

Women as the New Nobility: Feminism, the Rule of Fear and Contempt for Thought

Matthew Raphael Johnson
Johnstown, PA

I came to this discipline precisely on January 1 1990. My mentality at the time was naive: I believed that, if I possessed enough facts and could verbalize them in a rational order, I would not only win the debate but eventually, convert my opponent. I assumed, in other words, that people care about the truth. I no longer hold to that view: people demand to hear what serves their interest. Generally speaking, the honest portrayal of truth will, at some point, have you assaulted in public.

One of the county bar associations in Pennsylvania asked me to write a summary and analysis of major recent cases on “Protection From Abuse” orders and the means whereby these orders are signed by defendants. They were concerned that almost 97% of these were signed by the defendant without a hearing even though it means the loss of his home, children and most of his income. It is often treated as a criminal conviction though it is only a civil case. I was shocked by not only the laws and case law concerning these orders, but the tricks that are used to force men, especially the poor, to sign them without argument.¹

This assignment required me to interview men at these hearings and ask them about their motivations. In late 2015, I went to the county courthouse and asked the defendants their story. They were overjoyed that finally, someone was willing to listen to them. They were almost all very poor males and none had lawyers defending them. I was surprised that they didn't know the difference between civil and criminal law or that judicial proceedings were public. They were not guaranteed a lawyer because these are civil cases, but they were all convinced regardless that it is a criminal trial.

On the other hand, the women are granted a free lawyer (on permanent retainer for life) and are actually dressed up by the feminist group supplying them. They are given lines to memorize and all are told to cry on the stand. However, it is very rare that they ever get that far. Many defense attorneys are loathe to challenge the local feminists.

I struck up a conversation with a very young-looking man, poorly dressed, wearing a terrified, pale expression. He looked like he was about to vomit. He was all alone and seemed younger than 18. He must have just come from his shop because he was wearing greasy work clothes and he had clearly made no preparations of any kind for his court date.

I approached him and asked if he was OK. He told me that he and his girlfriend just had a baby. Tiring of him, she issued a PFA against him without cause, warning or warrant. No evidence is required for these in the state of Pennsylvania.² The day after it was issued, her new

1 It does differ by country, with some judges being stricter than others. On the rare occasions these orders are denied, it is because a) the woman does not show to the hearing, b) the couple is reconciled, c) the man kills himself or d) the woman's testimony is so manifestly irrational that the judge gets suspicious. I failed to find a single case where the PFA was rejected because the evidence of the circumstance favored the male.

2 DeHaas v. DeHaas, (Pa. Super. 1998); Buchhalter v. Buchhalter, (Pa. Super. 2008); McCance v. McCance (Pa.

boyfriend moved in to his house. The restraining order forced him to pay \$750 each month in child support or face prison. His ex quit her job and now both partners live off his forced support. When I asked what he makes here in a month, he say “about \$850 or so before taxes.”

Worse, his ex-girlfriend now gets a free lawyer, free and unobstructed access to all social services (she cannot be turned down for welfare programs), and free weekly counseling. If his ex had any moral qualms about what she had done, there are a battery of counselors there to justify it and give their official sanction to her “act of self defense.” This young man was too small to be a threat to anyone but the most anorexic. I refused to believe he had done anything wrong, especially when he told me there was no criminal case concurrent to this.

I discovered that when a woman claims she was assaulted by her mate, police are constrained to arrest regardless of probable cause. The condition of bail is always that he cannot return to his home and he cannot have any contact with the “victim.” He is presumed guilty. The question arose: if this is the condition of bail, why use the PFA? If this woman had been assaulted, why not get him arrested? The answer was clear: that the young man never hurt a soul. A criminal case requires evidence, unlike a PFA. A criminal case will at least guarantee him a minimum of state-sponsored legal assistance. Furthermore, a PFA can contain a support order as well, meaning that a woman can pad her income merely by making this claim without evidence. Worse, her victim must pay all court costs and no cost can accrue to the claimant by law. Almost always, she never needs to testify or face cross-examination.

All manner of trickery is used to get the ignorant victim, usually a man never before in trouble, to sign and accept his fate. In Indiana County PA, it is common, for example, for the local feminist “victim advocacy” organization to use blackmail. They tell the terrified man that they will not leak this case to his employer if he just signs the PFA without a hearing. Elsewhere, he's told that he can sign it “without admission of guilt,” implying that a PFA is tantamount to a criminal conviction. Of course, no guilt is assumed regardless, as this is a civil matter and has no (official) punitive purpose. It is a rhetorical trick to ensure their client never needs to testify.

Quite literally, the woman does not need to spend a penny or life a finger to destroy her mate's life, assure herself an income, receive endless sympathy and control the behavior of her ex. She becomes a member of a noble class that has immediate access to all social welfare, highly motivated and specialized legal representation and weekly free counseling that exists solely to justify her actions.³

It is men who pass these laws and it is men who justify them. This proves that women rule absolutely. When men pass these laws even they realize that they might well be the victim of them, female rule is complete and without historical precedent. A man is not secure in his home or in his property if a women is living with him. Muscular, powerful women, when attacked by weaker men, are seen as helpless victims.

This is just one example of not merely female dominance, but their utter irresponsible totalitarian domination of men. Women live almost a decade longer than men. They control almost all personal (that is, disposable) wealth, and are now almost 60% of all college graduates. Even wealthy women are automatically promoted and hired through affirmative action. Women suffer about 5% of all work related fatalities or accidents. They are victims of only 30% of all violent crimes. Men are sentences far more harshly than women for the same crime in the justice

Super. 2006) and *Ferri v. Ferri* (Pa. Super. 2004) are four of many Pennsylvania cases establishing that no evidence is required for a PFA. All that is required is that the woman utter the words “I fear this man.” No violence need be alleged and no injuries are needed for proof.

3 See my paper on “Victorian Feminism” for the legal cases and authorities for these claims. In the state of PA for example, no evidence at all is required for a Protective Order, only the exhibition of fear.

system at all levels. Two-thirds of all health care dollars are spent on women. Men, unsurprisingly, almost all white, commit 90% of all suicides.

Feminism as an ideology does not demand power, it is a manifestation of power long institutionalized. It is a means to maintain power. The question here is why did feminism emerge when it did as a dominant ideological force unchallenged in academia. Female academics are often absurdly ignorant. This is not because they are inherently idiots, but because they have no need or incentive to study. The better looking the woman, the more privilege she receives. She can walk into any cocktail party, sit down, cross her legs and hold court: dozens of men will be there fighting one another to give her money and jobs.

We don't see feminism in the Roman Empire, Egypt or Ming China. Why did feminism develop? The reason is that capitalism required wages to fall. Feminism came into existence at the same time as immigration laws were relaxed. This was also the height of union power and the zenith of male wages in the US. American males, from the capitalist point of view, were doing too well. Capitalism created feminism, "anti-racism" and mass immigration. It served their interest in obvious ways, but the clearest and most fundamental way was to lower labor costs and discourage cooperation.

The example of the Pennsylvania "Domestic Violence" laws above is considered mild by national standards. It is proof beyond doubt that the US is a violent gynocracy. It is proof that women, especially if they are attractive and not too obese, are an aristocracy with more power than any that ever existed. The question, however, is where did it come from? How did such an absurd view get the support of all elites and both parties?

Feminists Teresa Amott and Hester Eisenstein, writing separate studies, both came to the conclusion that feminism is largely a means for corporate America to "remain competitive" by lowering labor costs. Further, Eisenstein adds that the weakening of unions was a part of this. Male-dominated unions both kept wages high and controlled the labor pool for an industry. Breaking the unions meant that more part-time and new female workers (let alone immigrants) can move into an industry, drastically cutting labor costs. It was a diabolically brilliant idea that was based on crass self-interest while able to pose as the most selfless of idealisms.

Teresa Amott notes:

Hiring women was a central part of the corporate strategy to restore profitability because women were not only cheaper than men, but were also less likely to be organized into unions and more willing to accept temporary work and no benefits. This led to what has been previously held only by men and as jobs that were already predominantly female became even more so (Amott 1993, 50).

The fact that feminist ideology developed precisely at the very height of male wage growth and unionization in the late 1960s is not a coincidence. This is also the beginnings of rapid globalization and when the recovery of Japan and Germany began to challenge American dominance.

Although I am obviously not arguing for a return to dependence on men and marriage as the only options for women, I think it necessary to acknowledge that the independence won in the 1970s and 1980s came at a high price: the abolition of the family wage, both as a reigning ideology and as a reality at least for high-paid male workers, and an extended period of wage stagnation for

all workers. Even though the family wage concept may have been patriarchal, it was a wage norm that acknowledged the need to support “dependents.” In the low-wage economy that replaced it, no such concept remained (Eisenstein, 2009: 117).

She never tells us what she is arguing for. The American economy permitted a single blue-collar job to support a family, even in urban areas, up until 1970. This was intolerable to the Anglo-Jewish elite. In the early 1970s, profits could only be increased by lowering labor costs and increasing labor productivity. Rises in technology were augmented with bringing in millions of women and immigrants (of all backgrounds) into the labor force. Only recently has it occurred to the feminist movement that when one increases the supply of an x, the price of that x will go down. The articles cited in this paper are an admission of an obvious reality 30 years too late.

Feminists have been forced to grasp the truth that they are a cynical capitalist creation to lower costs. Absurdly illogical arguments were made in the late 1960s such that women's family life was “oppressive” while entering the workforce meant “liberation.” Women were considered “oppressed” as they sent men off to prison on a whim. The man in his cell would fully agree and speak of the terrible treatment of the female race.

Men, fearful of female disapproval, hid from the discussion or overcompensated, accepting these irrational arguments. All the major movements of the era: civil rights, feminism and immigration, all had the strange consequence of increasing the number of both workers and consumers. Wages began to stagnate and then, in real terms, fall. When interest, debt service and taxes are considered, wages plummeted. That's not a coincidence. Feminism is a mystification.

The admission of these facts destroys the 40 year old narrative of these movements. The “family wage” was that wage that a single, blue-collar male could make to support a family. Health care was a fringe benefit and most companies had on-site doctors. Ruth Milkman notes that the family wage was intolerable from the capitalist point of view. It was slowly destroyed

after the expansion of the female labor force had exhausted the supply of single, divorced, and widowed women, so that married women and even mothers were incorporated into the labor force in large numbers. . . In the inflationary 1960s and 1970s. . . the expanded demand ‘pulling women into the labor market came to be supplemented by a new family economics ‘pushing women out of the home.’ The resurgence of feminism in the 1960s and its increasing popularity in the 1970s created “a new egalitarian ideology... proclaiming womens' right to equal treatment in the labor market (Milkman 1987, 121).

Men fear women. With a few exceptions, puberty is a time when all movements of a male brain are dedicated to impressing this aristocracy: the goddess gynocracy. The alternative is social isolation and crushing self-hate. Attractive women have money (almost literally) thrown at them on a daily basis. They are sentenced for crimes far lower than men and a movement exists to stop charging women for criminal activity altogether. There is no rule of law concerning domestic violence and restraining orders destroy men' lives without proof or evidence. These laws are passed by men knowing that it might be turned on them. They respond by demanding stricter punishments. Such power is unknown in history.

One example is the false claim that “women make less than men.” Despite this being disproved over and over, corporate media, highly concentrated in a few firms, maintains this

without deviation. Why? The truth is easily available:

Among college-educated, never-married individuals with no children who worked full-time and were from 40 to 64 years old— that is, beyond the child-bearing years— men averaged \$40,000 a year in income, while women averaged \$47,000. But, despite the fact that women in this category earned more than men in the same category, gross income differences in favor of men continue to reflect differences in work patterns between the sexes, so that women and men are not in the same categories to the same extent (Farrell, 2005: 16-17).

There, like in all other areas, women are a privileged caste. Once all relevant variables are taken into consideration, women make far more than men. Once hired, men live in fear of them. One, solitary complaint that might be overheard by an authority figure can paralyze the institution. Not only can the state then take action against the firm, but more commonly, corporate-funded groups like the ACLU or the local feminist advocacy group can also provide the legal help to destroy her male rivals. This is defended by the corporate elite.

Barabra Reskin makes the startling claim:

Corporations were now free to substitute female for male labor wherever they saw fit. The national press in the 1980s celebrated the unprecedented entrance of women into a range of formerly male-dominated jobs, from executive and lawyer to pharmacist, bartender, bus driver, and baker. But a careful examination of these changes showed that in nearly every case of such “breakthroughs,” the switch from male to female labor was a decision by management responding to pressures to become more competitive (Reskin and Roos, 1990: 40).

American capitalists were boosting profits in several ways. First, technology was making American workers highly productive while there was no concomitant decrease in hours worked. A “labor saving” device did not shorten the work day, but just increased the demands a boss can make on a worker in a eight hour period.

Second, globalization permitted firms to set up manufacturing in the third world, so both technology and production could be outsources for a fraction of its former costs. Third, in outsourcing, unionization was destroyed, since the threat of moving the company overseas was always present. Labor ceased making any real demands.

Third, feminism was created to lower labor costs at home. Susan Thistle writes:

Economists have long recognized that the development of new regions and the conversion of nonwage workers into wage workers can create great profits, leading corporations to set up factories overseas. To understand the gains of the past forty years, we must realize that a similar lucrative process was happening within the United States itself, in the very center of American homes. As the market reached into kitchens and bedrooms, turning many household tasks into work for pay, and as women themselves applied labor freed from domestic chores in research labs, hospital's, factories, and fast food restaurants, productivity rose greatly and a large new pool of income was created. (Thistle 2006: 112).

Fourth, immigration of both high and low wage labor would increase downward pressure on wages and, like globalization, make unionization a thing of the past. Put crudely: it was all a scam. Issues were invented, groups financed and media consolidated. A single mantra was promoted that, in consequence, led to a massive increase in the labor pool available to companies.

Fifth, immigration has the consequence of diluting the unity of its target country. A deeply divided country is easy to control, since one group can be mobilized against another. Workers can be mixed and matched so they will not cooperate with one another. Media will invent, exaggerate and lie about racial incidents to maintain a constant sense of tension and white insecurity so as to prevent any demand on their part for better treatment.

Immigration works on the same principle. In truth, the US would not be harmed in the least if not a single new immigrant was ever admitted, ever. This has been true for 100 years at least. However, mass immigration has been instigated and defended by both major parties and all segments of the elite. The Republican party is willing to throw the 2016 election in order to maintain their support for unlimited mass immigration. Since this is not a daily occurrence, it shows that the forces operating on these characters is overwhelming.

There is no labor shortage in the US. Males alone can do all the necessary work, but that would lead to such a massive spike in wages that the leftist regime is taken as permanent. This is proof that the US is totalitarian, where every single word or gesture must be monitored. The accusation of wrongdoing is sufficient to establish guilt in the popular mind and that alone will destroy a life (and lead to suicide, a pandemic among white males).

This paper has shown that the left is a corporate creation designed to suppress wages. While focused on feminism, immigration was briefly mentioned as well to show the systematic nature of the problem. However, the feminist issue is far more powerful because immigrants do not hold the self-esteem of males in the palm of their hand. This adolescent fear of humiliation means that male lawmakers and elites – even apart from financial concerns – will never challenge the gynocracy and will happily go off to prison rather than reject the official narrative.

Bibliography

Rush, NM (2014) Who Are You Rooting For? George Borjas on the Economics of Immigration. An Issue Brief by Nayla M. Rush, Senior Researcher 2014 FAIR

Julie L. Hotchkiss and Myriam Quispe-Agnoli, "The Labor Market Experience and Impact of Undocumented Workers," Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, June 2008 (Working Paper).

Milkman, B. (1987) Women Workers and the Labor Movement in Hard Times: Comparing the 1930s with the 1980s. Pp. 111-131 in Women, Households, and the Economy, edited by Lourdes Beneria and Catharine R. Stimpson. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press

Thistle, Susan (2006) From Marriage to the Market: The Transformation of Women's Lives and Work. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press

Reskin, Barbara, and Patricia A. Roos. (1990) Job Queues, Gender Queues: Explaining Women's Inroads into Male Occupations. Philadelphia: Temple University Press

George Borjas, Increasing the Supply of Labor Through Immigration. Center for Immigration Studies, April 2004

Farrell, Warren (2005) Why Men Earn More: The Startling Truth behind the Pay Gap and What Women Can Do About It. Amacom

Eisenstein, Hester (2009) Feminism Seduced: How Global Elites Use Women's Labor and Ideas to Exploit the World. Paradigm Publishers