

8 | WHY ARE FAT WOMEN FAT?

It's a mystery,

Oh, it's a mystery.

Toyah Willcox 1958- English actress and singer: 'It's a Mystery' (song, 1981)

As an overweight man I accepted for many years the relationship between my 200-pound weight and my fondness for good food, beer and wine. Other fat men of my acquaintance were equally accepting of the relationship. Last year at the age of 52, on my doctor's advice, I embarked on a programme to lose weight and reduce my blood pressure. I cut down my calorie intake and undertook more exercise: two games of pool a week, nothing too onerous. Over six months I lost over 50 pounds. My blood pressure fell to target levels.

Women's weight problems appear to be different to men's weight problems. I never cease to be amazed at how many fat women believe there isn't a direct relationship between the calories they consume, and their weight. A fat woman recently declared to me, 'I only have to look at a chip to put on weight!' The next day I saw her in a local carvery, where customers can eat as much as they like. With a plate heaving with high-calorie food items she should have changed her plea to, 'I only have to eat ten roast potatoes to put on weight!' Half an hour later I was at the bar when she ordered a drink: Diet Coke.

With impeccable man logic I've sometimes pointed out to overweight ladies that every atom in their bodies was either present when they were born, or had been ingested. With peccable lady logic they always beg to differ, but to date none has yet come up with a working hypothesis on womanly weight gain. Some years ago a woman told me, 'I'm overweight because of my hormones.' Quick as a flash I replied, 'Oh yes,

the hormones that make you eat family-size pies! I woke up in hospital two days later.

So it falls to me to introduce a theory which I confidently expect to land me the Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine. A simple observation was the key to understanding the riddle of why fat women are fat. Fat women often have fat children, and their fatness generally stays with them into adult life. The fat sons obviously eat and drink too much and exercise too little, but what of the fat daughters? Might there be a genetic dimension to their weight problem?

I haven't ironed out all the details of the theory yet, but it appears that some women are genetically predisposed to putting on weight regardless of what they eat and drink. The most obvious scientific explanation for this phenomenon is that the women are photosynthesising. Photosynthesis is the process which occurs in plants, algae, and many species of bacteria, and results from the action of light upon the green pigment chlorophyll, which enables organisms to put on mass by converting carbon dioxide from the atmosphere into organic compounds, especially sugars.

The first woman to have this genetic mutation would have been green, and we must assume that not even the most desperate men wanted green offspring. A later genetic mutation resulted in a pigment which mimics the action of chlorophyll but is colourless, so photosynthesising women are no longer green. Although it might be that the pigment isn't colourless after all, but orange. A surprising proportion of fat women – in England at least – are orange.

In September 2011 a feminist emailed me about the cover of *The Glass Ceiling Delusion*, complaining that it played to the stereotype of feminists being unattractive.

In an effort to ‘disprove’ the stereotype she then bizarrely emailed me a photograph of herself, but being conscious that in the photograph she was very overweight she informed me of a book which ‘proved’ that for many women obesity was the result of neither excess calorie intake nor inadequate exercise. We then had the following email exchange:

Self: Every atom which is present in obese people, as in non-obese people, was either present at birth or was ingested later.

Feminist: You’re wrong. You need to read the three books by this author which TOTALLY discredit the calories in/out model of weight gain.

Self: I lost over 50 pounds over six months simply by reducing my calorie intake and taking a little exercise.

Feminist: As a man you don’t have the hormonal problems women have with respect to weight control.

Self: It can have nothing to do with hormones, unless they induce you to eat and drink too much, or exercise too little. The claim of there being no link between calories in/out and weight control is an absurd denial of two fundamental laws of nature, the Laws of Conservation of Energy and Mass.

Feminist: Oh, so you’re a f***ing endocrinologist and a physicist now, are you? Typical arrogant man! You misogynistic pig!!!

Self: Thank you. I’ve much enjoyed our chat, but I must dash.’

In early October 2011 I had an exchange of emails with an authoress who wanted some advice on publishing her forthcoming book on dieting. She’d lost 145 pounds in weight ‘and I’ve kept it off for a year so far’. She wrote:

I'm quite excited about my book <title omitted> and can see lots of spinoffs with this – maybe change my focus onto health as losing the weight has certainly changed my life. I used to say I was happy fat – I lied! It's fantastic to be able to wear normal size clothes and to have so much energy, and apparently men like my new bottom! There's something on Facebook with a picture of a chubby woman who says she is so large because of all the wisdom that can't fit in her head!!!

9 | ARE FEMINISTS LESS ATTRACTIVE THAN NORMAL WOMEN?

Feminism is just a way for ugly women to get into the mainstream of America.

Rush Limbaugh 1951- American radio host and conservative political commentator

Rush, thank you. A good point, well made.

Many years ago, as a young man, I went to a nightclub late one evening and made an observation which mystified me at the time, but which suddenly made sense when I came to write this chapter. There were perhaps 20 to 30 young women in the club, many of them inebriated in the British manner which tends to shock those of the American persuasion. The behaviour of the young ladies ranged from attention-seeking on the dance floor to being slumped moodily in the darker corners of the room. If I'd lined up the ladies in a line reflecting their apparent levels of confidence – an action to which they might have objected, to be fair – the line would have accurately displayed a spectrum of attractiveness, ranging from the least attractive woman in the room to the most attractive. There was clearly some sort of hierarchy based on attractiveness, in a way that was far less true of the young *men* in the room (if true for them at all). Why might this be? We'll return to the question shortly.

Are feminists less attractive than normal women? In general, yes. Oh, come on. A number of feminists contacted me after the publication of *The Glass Ceiling Delusion* to complain that the woman on the cover pandered to the stereotype of feminists being unattractive. Ironically, they themselves were reinforcing the stereotype. It hadn't occurred to me that anyone might think the woman was a feminist. The image had simply been

one of more than 7,000 photographs on the internet photograph library Bigstockphoto.com which appeared after I'd employed the keywords 'angry woman'. From memory it was the only photograph which showed an angry woman looking upwards into the viewer's eyes, thereby intimating that she was looking *through* the glass ceiling at the viewer. The responses I received from a number of the feminists to this explanation might best be described as unladylike.

The fact that *some* feminists are physically attractive doesn't alter the fact that most aren't. There often seems to be a link between the degree of a feminist's unattractiveness and her commitment to feminist ideology. The late Andrea Dworkin comes inevitably to mind. Until and unless we accept the link between unattractiveness and feminism we can't begin to understand one of the prime reasons feminists are so angry, unless there's some truth in an alternative explanation I outline in the next chapter, that feminists might suffer from PPS (Permanent Premenstrual Syndrome).

British author Steve Moxon in his book *The Woman Racket* (2008) describes the male dominance hierarchy ('DH'). In the pre-industrial world a man's position in the DH was largely dictated by physical prowess or access to men and arms, while in the modern developed world it's largely dictated by actual or potential financial resources. Women seek partners as high up the hierarchy as possible and have their own dominance hierarchy, as Moxon explains:

'So how does a female DH form if it does not involve physical contest? Mostly it's simply by inheritance – including in primates and human societies. The physical attributes of females that are attractive to males in signalling fertility of youth and beauty are predominantly genetically based, so are well conserved from one generation to the next. Attractive women will tend to have attractive daughters. The key

attribute of youth is an even more pronounced 'given', in that older age cohorts are simply not 'in the game'.

In traditional societies a woman's position in the DH is largely a product of nature, as youth and beauty are the main factors. However the existence in modern societies of multi-billion dollar cosmetics, fashion and plastic surgery industries shows that beauty can be enhanced and the ravages of age can at least be postponed. The rocketing sales of celebrity and beauty magazines show that women are indeed keen to rank themselves according to a uniquely female DH; but the great difficulty involved in attempting to overcome the limitations of nature has manifested itself in the form of modern female epidemics such as anorexia nervosa and bulimia, slimming disorders being rare in males.

Perhaps the sheer difficulty of the task of climbing the female DH (males simply have to work harder or take extra risks) explains the fascination of Victoria Beckham to a female audience – her strange elfish features and cyborg-style cartoon body are more frequently found on the front covers of women's magazines than anyone else. If such an odd-looking creature is attractive to an über-alpha male like her husband David, then women are understandably eager to reassess their *own* DH ranking in the light of this.

Females also tend to compete by doing down other females in terms of sexual propriety – hence the common playground 'ho' and 'slag' derogations. This alerts men to a woman's propensity to indulge in extra-pair sex, and consequently might well put them off considering her as a long-term partner.⁷

While women bemoan societal pressures to be attractive and slim, for example by exposure to advertising for cosmetics and skincare products, you have to ask why they respond to those pressures so much more readily than men would. The use of such products as 'manscara' and skin products for men appear limited to fashionable metropolitan males, 'metrosexuals'. The answer is clear. Women receive special treatment in proportion to their degree of attractiveness – mainly, but not solely, special treatment from men. There's a high financial and emotional

return on attractiveness for women, a great deal higher than the returns enjoyed by attractive men.

The higher up the female dominance hierarchy a woman can manage to climb, the better her chances of attaining and retaining a high status male. The 'attaining' element typically results in marriage, and given the crippling financial implications of divorce to men, women have little incentive to remain slim and attractive after they marry; which perhaps goes some way to explaining the near-universal phenomenon of women putting on weight in the months and years after they marry. While their husbands remain in fine physical condition throughout their lives, obviously...

But what of the women towards the bottom of the female dominance hierarchy, the *least* attractive women? For many of them, even a superhuman effort won't move them far up the hierarchy, so they inevitably feel a resentment towards not only the men who pay them less attention than they pay more attractive women, but also towards the women able to exploit their attractiveness. It shouldn't come as a surprise that such women will tend to have a bitter outlook on the world, and seminars on 'Celebrating and Experiencing Fatness' (which we'll be coming to later in this book) make sense in this light.

There's an intriguing irony here. The women who come the closest to attaining equality with men are the *least* attractive women, because they share men's challenge to improve their lives through the medium of work rather than relying on their attractiveness to exploit the earning power of a partner. It's little wonder unattractive women are unhappy so much of the time, or that they make up such a large proportion of the feminist sisterhood.

A final thought. I've long been puzzled at the lack of serious criticism of feminists from the vast majority of women who are

not themselves feminists, and whose interests are – I would argue – harmed by them. What might account for this? On the one hand there is, I think, a sense of group solidarity. But I suspect also that attractive women are conscious that unattractive women aren't enjoying the special treatment that they themselves enjoy, and feel some guilt about that reality. Also, I suspect, many women simply find some feminists *terrifying*. As do many men, to be fair.

10 | DO FEMINISTS SUFFER FROM PPS (PERMANENT PREMENSTRUAL SYNDROME)?

Women complain about premenstrual syndrome, but I think of it as the only time of the month that I can be myself.

Roseanne Barr 1952- American actress, comedienne, writer, television producer, director

As a business executive I started managing staff in the early 1980s. I well remember one female member of staff, Mary, who had time off every month so she might better cope with ‘women’s problems’. Ironically Mary *was* quite contrary, in accordance with the English nursery rhyme. How her garden grew, I have no idea. I digress.

Mary was a Leftie; you’d probably have predicted that. Her absences from work would last two or three consecutive days, the days invariably adjoining a weekend or a bank holiday.

She wasn’t one of life’s sunniest characters. During the days leading up to her monthly mini-breaks she was even more difficult than usual, and the other members of staff would whisper to each other when Mary’s ‘time’ came around again.

An acquaintance who knows a number of feminists tells me that in his experience feminists have their ‘time’ 365 days a year, and 366 days in a leap year. So is feminism simply a result of hormonal imbalances? We need some research on this. In a later chapter we shall consider a book by a psychologist of the female persuasion, Professor Louann Brizendine’s *The Female Brain* (2006). A short extract is appropriate here:

‘One day it struck me that male versus female depression rates didn’t start to diverge until females turned 12 or 13 – the age girls began menstruating. It appeared that the chemical

changes at puberty did something in the brain to trigger more depression in women...

When I started taking a woman's hormonal state into account as I evaluated her psychiatrically, I discovered the massive neurological effects her hormones have during different stages in life in shaping her desires, her values, *and the very way she perceives reality* [Author's italics]...

Of the fluctuations that begin as early as three months old and last until after menopause, a woman's neurological reality is not as constant as a man's. His is like a mountain that is worn away imperceptibly over the millennia by glaciers, weather, and the deep tectonic movements of the earth. Hers is more like the weather itself – constantly changing and hard to predict.'

Here's an idea. Maybe we could rid the world of feminism by regularly measuring feminists' hormone levels, then adjusting the levels until they started to think and act like normal women. Think how much happier they'd be and, by extension, how much happier the other 95% of the population would be. I'm sure feminists would look favourably on the idea if I and other right-minded men just explained it to them slowly...