

# **X-inactivation in women, the innate bisexuality as balancing factor, and the clitoris – a summary**

By Florent Pirot  
[florent.pirot@orange.fr](mailto:florent.pirot@orange.fr)

This paper comes back on sexual dymorphism, the innate bisexuality and the clitoris, to express essential comments of the author. A follow up on the first chapter of From an Einstein Syndrome to the People.

*(This is too transdisciplinary for peer review I think...)*

It is first reminded a fact : in humans, sexual dymorphism is much more important than in other animals. Women show bodies usually less strong than men.

This is related to X-inactivation. X-inactivation is the decisive “rolling” of one of the two X chromosomes into a small protective bubble (Barr form). Hence it does not express as much as the other.

This leads to what is obvious in the eyes of the author, e.g. the fact that sexually attractive characteristics in women are usually (in the eyes of most..) defined through the “ductility” : some “amorph” traits are usually researched. Also translates in the researched behaviour, more passive, mothering, and, in general, as a combination of both, due also to less physical exercize, less eating during young years, smaller sizes in general. Simply a sign of the lack of expression of the one X chromosome.

**1. This – X inactivation – can be understood in a social perspective, it is a choice made by each woman, to fit the norm.**

X inactivation is also why the clitoris is not expressed fully (as it should i.e. as long as the penis in erection, bending down). This translates psychoanalytically into “penis envy” - the girl feels “castration” versus the boy. Freud did not understand its real meaning (or maybe knew about the real clitoris length and choose not to talk about it, extending male dominance).

The second consequence of X inactivation is, also, a more important ratio of boys over girls in the cradle after intercourse (ovules that come from the inactivated X certainly tend to demand spermatozoids carrying an Y, for chemical reasons, I guess).

**2. There is certainly another factor that comes into force**, in the choice of women to inactivate their X, which is pollution : alpha-emitting nanoparticulates, their decay energy ; the sexual chromosomes carry vital information and the bubble & its protective effect are a shield against alpha decays. Likewise against solar neutrons.

This pollution can be somehow partly avoided when you know what to do (in ancient times, eat more vegetables and drink less water if you live in areas of high natural radioactivity; today drink more coffee... for instance). There are natural instincts, your body guides you. Likewise, avoiding sun exposure. But many people do not listen to their body because they suffer, this is called self-repression.

Most women inactivate one of their “X” chromosomes. Not all. Especially in Anglo-Saxon countries and Scandinavian countries, where this is obvious, many women show identity of size and beauty with men (very unlike what is in Latin countries, not to mention what’s more to the East where it’s even worse). No X-inactivation in these women.

It is also true that natural radioactivity is very low in these countries (England, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway especially) and yearly amounts of sun exposure also very low. In general internal contamination with radioactivity can be avoided and / or excreted, through listening to bodily instincts. But there also is the benefit of relatively low exposure to solar neutrons.

Nevertheless **the social factor is key** : why ? Cannabis. A well-known product in Scandinavian countries during Viking times, allows to eliminate the effects of internal contamination with radioactivity and of solar neutrons. Hatred of cannabis – linked to the monopoly the Catholic church has tried to build on a product that in fact explains the “miracles” of Jesus, and that kings it blessed used as well to produce new “miracles” i.e. the scrofula healing, in France and England – is a social thing. Second, the work balance between men and women, exposure to hard tasks involving exposure to sources of contamination, sun, alpha-emitting radioactivity in dust... This also is a social issue and so it leads back to the core argument : X-inactivation is a social thing<sup>1</sup>.

Lastly, the representation of the “devil” typically as an animal with horns and an arrow-shaped tail together with the general idea the devil is “feminine” also strongly demonstrates implicit social condemnation of the erect clitoris. With variations of course depending on the country, as well, of course one can point to the extremum seen in Iran, with men ritually hunting down hyenas to cut their clitoris...

Bisexuality works as a balancing factor. In men, there will be more demands for other men, sexually, when men are surrounded by women that have inactivated their X. Because, simply, men are more beautiful than women in this setup. X-inactivation creates an artificial inequality and the emergence of homosexual needs is a response to that artificial inequality.

But where there is more X-inactivation there is also more homophobia, because of the rejection of natural tendencies, of nature in general, of cannabis & other healing plants, and because of the will to build a culture that legitimates this X-inactivation and that legitimates the fear of nature. So, men will suffer. Because of their rejection of nature.

### **3. Two consequences :**

First, in countries with bigger X inactivation, more boys than girls are born. This combines with the fact that men become more beautiful than women because they have their full genetic package activated, unlike women, to create a very powerful imbalance ; there will be a very very strong prevalence of homosexual desire in society, but this will be unlikely to come to many homosexual couples because in the countries where there is more X-inactivation, there is also more homophobia ! So instead the boys will try to form collective communities with a political purpose, to feel a collective spirit that is a substitute for the love they are missing. Hence the birth of authoritarian regimes that on the long term tend to self-destruct, together with the people in them, in the violence of war & / concentration camps (evolution to totalitarianism). Self-arson in other words.

In other words the result of the intercourse (more boys than girls in average being born in countries that are not in peace, this is a well known statistical result) comes naturally to fight the homophobia that is, I argue the main cause of X-inactivation in women. **Women inactivate one of their X**

---

1 “Social” being defined as the emerging effect from the aggregation of individual choices, of course.

**unconsciously when they are in an homophobic environment because their mind feels something is missing, there is something “not right” in the air...**

**The lesser-known X-reactivation is possible (thanks to the Tsix and PRDM14 genes [1]). It has also been shown that human female pluripotent stem cells have two active X chromosomes [2].**

Second, institutions of authoritarian regimes of course are a product of that attempt to build a culture legitimating X-inactivation. The first example is the Catholic church and its integration of the celibacy of priests ; an institution implicitly intended to welcome “those men with homosexual demands”. There is also the institution of the destruction of many female foetuses in many countries, for instance India and China. The tradition, or still ongoing practices of forced (“arranged”) marriage (in Arab cultures & India & Russia & China & South East Asia...) too.

All these institutions (and others, not listed) spin around the core thing which is the negation of the fact that women and men are equal, and that homosexuality is natural (forced marriage in particular is the symbolic representative of a “warrant against homosexuality” that totalitarian regimes later represent at a wider level – homophobia is the core foundation of all authoritarian and later totalitarian regimes, state intervention to prohibit homosexuality, attempt to “cure” it is a core element in all these regimes, the homophobic element in the Soviet Union for instance was underlined in the first chapter of From an Einstein Syndrome to the People – this is one core thing that ensures the popularity of these regimes, they simply reply to a demand). The abortion of female foetuses an innovation brought by technology allowing the reinforcement of this trend.

Due to the lack of love, of many men feeling homosexual needs that they self-repress, there will be more and more demands for authoritarian regimes that provide alternate “thrills”, and hence demands for war, the ultimate thrill.

And likewise, as women give birth to more boys than girls in average in these countries, this will self-sustain ! Until collapse of the society.

Penis envy and the shared feelings between women that cannot express their clitoris is also why lesbian couples come alive. They rely on solidarity, more than on love. Which is why there is a strong tendency of lesbianism to become “political”.

\*\*\*\*

We were told, in the Ancient Testament, that “we will suffer”. Yes, but we suffer because of deliberate choices, of self-repression of natural tendencies.

Bisexuality is simply the natural way the minds self-defend against imbalances. Human societies, unlike animal societies have this X-inactivation that also shows up in a few animals that have been strongly accustomed to humans, especially cats. (And at the very opposite of the spectrum, we have the hyena, the animal we are told to hate, but this animal shows up a wide smile and exhibits the truth of the real length of the erect clitoris – it is obvious that the closer animals are to humans, the less easily they can show the erect clitoris and their sexual equality, except if they have weapons that allow them to be feared and let alone by humans – lions for instance are feared but are also attractive as trophies, stupid men hunt them, so lions do not show the clitoris, they solely show homosexuality, to remind hunters they should try homosexuality instead of trying to exhibit the false concept of “male dominance” with rifles)

The body is more adequate for heterosexual relationships with the clitoris penetrating the man's anus as the penis penetrates her vagina (this also sublevates the "hymen", that is just part of the clitoris, opening a real way in the vagina). Less for homosexual relationships. BUT because of social pressures, minds, naturally, react by guiding more and more people to homosexual relationships, as natural consequence of strong levels of X-inactivation in the country. And many humans self-condemn because they opt for supporting the condemnation of homosexuality, reject as well nature in general beyond homosexuality, jailing themselves in a vicious circle.

By the way, the PRDM14 gene linked to X activation is also linked to the resiliency of colorectal cells, fostering their proliferation [3] – which demonstrates again how the erect clitoris is linked to anal penetration, since the gene linked to X activation and hence clitoris erection is also linked to a property that allows self repair of the rectum (when this gene expresses in the man's X chromosome). This cell proliferation may also be carcinogenic but, due to anal penetration, that is not an issue at all, the association found in [3] relates to men that have not accepted the sexual nature of their rectum, so the gene can become malignant, nature takes revenge. (For men that accept natural sexuality, you might just have "menstruations" just after penetration !)

(A paper not to put in the hands of CNN progressives : "X-inactivated women are beautiful too!")

#### **References :**

[1] Payer B, Rosenberg M, Yamaji M, et al. Tsix RNA and the germline factor, PRDM14, link X reactivation and stem cell reprogramming. *Mol Cell*. 2013;52(6):805–818. doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2013.10.023

[2] Sahakyan A, Kim R, Chronis C, Sabri S, Bonora G, Theunissen TW, Kuoy E, Langerman J, Clark AT, Jaenisch R, Plath K, Human Naive Pluripotent Stem Cells Model X Chromosome Dampening and X Inactivation. *Cell Stem Cell*. 2017 Jan 5;20(1):87-101. doi: 10.1016/j.stem.2016.10.006. Epub 2016 Dec 15.

[3] Igarashi H, Taniguchi H, Nosho K, Ishigami K, Koide H, Mitsuhashi K, Okita K, Takemasa I, Imai K, Nakase H. PRDM14 promotes malignant phenotype and correlates with poor prognosis in colorectal cancer. *Clin Transl Oncol*. 2019 Nov 18. doi: 10.1007/s12094-019-02239-z. [Epub ahead of print]