

MANIFESTO OF JUNE 22nd

By Seth Hatfield

Preamble

This work delivers an explanation of the very peculiar and ghastly state of things that the western world has found itself in, especially regarding the situation of terrible loneliness, isolation, and social degradation that is now a stark reality for many men of varying ages across our societies.

It is a reality that was steadily growing, and looming within the shadows on the peripheries of common discourse for a long time, and only relatively recently has it grown prominent enough to come to be openly acknowledged by the powers that be; and indeed also by the general population to some extent, as something that actually exists at all. Although the existence of this mysterious dread is now at least verbally acknowledged on a considerable scale, it is still the case that its true nature, and the way in which it can be done away with, remain almost entirely hidden from people.

I have seen it fit to produce and publish a concise and scientifically supported account of just what this gloomy and pervasive male loneliness actually is, how it came to be, and what should be done about it henceforth.¹

In this text, I primarily deal with the state of things regarding young people (approximately under the age of thirty) that live in the highly developed western nations of today, but I maintain that the information here is still very relevant to many older people, and to other areas of the world, and I believe that some of the ideas expressed in this writing may possibly be even more well-received in various non-western nations than in the western nations that this work describes. I therefore directly condone and encourage the publication of this text in the Russian, Arabic, Farsi, Hindi, Spanish, Portuguese, and Mandarin Chinese languages.

Note however that I do not intend to cause unrest within non-western nations by the distribution of this text therein, but rather I hope that this work will help to elucidate the true nature of the west to the inhabitants of those places, so that they may be disillusioned of any residual notions of western advancement or 'superiority' that they might still hold.

¹ "In other words it is part of my happiness to lend a helping hand, that many others may understand even as I do, so that their understanding and desire may entirely agree with my own." (Benedict de Spinoza, *Opera Posthuma*, Amsterdam, 1677, p. 360.)

I: Foundations

In the reality in which we live, manifold things exist. None of these things exist in complete isolation from other things,² but are engaged in a constant process of interaction, which manifests in varying ways, and has varying effects on the manifold things that exist. The reality in which we live is henceforth referred to as nature.

Some of the things that exist within nature are living, and some are not. The broad category of living things that exist in nature are henceforth referred to as organisms. Organisms can be coherently classified into various categories, based on characteristics that they hold in common. The study of this classification is the science of taxonomy.

In taxonomy, organisms that share the common characteristic of having a vertebral column are assigned to the subphylum Vertebrata.³ Because very many organisms have vertebral columns, the subphylum Vertebrata accordingly has very many members, including frogs, fish, snakes, birds, raccoons, deer, human beings, and many others. Organisms of the subphylum Vertebrata are henceforth referred to as vertebrates.

Vertebrates tend to exhibit a trait known as dimorphism. Dimorphism is defined as the existence of two distinct physical morphs, exhibited within a given species, by males and females of that species respectively. Dimorphism in many vertebrates is not so easy to discern by merely glancing at them, but with others, such as certain bird species and humans, it is quite easy to spot.

The brain is an organ of the body, and is possessed by all vertebrate organisms in nature. Therefore dimorphism, which effects the physical aspects of vertebrates, consequentially can effect the mental processes and behaviour of vertebrates, since the brain – which performs mental processes and induces behaviour – is itself a physical organ.⁴ Of the many vertebrates that exhibit dimorphism, humans are among

² “No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main. If a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less ...” (John Donne, *Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions*, London, 1624, p. 98.)

³ J.-B. Lamarck, *Système des Animaux sans Vertèbres*, Paris, 1801, pp. 6–7.

⁴ The objectivity of the mind’s processes isn’t as new of an idea as some may think. It can be traced at least to ancient times, e.g. in the philosophy of Democritus; and in the seventeenth century the royalist writer Thomas Hobbes described it thusly: “The cause of sense, is the external body, or object, which presses the organ proper to each sense, either immediately, as in the taste and touch; or mediately, as in seeing, hearing, and smelling: which pressure, by the mediation of nerves, and other strings, and membranes of the body, continued inwards to the brain, and heart, causes there a resistance, or counter-pressure, or endeavour of the heart, to deliver itself: which endeavour because outward, seems to be some matter without.” (Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, London, 1651, p. 1.)

the species in which dimorphism, especially as it pertains to the behaviour and mental processes of individuals, is the most plainly apparent and self-evident, and this has been understood for a long time.⁵

Since dimorphism effects both the external appearance of humans based on their sex, and the behaviour of humans based on their sex, there resultingly are general differences between the two sexes which are quite consistent across all human populations. Of course, some outlier instances do sporadically occur, and it is entirely possible for humans of the female sex to sometimes outwardly resemble humans of the male sex; while it is also possible for humans of the male sex to behave like humans of the female sex normally do, and so on and so forth. Such instances however do not diminish the inherent reality of dimorphism and its effects, just as outlier instances in which people have survived falling from a great height do not diminish the inherent reality of the danger of falling from a great height. At all events, the effects of dimorphism – which are in large part uniform across all human populations – remain self-evident.⁶

The physical effects of dimorphism, as manifest in humans, can be described thusly: males and females of the human species display generally consistent variations in stature, with males typically being larger than females. The sexes also display generally consistent physical variations in the strength and

⁵ “And in respect to human beings, their nature is considered first as to sex whether male or female ...” (Marcus Tullius Cicero, *De Inventione*, Bk I, Ch. 24.)

⁶ This is true despite the fevered outcry of many western academics of the liberal or bourgeois persuasion, who hold to the absurd and recent fabrication that there exists some difference between biological sex and gender. They proclaim that while sex does indeed exist, gender somehow exists separately from it, and that gender, i.e. male and female, is a mere ‘social construct’, which can be changed on a whim by anyone, and for any reason. The reality however is the utter opposite of what they say, and it is objectively the case that there is no difference between biological sex and gender, and that gender/sex are words that have been applied by humans to a material construct, that exists as matter, and is derived from complex natural processes which began unfolding long before the appearance of the first humans. Contrary to the debauched whims of many mentally unsound people, such processes are impossible to reverse by human meddling. People that say otherwise either cannot see, or pretend not to see, that a male dressed as a female, and who believingly proclaims himself to be a female, is still a male, despite his warped perceptions. His vain efforts are not against some imaginary social construct that can be socially deconstructed, but rather they are against a practically timeless material reality; that of dimorphism, and thereby his feeble efforts are hopeless, even if he goes as far as to initiate the mutilation of his own body in an attempt to make its morphology more like the body of a human female; as all he would accomplish therein would be transforming from a male human into a mutilated male human, since sex is already determined in humans before birth, and this is irreversible after it has occurred. The ridiculously tiny percentage of humans that are born with abnormal genitalia don’t count as anything against this, because as we have already seen, sporadic outlier cases do not automatically admonish general realities. In reality, there is nothing that is a mere ‘social construct’ that exists floating aimlessly, without any material form, in some unseen dimension of the intuition or beyond. There are things that exist, and there are not things that do not exist. Sex/gender can only be explained coherently as being the result of dimorphism, a natural and physical phenomenon, while the baseless notions about some mystical ‘social construct’ are spouted by bourgeois-minded and often vain people who cannot provide any convincing evidence for their claims. As to why this delusional phenomenon has become so prevalent recently, we will see later.

thickness of the bones; the pitch of the voice; the morphology of the skull; the likelihood of experiencing balding; and the ability to grow facial hair, with males being more likely to experience balding and to grow facial hair, and also typically having stronger and thicker bones, as well as a more robust morphology of the skull, and a voice of lower pitch. The reproductive organs of the sexes vary greatly in their morphology; and the two sexes themselves serve different respective functions within the reproductive process, this being a dynamic which is a characteristic feature of members of the subphylum Vertebrata.

The typical process of human reproduction occurs when a male individual and a female individual engage in copulation that results in the impregnation of the female, after which the embryo within the womb of the female remains alive until it is born, and reproduction has thereby occurred. In vertebrates broadly, and in humans especially, the desire to engage in reproduction – and thereby in copulation – is very strongly present in healthy individuals that are of adult age. This desire to reproduce does not arise by any means through some kind of human autonomy, but is simply a consequence of innate natural factors.⁷

Now that we understand the basics of human reproduction, and have looked at some of the effects of dimorphism which relate to rather overt physical characteristics in humans, we will proceed to examine more closely how dimorphism effects human behaviour.

There are certain behavioural differences between the two sexes in humans that are widely understood, even if that understanding is not always verbally expressed by those who partake in it. These more widely acknowledged differences comprise relatively superficial aspects, namely preferences of clothing, inclinations towards different varieties of entertainment, and other such things.

Another category of differences exists, and these are still generally understood by people, albeit to a somewhat lesser degree, especially in western societies. These differences are moderately less superficial, and are composed of elements such as career preference, political ideation, and variations in the emotional processing of events.

Finally – being even more obfuscated from common view – there exists between the sexes in humans one more category of differences, which pertain to their methods of participation in the reproductive process itself. Now, we have indeed already seen how each sex serves its own function in the reproductive process; namely, they must come together to perform copulation, with the male impregnating the female during that

⁷ “The first point is that those which are ineffective without each other must be united in a pair. For example the union of male and female is necessary for successful reproduction, since each is powerless without the other; and this is not a matter of choice, but is due to the desire, implanted by nature in both animals and plants, to propagate one’s kind.” (Aristotle, *Politics*, Bk I, Ch. 2.)

act. But what we are now talking about here, is exactly how they come together in the first place, or more precisely, how the methods of mate selection vary between male and female humans.

Just what these variations are will become clear momentarily, but first it is necessary to explain how such differences arose at all, and in doing so we will see that their origin lies in the very nature of dimorphism.

In the reproductive process of humans and many other dimorphic vertebrates, the females of the species are the sex that give birth to offspring, while the males can only impregnate the females. For adult human males, the bodily production of sperm is ongoing constantly, and for a very large portion of the male's life, with a steady quantity being continually produced, while the act of expending it relatively frequently does not result in deleterious physical effects in male individuals that are generally healthy. For adult human females on the other hand, ovulation occurs only about once a month, and it takes approximately nine months after the instance of the impregnation of the female for that female to birth a single healthy offspring. It is also a reality that the reproductive process is vastly more strenuous and taxing on the body with human females than it is with human males, and this is in large part due to the fact that it is females who physically birth the offspring in the reproductive process; and that great physical complications come with the act of directly bringing a newborn human into the world.

As a result of these various factors, it is possible for one male human to impregnate hundreds of female humans, and to thereby have hundreds of offspring within his lifetime – and even within a relatively short fraction of it – but the converse does not hold, as it is not possible for one female to birth hundreds of children within a short period of time; and even if she gave birth continually throughout her adult lifetime, she would become infertile before even coming close to having just one hundred children. And so with all these factors in existence, it is by necessity that the healthy adult human female, who desires to reproduce, is more exclusive in the process of mate selection than is the healthy adult human male who also desires to reproduce.

To reiterate: she is more exclusive because there is inherently much more biological risk for her in the reproductive process than there is for her male counterpart. By biological risk, I mean regarding the health of both herself, and her offspring. Healthy humans do not want to die, and they desire for their offspring to survive, and to thrive while doing so; and offspring will naturally struggle to do that if they are physically weak, or otherwise vulnerable or unhealthy. Both parents pass on some of their traits through their genes, and traits that signal greater health or genetic quality in nature – such as height and handsomeness in males or prettiness and curvaceousness in females – are called attractive by adult human beings.

Since the female understands implicitly that the male passes on some of his traits in the reproductive process, the female wishes to make sure that her mate is the best – i.e. the most attractive – that she can possibly get, in order for her offspring to be as healthy as they can possibly be.

The male on the other hand is not so concerned about this. Certainly, if given the option of only producing offspring with the most attractive of females, he will indeed do so, but since nature almost never presents such opportunities, the male is usually perfectly content to copulate with almost any adult female that is available to him, with his only selection criterion being that the female is at least remotely healthy. As we have seen, there is less biological risk for him to act in this way, since his production of sperm is merely continual and not cyclical, and since his only required role in the reproductive process is merely to dispense his sperm, and nothing beyond that. Even if his copulation results in an unhealthy, short, and physically weak offspring, he can merely try again hundreds of other times. Hence why there is no strong incentive for him to be very exclusive in the mate selection process like there is with females.

What results from all of this is a situation among humans in which a glaring contradiction is present, as the two sexes broadly have opposing biological interests.⁸ The healthy males all seek to reproduce, and their biological imperative (which is an imperative because it is immensely strong and unyielding) is to reproduce with as many females as possible, with little regard to their attractiveness. On the other hand, all the healthy females also seek to reproduce, but their biological imperative is to reproduce with only a select group of males, and with great regard to their attractiveness. In this we see that the biological imperatives of the two sexes are contradictory, as they cannot both be fulfilled at the same time, and this phenomenon I call the contradiction of the imperatives.

This relatively simple and demonstrably true reality, now laid bare before us, has previously been generally obfuscated from the view of humanity; and thusly there are few who are fully aware of its reality at the time of this writing. Since we have now managed to gain a conscious understanding of its existence, we have acquired the fundamental knowledge that will be essential for us to comprehend the state of western society today, and this comprehension will be attained by us throughout the rest of our investigation.

⁸ This contradictory dynamic in which the females of the species are far more selective in mating than the males of the same species has been observed many times to occur in vertebrates other than humans, including our closest living relatives, chimpanzees. (R. Stumpf & C. Boesch, "The Efficacy of Female Choice in Chimpanzees of the Tai Forest, Côte d'Ivoire" *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, Vol. 60(6), 2006, pp. 749–65.) Darwin described the basic dynamic in the following way: "... with almost all animals, in which the sexes are separate, there is a constantly recurrent struggle between the males for the possession of the females ... the female ... with the rarest exception, is less eager than the male ... she is coy and may often be seen endeavouring for a long time to escape from the male ..." (Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*, London, 1871, pp. 260, 273.)

II: The Contradiction of the Imperatives and Human Society

The existence of the contradiction of the imperatives has naturally produced oppositional forces, at varying degrees of severity, between the two sexes in all hitherto existing human societies.

Historically, we have seen that the transition from the primitive hunter-gatherer mode of human life into early civilization itself entailed the establishment of regulations, or restrictions, which were legalistically imposed onto human populations, and without which civilization would not have developed at all. Some of these regulations were involved directly with ameliorating the antagonistic dynamics between the sexes produced by the contradiction of the imperatives. The foremost of this category of regulation was the practice of monogamy.

Monogamy is defined here as two individuals of a given species coming together to form a social pair, and thereby living in cooperation with one another, while occasionally mating and producing offspring together; offspring which is cared for and raised by the pair. Some non-human animals do engage in this, but it is primarily known to occur amongst civilized humans. The reason why monogamy was so crucial as an ingredient in the creation of the earliest civilizations, was the very powerful way in which it improved the lives of the broad category of adult male humans of merely average physical ability and attractiveness, or in other words, the people who composed the vast majority of those labourers, urban and agricultural, who physically constructed the infrastructure of the first civilizations.

In previous times, before monogamy had been instituted, this large class of males was usually subjected to an existence full of harshness and brutality. Their short lives were comprised largely of serving small communities which did not benefit them very much; or more specifically, they were serving the females who themselves were all only breeding with a few of the males, evidently those males that were the most strong and attractive, and held leading roles in the primitive hunter-gatherer societies. This state of things remained for a long time, to the point where it is even the case that while most of the female humans who lived in the past were indeed able to reproduce, most male humans that lived in the past actually never ended up reproducing at all,⁹ as most of them lived in those primitive days, and found themselves amongst

⁹ (J. Wilder et al., “Genetic Evidence for Unequal Effective Population Sizes of Human Females and Males” *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, Vol. 21(11), 2004, pp. 2047–57.) (J. Tierney, “The missing men in your family tree” *The New York Times*, 2007.) (M. Karmin et al., “A recent bottleneck of Y chromosome diversity coincides with a global change in culture” *Genome Research*, Vol. 25(4), 2015, pp. 459–66.) The latter paper demonstrates to us that things were at their absolute worst socially for common males about 8000 years ago, when the female to male ratio of genetic diversity was at its most skewed towards the female side (see Fig. 2 in the paper), with the female effective population size being up to seventeen times larger than the male effective population size. Agriculture had indeed already come into existence at that point, but it did not become widely established until about 7000 years ago, with the first civilizations accordingly appearing no later than 6000 years ago. The latter paper also demonstrates that during those more recent times – once civilization was established

the large category of males who were not desired as mating partners by females, and were not strong or organized enough to take power from the dominant males.

Eventually, the widespread hunter-gatherer lifestyle began to be replaced in certain areas by agricultural lifestyles. In regions where this occurred, there appeared the earliest formations of human civilization, and therein, the initial institution of monogamy as a societal practice. Once monogamy had been instituted, the broad class of common males¹⁰ found themselves far better off than they had been, for under monogamy, they no longer had to spend their lives in miserable loneliness and savage brutality, only to die young at the hands of some stronger human male, or some carnivorous wild animal. Within the monogamous agricultural city states of the earliest civilizations – which were often quite communal – these men could instead spend their lives in relative peace, engaging in agricultural work, developing civilization further, and living with their wives. Having gained secure and steady access to intimacy through the institution of monogamy, these men could now experience copulation and romantic love, thereby attaining self-actualization, something which was previously inaccessible to them. Thusly their lot had vastly improved in every way, and civilization was now able to advance, since most of the male population was now stabilized, and reproducing via monogamy.

The new arrangement however was not uniformly beneficial to every group of people. Indeed, under monogamy in early civilization, most women – while their lot had indeed been improved in many ways through factors such as easier access to food, greater general safety in daily life, and the presence of stronger and more unified communities – ultimately could no longer indulge in the excessive fulfillment of their biological imperative as they once did back in the pre-civilization times. Now, they found themselves legalistically bound to just one common man, while those rare few males whom the females most strongly desired to copulate with were either far away and rather inaccessible in their palaces, or themselves were engaging in monogamy.¹¹

– the female to male ratio of genetic diversity altered rapidly and dramatically, shifting to become more equable, and thereby more favourable to common males. This reality can only be explained by the fact that monogamy was being widely instituted amongst the growing early civilizations.

¹⁰ In this work, I use the term 'common males' to refer to essentially any human males who are/were not among the most physically attractive group of males – to most human females – in any given society. The majority of human males who are alive today, or were living at any given time, are and were in fact common males.

¹¹ Of course it is the case that despite these realities, in ancient times many women still managed to find ways to escape the (sexual and financial) limitations of monogamy both temporarily and completely; and some of the ways they achieved this was by becoming concubines for powerful men, engaging in infidelity, or simply by turning to prostitution. One such example can be found in Herodotus: "Working class girls in Lydia prostitute themselves without exception to collect money for their dowries, and continue the practice until they marry." (Herodotus, *Histories*, Bk I, Ch. 93.) Such behaviour

Lastly, we have the small class of males that were strongly desired as mating partners by females. These types seem to have benefitted the least overall from the societal shift into agriculture and monogamy, as previously they were the unchallenged masters of their primitive hunter-gatherer realms, being able to have women in practically endless abundance, and with basically no repercussions; while in the new agricultural city states on the other hand, there often were severe repercussions for them if they violated the established laws; and they additionally had to contend for power with more gentle and civilized males who operated not by brute strength, but by sagacity and knowledge; these men who would've been easy targets for the elite, powerful, and strong men in earlier times, but who now found themselves under the generally firm protection of the new laws and their enforcers, whilst also having access to new metal weapons that gave them a fighting chance against taller and stronger males.

And so it was that ancient monogamous civilization, beginning as far as we can tell in Mesopotamia, also emerged elsewhere in places such as China and India, and spread organically throughout much of Eurasia, civilizing many populations, and bringing them into a more ordered, gentle, agricultural, harmonious, and monogamous way of life.¹² Now, the new way of life that had come into existence, although it did indeed provide many improvements, was still far from ideal; and there was in fact still many wars, famines, and pestilences, while it is also the case that the main pillar of the economic structure of these ancient societies was slavery.¹³

To trace in detail the development of the rest of human civilization up until the present moment would be quite a task, and would also be beyond the scope of this work, as what we are trying to do here is not to gain an exhaustive view of all of history, but simply to understand the present state of things with clarity. Thus

however was rather limited overall, because of how strongly male-dominated authorities generally enforced monogamous laws in those times.

¹² A semi-mythological account of this process is given by Marcus Tullius Cicero: "For there was a time when men wandered at large in the fields like animals and lived on wild fare; they did nothing by the guidance of reason, but relied chiefly on physical strength; there was as yet no ordered system of religious worship nor of social duties; no one had seen legitimate marriage nor had anyone looked upon children whom he knew to be his own; nor had they learned the advantages of an equitable code of law. And so through their ignorance and error blind and unreasoning passion satisfied itself by misuse of bodily strength, which is a very dangerous servant. At this juncture a man – great and wise I am sure – became aware of the power latent in man and the wide field offered by his mind for great achievements if one could develop this power and improve it by instruction. Men were scattered in the fields and hidden in sylvan retreats when he assembled and gathered them in accordance with a plan; he introduced them to every useful and honourable occupation, though they cried out against it at first because of its novelty, and when through reason and eloquence they had listened with greater attention, he transformed them from wild savages into a kind and gentle folk." (Marcus Tullius Cicero, *op. cit.*, Bk I, Ch. 2.)

¹³ That being said, it should be noted that this ancient slavery was, at least in Europe generally, far less brutal than the slavery that would come about later after the rise of capitalist societies, in the antebellum south and in the Islamic world.

it will suffice to say that for many centuries, as the ancient societies reformed into feudal societies, and those feudal societies then reformed into low capitalist societies, it is the case that monogamy remained quite firmly in place throughout; and resultingly most common males were able to live relatively fulfilling existences, being able to have families with their wives, and to contribute to their societies, whether that be as a labourer, artisan, poet, soldier, or philosopher; all of this was possible as they did not have to waste their lives in savage, senseless, and brutal sexual competition like they formerly did in primitive times.

Recently however, there has been a great shift in things, and, where once the antagonisms that result from the contradiction of the imperatives were widely ameliorated through the institution of monogamy, it is now actually the case that in high capitalist societies – i.e. in the societies of the western world – monogamy is no longer prevalent at all; and as a result we find present a vastly unequal distribution of intimacy amongst the human populations of those nations, a skewed inequality not so unlike that which existed in primitive times, in that we find most of the females only copulating with a tiny fractional group of the males.

In order to understand how the present high capitalist societies came into existence, and just why it is that monogamy is not something that prevails within them, in the next chapter we will examine the relatively recent circumstances of the twentieth century which led into the creation of the present state of things in western society.

III: The Genesis of the Hypergamy State

The hypergamy state in which westerners now live is essentially an inevitable result of the economic system of capitalism, as we shall soon see.

Before we begin the narrative of this chapter itself though, it will be necessary for me to give some definitions of certain terms that are used in this text. Several of these terms are not of my own invention, and therefore the reader may already be familiar with them, but I give definitions here because my own understandings of these terms may not correlate to the readers' previous knowledge of them.

D1: By low capitalism I mean capitalism in its pre-industrialized form, as it existed from its earliest days in the European towns of the renaissance, until the completion of the industrialization process – which occurred varying in different places – but in western societies had largely taken place by the end of the Victorian era.

D2: By high capitalism I mean capitalism in its fullness; that is, capitalism with the entire strength of technological industry, and all of the many powerful assets produced from that industry, being fully and extensively utilized in enhancing and enforcing the continuing dominance of the bourgeois class. Some people refer to this as 'monopoly capitalism', 'imperialism', or 'globalism', while additionally some others say that it is actually a bastardized form of socialism, since the corporations plan the economy in some ways. For the sake of clarity however, I will simply be using the term 'high capitalism' in this work.

D3: By middle class I mean both the petty bourgeois class and the labour aristocracy together as one broad group.

D4: By western society I do not mean just the societies of western Europe, the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand; but rather I refer to a more broad category of strongly developed high capitalist societies, including in addition to those places I just listed, the nations of South Korea, Taiwan, and Japan, along with the most developed regions in South America as well.

D5: By hypergamy I do not mean the traditional definition of that word, which pertains to women marrying into wealthy families; but rather I mean something like the opposite of monogamy, or namely a phenomenon in which females simply copulate as they please with a plethora of attractive males, as opposed to monogamy, in which the same females would be bound legalistically and culturally to just one male.¹⁴

¹⁴ I know that the term polygamy could perhaps be used for this, but I've deemed hypergamy to be the better word for our purposes here.

D6: By hypergamy state I mean any civilization or civilized nation in which hypergamy has become the dominant mode of intimacy. Thus, both modern western civilization itself, and individual nations such as the United States, Canada, et cetera can all be defined as hypergamy states.

D7: By intimacy I mean romantically physical and/or sexual contact between two rational, consenting, and reproductively mature human beings of the opposite sex. Not all intimacy results in the production of offspring, though practically all of the production of offspring is the result of intimacy.¹⁵

With that, we are able to proceed with our investigation.

In western society today, the dominant economic system is high capitalism. High capitalism evolved from low capitalism, which itself was fostered by the bourgeois class during the latter stages of feudal times. All this is to say that capitalism as a system was not a creation of the common man; or more specifically, the monogamous male farmers and labourers of feudal times, but rather capitalism was the creation of a smaller and more privileged male clique, who had very different interests than the workers and peasants around them.¹⁶ It is crucial that any readers who are males of proletarian background understand that capitalism was not created for them, and as a system it was never designed with their interests, or the interests of people like them, in mind.

It is the case that capitalism – a system of bourgeois creation – tends in its nature more to benefit that specific clique of bankers, merchants, and businessmen which comprises the bourgeois class that created it, rather than male proletarians, who under capitalism can largely only live by selling their labour to the bourgeois class for a wage.

Though it is heavily obfuscated and unknown today, it is an objectively true reality that the economic structure of a society – or in other words its base upon which all of the useful things that assist in the daily life of its members are produced – has a powerful and continuing effect on the many other aspects of that society, which comprise the superstructure, i.e. culture and all of its various manifestations, including religion,

¹⁵ Exceptions are very rare, and comprise instances of artificial insemination which have resulted in the production of human offspring.

¹⁶ This is evidenced in many points in history, and especially in the English bourgeois revolution of the 17th century, during which England was plunged into a terribly gruesome civil war, with the parliamentarians on the one side representing the rise of capitalism; and composed of merchants, bankers, businessmen, and relatively well-off liberal people generally, while the royalists were on the opposing side, and they represented the old feudal order of things; and were broadly composed of the ancient aristocracy, and the humble farmers of the more antiquated areas of England. The parliamentary victory would allow for the forthcoming ascension of the English bourgeoisie to total dominance in that nation, with the founding of the Bank of England in 1694 by William III – a dissolute sodomite and bourgeois champion. (Karl Marx & Friedrich Engels, *Marx & Engels Collected Works: Vol. 10, Marx & Engels: 1849–51*, Lawrence & Wishart, 1978, p. 252.) (Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Vol. 1*, Penguin, 1990, p. 884, note.)

music, politics, social practices, and also the way in which intimacy is engaged in most frequently, or the dominant mode of intimacy.¹⁷

It isn't terribly hard to see this reality demonstrated as being a true thing in history, as it is known that time and time again, a change in the economic structure of a society is followed by massive cultural changes; and there exists one such example that we have glimpsed so far in our own investigation, when we saw that with the transition from hunter-gatherer economies into agricultural ones, there occurred the transition from mostly hypergamous modes of intimacy into mostly monogamous ones.

Since the economic base of western society is high capitalism, we can expect that the nature of the superstructure of western society will reflect and be conditioned by the economic aspects of high capitalism.

High capitalism itself is deeply interconnected with the philosophy of liberalism, which in earlier times was almost a synonymous term for capitalism; and, like capitalism, it was created by the bourgeois class, for the benefit of themselves. This is plainly evident upon a closer examination of the core principles of liberalism – which are essentially also the core principles of capitalism – and in looking at these core principles, we can effectively view the most crucial underlying philosophical ideas of present-day western society, which actively work to help maintain the dominance of capitalism, through their psychological effects on the general thought processes of the populace broadly.

To increase our understanding, it is necessary for us to go over these core principles, or assumptions, here in this chapter.

Firstly, liberalism and capitalism operate under the assumption that all humans are created equal. This assumption is blatantly and demonstrably false,¹⁸ but the bourgeois class needs people to believe in it, for when it is widely accepted to be true, it is consequentially inferred by people generally that any problem which occurs in society is not the result of tangible and inherent problems in the societal order itself; but of some personal autonomous choice of laziness or otherwise on the part of the person or people suffering from any given problem, as since they supposedly started out with the exact same setup as the successful people, it follows that they must have received their misfortunes by deliberate choice. Consequentially, people tend not to look deeper into the underlying systemic causes of societal problems, and thusly the underlying

¹⁷ “My view is that each particular mode of production, and the relations of production corresponding to it at each given moment, in short ‘the economic structure of society’, is ‘the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness’, and that ‘the mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political, and intellectual life’.” (ibid., p. 175, note.)

¹⁸ “People differ in their gifts. One man can fight, another dance, or play the lute and sing; and yet another is endowed by all-seeing Zeus with a good brain, to the frequent advantage of his friends, whom it saves from disaster time and time again, as *he* knows even better than they do.” (Homer, *Iliad*, Bk XIII, 730–4.)

societal order of high capitalism is not criticized or endangered, which is to say that the wealth of the bourgeois class is not endangered.

Secondly, liberalism and capitalism operate under the assumptions that all humans are basically good, and that they desire to engage in competition. Both notions are patently and obviously false. Humans are neither basically good nor basically evil, but are inherently capable of both goodness and badness, as they are basically animals, and are complex creatures with very strong inherent drives that can have both harmful and positive impacts on those around them. Regarding competition, it is perfectly natural for some humans to have no interest in it, as life is not a sporting event, and cooperation is just as natural in biology as competition is. The bourgeois class needs people to think that humans are basically good in order for people to accept unquestioningly the absurd freedom that has been obtained by the bourgeois class, especially in economic matters. If it was understood widely that humans are not basically good, but do tend strongly to become very greedy and debauched when granted unlimited access to luxury, then more people would strive for stronger regulations, regulations which if installed would hinder or entirely remove the power of the bourgeois class. The reason the bourgeois class needs people to think that all humans naturally desire to engage in competition, is so that the bourgeois can then label anybody who does not wish to compete, or who wishes to restructure society in a form that is not capitalism, as being some kind of aberration that should not be listened to, on account of their supposed abnormality.

Finally, liberalism and capitalism operate under the assumption that all humans are rational-minded and fully autonomous, and are thereby fully capable of obtaining a life of contentment merely by wanting to live such a life greatly enough. This idea is completely false, for if it were true, we could reasonably expect that no human being would be dissatisfied with their existence at all, as they all would merely choose to live a better existence and then begin to do just that, since that option is supposedly entirely open to them.

No sane or healthy person wants to be in chronic pain, or to be starving, or socially isolated. These unfortunate conditions are by no means chosen, but are in reality forced onto people through biological, societal, and historical processes that are outside of the control of the individual. But the bourgeois class needs people to think that they are fully autonomous and rational-minded, for it not only gives people the illusion that the bourgeois class themselves attained all of their power through honest and genuine hard work, instead of through luck; but the assumption additionally causes people to falsely believe that any problems encountered by themselves or others are not serious issues that are the results of any inherent flaws in society that arise out of capitalism, but instead are mere trivialities that can supposedly be overcome easily by anyone who wishes to overcome them.

We thusly have summarized the main assumptions on which the philosophies of liberalism, capitalism – and by extension – of western society, are based and maintained.¹⁹

Therefore, we can now at last look with closeness at how monogamy has been largely done away with in high capitalism, and we also may view in detail the hypergamy that has replaced it.

To put it quite simply, capitalism is a system based on the continual profit of a select few people, who are the bourgeois class; and it was ultimately the case that the widespread practice of monogamy simply proved to be less monetarily profitable for the bourgeois than hypergamy did.

Remember, capitalism was never designed towards the benefit of the common male of the working class, or of the whole of society at all; but rather, it was designed by the bourgeois class towards their own benefit. During the world wars of the twentieth century (and the interwar period), while capitalism was increasing in its technological advancements, the stability of western bourgeois dominance was threatened greatly by the rise of communism, a system which directly attacked the power of the bourgeois class, and improved the lot of the proletarian male.

After the chaos of the world wars came to an end however, the international communist movement was still not as powerful as the western capitalist world; and the western bourgeois class, which had been increasingly gaining power for much time – and had just defeated its National Socialist enemies – suddenly found itself in an outrageously prosperous and triumphant position, being absolutely free to restructure western society to their own wishes, namely towards the goal of increasing their profit and power.²⁰ This

¹⁹ I do not mean that the entirety of society is upheld by these assumptions alone, as that would contradict the fact that it is the economic structure of high capitalism as a whole which itself upholds the political and cultural superstructure of western society. Rather, I mean that without these assumptions being so widely in place as they are, there would generally be a lot less mental grounds for people to believe in the efficacy of capitalism at all. Therefore, it is true to an extent that these assumptions maintain the public belief in liberalism and capitalism. There are in fact two more assumptions, but these don't seem to be quite as deeply engrained into the collective thought of people as the other ones that I discussed. These additional two are the assumption that humans are individualistic by nature, and that humans are 'blank slates' at birth (and the blank slate idea is basically the socially accepted alternative view to the idea that humans are basically good). Both assumptions are demonstrably false; and the bourgeois class needs people to believe the former one because it makes people more atomized and thereby more easy to control, while it also psychologically reinforces the notion that the present state of western society is somehow normal. The bourgeois class is fine with people believing in the blank slate idea because it produces an effect that is quite similar to that produced through the idea that all humans are created equal, which we already discussed.

²⁰ It is the case that there was amongst the western bourgeois class many Jews, who in their newly acquired power immediately set about creating the state of Israel, which became essentially a kind of base from which they were to assist in the expansion of capitalist hegemony in conjunction with American and British corporations. The influence of Zionist Jews upon the western bourgeoisie is in fact so strong that in my other works I sometimes refer to the western ruling class itself as the Judaeo-bourgeois class; with all that being said however, it is very important not to fall into the absurd delusion of

restructuring was not a wholly autonomous and deliberate act on their part, but was more so performed by them due to the nature of their very role in capitalism as the bourgeois class itself; and it was thereby merely an inevitable consequence of capitalism simply existing in western nations.²¹

It did not take very long at all for the sheer magnitude of the changes that western society was undergoing to become blatantly apparent, and these changes occurred to a degree of rapidness that had not been seen before.

The 1950s, though so commonly idealized by conservatives today, was in actuality a time of rampant substance abuse, infidelities, and general degeneracy in the west as compared with previous times. It was in that decade that the rapid growth and proliferation of a new degenerative capitalist monoculture occurred. This monoculture was the direct predecessor of the one which still dominates excessively in the western world today, and still indeed finds itself spreading to new corners of the earth. It was and is characterized by the spread of unhealthy and commodified food; the propagation of increasingly vulgar and degenerate commercialized music; and the replacement of more gentle, traditional, and localized cultural practices with new commodified practices based heavily upon the inordinate idolization of so-called celebrities, be they actresses, musicians, sports stars, or what have you.

If one examines the particular changes more closely, one sees how they were most certainly made towards the ends of bourgeois monetary profit.

It is more profitable to produce and sell good-tasting but unhealthy food than it is to produce and sell healthy food, which is more costly to produce, and is less enticing to a great portion of consumers. It is more

thinking that all Jews globally are somehow the participants in the globalist/imperialist scheme that the elite Zionists and their western bourgeois allies are so desperately trying to enact in present times. Ultimately, the true heart of the bourgeoisie is capital, and not the Jewish race; and it is still the case that a vast portion of the western bourgeois class is not Jewish at all, but is composed of people from a wide range of ethnicities, who would still be vile and corrupted without any Jewish influence – so long as they remain capitalists. Furthermore, it must be understood that various ethnically Jewish people throughout history have been some of the most renowned and effective combatants against the western bourgeois class.

²¹ The following lines from Marx and Engels elucidate this: “The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. Conservation of the old modes of production in unaltered forms, was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all earlier industrial classes. Constant revolutionizing of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation, distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away; all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses his real conditions of life and his relations with his kind.” (Karl Marx & Friedrich Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*, New York, 1895, p. 17.)

profitable to promote and sell newfangled and 'exciting' musical genres to people than it is to promote and sell classical music, which has far less of an appeal to potential consumers generally. It is immensely more profitable to inculcate and propagate a consumeristic monoculture within society than it is to maintain more simplistic and traditional cultural practices.²²

The transformation process accelerated throughout the 1960s, and by the 1970s, society had become practically unrecognizable from how it had been during the times before the second world war.

There is indeed one change that was made, which was more striking, and more socially and culturally consequential than perhaps all of the others; and this change itself was the abandoning of any and all societal aspects which had served the function of maintaining monogamy. Once this occurred, the hypergamy state came to prevail in the west, and this catastrophic change, as we may expect, was made towards the goal of bourgeois profit.

The reasoning for this is not terribly complicated. Back while monogamy was still very firmly in place, it was a reality that the majority of the female population – which itself comprised about half of the entire human population – was generally cut off from bourgeois exploitation, as they remained in their homes, performing household tasks and raising children with their husbands. Since such an arrangement was obviously highly unprofitable for the bourgeois class, feminism was allowed to flourish, and was directly promoted, while bourgeois businessmen gladly allowed women to enter the workforce,^{23 24} and thereby to contribute in massive numbers to the expansion of the power of bourgeois industries; and also to obtain their own salaries, with which they could consume countless products and stimulate the economy further.

²² Many people today believe that rampant consumerism is simply an inevitable result of technological advancement, but this is demonstrably false, as we can plainly see that in each of the communist countries that presently exist (these are China, Laos, Vietnam, North Korea, and Cuba; some may call them socialist countries, and perhaps they are correct, but for the sake of clarity I call them communist countries here), that there is indeed a presence of advanced technology, to varying degrees, while western consumeristic monoculture is either present only to a rather limited degree, or practically absent completely.

²³ In their mansions and skyscrapers, bourgeois men also readily and frequently indulged in adultery with some of these women, creating a situation which echoed the palaces of old, within which lived ancient rulers presiding over their harems of dissolute concubines.

²⁴ "Women ... offer less resistance than male workers to capitalist oppression. They are more submissive, more easily intimidated; they are more ready to believe the priest and to accept everything they are told by persons in authority. Hence the factory owner often replaces male workers by females ... This leads to the break-up of the working-class family. If the mothers ... go to the factory, what becomes of family life?" (Nikolai Bukharin & Yevgeni Preobrazhensky, *The ABC of Communism*, The Communist Party of Great Britain, 1922, pp. 56, 57.)

Having then obtained the means of generating their own salaries, and with traditional culture now being replaced by high capitalist monoculture, women simply no longer wanted, or even needed common men as much as they once did; and monogamy thereby plummeted in frequency, with women overwhelmingly preferring to work for corporations while earning money and engaging in hypergamy, as opposed to working for common husbands, who did not pay them money, and who expected monogamy.

It was during these times that divorce rates in western nations first started to skyrocket, while birthrates plummeted accordingly, and both of these phenomena were the direct result of the economic autonomy that the female population had gained. The simple reason that they largely preferred to be hypergamous while working for corporations, as opposed to being monogamous while working for a husband, is because the path of corporate concubinage was more in accordance with their biological imperative.

Since birthrates had plummeted, the bourgeois class needed a way to keep the population of western nations growing; and also to obtain more cheap labour, as the populations of western nations were growing more and more used to relatively luxurious conditions, and therefore were becoming less and less willing to work excessively low-paying jobs. Of course, the bourgeois class was not about to bring back monogamy in order to lift the birthrates back up – as that would mean ending an incredibly profitable arrangement – so instead, they opted for the cheaper solution, which was to begin the practice of merely importing continual and ceaseless waves of immigrants from the global south into western countries, drawing from a wide range of populations.²⁵

And so it was that the now ubiquitous global south-derived migration waves into the west began at the same time that the hypergamy state was becoming dominant, all because the insatiably greedy bourgeois class found it to be far more profitable to simply import cheap labour while allowing rampant hypergamy to go on, than to promote monogamy while paying white couples enough money to have healthy families.

During the 1980s, the bourgeois class vastly accelerated in its consolidation of power across the western world, and this was done in a very clever and deceptive way that is worth elucidating here.

In those times, common western men, seeing how bad things were now getting for them socially, wanted greatly to return to previous days, in which monogamy and more traditional cultural practices were

²⁵ This is the true origin of the phenomenon of senseless mass immigration into western nations. It is not, as many conservatives state, simply a practice enacted by the left alone with the intention of gaining more voters. It is in reality allowed and propagated by both the conservative and liberal parties in western nations, which themselves are both under firm bourgeois control; and it serves the end of furthering the profit of the bourgeois class, through cheap labour and the growth of their industries.

still widespread. Seeing this, the bourgeois class proceeded to prop up several conservative figureheads (e.g. Reagan and Thatcher), who claimed to be supporters of the common man. These figureheads then won elections by large margins, much to the rejoicing of males across the west. The problem for these males though was that the people who they had voted in were indeed mere figureheads; and when it came to actually fixing the problems that the common men wished to have fixed, the only solutions that these figureheads offered were things along the lines of more privatization, more emphasis on 'individual responsibility',²⁶ and more tax cuts for the rich; essentially things which all suspiciously only benefitted the bourgeois class, and not the common man, while these also were things which actually increased the speed and severity of the downfall of monogamy in western countries. Thusly monogamy in the west did not make a sudden comeback in the 1980s, but continued to decline ever more steeply.

But all of this thus far mostly pertains to the western high capitalist world. In regard to the communist world it is the case that little or none of the rampant degeneration of the west occurred there; and monogamy, along with traditional cultural customs, were maintained rather consistently.²⁷ But the bourgeois class gained a shocking victory with the collapse of the Soviet Union, along with all of the other European communist nations that once existed.

At the time that I am writing this, there are but five communist countries left on earth, much to the chagrin of the western bourgeois class, who wish to see all of those nations defeated, and their populations brought into the domain of western capital. Regarding the collapse of the Soviet Union, it is the case that nowhere are the evils of capitalism more apparent than in the horrific transformation that Russian and eastern European societies underwent in the 1990s, shifting from culturally healthy and largely monogamous nations under communist leadership, into chaotic, miserable, crime-ridden, hypergamous hellscapes under capitalism: a system which allows the most cruel and brutal of drug dealers, gangsters, pimps, and oligarchs to achieve firm and steady power, and to reign tyrannically over helpless populations.²⁸

²⁶ Or essentially on the myth that all humans are rational-minded and fully autonomous, one of the pillars of capitalist philosophy.

²⁷ This reality baffles western conservatives today, for they are largely under the deliberately propagated illusion that communism is somehow the cause of all the degeneracy which they have witnessed in their lives, in their own societies. In reality however, it is not communism, but capitalism which directly causes what they are witnessing, hence why the various communist nations of the world have always been comparatively devoid of the degeneracy that plagues western capitalist countries. The bourgeois class needs conservatives (who are mostly common males of proletarian background) to hate communism and to support capitalism, because in doing so, they are supporting the very system that has enslaved them, and destroyed the traditions of their ancestors, all to the profit of the bourgeois class.

²⁸ Several eastern European countries remain in this basic state of capitalistic depravity today, although Russia itself has undergone improvements with the re-nationalization of some industries, and the purging of western corporate influence.

With the Soviet Union and many of its allies having been defeated, and their populations brought into the domain of western corporate interests, the western bourgeois class, under the system which many of its members referred to as 'neoliberalism', entered into what has as yet been their halcyon days, which were those of the 1990s and early 2000s, the times in which we saw the genesis of the fully modern, fully contemporaneous western capitalist monoculture that we at the time of this writing are familiar with; and soon this culture became fully developed with the widespread propagation of the cellphone and social media in the late 2000s and early 2010s.

The hypergamy state in its fullness had emerged, and this hypergamy state is what we in the west are now living in. Its characteristic feature is an intense and appallingly unequal distribution of intimacy within the human population; and this disparity, along with other features of the hypergamy state and their effects on humans, will be examined by us with careful attention in the following chapter.

IV: Results of the Present Mode of Intimacy in Western Society

IV (I): General Results

From the prevalence of hypergamy in western society, an array of vile iniquities and warped abominations hitherto entirely unseen have arisen and become rampant.

To examine this chaotic catastrophe in an orderly manner, we will view the effects of the hypergamy state upon each of the three main sociobiological classes of contemporary western society in descending order, with regard to the amount and quality of intimacy that each class has access to.

The three classes are, in descending order: the males that are sexually desired and considered attractive by females; the females themselves; and lastly the common males, which are the majority of males.

The attractive males, who for our purposes we will simply refer to as 'the favoured' or 'favoured males', are the sociobiological class that has found itself thriving the most out of any within the hypergamy state. They are much less numerous than the females and the common males, and many of them actually also belong to the bourgeois and middle classes, while they tend generally not to work lower-paying labour jobs.

From the time of their birth, the life experiences of the favoured males are more positive and conducive to social thriving and general happiness than are those of the common males. This is because beauty is objective, and the perception of it is measurable within the brain,²⁹ and since humans are adapted to prefer beauty, it is simply inevitable that people who possess beauty are treated far better than those who do not, even at a very young age, and by their equally young peers,³⁰ as well as by their own parents; as it is known that homely-looking children are far more likely to face maltreatment at the hands of their parents than their more genetically fortunate counterparts, who conversely are more likely to receive genuine affection and care in abundance from their parents.³¹

For the favoured, these realities provide blissful childhoods which lead into exciting and fulfilling adolescent existences, in which they experience – through little or no actual effort on their part – a myriad of

²⁹ Several papers provide data that supports this. (C. Di Dio et al., "The Golden Beauty: Brain Response to Classical and Renaissance Sculptures" *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 2(11), 2007.) (J. Langlois et al., "Maxims or Myths of Beauty? A Meta-Analytic and Theoretical Review" *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 126(3), 2000, pp. 390–423.) (A. Brielmann & D. Pelli, "Aesthetics" *Current Biology*, Vol. 28(16), 2018, pp. 859–63.) (J. South Palomares & A. Young, "Facial First Impressions of Partner Preference Traits: Trustworthiness, Status, and Attractiveness" *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, Vol. 9(8), 2018, pp. 990–1000.) (D. Wood & C. Brumbaugh, "Using Revealed Mate Preferences to Evaluate Market Force and Differential Preference Explanations for Mate Selection" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 96(6), 2009, pp. 1226–44.)

³⁰ A. Slater et al., "Newborn infants prefer attractive faces" *Infant Behavior and Development*, Vol. 21(2), 1998, pp. 345–54.

³¹ University of Alberta, "Researchers Show Parents Give Unattractive Children Less Attention" *ScienceDaily*, 2005.

positive social interactions, with their friends and their female partners. As they continue to live, intimacy continues to prevail for them quickly and easily, and remains in abundance, as a great deal of females have no problem throwing themselves at the favoured, consistently and often repeatedly.

Due to the simply excessive amount of joyous triumph that favoured males are granted, a not insignificant portion of them often develop a vain, egoistic, narcissistic, arrogant, and aggressive attitude towards things,³² which they are not reprimanded for, solely on account of their beauty. The concepts of romance and love often become meaningless or nothing special to them, while they sometimes begin to see those things merely as jokes; and many of them take great delight in ridiculing and humiliating some of the more vulnerable of their common male peers. Some favoured males even degenerate into absolute psychopathy, and indulge in the most hideously monstrous forms of debauchery imaginable, though this often does little or nothing to repel the lust of females.

The reason for their outrageous degeneracy isn't so difficult to understand. Because intimacy is so unbelievably common for the favoured male, they often end up seeing very little value in it, for it is as abundant to them as the air that is breathed is abundant to the common male; and thereby the favoured male is more likely to be wasteful and ambivalent when it comes to the endless stream of intimacy and affection that he receives, and he commonly pays no mind as to how his debauched actions may negatively affect the many girls who adore him. As time goes on, he also often begins to require more and more depraved and shocking sexual experiences, since more normal sexual acts increasingly fail to bring him significant amounts of pleasure, for he has been desensitized to them.

The halcyon days of the typical favoured male are most certainly those of his young adulthood, during which he is still youthful, but has just obtained a vast degree of freedom; and is for the time being, free of the more restricting responsibilities that typically emerge after young adulthood. Almost purely on the basis of his looks, he continues to indulge in a life of popularity and social thriving,³³ with there being no shortage of friends, parties, and affection for him; and all the while he continues to roll about in nearly endless inordinate intimacy with a myriad of female partners. In many cases of course he will pretend at monogamy

³² It has been demonstrated that popular males, i.e. favoured males, do indeed tend to increase in aggressiveness over time. (L. Mayeux & A. Cillessen, "It's not just being popular, it's knowing it, too: The role of self-perceptions of status in the associations between peer status and aggression" *Social Development*, Vol. 17(4), 2008, pp. 871–88.)

³³ Of papers which demonstrate the reality that physically attractive males enjoy more popularity than other males, there are simply too many to reasonably list within one footnote, but some of them are the following: (C. Anderson et al., "Who Attains Social Status? Effects of Personality and Physical Attractiveness in Social Groups" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 81(1), 2001, pp. 116–32.) (A. Gugushvili & G. Bulczak, "Physical attractiveness and intergenerational social mobility" *Social Science Quarterly*, Vol. 104(7), 2023, pp. 1360–82.) (A. Lukaszewski et al., "The role of physical formidability in human social status allocation" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 110(3), 2016, pp. 385–406.)

by having an ostensible girlfriend, while continually copulating with other females without the knowledge of his so-called girlfriend. Alternatively, he may simply have a succession of girlfriends, being able to swiftly find a replacement whenever any given relationship ends for whatever reason. Lastly of course, he may at some point indeed obtain one girlfriend that he stays with, and eventually ends up marrying (though he may or may not remain faithful to her). This latter scenario is more likely to be found in areas of the west where traditional values are still present to some degree, as opposed to more cosmopolitan or liberal areas.

After his young adulthood ends, he is quite likely to ascend to a thriving socioeconomic position in society (if he was not simply born into such circumstances already, that is), and he is far more likely to find himself situated thusly than are his less attractive male counterparts.³⁴ He may continually remain unmarried, enjoying the revolving plethora of women that he has been given unlimited access to, or perhaps he may become married; though if he finds himself in a marriage in which he perceives himself to be lacking sexual satisfaction, he is able to simply cheat on his wife as he pleases, and such scenarios are very common now. Should he eventually get divorced for whatever reason, he will be able to find a new and committed partner with relative ease, so long as he is not too old, as all physical beauty naturally fades with age.

In summation, the favoured males within the hypergamy state typically live a life of abundant intimacy, which is given very passionately to them, as it originates from a place of genuine biological desire on the part of the females, who consciously or not, wish to reproduce with them. The favoured male is desired by females due to his physical appearance, which signals good genetics (or biological value), and thereby the female desires him for mating infinitely more than she does other males, whose appearances do not signal the same high level of biological value.

The physical traits which are widely characteristic of the favoured male are the following: a handsome, masculine face; a tall height; a healthy build; and Caucasian or Caucasian-looking features.³⁵ Favoured males seem to usually exhibit all of these physical factors together, and outlier cases typically are ones in which a favoured male is not tall, but is exceptionally handsome; or alternatively he is not exceptionally handsome, but is exceptionally tall. I encourage readers from western countries, while walking about in public places, to observe the young couples visible there, for in doing so you will realize that the

³⁴ M. Benzeval et al., "Does Perceived Physical Attractiveness in Adolescence Predict Better Socioeconomic Position in Adulthood? Evidence from 20 Years of Follow Up in a Population Cohort Study" *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 7(5), 2013.

³⁵ By this I do not mean stereotypical things like blonde hair and blue eyes. Rather I mean more generally white-looking features, pertaining to the morphology of the body, and especially of the skull, which itself largely determines the appearance of the face. As for hair colour, it is actually evident that women in general prefer attractive white men with brown or black hair far more strongly than they do attractive white men with blonde hair, and this is probably because blonde hair is perceived as looking somewhat more feminine than brown or black hair.

male of the partnership practically always matches up to the physical descriptions of the favoured male that I have given here, which in a word is tall/relatively tall, white/white-looking, and handsome/not bad looking; or at the very least he will exhibit two out of those three qualities (though more often than not, he will simply be tall and white with a marginally handsome face).³⁶ If you see a male that does not match up to what I've described, he will probably either be alone, or with people who are not women that he receives intimacy from.

The only real danger that the favoured male typically faces in his life is that of losing his attractiveness. This can happen if he manages to find himself in a predicament in which his height and/or his face have become rapidly altered in a bad way, though it far more commonly happens due to simple aging. Once the favoured male has aged to the point of losing his attractiveness, he basically becomes a common male, though one that has much more sexual experience, and probably more wealth, than other common males. So much for our general description of the favoured males of the hypergamy state.

* * *

Now, regarding the female inhabitants of the hypergamy state, some may contend that they are actually better off than the favoured males are, but I do not think this is so; and my view is that while the females are indeed vastly better off than the common males, they consistently do not quite ascend the favoured males – or at least the most fortunate of the favoured males – in the overall level of power and abundance that they obtain, and ultimately it is indeed the favoured males who typically face the least problems within western society.

As for the female childhood experience in the west, there is a similar situation to that of the favoured males, in that the female child is far more likely to be cherished, lauded, encouraged, heard, protected, and genuinely loved than the (common) male child is.³⁷ It is even the case that in the classroom, young girls are treated far better on average than young boys are by their teachers.³⁸ All of this causes young girls to usually

³⁶ Some people will try to say 'This is only because you live in the west! That is why you mostly see girls with tall white men! It's not because girls are hyper-selective, it's just the demographics of where you live!', as if the vast majority of men in the west today are both tall and white!

³⁷ This fact is basically self-evident, but there are several papers that support its veracity. (L. Barnett, "The Education of Playful Boys: Class Clowns in the Classroom" *Frontiers in Psychology*, Vol. 9, 2018.) (S. Dytham, "The role of popular girls in bullying and intimidating boys and other popular girls in secondary school" *British Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 44(2), 2018, pp. 212–29.) (J. Mascaro et al., "Child Gender Influences Paternal Behavior, Language, and Brain Function" *Behavioral Neuroscience*, Vol. 131(3), 2017, pp. 262–73.)

³⁸ Multiple papers attest to this. (V. Zayas & L. Jampol, "Gendered white lies: Women are given inflated performance feedback compared to men" *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 47(1), 2021, pp. 57–69.) (C. Terrier, "Boys Lag Behind: How Teachers' Gender Biases Affect Student Achievement" *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 77, 2016.) (N. Fortin

be vastly more sociable, contented, together, motivated, and confident than most young boys, and this in turn helps girls to gain more meaningful, socially active, and fulfilling adolescences.

Just like the favoured males, the females quite quickly are able to pass all of the important social milestones, and during their young adulthood intimacy exists for them in abundance. This reality is true for most females generally, and not just for the most attractive of them.

But how can that be? The reader may ask. How is it that basically all females in the hypergamy state achieve intimacy in abundance, while a gigantic portion of the males struggle to attain any intimacy at all? Well, this is because the intimacy is being distributed in an unequal manner, as the females are quite simply only dispensing it³⁹ to a select clique of males: the favoured, while the rest of the males, who are not perceived by females as having any significant biological value, are largely socially ignored outright, because in the hypergamy state there is literally no reason for females to even interact with them in a friendly way, let alone form romantic partnerships with them.

There is no more social expectation of monogamy, nor do females greatly need the finances and resources of common males anymore, since females can now work for themselves, or receive money from the government. Another crucial ingredient that contributes to the existence of hypergamy is dating apps, which allow women to have constant access to the most attractive males from across the globe, who themselves due to their biological imperative are perfectly willing to inordinately copulate with any fertile women, even ones who are the most utterly average in attractiveness. Thusly the woman does not need to be monogamous with a common male, at least not while she is even remotely young. She is free to copulate as she wishes, and this she does, though only with favoured males, because there is no systemic reason for her not to.

The typical pattern of her intimacy seems to be that she alternates between periods of having a steady boyfriend, and periods of being 'single' while copulating with various favoured males whenever she happens to feel like copulating. Some girls of course will be more consistent in their behaviour, and they will prefer to stay with one boyfriend for a long time, and to quickly move to a new boyfriend if the relationship

et al., "Leaving Boys Behind: Gender Disparities in High Academic Achievement" *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 50(3), 2015, pp. 549–79.)

³⁹ In hypergamous societies, it is women, and not men, who are generally the ones that decide when and if copulation occurs. (L. Cohen & L. Shotland, "Timing of first sexual intercourse in a relationship: Expectations, experiences, and perceptions of others" *The Journal of Sex Research*, Vol. 33(4), 1996, pp. 291–9.)

ends; while others conversely prefer to not have any boyfriend at all, but to continually copulate casually with a plethora of favoured males, with there being little or no commitment involved.⁴⁰

Things are certainly not all blissful and idyllic for the females though. It is a reality that many of them from a relatively young age do indeed face terrible ordeals, and undergo severe mental health problems due to an array of factors, which mostly stem from the general social chaos that exists within the hypergamy state. They of course have to face odious harassment from unwanted and degenerated common males, but in addition to this, many females also endure brutal, perverted, and excessively lustful treatment at the hands of the more barbarous and debauched examples of their favoured male partners. Some widely known cases of this are the many occurrences in which popular male sports stars and musicians have been found guilty of murder and other senseless crimes against their female partners.

A sexual crime that has become all too common in the west is that of trafficking, in which people – who are often old wretches – but also are often vain, egoistic attractive males and their concubines, lure girls on false pretences, and proceed to use violence and drugging to force their victims into prostitution. The effects of these experiences on the victims are obviously unfathomably traumatic, and any sane person should want such horror to be permanently done away with.

In addition to this danger, their prevails in the average western high school itself a sinister and brutish sexual culture, in which many girls – even those of the younger grades – are brought quickly into the hypergamous social practice, especially so at the hideously vile events known as ‘parties’, where favoured males, who are often out of high school, in their twenties, and very socially dominant, violate countless girls, commonly many young girls in one single night. These events often blur the line between coercion or trafficking and consensual copulation, and many of the girls that go through this actually enter into it while feeling either ambivalent, or outright disapproving of the copulation that they are about to experience; and a great many of them are pressured or forced by their peers into going through with it. In cases where the male perpetrators are prosecuted, the courts don’t do anything to them, and they are allowed to return to society unhindered, except for nominally being on ‘parole’. This hideous, barbarous, and disgusting culture of course negatively impacts the mental health of a great deal of girls who have to live through it.

Despite all of the negative things which afflict women in the west, it remains true that they consistently and firmly advocate tooth and nail against any sentiments that overtly go against the total dominance of

⁴⁰ It should be noted that despite living in the same endless sexual abundance that the favoured male does, the female, for one or more reasons probably related to biology, doesn’t seem to be as likely to develop the same vicious arrogance and vile psychopathy that the favoured male so often displays. Instead, most females seem to be able to maintain empathy and humaneness as they move through their lives.

hypergamy, which is – whether anyone admits it or not – the very mode of intimacy that allows for so much brutality and chaos to exist within the social lives of young people today.

It seems that when given the choice, women would far rather endure the present conditions than they would the generally more socially stable monogamous systems of the past; and the reason for this is that under this present hypergamous system, they are granted free access to intimacy with the most attractive of males, which is something that they unceasingly desire above all else, even if it means that they may face maltreatment from their favoured male partners.⁴¹ Heinous abuse of themselves (and sometimes of their children and pets) at the hands of a vile, stupid, barbarous slob – so long as he is tall and good-looking – is something that women would rather endure (so long as they can experience intimacy with their tall slob), than they would a traditional and rural monogamous life with a common male as their permanent partner. Why? Because they greatly and involuntarily wish to follow their biological imperative, which pertains to only mating with the most attractive of males that they can find.

Since there is no longer any legalistic constraint which prevents females from doing this, they simply do it, and the common man is sexually left behind.⁴²

In spite of all the chaos, and the rather common viciousness of favoured males, it is ultimately true that most females in western society do not end up traumatized. This may become less true as the west inevitably continues to decline, but at least for the time being, most women are able to remain mentally sound; and it is the case that the life of the western female generally is a mostly auspicious affair, as even if they for a time end up in a bad relationship with a favoured male, they usually sooner or later end that relationship, and move on to a better one, being able to remain mostly healthy.

For women that go through bad experiences or traumas of other kinds, there is a wide ranging and effective support network available for them, and to a far greater extent than for males. As we know however, many women – especially the most attractive of them – lead lives in which there are very little problems at all, with those few that do arise being merely fleeting and rather paltry matters. It is true today

⁴¹ Here I am not saying that the present system is women's ultimate 'ideal' system. It certainly is not. What I am saying is that they generally prefer today's system over the monogamous ones of the past.

⁴² This again is practically self-evident, but there are multiple papers that support it. (M. Bendixen et al., "Adjusting signals of sexual interest in the most recent naturally occurring opposite-sex encounter in two different contexts" *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 13(4), 2019, pp. 345–65.) (J. Townsend & T. Wasserman, "The Perception of Sexual Attractiveness: Sex Differences in Variability" *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, Vol. 26(3), 1997, pp. 243–68.) (A. Eagly et al., "Are Women Evaluated More Favorably Than Men?: An Analysis of Attitudes, Beliefs, and Emotions" *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, Vol. 15(2), 1991, pp. 203–16.) (D. Wood & C. Brumbaugh, op. cit.) (E. Bruch & M. Newman, "Aspirational pursuit of mates in online dating markets" *Science Advances*, Vol. 4(8), 2018.)

that the most attractive of western females essentially no longer have to work demanding jobs; and instead, such women simply exist, and look the way that they do, and for this they have love, support, opportunity, and wealth thrown incessantly at them.

In the present times, it is now the case that practically 100% of attractive girls in western societies do indeed belong to the bourgeois and middle classes, having been lifted entirely out of the blue-collar sphere. Lots of them simply go through life with the greatest of ease, and since the culture and institutions of the hypergamy state inherently favour them, they easily attain relaxed and lucrative white-collar careers that require very little work, while additionally a great number of them become models, actresses, and musicians.

Some attractive women do not need to engage with any profession at all, as they are able to ascend to high levels of wealth merely by marrying old and gullible rich men, for in doing this they are able to live in riches incessantly, whether they eventually divorce their so-called husband or not. Of the ones that do stay, they very often fulfill their biological imperative by secretly engaging in infidelity with favoured males. If their husband's monetary resources happen to eventually dry up, then like clockwork the female does not hesitate to immediately jump ship, leaving behind the old man who no longer possesses any wealth that she can swindle.

But this practice seems to be becoming somewhat irrelevant, because increasingly, such women no longer need to engage in an elaborate swindling process with deluded old men, as almost all attractive females are now able to simply attain thousands of admirers (who are mostly desperate common males) on certain social media platforms; and these hapless and ignorant male vassals are all too happy to throw money at such females, whom they feverishly desire. On some of these platforms (e.g. OnlyFans), attractive women can and do go so far as to upload videos of their debauched sexual activities with favoured males, footage that intimacy-starved and degenerated common males pay to see, to the profit of both the female video creators, and the wealthy bourgeois owners of the online platforms.

It is terribly obvious that overall, all of this most certainly benefits the males of the bourgeois and middle classes, who themselves are often of the favoured sociobiological class. And let nobody convince you that the more wealthy of these males do not occasionally indulge in the blackest depths of depravity and twisted perversions, together with countless attractive women of differing backgrounds, within various orgies and other such hideous events, that take place in their skyscrapers, mansions, and at many luxury hotels in major cities.

The sights and sounds of these profane clandestine gatherings would be enough to permanently traumatize any sane young proletarian man of our own and previous generations; and yet such things to the bourgeois males and their concubines represent the highest of pleasures, for the ceaseless and inordinate abundance in which they live has deformed their minds.

Since western governments are merely puppet entities, whose primary function is to preserve bourgeois dominance,⁴³ the mindless debaucheries of the bourgeois men and their young concubines usually go completely unchecked, and the perpetrators are not brought to justice, but are allowed to continue in their vile madness (and sometimes the perpetrators themselves are prominent members of the government).

Now, regarding specifically the lives of the greater majority of the female population, that is those many women who are not of precipitously high attractiveness, but who are only of average or less attractiveness, the picture of things in terms of monetary wealth is typically quite different from that of their more attractive counterparts.

Make no mistake, they are not cut off from romance and sexuality, and they do indulge in wanton and excessive intimacy with the favoured males, of course, as those men are more than willing to copulate with nearly any female whose attention they can acquire, in accordance with their biological imperative.

But since the average females usually do not have access to the same continual stream of wealth which the most attractive of the females do, it is a reality that the average females, typically upon graduating from their post-secondary programs, find themselves in need of financial, emotional, and general stability, which they often cannot obtain while being single and rolling about in inordinate hypergamy, because the cost of living is so absurdly high in western nations, to the point where at least two average incomes are basically a requirement to so much as rent a halfway decent property.

Therefore, in order to obtain stability in their lives, many average females are forced by necessity to eventually enter into a so-called monogamous relationship, and with a male that is not of the favoured class, since the males that are of the favoured class are more scarce, and they also usually do not have any reason at all to enter into a committed, long-term relationship with any average females.

The specific age at which average females find themselves settling for a common male varies depending on multiple factors, including the personality of the individual female, her general monetary

⁴³ “Thus in the end we arrive at the following picture. THE INDUSTRY OF THE WHOLE COUNTRY IS UNITED INTO SYNDICATES, TRUSTS, AND COMBINED ENTERPRISES. ALL THESE ARE UNITED BY BANKS. AT THE HEAD OF THE WHOLE ECONOMIC LIFE THERE IS A SMALL GROUP OF GREAT BANKERS WHO ADMINISTER INDUSTRY IN ITS ENTIRETY. THE GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITY SIMPLY FULFILS THE WILL OF THESE BANKERS AND TRUST MAGNATES. This is very well shown in the United States. Here the “democratic” administration ... is nothing more than a servant of the trusts. Congress merely carries out what has previously been decided at secret conclaves of trust magnates and bankers. The trusts spend vast sums in buying congressmen, in financing electoral campaigns, and the like ... Senators, ministers of State, congressmen, are merely the henchmen of the great trusts, unless they themselves hold large interests in these bodies. The State authority, the governmental machinery of the “free republic,” is nothing more than a workshop for the fleecing of the public.” (Nikolai Bukharin & Yevgeni Preobrazhensky, op. cit., p. 100.)

circumstances, and the degree of severity of the hypergamous culture that exists in her area. As we have seen, the settling usually occurs only after they complete their post-secondary programs (and the majority, or almost the majority of non-elderly women in western societies do indeed attend colleges and universities). More precisely though, it can be said that they mostly end up settling down sometime during the period ranging from when they are in their mid-twenties to their early forties, and as of this writing, the majority of them do settle in this way, though more and more of them are able to now remain single and continue copulating with the favoured, due to the ever increasing iniquities of the hypergamy state.

As for the 'monogamous' 'relationships' that they enter into with the common males, more will be discussed about this topic shortly, but for now it will suffice to say that most or all of these relationships are of a quality that would be considered as unconscionably low by any sane male of earlier eras in which monogamy was dominant; and additionally, a great deal of them simply end in utter disaster for the male, who ends up going through the terrible consequences of divorce, which are disproportionately and systemically allocated to him within western societies.

After divorcing her helpless partner (for reasons almost always related to simple dissatisfaction over his unattractiveness), the female is often granted most of his finances by the bourgeois courts, and is thereby able to plunge herself into a second helping of hypergamous indulgence, or alternatively to swiftly locate her next common male victim,⁴⁴ and all the while her former partner must struggle to even survive. Examples of these gruesome situations have become innumerable in western nations, and very many male readers of this text will inevitably be able to attest personally to this based on their own terrible experiences.

* * *

With that, we at last come to the icy lowermost sphere of the hypergamous inferno, that which holds the least fortunate of the three main sociobiological classes of the hypergamy state, the common males, who we will occasionally refer to simply as 'the dispossessed'. Their lonely realm is one of gruelling deprivation, and ever surging woe.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ It's important to understand that this harmful behavior typically isn't the result of any conscious maliciousness on the part of the female, but rather it is simply due to her unconsciously or semiconsciously following her biological imperative within a society that allows her to do so.

⁴⁵ "Then I beheld a thousand faces, made Purple with cold; whence o'er me comes a shudder, And evermore will come, at frozen ponds." (Dante Alighieri, *The Divine Comedy (Inferno)*, Canto XXXII, 70–2.)

It is a simple fact that the common male within western society today has been utterly dispossessed of any steady access to intimacy, or at least to intimacy of any significant degree of quality.⁴⁶

If you are among the dispossessed yourself (and if you are reading this, there is a very good chance that you are), then you must let nobody, including yourself, convince you that this loss is some minor trifle,⁴⁷ or that it is anything other than an entirely devastating plague of dread, which wreaks exceedingly terrible damage on the health of the common male population.⁴⁸

The mistreatment of common males begins very early on in their lives, and, while the conditions of life for common male children in the west vary widely based on a number of factors, it is nonetheless generally

⁴⁶ Most males, especially of the younger generations, if they are being honest, will be able to attest to this personally. Some relevant scholarly works however are listed thusly. (E. Maticka-Tyndale et al., “Casual sex on spring break: Intentions and behaviors of canadian students” *The Journal of Sex Research*, Vol. 35(3), 1998, pp. 254–64.) (R. Clark & E. Hatfield, “Gender Differences in Receptivity to Sexual Offers” *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality*, Vol. 2(1), 1989, pp. 39–55.) (FINSEX research project, “Finnish Sexuality Research Project, 2015 Survey Results” Statistics Finland, 2015.) (B. Neyt et al., “Education Level and Mating Success: Undercover on Tinder”, IZA - Institute of Labor Economics, 2018.) Regarding the Finnish survey, its results seem to have now been largely scrubbed from the internet, but what it revealed was that young females (aged 18-24) had approximately double the amount of sexual partners than young males of the same age, and additionally, there was found to be a precipitous increase over time in the amount of females who approved of so-called ‘consensual sadomasochistic sex acts’, with the young female demographic showing the highest approval rating of such filth, at 75%. Since Finnish culture is more or less typical of western nations, we can expect the same or even more gruesome findings to be uncovered, if similar studies were done in places such as the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, et cetera. Pointing in this direction, a recent study has indeed found that both sexual assaults and STDs have become sharply more common among American young adults since the introduction of Tinder, i.e. since hypergamous activity was made instantaneously obtainable for females and their favoured partners. (Berkeren Büyükeren et al., “The Impact of Dating Apps on Young Adults: Evidence from Tinder” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, Vol. 18(2), 2026, pp. 61–106.) In regard to both Finland and America, such woeful findings can only be reasonably explained as the result of the young female populations exclusively engaging in intimacy with a small clique of biologically favoured males, leading not only to a hideously unequal distribution of intimacy overall, but also to the increase in disgustingly brutish perversions performed by the favoured males on their countless concubines in their heinous excess.

⁴⁷ Those who deny the reality of the severity of loneliness are always either women and favoured men who have lived in sexual abundance, and thereby do not know what they are talking about; or alternatively they are themselves among the dispossessed, but are in denial about their own circumstances.

⁴⁸ (M. Apostolou et al., “The emotional cost of poor mating performance” *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 138, 2019, pp. 188–92.) (J. Holt-Lundstad et al., “Loneliness and Social Isolation as Risk Factors for Mortality: A Meta-Analytic Review” *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, Vol. 10(2), 2015, pp. 227–37.) (J. Holt-Lundstad et al., “Social Relationships and Mortality Risk: A Meta-analytic Review” *PLoS Medicine*, Vol. 7(7), 2010.) (S. Van de Velde et al., “Gender differences in depression in 23 European countries. Cross-national variation in the gender gap in depression” *Social Science & Medicine*, Vol. 71(2), 2010, pp. 305–13.) (E. Kross et al., “Social rejection shares somatosensory representations with physical pain” *PNAS*, Vol. 108(15), 2011, pp. 6270–5.) (K. Grewen et al., “Warm partner contact is related to lower cardiovascular reactivity”, *Behavioral Medicine*, Vol. 29(3), 2003, pp. 123–30.)

true that these children are treated worse by their parents, peers, and teachers, than are female children, while additionally handsome males are treated much better than are common males. In the social hierarchy of the typical western school, this leaves the bulk of the males at or near the bottom, far below the females and the more fortunate of the males.

Upon reaching adolescence, and especially in high school, a new array of torments enter the life of the common young man in full severity, as the traumatic and humiliating experiences of social and romantic abandonment begin. Perhaps he maintains a small circle of friends, or he simply has few or no friends at all, but in almost any case, he is not granted any access to a thriving and large community of close and socially active friends; and he is certainly not granted any access to intimacy with any of his female peers. In the exceptionally rare case that he is granted the latter, he is almost always only allowed to enter into fleeting and brief experiences. But those are only the most lucky of the common males, and for the greater part of that class, unending loneliness swiftly sinks its fangs into them, and proceeds to slowly drain out the vital essence from within.

During this sadistic deprivation, the dispossessed male is forced to observe as the more attractive and popular of his male peers proceed to feast themselves upon an endless banquet of thriving friendships, and vast quantities of warm, pulsating, voluptuous intimacy, which they receive not through any effort on their part, but simply due to their predetermined attractiveness, i.e. their height, and their face.

On the other hand, for the common male, the closest thing to intimacy which he is allowed to undergo is usually the twisted and debasing experience of watching graphic internet pornography through his phone screen, in the darkness of his room, late at night.

Upon being cut off from the very crucial developmental romantic experiences of adolescence, the common male psyche receives terrible and enduring damage.⁴⁹

In reaction to the initial trauma of severe romantic starvation that occurs generally in high school or around that time, a variety of responses are given by the countless unwitting members of the dispossessed. Many of them are traumatized and weakened so profoundly that they merely retreat into a life of almost complete solitude, hiding away in their rooms, and keeping largely to video games and other forms of escapism, in an effort to numb the chronic pain of their ongoing deprivation. The weaker of these types in their isolation often get severely addicted to pornography, and develop monstrous perversions (and their

⁴⁹ M-A. Boilard et al., "Sexuality (and Lack Thereof) in Adolescence and Early Adulthood: A Review of the Literature" *Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 6(1), 2016, p. 8.

situation is really the inverse reflection of that of the worst of the favoured males, who develop similar perversions, though out of excess instead of deprivation).

Some dispossessed males are afflicted by a certain pathology which is becoming more widespread, specifically within western nations; namely this is the mental illness which is characterized by the delusional belief that one is actually not of the sex which they objectively are.⁵⁰ A great number of these cases end in odious self-mutilation and suicide.

Many other males however, being relatively more mentally stable, and realizing to at least some degree how dire things really are for them, begin to seek out some way that can possibly lead them to their salvation, which is comprised of the attainment of consistent intimacy of a good quality, with a female partner that is genuinely interested in them.

To obtain this, the common male seeks to improve himself. The avenues of improvement which these males enter are those which are laid out openly in western society for any male wishing to socially advance; namely things along the lines of becoming wealthier, becoming more cultured, lifting weights, acting more confidently, dressing better; and other similar things which do not alter the core factors that truly decide male

⁵⁰ It is no coincidence that this phenomenon, along with other similar phenomena, almost exclusively arise amongst unattractive males that live in western societies. It is not, as many pretend, an autonomous choice, based on some vague notion of individual identity; but rather it is an involuntary pathology that physically exists within the bodily organ that is the human brain, and it arises from loneliness and/or social degradation – or in other words – the unfavourable biological conditions which are forcefully imposed upon the common male habitants of the hypergamy state. The reason that so many women are often so disproportionately and genuinely fervent to champion this pathology as something that is healthy for males, is because they detect unconsciously that it is improving things for them, namely by physically castrating a great number of unattractive males, and thereby ‘weeding out’ unwanted male genetic material that is perceived as being biologically inferior by them. They know, consciously or not, that an average looking young man who holds realistic views, and who has not castrated himself, is indeed a ‘threat’ to their wombs, while on the other hand a young man who has been castrated, and is pretending to be a woman, is not a threat to their wombs, for he is a mere eunuch, alike to the eunuchs who faithfully served the countless concubines of powerful rulers within the luxurious palaces of old. Thereby, women promote and gleefully endorse the horrible phenomenon of male self-mutilation (and everything related to the whole ‘LGBT’ ‘movement’); since it is not horrible to women, but is beneficial in the way that I have described. To the undeluded male, it is indeed horrible though, hence upon viewing its mutilated victims, we feel the same sense of palpable, involuntary disgust that one feels when viewing images of leprosy, or any other horrific pathology that gruesomely distorts the body. Here it is also worth mentioning that the bourgeois class greatly benefits from promoting the disease, as it means they make a great deal of money selling estrogen to, and performing countless ‘cosmetic surgeries’ (mutilations) on deluded males seeking to make themselves look like females, while they also profit greatly from the existence of a population of feminized males, who are more likely to spend wastefully on various products in the same manner that females so often do. The bourgeois class does not have to worry about how such a disease may lower birthrates, since as we have seen, at any time that they wish, they can simply import obscenely large numbers of immigrants in order to keep their enterprises growing. It can ultimately be said that in the same way that capitalists have always deceptively tried to pass off cheap and poisonous substitutes for the real thing, they are now trying to pass off mere eunuchs as real women.

attractiveness, which are a tall height, the handsomeness of the face, and race; or, in other words, things in which fertile females perceive actual genetic quality, because they are things which cannot be altered easily in nature, as opposed to the brand of clothing being worn, the level of engagement with the activity of weightlifting, and the amount of money possessed, which are all things that can be altered by most males with relative ease, and thereby do not signal very much if any actual genetic quality to females.⁵¹

And so it is that the dispossessed male, despite his genuine and manifold efforts to make himself more attractive, still finds himself continually unable to obtain intimacy, which he instead continually witnesses being given out in streaming abundance to the favoured males.

When he attempts to find success on dating apps, he doesn't get anywhere, for on such platforms he is not merely competing against the other males of his neighbourhood, but rather he competes in an impossible fight against uncountable legions of favoured males from across the earth. Facing the bitterness of failure, he often gives up wasting his time on such apps entirely, though some unfortunates end up spending huge sums of money on 'premium' services from these apps, which boost the profile visibility of the purchaser, but this is to no avail, as no amount of profile visibility can compensate for a lack of true genetic value in the eyes of females; and in any case, the common male remains dispossessed.

Some of these dispossessed end up being romantically abandoned for the rest of their lives, but for many others, as we know, they are not left entirely desolate of intimacy, but rather they find themselves in 'relationships' which some may consider to be even worse than complete abandonment. These partnerships form typically in the years after the dispossessed male obtains a steady job, and moves out of the home of his parents. Around that time, he does manage to find a partner, and to obtain intimacy. Despite this however, he has not obtained his salvation, for the intimacy that he has acquired is of a debased quality, and thereby not the same thing as the more pure intimacy that is received by the favoured.

But just how can this be? How, after so much effort, is he only given debased intimacy? This is, in truth, due to the common circumstances which have been described earlier in this chapter; which are, to reiterate, those in which the female must face up to the more stark realities of life, and in order to obtain stability, settle down with a common male whom she is not genuinely attracted to. In this way she leaves the embrace of those many favoured males who she actually is attracted to, and who she allowed for years on end to lecherously violate every part of her body. The favoured males do not mourn her exodus from their

⁵¹ Here I am not saying that physique is of no importance to females regarding mate selection, but rather I am saying that the vast majority of common men cannot become attractive through lifting weights. It also should be noted that tall and handsome males typically have healthy and well-built physiques without needing to set foot in a gym at all.

lives though, because they have no reason to wish to settle down with her, or to see her as anything other than just one easily replaceable concubine of many.

With that, a so-called 'relationship' forms, comprised of our hapless dispossessed male, and his bitter, dissatisfied, and jaded female 'partner'. Within such situations, the male is forced involuntarily to accept conditions that sane working males of any previous civilized age would have considered to be entirely unconscionable.

By this I mean that he is indeed forced, by his irrepressible biological compulsion to simply take whatever female partner he can acquire, to enter into a partnership with a female that exhibits one or more disagreeable characteristics that are the direct result of the sociobiological conditions of the hypergamy state, which have allowed her to indulge in inordinate hypergamy.

Some of the disagreeable characteristics of the average western woman in a relationship with the common western male appear as the following:

- 1: Frequent and cruel verbal abuse of her partner.
- 2: The abandonment of any or most efforts at making herself look attractive at all (efforts which she dutifully maintained previously, while she was being hypergamous with the favoured).
- 3: The allowing of herself to become flagrantly corpulent and/or generally unclean.
- 4: The mutilation and distortion of her body through piercings, excessive tattoos, and so-called 'cosmetic surgeries'.
- 5: The refusal to give her common male partner any children at all, or alternatively the begrudging acceptance of her partner's request, which is followed by her open neglect of and contempt for the children which she produced with the common male, who are children which she deems semiconsciously to be genetically inferior to those that she previously has produced or could have produced with any given male of the favoured class.
- 6: The forcing of her partner to raise her already existent children, which are the result of her previous hypergamous copulations with one or more favoured males (such situations have become exponentially more common with the advancement of the hypergamy state, and are now basically normal in many areas).
- 7: The outright refusal of the female to engage in copulation or even in any intimacy at all with her common male partner (which blatantly reveals the male to be a mere financial asset to her).
- 8: The unapologetic and lustful reminiscing of the female, openly and verbally, to the heartbreak and genuine disturbance of her current common partner, about her previous lurid sexual experiences with

favoured males (the existence of such a hypergamous past for the female is in itself a disagreeable characteristic).

9: The infidelity – open or clandestine – which is engaged in by the female with male members of the favoured sociobiological class.

10: Lastly, we have the final giving up at any faint pretension of a relationship, which occurs when either the male or the female initiates a divorce,⁵² which in turn almost always leads to a financial, emotional, familial, and generally severe catastrophe for the male, but not for the female, who usually finds herself with an improved monetary situation, as we have previously revealed.

It is indeed a reality that in the west today, for the common male, it is effectively all but impossible to enter into a relationship – if he can even enter into one at all – with a woman who does not exhibit one at the very least, but more likely several of the disagreeable characteristics that we have just examined.⁵³ Practically all women now spend the prime of their lives as the lecherous concubines of brutish scum, and we are then expected to marry them and support them financially once they grow too old to continue their depraved hedonism.

Such gruesome conditions would not have been remotely tolerated by the working males of classical, feudal, and renaissance societies; and yet we today, with all of our knowledge and technological advancement, have hitherto found ourselves in a state of nearly total submission to this unconscionable horror.⁵⁴

⁵² It is usually initiated by the female, who has a far lower ability to tolerate such marriages than the male does. (M. Rosenfeld, “Who wants the Breakup? Gender and Breakup in Heterosexual Couples” *Social Networks and the Life Course: Integrating the Development of Human Lives and Social Relational Networks*, Springer, 2018, pp. 221–43.) (American Sociological Association, “Women more likely than men to initiate divorces, but not non-marital breakups” *ScienceDaily*, 2015.) Regarding the latter work, note that the reason that women are not as likely to initiate non-marital breakups is because their non-marital partnerships (in western societies) are usually formed with favoured males that they are actually attracted to, and not common males whom they are merely using in order to obtain stability and mundane resources, as in the cases of many or most of their marriages. Hence, they are less willing to leave their favoured male boyfriends, and much more willing to leave their common male husbands.

⁵³ This is confirmed in Aaron Clarey’s *The Book of Numbers*, which he independently published in the year 2020. Note however that Clarey is of bourgeois class origin, and that therefore many of his views are accordingly compromised and dissolute. The relevant information within *The Book of Numbers* however is important, and holds true regarding western societies.

⁵⁴ “Perseus wore a magic cap so that the monsters he hunted down might not see him. We draw the magic cap down over our own eyes and ears so as to deny that there are any monsters.” (Karl Marx, op. cit., p. 91.)

Having no legalistic power himself, the common male upon being divorced ultimately finds himself in a situation that is rather alike to the one which his more isolated counterpart has found himself in, which is to say a realm of endlessly lonely desolation, a place that is freezing cold for lack of any of the warmth that intimacy provides. The male mind reacts to such woeful biological circumstances often by simply seeking an end to the searing pain through the act of suicide.⁵⁵ Males who do not succumb to this often live out the rest of their broken lives in quiet resignation and unspoken pain, facing alone all of the negative health effects that arise in human beings due to isolation and a lack of intimacy. In the few cases in which such males dare to speak up about the direness of their situations, they are met generally with the most pitiless and haughty of rebukes, from both other males and females; for in the hypergamy state, men are not socially allowed even to voice their sufferings, but are expected to take all of the brutal abuse in the world, and to simply continue devotedly serving in silence the vile system that has mercilessly defiled their very souls.

The only places which dispossessed males can retreat to in order to discuss their sufferings, are generally online forums, but even here, males who have no violent or illegal intent at all face heavy censorship and ridicule, simply for daring to talk about their problems.⁵⁶

Due to the present circumstances, it is the case that an entire library of forsaken texts could be created, its sprawling halls filled with countless shelves that each contain dozens of ponderous volumes, within which are written – at varying degrees of brevity – accounts of all of the nearly endless individual cases of unfortunate males, whose only ‘crime’ was being born as a male of average genetic composition within a western country during recent times – a transgression for which their lives were brutally and insidiously degraded to a horrific degree, through the excessive and continual application of a poisonous concoction of involuntary loneliness and systemic degradation. And of course, all of this is to say nothing of the many unfortunates who were not common males, or even human beings, but whose lives were mercilessly and brutally destroyed due to the machinations of the capitalist hypergamy state nonetheless.

We have thus far examined the general results of the present hypergamous mode of intimacy, and in doing so we have achieved a greater degree of understanding as to the true nature of the state of western

⁵⁵ It has been confirmed that in western countries, suicide is far more likely to be committed by males than by females, while in non-western nations, males are only slightly more likely than females to commit suicide. (P. Värnik, “Suicide in the World” *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, Vol. 9(3), 2012, pp. 760–1.) Also important is the reality that suicide rates have steeply increased over the decades in several western countries, including the United States; while worldwide, the demographic that is invariably the most vulnerable to suicide is males of the proletariat.

⁵⁶ Make no mistake, the most voiceless, exploited, marginalized, forgotten, despised, abandoned, and oppressed group within western society is objectively and undeniably common males. NOT women, NOT homosexuals, and NOT black people, but simply dispossessed proletarian males of all ethnicities collectively. It is we, and not anyone else, who have faced the worst conditions, and the most suffering, while also having the lowest amount of support and organized advocacy.