

1: PPT - The Rise (And Fall?) Of Feminism PowerPoint Presentation - ID

The Rise And Fall Of Feminism. Women had automatic value and special protection, but this came with a cost. Women were a dependent of their fathers.

Women had automatic value and special protection, but this came with a cost. Women were a dependent of their fathers, handed over to their husbands. Women were forced to deal with any mistreatment her husband gave her, simply because there was no where else to go. She could be married or a prostitute. It was one of the few jobs women could do and earn a salary to keep a roof over their head. In very old times such as medieval, a single woman past her prime was either the daughter of an aristocrat who could afford it by virtue of family wealth, or a spinster. This remained true for the most part right up until first wave feminism. Is it any wonder in a world where women had a proverbial gun to their head forcing them into marriage, forcing them into motherhood, just to survive, that the early feminists called marriage a trap, and seen a society that denied them equal access to higher learning, and equal access to jobs, as a patriarchal system that granted men power and control over women? An argument can really be made that the 19th century and earlier was patriarchal. Sure this would over-look the fact that women were not forced to work hard brutal jobs in the coal mines, railroad, military service, carpentry, brick laying etc. It over looks the fact they were exempt from being conscripted into military or even firemen and police duty in an emergency. It over looks chivalry, the ultimate display of gynocentrism. It over looks all the special protection that was afforded to them. On one hand that special protection could amount to being treated like princesses among the common rabble men , but on the other hand that special protection could look like they were eternal children devoid of autonomy and coerced into marriage and motherhood just for survival like a victim of human trafficking that has to spread their legs to clients in order to survive, and have no lawful autonomy. She was not allowed certain jobs that were men only, and even light weight jobs were off limits because of sexism, and lack of college, again because of sexism. This is where the stereotype of feminists being lesbians quickly came into play. By , you can bet your bottom dollar that every lesbian was a feminist, because they wanted the right to live an autonomous life of independence. Under these conditions, I find it hard not to sympathize with first wave feminists. I want you to picture women in those days. Not all of them wanted a dozen kids and to be bound to a husband, a husband that may mistreat them. They just wanted to live as bachelorettes, even if it did mean social ridicule. Again, some women were aristocrats, some women were lucky enough to be a maid to a wealthy family, some women got to be the exception and somehow bring home a livable wage. But this was not an option for most women. They called it Patriarchy, and in many ways, I can see where they got that idea. But it does overlook their special privileges, and the fact that men worshiped them. Men gave them chivalrous worship, but this love was conditional. A woman was worshiped so long as she conformed to her role as obedient wife and mother, always staying at home barefoot and pregnant. It was an interesting system. On one hand women consciously or unconsciously forged the male identity, man as doer, man as protector, man as provider, who would sacrifice himself for the safety and well being of women. But in making men the doers of society, it was men that built society. And as the builders of society they created rules that put them in charge. Again, this is in tune with the identity that women built for them, that they worked hard to conform to. But as men had an identity women locked them into, they equally had to lock women into their identity, their role, in order for their own role to work. Women were then locked into a role. All the protection and provision, so long as they never made an effort to be capable or independent. And laws and policies that held them to their role as helpless baby making machines. How many women laid in bed, spread their legs while thinking of England, while their ugly hairy husband grunted and thrust into them, every night, just to have a roof over their head and food in their belly, because the only other option was prostitution, until syphilis ruined her of course, all because society fought against women having autonomy. Again, that thing they call patriarchy, it is the ultimate manifestation of women wanting to be pampered and protected. And it worked out to the benefit of most women. What I am trying to say is, communism need not exist for feminism to have been born. Only artificial constraints caused by antiquated gender roles needed to exist. Men were, and still are, trained by

pussy like an animal is trained with food. Early feminism was primarily women fighting for autonomy. But then women eventually got their liberation, they got their autonomy. So why did feminism persist and continue even now, even after they got equality, then got special privileges and are now currently enjoying the best of both gender roles while men are stuck in theirs, and are the bad guys no matter what. In this ridiculous environment of female supremacy, why does feminism continue to exist? Misandry is the reason. It was always present in feminism, because it is always present in women. Women are greedy, narcissistic, jealous and resentful by nature, and they are especially jealous and resentful towards males. And the political feminist movement became nothing but a great conduit for their internal biologically driven misandry. They could fight for their entitlement, fight for more and more special protection laws, and fight to punish males for being male, and they could do it as part of a long and successful pro-female movement called feminism. Once upon a time the hatred of men was hidden behind legit gripes about women not being given the necessary opportunities to live an independent life style. I insist that earlier feminism contained a lot of misandry as well but the fact they were fighting for reasonable and legit things helps to hide it. We can write that off as an underhanded act to help win the war against a dangerous and aggressive nation. But if America had continued to firebomb German cities after Germany had waved the white flag and surrendered, it would become obvious that a deep hatred of the German people had been the motive for the war the whole time, but this fact would have been hidden earlier due to the circumstances of having a legit pretense. My point is, traditionalists among us blame the birth of feminism on communism. And while communism did fund feminism, to a certain extent, as it did with other things, and feminists did often register as communist due to the marxist concept of steal from the haves to give to the have-nots, and there is an undeniable link between the two, communism is not the cause of first, second, or third wave feminism. Women had enjoyed the ease of being female, the ability to stay home and play with the children while men worked the physically hard jobs, and died in the wars. They could live as eternal children, and this suited them for the longest time, until this very system became constricting in the light of new opportunities. Past traditionalism patriarchy failed when the environment changed. In a harsh and brutal environment, women playing the role of the helpless eternal child, worked for women. And whatever suits women, becomes the system of a culture. But when things got easier, they wanted out of the role they had created. Women will be as loyal to men as they have to be. Women will be with men so long as men serve a function to them. A man that can no longer provide a service to her is like a car that no longer starts worthless. This is the disposability of men. Men are disposable, and to women, they will always be disposable. The acquisition of a man is not the end onto its self; but a means to an end. If a man is needed for a woman to have X, than she is with him for the acquisition of X. If a man can no longer act as a proxy to having X, than that man is no longer needed. If she can acquire X without a man, she will go without a man. A man is a tool for women. A macho guy displays his strength, and authority to women. Interesting how a man will act like the toughest mother fucker on the planet, and buy thousands of dollars worth of jewelry to impress women, and then act shocked when she shows no loyalty to him as a person, but only to the utilitarian function he served. A man begs to be used, and then is shocked when he gets used. The problem here is, so long as men want pussy, and women are the gate keepers of pussy, women are in charge of men, and they set the rules. The old ways worked for the longest time, and when they no longer worked to provide women with the easiest route to get what they want, they rejected the very patriarchal system they created. Again, men want pussy, women have pussy, this puts women in charge. Men will do as women command them to do so that they can get the pussy. Thus society, social rules etc, are built by women, using men as tools. Women have claimed they needed a man to be strong and do all the work and take all the chances and make all the sacrifices. Men agreed because they need that pussy , and women quickly realized the weaker they act, the dumber they act, the more helpless they act, the more men will do for them to compensate. The weaker a woman, the stronger a man has to be to pull her weight. Thus women consciously or unconsciously created the gender roles: Men as doers, women as recipients. Men as capable and responsible, women as helpless children. All of society was built on the premise of men as strong courageous conquerors, protectors and providers for women. Less use for men means less love for men. If women have less love for men, men get less pussy, and men are born with a chronic addiction to pussy. Therefore men are threatened by women being

independent. Gynocentrism works like this: Again, the fear of female independence is the fear that men will no longer be valued by women, thus not get their approval. If women as a collective ever switched their mating instinct to no longer desire togetherness with males based on their utilitarian function, the male identity would instantly be recreated to fit the basis for women being attracted to him. Therefore, the old ways of men and women, are the fault of the biological drives of men and women. If feminists want to bitch about patriarchy, they need to realize patriarchy was their invention, and then not beat themselves up so hard for it, because the entire damn thing is based on human biology. And thus women will no longer serve any function in the life of men, and all of their value and power is completely removed. Trust me, this will suck for women more than they could ever imagine, and the bad news is, I do believe this day is coming I will be making a video on it. But I am getting side tracked.

2: Feminism has destabilized the American family

The rise of anti-male sexism and the corruption of feminism. By Frontier Centre for Public Policy on July 16, No Comment. Feminism today is simply a reversal of anti-female sexism.

The number of single father households has increased about ninefold since 1975, from less than 1 million, to more than 9 million. As a result, men make up a growing share of single parent householders. There are some notable differences between single mothers and single fathers. Single fathers are also somewhat less educated than single mothers, older and more likely to be white. Compared with fathers heading households with two married parents, single dads are younger, less educated, less financially well-off and less likely to be white. In this report, fathers include those men who are ages 15 or older, who are the head of their household, and who report living with their own minor children biological children, step-children or adopted children. Fathers who are living in a household headed by someone else are excluded from the analysis, as are fathers whose children are not living with them. They are younger, less educated and more likely to be living in poverty than are fathers who are raising children without a spouse or partner in the household. First and foremost, there has been a marked increase in the share of non-marital births. And even though divorce rates have leveled off in recent decades, they remain higher than they were in the 1970s and 1980s. Some experts suggest that changes in the legal system have led to more opportunities for fathers to gain at least partial custody of children in the event of a breakup, as well. At the same time, the role of fathers has evolved, and the public now acknowledges their importance not only as breadwinners, but also as caregivers. Analysis of long-term time use data shows that fathers are narrowing the still sizable gap with mothers in the amount of time they spend with their children. Public opinion ascribes roughly the same hierarchy of roles to mothers. Profile of Single Father Householders Like single mothers, single fathers are typically less educated and less well-off than their married counterparts. They are also younger and less likely to be white. However, single father householders differ from single mother householders on several indicators. Most notably, households headed by single fathers appear to be much better off financially when compared with those headed by single mothers. Single fathers are younger than married fathers, but older than single mothers. Single father householders are more likely to be white than single mother householders, but less likely to be white than married father householders. The educational attainment of single father householders is markedly lower than that of married father householders. In terms of household financial status, single fathers are much better off than single mothers, and much worse off than married fathers. The same pattern is reflected in poverty status across these household types. Single Fathers are Younger, Less Educated Among household heads who are fathers, some are more likely to be single dads than others. Single fatherhood is generally more prevalent among younger, less educated, poorer and non-white fathers. While the bulk of single fathers among younger men are cohabiting, the reverse is true for fathers ages 40 and older—most of these single fathers have no spouse or partner in their household. The prevalence of single fatherhood is closely linked to educational level; the more education a father has, the less likely he is to head a single father household. Poverty is also linked with single fatherhood: This allows for a further differentiation of single fathers—those who have no spouse or partner living with them and those who are cohabiting. There are significant differences in the profiles of each of the single father groups. Most notably, those who are cohabiting are younger, less educated and less financially well-off than their counterparts who are not living with a spouse or partner. In terms of racial and ethnic composition, cohabiting single dads are much less likely to be white and much more likely to be Hispanic. These educational differences likely reflect, in part, the relative youthfulness of cohabiters. Age differences also contribute to the differences in financial well-being between the two groups. Single fathers include those fathers who report that their minor child has been living or staying with them for at least two months. In some cases, a non-marital partner may also be a biological or adoptive parent of the minor child in the household. Single fathers who are married but not living with their spouse are classified as having no spouse or partner in the household.

3: Blessed the Waters That Rise and Fall to Rise Again | Christian Feminism Today

Feminism Responsible For The Fall Of Rome. Fall of Rome and how the rise of feminism portends a civilization's collapse. fathers are liable for the actions of.

Those women and men worked on some very basic goals. For the first time in American history, last year women outnumbered men on college campuses by a wide margin — around 34 percent more. The third wave is now in process, exploring new questions, aided by new technologies. The waters rise and fall to rise again. Each wave wrestles with its own issues and faces its own opposition. The struggle for full equality for women has not yet been won nor are its gains secure. Within Christianity, one has only to look at evangelical fundamentalism, the Roman Catholic Church, and the Orthodox churches to see the need for continued work. Within American society and around the world, women and children are still very much at risk, despite the courageous work of women leaders everywhere. At that time, I had just started Ph. I had also taken courses at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. And I was a woman. Only five or six of us were invited: It included lengthy paragraphs on racism, poverty, economic injustice, and militarism, but no mention of women at all. Eventually I raised my hand and pointed this out. A committee — still all male — was delegated to redraft a more succinct statement. So we call both men and women to mutual submission and active discipleship. Ron Sider later told me that when Billy Graham was shown the statement, he pointed to those sentences as the reason why he would not sign it. At the end of the weekend, an expanded committee was formed to arrange a second meeting. I graciously volunteered to be the token woman on that committee, and when we met to organize ourselves, I again graciously volunteered to be secretary. But I had no intention of wasting a precious invitation on 1 a woman who could not or would not show up Thanksgiving Weekend is not a time when most people want to go to a conference , and 2 a woman who did not think there was a problem with the status quo! So I started making my list and checking it twice, finding out who was naughty and who just wanted to make nice. I called more than a few people, finding women in positions of responsibility, checking out their viewpoints. If invited, will you come? And then I had to make a strong case to the rest of the committee for each and every woman on my list. Anyway, when the invitation arrived in her office, she showed it to her boss. He immediately insisted that there must have been some mistake, that surely the invitation was intended for him! He was still dubious even after she produced the envelope that also had her name and title on it. We worked on the manuscript for several years and then spent several more years finding a publisher. Word Books finally released the book in August , just prior to the second conference of the group that had drafted the Chicago Declaration, the group which came to be called Evangelicals for Social Action. All but one or two of the women I invited became part of it. During our caucus sessions, several issues emerged. We called for inclusive language in all Christian education materials, and equal pay for equal work in Christian institutions. At the conclusion, several people from the Washington, D. I have many memories of that conference, but several things stand out. First, we had no ordained women within the evangelical orbit. Second, many of us were just starting out on careers — Virginia Mollenkott had her Ph. Looking Back over 30 Years When I think back over the past thirty years, what I see is the way that our lives have blossomed. Yes, many of us have followed traditional life patterns. We have been married and reared some wonderful children. Many of us have gotten divorced, been widowed, and sometimes remarried. We have also pursued our other dreams. Absolutely no one ever suggested that I might consider going to seminary — until I was finishing my Ph. Since many more denominations have ordained women. Half of seminary students these days are women. Several denominations have women bishops. In one denomination, the Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Churches, fully half the clergy are women. EEWCC has been blessed with ordained women from many different groups. Early EWC member the Rev. Others of us have found our ministries in other vocations — education, law, writing, publishing, medicine, computer science, finance, counseling, business, social service, and many more fields. I think we also need to take pride in the fact that we have worked hard for education, ordination, professional achievements. As privileged women, we have a responsibility to continue to publish, lecture, preach, and speak out professionally with the basic messages of biblical feminism. Male

domination is a sign of sin, not salvation. I live in South Carolina. The only national category in which my state consistently ranks near the top Number Three is in the number of men who shoot their wives or girlfriends. They are defending domestic violence just as surely as they defended chattel slavery years ago. And that includes as well, those Christians who use Proverbs to argue their right to beat their children. With instruction from women of wisdom such as Virginia Mollenkott and Rosemary Ruether, we came to see biblical feminism as a much more inclusive idea, a much more comprehensive and global notion. Patriarchy has many tentacles. And one of its strategies is to divide and conquer, to set women against each other. Our Jewish sisters pointed out early and emphatically that especially as evangelicals who said we took the Bible seriously, we could not build our case by arguing that the Jews treated women badly until Jesus came along and set them straight. Jesus was a Jew; Paul was a Jew. Their inclusion of women was not unique or novel but common practice in Jewish Amystical and messianic movements of the first century. Christian and Jewish feminists can work together to appropriate the Bible. We learn from each other. From the beginning, Evangelicals for Social Action and EWC have made very conscious and consistent efforts to combat white racism and to include African Americans and those of other ethnic groups. We have also respected the rights of other women to articulate their own womanist, mujerista, Asian, and other biblical interpretations and theologies. We have tried to reach out to people of all races and ethnicities. And we admit with regret that we remain all too Euro-American. All of us have been very aware of the economic discrimination against women in our society. This is not just an economic issue, but also a very biblical issue. The line between combat and support troops was erased in a heartbeat for Jessica Lynch, Lori Piestewa, and Shoshanna Johnson. My community buried Kimberly Hampton, a bright and beautiful young woman, a graduate of Presbyterian College, and the first female helicopter pilot to die in combat. A woman general apparently was in command when the prison abuses " by both male and female soldiers " took place. Including women in the military has obviously not changed the insidious relationship between patriarchy and militarism. From the beginning of this organization it was clear that a biblical feminism must include all issues of both gender and sexuality. We argued that this meant liberation for both women and men, boys and girls. And not all lesbians are non-believers " although one must admit that far too many Christian churches are working really hard to make it that way. Virginia was asked to do a workshop on the Bible and women. Although Virginia and I had agreed to take written questions only, Jeanne raised her hand and insisted on telling us about a young coworker who had revealed to Jeanne that she was a lesbian. Sitting right in the middle of that small but crowded room was one of my former Trinity students who had just informed me that she was a lesbian. And right behind her sat the conservative writer Elisabeth Eliot. I myself had been surprised to discover that year at age 34 that I was a lesbian and had only very recently shared that information with Letha. Virginia and I had not yet discussed the topic. I was certainly not ready to acknowledge my own sexuality publicly, nor was Virginia. So our comments in the workshop were quite circumspect. Still they created quite a furor in the halls because we were not immediately and emphatically condemnatory. The lesbians in EWC first met over a table in the food court and later in my hotel room during the Seattle conference, thanks to a courageous member of the Seattle planning committee and the help of gay men from a local church who manned the information booth so that no woman would have to miss a session of the conference. The issues came to a head at Wellesley College in and then in Fresno in Before the Wellesley conference, the National Council formulated a procedure by which members could submit resolutions to the membership for vote. The resolutions were tabled. Over the next two years, EWC leadership moaned and fretted, dithered about what to do, but stubbornly resisted formulating a way of responding. The Council came to Fresno, so devoid of a plan that the Council co-coordinators each refused to chair the discussion portion of the membership meeting. I volunteered to do it, really assuming that it would be relatively uneventful. But at a meeting of lesbians and friends the night before the membership meeting, it became clear that many people wished to re-introduce at least some of the tabled resolutions. They set about formulating a strategy. The next day three resolutions were introduced: Discussion was intense and lengthy. Various members threatened the membership. Some members expressed their fears that membership would cost them their jobs in Christian organizations " ignoring the fact that those organizations would instantly terminate any other employee honest enough to admit they were

gay or even someone they suspected might be a lesbian.

4: The rise of anti-male sexism and the corruption of feminism | Troy Media

The Rise of Christianity, the Fall of Ancient Feminism The argument is an old one, and yet has somehow kept its vigor, even in the 21 st century. What affect did Christianity have.

However, since the late 20th century it has more often been used to refer to social systems in which power is primarily held by adult men, [12] [13] [14] particularly by writers associated with second-wave feminism such as Kate Millett ; these writers sought to use an understanding of patriarchal social relations to liberate women from male domination. Strozier , historical research has not yet found a specific "initiating event". In this view, men directed household production and sought to control women in order to ensure the passing of family property to their own male offspring, while women were limited to household labor and producing children. Ancient history[edit] A prominent Greek general Meno , in the Platonic dialogue of the same name, sums up the prevailing sentiment in Classical Greece about the respective virtues of men and women. Maryanne Cline Horowitz stated that Aristotle believed that "soul contributes the form and model of creation". This implies that any imperfection that is caused in the world must be caused by a woman because one cannot acquire an imperfection from perfection which he perceived as male. Aristotle had a hierarchical ruling structure in his theories. Lerner claims that through this patriarchal belief system, passed down generation to generation, people have been conditioned to believe that men are superior to women. These symbols are benchmarks which children learn about when they grow up, and the cycle of patriarchy continues much past the Greeks. He observed that Egyptian women attended market and were employed in trade. In ancient Egypt, middle-class women were eligible to sit on a local tribunal , engage in real estate transactions, and inherit or bequeath property. Women also secured loans, and witnessed legal documents. Athenian women were denied such rights. It explains that an obedient woman is to obey their father before her marriage, her husband after marriage, and her first son if widowed, and that a virtuous woman must practice sexual propriety, proper speech, modest appearance, and hard work. Women who lived according to this Neo-Confucian ideal were celebrated in official documents, and some had structures erected in their honor. The patriarchal political theory is closely associated with Sir Robert Filmer. Sometime before , Filmer completed a work entitled Patriarcha. However, it was not published until after his death. In it, he defended the divine right of kings as having title inherited from Adam , the first man of the human species, according to Judeo-Christian tradition. Thus the positive laws of God that relate to the obedience of children join the father and the mother without any differentiation; both possess a kind of ascendancy and jurisdiction over their children She proposed alternative translations and interpretations of passages relating to women, and she applied historical and cultural criticism to a number of verses, arguing that their admonitions applied to specific historical situations, and were not to be viewed as universal commands. This tendency was enlarged by feminist theory, which denounced the patriarchal Judeo-Christian tradition. Family Law at the Turn of the Century, Michael Grossberg coined the phrase judicial patriarchy stating that, "The judge became the buffer between the family and the state. Men and women were both subject to strict laws regarding sexual behavior, however men were punished infrequently in comparison to women. Shulamith Firestone , a radical-libertarian feminist, defines patriarchy as a system of oppression of women. Firestone believes that patriarchy is caused by the biological inequalities between women and men, e. Firestone writes that patriarchal ideologies support the oppression of women and gives as an example the joy of giving birth, which she labels a patriarchal myth. For Firestone, women must gain control over reproduction in order to be free from oppression. The system of patriarchy accomplishes this by alienating women from their bodies. Interactive systems theorists Iris Marion Young and Heidi Hartmann believe that patriarchy and capitalism interact together to oppress women. Young, Hartmann, and other socialist and Marxist feminists use the terms patriarchal capitalism or capitalist patriarchy to describe the interactive relationship of capitalism and patriarchy in producing and reproducing the oppression of women. In its being both systematic and universal, therefore, the concept of patriarchy represents an adaptation of the Marxist concept of class and class struggle. Audre Lorde , an African American feminist writer and theorist, believed that racism and patriarchy were intertwined systems of oppression. Does a "good

mother," she asks, train her son to be competitive, individualistic, and comfortable within the hierarchies of patriarchy, knowing that he may likely be economically successful but a mean person? Or does a good mother resist patriarchal ideologies and socialize her son to be cooperative and communal but economically unsuccessful? Because patriarchy is a social construction, it can be overcome by revealing and critically analyzing its manifestations. The family not only serves as a representative of the greater civilization by pushing its own affiliates to change and obey, but performs as a component in the rule of the patriarchal state that rules its inhabitants with the head of the family. Culture repositioning relates to culture change. It involves the reconstruction of the cultural concept of a society. Sex differences in humans and Social construction of gender difference As a common standard of differentiation between sexes, advocates for a patriarchal society like to focus on the influences that hormones have over biological systems. Sociologists tend to reject predominantly biological explanations of patriarchy [1] and contend that socialization processes are primarily responsible for establishing gender roles. Opponents of gender feminism, such as Christina Hoff Sommers, have argued that patriarchy has its origin in biological factors. The male testosterone hormone is, for instance, known to greatly enhance risk taking behaviour; which can generate increased status in groups if successful balanced with an equal increase in number of failures, with potential losses of status or death as result. The potential magnitude, frequency and longevity of the increased status from a hormonally driven risk-taking success depends on opportunities, which increases rapidly with societal complexity. A hypothetical patriarchal culture based primarily on a hormonally-driven increased rate of male successes, thus require a certain critical level of societal evolution[clarification needed] before it could evolve. Through this simple basis, "the existence of a sexual division of labor in primitive societies is a starting point as much for purely social accounts of the origins of patriarchy as for biological. Lewontin and others argue that such biological determinism unjustly limits women. In his study, he states women behave a certain way not because they are biologically inclined to, but rather because they are judged by "how well they conform to the stereotypical local image of femininity". This claim cloaks the fact that men also have periods of time where they can be aggressive and irrational; furthermore, unrelated effects of aging and similar medical problems are often blamed on menopause, amplifying its reputation. For example, it was asserted for over a century that women were not as intellectually competent as men because they have slightly smaller brains on average. On the other hand, men have a greater variability in intelligence, and except in tests of reading comprehension, in tests of perceptual speed and associative memory, males typically outnumber females substantially among high-scoring individuals. Particularly in mathematical and scientific fields, boys are presumed to have more keen spatial abilities than girls, whereas girls are supposed to assume better linguistic skills. These stereotypical manifestations within educational institutions contract with the notions of differently gendered brains and a "relationship between intelligence and brain size". Sociologist Sylvia Walby has composed six overlapping structures that define patriarchy and that take different forms in different cultures and different times: Goldberg also contends that patriarchy is a universal feature of human culture. In , Goldberg wrote, "The ethnographic studies of every society that has ever been observed explicitly state that these feelings were present, there is literally no variation at all. Also, the effects of colonialism on the cultures represented in the studies were not considered. It suggests females place the most important preference on males who control more resources that can help her and her offspring, which in turn causes an evolutionary pressure on males to be competitive with each other in order to gain resources and power. However, an alternative evolutionary theory has challenged this theory. Because the investment in offspring required by human males and females is nearly equal, they are proposed to have evolved sex-similar mating preferences Mutual Mate Choice, [77] that is, both men and women prefer caring, attractive, and successful partners. The idea that patriarchy is natural has, however, come under attack from many sociologists, explaining that patriarchy evolved due to historical, rather than biological, conditions. Similarly, contraception has given women control over their reproductive cycle. She lists six ways that it emerged: Some of these younger men may inherit and therefore have a stake in continuing these conventions. All are subject, even fathers are bound by its strictures. Marx was on to something more profound than he knew when he observed that the family contained within itself in embryo all the antagonisms that later develop on a wide scale within the society and the state. For unless

THE RISE OF FEMINISM AND THE FALL OF FATHERS pdf

revolution uproots the basic social organisation, the biological family – the vinculum through which the psychology of power can always be smuggled – the tapeworm of exploitation will never be annihilated.

5: Eternal Bachelor: The rise and inevitable fall of feminism

The world is a dark and scary place, women value masculinity. Civilization advances and the world appears safe, women grow tired to masculinity. Civilization declines and the world becomes dangerous again, women value masculinity.

Blowing raspberries at grumpy hairy feminists since ought-five. Feminism is not the problem here. Its proponents have neither the brains nor the talent to advance this far on their own - high-status elite managerial men have allowed this to happen. Men run the world. Just a small number of alphas though. But that white technocratic political elite realised that in feminism they had found an unbeatable tool for cowing and demoralising lower status males who will always be potential usurpers. Feminists are no problem to high status bosses. Women are wired to treat them with adoration and give them a pass whatever the transgression - see Bill Clinton or even George W Bush being invited to slap a female gymnast on the rear "for luck. Even feminist women are totally loyal to their male bosses, and reserve their wrath for peers and subordinates. Feminism is part of the new class war whereby the right wing authoritarian elite have found they can use left wing dogmas to shore up their power. That is why elite managerial white alpha men like Tony Blair, David Cameron and Brown are so keen on it - it does not threaten them. Feminism has finally achieved what Mrs Thatcher could never quite do - destroy workplace solidarity and ensure that collective action is largely a thing of the past. And it did not take billy-club wielding strike-breakers or labor camps. It took a generation of victimhood obsessed, unhinged females, who knew they could get away with saying and doing anything. Yet they seem to have been rather successful in inflicting their shitty ideology onto Western Society; and it does seem rather suspicious that virtually every man in mainstream-politics licks the unholy arses of feminisms. David Cameron forever being associated in my mind with his leadership acceptance speech when he bemoaned the horrors of the lack of women in his party, thus losing the vote of many men at a single stroke. The guy who does dirty and dangerous work to try to support himself and his wife and kids. The families who are almost on the breadline. What the fuck happened? All they wanted was power, and what better way to wield power than to sideline men by encouraging their removal from families, and make women subservient to the government by hooking them on benefits and governmental support. And us men have been declared redundant. This is what is happening in British Society and, no doubt, in other Feminist infected nations. And who can blame them? And even many guys like me who do work only work the bare minimum, avoid marriage and other traps to transfer what wealth we have to women, and who plot to emigrate. Or just vent our spleens on blogs. We might as well join the invaders and wreck some stuff for laughs. And fighting wars of course. And a hell of a lot of seriously annoyed men with nothing to lose. So we can make it grind to a halt with very little effort at all.

6: The Rise And Fall Of Feminism | razorbladeandy

The Fall: feminist, anti-men and sadly accurate Gillian Anderson's performance as Stella Gibson suggests a woman fighting the battle of the sexes on her own terms.

Their fame has faded, but their influence lives on. Lena Dunham, who has built a persona as a spokesman for women, wondered how any woman could reject the label feminist a poll found that 68 percent of American women use the term to describe themselves. Her free-floating contempt for men was evident in a recent tweet: Dunham is voicing the 21st-century version of the s slogan: One of those was stoking such bitterness between men and women. While there is near-universal agreement that women should be treated equally in the workplace and in the family, other aspects of the feminist agenda — such as devaluing marriage — have left women more, not less vulnerable than they were pre-revolution. In , Katie Roiphe, feminist and mother of two children by different fathers, condemned concerns about single motherhood: Forty percent of American children are now born to single mothers It should not be anti-feminist to recognize that men and women do need each other and that, contrary to feminist theories, marriage is a key pillar of stability for both sexes and especially for children. Feminists greeted unwed parenthood and easy divorce as steps on the ladder of liberation. For some it was and is. But the price has been steep. Women are commonly worse off financially after divorce than their ex-husbands. Those who worked before, during or after their marriages experienced a 20 percent decline in income after divorce, compared with men, whose incomes rose by 30 percent. Forty percent of American children are now born to single mothers. Social scientists across the political spectrum agree this family chaos is destructive. In , the poverty rate for woman-headed families with children was And abundant data show married adults are happier, healthier and wealthier than singles. The sexual revolution has scythed through the institution of marriage, leaving millions of women without the love and emotional and financial security that they and their children so need. Recent studies about the effects of fatherlessness have revealed that the rise of single-parent which usually means mother-only families has had even worse consequences for boys than for girls. Father absence in African-American homes leads to more mental-health and behavioral problems for boys, according to an MIT study by two economists looking at brothers and sisters born in Florida between and When more boys are growing up without fathers, there are fewer young men who become the kind of adults women want to marry — educated, employed, non-drug-abusing and not involved with the criminal-justice system. Without the grounding of marriage, men become disconnected from society. Some 22 percent of prime-age men 25 to 54 are not working or looking for work. Unmarried men are over-represented in this group. Diseases of despair — alcoholism, overdoses, suicide — have been rising among white, working-class Americans, the very population that has witnessed a steep decline in family stability over the past several decades. Most women want and need upright, well-adjusted, dependable men to serve as co-anchors of healthy and happy families. The feminist movement was deeply misguided to take aim at marriage. Far from oppressing women, it offers a safe foundation for a full life.

7: Michaelia Elizabeth: The Rise of Christianity, the Fall of Ancient Feminism

The Rise And Fall Of Feminism - talks briefly about why feminism became "a thing", and why it is decreasing in popularity. It also talks about the rising of Traditionalism (or Patriarchy), and the.

The first argument, tradition, is the one closest to faith. It is not subject to much debate. But precisely because this argument is so personal, and so religious, it is the least used by opponents of gay marriage in public debate. The second argument, children, tends to only show up at the most heated political moments, often with devastating effect. During the Proposition 8 campaign in California, opponents of gay marriage repeatedly evoked innocent children in their advertising campaign. No one has proposed teaching second graders about homosexuality. But if the state officially sanctions gay unions, the notion that gay unions are not an abomination see tradition is certain to filter down. The secondary argument, about gay parents and gender roles, meanwhile, is based on an unfounded fear, at least according to scientists at the American Psychological Association. There is no evidence that children of same-sex parents are worse off, nor is there evidence children of same-sex parents are more likely to become gay. The third argument, that gay marriage threatens straight marriage, is the most prominent in the public debate. Outspoken opponents of gay marriage, like Kansas Sen. Sam Brownback, can expand at length about Nordic marriage trends, where gay unions are not so frowned upon. This argument follows from the idea that marriage is a singular societal institution that is instrumental in keeping straight couples together. If the definition of the institution changed, goes the argument, then straight couples would be less likely to think marriage is important, and therefore less likely to stay together for the sake of their children. Why would the gay couple next door make me less interested in monogamy, my fidelity to a woman I loved, or my desire to provide a stable family structure for my children? I bring all this up because the great American essayist Richard Rodriguez, who is a practicing Catholic, a gay man, and a long-time resident of San Francisco, seems to have an answer to this question, in an interview published in Salon. His description of the effects of the straight marriage crisis now roiling the nation should not be missed. Read an excerpt after the jump. American families are under a great deal of stress. And the majority of American women are now living alone. We are raising children in America without fathers. I think of Michael Phelps at the Olympics with his mother in the stands. His father was completely absent. He was negligible; no one refers to him, no one noticed his absence. The possibility that a whole new generation of American males is being raised by women without men is very challenging for the churches. I think they want to reassert some sort of male authority over the order of things. I think the pro-Proposition 8 movement was really galvanized by an insecurity that churches are feeling now with the rise of women. Monotheistic religions feel threatened by the rise of feminism and the insistence, in many communities, that women take a bigger role in the church. At the same time that women are claiming more responsibility for their religious life, they are also moving out of traditional roles as wife and mother. This is why abortion is so threatening to many religious people – it represents some rejection of the traditional role of mother. In such a world, we need to identify the relationship between feminism and homosexuality. These movements began, in some sense, to achieve visibility alongside one another. I know a lot of black churches take offense when gay activists say that the gay movement is somehow analogous to the black civil rights movement. What we represent as gays in America is an alternative to the traditional male-structured society. The possibility that we can form ourselves sexually – even form our sense of what a sex is – sets us apart from the traditional roles we were given by our fathers. Read the full interview here. Subscribe Popular Among Subscribers.

8: Feminism and The Three Arguments Against Gay Marriage | www.enganchecubano.com

The rise (and inevitable fall) of feminism This www.enganchecubano.com piece focuses on British society, but it's pretty much the same in any feminist country. I've been to several feminist countries and all seem to be suffering from decay as the result of their welfare state coffers gradually being diminished to nothing by all the entitlement mania.

What affect did Christianity have on gender roles in western society? Some people assert that the rise of Christianity effectively stomped out any ability for women to be considered equal for, arguably, millennia afterward. Others might say that the writers of the Christian scriptures were the feminists of their day, affording each woman the hope and knowledge of spiritual equality to men in her own rite. So, which is it? Is the answer really that difficult to discern? Liberties of Ancient Roman Women To begin, an examination of the role of women in ancient Rome must be done. Little is known about women in the very early days of Rome. They must have had some measure of equality because they worked with their husbands on family farms. They were hard-working farmers who had no time for leisure. After the Punic wars, in which Rome inherited almost a million slaves, the political structures of society changed as farmers moved into cities and fought for the professional army. Rome became a great empire at this point and women were granted citizenship, allowed to inherit and retain property, have wills, appear in court and have the equal testimony of a man, and even sit at the dinner table with the men in the household. There were limits to these relative freedoms, however, but citizenship, business and land-owning liberties speak volumes as to her worth in first-century Roman society. Marriage and Sexuality One must divorce him or herself from the idea of modern marriage to consider the societal functionalities of ancient Roman marriages. Women were usually linked with their families of origin, except in just a few circumstances. Adultery for the ancient Romans did not have the same definition as today. One could participate in sex with slaves or prostitutes, or virtually anyone of lower social standing to them. This was true for both men and women. Loyalty was important to a Roman marriage, but loyalty did not necessarily mean faithful. Women, in reality, did have less liberty than men in this department, but it was not a matter of morality like one would think; it was a matter of paternity. If a woman were to get pregnant from an extramarital affair, then paternity and inheritance to the child could not be certain, and this could interrupt the status quo. Women and Roman Law Women did have considerable influence in Roman society in spite of the fact that they did not have the right to vote. They had so much influence in fact, that it is arguable that they may have been on the verge of being given the right to vote until spread of Christianity. The influence of women in the political realm, though collateral, should not be understated. Women often participated in political discussion in a wide variety of places, yet were expected to be subject to their husbands in the public eye. Rome, as mentioned, originally built on the backs of the middle class the small farmers , became increasingly elitist. Eventually, politics were completely monopolized by the elite, and the middle class became disenchanted with the sovereignty of Rome. The patriotism in Rome began to wane. Many decided not to fight for the military and the number of soldiers dwindled. Perhaps it was understandable that Christianity gained popularity. The original precepts of Christianity did not distinguish between the poor or the rich, male or female, slave or free, but held all in the same regard. Thus began the exchange of the enchantment with Rome with the enchantment with Christianity. Not only had freemen begun to question the authority of Rome, but younger women had begun to rebel against social norms by stepping out of their traditional roles, even where motherhood was concerned. Roman women were expected to bear children, but it was uncommon for Roman women to have more than a couple of kids. Women often chose not to breastfeed their infants but purchase breast milk, and for those who could afford it, full-time wet-nurses were hired to live in the home and care for infants. One of the rights that ancient Roman women had that modern western women are still struggling to regain, is reproductive freedom. There is evidence of herbal birth controls that were high in estrogen. If the women ingested these herbs, ovulation could be suppressed, and thus, pregnancy would not occur. Spermicides, both male and female condoms, and vinegar douches were also common. Abortions were not considered a crime, because it was believed that one is not fully human until after birth. Reproductive rights might help account for the small size of most Roman families. Christianity was

still not a driving force in Rome even at just before the conversion of Constantine; however, once Constantine declared Christianity as the official religion of Rome, Christianity took on a highly political livelihood. As was clear with civilizations past, successfully functioning societies need "unifying agents. Unifying a dying society through Christian teachings would beget control. It is admittedly speculative, but perhaps Rome thought it needed to get back to its "roots. It should be noted that the rise of Christian principles were arguably to blame for women not having any kind of consideration or a voice at all. For instance, the once growing practice of obstetrics became obsolete by the Middle Ages. They were, in a sense, raped of all liberties and influence in society. The use of contraceptives was punishable, requiring penances lasting two to fifteen years, for it was considered as grave as the sin of murder. If any woman enjoyed sex, she was said to be prone to witchcraft. And so it was, that in a relatively short period of time, women had lost all the influence they once had at the height of the Roman Empire. And even today, there is still pressure to marry Christianity to politics. What is truly the liberation of women? For some sects of Christianity, spiritual equality will never translate to physical equality to men.

9: Patriarchy - Wikipedia

Fiorina's recent rise in the public eye notwithstanding, plutocrat feminism is, even now, on its way out, replaced by a movement, often referred to as intersectional feminism, that emphasizes.

No Comment Feminism today is simply a reversal of anti-female sexism. All males are reduced to a common set of evil characteristics. Feminism began as a challenge to male domination and female subordination. It could have become a champion of equality and the dignity of individuals. Unfortunately, contemporary feminism is not a liberation from sexism. On the contrary, feminism sees people as defined by their gender and lobbies for the interests of females. It advocates anti-male sexism. By framing females as oppressed by males, feminism frames men as arrogant and insensitive, oppressive and brutal. The systematic vilification and demonization of males is part of the feminist strategy of raising women by lowering men, by convincing people that women are good and men are bad. This is simply a reversal of anti-female sexism into anti-male sexism. All males are reduced to a common set of evil characteristics, while all females are celebrated. Female victimhood is described in many feminist works. But is it saying that men can never be trusted and women, for their own self defence, should take control of society and keep men well away from power? If so, is that an appropriate message for 20th and 21st century Canada and America? The feminist tactic appears to be, once again, scaring women and demonizing men. Hillary Clinton, during her campaign for the U. If feminists thought of humans as individuals, rather than as members of a good or bad category, they might realize that many people lie. Long-standing policy in Canada and the U. Most scientific studies show that the best interests of children are served by joint custody. But whenever legislation supporting joint custody is considered, feminist groups lobby against it. In Canada, feminist lawyers have argued against joint custody. In Canada and the U. Feminists prefer to support the best interests of mothers rather than those of children. For feminists, once again, gender trumps all other values, even the well-being of children. Feminists are never shy of demanding that gender representation in any organization or activity reflect the demography of the general population. The prime minister proudly celebrates his cabinet having an equal number of females and males. In Canadian universities, 60 per cent of the graduates are female. At McGill University, a fall senior seminar I taught had 18 registrants, all female. The entire faculty of Arts is demographically dominated by females, just as feminist ideology dominates in that faculty, as well as in Education, Social Work and Law. As of July 1, when two new appointments take effect, that number will increase to 58 per cent. Certainly, feminist organizations act as if they take a supremacist approach. The net effect of toxic feminism is to reduce complex individuals to simplistic gender categories, to dismiss all values but the partisan interests of females and to endorse anti-male sexism. The rise of anti-male sexism and the corruption of feminism added by Frontier Centre for Public Policy on July 16,

Season of high adventure Literature of Somali onomastics proverbs with comparison of foreign sayings What is an emotion, anyway? Minutes of the International American conference Je java tutorial campone edition Federal Employees Guide to Equal Employment Opportunity (Eeo) Drafting Corporate Agreements 2007 Houses and gardens by E.L. Lutyens Caskets, other boxes, memorials, and markers Son of the male muse Blank basic account equation balance sheet Perfect motherhood The Inevitable instability of american corporate governance Measuring outcomes. Science, Technology, and Democracy (Suny Series in Science, Technology, and Society) Book three : The grand alliance (Sunday, December 7, 1941, and onward) The People Came First Urban economic development The bestof F.B. Meyer. Grade 4 music theory A tale of two Chinas The Federal deficit Early education, 1898-1911 Good Mornin Glory Spring day bts piano sheet music Darius Milhaud (1947) Guinness book of film facts and feats Gifts, corruption, philanthropy Demilitarizing Public Order Buntings Messiah Effects of estrogen on brain function Estimating the returns to education in Argentina Abbreviations 213 You Asked for It,c B Matter of Honr CST The white deer: Roanoke Island Pro bash programming Drug Therapy in Nursing, Second Edition and Lippincotts Nursing Drug Guide 2007, Canadian Version Lesbian bars, 1920s-1970s Borderline personality in analysis