

PULL OUT

ARVIN VOHRA

CHAPTER 1:

Lessons of our Forefathers

It has become common in the men's movement to seek to turn back the clock, to attempt to recreate the past. Some men believe that if we act the way men did in the past, we'll regain some lost greatness. That idea is insanely stupid.

During the revolutionary war, the British soldiers dressed in bright red and lined up in nice, orderly, parade style ranks. They got slaughtered by the guerilla tactics of the American revolutionaries. An empire at the height of its power got defeated by a randomly trained, ragtag group that could barely be classified as an army.

Can you imagine an army today using the tactics the British used back then? Can you imagine a modern general saying, "This is what the British did at the height of their empire; let's do that now!"

Obviously not. It's a tactic that everyone knows doesn't work, and everyone knows how to defeat.

What men did in the past didn't work. It was a strategy that failed then, against an inexperienced, restricted opponent. In the past, women faced every kind of obstacle, including lack of voting rights, social and legal barriers to working, and cultural barriers to speaking out. Despite all that, they overwhelmed the male culture at the time. Our current situation, of being silenced on campuses, of being forced to pay for the products of paternity fraud, of being denied access to our own children, of being psychologically beaten down in marriages, is the proof.

Part of that comes from the effectiveness of the strategies used against men. But most of it comes from the sheer ineffectiveness of the strategies used by men. The men of the past had a monopoly on voting, business, family power, and law. Despite those huge advantages, they still lost. That's how bad their strategy was. With every advantage imaginable, they still lost.

The men of the past are not role models. They are incompetent failures. They are historical laughingstocks from whom we can only learn what not to do.

Their failures did not come from bad luck. They came from bad thinking.

Instead of trying to adapt and innovate quickly, they clung to their decaying institutions. When they should have been innovating faster than their opponents, they instead sought to maintain increasingly meaningless legal and social systems.

The men of the past insisted on every kind of ignorance and every kind of dependency. Some decided that it was masculine to literally be dependent on others for food, and refused to learn how to survive on their own. Obviously, a man who can't prepare his own food is dependent, and in a relative position of negotiating weakness.

Even when they tried to rebel, they did so with laughable ineffectualness. For example, various rebellions against marriage have been going on for decades. The men who played with the ideas of those rebellions figured everything out...except any effective way to have and raise kids outside of marriage. Their rebellions never amounted to anything, because they didn't think them through. Sure, men found ways to enjoy some freedom in their 20s. But they never knew how they would have kids. So, when they did have kids, they had them on someone else's terms. To see what that looks like, feel free to visit family court, or talk to men whose ex wives use their kids as

financial weapons against them. Or talk to men whose ex wives use other people's kids, products of paternity fraud, against them.

We do not need to repeat the mistakes of the men of the past, or use their failed strategies. We don't need to do what they did, because what they did failed, even when they had every possible advantage. If we use that now, we will just fail faster.

Instead, we need to do what they failed to do. We need to replace their blind acceptance of cultural norms with a brutal analysis and questioning. We need to replace their total lack of awareness with vigilance. We need to replace their constant desire for cultural approval with an indifference to the approval of others.

The "strategy" used by men of the past combined blind acceptance of social norms and a willful ignorance of economics and psychology with a dependency on social approval. They adopted a mentality of, at most, weak willed resistance to change. They clung desperately and blindly to the past, like people who haven't figured out their jobs have been made obsolete by technology.

Instead of clinging to the past, they should have fought for a better future. Instead of standing still, they should have forged ahead. Instead of looking backwards, they should have imagined a better future for us.

They were unwilling, or more likely unable, to challenge the institutions they clung to. (Just to be clear, they were unable because they were too small minded and stupid). While the movements that succeeded re-imagined every part of society from economics to sex, men clung to a fading past of disintegrating institutions.

We need to be better than they were. When they lost, they had every possible advantage. We don't have that now. Our strategy, our mindset, needs to be a thousand times more effective than anything they could have considered. We need to act with incisive intelligence

and unshakeable discipline. Our weapons are our minds and our awareness, and those weapons must be sharpened. We need to think more deeply than they were willing to, challenge everything men of the past held sacred, and devise new strategies, rather than reminiscing about obsolete ones.

The next section looks at economics, one of the many areas in which men of the past failed, and how it shapes our culture. Men of the past supported every kind of ill-considered economic view, from mercantilism to New Deal welfarism. Of course, there were great economists in the past. Adam Smith was certainly one. But those men were the exceptions. Today, thanks to the incompetence, timidity, and myopia of men of the past, we now face cultural and economic defeat.

CHAPTER 2:

Symptoms of Defeat

The rising occurrences of men being silenced on college campuses, robbed in court, forced into small corners of houses they pay for, and stripped of their realities are not unrelated coincidences. They are symptoms of defeat.

They are not even particularly unusual symptoms of defeat. They are the most standard symptoms of defeat that exist.

Native Americans, after being defeated, were robbed of their land, forced onto small reservations, and stripped of their social reality. Their religion and language were gradually erased, and their kids were forced into school systems that didn't fit. They were subjected to wave after wave of missionary attempts to "fix" their culture, "fix" their religion, "fix" them. Their ways of being and thinking were almost entirely eliminated, and they were forced into molds that they believed were foreign, uncomfortable, and false.

Thousands of years ago, when the Aryan tribes conquered the Dravidian tribes in what we now call India, the same thing happened. The Dravidians were forced into a religion and caste system that treated them worse than dogs, denied their entire understanding of reality, and separated them from their prior way of life.

In these cases, and many like them, an initial military victory paved the way for cultural conquest. But in the case of men, there was no major military defeat. Instead, it began with a fundamental economic change: the loss of male ability to withhold economic resources. Men lost their economic right to say no.

Male power comes from economic power. That power is the power to either give or withhold economic resources. A man can provide for the mother of his offspring, and not provide for the mother of someone else's offspring. He can choose to whom he gives his resources, and whom he denies.

Let's look at how that has worked in marriage. If we strip away sentimentalism to reveal the underlying economic truth, for most of the last centuries, marriage has been an exchange of resources for sex and reproduction. To put it in the bluntest way possible, women have provided sex and reproduction, and men have provided resources.

Traditionally in the west, this was a total exchange. The man gave all of his resources to one woman and the offspring she produced, and the woman gave all of her sex and reproduction to one man. Women were expected to be virgins at marriage, and men were expected to provide for one woman, and the offspring they produced. A non-virgin was considered ruined and unmarriageable, and a man who couldn't provide was also considered unmarriageable. Men provided total resource fidelity, and women provided total sexual fidelity.

Note that this was an exchange of male resource fidelity for female sexual fidelity. It was not an exchange of sexual fidelity for sexual fidelity. For example, a man's having an affair was not considered grounds for divorce. However, if the wife had extramarital sex, it was definitely considered grounds for a divorce.

Most Christian cultures followed this type of monogamy. Other cultures found other methods that worked for them. Islam allowed a man to have up to four wives, as long as he could provide. If the man was not a fornicator (meaning, if he was a virgin, or had only had sex inside of a marriage), then it was only appropriate for him to marry virgins. He also had to provide for them equally. Again, it was an exchange of resources for sex and procreation.

In most cultures, though not all, the exchange was of resources for sex and procreation. Many men and women have attempted to argue that this is because men are inherently better at providing. In the modern era, this isn't really true, and I honestly doubt it was ever as true as many men would argue. It also doesn't really matter whether men are better at providing or not. What matters is that they are really bad at producing children.

In economics, we talk about absolute advantage and relative advantage. Suppose a lawyer can type 100 words a minute, and he also knows how to practice law. Suppose there is also a secretary who can type 40 words per minute.

The lawyer has an absolute advantage in typing and practicing law. He is better at both. However, he still might hire the secretary. While the secretary types slower than the lawyer, the lawyer's time is better spent on the more in-demand process of practicing law. He might make \$1000/hour doing that. Even though the secretary types slower, it makes sense for the lawyer to pay the secretary \$10/hour to do the typing.

In this situation, we say that the secretary has a relative advantage in typing. Even though he is slower at typing than the lawyer is, he is so much worse at law that it makes sense for him to dedicate his limited skills to typing.

He's a slower typer, but even so, he still spends his time typing.

Now let's consider that in the male-female marriage example. Suppose the woman is better at making money and also better at producing offspring. What should the man do?

Obviously, he should still focus on providing resources. It would make zero sense for him to focus on producing offspring. He can't do that.

Can he raise kids while the woman is the breadwinner? Sure. But that's just a different type of resource being provided. He's providing time, care, and effort. All the man can do is provide resources - money, time, skills, etc. The magic of procreation is out of his reach.

I know that the men of the past insisted that a man who raised kids was not a real man, but given that those men were defeated by a restricted opponent, I'm going to go ahead and ignore their views.

Because men can only provide resources, their only source of power is economic. Women have reproductive power, sexual power, and economic power. Men have only economic power.

Even if women made 100 times as much as men do on average, universally eliminating economic power would hurt men more. It would mean that they have no power sources at all left. Using the lawyer and secretary example, it would be as if typing robots were invented. They would replace the only skill the secretary had. The lawyer would still have other abilities; the secretary would be powerless.

Only women can bear children. In a market sense, the sexual demand for women is greater than the sexual demand for men. An average woman could find 100 willing male sex partners a day. An average man probably could not find 100 willing female sex partners a day.

Let's take a moment to define what power actually is, in the sense of economic, reproductive, or sexual power. As used here, power means:

- Having something that people want
- Having the ability to decide who gets it and doesn't get it.

Suppose that the second criteria, the ability to say yes or no, was removed. It would, at the very least, neutralize the power. More likely, it would turn it into a liability.

Look at the parallel for women's sexual power. Suppose that women could not turn men down for sex. Then the last thing you would want to be is an attractive or fertile woman. You'd spend all day either evading rape or getting raped.

If economic power were similarly neutralized, having resources would be meaningless. The ability to create or provide resources would not give you any advantage if everyone could immediately take them from you. You'd spend all day either avoiding robbery, or just getting robbed.

The ability to say "yes" or "no" is fundamental to power. If you cannot say no, then you have been disempowered. Power is the power to say "no".

What would happen if only economic power was neutralized? Would it affect men and women equally? After all, in the modern world, both men and women have economic power.

The problem is that men have only economic power. If economic power is taken from everyone, then it leaves men with no power, and women with some power. The only scarce resources that men can possibly have power over are economic ones.

Some people have argued that men have reproductive power as well, since a woman can't really get pregnant without a man's sperm. But this ignores basic arithmetic. A woman can get pregnant and produce a child, at most, once every nine months. A man can theoretically impregnate several women a day. Sperm is nowhere near as scarce as entire pregnancy cycles. Women control the scarce resource.

Some have similarly argued that men can have sexual power as well. To some extent that's true. Very attractive men are often in demand. But let's look at the actual numbers.

Online dating has given us plenty of data on the subject. According to an October 2016 article from CNET, men on Tinder swipe

right 46 percent of the time, while women swipe right only 14 percent of the time. Women's sexuality is over 3 times more in demand than men's.

Male power comes from economic power. Our current disempowerment comes from economic disempowerment. We have lost our economic ability to say "no".

CHAPTER 3:

Power is the Power to Say No.

Let me ask you this: can a man today choose to withhold or deny resources?

A divorced man cannot. Unless he has a strong prenuptial agreement, he will be forced to pay alimony. No matter what, he will be forced to pay child support. In fact, in many states, he will be forced to pay child support even if he has been cuckolded, and the child is not biologically his.

In recent years, men in Texas, Oklahoma, Michigan, and other states have been forced to pay tens of thousands in child support - after having DNA evidence prove that they weren't the father.

Some of these cases are truly bizarre. Gabriel Cornejo was accused by a long past ex girlfriend of being the father of her child. The DNA test showed that he wasn't. The state of Texas still declared that he owed \$65,000 in back payment. Why? The law stated that he had to pay child support from the time of birth up to the point that the paternity test proved that he was not the father!

Carnell Alexander was ordered to pay \$30,000 for a child that wasn't his, and that he didn't know about. Why? The mother put his name on a hospital form. He never knew about that, or about the child, until he was pulled over for some minor traffic stop. Suddenly, he was being arrested for failure to pay child support for a kid he had never known, and did not father. Even after DNA tests proved his innocence, he was still ordered to pay. Why? He didn't challenge

the paternity within 3 years of the child's birth. Given that he had no reason to know about the child, that was an insane requirement.

In a 2015 issue of the Akron Law Review, Vanessa S. Browne-Barber listed her findings about legally disestablishing paternity in the U.S. The results are shocking. She writes:

“The majority of jurisdictions require disestablishment actions to be brought within a stipulated period of time. These statutory limitations range from a requirement to file a petition within three years of the birth of the child or, alternatively, within three years of the time that the presumptive or legal father knew or reasonably should have known that another man is the father of the child.”

In other words, in many states, men only have 3 years from the birth of the child to sue for disestablishment. If you wait longer than that, you have to pay child support until age 18, even if you can prove that the child is not yours.

Remember all the times your teachers, counselors, doctors, and college advisors warned you about that? Neither do I. This rampant abuse of men's natural rights is ignored by the institutions that are supposed to protect you. Most men don't know that they have a limited time window.

Note that if a woman waits more than 3 years to tell you about the existence of a child, as happened with Carnell Alexander, then you might be totally screwed. You might literally be forced, by the state, to pay child support for a child that has nothing to do with you. If she writes your name on the hospital form, you might become financially responsible for a kid that has nothing to do with you.

According to Denver family law attorney Ron Litvak, who was interviewed by ABC news after a Colorado father was also forced to pay for a child he discovered wasn't his, “It's very rare that a court will

ever allow someone to terminate their parental rights unless someone else is willing to step into that role.”

This isn't just the millions of men who are unknowingly paying for a child that is not theirs. These are situations in which the courts know that the child isn't the man's, and are forcing him to pay anyway. In state after state, cuckolded men are being forced to pay for the products of paternity fraud, even after that fraud has been determined. Instead of punishing the women who committed the fraud, they are punishing the men who are the victims. The men who were the victims of the crime are being punished by the state.

In the most backwards parts of the world, women are punished for being raped. Instead of punishing the rapists, those countries punish the victims.

Despite America's supposed enlightenment, our supposed civilized state, our role as the country that other countries should look to as an example, we are doing something disturbingly similar to men. The men who are getting defrauded are then being punished by the state. The state is punishing the victim, and then rewarding the fraud! The women who commit the fraud get monetarily rewarded. As far as I know, in backwards parts of the world that punish rape victims, the rapists don't then get a monetary reward from the victims.

But the fact is, even men that have absolutely nothing to do with a particular woman or child can still no longer choose to withhold resources. You have no choice in the matter. Through taxation, your money is going to pay for the care of children you had nothing to do with. It's not just food stamps and welfare. It's public schools. It's college subsidies.

As a man, your economic power has become increasingly meaningless. This is not because women can now work, and thus don't

need a man. It's because even women who do not work can get your resources with ease.

In the current situation, the cuckolded man isn't really the one who has it the worst. He at least got some value from the adulteress. Maybe he got some sexual enjoyment or some companionship. Everyone else is far worse off than he is. The rest of us have to pay for her childcare, but get absolutely nothing in exchange. We're all getting tricked into paying for every woman. We cannot choose to withhold resources. The woman doesn't even need to bother sexually deceiving anyone. She doesn't have to date you and lie to you about her other men on the side. She just needs to have kids, and she gets your money.

In the current situation, you are being cuckolded by every woman with kids in America (excluding those that homeschool or use private school). You are being tricked into paying for her kids; she is cuckolding you effortlessly. She doesn't need to lift a finger to make it happen. She's getting your resources, and providing you with nothing.

One may argue that eliminating that ability to withhold resources affects women as well. And that's true. Economically productive women are losing the leverage that comes from the ability to grant or withhold resources. But they are still maintaining control over their sexual and reproductive value. They've lost some of their power, since they can no longer withhold resources. But they've kept some of their power, since they can still produce offspring. They still at least have some leverage.

Men, on the other hand, have lost the only kind of power they had: the ability to withhold or grant resources. Thus disarmed, men have been conquered in one area after another. In culture, in colleges, in schools, men have been beaten down, all negotiating power stripped away.

Today, quite a few men realize what has happened, but they feel fundamentally trapped, not just by law and culture, but by limited possibilities. They feel that the only possible arrangements are the exchange of resources for sex and reproduction, or the current situation, in which men give up resources in exchange for nothing.

But that's nowhere close to true. A casual glance at history and nature easily shows us alternatives. For example, you can have situations in which men provide zero resource fidelity, and women provide zero sexual fidelity. The bonobos monkeys are a classic example. These highly sexual monkeys have absolutely no concept of sexual fidelity. No male monkey has any reason to believe any particular child is his. Thus, male bonobos provide nothing for children at all; the females take care of that on their own. The male bonobos pursue casual sex, forage enough to feed themselves, and then just laze around all day.

You can have a proportional solution. Men differ vastly in their ability to provide resources. Some men are billionaires. Others barely make enough to get by. Women, on the other hand, don't differ as hugely in their ability to provide sexual fidelity.

Recognizing this, in many human cultures men could have as many women as they could support. For example, wealthy merchants might have a few wives; kings might have hundreds. This was described in the Bible, in various Eastern histories, and continues to this day in many parts of the world.

In this situation, each woman's sexual fidelity captures a certain amount of resources. Instead of all of a woman's sexual fidelity being exchanged for all of a man's resource fidelity, a woman's sexual fidelity has a market value. Men buy as many sexual fidelities as they can afford.

The worst situations are sex slavery, in which a woman provides sexual fidelity in exchange for nothing, and manual slavery, in which a man provides resources in exchange for nothing.

The latter is what we have now. You're working several months of the year just to pay for other people's offspring. Half of your earnings are used to pay for every kind of childcare program for kids who are not yours. You've become accustomed to it. But it's obviously not the only way things can be.

Many of the above solutions have obvious issues. The current culture is highly indoctrinated against paternity testing, parents who live separately, and polygamy. Furthermore, men often prefer to know that a child is theirs, and to care for it, so a bonobos arrangement might not be ideal. But the fact is, there are many alternatives that could be fought for and won. Refusing to fight so we can continue to be slaves is the only definitively idiotic option.

CHAPTER 4:

We're All "Cucks"

Recently, many political conservatives have been using the word "cuck" to describe basically any male they don't like. Cuck is short for "cuckold", but in current slang it has completely lost its meaning. It reminds me of when "gay" was a common slang term for anything that the speaker disliked, even if that thing had nothing at all to do with homosexuality (e.g. "It's so gay that we have a math test right before spring break.")

The word "cuckold" comes from the behavior of the cuckoo bird. This bird lays its eggs in the nests of other birds. Those birds go through the effort of looking after the eggs, and even the cuckoo's offspring. They put in their labor to care for someone else's offspring. Interestingly, in the bird kingdom, female birds are the ones most often "cuckolded"!

Thus, cuckold refers to a man whose wife had been impregnated by someone else, who was then tricked into raising that man's offspring. Like the bird sitting on the cuckoo's eggs, the man is pouring in his labor to support someone else's genetic offspring.

Etymologically, this isn't about sex. The cuckoo bird does not have sex with the defrauded bird or its mate. Instead, the cuckoo tricks the bird into wasting resources on the cuckoo's offspring, rather than on its own offspring. Cuckoldry is about misdirecting your resources to support someone else's offspring rather than your own.

Today, anyone who unwillingly pays massive taxes to support the offspring of others is functionally being cuckolded.