

WHO KILLED BANAZ: IS THERE ONE BLOODY POLITICIAN IN THIS COUNTRY PREPARED TO BACK WOMEN AGAINST MEN?

I have just finished reading an unpleasant but gripping novel called *The Playroom* about the (initially subtle) abuse and attempted murder of wife and toddler daughter in a white upper-middle-class enclave. Domestic violence and screaming fucktard domineering psycho males recognize no boundaries of class, race or creed. But there are differences, not in the basic psychology of the fucktards, but in the microcosms of society that surround them.

FOUR million women are victims of domestic violence in Britain, says a shocking poll.

More than half are attacked on a regular basis – with ten per cent abused **TWICE** a week.

The alarming findings come from a survey of 3,000 women who told of their horror stories anonymously.

It suggests that 13 per cent of the 30 million women in the UK are assaulted by their partners

[4m women beaten by brutes, The Sun, 21st April 1007](#)

Even the Sizzling Sun occasionally justifies its existence, though it is hard to see how an overall figure can be extrapolated from the 'horror stories' of 3000 women and the final statement is a little bizarre, since it assumes all women have partners.

There are 21,660,475 households in England and Wales according to Census 2001, and 30.0 per cent of these (6.5 million) are one-person households - up from 26.3 per cent in 1991.

Nearly half of the one-person households (3.1 million) are one-pensioner only households and three-quarters of these (2,366,000) are occupied by a woman living on her own. However, in the remaining 3,376,000 one-person households, male occupants outnumber women by three to two. [National Statistics Online](#)

The myths abound but the reality is that domestic violence is not caused by alcohol, drugs, unemployment or stress. It is the result of a complex interplay of psychological and social factors which have created an imbalance of power between the sexes. Where there is an imbalance of power, it may be abused, and it is this, coupled with society's tolerance, which has allowed domestic violence to flourish. [Sandra Horley, Chief Executive of Refuge, writing in the Guardian](#)

I can remember in the mid 90s a major campaign by feminists on the issue of domestic violence. The feminists claimed that 1 in 3 women would be victims of domestic violence and that it was just as likely to happen to women in well-off homes.

At the time I found this hard to believe. Growing up in the comfortable south-eastern suburbs of Melbourne I wasn't aware of a single case of wife beating amongst family or friends. In fact, it seemed to be a culturally unacceptable thing.

On Angry Harry's site yesterday I saw a graph which strongly suggests that the feminists of the time were wrong. The graph shows the incidence of domestic violence in Britain in 1995.

Revealingly, among the wealthiest 50% of Britons the risk of domestic assault for women was 3%. The incidence of domestic assault against men among this group was actually higher than against women, being 4.2%

It's only among the poorest quarter of the population that the rate of domestic violence against women rises to 10%, as opposed to 4.4% for men.

Conclusions? Firstly, the feminists were wrong to claim a 33% rate of domestic violence against women. For most women the risk in the 90s was a little over 3%.

Secondly, the feminists were wrong to claim that women in middle class homes were just as susceptible as the poorest of women. Poorer women, on the British figures, faced three times the risk of domestic violence.

Thirdly, the feminists were wrong to see domestic violence as something in which men are always the oppressors and women the victims. For most of the population, the risk of domestic violence was roughly similar for men and women.

[Oz Conservative, 3rd May 1004](#)

Domestic violence exists because delusional and inadequate males (and females) exist. It's a long story. The difference between the households of the 'the wealthiest 50% of Britons' and the poorer is not I think that relative wealth magically cures psychosis but that the women may be better educated and won't put up with it and have families who won't put up with it. If you are qualified, if you have a perfectly good job of your own, you can simply leave, even if you have kids; single parents manage, at least when the single parent is qualified with a perfectly good job of his or her own.

You can go back to mum and dad, who will not reject you, and your community will not exert itself to tell your ex your whereabouts. Possibly a member of your family has made it clear to the ex that if he harasses you he will be prosecuted. In the wider world, few either comfort white upper-middle-class male sexist pigs or pounce on those who unequivocally condemn them. Politicians cannot be found drooling that their culture must be beyond criticism and to condemn it is Islamophobic and probably racist. No-one suggests to them they are free to act out their delusions. Their own arrogance and insanity may lead them to rape and murder but they cannot think rape and murder acceptable.

Who killed Banaz? Her fucktard psycho family killed her. Who were the accessories?
Too many to list, politicians, especially those of the kitsch Left, slimy grub commentators, churchmen, journalists, the CRE...

Because she had no-one to turn to, as her sister has no-one to turn to, in her community, because her bloody family are the enemy, and the prime achievement of the Great Maggot Kitsch Left has been to abuse and condemn not the standards of this delightful little community but anyone who wanted to force a little fact and reality on such communities, let in the light of day. They have not only been allowed to think it's fine to be as they are, but encouraged to dismiss criticism as racism.

...the inverted colonialist mentality of the Western marginal left...To them, ...people have this strange 'culture' of depriving themselves from achievements of human society in the 21st century. In this entity, women love to be deprived from any human rights and spiritually adore sexual apartheid; girls love to be segregated from boys; people hate freedom of thought, conscience and expression....**If people are executed for a simple out-of-marriage relationship or because of expressing a simple doubt about the validity of the 'divine' laws of Islam, they deserve it.**

[Anti-war Coalitions: Lost Causes and Self-defeated Movements Interview with Koorosh Modarresi \(Worker-Communist Party of Iran\)](#)

Or merely should expect it, of course. Hey, girls, it's your culture. Live with it. Or die, of course. Come on, the guys say, she knew the score. Stupid bitch, what's the worry?

And what vast proportion of the electorate are we appeasing? 0.5%? 1%? Men. A tiny number of men from certain cultures must not be upset.

"So what was it about?"

"I'll tell you, lad, if no-one else will. It were about lasses."

"What about them?"

"Equal pay."

"Ah," said Sarat. "And?"

"There's some as don't hold with it. 'Man has to be master in his own home'," she mocked.

"Ah," said Sarat.

"And it hasn't even happened yet," murmured Baz.

"The woman question, lad."

"What," asked Sarat, "is the woman question?"

"We serfs," snarled a girl, "are getting uppity."

"There's things that's suitable and things that int."

"Such as?" asked Sarat.

It seemed to take hours, but he got the lot.

"Mayhap," said Sarat, "there's men in Kadun as ought to flaming well grow up. If you ask me if I back female Kadun against male Kadun, I do. I do not, however, think it comes to that."

"There yer wrong, laddie. Most girls is right happy with things as they are."

"Who's asked them?" enquired Sarat.

"Running around sticking their noses into politics. It may be all very well in Dabida but it int how we do things."

"How convenient for you," said Sarat. "Keeping women away from both power and influence."

"Now, Sarat, you don't want to start a riot," muttered Baz.

"Exactly what has happened?" asked Sarat.

[Sarat, our hero](#)

Is there one bloody politician in this country prepared to back women against religious men?

Surely even our greasy little wannabe-vanguard of the Catholic imperium government understands about sins of omission - 'we have left undone that which we ought to have done and there is no health in us'.

There has been not a failure to, but a blank outright rejection (could even be a demonization) of making clear to all comers that women are free in this country, as speech is free. Women's rights are non-negotiable and if you abuse them, most of the rest of the nation will oppose you. If your response to your daughter engaging in romantic, never mind sexual, activity, is to kill her, if you uphold such killings, piss off, because no-one wants you here and your nice free brave daughter and her lovely sister can live in your bloody council house and get on with living their own lives.

There has been not a failure to, but a blank outright rejection (could even be a demonization) of condemning absolutely certain attitudes and behaviours supposedly legitimized by bloody religion.

Let's keep this very simple because they're only politicians and such brains as they ever had have long since been replaced by microchips.

There are things that unite most of the nation from high Tories to Marxist-Leninists. These things include (thanks for the offer, guys, but no thanks) rejection of Sharia as Britain's system of government and rejection of 'honour killings'.

If an action or behaviour is judged criminal or mad when carried out by a person of no particular religious allegiance, it is also criminal or mad when carried out in the name of religion.

If the framework of the host society is not made abundantly clear, repeatedly, daily, if, obscenely, they receive no backing from the courts, it is that much harder for those in Stone Age families, in communities ruled by fear, to assert themselves. Some people like to deride the concept of 'moderate Muslims'. Why, if there are all these liberal Muslims, do we not hear more from them? "Because I think my father would kill me" is a rather good reason.

[Retarded Rabbit Syndrome](#), they call it at [Pickled Politics](#). I love it.