

CAUSES OF THE PATRIARCHY

Prof. Dr. Hugo de Garis

profhugodegaris@yahoo.com

<https://profhugodegaris.wordpress.com>

What causes the patriarchy, i.e. the general male dominated culture we live in, in which men have nearly all the power, dominate our cultures, invent almost everything, build almost everything, create almost everything, who rule the world?

The short answer to this question is that it is a consequence of two main things, i.e. women's hypergamous nature, and men's greater variance (i.e. GMV = greater male variance).

A few days before writing this flyer I was actually a witness to a feminist demo downtown in the city I now live in, i.e. Melbourne, Australia. I was sitting in the tram going home after attending a seminar at the local university (Melbourne University) and heard a commotion outside the tram. I looked up to see what it was and saw amongst other groups, a bunch of placard-carrying feminists with messages such as "Remove the Patriarchy!"

I thought, "Oh, this looks interesting, my first contact with real live feminists, after 12 years in China, where there is virtually

no feminist organization.” So I got off the tram and walked around the demo groups reading their placard messages. At the feminist group was a young woman in her 20s who held the placard “Remove the patriarchy” so I thought I would see how she coped with the masculist and MGTOW critique of the feminists’ view of the patriarchy. I asked her “How can the patriarchy be removed when it is largely women who created it?” She replied in a fairly polite manner “I think you have been badly misinformed.”

Then out of the blue, a much older woman, about my own age, i.e. in her 70s, turned around and told me with a voice full of hatred, “Get out of here! This is a women’s demo!” This was the first time I had had a real taste of what the American and Canadian men’s movement refer to as a true, real-life “feminazi.” i.e. a woman who truly hates men and is EXTREMELY vindictive towards them. It blew the wind out of my sails.

This old woman, with a face utterly wrinkled, obviously worn down by life, full of hate, vindictive, totally misandrist, generated in me an impulse to slam my fist into her ugly, low class, low IQ, vindictive face, but there were cops around, who knew nothing about masculism, so all I managed was a “Oh shut up!” “I won’t shut up, get out of here!” she harped back, with real venom in her eyes.

It was clear that this conversation was going nowhere, so I just walked away, stung by the level of hatred for men in this old

woman, whom I assume had made a near total failure of her miserable existence, ground down by the cares of life and who totally, unquestioningly, blamed men for her situation, instead of facing up to the much tougher question of what role her own inadequacies and female inferiorities were partly responsible for her situation.

I went away in a paranoid rage, with a real bitter taste in my mouth. I later reflected on my own level of anger at this shrewish bitch, that men in the 16th century Europe would have burned. I wondered, where did my own hatred for such behavior from women come from? I thought probably from the deep frustration and alienation small boys feel at the hands of female dictatorial giants called mothers and female primary school teachers.

In 4th grade, I had a spinster teacher who had the habit of poking her young male students. I hated this woman with a passion. She actually hurt me physically. I suspect she was getting her own back at being rejected by men, since she was a spinster. She had power over small boys, and enjoyed using it, probably more at an unconscious level than at a conscious, rationalized level.

This nasty incident with the shrewish feminazi in Melbourne got me thinking more about the origins, the causes of patriarchy, and I came up with what I think are the two main factors, i.e. female hypergamy, and greater male variance (GMV).

When I asked the young feminist holding the placard which said “Remove the patriarchy!” “How can the patriarchy be removed, when it is women who largely cause it?” it was not a tongue in cheek question, it was serious, and is one of the major reasons why masculist scientists like myself don’t take feminism seriously, since so many of its basic ideas don’t make any sense.

I was curious to see how this young feminist would cope with the masculist science behind the masculists’ critique of the feminist conception of the patriarchy, until it was so rudely interrupted by the shrewish burnable witch who killed the conversation I was having with the much younger, much more polite, feminist.

Women are hypergamous. i.e. they have an evolved female instinct to “mate up” i.e. to allow a man to ejaculate in her who is taller, bigger, stronger, fiercer and smarter than she is. Women have always had a monopoly over control of reproduction. It is women who decide which man will ejaculate in her, making her pregnant.

Given this power that women have always had, it is not surprising that woman (ab)use this power in their own interest. So why have women chosen men who were taller, bigger, stronger, fiercer than they were to be the fathers of their children? Because it was to women’s advantage to do just that. By giving access to her vagina to a taller, bigger, stronger, fiercer male than herself, she would be more likely to keep him around, so that he could get more sex from her, that he so

desperately wants, given that ejaculating in a woman fills his brain with pleasure hormones, making him feel wonderful.

A taller, bigger, stronger, fiercer man would be more likely to be able to defend her against tall, big, strong, fierce men from enemy tribes in times of tribal warfare, or even from tall, big, strong, fierce men from her own tribe, so it was in her self interest to mate with such a man, rather than with some small, gentle, nice natured man, who would lose out in a one to one violent contest with another man who was taller, bigger, stronger, fiercer than he was.

Women have also sexually selected men who were smarter than them, because smarter men tended to be better hunters, who were more likely to come home after a hunt with meat, that the women and their babies needed to survive on, especially in times of starvation, when death was just one missed meal away.

Since women have monopoly control of reproduction, who decide which man ejaculates in them, it is women who have made men the way they are. Since women have been sexually selecting men for 10,000s of generations who were smarter than them, more aggressive than them, then surprise, surprise, today's men are more aggressive and smarter than women, hence the patriarchy, where men are smarter than women on average by 4 IQ points, modern research shows, so it is not surprising that men have won 99% of the science Nobel prizes.

We live in a patriarchy, that indirectly, women have created, that women have caused, due to their hypergamous instinct to mate up. A classic case would be when a female doctor refuses to date a male plumber, even if the plumber makes more money than she does, because the plumber's genes are too inferior in her judgement for her kids, so she rejects him. She wants a superior man with superior genes for her kids, so that her kids can have superior genes compared to hers, and that is good for the species, so was inherited.

Thanks to the lower average intelligence and lower level of numeracy (i.e. ability to think mathematically) of women compared to men, the above hypergamy argument of masculist scientists just washes over the heads of most feminists. Their 10% smaller brains and 4 IQ point lower average intelligence compared to men make it more difficult for women to understand the above hypergamy arguments.

It is this relative inability of most feminists to grasp such arguments on the part of the masculist scientists that causes such men to sneer at the run of the mill feminazi, who is too stupid, too ignorant to understand such masculist scientific thinking, which merely increases the level of contempt coming from masculist scientists towards these ignorant, isscienate (i.e. unable to think scientifically, due to ignorance of science) feminazis.

But, female hypergamy is not the only important factor in causing the patriarchy. Another big one is the phenomenon of

GMV, i.e. greater male variance. If you ask most feminists what variance is, they will stare blankly at you. Most feminists are innumerates, i.e. cant calculate, due to having dropped math as soon as the education system allowed them to do so, i.e. after 10th grade in many countries.

Women have lower energy levels and lower average IQs than men, so prefer to take the intellectually lazier, intellectually easier “soft option” at high school, choosing to study memory based majors, such as English literature, languages, history, etc., rather than the analytical, thinking majors such as math, and the sciences.

These intellectually lazy young women, become what the masculists call “fluffie crappers” i.e. they study fluffie crap, i.e. career incompetent majors, that will force them to study more fluffie crap majors at college, so that they end up with a fluffie crap diploma that the economy does not value, so that these fluffie crappers start looking around for some gullible manslave to parasite upon in their 30s, when their biological clocks are ticking hard, and they realize with their fluffie crap diplomas they cant afford to buy their own middle class house that they want to raise HER kids in, so tries to get her financial claws into some gullible manslavable man who knows nothing about MGTOW (men going their own way) nor masculist ideas, so that HE pays for the house she raises HER kids in.

This fluffie crapper typically has had, research shows, some 40 different penises in her by the time she is in her 30s. She has

imbibed feminist rhetoric that with the male invented contraceptive pill, women can fuck around as much as men, but they fail to note that there is a basic asymmetry in men's and women's role in reproduction, i.e. that women know that they are the mother, and usually who the father is, but men can't be sure that they are the father, since women constantly cheat, wanting the sperm of an alpha male for their kids, i.e. the female hypergamous instinct is operating here.

Research shows that the more penises a woman has in her, the higher is the probability that she will divorce, dragging her husband through the horrors of the fluffie feminist hypocrite dominated divorce court system, financially crucifying him, ripping his kids from him with a 90% probability, taking HIS house so she can raise HER kids in it, taking half his possessions, forcing him via the deeply misandrist gender laws of the divorce courts, to pay child support to kids he will barely see, and often if his ex-wife is a real fluffie, he will be forced to pay her alimony for the rest of his life, with no moral nor legal obligation on her to FIP up (become a FIP = financially independent person) by getting a career competent education, so that she can become a moral, financially responsible adult, instead of remaining a fluffie parasite, that the masculists hate so much, that they aim to wipe out such women by forcing them to rot on the shelf to extinction, by totally ignoring such women, not even pumping and dumping them, so as to remove their fluffie bitch genes from the gene pool, leaving more FIP women,

more moral, responsible adult women, who survive this masculist selection, this masculist genetic filtering of women.

In any sexually dimorphic species, i.e. where the bodies of the males and females differ, then on just about any measurable quantity you choose, the males will have a greater numerical variance, i.e. over the whole population, the scores on whatever is measured, will be more spread out over the male population, than the female population, whose scores will be more bunched up.

For example, in the case of human IQ scores, men have a GMV (greater male variance) of 10%. We know this scientifically, because every year in the US, 100,000s of school kids have their IQs measured, so the IQ variance ratio (i.e. the male IQ variance, divided by the female IQ variance) is very accurately known, and like clockwork, every year, comes out as 1.1, 1.1, so that the male IQ variance is about 10% higher than the female variance.

Variance is a technical term from statistics, that measures how spread out scores are over a population. The distribution of these scores takes the usual bell curve shape of the Gaussian probability distribution.

Masculist mathematicians like myself can plug into these bell curve distributions the two needed parameters, i.e. the average IQ, and the variance, and derive the two bell curves, the male IQ bell curve formula, and the female IQ bell curve formula. From

these two bell curves, once can easily predict the proportion of men to women, scoring at various IQ levels, e.g. the level needed to get a bachelor degree in math, a masters degree in math, a PhD in math, become a junior professor in math, a senior professor in math, win a Field's Medal or Abel Prize in math.

These theoretical predictions on the proportions of women with such IQs, compared to men, can then be compared with the actual proportions in the real world. The match is actually pretty good. I have done this calculation myself, predicting that only one woman would win the Field's Medal in math per century, and that is what has happened. Only one woman has ever won the Field's Medal (the Nobel prize equivalent in math). This mathematical model predicts that about a tenth of math and computer science full professors would be female, and that is roughly what I observe in my own experience in many of the universities I have been associated with.

Thus the phenomenon of GMV also plays an important role in the causation of the patriarchy. With a 10% higher IQ variance, men dominate the extreme fringes of the IQ distributions, i.e. the moron end, and the genius end. No one cares about the morons, they are a societal liability, but all cultures care very much about the top end, the genius end, because it is the geni who create and drive society, and they are nearly all men, as a simple consequence of the phenomenon of GMV.

Most feminists know nothing about such stuff, so it is not surprising that masculist scientist, mathematicians, like myself, sneer at the level of feminazi isscienacy and innumeracy, not taking such women seriously, treating them like children, because to such male minds, such women are children, with child like minds, who contribute so little to world culture, due to their greatly inferior minds.

With men being both 4 IQ points on average smarter than women, due to women's hypergamy, and men's 10% larger IQ variance, (plus the even more damning fact of women's 10% smaller brains, their 10 billion fewer neurons in their female brains) it is not surprising that today's world is a patriarchy, i.e. male dominated.

It is to be expected, that the smartest members of a culture will dominate it. Since men are smarter than women, and have a greater IQ variance, it follows that men dominate our cultures, and hence we all live in patriarchies. It is not going to go away, until women give up their hypergamy, which is not going to happen, given that it is a strong instinct in women, to mate up for the sake of their kids, and the phenomenon of GMV is also not going to disappear, until we genetically engineer men and women to be fundamentally different from what we are today.

Speaking of GMV, where does it come from? Recently I asked an expert in math and the human genome, who specializes in Denisovan genes in Papuan populations, whether he agreed with the following reasoning that I dreamt up. He said he was not an

expert in such matters, but given his math background and his expertise in molecular genetics, he said that what I proposed to him was “very plausible, and interesting.”

I made the claim to him, that the primary reason for the GMV phenomenon was due to the fact that men have only one X chromosome in their genomes, whereas women have two. The male Y chromosome is small, about a quarter the size of the average chromosome. The X female chromosome on the other hand is one of the largest, in the top 5 of the 23 chromosome pairs we have in our cells. There are about 23000 genes in the human genome, so that's roughly 1000 genes on average per chromosome, so since the X chromosome is one of the biggest, lets say it has about 1250 genes, and that the Y chromosome has only about 250 genes, i.e. is 5 times fewer than the X chromosome.

The father gives his 23 chromosomes to the baby, and so does the mother, so there are 23 PAIRS of chromosomes in each human cell. Each gene on the female chromosome pairs off with its corresponding gene on the male chromosome, but only one of them gets used, i.e. expressed. The gene that gets used is called dominant, because it dominates, i.e. switches off, the other gene from the other parent, which is called the recessive gene.

It is a biological fact that there are many more recessive genes than dominant genes. Since they are routinely switched off, they accumulate over 1000s of generations, and there are good evolutionary reasons to say why this is a good thing, because

when the environment suddenly changes, new varieties of creatures in a species need to be created, so that the species survives the environmental catastrophic changes.

So there are about 1000 more genes on the male's X chromosome (inherited from the mother) than on the male's Y chromosome, that get used (expressed). Many of these X chromosome genes are NOT paired off with corresponding genes on the other X chromosome that exists in females, who have two X chromosomes.

This means that a greater variety of genes get expressed in males than females, i.e. that the males have a greater genetic variation, i.e. a greater genetic variance, than females, hence the phenomenon of GMV. In the case of IQ, men have a 10% higher IQ variance than women.

The math molecular biologist I talked to seemed very interested in my proposition, but said he was not an expert in such reasoning, and had not read anything along these lines, but he did say that he found it "very plausible and interesting." I told him my background was in math, physics and computing, but that I was not an expert in mathematical genetics.

So, I'm still looking for scientific confirmation of my "One X male chromosome theory, as an explanation for men's GMV." Anyone who reads this who is such an expert, please email me, to set me straight, because if confirmed, it would be a devastating piece of science based propaganda against the

isscientate, innumerate feminazis, some of whom are so hateful of men, so ignorant and tied up in their own echo chambered feminazi propaganda mill, that science and facts become irrelevant to these child minded fairies, living in a fairy land, believing what they want to believe, without evidence, making them no better than religionists, creationists, flat earthers. If you are free to believe whatever you like, you are free to believe in the tooth fairy.

When the feminazis come out with their isscientate, innumerate garbage, e.g. with respect to the patriarchy, then the scientate, numerate males, such as myself, merely sneer, increasing the level of contempt we have for these poor inferior creatures, who just don't have the brain power to be anything better than what nature programmed them to be.

Cheers,

Prof. Dr. Hugo de Garis

profhugodegaris@yahoo.com

<https://profhugodegaris.wordpress.com> (contains links to 300 YouTube masculist essays/videos)

=====