

[return to updates](#)

Blurred Lines



by Miles Mathis

After months of excruciatingly serious articles, I get to change speed a bit with this one. This is a response to [Elizabeth Plank at Policymic](#), who wrote a breath-heavy screed in July [2013] entitled *A Feminist Takedown of Robin Thicke, And Anyone Who Thinks There's Something "Blurry" About Sexism*. First of all, great title Liz. Way to keep it below 14 words. And so mod of you, capitalizing “and” but not “of” in the title: so avant garde.

For those of you who don't know, Robin Thicke (pictured above) debuted a new single last summer called *Blurred Lines*. It is just another fake R&B/rap tune, completely unmemorable except for the accompanying video. Robin tells us it took thirty minutes to write, and we wonder what they did the other 25 minutes. In it, three gorgeous models wearing nothing but a thong (or three thongs, actually—though it would be interesting to see them all in one thong) dance around and do other silly things. Oh, and three guys are there, too, although no one really sees them. Emily Ratajkowski steals the show with her perfect body, and I assume all men and most women who watch have their eyes on her most of the time, just going, “OH—MY—GOD!”



Which leads us back to Liz at Polycymic, who argues the video is disempowering to women. It is sexist. Is it? No. A lot could be said about the video and the culture it is in, and I will say a few of those things here. But it isn't sexist.

But before we get into “sexist”, let's pause on “disempowering.” That is even easier to shoot down. Since your eyes are on the girls the whole time, they must have power, right? They have the power to make you look at them. They completely steal the show, and the guys let them. Are the girls made to look bad? No. They look fantastic, and they know it. You might disempower one of the guys by making him get naked, since he might not look so good naked. You might disempower some women by *making* them get naked when they didn't want to get naked—either because they looked bad naked or because they looked good but were uncomfortable. That would be bad and disempowering, and it shouldn't be done. We all agree on that. But you can't disempower Emily Ratajkowski by *letting* her get naked. Are you kidding me? That is like saying you could disempower Tiger Woods by making him play golf.

Let me tell you a secret: if you do something very well and people see you doing it, you have become empowered, not disempowered (what you do with that power is another question). Women now wish they looked like Emily Ratajkowski and men want to be her boyfriend. So what? What is wrong with that? That was true before the video and will be true no matter what culture we live in. Emily isn't “messed up” in any way, as far as we know. She isn't a drug addict or an anorexic or a child molester. The worst we can say is that she's exhibiting her sexiness in public, but at least her sexiness is straightforward and what most of would call fairly normal. She isn't sticking her tongue out like Miley Cyrus or licking a wrecking ball or something. She's just dancing around. She is just a girl with great tits. If girls weren't wanting to look like her, they would be wanting to look like the pretty girl down the street. Everybody wants to have tits like that, and the best we can do is admit it. Liz even admits it in her article. I can admit it. I wish I had tits like that. If I did I'd never leave the house.

As for the so-called bestiality in the video, I have to admit I missed it, too. What I saw was a stuffed dog and a real sheep. But no one was twerking either animal, as far as I remember. What I remember is the blonde girl holding the sheep in her arms, and the sheep blinking contentedly. The sheep didn't care the girl was almost naked. They looked sort of sweet together. I didn't get the bestiality thing until afterwards, when I *read* that they were referencing bestiality. I thought they were using the sheep to reference an “innocent lamb”, like the good girl in the song. Honestly. The whole video is actually very tame.

Now, what about Liz's point about the women being mostly naked and the guys being clothed? Is that

sexist? No. No one *wants* to see those guys naked. That wouldn't have helped sell the stupid song. What helped sell the stupid song was Emily Ratajkowski being naked, which almost everyone wants to see—man, woman, and child. They want to see her because she is so unbelievably perfect. That is a good thing, not a bad thing. Yes, some bad guys may wish to do horrible things to her, but I'll tell you another secret: those bad guys were bad before the video and they will be bad after the video. The video had absolutely nothing to do with them being bad guys. Seeing Emily's tits didn't make me into a bad guy, not even a little bit. I was born wanting to see tits like that and I will die wanting to see tits like that. It is called being a man.

That's right: beauty sells and it always has and always will. It helped sell the Venus de Milo, though some bad guy was so turned on he had to gnaw both her arms off. We are human, and we like to see beautiful human bodies. I don't mind seeing beautiful men, either. I can admire the *David* as much as the next guy. I don't mind looking at Hugh Jackman on the beach, although I feel what most women feel when they look at Emily: *I wish I looked like that—what can I do (that is easy) to look a bit more like that*. That is only natural. Hugh Jackman doesn't disempower me. He may even empower me to work out more and eat better.

Liz might say, “Yes, but we now take it to extremes. The girls don't just want to do a little yoga and skip the cookies to look like Emily. They want to have their entire bodies remade by plastic surgeons.” Yes, that is a problem, but it isn't a problem caused by Emily Ratajkowski or by this music video. Personally, I don't have any impulse to get surgery when I see Hugh Jackman on the beach, and that is because I know that *surgery doesn't work*. I have seen the results on thousands of other people, and I don't want to look like them. I want to look better, not worse. I know that the only thing I can do is look my natural best, and other people have to come to that conclusion on their own. If they don't, there is nothing I can do about it. Outlawing music videos won't change it. Outlawing girls like Emily won't change it, either. Outlawing plastic surgery *would* change it. Why doesn't anyone talk about that? I guess because our culture is more interested in the right of plastic surgeons to make obscene amounts of money than it is in the right of Emily to be gorgeous. The feminists never talk about outlawing unnecessary plastic surgery, but they seem fine with outlawing natural beauty. I have never seen a feminist article attacking plastic surgeons and their ubiquitous advertising, but I have seen thousands of feminist articles attacking supermodels.

What about the lyrics? Liz tells us the song promotes rape. I have studied the lyrics, and again, I can't find anything “rapey” in there. The lyrics are stupid and shallow and vulgar, but I don't see anything remotely rapey. Let's hit the title first, which the feminists are saying indicates the “blurring” of rape definitions. No it doesn't. The blurring this song is talking about isn't *that* blurring. The blurring they are talking about here is the blurred signals the boy is getting from the girl. She is saying she is a good girl while wearing skin-tight pants. She is pushing her rump against his crotch while rejecting his come-ons. She is saying she doesn't want it while her body is saying she does. So the boy is asking for clarification. That is what the whole song is about, and it isn't hard to decode. If the boy were thinking about raping her, he wouldn't be talking to her, trying to *convince* her. She has said both yes and no, so he is asking for clarification.

The feminists will say it doesn't happen that way, but it does, in clubs and bars all over the country. Both the guys and the girls are very confused, and they have been for decades. And yes, it is the nicest girls that are the most confused. There are a lot of nice girls out there, desperate and confused, saying yes when they mean no and no when they mean yes, wanting to meet a nice guy who will do lovely things to them and with them without hurting them later, but not knowing where to look. A regrettable situation surely, one in need of some rules, but the “no means no” rule is not among them.

Read your Camille Paglia, for Chrissakes. She blew apart the whole “no means no” campaign twenty years ago. In male/female courtship, no has never meant *only and always* no, not in the 19th century, not in the 20th, and not in the 21st. Sometimes no means no, and if the woman shouts it at you, you can be sure it means no. If she grimaces when she says it or reaches into her purse for the mace or holds tightly to some homely guy next to her, it means a definite no. But often, no means “I want you to spend more time convincing me.” Women like to be convinced. It makes them feel *empowered*. They love the attention they are getting when you are trying to convince them. Everyone who is either a woman or who has dated a woman knows that. It is one of the basic facts of courtship, and the “no means no” campaign has been even more devastating for women than it has been for men, since it takes all that pleasure away from the woman.

I have personally seen it happen many times. I have been with a woman when she started playing the old game. She said no softly while squeezing my hand tightly. Since it was the 1990's and I was as confused as anyone, I pried my hand out of her grip and left, thinking that no meant no. I looked back from the door and saw that her face had fallen. Why was I leaving. Why wasn't I playing the glorious game with her? Liz knows why.

I lost entire years to that stupid rule. Why? Because I am a nice guy. A nice stupid guy who believed the feminist patter.

But isn't that the blurred line Liz is talking about? Again, no. I have been all over the blurred line I am talking about. I have never been anywhere near the blurred line she is talking about, because they aren't within a mile of each other. The blurred line I am talking about is created by the girl's indecision. Most people are indecisive, and young girls famously so. Therefore you have to be patient. You have to wait it out, and maybe do some subtle convincing. You treat her well so that she trusts you. Nothing manipulative about that, it is just the way things are. But the line Liz is talking about happens later, after the foreplay has started. That is when her line is crossed, and it can only be crossed by totally ignoring all signs from the girl. No “nice guy” can possibly cross that line, by definition. If you are nice guy regarding sex, it is because you are aware of the girl and how she is feeling. If you aren't, you aren't a nice guy, period. You're a selfish bastard. For this reason, I have never bought the whole “blurred line” idea. There is no blurred line. You either raped the girl or you didn't. She was either very happy she was there or she was not. If she isn't happy, you shouldn't be there. No upstanding guy would want to be in bed with a girl who wasn't happy. No nice guy has ever gotten anywhere near that line, not even the “blurriest” part of it.

What bothers *me* about the video and the culture in which it is embedded is not the blurred lines, it is the *mixed signals*. The video implies that we are a very sexual culture, and sexually liberated. But we aren't. It is all a pretense. Sex is used to sell things, but the culture as whole is still very screwed up. Men and women aren't getting along together very well, not sexually or any other way, and it isn't the fault of Emily or her tits. It is the fault of all these no-means-no campaigns and other equally stupid campaigns, which have so confused everyone we can hardly speak. All the idiotic campaigns of the past 40 years have given us a thousand ways to start a fight and break-up over nothing, but no way to stay together happily.

If feminists were really interested in the happiness of women, or their pleasure, they would have stopped pushing decades ago. They already had it won by 1980. All they had to do is sit back and collect their prizes into piles. And now, they are so far ahead of guys they should pity us. In most relationships, they have more than their share of power. Yes, some high-profile rich guys still act like

jerks, and I don't like watching it any more than you do. But high-profile women now act like jerks to the same degree. And—what is worse—average women act like jerks most of the time and don't even seem to realize it. They are swimming in so much power they can't even see the shore. And no one ever calls them on it.

But back to the video. Although I don't accept the so-called feminist critique, I do have some problems with the video, even beyond the fake sexual freedom it is selling. The main problem I have is that the music industry still seems to be in bed with the drug industry—legal and illegal. They have been pushing drugs since the 1950's, and it continues to crescendo. Although this particular video only pushes drugs to a small degree, it is still worth commenting on. We see Robin Thicke chasing one of the models with a huge syringe. Although it could be passed off as just more silliness, it does tie into the drug culture. We see that with the line in the lyrics

*Baby can you breathe? I got this from Jamaica
It always works for me, Dakota to Decatur, uh huh*

That's coke, of course, and I guess coke in a syringe is crack. I don't really know or care. That concerns me a lot more than Emily's tits, and it should concern you more, too. Why? Because titties are good, coke is bad. Can I make it any simpler than that? Titties have no side effects. Titties have no long-term effects. Titties are free.

You will say that sex can be a drug, blahblah. Yes, it can, but there is a difference. If you equate the drug industry to the sex industry, you are leaving out the fundamental fact. Sex can be made into an industry, but drugs are *necessarily* an industry. Sex can be completely good. Titties can be completely good. Yes, they can be perverted or corrupted, but they are not necessarily so. Yes, you can get your titties from a pimp and pay high-dollar for them and they can turn you into a maniac. But you can also get your titties for free from your lover whom you treat very well and they can make you very happy. There is no analogy with coke. You always get your coke from a coke-pimp who charges way more than it is worth, and you always turn into a maniac. You never get your coke for free from someone who loves you, and it never makes you happier and healthier in the long run. Never.

Treated right, that desire for titties puts you in bed with your lover, where everything is grand. The desire for drugs never does that. It always puts you in company of a bunch of selfish creeps, burning themselves out, flushing money down the toilet, and acting like assholes. Oh, and drugs always end up enriching even bigger creeps, creeps working at Pfizer or the CIA. Can't say that about your lover's titties, can you?

So—to sum up—the problem was not the naked girls, it was using the naked girls to sell drugs and bad music. And using the naked girls to make you think we are a sexual culture when we aren't.



What would have been better is if Emily had worked with me instead these dopey pimp-wannabes. Then we could have seen her naked without having to look at those guys at all, and without having to see her in 10-inch heels with cars driving over her and little stopsigns up her butt. We could have admired her perfection without that crap music in the background and without the #THICKE (what *was* that?) blocking half the good parts and without that cheap thong cutting her lines. Next time she should consider working with a real artist. Of course you won't see that happen, since the minds of most people have been broken by the pressure of decades, and they prefer a loud vulgar romp to real art. And besides, it is hard to sell music videos and CD's and coke and advertising placement with real art. In a mass-culture, any bad song/silly video can be spun out into millions in merchandising, as long as you have at least one pair of perfect tits fronting it. But a great painting is just a great painting: it doesn't translate into mass media, doesn't look good at VEVO even in hi-def, doesn't look good on tour with a laser light show, and doesn't generate a fake argument in the press by which culture can be further atomized.



As I wind this down, I will make one final comment on Robin Thicke, who came out of this much worse than Emily Ratajkowski or any possible woman. His comments afterwards were so asinine they passed belief. That is about the only place I agree with Liz, here.

We tried to do everything that was taboo. Bestiality, drug injections, and everything that is completely derogatory towards women. Because all three of us are happily married with children, we were like, 'We're the perfect guys to make fun of this'. . . What a pleasure it is to degrade a woman. I've never gotten to do that before. I've always respected women.

What? First of all, how are drug injections taboo? Drugs are now commonplace, and that would include injections. But more importantly, how are bestiality and drug injections derogatory toward women but not men? My guess is more guys partake of bestiality, but in any case bestiality only affects those doing it, not men in general or women in general or sheep in general. And finally, what does being married or not married have to do with creating this video? Is it OK for married men to "make fun of" bestiality and drug injections and nude dancing and so on, but not bachelors? Thicke may have been nervous, what with not being able to lip-sync lines or read from a Teleprompter. He was expected to speak from his brain, and most people can no longer do that. His comments therefore look like gibberish. Next time he should just grunt and say, "I dunno, whatever", like most guys now do. That is the only safe thing for males to say anymore.

This is why women should pity men. We would have expected Emily to say something shockingly stupid afterwards, since she is being attacked as an air-headed fashion model. But she didn't. It was Robin Thicke who said the stupidest things by far. It is the guys in the video who look stupid, standing there with clothes on while everyone else is skinny dipping. They look like CEO's or bankers at a beach in France, swimming in their suits. It is the guys who look disempowered, since they need lots

of clothing and props and watches and sunglasses and hats and thousand-dollar jackets to look good, while the girls look great with nothing but a smile. *The guys are relying on the naked girls for their power.* Without the naked girls, no one would be watching this garbage. We have to be told that Robin Thicke has a big dick (it says that in the background), while we don't have to be told anything about the girls. We don't need to be told that the girls are sexy, do we? We don't need any proof that Emily has wow tits or that the other girls are hothothot, but I think we need more proof that Thicke has a big dick. If he had a big dick, I don't think he would have to be telling you he has one. Do you see Emily doing interviews and telling people she has great tits? That would be kind of redundant, wouldn't it?

I almost hate to say it, but I am afraid I am going to have to dodge back into conspiracy theory to finish this. My mom is a big feminist and I was raised as a feminist, so I have always thought women were equal and treated them as equal. That said, I gave up on mainstream feminism sometime in the 1980's. I used to think that feminism had sort of spun out of control after, say, 1985, due to natural causes. I used to say that the pendulum had swung too far, to explain some of the things that were going on. But I no longer think that. The pendulum isn't just swinging, it is being pushed. I have no proof that Elizabeth Plank is writing her feminist articles from Langley, VA, but it occurs to me that her article is just that sort of misdirection. Did she misread this whole issue only because she is so focused on women's issues, or did she misread it on purpose? It occurs to me she may be crying sexism to keep you away from other ideas. To see what I mean, you have to realize that the hyper-sexualizing of music video right now is not an accident. It is all of a piece with the other topics we have been looking at for the past few years, having to do with destabilizing the culture. Everything is now a psy-op, purposely pushed on you to crush your ability to think rationally. Re-read Robin Thicke's quote in that context and you see that they are trying to get you into a place where what he said makes sense. They want you to be so confused you can't tell sense from nonsense. The video also works on those lines, as I said, making you think other people are dancing around naked and having a good time. The director of the video and Emily Ratajkowski are interviewed, and they encourage you to chill out and have fun with it. But then everyone from Elizabeth Plank to Simon Lebon is paid to pop up and shame you if you do. If you liked looking at Emily's tits, you are sexist. Beyond that, just try to find a group of nice people you can dance around naked with. You won't find them. With only a few exceptions, the people in the US who would think of doing it are creepy. This isn't naturist Europe. This is still puritan America, only pretending to be liberated. We are caught in the vise of mixed signals, which is even worse than being a straight puritan. If you were a puritan, at least you knew what to expect. Everyone else was a puritan then, too. But now, everything you do is wrong. You are always too much or too little, too straight or too crooked. You are never just right.

That is no accident. You are caught in a decades-long program, and your discomfort was the goal. Is the goal. You are fed at least two lines of contradictory advice at all times, and they want to keep you in a state just short of cranial collapse. In the evenings, you are sold a world where everyone is having wild sex with very accommodating women (via TV, Hollywood, or porn), but the rest of the time you live in a world where no one is. The only way to get into that world is to *actually become a porn star*. And it turns out even that isn't any fun, since you can't come when you want to and you have to do it in front of cameras with creepy people, etc. You can't win, and it is because they don't want you to win. The billionaires became billionaires via your dissatisfactions and miseries.

Remember, porn is a multi-billion dollar industry. Do you really think porn is independent of the intelligence agencies? What other multi-billion-dollar industry do you know that has been allowed to remain independent of the government and all the government mobsters? Therefore, you see what you are meant to see, whether you are seeing it on TV, on film, or on the internet. Only your grandmother wants you to stop looking at porn. Everyone in government wants you to look at more.

What I am saying is that these videos and the scripted reactions to them are no accident. I agree that the entire culture would benefit from being more chaste in public, but that isn't what this is about. I agree that Miley Cyrus has gone too far and that young teenage girls and boys shouldn't be looking at that. But that isn't what this is about. It is about keeping you and everyone else on a yoyo, telling you one thing while showing you another. *That* is the blurred line that is more important than any of the others. The government has actually borrowed the yes/no blur of the woman, but in the case of the government the game has lost all possible charm. The government never gets around to actually satisfying you, because that would cut into their profit margins. They want you permanently and chronically and acutely dissatisfied, so that you will buy all their crap—all their products and all their propaganda. They do that by telling you YES, NO, YES, NO, YES, NO, even while they are fucking you.

But you know what, Miley Cyrus and Robin Thicke aren't even aimed at me. They mess me up a little bit more, or it is hoped, but the intended primary consumers of this shit are teenage girls. They are the ones being simultaneously encouraged and shamed, pushed and pulled, stretched and compressed. It looks to me like the junior high/highschool girl is job one for this sort of psy-op, since you can't succeed in this culture if you don't start early. These poor kids are turned into a big sexual mess before they hit sweet sixteen, and it is all downhill from there. If you can totally ruin their first experience, you have just raised the odds of ruining all their other experiences, and this is what is wanted. And if you have ruined all the heterosexual young women, you will have immediately ruined all the heterosexual young men, since it is a 2-fer. That's how sex is: if one side is broken, the whole thing is broken.

As you have seen, it isn't sexism that ruins these young girls. They aren't disempowered by the men around them, or by sexual rules stacked against them, or by any other double standards. They are disempowered by their own inability to make good decisions, and that inability is purposely cultivated by all the implanted adults, male and mostly female, giving them contradictory advice. Yes, if you're a top singer or actress or model, you may get preyed on by big bad men, but most young girls in this country never come up against that. What they come up against very early is a culture that can't seem to make up its mind about sex. They come up against the giant blurred line. Is sex good? Is it bad? Yes or no? But the culture won't tell them. It won't even clearly differentiate good sex from bad sex, although it isn't that hard to do. The lines are blurred on purpose; and when giving advice to young women, the lines are mostly blurred by older women. This must be, because young women won't listen to older men, or any men. Young women have been taught to look on all men as a species of morons, so we have to imagine that even when a young woman is “being manipulated” by an agent or producer, she is doing it only for the money, knowing full well what a moron, shit-brained bastard the guy is. In fact, that is a cliché, and isn't anything new. You can see that stereotype in movies from the 1940's and 50's, when the the young ingenue who everyone thinks is stupid goes back to the dressing room and tells the mirror the truth: she knows the producer is a crumb, but she will find a way around him—you'll see.

It isn't sexism, it is a lack of real opportunity, and it effects both sexes equally. In nearly every situation, sexual and non-sexual, you seem to find yourself on a road that forks two ways, but both ways lead to ruin. You are always given two choices and told to enjoy your freedom to choose, but both choices lead to ruin. Only an idiot would choose either one. Democrat/Republican, CBS/NBC, Foxnews/CNN, Congress/the President, Facebook/Twitter, Microsoft/Apple, NSA/CIA, and on and on and on. That is what we are seeing here again, but it has nothing to do with sexism. Boys are being destroyed just as efficiently as girls now, and probably more efficiently.

And another problem is being hidden behind the manufactured mainstream dialog. I have mentioned it before, but was of course totally ignored. The advice from feminists to girls now is don't get married, or if you have to, wait until you're thirty. But since we are allowing all sorts of chemicals in our food and water which have brought on puberty earlier and earlier, the advice from nature is just the opposite. Nature is turning girls on at 12, or 10 or 8. How do feminists plan to deal with that? Do you ever hear them talk about it? Do you see feminists on the front line against Monsanto and the FDA and the USDA, trying to get the chemicals out of the food and water? I don't. I don't know that I have ever seen that spun as a feminist issue, although that would make a lot more sense to me than the spin we have seen for four decades—spinning everything against men. Do only men work at Monsanto and the FDA and the USDA? Do only men work in the Justice Department? Are only men allowed in city councils and city council meetings? Some women are fighting this battle and some of them are feminists: obviously I am not talking to them. I am talking to the vast majority of people who have their heads buried on this and just about everything else.

If a young woman's body is ready for sex at 12, you have to deal with that one way or another, because *she* has to deal with it one way or another. And telling her to wait until she is 30 isn't the way to deal with it. You can't wrap her in plastic and you shouldn't turn her into a slut *a la* Miley Cyrus, so someone better come up with a third plan. Feminists seem to think birth control is a plan, but it isn't. Birth control is a plan against pregnancy, it isn't a plan for how a young woman is supposed to live from 12 to 30. I have heard from feminists, who have told me they don't need any help raising their daughters from the likes of me. Maybe they don't, but they need help from somewhere. We see the job most of them have done, and it isn't pretty. It may be time to quit pointing the finger at men and to instead look at those who are actually raising these girls: their mothers. The father, when he exists, is now normally found sitting in the corner sucking his thumb. He wouldn't make a peep if he remembered how. And as for college-educated moms taking advice from men in the media, you have to be kidding me. They would sooner take advice from gorillas or wombats. Women are getting their advice from other women, and have been for many decades. That by itself pretty much kills the idea of sexism. If the media is so sexist, why do women let it in the house and go to work for it? Are we to believe that *Vogue* is controlled by sexist men, but that women buy it anyway? Are we to believe that Oprah is controlled by sexist men, but women listen to her anyway? Oh, but I forgot, there aren't any supermodels in *Vogue*. And Oprah doesn't let any skinny pretty people on her show.

Again, I suspect that many of the women paid to write for the mainstream media are misdirecting on purpose. That is what the mainstream media now is: misdirection 24/7. If you are being led toward sexism and away from Monsanto, it is no accident. If you are being led toward racism and away from the CIA, it is no accident. If you are being led toward sexism and away from Pfizer, it is no accident. If you are being led toward racism and away from Goldman-Sachs, it is no accident. You are told the problems are huge, but you are led away from the real problems, so it is no accident they never get solved. The mainstream media isn't mainly spearheading a war against women or blacks by white men, it is a war against the poor and what is left of the middle class by the very rich. That is known, by anyone who wants to know it. If you are disempowered, it isn't because you are male or female, black or white, it is because you weren't born into the right 400 old families. It is because you haven't been recruited by the Intelligence communities. Marry into the families or join the New World Order, and you too can become empowered, just like those folks in the media pouring stupid ideas into your heads from a million subsidized fonts.

