

Flesh & Buns

20/12/13

I really must stop reacting to articles in The Guardian. There's no end to it and I can't possibly keep up with the deluge of anti-male sentiment emanating from that august organ. But here's another such reaction anyway. The regular Comment & Debate spot on 20/12/13 featured an article by one Ms Cosslett. It occupied nearly half a page and contained no news. The factual content of the article was that in a Soho establishment called Flesh & Buns there was pornography - specifically pornographic wallpaper in the ladies toilet. I think you will agree that the discovery of pornography in a Soho establishment called Flesh & Buns does not really qualify as news. So the question which a reader should ask is: why did The Guardian devote nearly half a page to non-news. It is not a rhetorical question. It is important to identify the motivation. Whatever the purpose might have been, if successful, the intention should be apparent in the nature of the article itself. So what was the message of the article, since it was not news? One clue is that Ms Cosslett is the co-founder of a well known feminist blog.

It was, of course, another exercise in the denigration of men - all men. This article is feminist propaganda. Feminist propaganda techniques are very simple. They use the same few methods over and over again. One of the most common techniques is what I refer to as Implied Universal Guilt (IUG). Another is the time-honoured half-truth¹. This is how they work. Some men are sleazy, sexist scumbags. Yes, indeed they are. It's undeniable. But the operative word in that sentence is "some". The application of Implied Universal Guilt in a feminist article consists of expressing things in such a manner as to give the reader the impression that *all* men are sleazy, sexist scumbags. This is entirely deliberate and, of course, entirely false. It is in fact the sole purpose of such articles to create this impression. This conversion of a truth into a falsehood by misleading implication is what propaganda is. The other technique, the half-truth, is illustrated in this example by the careful omission of any mention that it is also true to say that some women are sleazy, sexist scumbags too.

So, your feminist propaganda article, such as this one, deliberately paints a picture of a world populated entirely by scumbag men and innocent victimised women, when the truth is that the majority of men and women are OK but there is a small percentage of scumbags of both sexes. Recognition of the latter, true, state of affairs is crucial if your objective is equality. The feminist insistence on the former, propagandised and false view of the world, prevents equality being a possibility. Equality is not possible in a world in which one gender is demonised by a universal propaganda machine. In our heavily propagandised society what we get is "woman's equality". This is the phrase which feminists use. But do note that it is a mathematically ludicrous phrase. You cannot talk of the equality of just one thing. The phrase should be "woman's and men's equality", thus indicating the two things between which equality is sought. But feminists will never countenance using a sentence in which the words "men" and "equality" both occur. When feminists use the phrase "woman's equality" what they actually mean is "woman's advantage".

¹ Remember the Yiddish proverb: half a truth is a whole lie. Also recall Hitler's excellent advice to the propagandist: "*The function of propaganda is not to weigh and ponder the rights of different people, but exclusively to emphasize the one right which it has set out to argue for. Its task is not to make an objective study of the truth, in so far as it favours the enemy, and then set it before the masses with academic fairness; its task is to serve its own right, always and unflinchingly*".

How do feminists get away with presenting the relentless pursuit of advantages for women as if it were the pursuit of equality? How come the purported pursuit of 'equality' is carried out with never any reference to one half of the equation: men? The answer lies in women's propagandised monopoly of victimhood and disadvantage. Provided the fiction is maintained in everyone's mind that women are far behind men in terms of societal advantage, it becomes axiomatic that pursuing advantages for women can only be a change in the direction of equality. So women are granted preferential treatment in law based on a falsehood maintained by propaganda. It is important to recognise this, because it means that there is a direct causal connection between articles like Ms Cosslett's and the fact that nearly 4 million children in this country have no father. There is a direct causal connection between all these instances of anti-male propaganda, whatever the ostensible topic, and the fact that in good old Blighty men are not permitted to know whether a child is theirs.

But back to Ms Cosslett's specific 20/12/13 article. How do IUG and half-truth play out here? The IUG part is conveyed by this sentence, "*That's what we (women) are now, still, in 2013 - flesh and buns, and meat and fat; or cuts on a menu, birds, with "small breasts and huge thighs", sold at a premium by men to be consumed by men and by extension therefore, all of us, all the time*". This is a perfect example of IUG. Note that the blame for the objectionable sleaze on the toilet wall is placed, not on "a man" but on "men". That's how it works. You see, I personally share in the guilt of imposing this nasty porn on the world. Which is odd, because I would not enter an establishment in Soho called Flesh & Buns. I would know what to expect and have no wish to be exposed to such stuff. In truth, only a vanishingly small percentage of men are involved in this sort of rubbish. The vast majority of men are builders, plumbers, garage mechanics, bin-men, etc etc. Ms Cosslett, on behalf of 99% of men, I refuse to accept the slice of implied guilt you are offering me. I refuse to accept it.

Unsavoury places like Flesh & Buns exist only because people frequent them and put money into the hands of their owners. Of the two of us, Ms Cosslett, you have put money into their hands and I have not.

And what about the half-truth element in this article? Well, as far as I can see Ms Cosslett did not even find out whether the establishment in question was owned by a man rather than a woman. I don't wish to shock you, but women do have a track record of making money out of sleazy sex. To assume that a man rather than a woman is behind said porn is unjustified. And if it were a woman, Ms Cosslett's position is to blame all men for the doings of one woman. Outstanding reasoning! There is an explicit example within the article of this tendency of feminists to fail to notice that many of the things they object to are actually perpetrated by women, not men. She mentions Robin Thicke, a reference to the Blurred Lines video. This is another bit of nastiness, we can agree on that. But the Director and creative agency behind Blurred Lines was a woman (Diane Martel), a fact that feminists never mention. Moreover, Martel's declared intention in that video was to take the piss out of men (<http://redpilluk.co.uk/BlurredLines.pdf>).

Ms Cosslett expresses concern for her hypothetical daughters in potentially being exposed, without their consent, to pornography. But she fails to express any concern for hypothetical sons. Perhaps the thought of bearing male children is too horrible for her to contemplate. But if she could bring herself to imagine it, she might like to consider how they would feel about being exposed, without their consent, to the abuse of being blamed for things they have not done - things of which, being not yet born,

they must be innocent. Yet they will be expected to carry their share of the burden of guilt simply because they are male.

Ms Cosslett finds the porn particularly offensive because it appeared in the women's toilet. She writes, "*Perhaps it's because the ladies' loos are supposed to be "our" space, a private sphere where men and their junk, both literal and metaphorical, are not invited*". I sympathise with this. Surely our respective toilets at least should be sanctuaries from the gender war raging everywhere else. And this is why I am particularly outraged by initiatives in Europe to remove urinals from men's toilets, forcing men to sit down to pee - see <http://digitaljournal.com/article/352108>. Do not be fooled by the spurious justifications for this: it is simply man-shaming. The objective is to do away with the last remaining man-only space: our bogs. Feminists (and regrettably some of them are men) now believe they have the right to dictate the posture a man adopts when urinating. I hereby declare that I will forever pee standing even if it lands me in prison (and don't think that is too far fetched).

Ms Cosslett's accusation of misogyny might have some justification if it were directed specifically against those responsible for Flesh & Buns and similar places. But her own sin is the greater. She is contributing to reinforcing the already universal misandry of our society, and this misandry is the force which underlies the real gender disadvantage in our society. As such Ms Cosslett is hypocritical. I anticipate that she will not recognise this because she will steadfastly refuse to accept that it is unjust to blame all men for the crimes of a few (men and women). But this condemnation of all men because her mindset revolves around universal guilt is itself the essence of sexism. And this is why Ms Cosslett is a hypocrite. But it is not entirely her fault. She has been brought up in a philosophy which is based on anti-male sexism. The defining feature of feminism is patriarchy: the belief that all men naturally oppress women. Feminism is a pernicious and false philosophy which has perverted the minds of generations of women. It is a most tempting philosophy for women to adopt because it is so easy and comfortable for them to do so. It teaches them that, as women, they are invariably in the right and all the ills of the world can be laid at the door of men. How comforting for them, and how intellectually corrupt an ideology it is.

Whilst women are pressing for greater representation on the boards of multinational companies and in parliament, and are campaigning against people saying nasty things about them on Twitter and toy shops labelling toys as boys' toys, men's concerns are vastly more fundamental. Men want the right to know whether a child is theirs. Men want to be regarded as equal parents with mothers and to bring to an end a situation in which 1 in 3 fathers will have their children forcibly removed from them by the state for no reason other than gender discrimination. Men want the existence of violence against them, both within and outside the home, to be recognised instead of air-brushed away as it now is in all official documents and policies. The existence of policies such as the protection of women and girls would be a fine thing if men and boys were accorded the same concern rather than being portrayed only as the perpetrators of abuse and never its victims. Women have fourth wave feminism: men have yet to have their first wave of justice.