazing hubby who I somehow fooled into marrying me...

See also her post A bunch of things I do that my hubby doesn’t appreciate because he probably doesn’t even know I do them.

Candidate #2 is Anna Sheffer at Hello Giggles: Teen girls spend more time than teen boys on this one daily task, and it’ll piss you off

Although male partners are doing more chores at home than ever before, the gender divide in housework remains one of the most persistent (and frustrating) barriers to
gender parity. Women still take on most of the cooking and cleaning at home—a pattern that even continues among retired people. And depressingly, recent research shows that this trend starts early, with teen girls spending more time on housework than teen boys each day.

The highlight of the Hello Giggles article is the photos of terribly put upon women.

**Candidate #3** is Kristen May at Scary Mommy. *Dear Wives: It’s Not Petty To Expect Your Husband To Complete Household Chores*

My face is hot. I want to be mad. I am mad — but I shouldn’t be. Right? This is petty, right? I’m petty. I should be grateful he made any effort at all.

Especially because he did it without any prompting.

But wait a minute here.

WAAAAAAAAAAIIIIT. A. DAMN. MINUTE.

Why do I think there is something wrong with me for being mad about this rather than that there is something wrong with him for not doing his fucking share?

But. But...but...but. It’s a single load of laundry. I should let it go. I shouldn’t be mad about something so small. So trivial.

May gets bonus points for the stock photo of a husband doing housework as his wife relaxes on the couch. Later in the same article she makes a great case for her husband to win Beta of the Month:

To be clear, my husband isn’t lazy. He wants to help. He truly, honestly, with every fiber of his being (and because he likes having sex with me), wants to do his share. He is a good man, for sure the top 5% of husbands, and I love him and appreciate his efforts, I really, really do.

**Candidate #4** is mommyblogger Anna Luther. From *45 Ways To Annoy Your Husband*

I think that women are naturally much less annoying than men. Therefore, it is our duty to ATTEMPT to annoy our husbands every now and then so they can understand the pain we live with on a daily basis. Amiright?

...

When you get down to the last roll of toilet paper – hide it.

I did this once before we had kids. I’m pretty sure that Even Steven did something really annoying – or maybe I had PMS - the details don’t matter.

But when I saw we only had one roll of toilet paper left in the entire house, I hid it in
my bedside table. The really frustrating part was that this went on for TWO WEEKS, and he never said a single word. Not once. See how annoying he can be?

Not surprisingly, Luther makes a strong case for her own husband as Beta of the Month:

Sure – he lets me write pretty much whatever I want on this blog. He encourages me to have girls nights. He gets home from work every night in time for dinner – and even makes dinner a few nights a week. He likes to help with the grocery shopping, the laundry, the cleaning...

Bonus poll:
DC McAllister swarmed by ugly feminists, fired by The Federalist.

by Dalrock | April 3, 2019 | Link

Update: Moderation is now off.

I’m late coming to this story and don’t have time to do a proper write up on this (I’ll be turning on moderation tonight). But see this story for an introduction and what looks like a screenshot of the tweet that started it all. I can’t find the original tweet, so I suspect she has since deleted it*.

In a nutshell:

1. McAllister tweeted about an interaction she had with her husband while he was watching a ballgame. Her husband has game. She reacted to him with a quiet and gentle spirit, and brought him a beer.
2. Ugly feminists shrieked in horror at the thought of a woman not being an ugly feminist, and accused her husband of being abusive. One ugly feminist responded by declaring that being called woman and bringing her husband a beer was “A fate worse than death”.
3. A gay journalist jumped in on the criticism of her and her husband (see below), and as a result of the exchange McAllister was fired.

Check out her twitter feed as well:

I’m not going to quit. The mob lost.

I am going to take a short break because I do still have work and I have a ton of great stuff to write that will make Leftists quiver in their slippers.

To everyone who has supported me—and there have been many—thank you.  
https://t.co/T3sSagRht6

— DC McAllister (@McAllisterDen) April 2, 2019

I was fired when I criticized a gay man who mocked my heterosexual relationship. Yet no one defended me when I stood for masculinity and God’s design for sexuality despite outlets saying they represent Judeo-Christian values about sexuality, identity and purpose. What is truth?
— DC McAllister (@McAllisterDen) March 31, 2019

The real hatred isn’t toward me. It’s toward masculinity, the image of God in man. That’s what our twisted society seeks to corrupt. That’s what it hates and seeks to tear down. Beware, men. The trap is being laid for you. They hate me because I’m revealing the traps. https://t.co/ac1vedBXG3

— DC McAllister (@McAllisterDen) April 2, 2019

*Edit: This tweet from the gay journalist includes a screencap of her original tweet:

“He’s right. I slipped.”

Oh Denise 😓 pic.twitter.com/8cWlcGPtUm

— Yashar Ali ☺️ (@yashar) March 31, 2019
Chivalry just got even gayer.

by Dalrock | April 9, 2019 | Link

Presidential candidate Pete Buttigieg cleverly co-opted chivalry in the service of gay marriage (emphasis mine):

Buttigieg, in a speech at LGBTQ Victory Fund National Champagne Brunch in Washington, D.C., referenced the vice president’s less-than-welcoming attitude toward members of the LGBTQ community when discussing his marriage to his husband Chasten. He called marriage equality a moral issue, saying his marriage of two years has made him a “better human being.”

“My marriage to Chasten has made me a better man and yes, Mr. Vice President, it has moved me closer to God,” said Buttigieg, a devout Episcopalian.

This is brilliant because he is using an argument that conservatives will love without even understanding why they love it. This is something married men say about their wives, it isn’t something married women say about their husbands, and it goes back to courtly love (what we call chivalry). As Roger Boase explained, summarizing Gaston Paris (the man who coined the term courtly love):

…the lover continually fears lest he should, by some misfortune, displease his mistress or cease to be worthy of her; the lover’s position is one of inferiority; even the hardened warrior trembles in his lady’s presence; she, on her part, makes her suitor acutely aware of his insecurity by deliberately acting in a capricious and haughty manner; love is a source of courage and refinement; the lady’s apparent cruelty serves to test her lover’s valour

Likewise C.S. Lewis explains in The Allegory of Love that courtly love teaches that men must look to women for moral guidance (emphasis mine):

The love which is to be the source of all that is beautiful in life and manners must be the reward freely given by the lady, and only our superiors can reward. But a wife is not a superior.81 As the wife of another, above all as the wife of a great lord, she may be queen of beauty and of love, the distributor of favours, the inspiration of all knightly virtues, and the bridle of ‘villany’;82 but as your own wife, for whom you have bargained with her father, she sinks at once from lady into mere woman. How can a woman, whose duty is to obey you, be the midons whose grace is the goal of all striving and whose displeasure is the restraining influence upon all uncourteous vices?

Puritans tried to tame courtly love (a parody of Christian sexual morality) by bringing it inside Christian marriage. For gay men to bring the idea into their marriages is a fully logical next step.
Update: Buttigieg even notes that he is co-opting a conservative sensibility in his CNN interview with Father Edward Beck (H/T JRob):

Beck: What’s your take on why religion finds same-sex marriage so divisive?

Buttigieg: I saddens me because when I think about the blessings of marriage. First of all, it’s one of the most conservative things about my life, very conventional. It is morally one of the best things in my life. Being married to Chasten makes me a better person. I would even say it moves me closer to God. And so the idea that this of all things is what people are attacking each other over and excluding each other over, when God is love, we are taught. Of all the things to beat people up over on theological grounds, it just seems to me that loving shouldn’t be one of them. So it’s a painful thing to watch. I mean I get it, but. ...

If you believe marriage has to do with love, if also, by the way, at the risk of sounding a bit conservative, you believe that sex has to do with love, or ought to, then I think it takes you to a pretty specific place. I’ve learned that it’s an expression of love, at least it can be. And I guess I believe it ought to be.

Related: Light years closer to God.
Stephen Green at Instapundit linked to an article on nearly all house democrats sponsoring a transgender sports bill:


Predictably this led to much celebration amongst conservative commenters (as the real feminists). One commenter wrote:

Congratulations. What better way to tell the female half of the population that no matter how hard they work, or how good they become, the system will always be stacked against them, and society encourages this.

Another replied:

Make no mistake which fraction of society is promoting this. The lesson women need to take from this is that the democrats and left are willing to throw them under the bus to cater to a mentally ill splinter.

My response to the latter comment:

This is the political equivalent of the beta orbiter excitedly waiting in the wings for a woman to realize that she’s been wasting her time on bad boys for years, when her prince charming was right in front of her all along. Republicans aren't going to win the feminist vote because of this.
A chivalrous view of marriage and divorce.

by Dalrock | April 12, 2019 | Link

Pastor Russ Dean* at Baptist News Global asks Why do we continue to label the death of a marriage as a ‘failed marriage’?

The United States remains one of the most religious nations on the planet, and in my part of the world the air remains tainted by a religious-conservatism that once dominated the ethos. Our collective conscience remains stained by a selective biblical literalism that allows us to pick and choose whom to bludgeon and how to bludgeon. You know what Jesus said about divorce, right? Most people do not – but, it’s in the Bible, so . . . “You failed.”

While he blames conservatives, he offers a thoroughly conservative (chivalrous) view of Christian marriage.

So much worse than the end of a marriage is a marriage that dies but is never given the grace of a kind ending – though we seldom acknowledge this reality. How many have stayed in some kind of Zombie Marriage, like the walking dead, occupying one house and one life, long after the intimacy and the companionship ended? Surely this is not what Jesus was encouraging with his words about divorce.

“We did it for the children,” they sometimes say. Really? And exactly what are your children learning from this kind of marriage? “The Bible doesn’t allow divorce, except for unfaithfulness.” Really? And to what exactly are you being faithful in this so-called “marriage”?

*He is co-pastor along with his wife Amy of Park Road Baptist Church.
The unbearable cuteness of complementarianism.
by Dalrock | April 15, 2019 | Link

There is a cuteness to complementarianism that I struggle to name, but it is a form of gleefully smug cynicism. I’ll offer two examples in this post. Exhibit A is *How Jesus Trains Husbands* by Guy M. Richard. Richard absolutely drips cuteness as he contorts biblical marriage into feminist orthodoxy.

Exhibit B is Dr. Everett Piper* explaining to Rollo that he would oppose the feminist destruction of biblical marriage if he wasn’t so firmly committed to biblical marriage (alternate link).

*Dr. Everett Piper is President of Oklahoma Wesleyan University, and should not be confused with Dr. John Piper, cofounder of the CBMW.

H/T Emperor Constantine & OKRickety.
In a sort of ghastly simplicity we remove the organ and demand the function. We make men without chests and expect of them virtue and enterprise. We laugh at honour and are shocked to find traitors in our midst. We castrate and bid the geldings be fruitful."

― C.S. Lewis, The Abolition of Man

A few weeks back commenter Nick MGTOW shared a link to a Men’s Health story about 43 year old Charlize Theron asking where all the good men have gone: Charlize Theron Says Somebody ‘Needs to Grow a Pair’ and Ask Her on a Date

“I’ve been single for ten years—it’s not a long shot,” she said. “Somebody just needs to grow a pair and step up. I’m shockingly available...I’ve made it very clear.”

I did some digging and while today she is complaining about the lack of traditional men, just a few years ago she was outspoken (in word and deed) in her rejection of tradition. People magazine quoted her in Charlize Theron Adopts a Baby Boy

Though Theron is surely thrilled about expanding her family, she has previously spoken out about not feeling the need to tie the knot. Marriage, she said last year, was “never something that was important [to me].”

But then I saw that she was taking her rejection of traditional roles a step further, and was dressing the unfortunate boy as a girl. I decided against a post on it, because Theron is simply too weird, too crazy to offer as an example of the trends we see all around us.

I reconsidered this decision today after Larry Kummer reminded me of her statement, and after reading an article from Fatherly.com linked from Instapundit. The piece is by Lauren Vinopal, and is titled Why Am I Unhappy? Because All American Men Are Getting Sadder. Fatherly warns that modern men are unhappy because they can’t shed their toxic masculinity in response to the triumph of feminism:

Unlike femininity, masculinity is regularly challenged, policed, and taken away. This causes more “toxic” men to behave badly and many other men to live unhappy lives.

...the shrinking of the middle class and traditionally male dominated industries as well as the rise of dual-income family as a cultural norm has required men to pivot into unexpected roles and grapple with concepts at odds with internalized notions of manhood. Equally terrified of the #MeToo movement and being misconstrued as gay, men stumble down an untenably narrow middle path.
“Although these shifts are exceedingly positive, they can be daunting and intimidating for men,” Manly says. “This is a rather off-putting shift for those who have found safety in the left-brain, ‘logic is superior’ mentality.”

The whole piece is unintentionally hilarious, and therefore very much worth reading. It reads like a propaganda piece that was somehow blended with the author’s diary entry obsessing over the fact that the propaganda clearly isn’t working.

After laboriously arguing that men need to free themselves from traditional ideas of masculinity in order to be happy, the article closes by inadvertently explaining that what men desperately need isn’t yet another invitation to talk about their feelings, but a chance to do manly things with other men, without women (like Vinopal) barging in:

...Manly and Moore agree that such groups can be far more casual and may attract more members if they are. A basketball league works as well as a talk session.

“Men are desperate to be a part of groups of other men,” Moore says. “The opportunities for men to bond with one another have become fewer and fewer, and so they feel more isolated and less connected, and in some cases become depressed.”

But as unintentionally funny as all of this is, we shouldn’t celebrate. We lost, and the feminists won. We lost in large part because we had conservatives constantly assuring us that there was no feminist rebellion in progress. When women demanded to enter all male spaces, up to and including combat roles in all branches of the military, conservative Christians concocted a fantasy world where no such rebellion existed.

Now we are trapped inside the psychotic mind of modernism. On the one hand we have progressives, represented by Theron gleefully dressing a little boy as a girl. On the other side we have conservatives, represented by Theron denying reality and sternly admonishing men to man up, to grow a pair.

Related:

- Call me unchivalrous.
- Why Game is a threat to our values.
- He almost had a masculine thought.
Deep Strength’s book is now available.
by Dalrock | April 18, 2019 | Link

Deep Strength’s much anticipated book is now available! From Deep Strength’s post announcing the book:

—- Deep Strength ——

The book is now up on Amazon!


[Print edition](#) and [Kindle Edition](#).

Thank you to all of the contributors mentioned in the book and those who chose to remain anonymous. I could not have written some of the chapters without you. Also, thank you to the publishing team and the go-between people I used to get this professionally done.

Book description:

Because many young men and husbands do not have good masculine role models, it can be difficult for them to understand what a godly relationship and marriage might look like. In today’s culture, there is a lack of fathers passing down teaching to their sons, and, in many cases, what the Church teaches is more assimilated with secular culture, resulting in ineffective discipleship. Even seemingly good things like “purity culture” can have negative influences on marriage.

The Biblical Masculinity Blueprint aims to remedy some of these areas by giving Christian men the knowledge and discernment needed to have successful, godly relationships and marriages.

This book covers five distinct sections:

- Highlight problem areas of modern culture and how it has influenced the Church.
- Foundation Bible verses and their implications for relationships and marriage.
- Addressing any incorrect notions surrounding marriage, attraction, and the pitfalls of relationships.
- Ways single men can develop themselves to head a relationship and, eventually, a marriage.
- Ways married men can learn to obey God, become an effective head in marriage, and influence their wives and children toward godliness.

This book is not meant as a be-all end-all solution to dating, relationships, and
marriage as the Bible gives considerable freedom with how to approach them in a godly manner. Instead, it is written in the style of Proverbs 27:17 As iron sharpens iron, so one man sharpens another. Study the Scriptures, pray, use wisdom and discernment, and get additional godly counsel as you develop into a godly man who chooses the path of relationships and marriage.
The joke’s on him.
by Dalrock | April 19, 2019 | Link

Yesterday my wife had an ad pop up on her phone selling women divorce. I wasn’t able to find the online version of the ad, but with some digging found a picture of the same ad on a billboard here in the DFW area:

This is one of the pettiest things I've seen all year 🤦‍♂️ https://t.co/OQ1DWckRQO pic.twitter.com/Laa8Bb8LFT
— Malik Dilonga (@thattallldude93) May 6, 2018

A key aspect of our disrespect for respectable men is our denial of the fact. If we admitted we have contempt for men who marry and work to support a family, fewer men would do so. After all, divorce theft isn’t an option if the sucker won’t agree to the bargain in the first place. So it is essential for conservatives especially to pretend that the business of the billboard isn’t really going on.

Our careful denial of the true nature of our new family model leads to interesting results. You can boldly sell divorce right out in the open like this, and your target audience (married women) will get the message while everyone else either ignores it or fails to grasp what they are seeing.

While searching for the ad I first found a discussion of another incarnation of the same billboard. This version was in Chicago, and only included the text. When a user posted a picture of the billboard for comments, a man in the discussion couldn’t understand the message. Divorce theft is something you fear, not something you look forward to:

I am a little confused. “Double your closet space” means more room in your closet, so that means your wife will take half of your belongings/things you kept in the closet. Which is no good. On the other hand, if you mean that taking a divorce=wife will go away and take her stuff out of the closet so you have more room, still doesn’t work because the point of hiring an attorney is to keep as many of the possessions as you can, not simply get rid of the wife.
For me the line doesn’t work (unless I didn’t get it), but the idea to say something clever on the billboard, and keep it nice and simple works great.

Another commenter explained that the message on the billboard worked quite well if you thought of it from the perspective of women. Notice that even while explaining the joke he pretends this isn’t what is going on:

This ad really isn’t gender specific, but if you’re having trouble imagining this from
the perspective of a man, try imagining it from the perspective of a woman. Your husband moves all his crap out, you get more room for shoes and whatnot. And the point of hiring an attorney IS to get rid of the wife/husband, and while you may want to keep as many possessions as possible, you don’t want your wife’s shoes. This ad says you get the HOUSE, which is more important than any clothing. It also implies confidence that you’ll win your case, and it does it in four words :]


Don’t be the guy whose wife wanted more closet space.

by Dalrock | April 19, 2019 | Link

This is one of the pettiest things I've seen all year 😡 https://t.co/OQ1DWckRQQ pic.twitter.com/Laa8Bb8LFT

— Malik Dilonga (@thattalldude93) May 6, 2018

One of the ways we deny the obvious truth of the billboard is by declaring any man whose wife succumbs to the temptation to betray her marriage vows a “deadbeat”. Deadbeat has become a euphemism for a man who has been kicked out of his family, and we tell ourselves that such men deserve the cruelty our family courts visit upon them. That a man is in so wretched a state after the family courts get through with him is all the proof we need that he is a loser who deserved what was coming to him.
Never forget the eager role of the conservative anvil.

by Dalrock | April 20, 2019 | Link

I originally left this as a comment in response to Larry Kummer’s recent post: Marriage: soon the Surgeon General will warn about it. Larry wrote:

Summary: The Left has worked for two generations to destroy marriage as an institution by making it a bad bet for men. See these examples showing how they no longer even hide their intent. What happens if young men see this?

This is where conservatives come in. The conservative anvil is every bit the willing tool of the feminist blacksmith as her man-smashing hammer. Conservatives have responded to the sexual revolution and the destruction of marriage by adopting a highly selective sense of moral outrage. When women delayed marriage to focus on sexual freedom and career, conservatives cheered them on (while ignoring/denying the whoring). Thus the 700 Club touts a book by a 50 something never married career woman advising young Christian women to follow her lead and never settle. Likewise pastors regularly lecture young Christian men that they have a duty to marry single mothers, because:

Single Christian moms are as pure as the sinless Son of God, which is more than you deserve in a wife.

But make no mistake, if a man is foolish enough to follow conservative Christian moralizing, he will find the modern Christian taste for moralizing ends the instant the rube has taken the bait and said “I do”. If the man naively expects his pastor to continue to exert strong moral pressure after the wedding he is in for a massive shock. Suddenly the Christian taste for moralizing evaporates, and the man being obedient to conservative instruction is proof that he deserves a rebellious wife. After all, he is the one who was foolish enough to marry her in the first place! (emphasis mine):

Sadly, the sort of husband who demands his pastor or elders reduce his wife to submission to him is the sort of man who is generally pathetic. Often he can’t face his own failures in leadership, so he drops his wife on the pastors and elders demanding they do what he couldn’t or wouldn’t.

Don’t let him manipulate you into feeling responsible for his dilemma. You can pity him. You can sympathize with him. You can help him. But don’t let him place the responsibility for his wife’s conduct in his home on you. He married her. His sins have added to the problem. He bought the farm and now he is responsible to run it.

Don’t go to the elders and tell them it’s their responsibility to discipline your wife into submission.

It isn’t.
Men stopped reverencing women.

by Dalrock | April 29, 2019 | Link

Instapundit linked to an article at Evie Magazine* by S.G. Cheah titled How Feminism Is Driving The Growing Trend Of Anti-Women Subcultures. Cheah describes a disturbing conversation she had with a beta orbiter, where he explained to her why men are going MGTOW:

During the conversation, my buddy explained how despite persuading his friend against becoming MGTOW, he was still sympathetic to his friend’s excuse for doing so. In his words “Men are disgusted with women in almost every way today and are finding happiness in just cutting them out of their lives.” He continues, “And I can’t really argue against anything they (MGTOW) say because I relate to it all myself.”

I pressed harder to ask if he could elaborate on exactly what he meant by that. “Look around you. Every girl acts like a dude and has to have more guy friends than her actual boyfriend. Relationships are no longer partnerships. They’re just mutual debauchery based on meaningless sex and fickle mind games. And in most relationships, I see the women being an overbearing * constantly humiliating their dudes.”

That her beta orbiter would say or even think such things greatly disturbed her. He is a modern Christian, and was raised in the chivalrous model (emphasis mine):

I stood in momentary silence because I was unsure of how to respond to that. I wanted to hear the uncensored truth from him because he (unlike the women hating MGTOWs, Incels, and PUAs) had never viewed women in this way before. He was brought up in one of those traditionally wholesome, family oriented, Christian household, whereby the reverence for women was ingrained in him since a young age.

His father and male relatives were his role models for they knew exactly what it meant to be a protector and a provider. Consequently, the women in their lives (like his mother and grandmother) cherished and respected their men for that. It was then that I realized we’re in a turning point of history where men no longer held a reverence for women like they did in a previous generation.

Imagine her surprise if she learned that the chivalrous model isn’t Christian at all, and is a perversion of Christianity. Imagine if she learned that in Christianity it is wives who are to submit to their husbands in fear and reverence, and not the other way around.

Cheah briefly indicts feminists on her way to concluding that the real problem is weak men screwing feminism up:

The culture establishes that the ideal woman is smarter, stronger, better than the men in every way, and you can always depend on her to swoop in and save the day.
This trope is apparent in just about any family sitcom, movies, music, and the literature we consume today. Think—the bumbling fool of a dad in contrast to the highly efficient mom.

The problem when we constantly showcase women in this way is how we are presenting women as nothing but a mother figure. This is perilous because it pushes men to subconsciously embrace the role of the Puer Aeternus—the “eternal boy.” The man need not grow up because why would he? He has women to bear the burden of life for him.

Nowhere in the article does she grapple with the question of how women have responded to feminist indoctrination, or how women should go about undoing that indoctrination. The article concludes with Cheah’s beta orbiter assuring her that real men won’t become incels, MGTOW, or PUAs, and that:

“The problem isn’t women. The problem is feminism.”

*After reading the Evie about page, I would have described it as a secular Christian Cosmo. But then I saw that the creator of the magazine describes it as a conservative alternative to Cosmo.*
Insta-Whores: Is money the real problem?
by Dalrock | April 30, 2019 | Link

The Other McCain has a post up titled Insta-Whores, about social media prostitution. As McCain notes, the lines here can be blurry, and either way this is likely to corrode social trust:

Much of the behavior enabled by this emerging online market isn’t exactly prostitution — not a straightforward fee-for-service arrangement — but in general, social media is a mechanism by which good-looking young women may discover the cash value of their youth and beauty...

One result of this phenomenon — so-called “sugar babies” vending themselves to “sugar daddies” — is widespread cynicism and distrust. College girls who become accustomed to jetting off to Miami, Palm Springs or the French Rivera for “vacations” with well-heeled clients are not likely to be impressed with their male classmates, who can’t afford to spoil them in this manner. And a young man never knows whether the attractive woman with whom he’s trying to strike up a conversation is secretly engaging in such commercial activity. Recall the experience of Anthony Johnson (“Hypergamy Doesn’t Care,” April 23) who says he discovered his ex-wife had been engaged in prostitution for years. Once you become aware that this hidden sexual marketplace exists, the awareness changes your perception of women’s behavior.

But this also raises the question of what we expect young (and not so young) women to do while they delay marriage. Nearly all people are troubled by the idea of a woman marrying at 18, 19, or even in her early 20s, and most would be troubled to learn that she did so without having sex with other men first. How can she be ready to marry if she lacks “life experience”? Once married, we fear she will stay married if she no longer is happy honoring her vows.

Collectively, our biggest fear isn’t that our daughters will become whores, but that they won’t become whores. We just tell ourselves whoring is good so long as no money changes hands.

But again, what do we really expect young women to do in the interim, as the median age of first marriage continues to advance? In theory they are supposed to be looking for their soulmate, but while busily sampling their options are also not supposed to find him too soon. We expect young women to engage in the sexual marketplace, and we tell ourselves this is good so long as they don’t marry, and don’t accept cash or excessive gifts. They must whore for the joy of whoring, or it would be immoral and possibly illegal.

A few years back AXA Equitable ran a hilarious commercial about a woman who was too busy planning for retirement to notice her soulmate:

If anything, conservative Christians are even worse in this regard. The 700 Club’s Wendy Griffith is in her mid 50s and has yet to find a husband. Instead of a cautionary tale, this makes her a role model young Christian women want to follow. What was Griffith’s epiphany
after failing for decades to find a husband? She wasn’t picky enough!

In Griffith’s case she claims to have retained her virginity as she drew out her husband hunt well into her 50s. I have no reason to doubt this, but I do doubt that this is common for Christian women, including the very women who read her book.

The reality is that both Christians and non Christians are deeply uncomfortable with Christian sexual morality, and we have reordered our society accordingly. With this in mind, our sudden fear that our young women are turning into whores would be comical if it weren’t so tragic.

**Related:** Losing control of the narrative.

**Update:** See The Other McCain’s response [here](#).
One of the biggest impacts of the sexual revolution and second wave feminism is the trend of women delaying marriage to focus on a combination of sexual promiscuity, education, and career. A quick and dirty way to visualize this is the number of years between when a woman turns 18 and when she marries.

We tend to think of the sexual revolution as something that happened in the past, but as the chart above shows it started in the late 1960s and is still underway.

As Novaseeker explained in his excellent comment (see also here and here), when conservative Christians were faced with the choice of following modern values or following biblical values, they cast aside biblical values and followed the culture:

Prior to the sex rev/60s changes, it was quite possible to follow the standard American middle class life script (or upper middle class one .. the upper middle was tiny then anyway) while not contradicting conventional Christian sexual morality. The two meshed. After the sex rev/60s, that meshing came apart. The middle class and above started to prioritize education for their daughters — again, in part as
divorce insurance but in part also because it became a middle class norm for parents, especially fathers, to take pride in their daughters’ achievements educationally and professionally. The sexual revolution, the advent of cheap and reliable contraception and abortion, the changed social mores about women pursuing careers and so on ... all of this basically changed the middle class life script. Christians who were in the middle class were theoretically faced with a conflict — which script to follow, the Christian one (which also previously was compatible with the middle class one) or the new middle class one which conflicted with the Christian one because it implied lots of fornication?

Well, we know how *that* turned out, don’t we? What we learned was that most American Christians, of all stripes, were more committed middle class strivers than they were committed Christians. So when the life scripts diverged, they followed the (new) middle class life script en masse ... basically kept on following the prevailing middle class life script and left the Christian one by the wayside, observed with the lips but not with the actions. This was almost universally taking place at the time, and it became quickly entrenched. The churches didn’t fight it too much — there was some fighting in the 60s and 70s about it, but at the same time most of the “conservatives” in the churches were also adopting, de facto, the new middle class life script for their own daughters, and so the active opposition to this from the churches became weak relatively quickly, and then in the later 80s and into the 90s became virtually unheard of apart from radical separatist elements.

Key to understanding this process is to understand that conservative Christians don’t admit this is what happened. This massive shift is cloaked in denial. While the rest of society admits why women are delaying marriage, conservative Christians have declared that the trend that started in the late 1960s represents Christian women obeying God’s will. The term of denial is season of singleness, and the premise is that marriage delaying Christian women are responding to God’s call for them to wait for a husband. If you aren’t familiar with this part of Christian culture, do a web search on “season of singleness”, and you will find a cacophony of articles and videos on it.

Popular women’s preacher and former Miss Washington Allyson Rowe explains on Youtube: If God’s calling you into a season of singleness, REJOICE in it!

Rowe is 30 and has never married, but giving advice to women on the proper way to wait for a husband is her specialty. Here she explains that Godly women must not compromise on their long list of demands for a husband, because their desires are given to them by God. Settling, and marrying a real life man who is interested in them would be disobedient (sinful!), and betray a lack of faith in the goodness of God’s plan:

See Also:

- A very long season (part 1).
- A very long season (part 2).
The “no marriage proposals” canard.

by Dalrock | May 3, 2019 | Link

During the discussion of The season of singleness commenter innocentbystanderboston (IBB) made a fairly common argument, that women like Wendy Griffith and Allyson Rowe didn’t delay marriage in pursuit of feminist goals, but instead were forced to pursue feminist goals in their youth because they had no suitable marriage proposals:

If a medical doctor asked Wendy Griffith to marry her when she was 20, she would have said yes. So would Allyson Rowe. So would any of them. But they had no offers SO (to keep their “pride”) they bullshit us (and bullshit themselves) and make youtubes telling us about how they weren’t really looking or they were trying to find themselves to be better Christians or what-not. Its all a lie. Now we can say that “prideful lie” was the result of the feminist imperative and I would agree with you Dalrock, but its still a lie. They were looking. They were just never picked by anyone that was (in their minds) worthy of them. That is the red pill truth gentlemen.

This is technically true, in a No True Scotsman sort of way. Had their favorite rockstar walked out of the TV during a music video and suddenly proposed to them, they might have said yes. And even if they said no, this would mean the man (or the moment) simply wasn’t magical enough.

But while technically true, this framing misses the point. Not only does this framing overlook the woman’s responsibility not to price herself out of the marriage market (if she is serious about marriage), but it also has a false embedded assumption about the very nature and context of marriage proposals. While it is true that social convention strongly states that the man should be the one to formally propose marriage, it is also true that it is foolish for a man to go around proposing to women he doesn’t already know want to marry him. This is the reason the rejected stadium marriage proposal hoaxes are so compelling. The audience just knows she will say yes, because if he’s asking surely she must have already made her desire to get married unmistakably clear. So when the punchline comes and she says no, the audience is aghast, every time.

Another more subtle problem with this frame is the embedded assumption that Christianity requires that men pursue women for marriage. This is another case of mistaking what we call chivalry (courtly love) for Christianity. In the courtly love model the man must boldly declare his romantic intentions and win the heart of his lady fair. Her job is to sit pretty and judge the performance, both during courtship and throughout marriage. This isn’t a biblical model, but because we can’t distinguish between Christianity and a twelfth century parody of Christianity we refuse to see it. In her videos Rowe repeats Griffith’s claim that women are a prize to be won, and she backs this up with an appeal to Proverbs 18:22 (ESV):

He who finds a wife finds a good thing and obtains favor from the Lord.

She offers this as irrefutable proof that the courtly love model is the biblical model. But this is an incredible stretch, especially if you weigh it against the Book of Ruth. Ruth subtly and not
so subtly pursued Boaz for marriage, even though one might argue he is the one who formally proposed. This is true as well for Esther, the only other woman in the Bible to have a book named after her*.

Lastly, consider one more assumption nested in this frame. The assumption is that Griffith and Rowe failed because men failed. But *which* two men are responsible for Griffith’s and Rowe’s failure to marry in their youth? What we don’t see is a movement by the most desirable prospective husbands complaining that they were never able to marry. Certainly one didn’t exist 10 years ago when Rowe was in her early twenties, or 30 years ago when Griffith was in her early twenties. IBB’s hypothetical marriage minded dreamboats surely were not kept away from marriage. Desirable men who want to marry aren’t becoming the male equivalent of old maids. So the perfect men IBB and so many others want to blame for Griffith and Rowe failing to marry in their youth in all likelihood succeeded in marrying. This frame blames men who succeed in marrying for the women who fail at it. This is nuts.

**Related:**

- Feminine wiles
- She isn’t getting enough dates.
- What a setup looks like.

*Unlike Ruth, some would argue that Esther isn’t presented as a role model. I’m not convinced of this, but clearly both women were in atypical situations. However, both women clearly pursued their eventual husbands, and as a result of doing so truly wonderful things came to pass. In the case of Esther the Jews were saved from persecution. In the case of Ruth, she went from being a childless widow to the grandmother of King David, from whose lineage Christ would ultimately come.
Word has it there is a tip jar.
by Dalrock | May 3, 2019 | Link

I just noticed that I missed a response yesterday by The Other McCain to my post Insta-Whores: Is money the real problem?

Other men, perhaps much better men than me, have fared far worse in their marriages, and as I am basically Calvinist in my theology, I must interpret the blessing bestowed on me as evidence of unmerited grace — not what I have deserved, but what it has pleased God to grant me, making manifest His mercy.

Readers may ponder this mystery, while I call attention to a reaction to Tuesday’s blog post, “Insta-Whores,” in which I talked about how social media is enabling prostitution. This prompted some commentary from “red-pill” blogger Dalrock:

[excerpt from my post]

You can read the whole thing, and Dalrock’s point is correct. Most Americans do expect their daughters to delay marriage and, consequentially, they at least tacitly endorse pre-marital sex (fornication). Even many self-professed Christians have adopted this attitude, deeming college education and a professional career (the usual reasons for postponing marriage) more valuable than virtue.

Having contemplated this problem, I have no one-size-fits-all solution to offer, except to say that we need to change our expectations, and warn our children against this amoral and materialistic view.

Sin happens — we cannot change human nature — but: “Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil.”

I share McCain’s sentiment of having been blessed far more than I deserve, and I don’t have a one size fits all solution to offer either. Still, speaking the truth is an essential first step, and I’m very pleased to see McCain take this up.

According to the post he is on his way to Florida to cover the 21 Convention. It will be interesting to see his take on it. If you’d like to contribute to his travel expenses you can do so here.
RS McCain has published his report on The 21 Convention at The American Spectator, titled Red Pills and Red Hats.

President Donald Trump “represents the return of the patriarchy,” popular fitness entrepreneur Elliott Hulse declared at this weekend’s 21 Convention, a gathering of so-called “red pill” men dedicated to revitalizing masculine influence in society. A muscular New York native and father of four with nearly 800,000 YouTube subscribers, Hulse gave an impassioned presentation entitled “Defending Marriage in a Degenerate Culture.” Marriage and fatherhood were the focus of this, the 16th such conference organized by Anthony Johnson’s 21 Studios, billed as “The World’s Ultimate Event for Fathers.”

While most of these guys are Trump supporters, the “red pill” is not about politics in the usual sense. The phrase, borrowed from the 1999 film The Matrix, refers to seeing through socially accepted illusions to understand the brutal truths of human nature. A major popularizer of this concept as applied to male-female relationships is Rollo Tomassi, author of the 2013 book The Rational Male and its sequels. Tomassi was introduced at the 21 Convention as the “godfather” of the red-pill community. “A lot of men are finding the red pill because they’re looking for answers,” Tomassi said during an on-stage discussion with popular Tulsa radio talk-show host Pat Campbell. Often the experience of divorce or the break-up of a romantic relationship leads men to discovering the online community known as the “manosphere,” where Tomassi’s books about “intersexual dynamics” are widely read. Campbell says he’s heard from men who say their lives were quite literally saved by reading The Rational Male. “They were ready to end it all, zero out,” Campbell told me, describing men — typically in their 40s — who were devastated by divorce. . . .
Poking around *The American Spectator* site I noticed a piece titled *Fantasy Women* by Lou Aguilar, and one bit jumped out at me (emphasis mine):

Leftist lunacy literally sped up last month, when two biological males took first and second place in the girls’ 55-meter dash of Connecticut’s high school indoor track championship. That an actual girl runner who trained hard for this event consequently lost out on qualifying for the New England regionals is a small price to pay for the Wokening of America. But **the irony hasn’t escaped us immutable traditionalists** that progressives are now eating their own, such as tennis legend Martina Navratilova.

The true irony is that “traditionalists” are **anything but** immutable, as Aguilar goes on to demonstrate throughout the very same piece. The whole article is a longing for the feminism of yesteryear:

Yet Hollywood keeps shoving deliberately sexless action women down our throats, no matter how many of these movies bomb. Very few people went to see Gina Rodriguez as Miss Bala, Jennifer Lawrence as Red Sparrow, or Jennifer Garner as Peppermint. A great many did pay to see Gal Gadot as Wonder Woman. But then Wonder Woman is a famous sex symbol in a fetching costume, who actually falls in love with a male hero (Chris Pine). She’s something both boys and girls could enjoy, like her previous, hotter TV incarnation by the spectacular Lynda Carter. Things appear much grimmer for another big screen superheroine in this Friday’s release of Captain Marvel.
He lost his faith in fake Christianity.

by Dalrock | May 10, 2019 | Link

The Christian Post has a piece up about former pastor Dave Gass titled After 40 years, ‘megachurch’ pastor slams Christianity and quits, deacon claims he had affair. The church Gass quit is Grace Family Fellowship, and from their about page they appear to be a fairly standard issue complementarian church:

| We are a Southern Baptist Church (SBC) and are affiliated with The Gospel Coalition.

There is a lot packed into the story, including a deacon explaining that Gass is covering for his own unrepentant sin:

| ...he was my pastor when he “walked away”. He actually just slept with a married women in the church and got caught. He never repented and they still live together.

According to Gass, he lost his faith in Christ in part because of the lies modern Christians taught him about marriage:

| As an adult my marriage was a sham and a constant source of pain for me. I did everything I was supposed to – marriage workshops, counseling, bible reading together, date nights every week, marriage books – but my marriage never became what I was promised it would be...

Obviously the Bible makes no such promises. But modern Christians certainly do. Modern Christians teach that if a husband is godly enough, God will grant him a happy wife and therefore a happy marriage. See for example How Jesus Trains Husbands.

Pastor Doug Wilson explains in the introduction to his book Reforming Marriage that if a husband is godly he will have a happy marriage. Conversely, if the husband follows Pastor Wilson’s instructions but the wife still isn’t happy, this is an indication that the man is a hypocrite:

| This is why I am afraid that this book will be of little use to those who simply want a “formula” to follow that will build them a happy marriage....

| ...the love of the Christian husband does not proceed from reading the “right books,” including this one, or going to the right seminars. God will not patch His grace onto some humanistic psychological nonsense—even if that nonsense is couched and buried in Christian terminology.

| ...

| When a husband seeks to glorify God in his home, he will be equipped to love his wife as he is commanded. And if he loves his wife as commanded, the aroma of his home will be pleasant indeed.
The damage this false teaching does goes beyond merely destroying Christian families. It also threatens Christians’ faith in Christ. Men like Gass think this is actually Christian teaching. When they realize it is nonsense they reject Christ and not the false teaching.
Vaginas of the world, unite!

by Dalrock | May 13, 2019 | Link

On Friday Alyssa Milano called for a sex strike to protest abortion laws in Georgia. The response has been mixed. Sirena Bergman, a scold at the Independent, objected to such a patriarchal proposal:

Women still struggle to advocate for their own autonomy, consent and pleasure when it comes to sex with men. They’re still constantly judged on their sexual appeal to men. The idea that all women’s power lies in their sexuality is one of the most pervasive evils of a patriarchal society – and this is exactly what Milano is reinforcing.

Bergman proposed instead the forced sterilization of offending “sperm havers”:

I wrote about why @Alyssa_Milano's *sex strike* is seriously damaging and a MUCH better option would be to force sperm-havers into getting vasectomies every time they impregnate someone https://t.co/M5pCaR76Vg

— Sirena Bergman ☡ (@sirenabergman) May 13, 2019

On the other end of the spectrum, the Daily Wire responded with a hilarious satirical piece: Men Forced To Make Love To Wives As Alyssa Milano Goes On Sex Strike [Satire]

Finally it occurred to me that Alyssa Milano’s sex strike didn’t actually affect me since she’s some Hollywood actress I’ve never met and I wasn’t having sex with her anyway, so I just went home to my wife, who’s always been very nice to me and makes an absolutely spectacular meat loaf and is pretty good at sex too.”

Many feminists, however, flocked to join Milano’s sex strike, though a feminist sex strike is sort of like a Hollywood writer’s strike since most of the people going on strike haven’t been working all that much anyway.

As this post goes to press I have not been able to confirm rumors that Pastor Doug Wilson is writing a detailed piece explaining that since neither Milano nor Bergman are medical doctors, it would take at least a thousand years before they could understand that abortion is wrong.

Update: In Pastor Wilson’s defense, 1,000 years may not be long enough to explain the issue to Bergman:
Women who do not have sex with men may also need abortions. Sad for you that you're finding it such a complex concept to wrap your head around. Sit down.
https://t.co/vP6PquTRLt

— Sirena Bergman [] (@sirenabergman) May 13, 2019

Related: Sex Cartel!
she’s teaching her daughters to play patriarchy chicken.

by Dalrock | May 14, 2019 | Link

Anna Lee Beyer at HuffPost writes in How I Am Teaching My Small Daughters To Play Patriarchy Chicken:

Imagine me, a grown woman, with a jumping 5-year-old on one hand and a rogue 2-year-old pulling on the other. We are broad. We take up space. And now we hold that space, especially in the face of anyone who chugs toward us expecting to have the path cleared for them. So far only one person has run into us, bumping into my daughter’s child-sized shopping cart in the produce section.

My daughter said, “Watch out!” And I jumped to correct her tone, embarrassed that she seemed rude. Then I noticed that the other shopper was annoyed, not about to offer an apology, and I thought, “Why are we the rude ones in this scenario?”

Just like the woman who fights the patriarchy by farting in public, this kind of childish power game is a physical manifestation of the ugly feminist mindset.

Now when we are out shopping, taking a walk or engaging in any other family activity, I focus on the children and on our objective. I don’t look around to see how we can make ourselves more convenient for everyone else.

What harm am I going to do? Contribute to a new stereotype that mothers and small daughters are self-focused instead of submissive? OK, sounds great. Raise women who feel entitled to prioritize their own goals? Cool.

And ironically it relies on her unshakable faith in the good will of men she doesn’t know, of the very men she tells herself are evil.

Unfortunately, we know that simply standing in a man’s way can be dangerous.

Like Riley, I know I am exercising the privilege of a white woman in my upper middle class neighborhood where I can be inconvenient without worrying that it puts my children in danger.

One interesting aspect of the article is that while she calls this “Patriarchy Chicken”, borrowing the phrase from another ugly feminist, she describes her habit of intentionally getting in the way of strangers in gender neutral terms. She is especially careful not to reveal the sex of the person her daughter ran into with the shopping cart, which makes me suspect it was a woman, not a man.

See Also: The perfect response to Patriarchy Chicken.
Ugly feminists are large and in charge.
by Dalrock | May 14, 2019 | Link

The other day readers suggested that Sirena Bergman was a satirical character mocking SJWs, like Titania McGrath:

Sisters! We MUST get behind the #SexStrike NOW. ☒

ALL of us. No excuses.

As women, it is our duty to stand up for our right to an abortion by ensuring that none of us get pregnant.

— Titania McGrath (@TitaniaMcGrath) May 12, 2019

However, Bergman appears to be the real deal. Moreover, if she is a satirical character, she managed to fool The Independent:

I wrote about why @Alyssa_Milano's *sex strike* is seriously damaging and a MUCH better option would be to force sperm-havers into getting vasectomies every time they impregnate someone https://t.co/M5pCaR76Vq

— Sirena Bergman [] (@sirenabergman) May 13, 2019

I won’t try to guess what “wave” of feminism we are currently in, but the lunatics from university identity studies departments are now embraced by mainstream publications. Back in 2015 Allison Hope wrote in her XO Jane article Farting Is My Secret Feminist Weapon that Works Every Time

I fart in the grocery store to get the men behind me in line to back up a notch. I fart on the ferry to get men to take their goddamned arm off the back of my seat.

XO Jane was a fringe publication, and even some of its staff was glad to see it die. But today women like Hope are sought out by respected publications. As the Editor’s Note at the top of her recent opinion piece at CNN notes:

Allison Hope is a writer whose work has appeared in The New York Times, Washington Post, CNN, Slate and elsewhere.
Another example of this is Anna Lee Beyer. As I noted earlier today, she wrote at HuffPo about taking up maximum space in her fight against the patriarchy. Beyer is a champion of the radical feminist fat acceptance movement, and she is embraced by mainstream publications. From her bio at Fatventure Mag:

Anna Lee Beyer is a former librarian and newspaper reporter, now writing essays about parenting, mental health, being physically active in a large body, travel, relationships, and books. Her work has appeared in Slate, Cosmopolitan, Good Housekeeping, and Motherly.

I wasn’t familiar with Fatventure Mag, but I was able to find a description of it on their kickstarter page, it was created by “two fat lesbians who wanted to create a space” safe from “fitness culture” and toxic diet culture:

Who We Are & What We Do

Fatventure Mag is a printed and digital magazine focusing on active lifestyles beyond the boundaries of weight-loss culture. We’re shining the spotlight on work by fat creators who love spending time outdoors, communing with nature, and being active, no matter what “fitness culture” has to say about it.

Fatventure Mag was co-founded by Alice Lesperance and Samantha Puc, two fat lesbians who wanted to create a space where fat folx could talk about their experiences in the active/fitness community without being devalued for their size, ability, or motivation...

If you want more of Anna Lee Beyer, you can get it at Parents.com in My Husband Running Makes Me Rage & Here is What I Do About It

What The Other McCain calls Tumblr Feminism has gone mainstream. Tumblr feminists are our new cultural leaders.
End of transmission.

H/T Boris, Steve, & Anna.
Thoughts on conducting a proper manhunt.
by Dalrock | May 15, 2019 | Link

Commenter Rachel asked a question a little over a week ago:

I have a bunch of teenage daughters. I try to teach them to respect their father and men in general, like their youth group leader who recently nearly died in the Air Force yet still laughs with them every Friday night. I know I have been a jerk here but I want my daughters to be better than me. I had a discussion with my nineteen year old about ‘settling’ yesterday. Deti says we shouldn’t settle (i think) -I mean who wants a woman who isn’t totally into them. I think he is right. My 19 yr old currently has 2 men interested. One is autistic, he is in her high school class and she treats him like a human being. Since all the other girls treat him like crap she worries that she is encouraging him. Being hypergamous, she doesn’t even see him as a man. The other is a normal shy guy. He appears to be a solid Christian but we don’t know since she only met him at a Christian camp. I have warned her not to dismiss him but he doesn’t push her buttons. Is he the one and she should settle or is he just the first guy she’s met and she doesn’t know any better. I honestly don’t know.

When responding to another commenter, she added:

…he may not be interested, but she is barely communicating with him because she doesn’t want to lead him on - is that just one of those many little choices that lead to spinsterhood?

I initially held off on answering this because I’m not in a position to give parenting advice on the topic. Since Rachel and her husband have multiple teenage daughters, I might hit them up for advice myself in a few years. But as I’ve covered the related question in several posts I wanted to take a crack at it. However, instead of offering parenting advice I’ll frame my response as general advice to young women looking to marry.

The first thing I’ll say is that I wouldn’t worry about a young woman not being interested in any given man. This isn’t cause for concern, and she doesn’t owe them romantic/sexual interest. What would be concerning is if a woman found herself unable to feel attracted towards the kind of men who are in her “marriage league”. I don’t know how often this occurs, but we do hear frequent complaints from the women who experience this.

The solution if that happens is for the young woman to recognize that she has a problem, and if she still wants to marry she can solve it in one of two ways. She can either become more attractive to the kind of man she hopes to marry, or she can humble herself. This may seem obvious upon reading it, but I mention it because it isn’t how we typically see women responding to the problem. Most commonly what we see is a woman urging men to fix the problem for her, either by becoming more attracted to her or more attractive for her. But just like she doesn’t owe it to any given man to be attracted to him, no man owes it to her to become attracted to her. And if the man in question is able to up his attractiveness, this
would mean he could hope to attract a more attractive wife. This would solve his problem, not hers.

All of this is made more difficult for young women than it was in the past. Prior to the sexual revolution older women advised young women to not become overly full of themselves, and to look for a husband when young. Ironically now middle aged feminist women are starting to warn younger women of the dangers of overly valuing themselves and waiting too long, but middle aged Christian women are teaching young women the opposite. At the same time, young women looking to marry today lack the wealth of information young women had in the past. When most women married by their early twenties, women in their teens could look at the women a few years older than them to get a sense of what they might hope to attract for marriage. Now far fewer other women are marrying young, so there is much less information available here. Even worse, the lack of information comes as the amount of noise (social media attention, attention from men running day game, etc) has greatly increased.

On the other hand, while the cultural changes have made it more of a challenge for a young woman looking to marry, the relative lack of competition does offer her an advantage. The way I would frame this for a young woman looking to marry is to realize that the best man she can hope to marry is out there today. There may be fewer attractive Christian men looking to marry young, but they exist. Her goal is to find him and attract his attention before another woman snaps him up.

Again, this may seem obvious upon reading it, but this mind frame is surprisingly uncommon. Young women are being encouraged to wait around and judge the performance of a stream of suitors they hope will appear any day now. But other women’s foolishness is a wise woman’s advantage, so while other women are foolishly declaring themselves the pearl of great price, a prize to be won, etc. a wise young woman can quietly go about finding her man before one of those other bitches does. I should add that because modern Christians tend to confuse chivalry for Christianity, many will falsely teach that a Christian woman’s job is to wait around while wiser women are seeking out the man she hopes to marry. This simply isn’t true. The Bible doesn’t give us a formal set of instructions on finding a spouse, but it certainly doesn’t teach the chivalrous model. Consider the fact that only two books of the Bible are named after women (Esther & Ruth), and both describe how the heroine won over her future husband.

**Thoughts on Optimizers**

Part of the problem with the term “settle” is that it implies that the goal should be other than optimization. More accurately, the problem is either that the woman needs to fix something that is broken, or that she isn’t optimizing enough. We should encourage young women (and men) to seek out the most attractive spouse they can hope to attract. For a husband this would be a combination of his physical and personality traits along with his ability to provide (or signals of such). Most would hopefully add in the importance of seeking a fellow Christian who is strong in their faith. All of this should be in the optimization matrix, but we should also include the young person’s chastity. In 1 Cor 7 the Apostle Paul instructs us that if we burn with passion we should marry and have sex. He doesn’t give us a timeline here, but clearly he isn’t saying that time is no object. At the very least the goal should be to marry soon.
Remember, good men are hard to find.

If a young woman takes this seriously, one thing that should be clear to her is that the kind of man she wants is both rare and attractive to other women. Once she finds him, she should keep that in mind as the culture (including Christian culture) repeatedly tells her what a loser he is. She should be appreciative of him not only because this is proper for a christian wife, but for her own happiness. This is also an area where her parents can assist by setting an example. I can say this from experience, not as a father, but as a son-in-law. My mother-in-law and father-in-law have both blessed our marriage by being truly grateful that I am their daughter’s husband and their grandchildren’s father. This is sadly counter-cultural, especially in conservative Christian circles.

See Also:

- How young should a woman marry? (Part 1)
- Calibrating attraction by controlling the venue.
They’re too traditional to stay married.

by Dalrock | May 17, 2019 | Link

Rollo kindly shared a New Yorker article that he thought I’d be interested in:
A Sociologist of Religion on Protestants, Porn, and the “Purity Industrial Complex”

The article is an interview with sociologist Samuel L. Perry, who is looking at modern Christian culture from the outside. One of his observations is that “complementarian” wives are twice as likely as other women to divorce their husbands for viewing pornography:

Conservative Protestants tend to be what we would call “complementarian”...

Conservative Protestant women are twice as likely to divorce their husband because of his pornography use. And it’s not because their husbands are looking at porn any more often than non-conservative Protestant husbands. It’s because they draw a hard line, and they consider pornography use not just analogous to but literally adultery, or a betrayal, or a perversion. And so the consequences of pornography use for their relationships are extreme compared to consequences for anybody else’s relationships.

...

You’ve got these marriages that are blowing up because of pornography. With the survey data, I’m able to see the severity of consequences over the general population, but I’m not able to hear the stories. So what was so powerful to me was when Christian women would describe what it was like to discover their husband was looking at pornography: the anger that they felt, the betrayal that they described, and how they were processing it, how they called it adultery, and how they said it was betrayal. Or the husbands would describe getting caught and talk about how their wives didn’t talk to them for two weeks and threatened divorce. One of them came home to bags packed on the front porch.

Coming from the outside, what he doesn’t understand is this is about power. Complementarians pretend that they believe in biblical headship, but in practice the foundation of complementarianism is the wife is in charge. Pornography threatens a cherished lever of power for complementarian wives, which is denial of sex. This lever of power isn’t unique to complementarian wives, as all wives are tempted to use it. See for example Alyssa Milano’s recent call for a sex strike over abortion.

Athol Kay explained how porn threatens this lever of power, and why wives using denial of sex to manipulate their husbands have a much more violent reaction to their husbands viewing porn than other wives do in his post Wives Denying Sex and The Porn Firewall:

Here’s the situation...

After several months or a few years of his wife denying sex, the husband ends up
seeking some kind of sexual solace in using porn to masturbate to. Typically he carefully hides this activity from his wife, because he knows the reaction it will get.

Sure enough though, eventually he slips up and she discovers the porn. Whereupon she reacts just the way he knew she would – with a huge explosion of rage. Porn, it will be explained to him, is demeaning to women, disgusting, immoral, wrong, disappointing, revolting and hurtful. It’s also very likely to be explained to him that his use of porn has now put the relationship back several steps, just as she was starting to feel like she could open up to him, but of course now she can’t, and it’s all his fault.

Thus The Porn Firewall is created.

...

The unmet need for sex is a powerful impulse, and to keep a physically healthy male in an intimate relationship, but deny him sex, requires a heavy hand of control...

It’s an old behavioral technique to smack down hard on a person making a minor infraction, to intimidate then into never even considering a major infraction.

Complementarians are coy about this, but they play by the same script. Pastor Doug Wilson explains in The Suitor and his Porn that the problem with pornography is that it makes husbands lazy, and therefore they won’t be willing to work hard enough to earn sex from their wives:

Laziness: real sex takes real effort. Sometimes it requires two or more jobs — because the children must be fed. If the only effort for the young man’s sexual gratification is the effort his parents put out in getting a wireless connection down to the basement, then the chances are good that he will have come to believe that sexual release is low-hanging fruit, because in his lazy world, it has been. Marriage won’t fix sexual laziness because marriage won’t fix laziness. Marriage often makes laziness worse. But laziness as a character deficiency can be publicly identified. Marriage spurs the right kind of man to work hard, and encourages the wrong kind of man to slack off.

Entitlement: if the young man in question has a sense of entitlement about things generally — grades, employment, standard of living, and so on — it should not be surprising that he is the kind of person who will just “expect” what is his due. If for some reason that drifts away from him, he will still feel entitled. The most common way this happens in marriage is that a man does not treat his wife right, they start to quarrel and drift apart, and this naturally includes their sex life, and he feels just as entitled as he ever did. And the computer is right there. If she is going to take away x, then I will compensate with y — and she can’t complain, because its really her fault. Like laziness, the root problem is abdication of responsibility.

Dr. R. Albert Mohler Jr., president of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, explains the
problem with pornography in a strikingly similar way in his Christian Post article The Seduction of Pornography and the Integrity of Christian Marriage, Part 2 (emphasis mine):

The emotional aspect of sex cannot be divorced from the physical dimension of the sex act. Though men are often tempted to forget this, women possess more and less gentle means of making that need clear.

Consider the fact that a woman has every right to expect that her husband will earn access to the marriage bed...

...when I say that a husband must regularly “earn” privileged access to the marital bed, I mean that a husband owes his wife the confidence, affection, and emotional support that would lead her to freely give herself to her husband in the act of sex.

...Put most bluntly, I believe that God means for a man to be civilized, directed, and stimulated toward marital faithfulness by the fact that his wife will freely give herself to him sexually only when he presents himself as worthy of her attention and desire.

Perhaps specificity will help to illustrate this point. I am confident that God’s glory is seen in the fact that a married man, faithful to his wife, who loves her genuinely, will wake up in the morning driven by ambition and passion in order to make his wife proud, confident, and assured in her devotion to her husband. A husband who looks forward to sex with his wife will aim his life toward those things that will bring rightful pride to her heart, will direct himself to her with love as the foundation of their relationship, and will present himself to her as a man in whom she can take both pride and satisfaction.

Pastor Dave Wilson takes a slightly different approach, explaining that God communicates his displeasure with husbands through their wives (non) burning bush:

According to Pastor Dave Wilson and his wife, Ann, a man’s relationship with God is key to unlocking the mystery of marital intimacy.

...

Dave: Yes. Here’s all you need to know about that night—the thing that changed our marriage is when Ann was sharing with me what she felt—I had a pretty unique encounter with God. I sensed God was speaking to me, through Ann;

The complementarian response to men viewing pornography isn’t about the threat pornography poses as a sin, it is the threat pornography poses to one of complementarians’ favorite sins. Key to understanding this is to remember that the Bible teaches that husbands and wives are not to deny each other sex, because this would create temptation for sexual sin. This comes in the same passage where the Apostle Paul explains that Christians who
experience sexual temptation should marry and have sex (1 Cor 7:1-5, ESV).

7 Now concerning the matters about which you wrote: “It is good for a man not to have sexual relations with a woman.” 2 But because of the temptation to sexual immorality, each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband. 3 The husband should give to his wife her conjugal rights, and likewise the wife to her husband. 4 For the wife does not have authority over her own body, but the husband does. Likewise the husband does not have authority over his own body, but the wife does. 5 Do not deprive one another, except perhaps by agreement for a limited time, that you may devote yourselves to prayer; but then come together again, so that Satan may not tempt you because of your lack of self-control.

Complementarians have inverted Scripture, because what Paul tells us is prohibited (denial of sex) is a cherished tool for complementarian wives. In this sense it is a sin being used to further another sin (not submitting to their husbands). Husbands viewing porn threatens this cherished complementarian sin, and so it must be eradicated. But again, the reason for the intense focus on pornography isn’t to forsake sin in general, it is to pave the way for other sins that complementarians are heavily invested in.

One way to cross check this is to see if the complementarian response to women using pornography is similar. Complementarians don’t teach that a husband’s sexual attraction to his wife is God’s method of making his wife submit to him. Moreover, in the same New Yorker interview sociologist Samuel L. Perry explained that complementarian husbands don’t threaten their wives if the wife is viewing pornography. In that case, the sin this is ostensibly about is not nearly the problem:

Of the women who were watching porn, was it more that they themselves were feeling guilty, as you hinted at? Or was it that their husbands were also mad at them?

I had very few interviews where a Christian wife was looking at porn. In the heterosexual relationships in which I interviewed conservative Christians, it was almost always the man who was looking at porn. The Christian women who were looking at porn that I interviewed were primarily single college girls. I guess when women were married, the temptation to look at pornography was not quite the same.

But I will say this: the statistic that I gave you about conservative Protestant women being twice as likely to divorce their husbands as non-conservative Protestant women—the reverse is not true. The data that I have shows that men almost never divorce their wives because they’re looking at pornography. It’s just not something that they draw a hard line about, or get offended by, the way women do.

This is, I have to admit, a very clever tactic by complementarians. They are able to frame their own sin as merely a dislike for sin, and frame anyone who notices what is really going on as advocating for men to sin. Moreover, that this is wholly insincere doesn’t change the
fact that pornography is a problem in itself.
I’ve created a new category to tag posts: *Too traditional to be traditional*

So far only three posts (aside from this one) are tagged with it, but the thought process is common so I’m sure more are to come:

- They’re too traditional to stay married.
- The unbearable cuteness of complementarianism.
- She’s too traditional to marry her baby daddy.

I’ve probably missed some existing posts that fit into the category. Feel free to let me know in the comments if you have any suggestions.
“Look what he made me do!” as a murder defense.

by Dalrock | May 20, 2019 | Link

Submitting to the Lord sometimes involves drawing clear boundaries and enacting consequences when a husband sins.

-Mary Kassian

Fox News explains that a wife who shot and killed her husband was trying to give him a wakeup call in Arkansas woman convicted of killing husband for his refusal to quit porn

Hill was infuriated that her husband had repeatedly subscribed to a porn channel on their Dish Network, despite her protests, Hill’s attorney said in court Monday.

...She said she didn’t know that shooting at his feet could kill him as he bent over.
She said she only meant for the shooting to get his attention.

In other words, this was about power and control.

According to a local news story, her attorney explained that she shot her husband because what he was doing was an affront to her and God:

James said Frank Hill’s watching pornography was a “personal affront to her (Patricia Hill) and to her god. She told him over and over again to stop, and he said he would but went right back to doing it.”

According to People, Patricia Hill was found guilty and sentenced to 12 years.

Not surprisingly, none of the news stories I’ve found on the trial frame Patricia Hill as a domestic abuser who killed her victim in a fit of rage when she couldn’t exert power and control over him. Yet if the sexes were reversed this would be a textbook case of the Duluth model. As the founders of the Duluth model explain, domestic violence is always an expression of men feeling entitled to dominate and punish their women, which they blame on Christianity:

The underpinnings of the Duluth curriculum do come from a historical analysis. When Europeans came to this continent, they brought religion, laws, and economic systems that institutionalized the status of women as the property of men through marriage. From the church to the state, there was not only acceptance of male supremacy, but also an expectation that husbands would maintain the family order by controlling their wives. Various indiscretions committed by wives were offenses to be punished by husbands.

...Violence ends arguments. Violence is punishment—it sends a powerful message of disapproval.
That her own attorney felt free to present her desire to exert power and control over her husband as wholly natural speaks volumes. The reality is that nearly everyone in our society wholeheartedly supports domestic violence so long as the wife is the one exerting control. Hill’s offense in the minds of most is not her desire to dominate her husband. That is seen as good by everyone from feminists to complementarians. Her offense is the method she used to achieve power and control. Flying into a violent rage and breaking things would have been the preferred complementarian reaction, and Kathy Keller smashing the couple’s wedding china with a hammer is offered up as the model for Christian wives to follow. As Family Life explains, often times a wife has to result to violent measures to ensure that an “issue” is resolved. From Cycle of Unresolved Issues:

“What will it take to get your attention?” In the book The Meaning of Marriage, authors Tim and Kathy Keller relate how Kathy got Tim’s attention by lining up some of her good china, and as soon as Tim walked in the door, breaking it with a hammer. She got his attention!
I came across a page on Chivalry and Courtly Love the other day. It appears to be lecture notes from DePaul University, and is dated 1998.

What nearly all conservative Christians now falsely believe to come from Christianity (chivalry) is of course a mockery of Christianity (emphasis mine):

Chivalric or Courtly Love (known in medieval France as “fine love” or fin amour) originated with the so-called troubadours of the late eleventh century. **Promoting a suave new form of paganism** which they called Gai Saber (literally, “the happy wisdom” or “gay science”), these colorful figures from the Provence region of southern France effectively **challenged and sought to redefine traditional Christian ideals of love, marriage, manhood, virtue, and femininity**. Under the sponsorship of powerful nobles like Eleanor of Aquitaine and Marie de Champagne, their influence gradually spread throughout France and eventually into England and Germany. By the middle of the 13th century, the troubadour philosophy had become practically institutionalized throughout the courts of Europe, and “fine love” had become the basis for a glamorous and exciting new style of life.

Courtly love (what we call chivalry) is a tempting game for conservatives of all stripes to play with:

Couples engaged in a courtly relationship conventionally exchanged gifts and tokens of their affair. The lady was wooed according to elaborate conventions of etiquette (cf. “courtship” and “courtesy”) and was the constant recipient of songs, poems, bouquets, sweet favors, and ceremonial gestures. For all these gentle and painstaking attentions on the part of her lover, she need only return a short hint of approval, a mere shadow of affection. After all, she was the exalted domina—she was but her servus—a lowly but faithful servant.
They’re too traditional to submit to their husbands.

by Dalrock | May 24, 2019 | Link

Submitting to the Lord sometimes involves drawing clear boundaries and enacting consequences when a husband sins.

-Mary Kassian

As I noted the other day, complementarians have a brilliant tactic to put wives in charge of their husbands. They support their favorite sin by claiming they are merely objecting to sin. If you don’t support making Christian wives the rulers of their husbands, you must be an advocate of men sinning with pornography!

For another example of this, see His Dearly Loved Daughter Ministries. Click on the link to see the disturbing pictures of what complementarian marriage looks like (scroll down for more at the bottom). Her thoroughly broken and traumatized husband looks like a kidnap victim trying to signal for help.

The dominating wife in the pictures is Esther Hosea (blog handle). In her post What should I do about his porn problem? 8 “First Steps” for Wives she explains that wives who submit to their husbands instead of dominating them via the wake-up call model are guilty of the sin of idolatry. They must fully prepare themselves to divorce their husband if he doesn’t submit to their authority:

**Step Three - Surrender Your Pride and Your Idols to God**

This one is hard. This one hurts a little bit. (Or if you’re like me, a whole lot!) But it’s one of the most important steps for those seeking true healing. I’m going to ask you a few questions. They’re hard questions. Please take your time, seek God, and answer them as honestly as you can.

1.) Does the thought of your marriage ending bother you more than the thought of living with this sin forever?

2.) Are you more horrified by the idea of everyone knowing you “failed” at your marriage than you are at the idea of there being a secret sin in your marriage that no one knows about but you and your husband?

3.) Do you believe God would prefer for you to be abused than divorced?

4.) What’s more important to you, obedience to God, or the approval of Christians?

Once Christian wives repent of the sin of making an idol of their marriage, they will be prepared to set and enforce boundaries on their husbands:

**Step Seven - Make Strong, Clear, Biblical Boundaries**
I could write a whole book on the importance of Biblical boundaries... oh, wait. I have!

[Promo for her book at Amazon]

What does the Bible say about relational boundaries? Find answers to that question and many others. Learn how to define, establish, and implement healthy, God-honoring boundaries in your own life with the Biblical Boundaries Workbook. Available now on Amazon!

You guys, second only to seeking God, this is the most important step on this list! And frankly, if you’re seeking God, He IS going to lead you to make strong boundaries that honor Him.

If you have no idea where to start, check out this series I wrote: Biblical Boundaries, or just buy the workbook, which takes all the information in the series and adds tons of interactive questions to help you figure this issue out for yourself. If you know you need to make boundaries, but you have no idea where to start, or how to do it in a way that honors God, this book will show you where and how to find the answers! By the time you finish it, I guarantee you’ll have good solid boundaries ready to go and know everything you need to know about how to keep them.

The whole site is packed with statements like this. For example, from one of the posts in the Biblical Boundaries series she links to she explains that at times she is tempted to waver in dominating her husband. But then the Bible reminds her that wives must dominate their husbands (emphasis mine):

This is probably the area I struggle most in. It doesn’t “feel” loving to say, “If you do x, I will have to ask you to leave our house for 90 days.” It feels mean.

The thing is, I can see it easily with my children. I totally get that setting strong boundaries with them and enforcing painful consequences when they disobey is a loving way to set them up for success in life. I can understand that as a result of my delight in them, I will faithfully discipline and correct. But my husband is not my child. My friends, my parents, extended family members are not the same as my children. Sometimes it doesn’t feel like I have a right to “discipline” those people.

Then I read a passage like 1 Corinthians 5. Wow!

Sisters, God has commanded us to establish and enforce boundaries around morality with all believers! Why? As an act of love. Verse 5 shows us that disciplining such violations will basically force the person to hit rock bottom, which is the most likely way to see him restored.
Freeing the universe from microaggressions.
by Dalrock | May 28, 2019 | Link

From The Washington Examiner Extended scene showing Captain Marvel subduing sleazy biker draws groans, mockery:

An extended scene from “Captain Marvel” showing the hero intimidating a male biker has drawn criticism for what some describe as its overly feminist message.

The feminist trope of the kickass gal putting a sleazy biker in his place is an old one, and is loved by both feminists and conservatives. I was surprised it would cause such a reaction. But after watching the scene I get it. First, this is the nicest “sleazy biker” I’ve ever seen. He isn’t intimidating, he’s just cheesy. Second, Captain Marvel is entirely humorless. Normally the trope involves a sassy kickass gal, but Captain Marvel comes off like a women’s studies major. Think the dour Dr. Judith Draper from 3rd Rock From the Sun wearing a pleather jumpsuit. This all makes for a hilarious scene, but not in the way that was intended:
Four weeks ago Anna Hitchings bravely told her story and the stories of women like her who are in their 30s and can’t find one good marriageable man in For want of a lot of good men. Not everyone was sympathetic to her plight, and some on the internet even suggested that Hitchings herself may have played a role in her predicament. Hitchings has since created a blog and set the record straight.

All of this has inspired one of my readers, and at my urging he is starting his own blog and agreed to write a guest post (below) introducing himself and his blog. His name is Dana and he is part of a growing trend; Dana is 32 years old and has never worked a day in his life.

Hello Dalrock readers. My name is Dana Hitchings, and despite recently turning 32, I've never held a job. As you can imagine, when I tell working people this I'm constantly told that my problem is some combination of three things:

1. I haven't really been seriously looking for work.
2. My expectations are too high (I'm too picky).
3. I haven't made myself attractive to prospective employers.

But none of these are true. I know this because I've spoken at length with men my age and older who have never worked, and all of us are adamant that none of the three apply to us. Some have accused me of having a blind spot in this regard, but I'm very good at seeing other people's blind spots; surely it would be even easier to spot my own!

The real problem is not me, it is employers. I could write a book about all of the mistakes I see them making. Over and over again, I see them hiring people who aren’t nearly as great as I am and going about their business. Laughably, these employers have no idea how stupid they are being as they foolishly give these men raises and even promotions. They have no idea they failed to locate the absolute best employee for the job, me. They are totally oblivious!

This brings me to the first of two reasons I have decided to start my blog. With all of my years of experience, I know what employers need to learn about hiring. Granted, I don’t know as much as some other older bloggers in the field, but I’ll be able to leverage the wisdom of these older bloggers while providing a fresh, energetic perspective. I’ll be writing regular articles offering employers effective, practical advice on how to hire me.

As I mentioned, I'm actually on the younger side when it comes to this field, and I owe a great debt to the men who came before me who got me to where I am today. Now I want to pay it forward, and teach young men in their teens and twenties, and even early 30’s how to hold out for the best job possible. This is the second reason I’m starting my blog.
For example, Wendell Griffith has forgotten more about not finding a job than I’ll probably ever learn. Wendell is 55 and has never worked a day in his life. Now that is experience! He is a source of great inspiration to me. At times I’ve felt tempted to lower my standards and accept the real life jobs that are all around me, but then Wendell reminds me that I am a prize to be won, and that God will send me His perfect job in His time! If Wendell can be patient at 55, surely I can be faithful in my season of unemployedness.

Another mentor I hope to emulate is Randy Hale. Randy just turned 40 and has never had a job. Yet Randy has dedicated his life to inspiring others to be just like him. Randy has been writing books on being unemployed since he was in his early 30s, and his expertise in this area really shows. As Randy explains, the secret to a great career is having a truly excellent unemployed life!

I’d be remiss if I left out Leo Anderson. Leo is 47 and still looking for work. He has so much experience being unemployed that he now runs a ministry focused on helping young Christian men and women find jobs. His enthusiasm is boundless!

Lastly, while he’s a few years younger than me I want to give a shout out to Alistair Rowe. Alistair has a degree from Harvard Business, but still hasn’t been hired at age 30. Granted, being only 30 makes him a bit young to be an expert on not finding a job. But what he lacks in experience, he makes up in passion! Alistair makes regular passionate youtube videos that inspire me and countless other men to stop worrying that we are doing something wrong. As he reminds us, God is preparing us for the job He has prepared for us. You can’t rush these things, as they will happen in God’s perfect timing.

H/T Ray6777
Taking things too far.

by Dalrock | May 30, 2019 | Link

What is so striking about the modern Christian rationalization of the feminist life script is how much further Christians take it than secular feminists. This seems to be an artifact of claiming that the results of feminism and the sexual revolution are actually God’s will. For example, Christian women have adopted the same “never settle” mantra in their twenties that secular women have, but Christian women claim God is telling them to never settle. Wendy Griffith literally wrote the book on this, but you can see her making the same claim in this video:

Griffith: If we don’t know that, again we’ll settle for much less. You know it breaks God’s heart when we settle. And that’s the other thing that the Lord taught me through the heartbreak was God hates compromise! He hates it when we settle, because He’s a good daddy, he wants to give his daughters – and his sons – His very best. And He’ll let us settle if we ignore all the red flags and if we keep going He’ll say ok but He desperately doesn’t want us to settle. He want’s us to hold out for His best.

More recently Griffith described God’s direct instruction to her to follow the feminist life script. Unlike secular feminists who focus on marrying by their mid thirties (late thirties at worst), Griffith has taken this into her 50s.

Now, God had told me in my late thirties ... I had a very clear word from the Lord that I would have to wait for my husband. And I was having a great time. I didn’t even want to get married then because I was traveling all over the world, and doing exciting stories for CBN, and my TV career was taking off. But when I turned 40, I remember driving down the road and screaming. And it wasn’t necessarily a good scream. It was sort of like, “Okay, God, where is he?” But it wasn’t time. I was rushing it. Little did I know, you know, that I would be, you know, well into my fifties.

Griffith then explains that God has finally provided the man He told her to wait for:

But, I’m telling you, Joel 2, Doug, God restores the years. I wouldn’t trade anything. You know, Bill, my boyfriend now, is 5 years older than me. Well, he’s 4-1/2 and, I don’t know, it’s perfect.

That was a year ago, making them 54 and 59 now!* Contrast that with the secular feminist warning to young women not to ride the carousel too long, and to settle in their thirties, when the settling is good. Also keep in mind that Griffith isn’t claiming God had a fairly unique life script in mind for her by having her delay marriage until (it would appear) her late 50s. Griffith is selling “God hates it when you settle” to Christian women across the board.

Christian women have also adopted the same empowerment message that goes along with the feminist life script. The more empowered a Christian woman is in her “season of singleness”, the better her Christian marriage will ultimately be! See never married Wendy Griffith (now 54) and never married Mandy Hale (now 40) discussing how to be successful in
marriage at the 700 Club:

Hale: As long as you’re in this moment, as a single woman, loving yourself, thriving where you are at, deciding to live as big and bold and brave of a life as you can, regardless of whether you are flying solo or not.

Griffith: Now, how is being happily single a precursor to being happily taken?

Hale: I think it’s all about realizing that your self worth and your value is really based on what’s inside you and not in who is standing beside you. And I think, I’ve heard quotes that talk about, your married life can only be as successful as your single life. And so I think you really just work on as a single person becoming all the things you hope to attract in another person, you can’t go wrong.

Griffith: And Mandy I love what you said, you said “Stop looking for a hero and become your own hero.” How do you do that?

You can see the exchange between Griffith and Hale here:

You also see all of the same kind of vacuous social media messages aimed at women, but these are presented as Christian, if not God’s will.

“Cease striving, let go, be still, and know that I am God.” ~Psalm 46:10
https://t.co/vwZw3gA9Fk pic.twitter.com/cnsWnUHY1m

— Mandy Hale (@MissMandyHale) May 26, 2019

Happy Friday, strong women! pic.twitter.com/PzVmtAbz0R

— Mandy Hale (@MissMandyHale) May 24, 2019

It sounds cliche...but if you don’t enjoy your own company, how can you expect anyone else to? In my latest post for @the_gf_letter, I explain why a party of one can be just as fun: https://t.co/BTdDtWUjRD pic.twitter.com/6XexVqYs4U

— Mandy Hale (@MissMandyHale) May 28, 2019
As a sign of just how far Christian women are taking this, note that the last tweet by Hale points to an article she wrote for the AARP:  *Party Of One: Learning To Be Alone And To Like It*

*Correction:* I originally had the ages of Wendy and Bill as 55 and 60, instead of 54 and 59.
Worth the wait?
by Dalrock | May 31, 2019 | Link

I see from a CBN youtube video titled Worth the wait from March 8, 2019 that Wendy Griffith is now married:

CBN’s newly married Wendy Griffith and author of You Are a Prize to be Won! says it’s possible to live an abundant single life while you’re waiting for the right one.

In the video (below) she holds her long time frame, that God’s plan was for her to remain unmarried until her mid fifties, and that other women should follow her lead and never settle. This reinforces the fact that conservative Christian feminism outdoes even secular feminism, as secular feminist women are warning marriage delaying women to settle in their thirties, when the settling is good.

Still, I think if most of the women reading her book understood how long Wendy actually ended up waiting they would be horrified. As pleased as Wendy no doubt is to finally marry (and as pleased as I am for her), I don’t think many young women would be comforted in their season of singleness to hear that they will marry a 59 year old man when they are 54*.

Either way, while this new feminist life model allowed Wendy to focus her youth on having an exciting high powered career, it rules out having children and goes against the Apostle Paul’s clear instruction in 1 Cor 7. Moreover, very few women will remain as attractive as Wendy has into their 50s. Modern conservative Christians are selling an absolutely poisonous life script to young women, and outside of the Christian Men’s Sphere and Lori Alexander I can find no pushback against it. To the contrary, what we see instead is hand wringing that weak men are screwing feminism up when the effects of the poison become noticeable.

Surprisingly, I don’t see any reference to her being married either in her CBN bio or her self description on Twitter.

Jesus Follower, Kilimanjaro Summitter, Co-Host of the 700 Club, News Anchor for the Christian Broadcasting Network & Author of You Are a Prize to be Won!

With that said, obviously it isn’t a secret that she is married, but she isn’t broadcasting his name so I’ll avoid further speculation on who he might be. As promised above, here is the video:

*Assuming she married “Bill” that she referenced in this podcast. Note that I originally had the ages incorrect in my last post at 55 and 60, instead of 54 and 59.

Related: Devouring a lifetime of courtship.
Adam Piggott makes an astute observation about Wendy Griffith’s claim that God doesn’t want women to settle in Are you special enough for women like Wendy?

...when it comes to selecting their future spouse apparently God purposely made a great number indeed of very average men who are entirely beneath consideration just so that women like Wendy could test their faith by rejecting them. How is it even remotely statistically possible for God to supposedly want all of us to wait for His very best?

Implicit in this delusion is that Griffiths herself is one of these very best from God. Why else would she be holding out for the very best if she were not also one of the highly anointed?

Griffith has overlooked the fact that she wasn’t the only person involved in her relationships. For surely God wouldn’t create a puzzle that couldn’t possibly fit together. For the countless men Wendy decided weren’t God’s best for her in the roughly four decades she would have hooked up with, dated, or rejected before marrying at 54, Wendy wasn’t God’s best.

She simply wasn’t good enough, and God was sparing these men the misfortune of marrying her so they could marry someone immensely better. Chances are we are talking hundreds of men, really millions, even billions of men if you think about it. For even if Wendy never crossed a man’s path, she still wasn’t God’s best for that man, as God had a better woman in mind for him than Wendy Griffith. To marry her would have been to (in Wendy’s words) settle for crumbs. Moreover, if billions of men deserve better, and God is faithful to what Wendy claims He promises, that means that billions of women are better than her. Getting picked last sucks under any circumstance, but in this view it is especially brutal. At age 54, God finally found a man who didn’t deserve a better woman than Wendy.

I’ll clarify that this is the implication of Wendy Griffith’s feminist friendly view of Christian marriage, not my own perspective. But the conclusion is logically inescapable if you accept her claim that God has chosen His very best for all of us, and so long as we are faithful and wait, and don’t settle for someone who isn’t good enough, He will ultimately send us His best.

Griffith: If we don’t know [our value], again we’ll settle for much less. You know it breaks God’s heart when we settle. And that’s the other thing that the Lord taught me through the heartbreak was God hates compromise! He hates it when we settle, because He’s a good daddy, he wants to give his daughters - and his sons - His very best. And He’ll let us settle if we ignore all the red flags and if we keep going He’ll say ok but He desperately doesn’t want us to settle. He want's us to hold out for His best.
Secular feminists are more honest than conservative Christians.
by Dalrock | June 4, 2019 | Link

Lori Gottlieb writes a weekly series called *Dear Therapist* for The Atlantic. This week’s letter is from a single woman who is tired of her married friends coming to her with petty grievances about their husbands. The article is titled *Dear Therapist: It’s Hard to Accept Being Single*

They assume that because things are going well in other aspects of my life, I am okay with my nonexistent romantic life, and therefore free to listen to them complain. I am not. It’s the reason I have been in and out of therapy for the past few years—the inability to accept and deal with the fact that I am single, with no real prospects on the horizon.

I want to be a good friend, but I just don’t think I can hear another story about how he forgot to take out the trash or call right back so the marriage/relationship is over!

Gottlieb’s response is markedly different than what we would see from a conservative Christian. She makes no disparaging remarks about men, either the loser men who don’t take out the trash, or the loser men who aren’t showing up to ask the letter writer out on paid dates and propose marriage. She also doesn’t tell the letter writer to embrace her “season of singleness”, tell her to find meaning in “the wait”, doesn’t warn her to “never settle”, and doesn’t tell her that she is the pearl of great price, a prize to be won, etc. Instead, Gottlieb acknowledges that the letter writer has something real to grieve:

What your friends might not realize is that many single people who long for a partner experience something called ambiguous loss or ambiguous grief. It’s a type of grieving, but it’s different from the grieving someone might do after a concrete loss like the death of a spouse from, say, cancer.

Gottlieb even obliquely acknowledges the pettiness of the wives complaining about their husbands when framing possible responses the letter writer can employ:

When you complain about your partner, it’s like telling me that your meal at a nice restaurant was disappointing at a time when I’m hungry and not sure there will ever be enough food for me.

When you’re upset with your partner and make offhand comments like “Don’t get married!” or “You’re so lucky you’re single!,” please remember that I’m often very lonely. When you say “I wish I had your free time!,” remember that a lot of my time and emotional energy involves trying to find a partner, which can be demoralizing and exhausting. I’d rather spend my supposedly glamorous “free” time doing something as unglamorous as sitting on the couch watching Netflix with a significant other.
Imagine how I feel when you complain that your husband, who adores and desires you, wants to have sex with you at an inopportune time—while my choices are sex with strangers or no sex at all.

I think it is fair to say that implicit in Gottlieb’s response is an assumption that the letter writer is in her late thirties or older. I think this is a fair assumption about her age, given the fact that the letter writer reads The Atlantic and her friends are all married or in something like a marriage. If the letter writer were under 25 I would expect Gottlieb to assure her that she is too young to marry. If the letter writer were in her late twenties or early thirties, I would expect Gottlieb to give the letter writer advice in line with Gottlieb’s famous Atlantic article and book, and encourage her to stop being so picky and settle for a good enough man.
Late stage complementarianism.
by Dalrock | June 7, 2019 | Link

Commenter 7817 noted:

TBayly on Twitter has begun posting #manup beatdowns on a daily basis.

I pulled up Pastor Bayly’s twitter page to see what he was talking about, and it struck me that Bayly doesn’t have his heart in his man up rants anymore:

Men have followers who love them. Effeminates have followers who admire them. #comeonman

— Tim Bayly (@tbayly) June 4, 2019

The effeminate romanticizes danger. He be like WILD at heart. The man fears danger. He be like boring. #manup

— Tim Bayly (@tbayly) June 1, 2019

Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me. Fool me three times, I’m an effeminate. #manup

— Tim Bayly (@tbayly) May 30, 2019

The magic is clearly gone for him, and he is reduced to phoning it in. A bit further down there is perhaps a spark, although not much of one:

The man is afraid of marriage and fatherhood so he marries and has children. The effeminate is afraid and doesn’t. #manup

— Tim Bayly (@tbayly) May 29, 2019
It is possible this is just a short term bout of complementarian blues, and one day soon Bayly will once again be able to deliver full throated man up rants. But it would be understandable if he finds he can’t snap out of his late stage complementarian funk. All of the doublespeak is exhausting. It is *supposed* to be exhausting for the listener. That is the point, to wear would be critics out not with scripture and reason, but with sheer volume of traditional-but-not-traditional doublespeak. Yet it has to eventually become exhausting for the double-speaker as well.

In November of last year Bayly boldly tweeted that husbands need to exercise their headship muscles. Prince Asbel asked for concrete examples of how a husband might do this. When distraction failed Bayly was forced to backtrack, laughably explaining that husbands “exercised authority muscles” by lots of pleading:


— Tim Bayly (@tbayly) *November 18, 2018*

After that embarrassment Bayly can be forgiven for being gun-shy when it comes to bold man up rants. Even his tepid taunt of men who don’t marry comes with the risk of being soundly called out. Imagine for example that Bayly’s man up tweet is just what it takes to convince a man in Bayly’s congregation to marry. He marries and then his fear, the fear Bayly says is justified, comes true. His wife rebels. He tries pleading, and more pleading, and then yet more pleading. But somehow this makes him seem weak. So he follow’s Bayly’s other advice and goes to Bayly and the elders (the session), asking for help admonishing his wife. Bayly’s response is going to be that it *isn’t his problem*, and (adding insult to injury) he will suggest that the husband was foolish to marry a woman who might rebel!

If you were the husband asking me this question in my office, I’d say to you, “Don’t ask me—she’s your wife!” and we’d both laugh a little nervously. This precise exchange has happened before in my work as a pastor and one of the reasons I’ve responded this way is to reassure the brother he’s not alone in his problems, but also that they are his problems—not mine.

...I’d suggest you not haul your wife before the session. This counsel may surprise some, but it’s my experience most domestic problems involving the sin of women are best handled quietly by the Titus 2 “older women” of the Church, not the elders and pastors...

Sadly, the sort of husband who demands his pastor or elders reduce his wife to submission to him is the sort of man who is generally pathetic. Often he can’t face his own failures in leadership, so he drops his wife on the pastors and elders...
demanding they do what he couldn’t or wouldn’t.

Don’t let him manipulate you into feeling responsible for his dilemma. You can pity him. You can sympathize with him. You can help him. But don’t let him place the responsibility for his wife’s conduct in his home on you. He married her.

The thing is, the doublespeak mostly works. The intended audience will mostly give up trying to follow and simply assume Bayly really is being traditional. They will stop thinking about it because the doublespeak makes their heads hurt. But the longer the complementarian ruse goes on, the more doublespeak it requires. At the very least, since it is fundamentally a delaying tactic the need for more doublespeak never goes away. The quote I shared above comes from an 8 part series of doublespeak Bayly wrote on the subject of a husband’s authority in marriage.

Not long before his 8 story tall wall of doublespeak text around the authority of husbands, he wrote another post explaining that good Christian husbands should follow Martin Luther’s example and call their wives lord:

First, let it be said that Martin and Katie’s home was not Martin’s fiefdom, but Katie’s. Luther was a wise man who didn’t patronize women. He saw the division of authority God had decreed between man and woman and he didn’t infringe on Katie’s turf. She presided over the home and its domesticity, and he presided over the church and its instruction. Katie was the minister of internal affairs and Martin the minister of external affairs.

Is this heinous to our twenty-first century ears? If so, read on while asking yourself if any woman you know today has as much breadth of leadership, strength of influence, and personal authority as did Martin’s dear Katie?

Did Martin respect Katie’s authority over the home?

Yes. Martin affectionately referred to his wife as “My Lord Katie.”

Bayly delights in the thought of Lord Katie putting her husband in his place in front of guests:

After the evening meal, Martin retired to the living room with a small group of friends—and one woman, Katie. Here was the place where Luther’s “table talk” was recorded. Being the only woman present, Katie was no shrinking wallflower. She didn’t hesitate to express her disapproval of the talk—Martin’s in particular.

In fact, Bayly explains that the problem with modern Christian marriage is that it lacks this chivalrous bit of gender bending:

What John and these other reformed celebrities lack is “My Lord Katie.” She’d quickly put them in their place, and what a blessing it would be to the church of our time.

Bayly demonstrates in a note at the end of the post that he and his wife “My Lord Mary Lee” play the very same chivalrous game (emphasis mine) *:
Originally, I included the names of reformed celebrities in each of these particulars, but My Lord Mary Lee told me to take them out...

I won’t try to sum up all of Bayly’s reversals in his complementarian doublespeak, because it is as it is intended to be, **exhausting**. But eventually the sheer weight of decades of duplicity will become too much for even the most energetic complementarian to bear. Eventually the cuteness wears off, and we are left with only exhaustion. Even worse, all of the cool complementarians have moved on from selling traditional-seeming-feminism to selling traditional-seeming-homosexuality. At least they get to move on to a new fresh form of doublespeak, something they can practice for decades before it becomes as wearisome as the feminist form Bayly and a handful of others like Pastor Wilson restrict themselves to.

* Moderator’s Note: As I asked in a previous post, please keep the focus away from Pastor Bayly’s wife. Any comments that are unkind to his wife will be deleted and the commenter will be placed in moderation status for future comments. As disturbing as it is that a pastor would play such games with his wife, the much larger harm comes from him virtue signaling and modeling this role inversion via Warhorn media. 
Hondo had game.
by Dalrock | June 10, 2019 | Link

I’m sure I’m not the first in the sphere to note this, but I watched the old 1953 John Wayne movie on Amazon Prime the other day and was impressed with how thoroughly unchivalrous Hondo was.

Like the handful of other Louis L’Amour stories I’ve come across, the story is a blend of Romance and Western. Early in the movie Hondo calls his leading lady out for lying to him, and delivers a serious neg in the process:

| Hondo Lane: | I’m not talkin’ about rights, I’m talkin’ about lies. Why’d you lie to me, Mrs Lowe? Were you afraid that maybe you wouldn’t be safe here with me with your husband away? That it? |
| Angie Lowe: | That’s partly it. |
| Hondo Lane: | Women always figure every man comes along wants ‘em. |

Later on, after Hondo goes on at great length about how beautiful his now deceased wife was, and after he tells Angie she reminds him of her, Angie invites him to tell her she is pretty by saying she knows she is homely. He declines to do so, but then goes on to explain that her good character is far more important than looks.

| Angie: | I am fully aware that I am a homely woman, Mr. Lane. |
| Hondo: | I didn’t mean that. |

| I have a bad habit of telling the truth. |

| But being pretty isn’t much. |

At the end of the scene he pulls her into him and kisses her.

Later in the movie Hondo finds out her 6 year old son doesn’t know how to swim. Hondo doesn’t bat an eye, and picks the boy up and tosses him into the pond, urging him to grab handfuls of water and pull them towards himself. Angie runs over, furious that Hondo did this. Hondo matter of factly explains that everyone needs to know how to swim. Angie lets it slip that she doesn’t know how to swim, and from Hondo’s body language it is obvious that he is about to do the same to her. She quickly runs off before he can do so.

Update: I found the swimming scene on Youtube:
I’m with Wade Burleson on this one.

by Dalrock | June 11, 2019 | Link

Egalitarian pastor Wade Burleson anticipates that the SBC will capitulate on the topic of women preaching:

Within a decade or two, what I say the authoritative Scriptures teach about gender equality will be considered biblical, normal, and eternal by the majority of Southern Baptists, and what I heard today will have gone away, just as the former racism of Southern Baptists went away 100 years ago.

Complementarians have been looking for a way to cave on this issue since the founding of the movement. As Drs. John Piper and Wayne Grudem explained in their 1991 book introducing the complementarian perspective, they chose to reject the traditional reading on women preaching and invent a new one that better fit their modern sensibilities. From *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism:*

### 28. Do you think women are more gullible than men?

First Timothy 2:14 says, “Adam was not the one deceived; it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner.” Paul gives this as one of the reasons why he does not permit women “to teach or have authority over a man.” Historically this has usually been taken to mean that women are more gullible or deceivable than men and therefore less fit for the doctrinal oversight of the church. This may be true (see question 29). However, we are attracted to another understanding of Paul’s argument. We think that Satan’s main target was not Eve’s peculiar gullibility (if she had one), but rather Adam’s headship as the one ordained by God to be responsible for the life of the garden. Satan’s subtlety is that he knew the created order God had ordained for the good of the family, and he deliberately defied it by ignoring the man and taking up his dealings with the woman. Satan put her in the position of spokesman, leader, and defender. At that moment both the man and the woman slipped from their innocence and let themselves be drawn into a pattern of relating that to this day has proved destructive.

If this is the proper understanding, then what Paul meant in 1 Timothy 2:14 was this: “Adam was not deceived (that is, Adam was not approached by the deceiver and did not carry on direct dealings with the deceiver), but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor (that is, she was the one who took up dealings with the deceiver and was led through her direct interaction with him into deception and transgression).”

In this case, the main point is not that the man is undeceivable or that the woman is more deceivable; the point is that when God’s order of leadership is repudiated it brings damage and ruin. Men and women are both more vulnerable to error and sin
when they forsake the order that God has intended.

This created a designated role for women like Beth Moore to preach to women, so long as the women preaching weren’t “in authority” over men. Keep in mind that this feminist friendly rationalization is perceived in complementarian circles as taking the ultimate hard line against feminism. This is the most “traditional” perspective complementarians consider acceptable. And of course as time has passed, the urge to further reinterpret Scripture on the issue has only grown stronger. John Piper has already modified his teaching on the subject to permit women to preach to men, so long as no one involved compromises their maleness and femaleness:

I’m a guy. Is it wrong for me to listen to Beth Moore?

No. Unless you begin to become dependent on her as your shepherd—your pastor.

This is the way I feel about women speaking occasionally in Sunday school. We don’t need to be picky on this. The Bible is clear that women shouldn’t teach and have authority over men. In context, I think this means that women shouldn’t be the authoritative teachers of the church—they shouldn’t be elders. That is the way Rick Warren is understanding it, and most of us understand it that way.

This doesn’t mean you can’t learn from a woman, or that she is incompetent and can’t think. It means that there is a certain dynamic between maleness and femaleness that when a woman begins to assume an authoritative teaching role in your life the manhood of a man and the womanhood of a woman is compromised.

This is of course nonsense, and classic complementarian doublespeak. But it doesn’t have to make sense, it just has to seem somewhat traditional while giving in to the same temptation Piper and Grudem tell us they succumbed to in 1991.

All of this is much less baffling when you realize that while Scripture is ostensibly the foundation of the discussion, this isn’t about Scripture. Complementarians are paying lip service to Scripture while following their true philosophy of chivalry, a parody of Christianity. Under the chivalrous view, women are more moral than men, and men should look to women for moral guidance. This is why you have complementarians teaching that pastor’s wives are light years closer to God than their husbands. It is also why Pastor Doug Wilson teaches that the wife’s role is house despot, and why Pastor Tim Bayly calls his wife “My Lord Mary Lee”.

Burleson understands this reality, at least intuitively. This is why he brilliantly charged complementarians with being unchivalrous when they said that Beth Moore shouldn’t preach in church on Sunday:

First, let me say that Dr. Tom Ascol, the head of the SBC Founder’s Conference is a very humble man of character. He and I had some good conversations face-to-face today. Everyone with the Founders treated me cordially. I could tell there were hurt feelings from some, mostly family members of the men I charged with bullying Beth Moore. But we worked through it.
It's all over but the rationalization.

H/T Emperor Constantine

See Also: Defenseless
As I wrote in **Feminists are ugly**: 

The ugliness of the feminist mind-frame towards cooking, cleaning, and caring for others is so profound that it is difficult to process. These women are so obsessed with not showing Christian love that they make it a priority not to serve their own families. Cooking, cleaning, and caring for their own husbands and children is a concept which is repulsive to them. Acts of service to others are in their twisted minds traps to be avoided, and many go so far as to order their entire lives around avoiding showing love to others, especially their families. These women are so gripped by miserliness they have made it a priority not to show love to their own children. When they find themselves unable to avoid an act of service and love to their families altogether, they first steel their hearts with resentment, turning their hearts to stone to avoid the feelings of selfless love they live in constant terror of developing.

**Exhibit A:**

Abortion is a form of necessary violence. We need to move away from arguments designed to placate our enemies, and defend abortion as a right to stop doing gestational work | ![reprotopia](https://twitter.com/reproutopia)

Sophie Lewis is the author of Full Surrogacy Now: Feminism Against Family [pic.twitter.com/qntnD2Zb3Z](https://twitter.com/qntnD2Zb3Z)

— Verso Books (@VersoBooks) [June 7, 2019](https://twitter.com/June72019)
The Heritage Foundation isn’t serious yet, but one day they might be.

by Dalrock | June 14, 2019 | Link

As a society both left and right love the system we’ve replaced marriage with (child support) far too much to make any serious changes. That the Heritage Foundation chose Genevieve Wood, a never married childless woman* to deliver their message that declining marriage rates are a serious problem is only one small indicator of this.

Still, the real effects of our rejecting marriage as a family model are piling up, and they risk limiting the resources our elites have to play with. While they aren’t yet serious, one day a significant portion of our elites will likely start to become so.

*At least this would appear to be the case based on her Heritage Foundation Bio. It is also possible that she has married and the Heritage Foundation doesn’t view that as significant.

H/T Instapundit
Darcy Lockman at *The Atlantic* warns wives against the danger of feeling gratitude in *Mothers Shouldn’t Be Grateful for Their Husbands’ Help*

Gratitude is a brand of benevolent sexism, a force that repels change. To offer thanks for whatever contributions men happen to make reinforces the implicit idea that parenting is women’s work, that 65/35 is a very fine place to stop. For too long, women have paid for this imbalance with their well-being—financially, emotionally, existentially. Only once gratitude is relinquished for righteous anger will gender rules in this realm be rewritten. Then we can land somewhere different: not grateful, only glad.

H/T The Question
Gratitude is the cure for feminist resentment.
by Dalrock | June 19, 2019 | Link

14 And we urge you, brothers, admonish the idle,[c] encourage the fainthearted, help the weak, be patient with them all. 15 See that no one repays anyone evil for evil, but always seek to do good to one another and to everyone. 16 Rejoice always, 17 pray without ceasing, 18 give thanks in all circumstances; for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus for you. 19 Do not quench the Spirit.

-1 Thessalonians 5:14-19 (ESV)

3 Older women likewise are to be reverent in behavior, not slanderers or slaves to much wine. They are to teach what is good, 4 and so train the young women to love their husbands and children, 5 to be self-controlled, pure, working at home, kind, and submissive to their own husbands, that the word of God may not be reviled.

-Titus 2:3-5 (ESV)

From Cafe Mom: Wife Gets Roasted for Post About Cleaning Up After Husband | CafeMom

As a younger wife (especially in the baby & toddler zone) this often made me irritated. “Don’t I have enough to clean up daily after the kids!” years ago I actually felt bitterness about it.

But these little things represent his presence in our home. What if they weren’t there each day? What else would be missing from our lives? His laugh, his comfort, his guidance? How many women and children are living that harsh sadness out?

The scattered trail of his daily routine means I have a husband who keeps coming home. I’m not doing life on my own. I’m not raising my girls by myself.

And that is a cause for gratitude, not irritation if you’re in that mode sister, take a breath, this is a common attitude trap for us. And You’re most likely tired. But Remember-It’s not “your burden” it’s your gift.

The wife in question (Holly Simon) posted this on Facebook, and as the article notes it didn’t go over well in the social media henhouse. Resentment and a miserly outlook are the core fuels of feminism, so proposing gratitude is a direct attack on what nearly everyone thinks is progress and enlightenment.

This however shows an opportunity for any Christian leaders who want to be faithful to Scripture and help rescue wives from the torment of the feminist mind frame. Christian leaders could teach the same message as Holly Simon did above, and they could urge older Christian women to do the same.

In the past I’ve noted that nearly all Christian leaders are terrified of the kind of violent
clucking Simon experienced when she offended feminist sensibilities. Others have noted that Christian leaders very often have a financial stake in not ruffling feminist feathers. Both are certainly true, but we shouldn’t underestimate how much of the unwillingness to challenge feminism comes from a love of chivalry. On the extreme conservative side we have pastors like Pastor Tim Bayly who proudly calls his wife lord, and argues that Christianity would be much better if all Christian husbands did the same. Feminist resentment creates an opportunity to urge husbands to submit to their wives. It also fits with the chivalrous idea of the husband nobly suffering at the capricious hands of his wife, just as Lancelot suffered for Guinevere. That this childish game also causes suffering for the wife herself, not to mention the children and the rest of the family, is considered a small price to pay to indulge the chivalrous temptation.
At Instapundit, Stephen Green wrote:

GOOD. It’s Happening: 3 High School Girls File Complaint Over Dominating Transgender Athletes.

Commenter Allen responded with:

If I have to live in clown world, so does everyone else.
Melinda Gates, miserly billionaire.
by Dalrock | June 20, 2019 | Link

From what I have read, Bill and Melinda Gates are generous with their money. But Melinda Gates is an incredible miser when it comes to gratitude. She married one of the world’s most successful men, arguably of all time, and spends a great deal of energy talking about how put upon she was by being married to Bill. From Melinda Gates: Being married to Bill Gates is ‘incredibly hard’ sometimes

It takes patience being married to the second richest man in the world.

...

One recurring problem was Bill’s struggle to find work-life balance. She recalled being angry with him years ago because the voracious reader was paging through a book about Winston Churchill instead of helping her get their three children ready to go out, or packing up the car.

One of her proudest achievements is spreading her own pettiness to other wives:

This was such an achievement that she mentioned it in her recent book and featured it as she made the rounds plugging the book. Here is her discussion of this same crowning achievement at CNN Business: Melinda Gates opens up about finding equality in her marriage with Bill

Complementarians are convinced that the solution to feminist discontentment is for husbands to do more. If they work harder, do more housework, etc. wives will be content. This isn’t a Christian perspective, but it is the Modern Christian perspective, and it is pure folly.
Should we fine tune our replacement of marriage?
by Dalrock | June 26, 2019 | Link

Workingmother.com has a post up about the question of **whether men should be able to legally opt out of fatherhood**:

The woman said the idea came from a friend—a woman who had a child out of a friends-with-benefits situation with a man. Although he didn’t want the baby from the beginning and didn’t help during the first couple years, he recently “decided that he wants to have access to the child and start to build a relationship now [that] he is older.”

...  

To prevent such a thing from happening to other women who had accidental pregnancies, the friend proposed the following solution: Before the baby is 1-month-old, a man who wants to opt-out of fatherhood would sign a document that states that he “has no desire to be a part of the child’s life in any way, will not ever be able to seek any type of access, and will not pay money.”

By having men sign the document, it would save mom and child “significant stress and heartache.”

Not surprisingly, this proposal didn’t go over well with the single mother crowd. I would predict that it would fare equally badly with the *My Lord Mary Lee* crowd. While the proposal is an effective way to troll both groups into an impassioned defense of our current child support family model, in my opinion in the US at least it isn’t likely to be even seriously entertained by lawmakers.

Moreover, note the absence of even a mention of the fact that the proposed fine tuning of our family model addresses important questions that our previous family model (marriage) used to address. Prior to the child support model, marriage was the way both men and women resolved the question of involvement by and support from the father. In the past, marriage granted men fatherhood rights they otherwise could not expect to receive. It also granted women the right to support from the father. This way of viewing marriage is absolutely foreign to us now, as marriage is now about the **moral primacy of romantic love**.
Stinky feminists strike back.

by Dalrock | June 27, 2019 | Link

H/T Instapundit

Stinkyness is a favorite weapon of ugly feminists, so the new Slate article shouldn’t be entirely surprising.

Deodorants were created to solve a fake problem and thrived thanks to the patriarchy. [https://t.co/fuBEVucSvw](https://t.co/fuBEVucSvw)

— Slate (@Slate) June 22, 2019
Trump and toxic masculinity.
by Dalrock | June 28, 2019 | Link

The LA Review of Books has a hilarious article on toxic masculinity titled World War II’s Poisonous Masculine Legacy. The problem with World War II, according to the book, is a generation of men fought in the war and then supported families without complaining. This set the wrong example for future generations of men:

To understand how Sexton defines “toxic masculinity,” picture the semi-fictional “Greatest Generation.” They grew up in poverty, emerged victorious in war, and provided for their families (if they were white of course), often earning enough to buy a house and a car from one job in a manly industry like manufacturing. And they did it without complaining.

But a bit further down we get to the real problem facing our society, which is of course men at Trump’s rallies:

Sexton’s ideas about addiction and performance drawn from his experience at Trump rallies leads us to a potentially surprising conclusion. Some of the racist, sexist, and homophobic vitriol spewed at Trump rallies is performative, spewed by men who did not believe it, or at least with that intensity, but were afraid their masculinity would be questioned if they did not pose as an angry, hateful Trump supporter, who doesn’t care about your feelings.

You truly can’t make this stuff up.
They thought he was chivalrous (not that there’s anything wrong with that)

by Dalrock | June 28, 2019 | Link

From the Daily Mail, Modern day dandy, 25, who has dressed only in Regency-period clothes since burning his jeans at 14 says his eccentric attire has seen him receive ‘countless offers of marriage’:

Zack has a huge legion of online fans who adore his historical clothing, but has also been getting quite a substantial amount of interest from female followers.

He said: ‘I’ve received many marriage proposals and many other things.

‘I think it is indicative that women want a gentleman and someone that cares about his presentation and appearance.

‘For me, it is a bit of wrong tree wrong forest situation.’

H/T Instapundit.
Taylor Swift catches up with Russell Moore and the SBC.
by Dalrock | July 2, 2019 | Link

Hat Tip Instapundit.

Related: Adam and Steve jokes aren’t PC.
The great caliber debate and the FBI’s reversion to the 9mm.

by Dalrock | July 5, 2019 | Link

One common argument is that Game doesn’t exist because its proponents tend to argue on the internet regarding the best way to practice Game. This is nonsense, because all this proves is that people often squabble on the internet regarding topics they have a passion for.

When it comes to defensive handguns, the most common internet squabble is what caliber is the best choice. Lucky Gunner created a spoof video lampooning the attitude displayed by many .45 ACP aficionados on the subject:

The irony of the Lucky Gunner video is that while it accurately portrays the smugness of some .45ACP and big bore revolver fans, it does so from a more subtly smug 9mm uber alles perspective. This new smugness follows the FBI’s 2014 announcement that it was moving back to the 9mm. Prior to the 2014 announcement, the FBI’s 1989 report Handgun Wounding Factors and Effectiveness was the source of big caliber smugness. To my (non expert) eye, both reports share much in common, with the standout difference being how the FBI approached the subject of hollow point expansion. The 1989 report warns against relying on hollow point expansion when selecting handgun ammunition (emphasis mine):

> Permanent cavity can be increased by the use of expanding bullets, and/or larger diameter bullets, which have adequate penetration. However, **in no case should selection of a bullet be made where bullet expansion is necessary to achieve desired performance.** .35 Handgun bullets expand in the human target only 60-70% of the time at best. Damage to the hollow point by hitting bone, glass, or other intervening obstacles can prevent expansion. Clothing fibers can wrap the nose of the bullet in a cocoon like manner and prevent expansion. Insufficient impact velocity caused by short barrels and/or longer range will prevent expansion, as will simple manufacturing variations. **Expansion must never be the basis for bullet selection, but considered a bonus when, and if, it occurs.** Bullet selection should be determined based on penetration first, and the unexpanded diameter of the bullet second, as that is all the shooter can reliably expect.

The 2014 announcement argues that hollow point technology has advanced sufficiently in recent decades such that this is no longer the case:

> Projectiles are what ultimately wound our adversaries and the projectile needs to be the basis for the discussion on what “caliber” is best

...  

· Contemporary projectiles (since 2007) have dramatically increased the terminal effectiveness of many premium line law enforcement projectiles (emphasis on the
So far, so good. But the 2014 report goes a step further and argues that all three common defensive calibers are equal in terminal performance (emphasis mine):

One should never debate on a gun make or caliber alone. The projectile is what wounds and ultimately this is where the debate/discussion should focus. In each of the three most common law enforcement handgun calibers (9mm Luger, .40 Smith & Wesson and .45 AUTO) there are projectiles which have a high likelihood of failing law enforcement officers and in each of these three calibers there are projectiles which have a high likelihood of succeeding for law enforcement officers during a shooting incident. The choice of a service projectile must undergo intense scrutiny and scientific evaluation in order to select the best available option.

... 

**There is little to no noticeable difference in the wound tracks between premium line law Auto enforcement projectiles from 9mm Luger through the .45 Auto**

- Given contemporary bullet construction, LEO’s can field (with proper bullet selection) 9mm Lugers with all of the terminal performance potential of any other law enforcement pistol caliber with none of the disadvantages present with the “larger” calibers

... 

The extent to which a projectile expands determines the diameter of the permanent cavity which, simply put, is that tissue which is in direct contact with the projectile and is therefore destroyed. Coupled with the distance of the path of the projectile (penetration), the total permanent cavity is realized. Due to the elastic nature of most human tissue and the low velocity of handgun projectiles relative to rifle projectiles, **it has long been established by medical professionals, experienced in evaluating gunshot wounds, that the damage along a wound path visible at autopsy or during surgery cannot be distinguished between the common handgun calibers used in law enforcement. That is to say an operating room surgeon or Medical Examiner cannot distinguish the difference between wounds caused by .35 to .45 caliber projectiles.**

The problem with this argument is subtle. Note that the FBI is now simultaneously arguing that:

1. Given adequate penetration, what matters is the diameter of the projectile making the wound.
2. The diameter of the projectile making the wound is insignificant.

This self contradiction is obviously nonsense. The FBI isn’t merely arguing that modern hollow
point performance makes the 9mm good enough, it is arguing that caliber doesn’t matter. But if caliber doesn’t matter, why is the improvement in hollow point performance critical to the FBI’s move back to the 9mm?

The motivation for this doublespeak appears to be a desire to equalize the shooting performance of stronger and weaker FBI agents. From the 2014 report:

The 9mm provides struggling shooters the best chance of success while improving the speed and accuracy of the most skilled shooters.

As Massad Ayoob notes, prior to the FBI moving back to the 9mm, strong shooters were issued 40 cal weapons, and 9mms were reserved for weak shooters (emphasis mine):

Certainly, as a general rule, in platforms of similar size, shape and weight, the 9mm will have less recoil. This will be a particular concern with new shooters or “remedial shooters” who tend to flinch or jerk their triggers in anticipation of recoil. Many law enforcement agencies (including the FBI prior to announcing an agency-wide return to the 9mm) had been in the practice of replacing poorer shooters’ .40-caliber Glocks with 9mms of the same make.

Women of Caliber blogger Kellene argued that bigger “macho” calibers are scary for women to shoot in her 2009 post The Caliber Wars for Women (emphasis mine):

The reason why I fiercely advocate this point is because many women hesitate to shoot a .40 caliber. They are much more successful in their shot placement when shooting a smaller caliber. Thus it’s shameful to have a woman stopped or frustrated in her pursuit of gun ownership because some macho, misinformed man tells her that a strong caliber (that knocks her on her butt when she shoots it) is useless. One thing that men simply don’t realize is that women are physiologically more sensitive to the loud bass sound of the bullet igniting than men are. Women are literally more affected by the sound of a .40 caliber+ than men are. The sound resonates through them longer than it does in men. As such, the sound literally rattles a woman.

From a feminist perspective, allowing men who shoot well to retain their macho .40 cal weapons and issuing women 9mms is untenable. From a political perspective, the FBI had no choice but to move all of its agents to the weaker caliber while claiming there is no longer any difference between calibers.

This isn’t to say that the FBI made the wrong decision, as given their organizational needs the 9mm strikes me as the obvious choice given the tradeoffs between the calibers. None of the big three calibers are perfect, and especially with modern hollowpoints I wouldn’t argue with anyone who decided the 9mm is good enough in terminal ballistics. But the FBI is now claiming that there are no tradeoffs between calibers, which simply isn’t true*. Others, especially ammunition makers and sellers have their own vested interest in claiming caliber doesn’t matter, and it is all about the projectile:
The problem with this argument is that while hollow points have gotten better for the 9mm, they have gotten better for the .40 and .45 as well. See the results from Lucky Gunner’s ammunition tests here.

*Massad Ayoob’s three part series on the subject here, here, and here is the best treatment I’m aware of.
Krieger should reconsider, given the history here. After Amelia Earhart rode in an airplane while two men flew it across the Atlantic in 1928, she celebrated her feminist achievement with a visit to the White House.

After her June 1928 transatlantic flight with Wilmer Stultz and Louis Gordon, in which she became the first woman to fly the Atlantic, Amelia Earhart was given a hero’s welcome wherever she went. Receptions in Southampton and London, England, were followed by a ticker-tape parade through New York City and a visit with President Calvin Coolidge at the White House.

Related:

- The Guardian: Women’s World Cup – the best shots by female photographers
- Instapundit: THIS JUST IN: FANS OF DISTAFF METRIC FOOTBALL NOT KEEN ON TRUMP.
- The race to be first.
Discontentment is both the input and the output of feminism.

by Dalrock | July 8, 2019 | Link

Larry Kummer writes in Feminism has given us successful girls and broken girls:

Summary: I have two grown boys. The most frequent comment I get from parents who have daughters: you are so lucky; teenage girls are so difficult. The out-of-control, angry, hyper-emotional teen girl has become a common type in American society, even a trope in films and TV. Yet I see no mention of this as a normal phenomenon before the 1970s. What is happening?

We should only expect more of the same. Feminism cultivates women’s discontentment, what Betty Friedan famously called the problem with no name. Without women’s discontentment, there can be no feminist progress.

Only once gratitude is relinquished for righteous anger will gender rules in this realm be rewritten.

Feminism increases women’s discontentment, which then increases the power and appeal of feminism. Lather, rinse, repeat. As tragic as it is, you have to marvel at the evil elegance of feminism.
Instapundit has a link up to a Bablylon Bee piece about the “pay gap” for women’s soccer. One common refrain in the comments is that women’s soccer has a smaller audience because the level of play is lower. Commenter Bob wrote (emphasis mine):

Any D3 college men’s team could whip our women’s World Cup team ... and therein lies the problem. **Women do NOT play as well as men. They aren’t as fast, or as quick, or as skillful. Sorry ladies, but THIS is why men get paid more.** My suggestion to you women soccer players ... bring in the trannies. Big burly trannies “identifying” as women playing in the World Cup ... hell, even I would pay to see that carnage, and you gals could parade around preaching about how tolerant and diverse you are.

Mt Geoff-Debbie responded in agreement:

Players are paid to attract people to the game rather than to play the game. Players attract people by playing the game in an exciting way and, generally speaking, people enjoy the men’s games more than the women’s games.

On the flip side, I think more of the big money in ice-skating and gymnastics goes to women. Tennis seems to be close to parity. It all depends on how many people the promoters believe will pay for tickets or will tune in to broadcasts.

The second commenter is closer to having it right, but doesn’t probe why we like watching men in some forms of competition and women in others. The reason men’s sports are more popular than women’s sports isn’t simply a matter of level of play. Men and women are different, and compete for status in different ways. These are sexual competitions by their very nature. Watching women compete in ritual team combat doesn’t scratch the same itch it does when men do it. Likewise, beauty pageants for men just aren’t the same. Sports fans won’t ever really be “sex blind” as the common defense of the pay gap asserts they are.
Instapundit ran a post yesterday about the controversy the director of the latest movie in the Terminator series is trying to generate around the fact that the movie features a standard issue kickass female lead. As I write this there are 243 replies to the post, and not one reader stated that he didn’t like female action heroes. This is truly striking because movies are after all a matter of taste. But preferring male action heroes is one preference that is presently unthinkable.

As with the response to women’s soccer, the focus of the discussion was on assuring anyone reading that modern movie viewers are totally sex blind when it comes to action heroes. We love action hero gender bending, so long as the acting and story are good.

Several top rated comments featured animated gifs to prove how much everyone loves movies with kickass gals. In one, Old Jester featured an animated gif of Sigorney Weaver powering up her exo-suit from Aliens:

| No, we just want the strong women to have a story worthy of them… |

In another much loved comment, the same reader featured an animated gif of Sarah Conner doing pull-ups:

| Oh, yeah... us SciFi Geeks hate the strong womenz... that must be it... Linda Hamilton is a badass and we all know it. |

Another reader was aroused by such a badass display:

| *Drool*... |

Wait. Where were we in this discussion again? Oh, I’m a misogynistic SOB because I hated the latest Ghostbusters remake.

That there are large numbers of men, especially conservative men, who are enthralled by the kickass gal trope isn’t surprising. But it is striking that when it comes to a matter of taste, not one of the 200+ comments stated that the reader doesn’t enjoy a bit of heroic gender bending. Some of this has to be due to the Overton window in our feminist age, which would be telling enough. But I suspect that very few Insapundit readers make it a point of skipping action movies with female leads but were too afraid of internet disapproval to express their cinematic preference. The idea of not being sex blind when it comes to action heroes in our current age is simply unthinkable. Moreover, this is so natural to us that we can’t imagine an age when this wasn’t the case.

Related: How much girlpower is too much?
Stripmining can be dangerous.
by Dalrock | July 12, 2019 | Link

From She thought she had a date. Then he suggested going to a spa

As it turned out, Alan was a sales agent, employed by a company to beguile unsuspecting women into purchasing goods and services they do not need.

...

The potential financial loss is not the only impact of the scams.

Victims are often psychologically harmed by the encounters, which can take a toll on their self-esteem.

The truly surprising aspect of this is not that consuming mass quantities of men turns out to sometimes pose a risk, but how remarkably risk free the practice is, or at least has been. However, the story is from Hong Kong, so it could simply be that Hong Kong culture doesn’t have our western chivalrous obsession equating women seeking sex partners with a most noble moral quest.

H/T Fabius Maximus

Related:

- She needs more men!
- Ensuring a safe and pleasurable ride.
- How to guarantee satisfaction.
- Women’s sacred path to marriage is in danger.
- Fifty shades of Lancelot.
Ken Harrison, CEO and chairman of Promise Keepers, explains that the collapse of marriage in our feminist age is due to the failings of men in *When Men Mess Up, Women and Children Suffer*.

What I saw in my days as a Los Angeles Police Department street cop in South Central is that almost all the problems in this world come from the pride and the greed of men.

Calling men to be men isn’t chauvinistic or somehow against women, although it is countercultural and controversial. But it is a fact that when men check out of their families, women suffer the most.

And so do their children.

Harrison has a difficult task. He has to pose as fighting against the destruction of marriage while assuring everyone involved that Promise Keepers won’t threaten the status quo. Promising to not upset the apple cart is in fact the fundamental (albeit unstated) promise of Promise Keepers. To understand why this is the case, consider the two main groups in his target audience.

The first group is modern Christian (feminist) women. They have been freed by both the church and the state from the requirement to marry or remain married to the father(s) of their children. They can (from a practical perspective) reject not only making and honoring marriage vows, but their husband’s headship over them. This is of course the egalitarian position, so conservative Christians are careful to deny that they have for all practical purposes adopted the feminist status quo. This denial is essential, as it is all that separates conservative Christians from egalitarians. Without the denial, conservative Christians would lose their identity. However, the duplicity here is obvious to outside observers, as Dr. Russell More explains in *After Patriarchy, What? Why Egalitarians Are Winning the Evangelical Gender Debate* (emphasis mine):

Several other recent works have challenged, convincingly, the notion that grassroots evangelicals hold to male headship at all, at least in practice. University of North Carolina sociologist Christian Smith, for instance, in his *Christian America*, contends that American evangelicals speak complementarian rhetoric and live egalitarian lives. Smith cites the Southern Baptist Convention’s 1998 confessional wording on male headship and wifely submission as expressive of a vast consensus within evangelicalism. But, he notes, the Baptist confession could just as easily have affirmed “mutual submission” within an equal marital partnership and have fit the views of the evangelical majority. This is because, Smith argues, evangelicals have integrated biblical language of headship with the prevailing cultural notions of feminism—notions which fewer and fewer evangelicals challenge...
Modern Christian leaders have to carefully signal to modern Christian women that by telling men to man up and “lead” that they don’t actually mean for husbands (and churches) to return the family to biblical roles. Promise Keepers was from the very beginning recognized by modern Christian women as an organization that tacitly supports the wife’s headship. The implicit message to wives is *send us your defective husband and we’ll fix him for you.* Once wives were confident that Promise Keepers didn’t threaten their dominance in the home, they ordered their husbands to attend. From the same article by Dr. Russell Moore (emphasis mine):

> Likewise, in her *Evangelical Identity and Gendered Family Life* Oregon State University sociologist Sally Gallagher interviews evangelical men and women across the country and across the denominational spectrum and concludes that most evangelicals are “practically egalitarian.”6 Evangelicals maintain headship in the sphere of ideas, but practical decisions are made in most evangelical homes through a process of negotiation, mutual submission, and consensus. That’s what our forefathers would have called “feminism”—and our foremothers, too.

And yet Gallagher shows specifically how this dynamic plays itself out in millions of homes, often by citing interviews that almost read like self-parodies. One 35-year-old homeschooling evangelical mother in Minnesota says of the Promise Keepers movement: “I had Mike go this year. I kind of sent him. . . . I said, ‘I’m not sending you to get fixed in any area. I just want you to be encouraged because there are other Christian men out there who are your age, who want to be good dads and good husbands.’ ”7 This “complementarian” woman does not seem to recognize that she is “sending” her husband off to be with those his own age, as though she were a mother “sending” her grade-school son off to summer youth camp. Not surprisingly, this evangelical woman says she does not remember when—or whether—her pastor has ever preached on the subject of male headship.

The second group Promise Keepers has to convince that they won’t disrupt the feminist status quo is *chivalrous Christian men.* Like feminist Christian women, these men reject feminism in theory but in practice submit to their wives and *call them lord.*

H/T Nick MGTOW

This is a tough space for a modern Christian leader to break into. The field is already quite crowded, and I suspect there is more than a little “man up fatigue” as we are now fully in late stage complementarianism. With this in mind, promoting “servant leaders” to “servant kings” is a nice way to rebrand the idea that headship means husbands must nebulously “lead” but have no authority.

I did a quick search of the book on the amazon “look inside” feature. “Headship” comes back with no results, but submission comes up with a segment titled Our Role as Leader (emphasis mine):

As the church submits to Christ, so wives are to submit to their husbands in everything. Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ loved the church and gave Himself for her to make her holy, cleansing her with the washing of the water by the word. He did this to present the church to Himself in splendor, without spot or wrinkle or anything like that, but holy and blameless. (Ephesians 5:24-27)

God gave man the role of leader of his family, but what does that look like? The world often tells us that leadership and authority are the same thing, but this is not so. Authority is that influence that the law gives to a police officer or a military commander. Authority says, “Sir, please exit the vehicle,” or “Grab your backpack and sit down.” Authority offers no reward for obedience, only punishment for disobedience.

We are not called to be in authority over our wives; rather, we are called to lead them. Leadership creates a space for a person to choose whether or not to follow. Notice that a woman is commanded to submit to her husband, not to obey him. I obey the commands of a police officer out of fear of punishment, but do not submit to him. This is because submission involves equality and choice. Obedience involves a hierarchy and offers no choice.

Note that by implication Harrison is asserting that Christ has no authority over the church! This would explain why he left off verses 22 and 23 and started with verse 24. He appears to be quoting the HCSB translation, so the full quote of Eph 5:22-27 would be:

22 Wives, submit to your own husbands as to the Lord, 23 for the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church. He is the Savior of the body. 24 Now as the church submits to Christ, so wives are to submit to their husbands in
everything. 25 Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ loved the church and gave Himself for her 26 to make her holy, cleansing[g] her with the washing of water by the word. 27 He did this to present the church to Himself in splendor, without spot or wrinkle or anything like that, but holy and blameless.

Lastly, notice that he offers a perfect example of what I call the Headship sleight of hand. Scripture says the husband is the head of the wife. We can then deduce from this that if he is the head, then he has an obligation to lead. The Bible doesn't state that husbands have this obligation, the husband’s stated obligation is to love his wife, and the wife’s stated obligation is to submit to her husband. But leaders clearly have an obligation to lead. The specific nature of this obligation is another question, but the basic deduction is solid.

Harrison follows this implicit logic, but ends by denying that a husband has authority. He pretends that the Bible tells us a husband must lead (which it does not), and that modern readers infer that since the Bible says the husband must lead that he must have authority. But what is happening is the precise opposite. He infers that a husband must have the obligation to lead since the husband has authority. Then he tells us the husband has no authority, only an obligation to lead.
I recently came across a heartbreaking article at National Catholic Register that underlines why all of the books aimed at young Christian women telling them to focus on having fabulous lives in their “season of singleness”, they are a prize to be won, etc. are so cruel. The article is by Emily Stimpson Chapman, and is The Cross of Infertility: Finding Companionship With the Saints:

For as long as I can remember, I dreamed of having a large family. Five, six, seven, eight children — it didn’t matter; I was prepared to take as many children as God sent me. There was just one problem: My 20s came and went without God sending me a husband.

Another decade passed, and with my single status unchanged, reality set in. There would be no eight babies. Nor would there be five babies.

By the time I finally did meet a wonderful man and get engaged at age 40, I hoped for just two. The doctors assured me that was realistic. I was healthy, my hormones all checked out at optimum levels, and there was no reason I shouldn’t conceive. I believed them. After all, my friends my age or older were having babies. Why wouldn’t I?

Eighteen months later, I’m still asking that question, and the NaProTECHNOLGY doctor I’ve worked with has no answer. Even at age 42, he thinks I should be able to conceive.

When I read articles like this, I think “Why didn’t someone warn her?” From her bio at emilystimpson.com it is clear that despite her claim to have always wanted marriage and many children, she focused her youth on career and education:

Emily holds a BA from Miami University of Ohio (Phi Beta Kappa, summa cum laude), where she studied political science, history, and English literature. She also did graduate work in political science at John Hopkins University and theology at Franciscan University. Before moving to Steubenville, Emily worked in Washington, DC, first as a Legislative Assistant to then Congressman Jim Talent (R-MO), then later at the Heritage Foundation, where she served as Special Assistant to former Attorney General Edwin Meese III.

This is of course the feminist life script, and is not coincidentally the path men traditionally follow to attract a wife. It also has become the standard UMC life script, as Novaseeker describes. Most UMC women are able to pull this off, because as the clock is ticking down they get intensely pragmatic in their search for a man. Sheryl Sandberg’s famous quote on the subject captures part of this pragmatism. There is also a ramped up sense of urgency for nearly all UMC women around age 30. Lori Gottlieb’s famous Marry Him: The Case for Settling
for Mr. Good Enough article and book are reminders to UMC women not to wait around for Mr. Perfect.

But while large numbers of modern Christian women have adopted the UMC life script, they aren’t getting the warnings not to overdo it that their secular sisters are receiving. This is why you see Christian women like Emily Stimpson Chapman thinking that getting engaged at age 40 meant she could expect to have two children, and why she is shocked that at 42 she can’t conceive. Her secular sisters got the message, but she did not. Marriage delaying Christian women are being reassured that everything is fine. They consume social media posts and read books written by other marriage delaying Christian women, and they are urged not to act with urgency like their secular sisters are doing. I’ve written a fair amount about this army of aging never married Christian women writing on the season of singleness, including Wendy Griffith and Mandy Hale. Griffith finally married in her mid 50s. Hale is still unmarried, and blogged back in November of 2018 about her creeping doubts about the “You are enough!” message she has been selling to unmarried Christian women:

I’ve dressed it up in pretty pink girl power with a silver lining instead of gotten really, really REAL with you and with myself about my fears about being single and 39. And in doing that, my friends, I feel I have done you a disservice. I have done myself a disservice. It’s recently been called to my attention that I use positivity as a defense mechanism. Oh, I was angry when I heard that. Fearful. Indignant. Convinced the person telling me that HAD to be mistaken. I’m just a positive person! I argued. If I don’t look for the silver lining...what is the purpose to the bad things that happen?! If I choose to let in the darkness and the sadness and the REALNESS...won’t I sink in it? Won’t it drown me? Won’t it make me a...SHUDDER...negative person?!??!

The truth is...I don’t know exactly why I’m still single. I think I’m starting to come to a better understanding of why...but for the moment, it’s still just shadowed and blurry truth that I’m struggling to make sense of. But the reasons I often convince myself that I’m still single aren’t pretty.

I never meet guys. Like...literally NEVER. A few years ago I felt like I could simply walk into a room and command the attention of the men in the room. I had no trouble meeting men. I got hit on regularly. But something changed along the way and that’s not my experience anymore. I suspect it was more an internal change than an external one, as I honestly think I physically look better now than I did ten years ago.

The tragic thing is that when Hale should have been learning how to recover from her already failing plan, she was busy writing books encouraging other Christian women in the same situation. In 2012 she wrote The Single Woman’s Sassy Survival Guide: Letting Go and Moving On, and she wrote several others in the meantime. Now she writes articles on how to be a fabulous single retired woman for the AARP.

Coincidentally Emily Stimpson Chapman also wrote a book in 2012 with a similar title: The Catholic Girl’s Survival Guide for the Single Years: The Nuts and Bolts of Staying Sane and Happy While Waiting for Mr. Right. I haven’t flipped through her book, but my sense is that
Stimpson-Chapman’s book isn’t as bad as Wendy Griffith’s and Mandy Hale’s books are. Still, she clearly didn’t have even a tenuous grasp of the biological reality involved with “waiting for Mr. Right” while focusing on education and career. If she did, she wouldn’t have been shocked to find out at age 42 that she had waited too long to conceive.

Again, the difference between secular women and modern Christian women in this regard is astounding. Griffith, Hale, and Stimpson-Chapman all wrote their books after *The Atlantic* loudly warned marriage delaying women of the risk of waiting too long. Gottlieb’s *Marry Him!* article made a huge splash in 2008. Kate Bolick’s *All the Single Ladies* reinforced the warning in 2011:

We took for granted that we’d spend our 20s finding ourselves, whatever that meant, and save marriage for after we’d finished graduate school and launched our careers, which of course would happen at the magical age of 30. That we would marry, and that there would always be men we wanted to marry, we took on faith. How could we not?

... But what transpired next lay well beyond the powers of everybody’s imagination: as women have climbed ever higher, men have been falling behind. We’ve arrived at the top of the staircase, finally ready to start our lives, only to discover a cavernous room at the tail end of a party, most of the men gone already, some having never shown up—and those who remain are leering by the cheese table, or are, you know, the ones you don’t want to go out with.

But Griffith, Hale, and Stimpson-Chapman were too busy teaching younger women to learn from the warnings of older women. Even worse, aside from Hale’s glancing admission quoted above, none of them have come out to warn younger women that they were wrong, and not to make the same mistakes they made.

And so the cycle continues, with Anna Hitchings as the face of a new generation of never married 30 something Christian women attempting to teach what they should instead be seeking to learn. Hitchings’ career as a writer finally took off earlier this year when *Catholic Weekly* published her piece *For want of a lot of good men*. Hitchings capitalized on her new found celebrity by starting a blog teaching other Christian women (and men) who likewise have failed to marry. Recently she wrote a post titled *Making the most of your single years* where she acknowledges the debt she owes to the never married writers who proceeded her:

While the tried and true guide to helping Catholic women ‘survive’ the single years has been written by American author Emily Stimpson, I thought it would be helpful to share some of my own advice on getting the best out of your singlehood.

Just for the record, I don’t think being single is something that should be ‘survived’; I think we should be able to thrive in whatever state of life we are in, because that’s what God has willed for us now.
Manspreading is about envy, not space.
by Dalrock | July 19, 2019 | Link

The BBC has an article up about an ugly feminist receiving “backlash” for her pettiness. Laila Laurel won a “major award” for creating a pair of seats designed to force men’s legs together while forcing women’s legs apart.

According to the BBC, Laurel designed the chairs to solve the problem of men taking up too much space:

She said the “concept” chair was inspired by her experiences of men “infringing on my space in public”.

But if you look at the picture in the BBC article, by design the seats quite obviously take up extra space in order to assuage feminist envy of men. It isn’t about saving space at all.

She also made a second chair intended for women which encourages sitters to push their legs apart.

According to the Independent, the Belmond hotel company was so pleased with her feminist furniture that they want her to design something for their guests!

As part of her prize, Laurel will be commissioned to create a product for the hotel and leisure company and receive a £1,000 bursary.

Related:

- It would be petty to point out how petty it is.
- Who cares that Misty has a bigger dick than Colleen?
As I’ve shared previously, feminists have been wildly successful in bending the legal system to enable women to dominate men:

- The Duluth model is working as designed: you won’t smart mouth her again.
- Another case of Duluth working as designed.
- NFL Super Bowl PSA: Who is the abuser?

This is normal to us, so we tend not to notice it. But there are exceptions, including the viral video below.

Keep in mind that the model we teach police, judges, and other court officials across the US insists that the reason for domestic violence is that men are seeking to exert power and control over women. In fact, a man exerting power and control over a woman is the very definition of domestic violence according to Duluth. This is confusing because most people assume domestic violence is about violence, but feminists have redefined the subject entirely.

In theory, a woman threatening and beating her husband or boyfriend for looking at other women isn’t guilty of mere assault, but domestic violence. Or at least that would be the case if the sexes were reversed. So far I don’t see any stories describing the actual charges she is facing. Given that the video has gone viral it is possible the prosecutor will go against the teachings of Duluth and charge her the way he would charge a man in the same situation. It will be interesting to see.

From: Countering Confusion about the Duluth Model (emphasis mine):

We still live in a sexist society where women are devalued, where many men believe they are entitled to be in control in an intimate relationship, and where men who batter believe they have the right to use violence. While it is a goal to change the attitudes of men who batter, the ultimate goal of the Duluth Model has always been to ensure that victims are safer by having the state intervene to stop the violence and address the power imbalance inherent in relationships where one person has been systematically dominated and subjugated by another.

... 

The underpinnings of the Duluth curriculum do come from a historical analysis. When Europeans came to this continent, they brought religion, laws, and economic systems that institutionalized the status of women as the property of men through marriage. From the church to the state, there was not only acceptance of male supremacy, but also an expectation that husbands would maintain the family order by controlling their wives. Various indiscretions committed by wives were
offenses to be punished by husbands. This system of male dominance (like any social structure where one group oppresses another) was perpetuated by: a) a belief in the primacy of men over women; b) institutional rules requiring the submission of women to men; c) the objectification of women which made violence acceptable; and d) the right of men to use violence to punish with impunity (Dobash and Dobash 1983).

... Stating that domestic violence is gender neutral is not only disingenuous, but also has serious public policy implications... Men and women use violence in very different ways, and therefore our response must be different.

...We do agree that there are a small number of women who use violence resulting in police action against their partners without themselves being abused. This is not a social problem requiring institutional organizing in the way that men’s violence against women is.
Duluth worked even better than I expected.

by Dalrock | July 25, 2019 | Link

The Miami Herald reports that the woman in the viral video wasn’t arrested or charged. From Woman smashes husband with laptop on plane, video shows:

The woman was not arrested. According to the report, there was a delay from the time the incident took place to when police were notified and dispatched to the area. A search for her “yielded negative results.”

The husband spoke to authorities and said they were en route from Ecuador back home to L.A. when the argument ensued, but did not want to press charges. He went on to take a later flight. McLemore’s whereabouts are unknown.

The flight attendant and passengers were treated for bumps on their heads. Neither wanted to make a statement.

“If there’s no statement, we are not able to move forward with the case,” a Miami-Dade Police Department spokesman told the Miami Herald.

Note that according to the Miami Herald the police are saying there is nothing they can do because the airline crew failed to call them in a timely manner, and then refused to make a statement to police. Imagine the outrage if the sexes were reversed and the airline didn’t promptly call the police, declined to make a statement, and the police reviewed the viral video and left it at that. Every major media outlet in the country would have editorials decriying the proof the case provides that the evil patriarchy is systematically oppressing women. There would be calls for heads to roll, and the heads of the American Airlines, Miami-Dade PD, and the prosecutors office would all have made self abasing press conferences by now apologizing for not taking domestic violence seriously. All of the democratic presidential candidates would have expressed outrage on the issue, and very likely President Trump as well. And the men of National Review would stage a self flagellation parade.

Tellingly, the Miami Herald doesn’t use the terms “abuse” or “domestic violence” anywhere in the article*. It characterizes the woman smashing her disobedient husband over the head as a blowout fight between a married couple (emphasis mine):

Passengers on an American Airlines flight from Miami to Los Angeles got a front row seat to a blowout fight between a married couple seated in the exit row.

A woman, identified by police as Tiffany McLemore, can be heard yelling expletives at her husband on various videos taken by fellow passengers, and circulating on social media.

According to a police report on Sunday’s incident before taking off from the Miami airport to L.A., McLemore became “enraged” because he was “ignoring” her.
The silence in this case is all the more telling because the woman almost seems like a hoax given how perfectly she acts out the feminist description of men using violence to maintain power and control in a relationship. She is a female version of the stereotypical angry drunk abuser, straight out of central casting. From USA Today:

According to a police report of the Sunday incident, McLemore and her husband were arguing about McLemore's drinking. McLemore became "enraged" when her husband was ignoring her and when he got up to walk away, she got his laptop and threw it at him.

She even declares that she's the man in the relationship (emphasis mine):

In the video, the woman is heard saying: "I wear the f—— nuts, n——. Watch until we f—— get home."
The man leaves his seat and escapes up the aisle with the cabin crew, but the woman pursues him, smashing down her laptop over his head.

The cardinal rule of the Duluth paradigm of domestic violence is that you can’t apply the paradigm to women who abuse men. Obviously American Airlines, Miami-Dade PD, the prosecutors office, and the media are all following this cardinal rule. The alternative explanation would be that they don’t take domestic violence seriously.

Note also that while she was abusing her husband she was threatening to enlist the police to help her abuse him. From the Miami Herald article:

“Never come to my house again, n——!” she shouts in the curse filled rant. “I’ll call the police on you!”

She clearly understood how the process works, which is why she was so unconcerned when the flight crew (apparently falsely) claimed they were going to have her charged for assault.

*Likewise, neither term is used in the stories by Fox News, Business Insider, AOL, The New York Post, or USA Today.
Some questions for American Airlines.
by Dalrock | July 25, 2019 | Link

Maybe a reader with a Twitter account can run some or all of these past the American Airlines Twitter account. Regarding the recent viral video:

1. Does American Airlines take domestic violence seriously?
2. Why was the victim ejected from the plane along with his abuser? Does American Airlines blame him for being abused?
3. Is the Miami-Dade PD statement reported by the Miami Herald accurate in asserting that the police were not immediately called and the flight crew declined to make a statement?
4. Did American Airlines book the abuser on another flight before the police could locate her?
5. Assuming the Miami Herald report is accurate, was the flight crew’s decision not to give a statement after witnessing domestic violence inside an American Airlines cabin in line with American Airlines corporate policy?
6. Would American Airlines expect the flight crew to have handled the situation any differently if the sexes were reversed?

**Edit:** According to the Business Insider article, American Airlines confirmed that they ejected both the abuser and her victim from the plane:

An American Airlines spokeswoman told Business Insider in an emailed statement:

“Prior to departure from the gate on Sunday at Miami International Airport, two passengers who were traveling together were involved in a dispute.

“Law enforcement was requested, and both passengers were removed from the aircraft.

“We thank the American crew who worked quickly to diffuse the situation. Their actions resulted in a safe environment for all of our passengers.”
Meet the sexist tools of everyday carry.

by Dalrock | July 29, 2019 | Link

Steven T. Wright at Vox.com is troubled that there is a community of men talking about manly things. From Meet the men obsessed with carrying all the right stuff

The Boy Scouts in particular have been praised and criticized in equal measure for promoting a vision of rugged manliness that is inextricably tied to this idea of readiness, as reflected in their longtime motto, “Be prepared.” But while many admit that traditional Western concepts of masculinity certainly contribute to the popularity of the subculture, /r/EDC users like Sean S. (who asked that we not use his last name) stress that your personal choice of carry is ultimately a very intimate decision that says more about a person and their vocation than the community as a whole.

That said, not everyone is entirely happy with the community’s stereotypically masculine overtones. Although several subjects pointed to their mothers’ seemingly bottomless purses as inspirations for their EDCs, others, like Kevin Diale, feel that the subreddit can be somewhat hostile to women. “When you see people post problems that they bump into as a woman, like not enough pockets on pants, you get folks who crawl out of the woodwork and wave a pair of niche work pants marketed to women and try to invalidate them,” he says.

While he frames his concern in standard feminist terms, it is obvious that what keeps Wright awake at night is the fact that so long as competent men exist his own inadequacy is obvious. He opens the piece with an unhappy memory from his childhood, when his father presented him with a pocketknife.

We were searching for an appropriate knife for me to take on our hike up a nearby mountain, just in case something terrible happened. As we sifted through the pile, my father said that when he was my age, he carried a pocket knife with him everywhere he went. I pointed out that would probably get me expelled from my middle school, but he just laughed. “That didn’t stop us. We wanted to be prepared for anything. You should carry it with you when you can.”

Wright contrasts his own rejection of his father’s healthy masculinity with the experience of an Every Day Carry (EDC) enthusiast. Instead of viewing a gift from his father with shame and derision, the EDC enthusiast warmly recalled a similar moment:

The concept of treasuring the seemingly mundane objects that you carry every day was inculcated in Hayes by his father, who gave him a wallet that belonged to his own grandfather as a symbol of his entry to adulthood. As a former Boy Scout, Hayes was more than familiar with the concept of “readiness,” so when he stumbled upon
page after page of carefully posed shots of high-end gear like flashlights and folding knives, he felt right at home.

It is interesting to see the way that men like Wright’s objection to men who value tools and weapons has changed over time. Ten years ago the standard claim was that men who were interested in and owned guns and knives were betraying a lack of masculine ability. Real men don’t need weapons, went the argument, so men who have them must be inadequate. This is a foolish argument, as Doug Marcaida explains in the video below:

But now men like Wright don’t even bother projecting their inadequacy onto more masculine men. Now they come out and openly complain that other men are being too manly, not only for having an interest in weapons, but for having an interest in tools in general.

This shift is especially interesting because in most of the US the legal tide is strongly moving in favor of carrying weapons. It is not only easier to legally carry a gun in many states now, but restrictions on knives have been rolled back as well. As a result, a surprising number of states now allow carry of switchblade knives.

Of course not all jurisdictions are addressing the question in the same way. I suggest that the men of Vox.com would feel much more comfortable if they moved to the UK:

These items were found during a #weaponSweep near #MackworthHouse #AugustasSt during #OpSceptre. Safely disposed and taken off the streets pic.twitter.com/53HdeqMKu1

— Regents Park Police (@MPSRegentsPark) March 16, 2018
The future of gun control
by Dalrock | July 30, 2019 | Link

The tweet from UK police that I included in my last post reminded me of the video below. Here in the US we are often reminded that other countries like the UK are “more advanced” when it comes to gun control. While violent crime isn’t funny, the mind frame in the video below is unintentionally hilarious. It looks like a parody of US anti gun documentaries, substituting knives, old rusty axes, and even baseball bats for guns. Note the comment about the importance of stopping “the flow of knives” from retail stores.

Also don’t forget about the menace of pointy sticks.

H/T The Truth About Knives.
Did Jesus mean literal swords in Luke 22:35-38?
by Dalrock | July 31, 2019 | Link

35 And he said to them, “When I sent you out with no moneybag or knapsack or sandals, did you lack anything?” They said, “Nothing.” 36 He said to them, “But now let the one who has a moneybag take it, and likewise a knapsack. And let the one who has no sword sell his cloak and buy one. 37 For I tell you that this Scripture must be fulfilled in me: ‘And he was numbered with the transgressors.’ For what is written about me has its fulfillment.” 38 And they said, “Look, Lord, here are two swords.” And he said to them, “It is enough.”


In the discussion of The future of gun control, Red Pill Latecomer suggested that Jesus was not referring to literal swords in the passage referenced above:

In fact, He said the time will come to sell your cloak and buy a sword.

Jesus did not necessarily mean it in a literal sense. The evidence is that the apostles responded “‘See, Lord, here are two swords.” Jesus replied, “That is enough.”

Two swords are not enough for a battle. My Catholic study bible suggests that Jesus’ reply was in the manner of a weary sigh, brushing aside their focus on literal swords.

The most convincing and concise explanation for the verses that I’ve read comes from Pastor Doug Wilson in The Apostle Peter and Open Carry:

I believe that what Jesus is doing here is transparently clear, and it is equally clear that the disciples mistook His point entirely, and He has to tell them to drop it.

Jesus reminds them of the previous times they had been sent out on preaching missions, and how He had sent them out without any reserves, without any ordinary supplies. An example of Him doing this is found in Luke 9:1-6. Jesus is here reversing that pattern, teaching His disciples that this was a temporary measure while He was with them, and that now they must not forget to take their basic supplies. He mentions purse, knapsack, sandals, and swords. He says that the sword is important enough that they should sell their cloak if they need to. Better chilly than dead. This part of it is about their missions in the future (He is not talking about taking wallets, packs, sandals, etc. when they leave in a few minutes for Gethsemane). He is instructing them that they must learn to provide for themselves, unlike what He had told them to do on earlier missions. Things were different now. Among those ordinary provisions were swords for self-defense.

...
Christ was speaking about being prepared for that bad stretch of road north of Antioch, but the disciples interpreted Him as giving an *immediate* call to arms, a call to arm themselves against the powers coming against them *that very night*. This was not what He was talking about at all. Remember that they are going from this room, where they had produced the two swords, straight to the Garden of Gethsemane, where Peter was to use one of those two swords to chop off the ear of Malchus (John 18:10). Jesus, just a matter of hours after this, put the ear back on, and He did not say “Peter, non-violence is the way.” He rebuked Peter for yet again being the Satan that was trying to keep Him from finishing His appointed mission.

Note that this explanation is not a case of cooking up a *kooky backstory*. Pastor Wilson is tying in relevant Scripture, not creating a narrative that changes the clear meaning of the text.

Also note that Wilson’s defenders argue that the reason Wilson so regularly substitutes chivalry (the parody of Christianity) for Christianity is because he is not a clear thinker or writer. Whatever Wilson’s reason is for reliably substituting chivalry for Christianity when the topic is husbands and wives, it *cannot* be due to a deficiency of intellect or written communication skills.
Sloots: “Christianity means never having to say I’m sorry.”
by Dalrock | August 2, 2019 | Link

Such is the way of an adulterous woman; she eateth, and wipeth her mouth, and saith, I have done no wickedness.

-Proverbs 30:20, KJV

Several readers have asked for a post on the recent season of the reality show Bachelorette. I don’t follow the show, but according to the news accounts Christian bachelorette Hannah B is outraged at being slut shamed by fellow Christian Luke Parker. The Christian Post characterizes Luke as “polarizing” for suggesting that Christian sexual morality matters. From Bachelorette slams haters who label her bad Christian: ‘We all fall short of glory of God’

This season of “The Bachelorette” with Hannah B features polarizing Christian contestant Luke Parker, known as Luke P, who is outspoken about his Christian faith which has forced the bachelorette to own up to what she believes about her own faith and some of her actions.

...she declares that “Jesus still loves” her despite her decision to have sexual relations with some of the contestants when questioned about her purity by Luke P.

... “I refuse to not stand in the sun. I refuse to feel shame...

In a second article the Christian Post explains the comment by Luke that outraged Hannah:

“Let’s talk about sex and how the marriage bed should be kept pure,” the 24-year-old, who traded his player ways to follow Christ, told Hannah B.

“Let’s say you have had sex with one or multiple of these guys, I would be wanting to go home,”...

Hannah B, also a professing Christian, immediately took offense to Luke P’s comments and confessed that she has had “physical relations” with some of the other contestants but “Jesus stills loves her.”

While Hannah has received what she considers intolerable online rebukes for her lack of repentance, nearly all modern Christians would normally remain silent on the subject, especially if it is a woman who is committing sexual immorality. For many feminism is the proximate reason for this, as we are now regularly lectured on the evils of “slut shaming”.

But for other modern Christians the reason is perhaps less obvious. Like feminism, chivalry
also teaches that slut shaming is abominable. This goes back to the very birth of courtly love (what we call chivalry) circa 1177 in *Lancelot, the Knight of the Cart*. On his quest to save the adulterous queen Guinevere, Lancelot encounters a sexually liberated noblewoman who proposes a roll in the hay in exchange for information he needs. The narrator explains that her sluttiness is a wonderful gift (emphasis mine):

> Then the damsel said to him: “Sire, my house is prepared for you, if you will accept my hospitality, but you shall find shelter there only on condition that you will lie with me; upon these terms I propose and make the offer.” **Not a few there are who would have thanked her five hundred times for such a gift**;

Later in the same poem Guinevere is slut shamed after evidence of her adultery with Lancelot is discovered. This sets up the iconic scene where Lancelot *fights for her honor*, vanquishing slut shaming.

This is why Hannah is so outraged, and why the Christian Post is careful to call Luke, and not Hannah, polarizing for his view of sexual immorality. In speaking the truth Luke was terribly unchivalrous, which is the greatest sin of our era.
Commenter Opus wrote:

Now, as all who read here are Christians, I need hardly remind y’all that Jesus never slut-shamed. He did however when a woman came to him full of genuine contrition asking for forgiveness say to her that her sins were given and that she should go away and sin no more.

I would urge Opus to not overlook the incident in John 4 with the Samaritan woman, where He slut shamed her by asking her a question He already knew the answer to (John 4:15-18, ESV):

15 The woman said to him, “Sir, give me this water, so that I will not be thirsty or have to come here to draw water.”

16 Jesus said to her, “Go, call your husband, and come here.” 17 The woman answered him, “I have no husband.” Jesus said to her, “You are right in saying, ‘I have no husband’; 18 for you have had five husbands, and the one you now have is not your husband. What you have said is true.”

This is not the only example in the Gospels of Jesus being strikingly unchivalrous. Consider the case of the Canaanite woman (Mat 15:22-28, ESV):

22 And behold, a Canaanite woman from that region came out and was crying, “Have mercy on me, O Lord, Son of David; my daughter is severely oppressed by a demon.” 23 But he did not answer her a word. And his disciples came and begged him, saying, “Send her away, for she is crying out after us.” 24 He answered, “I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.” 25 But she came and knelt before him, saying, “Lord, help me.” 26 And he answered, “It is not right to take the children’s bread and throw it to the dogs.” 27 She said, “Yes, Lord, yet even the dogs eat the crumbs that fall from their masters’ table.” 28 Then Jesus answered her, “O woman, great is your faith! Be it done for you as you desire.” And her daughter was healed instantly.

Consider also the case of the woman with menstrual bleeding who touched his robe and was healed. The only chivalrous thing to do would have been to leave it at that. But Jesus wouldn’t let it go until she publicly submitted to Him and declared what her malady was (Luke 8:43-48, ESV):

43 And there was a woman who had had a discharge of blood for twelve years, and though she had spent all her living on physicians,[f] she could not be healed by anyone. 44 She came up behind him and touched the fringe of his garment, and immediately her discharge of blood ceased. 45 And Jesus said, “Who was it that touched me?” When all denied it, Peter[g] said, “Master, the crowds surround you and are pressing in on you!” 46 But Jesus said, “Someone touched me, for I perceive
that power has gone out from me." 47 And when the woman saw that she was not
hidden, she came trembling, and falling down before him declared in the presence of
all the people why she had touched him, and how she had been immediately healed.
48 And he said to her, “Daughter, your faith has made you well; go in peace.”

Lastly, see John 2, where Jesus reminds his own mother of her proper place before performing
a miracle she requests (John 2:2-5, ESV):

2 On the third day there was a wedding at Cana in Galilee, and the mother of Jesus
was there. 2 Jesus also was invited to the wedding with his disciples. 3 When the
wine ran out, the mother of Jesus said to him, “They have no wine.” 4 And Jesus
said to her, “Woman, what does this have to do with me? My hour has not yet
come.” 5 His mother said to the servants, “Do whatever he tells you.”

This last example has the potential to bring out the different perspectives of Protestants and
Catholics. This isn’t my intent, but it is instructive that both groups feel the need to explain
why Christ would speak to His mother in such a way. Protestants see him reminding her of his
place as a sharp rebuke. For from a chivalrous mind frame it is quite jarring.

I don’t know if the RCC has formal doctrine on this specific question, but here is what Joe
Heschmeyer at Shameless Popery writes on the topic:

There is another interpretation, however: that Jesus is cautioning her. Mary
has come to Christ with an implicit request for a miracle. Jesus responds by
addressing her as “Woman.” A lot could be said of that title, and its implications for
Mary as the New Eve (it’s the name that Adam first gives to Eve in the Garden of
Eden, Genesis 2:23). For now, though, it’s sufficient to recognize that it’s not rude to
call Mary “Woman”: Jesus does this again on the Cross (John 19:26-27) and Paul
does it in Galatians 4:4, and in both places, it’s unambiguously positive.

I’ll reiterate that my intent here isn’t to poke at the Protestant Catholic divide. Quite the
opposite, my intent is to show that both Protestants and Catholics currently feel the need to
explain why Jesus would respond to His mother the way He did in the first place. Both explain
that what seems unchivalrous really isn’t, but using different rationalizations.

See Also: Call me unchivalrous.
Feminist charisma
by Dalrock | August 5, 2019 | Link

It looks like the following video on Brie Larson made the rounds several months ago, but I only stumbled upon it last week.

The feminist dream has turned into a nightmare. Here she finally is, one of the guys, but instead of being loved she is unlovable. She traded her feminine power for masculine power, and now she has neither. Even worse, she is trapped by her own envy. Being more likable would mean being less feminist, as a feminist at Reddit/Ask Feminists explains:

First of all, I do see that Brie does seem a bit defensive. But I can’t help but feel her defensiveness is justified. Marvel fanbase is predominantly male and I can’t imagine what kind of bs poor Brie reads on a daily basis about herself. Odds are the reason she always wants to ‘win’ or ‘praise herself’ is because she knows damn well she works hard and she wants to be recognised. CoC argues she should let herself be the butt of the joke every once in a while to look humble, but here’s the thing: women are always the butt of the joke, so it wouldn’t surprise me if she just didn’t want to be the butt of the joke anymore now that she’s repping Captain Marvel. It’s easy for someone like Chris Pratt or Hemsworth to do it because they’re already very praised in general. But Brie Larson allowing herself to be the butt of the joke is basically like the poor school nerd just shoving himself into a locker.

Next on, the whole ‘Brie doesn’t smile thing’. Did anyone catch how all of CoC’s example of when she was charismatic was before her Captain Marvel days? That’s not a coincidence.

Larson and the feminists she represents want more than anything to be taken seriously, but the harder she tries to ape men, and the more she stamps her feet and demands to be taken seriously, the less seriously everyone takes her. It is painfully obvious in the video above that she is intensely disliked by her colleagues.

If you compare the clips of young Larson vs feminist Larson included in the video, it looks like she has had her personality, her charm, surgically removed. She looks like a robot, a Stepford feminist. But this is what feminism teaches women to become, as lesbian feminist Abigail Fenton explains in Brie Larson isn’t unlikable. She’s normal.

I was delighted to find I really like Brie Larson. She had me charmed instantly — laughing at my screen at 4am, thinking, yeah, I could be friends with her, as she lamented, “I’m sorry you had to google that. I feel like the Disney execs are super bummed about that,” in response to the question of who plays Captain Marvel.

In fact, I found her so charismatic and endearing that I resolved to finally get around to checking out her work.

Click through to the post to see the picture of a crazy looking woman at the top of the post,
hilariously captioned:

| No she’s not “unlikable”, she’s a normal woman

This kind of robotic unlikability is inherent to the feminist secret sauce. Remove it from the mix, or even dilute it a little, and feminists will shriek that Larson isn’t keeping it real. She has no choice but to keep it up, and even ramp it up. Keep in mind that Captain Marvel is being positioned as the new leader of the Marvel Cinematic Universe, so the unintentional comedy is really just beginning.

**Edit:** I see that the picture of the obviously deranged woman at the top of the second linked article is of Larson in her recent film *Unicorn Store.*
Andi does Melbourne?
by Dalrock | August 6, 2019 | Link

From The Sun: *I swiped through so many men on Tinder I was told there were NO matches left – and I’m still single*

Andi Lew, 46 - a wellness coach from Australia – even started “pin dropping to other places and countries” in her bid to find love.

...  
She explains: “If you reach ‘the end’ of the app a message will pop up saying ‘there’s no-one new in your area’ – at which point you need to widen your area and age range.”

She perfectly captures the female preferred form of promiscuity. She wants something *meaningful* (implying commitment), with no strings attached:

Andi says she’s focusing on apps that are “geared toward showcasing yourself to attract more meaningful connections”.

And while she’s not actively pursuing a relationship, she likes knowing that someone might be looking for “something real and kind”, and that things may develop naturally “without expectation”.

Related:

- [She needs more men!](#)  
- [Women’s morphing need for male investment](#)

H/T Nick M
Hoes mad.
by Dalrock | August 7, 2019 | Link

Iman Hariri-Kia at Elite Daily is outraged in College Men Are Finally Asking For Consent — But Only Because They’re Afraid Of Being “MeToo’d”

But the majority of women and femmes also believe men are actively seeking consent for the wrong reasons. Thirty-nine percent of those surveyed feel men are asking for consent because they're afraid of being publicly accused of sexual assault.

Yet striking fear in men was the goal from the beginning, as Ezra Klein at Vox.com explained back in 2014 in “Yes Means Yes” is a terrible law, and I completely support it (emphasis mine):

“No Means No” has created a world where women are afraid. To work, “Yes Means Yes” needs to create a world where men are afraid.

From the article it is clear that what really bothers feminists is not that men fear being victimized by the #MeToo witch hunt, but that #MeToo is recognized as victimizing men:

“#MeToo’d” is a phrase that keeps coming up in my conversations with college women and femmes. They claim to have heard college men use it in excess and in a defensive manner when describing the “threat of being accused of sexual assault.” (“You wouldn’t want to get #MeToo’d, make sure you don’t get #MeToo’d.”) It even has its own Urban Dictionary entry, which defines the slang term as “when a woman ruins your life by accusing you of sexual assault or sexual harassment, without any evidence or [past] the time that any evidence could be collected.” This phrase is hugely problematic, as it steers the conversation away from women and their bodies and onto men and their feelings.

This social response to #MeToo is the wholly natural reaction to a process founded on not distinguishing between real and false accusations. The callousness with which feminists like Hariri-Kia dismiss men’s fears of false accusations is breathtaking, and is what animates the larger #MeToo movement. They really can’t conceive that men are living, breathing, human beings, or understand why they wouldn’t want to be falsely accused. The reality is that the vast majority of men don’t rape, so the only logical behavioral change on their part isn’t to stop doing something they already didn’t do, but take necessary measures to prevent being falsely accused.

Still, we are very early on in the response to Yes Means Yes and #MeToo, so the full reaction hasn’t yet occurred. Over the long term the SJW pogroms will eventually birth a generation of men who eschew both feminism and feminism’s foundation, chivalry. #MeToo is founded on men’s goodwill towards women, and driven by a very open disdain of men. Long term something will have to give, but in the meantime the reservoir of men’s goodwill is so deep as to be seemingly inexhaustible.

www.TheRedArchive.com
Note: If like me you were confused by the term “women and femmes”, here is an explanation.
Yesterday The Atlantic published a largely incoherent article blaming the manosphere for mass shootings.

To Learn About the Far Right, Start With the ‘Manosphere’

The sexist world has become a recruiting ground for potential mass shooters.

The article doesn’t even try to tie mass shooters to any manosphere sites. Instead, it equates antifeminism in general with mass murderers. Ironically it simultaneously claims that:

1. By definition being antifeminist is a heretical radical fringe position. All right minded people today enthusiastically support feminism, and only dangerous and insane people would dare to oppose feminism.
2. Feminism is not a powerful force in our society. If you believe it is a powerful force in our society you are peddling an insane conspiracy theory because as feminism teaches us, women are powerless in our patriarchal society.

Finally, anti-feminist ideology has the capacity to become a 360-degree conspiracy theory, similar to the kind of anti-Semitic ideas that flourish online. Feminists are presumed to influence all government decisions, even though women are still underrepresented at every level of elected office. Across the fractured, diverse outposts of the manosphere, “one of the few things they will agree on is a conspiratorial view of feminism,” Murdoch says. “They don’t consider that it was ever a movement for gender equality. They think it was a guise to assert control over men.”
The best a brand can get?
by Dalrock | August 8, 2019 | Link

I noted back in January that Gillette ran the risk of becoming a cautionary tale for Marketing 101 courses. This has now come to pass, as P&G recently announced that they were taking an 8 billion dollar write down on the brand. The whole purpose of advertising is to increase the value of a brand. Yet the Gillette marketing team poisoned the brand in the mind of many of its target customers when they accused the average shaver of toxic masculinity.

The defense of the ad is especially humorous. The excuse is that the brand was already losing value when they took their infamous shot at their core customer base, so they aren’t to blame for the loss in goodwill. This would be like a fire department explaining that a home was already on fire when they showed up and sprayed it and neighboring homes with gasoline. The job of fire departments is to extinguish fires, not inflame them, and the job of marketing departments is to create goodwill or slow the loss of goodwill, not torch it.
McCormick mans the grill.

by Dalrock | August 9, 2019 | Link

The polar opposite of Gillette’s ad showing disdain for their primary customers is the flame and flavor ad by McCormick.

This of course carries its own form of risk, because feminist harpies consumed by envy of men are very likely to shriek that it is unacceptable to identify anything as manly.
She almost had him.
by Dalrock | August 12, 2019 | Link

The Blast has a post about a man who is having second thoughts about adopting his soon to be ex wife's daughter.

He then apparently told his wife that he was afraid to adopt their daughter because 1. he’d have to pay child support, and 2. the ensuing divorce would shatter the family they’re trying to create. When he told her all this, he says she had a panic attack and claims he’s just putting her back in control of her ex-husband.

Even before she showed her hand too soon by filing for divorce, he should have considered the foolishness of what he was planning on doing. Legally adopting the girl creates a cash incentive for the girl’s mother to eject yet another father from the girl’s life. Why would a man do such a thing to an innocent child?
What are fathers for?
by Dalrock | August 14, 2019 | Link

Several commenters have noted the troubling image featured at the National Responsible Fatherhood Clearinghouse (fatherhood.gov):

I’m going to partially defend the National Responsible Fatherhood Clearinghouse (NRFC), as we (as a society) have asked them to do the impossible. We ask them to stress the importance of fathers, when we believe no such thing. Since around 1970 we have waged war on the very idea of fatherhood, as part of our war against The Patriarchy. Fathers are no longer accepted as the head of the family, and aside from fulfilling the role of walking wallet we no longer even have a clear accepted definition of what fathers do. Fathers are now deputy parents, who serve at the pleasure of the mother.

Moreover, it isn’t just feminists who have waged war on fathers. If anything, “traditional conservatives” are even more hostile to fathers than feminists are. Just like feminists, the My Lord Mary Lee crowd can’t stand the thought of fathers in charge.

But making this all the more difficult, we are in denial regarding our war against fathers. The official party line is some version of:

1. Fathers are better now than they were in the past.
2. Fathers are “absent” for some entirely mysterious reason.

When we ask the NRFC to teach the importance of fathers, something we as a society vehemently disagree with, we are creating a no win situation for them. They dare not speak the truth, and yet they need to be seen encouraging fatherhood or they won’t be able to justify their funding. So it isn’t surprising that the NRFC would lead with an image of fathers as comic relief. Who doesn’t love laughter? And the image of fathers as clowns is one sure to please both feminists and chivalrists.

If you scroll a bit further down the page, there are links to resources, including DadTalk, a blog on fathering:
The most recent DadTalk blog post demonstrates the difficulty of the task we have assigned the NRFC. The post is titled How Fathers Shape Their Children’s Development: Revisiting the Literature. First the post has to deal with the fact that we have done so much violence to the concept of fatherhood; before we can discuss what fathers do, we need to seriously struggle with the question of what the word father even means. This is something I’ve noted before, and for practical purposes in government statistics it often comes down to who the mother is currently having sex with. In the modern family, the word “father” refers to a series of men who come in and out of the child’s life as their mother makes her way through the modern sexual marketplace (emphasis mine):

First, when we revisit the literature about fathers’ involvement, we need to define: what do we mean when we talk about fathers? The definition of who is a “father” has grown and developed alongside the field of fatherhood programming. We could be referring to a biological father or a stepfather, custodial or non-custodial, with a legal relationship to the child or a social one (e.g., a mother’s partner). Each has his own way of shaping the development of a child depending on when he comes into that child’s life and the amount of time he spends with the child on a regular basis. What matters most for a father’s relationship with his children is not the specific type of family situation, but how the father chooses to involve himself in the life and well-being of his child.

Next the post gets into the tricky question of what the proper role of fathers should be. As deputy parent, this boils down to general parenting assistance for the primary parent (the mother). The blog cautions that “fatherhood practitioners” (I assume this means social workers) need to be “culturally sensitive” regarding the role of fathers:

Second, the literature informs the question: what is the role of the father in the
family? The literature indicates that the image of an ideal dad and notions of a father’s role in the family are diverse, and to a large extent, shaped by cultural and demographic factors. This is especially important to keep in mind for fatherhood practitioners, who should strive for cultural sensitivity and competence. The way a dad sees himself or his position in the family may vary greatly from family to family, and the way you work with or relate to that dad should take his perspective into account.

With these two questions out of the way, the blog post finally gets to the question of what fathers should do, and what makes them special. This is, after all, the point of the post. It explains that today’s fathers are better than fathers in the past, because they know their place. Now in the role of mother’s helpers, fathers focus on generic child care and playing. This is where the post takes on an edgy counter cultural tone sure to delight the house despot crowd, because it asserts that fathers play differently than mothers, aunts, etc do:

Third, the literature continues to track the following question: in what ways are fathers involved in their families, and how is this changing? Fathers as a whole are more actively involved in the lives of their children now than they were 50 years ago. In 2016, fathers reported spending, on average, eight hours a week on child care—about three times more than in 1965. While dads previously may have been seen primarily as breadwinners, they are increasingly sharing parenting responsibilities with mothers. This increased involvement could look like any, and often all, of the following:

1. Positive engagement: direct interaction with children, including caregiving and activities
2. Accessibility: availability to children
3. Responsibility: participation in decision-making and ensuring that children are cared for

While each family balances these dimensions differently, we know that the quality of father involvement and engagement is just as, if not more, important than quantity when we talk about positive impacts on child development. Fathers can increase the quality of their involvement through many different means, including showing affection, teaching and communicating effectively, providing emotional support, sharing interests, and sharing activities. Research shows that, on average, fathers tend to be more involved in play than mothers. Furthermore, they tend to play differently than mothers do—engaging in more physical and challenging games and encouraging independence and risk-taking.

It isn't just the NRFC that struggles greatly with extolling the value of fathers fathering while agonizing over the question of who fathers are and what fathering is. See for example the National Health Statistics Report Fathers’ Involvement With Their Children: United States, 2006–2010. Like the NRFC, the report’s definition of father is a loose term where men often drift in and out of children’s lives as their mother cherishes her sexual freedom (emphasis mine):
Not all men are biological fathers and not all fathers have biological children. In addition to fathering a child, men may become fathers through adoption—which confers the same legal status, protections, and responsibilities to the man and the child as fathering a biological child. Men also may become de facto fathers when they marry or cohabit with women who have children from previous relationships, that is, they are raising stepchildren or their cohabiting partner’s children. **In this report, men were defined as fathers if they had biological or adopted children or if step- or partner’s children were living in the household.**

As for what fathers do, the list of activities fits closely with the NRFC’s definition. Note that all of the activities used to measure the impact of fathers would just as easily work if the report were measuring the impact of aunts and grandmothers:

This report focuses on activities that men did with their children, separately for coresidential and noncoresidential children, in the last 4 weeks. The activities by age group are presented below. For children under age 5, activities include:

- Eating meals with or feeding the children
- Bathing, diapering, or dressing the children, or helping the children bathe, dress, or use the toilet themselves
- Playing with the children
- Reading to the children

For children aged 5-18, activities include:

- Talking with the children about things that happened during their day
- Eating meals with the children
- Helping the children with homework or checking that the homework had been done
- Taking the children to or from activities

Men were asked how frequently they did each activity in the last 4 weeks.

H/T White

**Related:** Children are as likely to end up living with neither parent as they are with just their father.
The marriage marketplace connection to China’s ghost cities.

by Dalrock | August 19, 2019 | Link

Way back in 2011 I wrote an off topic post on China’s ghost cities. With the current trade war with China I’ve been watching some youtube videos to try to get a better understanding of what is going on with China’s economy. One thing I learned is that the infamous ghost cities aren’t merely a product of central planning gone wrong. There is a strong speculative component to the phenomenon, as the apartments in the empty buildings are being purchased for astronomical prices by highly leveraged chinese citizens, especially chinese men who are looking to signal their suitability to marry by owning “property”. I put property in quotes because what they are typically buying is an unfinished (bare concrete) apartment in a building on land leased from the government for 70 years.

As the video above explains, not all “ghost cities” remain empty forever. At times the speculation pays off and eventually the buildings are used for their intended purpose. But even here the nature of the arrangement is quite odd from a foreigner’s perspective. South African expat youtuber SerpentZA explains what this looks like in Shenzhen below:

SerpentZA and a colleague share more thoughts on the bubble here:

Whenever contemplating a bubble, I always keep the famous Keynes quote in mind:

| Markets can remain irrational longer than you can remain solvent.

On the larger topic of the trade war, I found this video by SerpentZA helpful:

And this one as well:
The Institute for Family Studies has an essay by Professor W. Bradford Wilcox, titled Marriage Facilitates Responsible Fatherhood. According to the editor’s note the essay is an abbreviated version of Wilcox’s testimony to the House Ways and Means Committee for the Worker and Family Support Subcommittee Hearing in June. The essay concludes with:

Given all this, federal programs and public policies designed to promote healthy fatherhood should not lose sight of the importance of also strengthening marriage in America. That’s because no other institution is as successful as marriage in connecting fathers to their children.

Wilcox’s closing plea may seem obvious, but the truth he is touching on is a politically dangerous one. This is because “responsible fatherhood” is a term used to minimize the entirely predictable consequences of reworking our family structure from a marriage based model to a child support model. The implication is that something mysterious suddenly happened to men, causing fathers to become less engaged with their children. Politicians promote this implication with organizations like the National Responsible Fatherhood Clearinghouse, and they do so to distract from their own evil actions. The reality is that we have created elaborate legal machinery to eject fathers from the home and alienate them from their children.

Professor Willcox urges congress to look for ways to strengthen marriage, but it would be hugely beneficial if the government would simply stop working so diligently to facilitate kicking fathers out of the home, and out of their children’s lives. But kicking dad out is essential to achieving feminist goals. The machinery of familial destruction is essential to empower women who are unmarried, divorced, and even married.

In the case of married women, giving mothers the ability to easily eject the father from the home gives wives great power over their husbands. Professor Martin Halla warns policy makers that joint custody harms married mothers by making it harder for mothers to alienate fathers from their children. From Do joint custody laws improve family well-being?

The redistribution effect of joint custody laws

The introduction of joint custody improves divorce as an option for men and potentially worsens it for women. The change to joint custody strengthens the bargaining position of men within marriage... This shift in allocation power should increase the well-being of men and potentially lower it for women.

Policymakers should acknowledge that regulating families’ post-divorce life may affect intact families...
To predict the effects of a planned reform, it would be important to assess how the relative bargaining positions of spouses will be affected. This can be approximated by checking how the reform affects the well-being of each partner in the case of a potential divorce. The party who will benefit from the reform will gain power within the marriage.

Economists Stevenson and Wolfers describe the mechanism Halla is referring to in their paper *Bargaining in the Shadow of the Law: Divorce Laws and Family Distress* (emphasis mine).

In the literature on the economics of the family there has been growing consensus on the need to take bargaining and distribution within marriage seriously. Such models of the family rely on a threat point to determine distribution within the household. The switch to a unilateral divorce regime redistributes power in a marriage, giving power to the person who wants out, and reducing the power previously held by the partner interested in preserving the marriage.

Alienating children from their fathers isn’t an unintended side effect of our current system. Giving mothers the power to kick fathers out of their children’s lives is a public policy tool used to strike fear in married fathers. Again from Professor Halla:

…it is useful to consider that a father’s situation improves on average after a divorce in a joint custody regime compared with the situation before the reform. On average, fathers lose a large share of their parental rights after divorce under sole custody rules, while they still have a good chance of being involved in their children’s upbringing under joint custody rules.

If fathers don’t fear losing access to their children, mothers can’t use this fear to threaten them. As a sociology professor, Wilcox has to understand the public policy reason fathers are being kicked out of their children’s lives. Men didn’t suddenly and mysteriously become less responsible; government kicked fathers out of the home to empower mothers. Yet Wilcox ignores this elephant in the middle of the room in his testimony to Congress. This was a shrewd move, because addressing that ugly truth would certainly threaten Wilcox’s career in public policy. As it stands even stating the painfully obvious, that legally (even if only temporarily) declaring that fathers are part of the family increases fathers’ investment in their families, is a potential threat to the status quo. For his tepid courage in the service of innocent children, Professor Wilcox deserves tepid praise. And should he or any of his peers one day develop the courage to speak the more dangerous truth, that alienation of fathers from their children is quite intentional, it would present a serious threat to our current family model.

HT Anon
You better do as she says, or she’ll take away your kids.

by Dalrock | August 28, 2019 | Link

In response to A dangerous truth, commenter Anonymous Reader challenged my assertion that as a sociology professor, Wilcox had to understand that there are public policy reasons fathers are being kicked out of their children’s lives. For reference, here is the quote he was responding to, in context:

> If fathers don’t fear losing access to their children, mothers can’t use this fear to threaten them. As a sociology professor, Wilcox has to understand the public policy reason fathers are being kicked out of their children’s lives. Men didn’t suddenly and mysteriously become less responsible; government kicked fathers out of the home to empower mothers. Yet Wilcox ignores this elephant in the middle of the room in his testimony to Congress.

Anonymous Reader countered with:

> No, he does not have to understand any such thing. First of all, his paycheck depends in part of not understanding it. Second of all, we’ve both seen vids of him speaking: he is a deeply betaized man.

> It would hurt his eyes a great deal at this point in his career to actually open them and see what the child-support paradigm of marriage really looks like. Because he might have to admit that he is part of that machine, that he’s been playing his own designated part / role in the Kabuki theater of “Fixing The Family”.

I agree that Wilcox’s has huge incentives not to see what is really going on. But the theory that threatening to take men’s children away is an effective way to achieve feminist goals is something that a sociology professor who specializes in marriage would absolutely be very familiar with. This is part of a larger theory called Intra-household bargaining. Key to this model is the “threat point”. From the Intergalactic article on the topic (red emphasis mine):

**Bargaining power**

Bargaining power is “the relative capacity of each of the parties to a negotiation or dispute to compel or secure agreements on its own terms”. [1] In other words, “if both parties are on equal footing in a debate, then they will have equal bargaining power”, and, conversely, if one party has an advantageous position in the debate, the parties have unequal bargaining power.

More specifically, what determines the equality or inequality of bargaining power is the relative fallback positions or “threat points” of the individuals in the bargaining process; that is, which bargainer has more to lose (economically, socially, etc.)?[2] In the context of intra-household bargaining, an individual’s bargaining power and
fallback position are defined by one’s ability to survive and thrive outside the family.[10]

Not surprisingly, feminists love this model, seeing it as a way for women to make men do what women want. For example, in her paper Cleaning in the Shadow of the Law? Bargaining, Marital Investment, and the Impact of Divorce Law on Husbands’ Intra-Household Work, Jennifer Roff explains that threatening to take men’s children away is an effective way to coerce them into doing a much larger share of the housework:

...once children are born, men face potentially greater costs to divorce than women due to custody loss, which allows women control over the most important marital capital, as well as direct decision making regarding expenditure of child support. Brinig and Allen (2000) find that maternal custody following divorce is one of the strongest predictors of the female initiating divorce proceedings, with similar negative effects of paternal custody on female initiation of divorce.

...columns 4 and 7 indicate that joint custody and unilateral divorce laws have significant interacting incentive effects on father’s household work. Consistent with a bargaining response, the increase in household work seen with unilateral divorce is primarily limited to those fathers who do not live in joint custody states and therefore face the probable loss of custody of their child upon divorce. Unilateral divorce laws increase fathers’ share of household work by roughly 8 percentage points in those states without joint custody laws. However, this increase in paternal share of household work with unilateral divorce is eliminated completely in those states with joint child custody. Given that fathers’ share of household work is about 25%, distributional effects of unilateral divorce on intra-household work are significant, with unilateral divorce in states without joint custody leading to an increase of close to 33% in fathers’ share of household work.

She closes by reminding the reader that there is a public policy opportunity here to achieve more feminist outcomes within marriage by enabling mothers to take men’s children away via no fault divorce:

Of course, this study faces several limitations, including the limited nature of time use data in the PSID. Still, given the relatively large increases in fathers’ household work and decreased leisure following unilateral divorce laws, this research suggests that men, and fathers in particular, may behave strategically in response to changes in marital policy.

This is truly ugly business, and this kind of cold calculating discussion of the benefits of ripping men’s children away is disturbingly common. As a sociology professor, and as the president of the National Marriage Project for the last 10 years, there is no way Professor Wilcox is unaware of this.
18 At that time the disciples came to Jesus, saying, “Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?”  2 And calling to him a child, he put him in the midst of them and said, “Truly, I say to you, unless you turn and become like children, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven.  4 Whoever humbles himself like this child is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven.

—Matt 18:1-4, ESV

One of the astounding things modern Christians have done is twist Scripture into a gospel of girlpower. Christian women are now taught that the Gospel is a message of high self esteem.

From American Heritage Girls Girl Power and God’s Power:

**RECOGNIZING HER WORTH IN CHRIST**

It is the prayer of the American Heritage Girls Ministry that girls understand both who they are and whose they are. Through Progressive Programming tailored to the age and ability of the child, AHG Troop Members are given the opportunity to discover their gifts and talents, allowing them to grow in their confidence and self-esteem. In a word, Girl Members are given a chance to find their worth. In a world that places so much of a girl’s self-worth in the way others perceive her, AHG strives to teach girls that they are already blessed with value beyond measure in the eyes of the Heavenly Father.

But even if there were no program like American Heritage Girls to teach girls the gospel of self esteem, they would be bombarded with this message across Christian women’s social media.

All of Scripture is tortured until it preaches a message of feminist empowerment. As Wendy Griffith explains, women are the Pearl of Great Price!

**Pearl of Great Price**

Ladies, the Lord wants you to know that you are a pearl of great price, a treasure worth pursuing and protecting. You are worth fighting for and, like the pearl in the parable at the head of this chapter, worth everything it might cost a guy to obtain you. You are worth someone sacrificing his time, his routine, his comfort, his money, his whatever in order to have you. You are worth it! You are a prize to be won.

Christian women are of course hearing the message, as the blogger at Drurywriting discovered when teaching college students about sin. In Do Women sin? he explains that while his students have no trouble identifying a list of sins men are tempted by, they are
reliably stumped when he asks them to list sins women tend to be tempted by. Eventually the women in his classes remember women’s solitary weakness:

| Lack of self esteem |

Of all the Scripture modern Christians torture into a gospel of girlpower, Proverbs 31 is probably the most frequently victimized. From A Proverbs 31 Princess at flourishgathering.com:

| You are the embodiment of the Proverbs 31 woman. |

For many of us, including myself, we read about the Proverbs 31 woman and immediately disassociate ourselves from her. She is described as a “wife of noble character” (v. 10) whose “children stand and bless her” (v.28), and most of the time we hardly feel we fit that description. Consider with me, however, that no matter what season of life you are in, you are a combination of the two truths I have set before you:

| You are a Proverbs 31 Princess |

The post concludes with:

| So, rejoice, dear sister! You are not just an ordinary woman going through the throes of life, destined to stay where you are. You are the jewel in your Father’s crown! You are a Princess who is every bit the Proverbs 31 Woman. |

In a followup post titled Embracing the Proverbs 31 princess, the author explains that for Christian women self exaltation is an act of faith:

| For many, accepting that we are a Proverbs 31 Princess is an act of faith, in and of itself. It’s contrary to the way we think. The majority of us have never been told that we are royalty, let alone that we’re worthy, beautiful, intelligent, and so-on. |

As the author explains, not only is there a biblical tie in to Disney princesses, but there is a tie in to chivalry as well.

| You and I have been given so much more than a magic pumpkin turned coach or a charming prince to woo us. |

**No, our Prince gave His very life for us at Calvary’s Cross to ensure our place in God’s kingdom was secured.** Our worth can be seen in the nail-scarred hands of the One who loves us beyond measure. Ephesians 1:4 tells us that “Even before he made the world, God loved us and chose us in Christ to be holy and without fault in his eyes.” (NLT)

Proverbs 31:10-31 provides with a model for being a Christian woman. This woman is set in the context of the culture of that time, but you and I can still aspire to be called “virtuous and capable.” Living in the modern age does not disqualify us nor
does it nullify her. As I said earlier this week, it doesn't matter what season of life you are in, you are the embodiment of the Proverbs 31 Princess.

Related:

- If she has enough self esteem she won't tingle for Harley McBadboy
- If she can't demand a husband then how do we expect her to demand salvation?
The weakened signal hits home.

by Dalrock | September 9, 2019 | Link

When looking for a life partner, my advice to women is date all of them: the bad boys, the cool boys, the commitment-phobic boys, the crazy boys. But do not marry them. The things that make the bad boys sexy do not make them good husbands.

-Sheryl Sandberg

A new study is making the rounds that found a mismatch between the imaginary men unmarried women are planning on marrying, and the real life unmarried men available to these women. This mismatch between fantasy and reality is predictably generating outrage that weak men are screwing feminism up. From the NY Post: Broke men are hurting American women’s marriage prospects

...researchers created profiles of potential husbands, based on real husbands as logged in American Community Survey data. They then compared these hypothetical spouses with actual unmarried men.

They found that a woman’s made-up hubby makes 58 percent more money than the current lineup of eligible bachelors.

“This study reveals large deficits in the supply of potential male spouses,” the study concludes.

“Many young men today have little to bring to the marriage bargain, especially as young women’s educational levels on average now exceed their male suitors’,” Lichter says.

This shouldn’t be surprising. The women who picked first chose the best options. The ones who waited to pick last are left with the rest.

But there is another aspect to this, because women’s past decisions to delay marriage also played a role in shrinking the pool of men who prepared to take on the role of provider. The first generations of women who decided to push out the age of marriage for the most part found that the same number of men still prepared to be husbands. But over time as the length of the delay increased, this weakened the signal women collectively sent to young men that respectable men will be sexually successful. It isn’t just that young women are now astonishingly open about their intent to have sex with badboys in their prime and settle for a beta provider at the last minute, although that has to have an impact. It also isn’t just that as a society we see married fathers as beneath contempt, although surely that’s having an impact as well. Today an 18 year old man doesn’t see the same incentive to knock himself out on education and career that men of previous generations saw. Today an 18 year old man sees that for the next decade or so his most effective sexual strategy is to focus on being the sexy badboy young women dedicate their sexual prime to, not patiently preparing...
to be the boring loyal dude who will pick up the tab*.

What should surprise us is not that men are slowly responding to the radical changes brought about by our still ongoing sexual revolution. What should surprise us is how many young men still focus their youth preparing for a role our society despises. Either way, young men are slowly starting to respond to the messages we are collectively shouting at them, and we should expect this trend to increase over time.

It is also worth remembering the outrage the “Princeton Mom” Susan Patton received back in 2013 for her advice to Princeton women to stop sexing up bad boys and snap up the best prospective husbands before other women beat them to the punch. From her original letter to the women attending Princeton:

Smart women can’t (shouldn’t) marry men who aren’t at least their intellectual equal. As Princeton women, we have almost priced ourselves out of the market. Simply put, there is a very limited population of men who are as smart or smarter than we are. And I say again—you will never again be surrounded by this concentration of men who are worthy of you.

From her interview with CNN after she published a book expounding on the same subject:

**Kelly:** I cracked up when I read what you wrote: “Be aware of marrying a dumb guy for good sex. The sex won’t improve, and he’ll never get smarter.”

**Patton:** There are two barnyard analogies that I cite regularly. The first is men will not buy the cow if the milk is free, and that’s the truth. If you give men sex without
commitment, you have eliminated the incentive for them to commit. ...
An equally important barnyard analogy has to do with just what you’re talking about: the bad guys, the crazy boys, just the men you know you shouldn’t spend time with. I’m telling women avoid wasting time with the pigs for the sake of a little sausage.

H/T Anno, Nick M.

*Details on the chart here.

Related: Will Wilcox and the men of National Review respect you in the morning?
It would be petty to point out how petty they are.
by Dalrock | September 11, 2019 | Link

New Monopoly Game Gives Women More Money Than Men
Do our Social Justice Warriors deserve the best money can buy?

by Dalrock | September 20, 2019 | Link

Stephen Green* at Instapundit linked to a fear mongering piece at Business Insider this afternoon:

*GULP: Navy SEAL who oversaw the bin Laden raid says China’s massive military buildup is a ‘holy s—’ moment.*

From the linked article:

China’s technological strategy and innovation are serious threats to US national security — now, according to retired Adm. William McRaven, the US has reached a ‘holy s—’ moment and needs to invest more significantly in technology research and development to keep its edge.

Whenever military leaders declare that without further military spending our security is in danger I think of Instapundit host Glenn Reynolds’ great line about global warming:

*I’ll believe it’s a crisis when the people who tell me it’s a crisis start acting like it’s a crisis.*

Our military leaders are fully on board with using the military to promote a social agenda at the expense of war-fighting ability. In this regard, their actions betray a sense that they are so superior to any potential adversary that they can afford to indulge in frivolity, no matter what their words might claim.

I wasn’t familiar with Adm. William McRaven, so I thought I would see if he was the exception to the rule. He is not. From Buzzfeed back in 2014, U.S. Special Operations Chief Wants More Women, Minorities In The Ranks:

*Adm. William McRaven, head of U.S. Special Operations Command and architect of the Osama Bin Laden raid, is spearheading an effort to get more women and minorities into America’s elite combat units.*

So rest easy. There is no crisis here.

*Interestingly it was another post by Stephen Green which first caused me to think this back in 2016.*
Larry Kummer at Fabius Maximus has an excellent two post series on the current state of marriage:

1. **We teach boys that marriage doesn’t work**
2. **Women embrace higher values, destroying their families**

In the second post, Larry writes:

> How do women integrate these values into their lives? They use Girls’ Game. First, romance a man to get married. Most women want children, and middle- and upper-class women are careful to not do so until they have a ring on their fingers (men’s assistance and money makes the first few years much easier).

> Weddings have become the Party of a woman’s life, in which they are Queen for a Day. This is new. In the past weddings were modest, except for the rich. See the wedding in The Best Years of Our Lives (1946): the bride wears her best dress to a ceremony at home, serving punch and wedding cake at the reception. The wedding was the focus, not the bride.

> Then have some kids. The husband provides support during those first few difficult years raising the children. When the children go off to school, file for divorce. There are always reasons: he does not meet her needs, she has grown, etc. Then get community property, child support, and independence. It is a logical strategy for women raised to value their independence, pride, and strength above all else.

This is an excellent description of the way the game is played, but there is an even greater motivator to consider, which is status. I left the following as a comment, and thought I’d expand it a bit into a quick blog post:

> Marriage conveys *legitimacy* to the children, and *status* to the woman. The man’s money could be obtained via child support without a wedding, and likewise his assistance (living together would do the trick). For middle class women, there is only one respectable way to babymamahood, and that is by marrying first, and then divorcing whenever it is most convenient after she has the number of children she wants (from that particular baby daddy at least). This is incidentally a weakness in the Girl Game model you describe that could be exploited socially (no legal change required) should we ever start to value marriage and respect men who marry and become fathers. Of course legal changes would quickly follow if our view of fathers changed, but the social mechanism would be extremely powerful even by itself for middle class women.

> Women who divorce do take a status hit in their intrasexual competition, unless they stick the landing. However, this status hit could be much worse if conservatives ever start respecting marriage and men who marry and become fathers. Simply speaking, or even
thinking the truth would be devastating to divorcing baby mamas.
At Fabius Maximus commenter J Allen described the pathetic men he observes in the local grocery store:

The other group were men who were following their wives (this group had wedding rings) like attentive children. They were pushing the cart while the wives grabbed the food. One actually asked his wife for permission to get some peanuts while another asked his wife if it would be a good idea to take the stairs instead of the elevator. This group of men sounded slightly homosexual, but that very well could mean nothing.

Based on his description I strongly suspect these are conservative Christian husbands. This is after all what conservative Christian pastors and other leaders teach. Go to Family Life and you will be taught that God speaks to husbands through their wives’ vaginas. Pick up a book by Pastor Doug Wilson and you will be taught that God intends for wives to be House Despots, and that “[a husband] should learn to see himself as a guest. He wipes his feet at the door, he eats what is served to him, and he seeks to conform to the pattern established by her”. Similarly, the authors of Every Man’s Marriage explain:

What I’m trying to say is that the “master” defines your rights (and remember again that though we refer to your wife as your “master,” it’s our shorthand for the fact that becoming one with her essence is actually your God-given master). Why? Because you’re called to oneness and her essence sets the terms.

Pastor Tim Bayly makes it even simpler, and merely tells husbands to call their wives lord. All of these examples fit the conservative Christian pattern that I’ve described in previous posts, substituting Chivalry (Courtly Love) for Christianity:

Poets adopted the terminology of feudalism, declaring themselves the vassal of the lady and addressing her as midons (my lord), a sort of code name so that the poet did not have to reveal the lady’s name, but which was flattering by addressing her as his lord.

All of this is quite jarring if you aren’t immersed in modern conservative Christian culture, and therefore aren’t an expert in making excuses for it. For a picture of what this looks like, here is a video starring Pastor Todd Unzicker and his wife.

Pastor Unzicker appears to no longer be actively preaching at The Summit Church in Raleigh-Durham, but from what I can tell he and his wife are still associated with it. Summit Church is lead by Pastor J.D. Greear, the President of the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC).
Fearless Girl come to life.
by Dalrock | September 25, 2019 | Link

As for My people, children are their oppressors, And women rule over them.

-Isaiah 3:12, NKJV

Greta Thunberg has been all over the web the past few weeks, and after clicking on [this story](https://www.thereadarchive.com/430559774) it struck me how much she looks like the “Fearless Girl” statue that was on Wall Street a few years back. I don’t think this is mere coincidence. Both are icons of our age, representing our greatest aspirations. Both are all about the sneer, 100% pure moxie un tarnished by wisdom or experience.

But Thunberg has something the statue can’t have, the power to scold. Surely this must give chivalrists a thrill up their legs.

**Related:** Feminism in a picture.
Last post I noted the uncanny resemblance between Greta Thunberg and the “Fearless Girl” statue. Another example of the bratty girl as savior archetype that is so common today is Laura from the movie Logan (violence warning):

The symbolism of a child come to save us from our own sin (Wall Street greed, Climate Change, etc.) is painfully obvious. Social Justice Warriors have not only rejected Christ, they are desperately trying to make their own. This is industrial strength feminist territory marking.
The screech heard round the world.

by Dalrock | September 27, 2019 | Link

Stop the economy! I’ve got a baaad feeling!

— The Left

The best part of Greta Thunberg is that like David Hogg, she won’t go away once her moment of usefulness to the left has passed. Not only did she reach her pinnacle of fame at 16, but her claim to fame is:

1. Convincing children to skip school on Fridays.
2. Angrily complaining that she has been wronged.

Neither of these are impressive accomplishments for a 16 year old, let alone lifetime achievements. You could add allowing a group of men to sail her across the Atlantic, which makes her a sort of modern day Amelia Earhart. But none of this took real work or skill, and she was rewarded with worldwide fame and adulation. What are the chances that she will understand she was only a prop, and quietly fade away now that her moment has passed? In the past she wouldn’t have necessarily had much choice in the matter. But in the age of social media her ongoing antics will be harder for the media to ignore. She may have to pull outrageous stunts and screech even louder, but eventually she will momentarily break back out of obscurity.
Well behaved Karens seldom speak to the manager.
by Dalrock | October 3, 2019 | Link

For readers who aren’t familiar with the Karen meme, check out this post (language warning) for a description and examples of the genre. But in a nutshell there are two primary themes of the Karen meme:

1. An entitled/pushy woman who demands to speak to the manager.
2. A selfish mother who kicks her children’s father out of their lives.

Memes are intriguing in part because they allow the expression of thought-crime, very often through humor. They are a natural reaction to political correctness, to vigorously enforced ideological conformity. Before the SJWs can open their mouths to scold you, you’ve already laughed at the meme. So when the scold appears they only make the meme funnier.

In the case of the Karen meme the thought-crime should be obvious. Well behaved women seldom make history, dour faced women’s studies majors lecture us. Sorry, not sorry. But the Karen meme dodges this lecture (while mocking it) in part by seeming to be very specific. The Karen meme is merely about one kind of misbehaving woman, the annoying kind, the kind named Karen, who has a Can I speak to the manager haircut. Yet the kind of bad behavior “Karen” exemplifies is widespread thanks to the feminist/chivalrist revolution.

The Karen meme has been around for some time, yet so far feminists appear to have managed for the most part to avoid the temptation to scold it as sexist. They appear to understand that lashing out at the meme and defending “Karens” as not evil, but the embodiment of feminist virtues would only make the meme more powerful. This is impressive collective restraint in the face of widespread thought-crime, but I wonder how long such forbidden thoughts can be tolerated before feminists can’t contain themselves any longer.
She’s their successor to Christ, their man of the year.
by Dalrock | October 9, 2019 | Link

Social Justice Warriors have been outdoing themselves with Greta Thunberg. After I wrote A (new) child to save us, I saw in Fabius Maximus’ post Using girls for propoganda that a church in Sweden has declared her a successor to Christ.

Now GQ has made her one of their men of the year for 2019. The headline of the Daily Telegraph reads: GQ Men of the Year 2019: Andrew Scott, Rory Stewart and Greta Thunberg

As usual, it would be petty to point out their pettiness. So I will not point out the petty envy that is driving this absurdity.
Of course they aren’t changing girls to boys and boys to girls.
by Dalrock | October 11, 2019 | Link

In the video “Has Swedish feminism gone too far?” a school administrator states:

People think that we are going to change girls to boys, and boys to girls. But that is of course not what we are doing.

Immediately after she says this, the video cuts to a picture of a children’s book with a little boy playing soccer in a pink dress on the cover. This isn’t intended to be humorous or to call out the lie, but to reinforce her argument that the school is merely allowing children to be themselves. Starting at 2:02:

The book is titled Kalle med klänning, which Google translates to Skull with dress. From the Google translation of the book’s description:

It is the hottest day of the entire summer holiday. Kalle is sweating and would very much like to have a dress that blows. When he gets one of his cousins’ grown-up dress that is completely pink with silver dots, he gets so happy! And the dots are luminous!
Kalle loves the dress, it is much cooler and more comfortable than his shirt and pants.
And when he starts school after the summer, he refuses to take it off. his teacher complains and his friends laugh – until the day he scores goal after goal on the football matches.
Kalle is wearing a real goalie dress.
And now everyone else wants a...

The author explains why she wrote the book:

One of my sons has spent much of his life dressed in a dress because he loves dresses. When he was four or five years old, many were disturbed by how he was dressed and thought he could do it at home where no one saw him alone. It was so hard to tell the difference whether he was a guy or a girl. I got angry and felt that Kalle was needed to show that if one can be as one wants then one becomes good at everything and that dress is a garment just like anything else.

The lie is paper thin, and all pretext of feminists wanting to allow children to “be as they are” is casually discarded when it isn’t useful. In the opening of the same video feminists are arguing that boys shouldn’t be permitted to pee standing up. They interview a Swedish lawmaker who introduced a law on the topic after teaching his own son to never pee standing up. No one is interviewed to directly challenge this proposed law, and instead the video cuts to a 1970s feminist who believes that modern feminism has started going too far.
H/T Red Pill Christianity
Scott commented:

Whether it’s dressing in a fairy tutu to go trick or treating with your daughter or playing football in pink, if you don’t want to participle it is said that you can’t just have a little fun or that you are not secure in your masculinity.

Part of why this form of virtue signaling flies especially well with conservatives is that it scratches the chivalrous itch. In the chivalrous worldview a man being humiliated to appease the cruel whims of a woman is the ultimate in masculine virtue. That conservatives are doing the heavy lifting for social justice warriors and corrupting our youth in the process is a small price to pay.

And make no mistake, this isn’t innocent chivalrous fun. When I was looking for the Swedish book referenced in my last post I came across a 2017 article about young UK schoolboys wearing dresses in Gay Star News titled Here’s to the brave boys who decided to wear a dress to school for World Book Day.

While most boys may have popped for Harry Potter or Captain America, a few kids decided to give a well earned kick to gender norms and go as The Boy In The Dress.

The story, written by comedian David Walliams, is a beloved children’s tale about a young guy that loves cross-dressing and football and is not afraid to be himself.

See Also:

- Militantly clueless
- Chivalry just got even gayer.
Scott from *Treasure State Psychological Services* was kind enough to send me a quote that is making the rounds on Facebook:

> Jesus didn’t die on the cross for you to be a side chick.

This is just one expression of an ubiquitous perspective by modern Christian women, and the corruption of the message of the Gospel is breathtaking. The problem with this perversion is twofold. First, Christ didn’t sacrifice Himself on our behalf so that Christians (male or female) could have a pleasurable life of sin. Yet the implicit frame of the statement is that women deserve a rewarding experience on the carousel, and if they aren’t getting it men have let them down.

Second, the message of the Gospel isn’t that we are worthy, but *unworthy*. This is a profound misunderstanding of our relationship to Christ and the very nature of His sacrifice. We don’t *deserve* the sacrifice He made for us. We are utterly unworthy. If we *deserved* forgiveness for our sins Christ’s sacrifice would not have been needed. Nor would we have reason to forever thank and praise Him for what He has done for us, since He would have merely been treating us as we deserved.

This twisted frame of mind is *everywhere*. One commenter at Lori Alexander’s blog reacted to her observation that men prefer debt free virgins by asserting that the message of the Gospel is that she *is worthy*:

> Whether I have or have not gone to college, had sex before marriage, aquired debt, gotten a tattoo, etc. does not make me any less worthy of the sacrificial love of Jesus Christ, so what right does any earthly man (or woman) have to call me less than worthy to simply be his wife due to the same criteria?! Christ > humanity. Be careful that you preach Christ and not your own ideals.

For an even more astounding example of this perversion of the message of the Gospel, see Wendy Griffith’s *book* for Christian women looking for a husband. Griffith takes the parable of the Pearl of Great Price and twists it so that *she and her readers* are the Pearl of Great Price, not *salvation*!

### Pearl of Great Price

Ladies, the Lord wants you to know that you are a pearl of great price, a treasure worth pursuing and protecting. You are worth fighting for and, like the pearl in the parable at the head of this chapter, worth everything it might cost a guy to obtain you. You are worth someone sacrificing his time, his routine, his comfort, his money, his whatever in order to have you. You are worth it! You are a prize to be won.

Keep in mind that the error isn’t just by modern Christian women. Christian men aren’t
challenging this perversion because to them it is perfectly sensible. This message is anti-biblical, but it fits with the chivalrous paradigm so Christian men remain silent or even promote this message. See for example Pat Robertson at CBN promoting Wendy Griffith’s book:

I’m holding in my hand a very special book. It’s a book that every young girl should have. Teenagers should have it, college students should have it, and young single women should have it. It’s called You are a prize to be won. Written by none other than the lovely Wendy Griffith, and she has had all kinds of experiences!

See Also: Call me unchivalrous.
I stumbled upon a tragically funny post that contorts Song of Solomon into the form of the religion created to mock Christianity, courtly love (what we call chivalry). The post is titled The Song of Solomon: the Psalm of Married Love: Part V: the Husband as Lover and the Wife as Responder. In the post, the author describes King Solomon following the script of the courtly lover, with the minor modification (as is now customary) of bringing it into marriage. Solomon sees the woman and is overcome by her beauty. This compels him to woo her.

In verses 9-11 Solomon goes on to declare his romantic infatuation with his bride. Much has been written about the pitfalls of infatuation by evangelical writers, but one thing is clear here: its existence within the bonds of marriage is in line with God’s purpose.

Verses 12-15 are Solomon’s comparison of his bride with a garden and a flowing fountain. Verse 12 is noteworthy for its declaration of her exclusivity for him. (Although Solomon has already professed his utter infatuation with her, it is unfortunate that he could not have likewise professed his exclusivity for her.)

Excursus: The Christian man as a loving husband: God’s provision of an example

One of the problems of men becoming loving husbands is often their lack of an example to follow. One of the most influential images of a man upon a man’s understanding of his own identity over the past generation has been that of man as provider. Thus, many men have considered their duties fulfilled as husband and father with the provision of a steady paycheck. Another image prevalent is that of man as hero (either in war or in sports). Biblically, the image of manhood is man as a son of God by faith in Jesus Christ. This adds another dimension onto that ruling metaphor for the Biblical definition of a man’s identity, to man as loving husband. The married man who follows Jesus Christ is not fulfilling God’s purpose for his marriage or his manhood unless he begins to allow himself to be molded into the kind of loving husband that he can be by the grace of God. Here God gives an example of marital wooing of a woman as a part of that image.

This is just a taste. See the full post at the link above for many more examples.

See Also:

- *Real men* confess their love to the gas station attendant.
- Call me unchivalrous.
- Women as responders
An earnest defense of John MacArthur’s chivalry.

by Dalrock | October 22, 2019 | Link

French poets, in the eleventh century, discovered or invented, or were the first to express, that romantic species of passion which English poets were still writing about in the nineteenth. They effected a change which has left no corner of our ethics, our imagination, or our daily life untouched, and they erected impassable barriers between us and the classical past or the Oriental present. Compared with this revolution the Renaissance is a mere ripple on the surface of literature.

— C.S. Lewis, The Allegory of Love

Pastor John MacArthur outraged a large portion of the complementarian world recently by stating that Beth Moore should “go home” and stop preaching, since she has taken on an unbiblical role for a woman. You can hear the audio of the exchange at Pulpit and Pen.

There really should be no controversy among conservative Christians regarding MacArthur’s answer. Scripturally he is on quite solid ground. But (mostly unwittingly) chivalry has become the dominant religion for conservative Christians, despite the fact that what we call chivalry (courtly love) was created as a parody of Christianity. While scripturally sound, MacArthur’s comments are strikingly unchivalrous, and this is what has created so much consternation.

It was the chivalry of the founding complementarians that created the feminist role Moore has refused to be confined to. In Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism Drs. John Piper and Wayne Grudem rejected what they acknowledge was the traditional reading of Timothy 2:14, torturing the verse to permit women to preach to women but not men*. Their argument was that the Apostle Paul wasn’t saying women were more gullible than men, but he was merely saying men were created first (emphasis mine).

28. Do you think women are more gullible than men?

First Timothy 2:14 says, “Adam was not the one deceived; it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner.” Paul gives this as one of the reasons why he does not permit women “to teach or have authority over a man.” Historically this has usually been taken to mean that women are more gullible or deceitful than men and therefore less fit for the doctrinal oversight of the church. This may be true (see question 29). However, we are attracted to another understanding of Paul’s argument. We think that Satan’s main target was not Eve’s peculiar gullibility (if she had one), but rather Adam’s headship as the one ordained by God to be responsible for the life of the garden. Satan’s subtlety is that he knew the created order God had ordained for the good of the family, and he deliberately defied it by ignoring the man and taking up his dealings with the woman...
If this is the proper understanding, then what Paul meant in 1 Timothy 2:14 was this: “Adam was not deceived (that is, Adam was not approached by the deceiver and did not carry on direct dealings with the deceiver)..."

So the complementarian position from the beginning has been one of radical innovation to accommodate feminist demands. No longer are women prohibited from preaching because they are more easily deceived, instead they are to focus on preaching to other women because... Adam failed to protect Eve!

In a separate chapter dedicated to the subject, Dr. Moo reiterates that the Apostle Paul cannot have meant that women were more easily deceived, because this would mean that women shouldn’t be preaching to women:

But a statement about the nature of women per se would move the discussion away from this central issue, and it would have a serious and strange implication. **After all, does Paul care only that the women not teach men false doctrines? Does he not care that they not teach them to other women?**

The complementarian objection to the plain meaning of 1 Tim 2:11-15 should be obvious. The Apostle Paul’s lack of chivalry is quite jarring (ESV):

> 11 Let a woman learn quietly with all submissiveness. 12 I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet. 13 For Adam was formed first, then Eve; 14 and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. 15 Yet she will be saved through childbearing—if they continue in faith and love and holiness, with self-control.

After reading the passage it is no wonder that Piper and Grudem were “attracted to” a chivalrous reinterpretation of the passage. It is also no wonder that Macarthur’s defenders have felt the foremost need to stress that his adherence to Scripture is in no way unchivalrous. Pulpit and Pen defended MacArthur’s chivalry in *Let Me Explain That Laughter at Beth Moore Real Quick* by explaining that the crowd’s reaction wasn’t an example of dreaded toxic masculinity, because women were laughing too:

**First,** contrary to what some have suggested, this was not laughter done by a group of “men” who were laughing out of an abundance of poorly misplaced testosterone.
In fact, there was a significant number of women in the room. This was not a pastors’ conference like ShepCon. The women also laughed. This wasn’t a man versus woman thing, as much as Critical Theorists who bathe in victim ideology would like to characterize it. This was not a group of oppressors laughing at the oppressed. This was a group of Christians laughing at a statement in regard to a false teacher.

Pulpet and Pen doesn’t explain why they would adopt the feminist frame of “toxic masculinity”, so it is possible that they have recently been won over by a group of Women’s Studies majors even while they claim to refute them. However, this is highly unlikely, and the far more obvious explanation is that they recognized the implicit charge of unchivalrousness, and that is what they were defending against.

Blogger Toby Sumpter likewise doesn’t come out and use the word chivalry in his post Beth Moore, John MacArthur, and Clobbering Girls in Football (reposted here as well). However, the hint is in the title, as well as the headline image. Sumpter makes a lengthy digression in the middle of the post to explain the proper chivalrous response to women pushing their way into men’s sports. Sometimes, he explains, the chivalrous solution is simply to forfeit the match to the woman.

A Preliminary, But Related Rabbit Trail

Now in order to address this business, I’d like to draw upon a matter of considerable concern and discussion in my community, a matter that faces most communities in these dark days of ours, and that is the matter of girls showing up to play contact sports with our sons. From wrestling to lacrosse to football to hockey, it’s a real issue since we are committed to teaching our sons to honor all women as sisters and mothers, and the culture we live in is committed to the opposite. In some instances, the honorable choice is clear and obvious: our sons will not wrestle a girl. It’s immodest, dishonorable, and shameful. Period. Full stop. So our boys who wrestle forfeit any match with a girl.

Note that Sumpter doesn’t call this chivalry, because to him it is merely Christianity.

At other times, Sumpter explains, the chivalrous answer is for boys and men to make it safe for women and girls to push their way into men’s sports.

But when it comes to lacrosse and football there are a number of complicating factors, and there are real wisdom calls to be made. The first principle remains in place: our boys are instructed not to tackle or body check girls. Of course in these confused days, it is not always possible to know if there is a girl on the field. But to the best of our ability, we will avoid any and all roughness with girls.

Depending on the circumstances, what position a girl is playing against our boys, this is sometimes fairly easy to accomplish (like if the girl is a goalie or kicker), and sometimes it is nearly impossible (like when she’s playing running back). Our general commitment is to play hard and play as much as we can without compromising our Lord’s requirement to honor all women.
...On occasion, our boys are having to learn how to push a girl out of bounds as gently as possible.

...these problems are certainly not going away any time soon, and we (and our sons) need to learn how to fight, sometimes how to fight with one arm tied behind our back, and how to fight as honorable Christian men.

Sumpter explains that MacArthur was merely being chivalrous in telling Moore to go home**:

John MacArthur’s two word response was one of the best I could imagine. He blessed her even as he gave her a brotherly shove. Get off the field, Mrs. Moore. You are a lady. Your calling is higher. You have a different glory. You deserve better.

But the point to the lengthy diversion into the chivalrous way to handle women invading men’s sports primarily comes in Sumpter’s conclusion. Sumpter brilliantly turns the tables on MacArthur’s detractors and explains that it is John MacArthur that is being chivalrous (again without using the term), and Beth Moore’s supporters who are being unchivalrous:

**Conclusion**

Ok, last thing. Maybe this is all a bit confusing or convoluted, and you’re not sure what to think or who to believe. Let me suggest this little litmus test: of the parties involved in this little spat, which would give you the most biblical answer regarding boys and girls in contact sports or women in the military? Would Mrs. Moore and her supporters tell you in no uncertain terms that girls should not be playing contact sports and boys should not be clobbering girls on a football field, and certainly not manhandling them on a wrestling mat? Would you get a clear, straightforward answer or would you get caveats and exceptions and relativistic blather? Should women be mustered for combat service or not? Who are you most likely to get a clear, biblical answer from? And if Mrs. Moore and her supporters insist that girls can *too* get clobbered on a football field, and they can *too* get blown to bits on a battlefield, then what is everyone up in arms about? Why are the very same people objecting to what Pastor MacArthur said? By their standards, Pastor MacArthur might as well be Mr. Rogers.

What makes the adoption of chivalry, a parody of Christianity, so insidious is that it’s adherents don’t even know they have replaced Christianity with something else.

H/T Oscar.

*Piper has since wiggled this loophole even wider, explaining that it is appropriate for Moore to preach to men so long as the men don’t “become dependent on her as [their] shepherd—[their] pastor”

**Note how similar this argument is to the chivalrous argument against women in the military here.
I stumbled across an astounding blog post on John Macarthur’s comments that is a strange blend of Social Justice Warrior and chivalry. The post is by Mark Beuving, and is titled John MacArthur’s Disgusting Comment: Go Home, Beth Moore. Beuving is literally shaking:

But—oh my gosh—I just heard an audio recording in which John MacArthur demeans and dismisses Beth Moore. I’m shaking. If I conjure up every ounce of optimism and benefit-of-the-doubt-ness I possess, I still can’t find a way to describe it as anything other than disdainful and mean-spirited. If I try to give an honest assessment of how it sounds to me, I think I have to say his words sound hateful and anti-Christ.

This is really striking because it was written by a man. He claims he is making a biblical case against MacArthur’s comments, but all that comes out is a lengthy description of how MacArthur’s words make him feel. Not only is he shaking, he also has the dry heaves:

This is absolutely disgusting. I’m seriously doing the theological equivalent of dry heaving right now. Once more I find myself pleading: Stop treating Beth Moore like garbage!

This is ironically the best indictment of MacArthur Beuving offers, albeit unintentionally. This kind of Leave Britney Alone! emoting is evidently what he learned in MacArthur’s seminary (emphasis mine):

This is a weird post for me to write. Maybe I should first tell you that I graduated from John MacArthur’s seminary...

...[John MacArthur] states with absolute confidence and condescension that no one can argue otherwise. And yet I’ll stand here as a graduate of his seminary, as someone who still employs the hermeneutical tools and methods I learned at his seminary, and make a strong argument to the contrary.

Taking this at face value, Beuving must have learned that Christians make strong arguments by having meltdowns, and focusing on their own feelings. Not only do MacArthur’s words make Beuving shake and have the dry heaves, they make him gag and die!

And that’s where I died. Those words are so condescending. They seem calculated to wound. To dishonor. To destroy. When I close my eyes and try to picture Jesus saying words like these, I gag.

Yet by the same standard, the Apostle Paul would clearly be anti Christ. Surely 1 Cor 14:34-35 (ESV) must make Beuving dry heave:

34 the women should keep silent in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be in submission, as the Law also says. 35 If there is anything they...
desire to learn, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church.

Likewise Titus 2:3-5 (ESV) must leave Beuving shaking!

3 Older women likewise are to be reverent in behavior, not slanderers or slaves to much wine. They are to teach what is good, 4 and so train the young women to love their husbands and children, 5 to be self-controlled, pure, working at home, kind, and submissive to their own husbands, that the word of God may not be reviled.

And 1 Tim 2:11-15 (ESV) can only make Beuving gag and die!

11 Let a woman learn quietly with all submissiveness. 12 I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet. 13 For Adam was formed first, then Eve; 14 and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. 15 Yet she will be saved through childbearing—if they continue in faith and love and holiness, with self-control.

Here is the Apostle Paul telling Beth Moore to be silent and go home! This violates both chivalry and feminism, and I strongly suspect it will leave our brother Beuving with a tummy ache.
Chivalry is the word that expresses that ideal.

by Dalrock | October 25, 2019 | Link

One of the frequent criticisms I’ve received with my writing on chivalry is that I’m using the term incorrectly. The argument is that chivalry is merely a code of martial honor, and that the ideals of reverence of women, idolization of romantic love, etc. are something entirely separate (courtly love). While it is true that courtly love has been adopted as the academic term describing these specific aspects of what we call chivalry, it is a fundamental part of how we use the word chivalry today, and how we have used it for hundreds of years. As I’ve shared previously, the oldest and most prestigious order of chivalry in the world was founded in 1348 to commemorate the time when the King of England picked up a noblewoman’s dropped undergarment and gallantly declared:

| “Honi soit qui mal y pense” (“Shame on him who thinks evil of it.”)

That moment of utmost chivalry was from the 1300s, and British passports to this day have a cover image which commemorates the time a lady dropped her garter and the King cautioned the court not to laugh.

This understanding of chivalry continued in the Anglosphere through the 20th century to our present day. Vox Day has a new post up with a fascinating quote from the Preface to “Heroes and Heroines of Chivalry” from Volume 4 of The Junior Classics (1918 edition). As Vox explains, the preface was removed from the anthology beginning in the 1958 edition:

| The campaign for the 2020 edition of the Junior Classics continues to go from strength to strength. To explain why it is important, consider the following preface from Volume 4 of the 1918 edition, “Heroes and Heroines of Chivalry”, which was excised from the 1958 edition for reasons that will be obvious to anyone who is conversant with the concept of social justice convergence and the long-running cultural war against Christianity and the West. And it probably will not surprise you to know that all three of the stories referenced in this preface were also removed from the 1958 edition.

Note that Vox considers Christianity and chivalry to be intertwined. Nearly all Christians today would struggle greatly to separate the two in a meaningful way, especially when it comes to the proper roles of men & women and the morality of romantic love. This is true despite the fact that the ideas now accepted as “Christian” were created as a parody of Christianity. The Bible teaches Christians that wives should submit to their husbands in all things, with fear and reverence, and call their husband lord. Chivalry teaches Christians that a man should submit to his lady in all things, with fear and reverence. Chivalry, the mock religion that decadent medieval aristocrats contrived as a devious joke, is now mistaken by modern Christians for the real deal. This makes modern Christians helpless when trying to fight against feminism, because the temptation is to offer chivalry as the “way back” to Christianity.

Here is an excerpt from the preface (emphasis mine):
By the time a boy was fourteen he was ready to become an esquire. He was then taught to get on and off a horse with his heavy armor on, to wield the battle axe, and practise tilting with a spear. His service to the ladies had now reached the point where he picked out a lady to serve loyally. His endeavor was to please her in all things, in order that he might be known as her knight, and wear her glove or scarf as a badge or favor when he entered the lists of a joust or tournament.

To become a knight was almost as solemn an affair as it was to become a priest. Before the day of the ceremony he fasted, spent the night in prayer, confessed his sins, and received the Holy Sacrament. When morning came he went, clothed in white, to the church or hall, with a knight’s sword suspended from his neck. This the priest blessed and returned to him. Upon receiving back the sword he went and knelt before the presiding knight and took the oath of knighthood. The friends who accompanied him now came forward and handed him the spurs, the coat of mail, the armlet and gauntlet, and having put these on he girded on his sword. The presiding knight now bade him kneel, and, touching him three times on the shoulder with the flat of his sword, he pronounced the words that received him into the company of worthy knights: “In the name of God, of St. Michael, and St. George, I make thee a knight; be valiant, courteous, and loyal!” After this he received his helmet, his shield, and his spear, and the ceremony was completed.

The knight’s real work, and greatest joy, was fighting for some one who needed his help. Tournaments and jousts gave them chances to show off their skill in public. We must remember that there were no big open-air theatres in those days, such as the Greeks had, no public races or trials of strength such as the Greeks held in the stadiums, nor were there chariot races or fighting gladiators such as the Romans had at an earlier day. Tournaments or jousts were the big public entertainments, and you will find a famous description of one by Sir Walter Scott in Ivanhoe, in the volume “Stories that Never Grow Old,” the tournament of Ashby-de-la-Zouche. In it you will find a clear description of how the field of contest was laid out, of the magnificent pavilions decorated with flags, and the galleries spread with carpets and tapestries for the ladies.

The same qualities that made a manful fighter then, make one now: to speak the truth, to perform a promise to the utmost, to reverence all women, to be constant in love, to despise luxury, to be simple and modest and gentle in heart, to help the weak and take no unfair advantage of an inferior. This was the ideal of the age, and chivalry is the word that expresses that ideal.
Back in a few weeks.
by Dalrock | October 26, 2019 | Link

I'll be turning on moderation later in the day, and probably won't be back until around Nov 13th.

Edit 10-26 6:30 PM: Moderation is now on.
Stephen Green has a post up at Instapundit on the US Submarine force’s failure to meet the needs of women. Not all women who want to serve on submarines are given slots, and thus the Submarine Community Can’t Meet Demand From Female Sailors. Green half jokingly suggests that this means the US needs to build more attack submarines. Commenter Chris Lutz responded with the old conservative position, that women shouldn’t be on ships:

Clearly, in order to address this iniquity, we need to build more attack subs.

No, we need to put women back into truly rear echelon support positions. Women on ships has been a disaster.

Commenter Southern Man wanted to agree that women shouldn’t be serving on ships, but pointed out that kickass conservative gals made him feel good:

Part of me agrees with this. But my daughter is in the US Navy and I’m pretty d*mn proud of her. Her second deployment was on the Harry S. Truman, CVN 75. I asked her “did you ever see the Bridge?” She rolled her eyes as only a daughter can do and said “Dad, my station was <redacted>, I was on the bridge all the time!”

Commenter evilsandmich reconciled the conflicting positions by pretending that the change we are witnessing isn’t due to feminists shoving their way in, but by men forcing women into harm’s way:

She’s great, the nation that would intentionally put its women in harms way, eh, not so much...

This is all of course very common, but this is the point. This is how conservatives respond to feminism across our society, and is why conservatives are such reliable allies of feminism despite the widespread belief that the opposite is true.
Chick-fil-A and conservative militant cluelessness.

by Dalrock | November 19, 2019 | Link

Over at Instapundit the linked headline in Stephen Green’s new post reads: Chick-fil-A Caved to the Wokescold's…OR DID THEY?

Instapundit commenter William T Quick nailed the conservative impulse involved here:

Interesting that whenever a conservative stalwart wobbles off course, there are always “conservatives” immediately coming forward to explain why it’s not really a wobble.

Quick accurately describes the situation. The headline is from a Stephen Kruiser piece, where Kruiser opens by suggesting that Chic-fil-a has done the nation a great service by cucking to anti Christian SJWs!

America caught a break on Monday, and was able to take the day off from a singular obsession with Impeachment Kabuki Theater. Not a complete break, but enough of one, thanks to Chick-fil-A making a shift in its corporate charitable donation strategy.

Next comes the bizarre meat of Kruiser’s argument, a vague suggestion anything less than full compliance to anti Christian SJW activists is really a bold act of defiance!

Anyone who has been paying any attention knows that just because the Right is unhappy doesn’t mean that the Left is. That’s primarily because they are incapable of not complaining. In the case of LGBTQ issues, however, unless you’ve given up your children for gender reassignment before they’ve reached the age of six, you aren’t doing enough to make them happy.

Kruiser then lectures his readers not to assume that Chic-fil-a did something as serious as capitulating to the SJW mob, before closing by explaining that whatever Chic-fil-a did, it isn’t a big deal:

There are any number of reasons that Chick-fil-A could have for cutting ties with the Salvation Army. We will only know if this was truly a capitulation to the rabid wokesters when we see who the company gives money to going forward...

...While many see this as an important battle in the culture war, I see it as a chicken place I eat at maybe once a year.

The closest Chick-fil-A to me is next to an In-N-Out anyway, and that wins out over chicken every time.

And they’ve still got Bible verses on their drink cups.
This is a textbook case of what I’ve termed conservative militant cluelessness. It is a bizarre conservative impulse to not only deny reality, but to actively work in the service of SJWs to ensure that others do as well. The role of conservatives has become muffling any alarm that would otherwise be raised as SJWs annihilate our culture. This sickness goes far beyond mere inaction in the face of evil, as the impulse is an active one, to prevent any possible action (reaction) by others.
One of Vox Day’s readers argued:

As Dalrock has explained, all that cultural bomb-throwers have to do is to borrow from the Satanic inversion that is chivalry, that puts women in the place of Jesus.

Vox objected, responding:

That’s not what chivalry is. Dalrock is confusing the literary tradition with the actual military ethos. This is basic Wikipedia-level knowledge.

[Vox quotes Léon Gautier’s Ten Commandments of Chivalry]

There is nothing inversive about it. Ironically, Dalrock’s description of chivalry is the inversion of the concept.

The problem with Vox’s dismissal is that it isn’t me that is confusing literary tradition with history, it is the culture at large, and (as I will show in this post), Vox himself. It was this very confusion that Infogalactic tells us Gautier sought to stamp out when he wrote his ten commandments in 1883:

Léon Gautier, in his La Chevalerie, published for the first time in 1883, bemoaned the “invasion of Breton romans” which replaced the pure military ethos of the crusades with Arthurian fiction and courtly adventures. Gautier tries to give a “popular summary” of what he proposes was the “ancient code of chivalry” of the 11th and 12th centuries derived from the military ethos of the crusades which would evolve into the late medieval notion of chivalry. Gautier’s Ten Commandments of chivalry are...

The problem, as Infogalactic points out (and as I pointed out here), is the very strong tendency for modern readers to mistake fictional Arthurian tales for historical accounts. Yet we can’t blame this entirely on modern readers. This confusion was built in to the Arthurian literature itself. As CS Lewis explained in Allegory of Love (regarding Chrétien de Troyes and his Lancelot, the Knight of the Cart from circa 1177):

Chrétien de Troyes is its greatest representative. His Lancelot is the flower of the courtly tradition in France, as it was in its early maturity...

He was among the first to welcome the Arthurian stories; and to him, as much as to any single writer, we owe the colouring with which the ‘matter of Britain’ has come down to us. He was among the first (in northern France) to choose love as the central theme of a serious poem...

...combining this element with the Arthurian legend, he stamped upon men’s minds
indelibly the conception of Arthur’s court as the home par excellence of true and noble love. What was theory for his own age had been practice for the knights of Britain. For it is interesting to notice that he places his ideal in the past. For him already ‘the age of chivalry is dead’.40 It always was: let no one think the worse of it on that account.

This confusion of Arthurian tales of what was much later termed courtly love with actual history is endemic, and has been from all but the very beginning. Wikipedia’s article on the term chivalry likewise explains:

Fans of chivalry have assumed since the late medieval period that there was a time in the past when chivalry was a living institution, when men acted chivalrically, when chivalry was alive and not dead, the imitation of which period would much improve the present. This is the mad mission of Don Quixote, protagonist of the most chivalric novel of all time and inspirer of the chivalry of Sir Walter Scott and of the U.S. South:[19]:205–223 to restore the age of chivalry, and thereby improve his country.[19]:148 It is a version of the myth of the Golden Age.

With the birth of modern historical and literary research, scholars have found that however far back in time “The Age of Chivalry” is searched for, it is always further in the past, even back to the Roman Empire...

Sismondi alludes to the fictitious Arthurian romances about the imaginary Court of King Arthur, which were usually taken as factual presentations of a historical age of chivalry. He continues:

The more closely we look into history, the more clearly shall we perceive that the system of chivalry is an invention almost entirely poetical. It is impossible to distinguish the countries in which it is said to have prevailed. It is always represented as distant from us both in time and place, and whilst the contemporary historians give us a clear, detailed, and complete account of the vices of the court and the great, of the ferocity or corruption of the nobles, and of the servility of the people, we are astonished to find the poets, after a long lapse of time, adorning the very same ages with the most splendid fictions of grace, virtue, and loyalty...

And as I noted above, Vox himself encourages the false belief that Arthurian tales are descriptions of what chivalry was like in the middle ages. In his post 800 percent and rising, Vox was very proud to announce that he was adding back teaching on romantic chivalry to Castalia House’ 2020 edition of Junior Classics, as this would teach modern children about Christian history and values:

To explain why it is important, consider the following preface from Volume 4 of the 1918 edition, “Heroes and Heroines of Chivalry”, which was excised from the 1958 edition for reasons that will be obvious to anyone who is conversant with the concept of social justice convergence and the long-running cultural war against
Christianity and the West. And it probably will not surprise you to know that all three of the stories referenced in this preface were also removed from the 1958 edition.

The preface and all four stories will, of course, appear in the 2020 edition.

The preface (and tales) Vox is so proud to have returned to the Junior Classics does exactly what Vox is accusing me of doing. It confuses pure fiction with historical fact. Even worse, it encourages young children to adopt this very confusion:

The word chivalry is taken from the French cheval, a horse. A knight was a young man, the son of a good family, who was allowed to wear arms. In the story “How the Child of the Sea was made Knight,” we are told how a boy of twelve became a page to the queen, and in the opening pages of the story “The Adventures of Sir Gareth,” we get a glimpse of a young man growing up at the court of King Arthur. It was not an easy life, that of a boy who wished to become a knight, but it made a man of him...

The preface goes on to explain that an essential part of making a man of a boy was to teach him to follow the ethic of courtly love:

His service to the ladies had now reached the point where he picked out a lady to serve loyally. His endeavor was to please her in all things, in order that he might be known as her knight, and wear her glove or scarf as a badge or favor when he entered the lists of a joust or tournament.

Finally the preface explains that the Arthurian version of chivalry, which combines both martial virtues and servility to women, is historical and is what the word chivalry means:

The same qualities that made a manful fighter then, make one now: to speak the truth, to perform a promise to the utmost, to reverence all women, to be constant in love, to despise luxury, to be simple and modest and gentle in heart, to help the weak and take no unfair advantage of an inferior. This was the ideal of the age, and chivalry is the word that expresses that ideal.

What is going on here is a classic game of Motte and Bailey. When Vox wants to sell courtly love as Christian, he points to Arthurian tales that teach chivalry, what it used to be like to become a man. This is nonsense, not only because Arthurian tales aren’t history (not even close), but also because the values of Arthurian tales aren’t remotely Christian. They are, in fact, a parody of Christianity, and were from the beginning. Courtly love was a devious joke decadent medieval nobles used to mock Christianity. As the 1918 preface to Junior Classics demonstrates, long ago Christians forgot that this was a mockery of Christianity and accepted it as not only Christian but history. The courtly love version of chivalry is the bailey that Vox is selling not just to his readers, but to their unsuspecting children. Yet when my assertion of the evil of courtly love is mentioned by one of his readers, Vox retreats to the motte, claiming that everyone knows the Arthurian/fictional/courtly love version of chivalry isn’t really chivalry at all! In the process, Vox accuses me of falling for the same misdirection that he is so proud to include his his revival of Junior Classics.
Vox needs to choose either the motte or the bailey when it comes to chivalry. Either we need to teach modern children Arthurian tales of courtly love in order to restore Christian culture and values, or we need to annihilate this abomination and replace it with the *Ten Commandments of Chivalry* Léon Gautier wrote in 1883 in a failed attempt to reframe chivalry to Christian values (away from the dominant fictional/Arthurian view of the term). If he wishes to do the latter, he will quite literally need to stop the presses.

H/T Sir Hamster
You say Jesus, they think Lancelot.
by Dalrock | November 23, 2019 | Link

Commenter Robert gives an example of how modern Christians can’t conceive of Christianity separate from what we call chivalry (courtly love):

I’m not clued up on chivalry, but Jesus loving us enough to die for us seems like chivalry to the max- and Paul tells husbands to love like that in Ephesians 5!

This is a very difficult snare to escape from. Conflating Christianity with the parody of Christianity is so natural, so effortless, and the idea of Christianity separate from courtly love is so horrifyingly alien. As I wrote in the comment thread before Robert chimed in that Christianity is chivalry (courtly love) to the max:

Christianity teaches that marriage is what makes sex moral (marriage is sanctifying), and that marriage is the moral place for sex and romantic love. Courtly love twisted this and taught that romantic love is what sanctifies sex, and that adultery is the only right place for romantic love. Christianity teaches that a wife should submit to her husband with fear and reverence. Courtly love taught that a man should submit to another man’s wife with fear and reverence. This is, in a word, evil, and the wreckage of this evil thinking is all around us.

It is worth noting that over the centuries the idea has been morphed, until the idea of courtly love was moved (to some extent) from adultery into marriage. If anything this only completed the corruption of Christian marriage. It also is the logical basis for no fault divorce, as a noted Puritan poet realized back in the 1600s. With this newly morphed version of the disease, whereas Christianity taught that it is immoral for a husband or wife to deny the other sex, modern Christians now believe that it is immoral for a wife to have sex with her husband if she isn’t in the thrall of sexual desire (which is difficult to distinguish from romantic love).
Rollo and Fabius Maximus both have new posts up with disturbing images. Check out Rollo’s post *Unconscious Contempt*, and Fabius Maximus’ post *Women are driving America into the future*. As you click over and view these disturbing images, keep in mind the chivalrous role the men are playing. To be abused and humiliated by a woman is a great honor to the chivalrous man. As Roger Boase explained (summarizing Gaston Paris, the man who coined the term *courtly love*, emphasis mine):

...the lover continually fears lest he should, by some misfortune, displease his mistress or cease to be worthy of her; the lover’s position is one of inferiority; even the hardened warrior trembles in his lady’s presence; she, on her part, makes her suitor acutely aware of his insecurity by deliberately acting in a capricious and haughty manner; love is a source of courage and refinement; the lady’s apparent cruelty serves to test her lover’s valour
Lancelot’s bowtie.
by Dalrock | November 27, 2019 | Link

A very common lament about conservatives, or if you prefer “cuckservatives”, is their uncanny knack for finding a way to “lose with honor” no matter how strong their position might be. Winning really doesn’t seem to be the objective. This makes perverse sense when you consider it from the chivalrous perspective. The best way to prove your chivalry is not to win, but to lose. For losing is the ultimate test of your chivalry. If you can lose with magnanimity, then you truly are chivalrous! What could possibly be more romantic?

Related: The Ministry of Ungentlemanly Warfare.
Humorless scolds.
by Dalrock | December 2, 2019 | Link

Feminism is the assertion that men are evil and naturally want to harm women, followed by pleas to men to solve all of women’s problems.

— Dalrock’s Law of Feminism

This summer Melinda Gates launched a campaign called Equality Can’t Wait. The goal was to use humor to solve the problem of inequality in STEM. Quartz at Work explains in Melinda Gates wants comedians to make fun of gender inequality:

...Gates’ campaign has a chance of helping to speed up change, not least because it puts another nail in the coffin of a worn-out stereotype: That women aren’t funny, and that bringing up inequality somehow shows them up as humorless. Female comedians have stormed the US market in the past few years, including Amy Poehler, Sarah Silverman, Julia-Louis Dreyfus, Nicole Byer, Tina Fey, and Maya Rudolph (some of whom appear in the video.)

The series is even more dismal than I would have imagined. Here is but one example of the campaign, five minutes of male and female feminist scolding dressed up as a comedy routine:

Here is a shorter piece, the ad that seems to always come up when I click on a youtube video regarding Linux or the latest gen CPUs from AMD and Intel:

Before you laugh at how pathetic this attempt is (and it is truly pathetic), remember that feminists like Gates don’t need to be clever. Feminists are in such a strong position that no matter how bad their campaign, only the radical fringe will dare to criticize it. Moreover, nagging doesn’t have to be funny, or inspiring, it just has to be persistent.
Pity the wife who doesn’t yearn to please her husband.

by Dalrock | December 3, 2019 | Link

A number of conservative bloggers are terribly disturbed by an ad that shows a wife who wants to please her husband. Stephen Kruiser wrote in his post titled Cops Should Do a Wellness Check on Woman in Peloton Christmas Ad:

A quick respite from the political news slog has been delivered unto us from the most unlikely of places. Peloton — the indoor workout bike that runs around fourteen and a half million dollars — has released a Christmas with a creep factor so high that it has people reaching across the aisle in agreement about its awfulness.

...

This fictional frightened woman’s yearlong journey to lose the 14 ounces of water weight that her husband the good Doctor Mengele insists she musts is the Christmas miracle that a news-weary world needs.

Kruiser’s reaction comes after reading Allapundit’s post on the ad:

The weird part is the ... eagerness with which she shows her gratitude. It’s lovely to be grateful for an expensive gift, but she’s *really* grateful and *really, really* wants her husband to know it. It’s not just that she feels compelled to record herself using the bike repeatedly over a span of many months. She looks curiously anxious doing it, even when smiling into the camera. At the end of the clip, when she finally shows him the footage, her eyes are trained on his reaction, seemingly desperate for his approval.

Is, um... How do I put this?

Is everything okay between these two?

I feel like there’s a lost scene here right after he gives her the bike where he grabs her by the throat and growls, “And you’d better use it.” Real “Sleeping With the Enemy” vibe in her excessive need to please.

Stephen Green linked to Kruiser’s post with the note:

I just watched the ad, and the creep factor is off the charts.

What I find disturbing is that none of these men can imagine a wife wanting to please her husband, and feeling grateful for a much loved (not to mention expensive) gift. I don’t know a kind way to put this, but I don’t think they understand what they are giving away here. It is fully natural for a woman to want to look good for her man, and to yearn to please him. When it happens it is a truly beautiful thing for both the man and the woman. This isn’t to say that there aren’t some hard bitten ugly feminists who would never deign to please any man, but
that such a woman is far more of a twisted outlier than these men can fathom. This also isn’t to say that even in excellent marriages the wife will always be intent on pleasing her husband. But what these men see as twisted is a truly wonderful thing when it occurs, for both the husband and the wife.

Related:

- Why Game is a threat to our values.
- Is fear of women the beginning of wisdom?
Fake news: Women over 65 are in the SMP power position.
by Dalrock | December 10, 2019 | Link

The Globe and Mail has a feminist boiler plate article up implying that women over 65 are in the SMP power position: The new reality of dating over 65: Men want to live together; women don’t.

For more than a decade, D’Alfonso, a Montreal writer, has been dating a Toronto widow. The two see each other every couple of months. D’Alfonso wanted more: He proposed five times, only to be rebuffed with every try. The older woman refused to live with him, D’Alfonso said, because she wanted to travel and be free. “I have to ask, and I always ask, so what do you want from me?” he said.

The pair took a two-year hiatus, during which D’Alfonso tried dating other senior-age women only to find that they, too, were reluctant to share a home – this even as D’Alfonso said he cooks and keeps a tidy house.

“I really believe that women no longer need men, whatsoever,” D’Alfonso said. “I’m totally irrelevant.”

Subtly nested in this quote is evidence of the absurdity of the premise. While D’Alfonso is no doubt a great guy, he is quite obviously very low in the sexual marketplace (SMP); from the bit offered by the Globe and Mail, he clearly couldn’t generate a tingle with an electric chair. Yet in the over 65 SMP, multiple women have been interested in claiming him as their boyfriend, so long as they don’t have to actually be around him. These women aren’t rejecting him outright, they just want to avoid being around him (emphasis mine):

For more than a decade, D’Alfonso, a Montreal writer, has been dating a Toronto widow. The two see each other every couple of months.

Note that not only has she stayed with a man for ten years she only sees every couple of months, he broke it off with her for two years to date other women, and she took him back. This isn’t proof that the women dating him have all the options, it is proof that they desperately want the status that comes with being part of a couple, even if that status is mostly or entirely fictional. If they were really done with men, or at least with relationships, they wouldn’t be rooting around in the bottom of the SMP barrel.

The article offers up another hilarious anecdote, of 77 year old Rhoda Nadell who (in her mind) is surrounded by men who desperately want to marry her:

When a guy chats up 77-year-old Montrealer Rhoda Nadell at her tennis club, her brain quickly fast forwards: Dinner dates will turn into a relationship, which will inevitably find Nadell cooking, cleaning and eventually caregiving for the elderly gentleman.
For an idea of the kind of RPMs Nadell’s rationalization hamster is sustaining, see the picture of her at the top of the article.
Merry Christmas!
by Dalrock | December 25, 2019 | Link
Farewell (for now at least), and thank you.
by Dalrock | January 22, 2020 | Link

As you have no doubt noticed, it has been several weeks since I have last posted, and over a month if you don’t count the Merry Christmas post. I’ve decided that it is time to shut down the blog. I don’t have a detailed explanation to share as to why I’ve decided this, aside from the fact that I think it is time. I do want to clarify that:

1. I haven’t suddenly changed my thinking and decided to embrace chivalry, feminism, etc.
2. All is well in the Dalrock household, and no one is pressuring me to stop.

I’ve been blogging for just under ten years, and want to thank my readers for their prayers, words of encouragement, and what they have taught me. I can’t say for certain what the future holds, but at present I don’t have any plans to return.
Message heard.
by Dalrock | January 24, 2020 | Link

I’ve been deeply moved and humbled by the overwhelming response to my post announcing that I planned on shutting down the blog. I’ve reconsidered and decided* to leave the blog up but shut down commenting in a few days.

Thank you again for your words of encouragement and your prayers. Words cannot adequately express my gratitude. Likewise, you have been and will continue to be in my prayers.

*I don’t know what the future holds so at some point I may have to revisit this question, but for now I plan on leaving the content up.