

On the beginning of humanity, "families" or clans had a simple structure, where was the man who provided most of the food, while females were put aside for menial collector tasks.

With time, and the creation of civilizations, women started to have a more sedentary role on society: as wives and caretakers of the household and the kids. This role lasted for many thousand of years, till the late 1900's where slowly, but surely, it started to disappear and to slowly be replaced by the image of women in the workforce, being equal to men (when biologically speaking that's a lie) and simply, plummeting the birthrates and creating a cycle of malfunctioning women on our society.

Today, Dr. N. Igmar and I, will tackle the long history of the family and how did the idea of being a house wife slowly but surely get destroyed and changed by the chains of a cold capitalist world that used the dreams of "an oppressed group" and turned against them, for the sole purpose of profit.

The early life of woman: was it truly that bad?

On the discussion of the early life of women, how they were forced to do many things, such as forced marriage, or limited to "woman things", it remains a question, was it truly that bad?

If you stop yourself and think about it, their lives weren't that bad compared to nowadays women: They had to work less which translates to doing more recreational things for themselves, the job and money making was all made by the father of the family, so their tasks as home owner were limited to maintaining the kids alive and healthy, cooking and cleaning, without a need to work at mines or fields like the male counterpart had to.

We also need to remember how nowadays, it has been compared that, we work more than medieval peasants; therefore, not only the woman of the future works more than her past counterpart, but she also has to do more heavy labor and is more fragile to economical shakeups than the medieval woman.

Another problem presented on the woman of nowadays, is her addictions and problems: alcohol, smoking, drugs and other ways to "have fun and relief stress", which the catholic church painted back then as sins, had led to a more unhealthy woman, dependant of those things and medicaments to "live and be happy".

Biological issues and blindness: How are we different if we are all humans? (Dr. N. Igmar)

For anyone who is paying attention, men and women are different and NOT equal. While it is certainly upsetting to some people that women are indeed not equal to men, they often will overlook that while they are not equal, men and women are also complementary. But what does "complementary" mean here? After all, as some people like to (falsely) claim, "one race, the human race", why does the same logic not apply to men and women just being "humans". Well, the most obvious factors are indeed biological, imprinted on every cell a man or woman has either being XX, XY, or a genetic defect in rare disorders (ex. XXY syndrome) to beat the tumblr tag reading this to the punch before he or she pulls up his or her infinity gender list. But for the sake of simplicity and generally reality, it's XX (female) and XY (male). These surface biological differences at a cellular level will not change throughout life: a man will still be a man; a woman will still be a woman. On a more technical level, the closest you could get to women being more similar to men than women is the instance of male microchimerism in females as a result of sex and pregnancy with male children, transferring male cells into the women's body that last, which obviously still doesn't make her a man. However, that is mostly besides the point, except as it pertains to increased promiscuity among women in recent times.

Moving on from the baseline genetic, biological differences. What makes a woman a "woman" phenotypically? And men? Men are the more muscular of the sexes, higher in testosterone, taller, and generally more physically capable than women in many respects. Beyond that, men's bone structure is more broad than women's as it applies to the skull and shoulders particularly; men also have stronger bones and are less fragile than women, obviously out of necessity biologically with bigger muscles. And arguably most importantly, men have a penis and testicles and are the sex that produces the seed necessary to grow a child within a woman.

When you think about it, all of that portrays women as a much weaker, perhaps even inferior sex with respect to biological differences. Perhaps, inferior in some respects physically, obviously, but that does not mean women are without usefulness. Women have the most important job of all in society (arguably), producing and nurturing the posterity of our society. Women are quite literally the lifeblood of any civilization by nature of their wombs being necessary for the continued replacement of previous generations and growth of our population.

Now, I'm not a complete misogynist and acknowledge the complementary nature of women to men without hesitation, but I still reserve hate for most modern "women" with due cause. Women are complementary, in many aspects, to men, such as the most obvious one being a piece of the puzzle necessary for producing a child. More importantly, women and men are complementary but not equal with respect to the the formation of a family.

The family is an extremely important, indispensable backbone of any society. It is the fundamental building block of which any society is initially built on, almost like an atom that can only be further categorized as a few individual parts but nonetheless an indivisible bond in the face of society at large. Foundations of men and women's complementary characteristics synthesize in the epitome component of nature and humanity which is fundamentally the family and relation by blood.

Thus, the people who advocate "equality" of the sexes and egalitarianism, whether naive or ignorant, sow destructive seeds splitting the structure of which our society is built on and extends from: the family unit. From these ideas, only further deterioration of society at large can be expected as men and women are no longer groups that complement each other, but good, little, assembly-line worker drones that benefit corporate interests and profits, as well as the tyranny of the unflavored masses, united and ruled after being divided and conquered.

Now that we have a clear idea of the biological and social benefits that a woman, working as a housekeeper or wife has compared to the nowadays female worker, it all comes down to ask how did they ended like this.

It all begins around victorian era, where womans had more access to books, and also, the spread of different ideas also occurred. On the French Revolution many of them participated, hoping to have more rights on society. With the access to books, they also became more literated and knew more, opening a world of opportunities for many, such as jobs of teacher for example.

But it wouldnt be till they started to gain more rights and entering the industrial work force that their world would change forever, and not for good.

With the introduction of the printring press, many other inventions followed, such as the idea of factories that produced not 1 but 100 items per day; global trade financed this ideas, and soon enough, more and more workers where needed, less farmers stood on the country side, and more people migrated to the cities, making a living for miserable penny's at much.

This capilitalistic opportunities didn't went with out notice to the owners of the factories, and soon, mom, dad and your older brother, had to work on the factories all day, for a scrap of the barrel, just as the rest of us. So, our first insight into the addition of womans into the laboral work was around the era of Ford, of the machinery and factories', which would leave to the ideas of womans being able to work at the same level as men's , and the idea of them being equals. Soon enough, womans would had their chance to shine, as a world war would take all their husbands away and bring them to the front lines, leaving the factories empty, and of course, the wallet of our rich buddies cant go empty, and well, neither can the war machine work with out bullets.

But before of that lets check something else first: when did womans adquire the right to vote? Around 1919 and 1920, the united states allowed womans to vote, which marked the first steps to a more equal society. Soon, around 1948, the league of nations would also decree the vote an universal right.

This would bring home more consequences than we know, as more voters would lead to more opinions, more ideas, more needs to be covered. Soon enough this new position of power would also translate on a configuration of the female behaviour on society, but as we know, this has been a thing since a while now.

Now, lets go back a few years ago, around the war era: as we mentioned they covered the jobs no one did back then because, well, all men where busy killing each other on the front lines. With this new opportunity the idea of equality rise up like a volcano, and soon, we would had more movements claiming equal rights (as we mentioned on the past paragraph).

But, unkown to them, this would also affect them on ways none would had seen before. The woman, a creature so beautiful, so cheerful at times, a vital part of the cicle of life, would soon lose all its petals, all her colors and life for a few penny's, because those who own all the jobs, all the strings of society, would see how willing they are to enter the laboral force, how much money can be made with more citizens who can afford their products, and soon enough, just as Dr. N. lymar mentioned, they would be just another assembly-line worker drone, whose main goal in life would be to waste and waste till the world ends, because they are as equal as men, strong as them, and of course, a prize woman who needs all the attention they can get because, well, they are ladies who can mantains themselves.

Newsflash alert: Being succesful doesn't mean you will be happy

Nowadays, we can see a lot of womans who claim success on their lives, drinking, partying, having sex whenever they feel like, and of course, claiming to need no men on their lives.

The true is that, men care little for how much money or how high a woman is on her job. Most conservative men will be glad with a woman who is ready to settle down and have kids, while the most liberal guys will be willing to share a house or relationship with them just to be happy.

Sadly, most women refuse the idea of settling down and having kids nowadays, mostly because it means they would have to abandon that "Beautiful" life they had made for themselves, a life of never ending pleasures they think, till of course, "the wall" hits them, and as we know "no one escapes the wall".

Past their 30's, a woman loses value for men, and so, the attention she was used to dissapears, and with good reason, as her looks dissapears with the chances of settling down and forming a family.

This idea of never ending parties, of being indepenedent, strong, not needing a man, has lead to a generation of womans to waste their fertile years, to taint their looks and the vision they gave to other men, in exchange of a few years of happiness, and its all attached to the original moment woman started to enter the factory's and claiming for equal rights. They fell for a trap wich was slowly build by them and the elite, and now soon, we will have a generation (if not already) of lonely womans who pass their saturday evening drinking wine, while scrolling on her cellphone, thinking where her young self went.

Its a reality they built, yet we let it happen. The nuclear family, has been abolished, as womans dont need a man anymore, but will work tirelessly till their time has run out and there is no way back to settledown anymore, and all they are left with is a simple questions, wondering where their years went by, where did all the good men went, and feeling lonely and sad, seeing those who avoided the trap married and happy, while their existence is resigned to a few cats, and the never ending bottom of their bottle of wine.

A last call: Single mothers and divorce

As a last point to add to the essay, we will talk about the effects of single mothers on society, and how this are merely a coping mechanism when bringed onto the table of arguments of "why women are equal or can handle things by themselves".

The idea of single parent is nothing more but a nightmare: a future kid who's mental stability would be questionable, one where you can tell how much he missed here and there, etc.

To bring such terrific consequence as an argument (because, let's be fair, some single mothers or parents didn't decide to be, sometimes, our reality is cruel and had taken away from us our loved ones, be it a wife or a husband), the truth is, that said women or even husbands, sacrifice their time and their children's young years to survive: there is no husband or wife to take care of the kid, where it comes to the paternal or maternal figure, to take care of his meals, school and more. No, all of that is vanished when it comes to single parenthood, there is little room for being a mother and a provider, and this leaves a scar on the development of the kid.

(Dr. N. Igmar) In addendum to what Professor Credo wrote, I would also emphasize the necessity of both biological (male and female parents) to take on their roles as mother and father in complementary fashion with their union. Typically, you see a rigid and strong father as the ideal archetype, teaching his kids by example how to be a moral and functional person in society, and vice versa with mothers as a nurturing figure from birth to toddler and child to unconditional familial love into adulthood. Where things go wrong, as Prof. Credo mentioned, is when there is only a single parent, typically a single mother, that imbalances the child's development. Specifically with single mothers, as a factor, they are the [second leading predicting factor in crime](#). And it really is no wonder to me personally why this is the case, as with the burden of being a provider and mother, they are strained further into filling the shoes of an absent father which women are generally incapable of since they are by nature enablers (of bad behavior), not strong, guiding moral figures like fathers. It should go without saying then the importance of having a father figure in the family, especially when single mothers can not and will not fill the void.

As for more on divorce, here is what Seneca the Sage had to say on the matter, "Bachelors do less well later in life both in life satisfaction and in wealth interestingly so I do not think that widows would do much better than bachelors in this regard, divorce is traumatic for children and deprives them not only of stability but also of the loving family unit, and interestingly enough, divorce RUINS your credit score."