

## CONTROVERSIAL OPINIONS ON FEMALE MODESTY

Feminism has allowed female intrasexual competition to go completely unfettered, intensifying competition among women over their image and desirability because men no longer control the standard for how women should present themselves. This has messed up certain dynamics needed for a functional civilization. We live in civilization, so this has been a disaster for both men and women. This problem has also been worsened by technological progress.

One example of this is how everywhere you look, almost every woman has her hair down, unleashed, on display. Why? Logistically speaking, women are only physically able to do this because their hair has been cut short. All these women with their hair on display have it no longer than their bra-strap, or their collarbone in most instances. But why do even high class, non-worker women keep their hair short? The short answer is that the industrial revolution replaced culturally specific knowledge of haircare, with chemical products and a “haircare” industry that incentivizes having short hair. This sets the stage for women even being able to have their hair down 24/7. But why do women actually choose to let their hair down? And why is this near universal in Western nations?

1) Feminist social norms give women the freedom to appear and behave however they want, with minimal or no social consequence.

2) Because having your hair down as a woman makes you more sexually desirable.

Having your hair down, especially in “face-framing layers,” hides how fat a woman’s face is, the shape of her ears, and how recessed her maxilla and mandible are. Women flatten the perceived range of sexual attractiveness by doing this, and it gives mediocre looking women a huge leg up. This contributes to what Red Pill guys call “hoeflation.”

It used to be, historically, that women would only let their hair down either in the evening, right before bed, or right before sex. An intimate treasure to behold. And this has been true across many civilizations, for thousands of years. What then, does it say about our current society that women have their hair down, 24/7, on display, in public for all men and women to see?

No doubt, styling your hair and showing it off every day is a lot of work. Not only due to social expectation that women create for each other and themselves, and the fact that men got used to this and expect it of women now, but because women are in a sense trapped without knowledge of tradition. Modern “haircare” creates more of a need for its products with continual use to the point where women complain that their hair “gets greasy” after 2 days of not using shampoo. This isn’t normal. But now, women are expected not only to brush their hair every day, which is impossible for a lot of hair types, but to get rid of all visible frizz, and style it. Exhausting! This is added aesthetic labor that women would not have to do in the past every day. There’s a reason why women washed their hair with egg yolks, powdered their hair, wore braids, and wore head-coverings. Life is NOT supposed to be this hard.

Nowadays, women with their shorter hair spend hours in the bathroom before a date, and what about women like me, whose hair reaches the bottom of their ass? What are we to do? I just braid my hair to retain moisture. And if I'm feeling fancy, I wrap it around my head like a crown with bobby pins!

Almost every woman partakes in having her hair down, even if they don't realize why. Women "vibe" their way into social status because they generally aren't fully conscious enough to be thinking of these dynamics. In short, women having their hair down is a matter of the Prisoner's Dilemma.

The Prisoner's Dilemma describes a situation where individuals acting in their own self-interest end up producing a worse outcome for everyone involved. Even though cooperation would benefit the group, each person has an incentive to "defect" to avoid being disadvantaged if others do not cooperate.

If every woman has her hair up, but *anyone* is allowed to have her hair down, the few women who then choose to have their hair down will receive special favors and more attention from men. Inevitably, the rest of the women would want that too, and have their hair down as well, but now only the women who are more attractive for other reasons get that attention, with the initial advantage of having your hair down completely gone. A new, immodest norm is created, to the detriment of all women. This phenomenon doesn't stop there, though. The loop repeats itself as mid women need new ways to differentiate themselves from other women to gain more attention from men. Hence, we have average women painting a jawline and cheekbones on their faces, wearing mini-skirts and yoga pants to incite lust, wearing long, fake nails to signal that they don't do any actual labor, lip filler, and other ways to gain more sexual attention from men, that women will say they do "for themselves".

This is why radical feminists encourage women to not shave, to not wear makeup, and to be au naturel, because they realize that women putting in all this effort is the Prisoner's Dilemma. What feminists get wrong is in thinking that this is all the fault of men. Men were the ones historically who maintained hem length laws (so no need to shave), enforced women wearing head-coverings, and enforced the social stigmatization of women who wore heavy makeup. Back in the day, women would just stuff the top of their corsets and their panniers to give the illusion of big boobs, a tiny waist, and a large butt, and men *knew* this and did not expect women to look the same under all that clothing. Contrast this to today, where feminists complain that "body types" are trends now, not realizing that this is a female creation that is allowed to exist due to feminist social norms. When men enforced modesty norms, they were capping the female arms race to the bottom. Now, women turn every square inch of their bodies into an advertisement. It's the difference between male-enforced modesty vs current female-driven standards and trends.

To return to the statement in the beginning of this essay, how does technological progress make this problem 10x worse specifically? Women are encouraged to not only purchase hundreds of chemical products, resulting in increased aesthetic labor, but the ability for even a mediocre looking woman to change her appearance is increased by magnitudes that the average man today does not want to understand. Women can fraud hair length, hair color, hairline, baby hairs, hair type, eyebrow shape, eyebrow fullness, eyelash length, eyelash thickness, canthal tilt, eye color, depth of eyebags, upper eyelid exposure, perceived thinness of nose bridge and bulb, perceived upturn of the nose, hollowness of cheekbones, depth of orbital sockets, robusticity and leanness of jaw, contrast of all features against the skin, depth of nasolabial folds, appearance of acne, brightness of skin, bloodflow to the cheeks,

fullness of lips, shape of lips, color of lips, proportion of lips relative to each other, perceived facial shape, and probably a bunch of other things I'm missing, and that's only for the face! You can quite literally purchase a pair of Abby Shapiro titties if you have the money. And if you're of a certain demographic and too lazy to lift weights, an ass as well. Needless to say, the standards are WAY higher for women now, not only because of the feedback loop I explained prior, but because we have the technological capacity to act upon those high standards.

And how exactly does this phenomenon mess up the dynamics between men and women? By artificially inflating women's sexual value, men are enslaved to women's perceived beauty more than they otherwise would be. Which weakens men by making them more subservient in the long term, and consequently, more feminine and less attractive. Ie, simping. This then feeds back into itself and makes women seem even *more* attractive than the average man for this reason, that she is so feminine in comparison to his diminished masculinity.

Feminism didn't free women from male standards; it freed the female arms race from any ceiling. The result isn't liberation—it's exhaustion.

## PART 2: WHY WOMEN SHOULD NOT SHOW THEIR FACES ONLINE

The intellectual marketplace of ideas should NOT be sullied by sex appeal. Ideas should compete on merit. Your "based" conservative commentary channel shouldn't be getting views on the fact that you're a blonde showing your collarbones, looking surprised in the thumbnail.

Aside from my channel, when was the last time you heard a unique philosophical or political insight from a woman online? Women online have to show their faces for their ideas to pick up any traction because their ideas don't stand on their own. If you are a female content creator who is upset at this, respond to this video with a faceless video essay of your own, and let's see whose ideas really stand.

The result? We already know that conservative women online are whores, and the farther right they are, the even more whorish. Like Sara Stock as an infamous example. I like to call them vril whores, since they've slept with 14 men and sucked 88 cocks. The "right-wing e-girl" ecosystem is just OnlyFans with extra steps: vril whores selling their sexual attractiveness and borrowed talking points to men who mistake arousal for agreement. At least female leftist "video essayists" have a majority female audience, and are actually less whorish despite defending whoredom in their videos!

Women shouldn't show their faces online not just because sex appeal and physical attractiveness keeps people watching and engaging with the content that is devoid of substance, but because it also distracts from whatever substance may have been there in the first place. Online, appearances are reality. Not truth. If you look too ugly or too sexual, nobody cares about the validity of your ideas. If you're too mid, the same thing applies. It's impossible to not have your appearance negatively impact the way your ideas are perceived as a woman. It doesn't matter if you are a female Nobel prize winner, if you aren't hot, nobody cares. The truth is that men view women as sexual objects first, by their nature, which SHOULD be restricted within civilization but is unraveling in this one due to feminism. You have to be a horny man to think Brett Cooper makes good arguments, but she doesn't. All she does is betray her husband online by making herself an available sexual object of desire to millions of men. If

you were to transcribe the subtitles of conservative female content, you'd realize they mainly make appeals to social norms and emotion. As for me personally, I already made a video titled "WHY I DON'T SHOW MY FACE", outlining my strategy for my colonization of the intellectual marketplace.

## MOVING FORWARD

Clearly, by no means am I stating female sexuality is a bad thing. I'm not for banning beauty, just noting that empires need veils, tribes don't, and that because we live in civilization, it makes far more sense on an individual long-term benefit level and short-term collective benefit level to act accordingly. Hair up, faces off camera, or shut up.