

**v5k2c2.com**

news about cooze that's always fit to print

# If She Only Had A Dad...



Over on Airstrip One, our Christian brother Jason [describes](#) his recent exploits as a

guerrilla minister. He goes out on foot in the evenings, not to run hoez or get drunk, but to try and do what society won't, namely keeping young people out of trouble. On one particular night, he met a nice but troublefinding kid named Aieesha.

*I offered prayer, one took me up on it (her name was Aieesha...pray for her....if she actually had a dad, a PASTOR or grandfather around she would turn around quick).*

Aieesha does have a dad, of course. She just doesn't live with him. It might be that skank-ho mommy threw him out of the house recently, and is now preparing to run him face-first through the divorce courts. It might also be that in the course of fucking and sucking hundreds of random strangers, she conceived Aieesha, and thus became entitled to 19+ years of taxpayer-funded freebies. Either way, it doesn't matter, as the result for the rest of us is the same. We have another aimless young girl wandering the streets, while she should be home doing her homework, under the protection and loving guidance of the only man who can be counted on to selflessly look after her interests.

The only winner in this scenario is skank-ho mommy. The rest of us lost, Aieesha's dad lost big, and Aieesha lost most of all. Pray for her, if you pray, and let your heart fill with hatred for the trash that has inflicted misery on her and upon her generation.



**Author: Boxer**

Sinister All-Male Dancer. Secret King of all Gamma Males. Member of Frankfurt School. Your Fave Contrarian! [View all posts by Boxer](#)



Boxer / 2018-05-10 / General Nonsense

---

## 14 thoughts on “If She Only Had A Dad...”

**earl**

2018-05-10 at 10:18

‘Pray for her, if you pray, and let your heart fill with hatred for the trash that has inflicted misery on her and upon her generation.’

Feminism.

What is the ethos that promotes promiscuity, abortion, divorce, and/or empowering single mothers for their bad decisions? If it is something else I’d like to know.

**Derek Ramsey**

2018-05-10 at 11:13

“*If it is something else I’d like to know.*”

It’s not either-or, it’s part-whole. Feminism is a subset (or tool) of ‘leftist’ philosophy. Leftism’s essence is anti-religion (really, anti-Christianity). The defining characteristics are moral inversion, destruction, and [abstraction](#). This can be demonstrated in countless examples. Christianity is moral, creative, and personal.

Unfortunately, this is confused by the false notion that the opposite of leftism is conservatism. It is not, and those who use ‘CONservative’ have realized this. Nor do the various other non-religious philosophical attempts (sorry Boxer) adequately explain the destruction of feminism or offer viable solutions. They ultimately contribute in varying degrees to the problem.

I objected to Simon Sheppard’s thesis and concluded my two-part guest posts with “*we need more fathers, more marriages, more babies, and more Christians*” because Christianity is the sole explanation and solution.

**earl**

2018-05-10 at 11:18

‘The defining characteristics are moral inversion, destruction, and abstraction.’

Well then the heart of it all is Satanism basically.

Feminism is the current flavor of the zeitgeist.

**Ramshackle Squatter**

2018-05-10 at 15:03

“*Well then the heart of it all is Satanism basically.*”

If, by Satanism, you mean both the implicit and explicit rejection of Christianity, then yes. It may seem trite, but if Christianity represents the ultimate good and truth, then anything deviating from that is ultimately destructive and false, varying only in degree of falseness.

“*Feminism is the current flavor of the zeitgeist.*”

Feminism is what we are concerned about here (i.e. selection bias), but it misses the bigger picture: cause (leftism) and effect (feminism). Feminism does reinforce leftism. Let’s look at a few examples that have leftism, but not feminism, as the underlying philosophy.

## Adoption

Catholic charities can’t operate because it won’t let gay couples adopt (moral inversion). So Catholic charities closes, resulting in fewer adoptions (destruction). They consider it a victory because some identity group (abstraction) wins. It doesn’t matter that real persons are harmed.

## Medical Care

Alfie Evans, against the desires of his family, was murdered because an abstract, morally inverted organization/policy said he needed to die and die immediately. This was facilitated by a system that is itself a product of leftism. Compare this to the Vatican's response.

## Economic Prosperity

For all the public talk about wage equality and prosperity, California has some of the highest poverty and homeless rates (destruction). The policies necessarily fail because they are moral inversions (e.g. immigrants violating the rule-of-law, forced wealth transfer for social services, minimum wage laws, etc.) and *essentially* abstractions (e.g. policy- and identity-based rather than personal). Contrast this with an effective, usually religious, charitable organization that provides food, clothing, shelter, and personal relationships and does so effectively on much smaller budgets and without the bureaucracy.

See also: *Acosta v. Cathedral Buffet, Inc.*; *Ernest Angley*.

I could go on and on: gun control, gay marriage, drug policy, government organization, corporate structures and environments, hate crimes/speech control, police culture, dishonesty, art, religious tolerance, racism, etc.



**Boxer** 

2018-05-10 at 19:20

Hey fellas: Good comments.

*If, by Satanism, you mean both the implicit and explicit rejection of Christianity, then yes. It may seem trite, but if Christianity represents the ultimate good and truth, then anything deviating from that is ultimately destructive and false, varying only in degree of falseness.*

This is a logical fallacy colloquially called “excluding the middle.” There’s a perfect example of it in no. 2 on this page:

### Example #2:

**I am not both a Christian and a Satanist.**

**I am not a Satanist.**

**Therefore, I am a Christian.**

**Explanation:** The truth of both premises does not guarantee that I am a Christian; therefore, this argument is invalid — the form of this formal argument is invalid. Being “not both” a Satanist and a Christian, only means that if I am not one of the two, I am simply not one of the two — we cannot logically conclude that I am the other.

<https://www.logicallyfallacious.com/tools/lp/Bo/LogicalFallacies/76/Denying-a-Conjunct>

Carry on,

Boxer



**Renee Harris**

2018-05-10 at 20:24

19 years? Are you talking about back child support



**Derek Ramsey**

2018-05-10 at 20:28

Having detected the potential for this exact fallacy in Brother Earl’s comment, I (re)defined “Satanism” as the end point on a continuum (‘varying only in degree’)

between ultimate good (Christianity) and evil ('implicit/explicit rejection of Christianity'). This avoids the logical either-or problem. Since you quoted me, I can only presume that I was unclear.

Regardless, I think Brother Earl and myself were not trying to label *someone* as Satanist or Christian: everyone is a sinner (in Christian parlance). Rather, the point is where one's beliefs (underlying *philosophies*) fall on the continuum.

My examples are there to show that (1) leftism is far, *far* to the evil side ('satanism') of the continuum and ultimately responsible for most of the things this blog complains about; and (2) the polarity is so stark that the most sensible conclusion is that the best way to fight leftism (and by extension feminism) is through Christianity.

My secondary point is echoing Matt 12:30: those not actively supporting Christianity are actively or passively against it. If you want to claim that I'm excluding a middle, then I'm guilty as charged: I think it is impossible to be neutral and also have skin in this game.



**Boxer** 

2018-05-10 at 20:45

Dear Peeps:

*My examples are there to show that (1) leftism is far, far to the evil side ('satanism') of the continuum and ultimately responsible for most of the things this blog complains about; and (2) the polarity is so stark that the most sensible conclusion is that the best way to fight leftism (and by extension feminism) is through Christianity.*

Aren't you an anabaptist? If I have that correctly, then you're sprung from one of the very few ethnic groups that have a greater historical commitment to communism than my own.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United\\_Order](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Order)

I'm pretty sure we stole some of our communist ideas from you guys, so, thanks.

In any event, political leftism was defeated (by Feminists and Christians, who usually work in tandem) decades ago. I think the fighting on that front is over.

More importantly, projecting the blame for wimminz behavior on nebulous scapegoats like "Satan" or "Karl Marx" just serves the feminist imperative. I'm a leftist, but my main concern is men, regardless of race or political preference, so I don't usually bother to fight with guys like you and Earl, over undefinable terms or castles-in-the-sky political nonsense.

*19 years? Are you talking about back child support*

The freebies begin the minute she conceives, in most parts of North America. There's food and cash subsidies, housing, medical and dental care, the works... Some of these freebies last well into her baby's 20s. If anything, I was being conservative in my assessment of the incentives.

<https://family.findlaw.com/child-support/college-expenses-and-child-support-faq.html>

Best,

Boxer



earl

2018-05-10 at 21:01

'I am not both a Christian and a Satanist.

I am not a Satanist.

Therefore, I am a Christian.'

Well you are Mormon so in this case the surprise is taken out.

But I digress...my point was things like ‘moral inversion, destruction, and abstraction’ are in Satan’s wheelhouse. Or more apt Christ said he was a liar and a murderer from the beginning. What Derek was explaining above is a good representation of where I was going.

---



earl

2018-05-10 at 21:29

‘More importantly, projecting the blame for wimminz behavior on nebulous scapegoats like “Satan” or “Karl Marx” just serves the feminist imperative.’

Duly noted...but to be fair Satan did give the first women the idea she could be ‘like God’ by consuming the knowledge of good and evil. Then she acted upon it. So she worked with the devil to rebel against God (with Adam following). Now the feminist imperative seems to recreate that ‘like God’ with some ‘goddess within’ nonsense.

When a woman’s behavior is ordered more towards God’s will...she tends to be more holy and more feminine. And I’m not talking the ones who say they are a devout Christian and then give into Boxer 2 hours later...I mean one who actually do live a life ordered towards God’s will.

---



Derek Ramsey

2018-05-11 at 06:27

“Aren’t you an anabaptist? I’m pretty sure we stole some of our communist ideas from you guys, so, thanks.”

In addition to communism, I’ve always thought that we Anabaptists were the original SJWs. There is plenty of apparent irony in this. Examine closely what I’ve said and note that that communism cannot work apart from a Christian context. The

philosophy du jour that rejects Christianity can't hope to make it work and every major example bears this out.

Political leanings (and spectrums) are meaningless to what I'm talking about. Look back at my examples. The goals, like economic prosperity, are universally good concepts regardless of one's political leanings. It is the way we go about implementing them that is the issue. Adoption is great and can be done by Christians and non-Christians alike. But when you try to remove or subvert Christian morality, it breaks down.

Let me explain it this way: capitalism's origin has its roots in Christianity. In its Christian context it has been wildly beneficial. And yet Christian communism can also be successful. This is because there is nothing inherently wrong with capitalism or communism. What makes it wrong is rejection of Christianity.

### | *"I'm a leftist"*

These politically loaded "undefinable terms" are difficult to work with. Understandably, we seem to be working with different definitions of leftism. Let it be defined as the prevailing anti-Christian philosophy that undergirds current culture, or as Earl says, zeitgeist. It most closely aligns to political leftism (especially among progressives), but shows up everywhere on the political spectrum.

I'd rather abandon the term completely and just use "rejection of Christianity", but most people don't realize that this is what they are doing. This is the point of my examples. Those who use their political views to shut down Catholic Charities think they are doing something positive but are really being highly destructive precisely because they are engaging in anti-Christian behavior, whether this is their intention or not. The worthless 'best intentions' lead to destruction.



**Derek Ramsey**

2018-05-11 at 10:11

“*projecting the blame for wimminz behavior on nebulous scapegoats...*”

I’m not projecting blame or scapegoating. This is a false dilemma: both the philosophies and its proponents can be examined critically. Those who subscribe to failed human philosophies are fully responsible for their own (inevitably) destructive actions. Explicitly linking these philosophies to a rejection of Christianity *increases* culpability.

“*...just serves the feminist imperative*”

We seem to be accusing each other of this. I’m not sure what to conclude from that.

“*...political leftism was defeated (by Feminists and Christians, who usually work in tandem)...*”

Alas, I do not understand this.

---

Pingback: [Positivist Leftism – Derek L. Ramsey](#)

---



RichardP

2018-08-24 at 01:11

Mine is only a theoretical point, made in the interest of adhering to logic as much as possible.

@ RS said: ... *but if Christianity represents the ultimate good and truth ...*

Boxer, you raised the issue of the excluded middle, which is relevant when a middle exists to be excluded. I think there is not a middle to be excluded in the example you gave, because the original author imposed constraints on his argument; it was not open-ended. The argument was bounded by the *but if X represents Y*. He is claiming his argument is valid only under the constraints he imposed. You basically said, yes

but ... in real life there is a middle to exclude. You may be correct. RS was talking about his bounded reality, not real life. And his bounded reality has no middle to exclude.

If all who are not Christians are satanists, and;  
(defines the argument as being either one or the other)  
I am not a satanist, therefore;  
I am a Christian.

By definition, you are either a Christian or a satanist. There is no middle to exclude here.

A cruder example is this:

You cannot cross a chasm in two hops.  
I am on the other side of the chasm, therefore;  
I crossed the chasm in one hop.

You either get to the other side in one hop, or you fall into the chasm. There is no middle here to exclude

---

**Comments are closed.**

v5k2c2.com / Website Powered by WordPress.com.