



# Exposing Feminism

The Thirty Years' War Against Men

Swayne O'Pie

# Exposing Feminism

The Thirty Years' War Against Men

Swayne O'Pie

---

---

*The Men's Press*

---

---

Exposing Feminism: The Thirty Years' War Against Men

---

---

*The Men's Press*

---

---

First published in Britain in 2011 by  
The Men's Press PO Box 2220 Bath

All rights reserved, © 2012 Swayne O'Pie

The right of Swayne O'Pie to be identified as author  
of this work has been asserted in accordance with  
Section 77 of Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988

Bibliography: Men's Studies – Equality –  
Gender Studies – Women's Studies –  
Feminist Studies – Sociology – Politics –  
Philosophy – Sexual Harassment – Employment

A CIP record for this book is available from the British Library

Typesetting: Matt Swann 21stBookDesign.blogspot.com

Cover Design: Matt McArdle

Cover photograph: Peter Canning

Printed and bound worldwide by Lightning Source Inc.

ISBN: 978 – 0 – 9568219 – 1 – 1

# Foreword

This book is of international relevance. It was first published in Britain only, in October 2011, with the title *Why Britain Hates Men: Exposing Feminism*. A British readership was anticipated, but to the author's surprise (and delight) orders for the book also arrived from readers in other developed countries, most notably the United States, Canada and Australia. Many of these buyers reported parallels in their own countries, especially with respect to the strategies used by feminists to justify their continued existence and to perpetuate their cultural and political power, now that equal rights and equal opportunities for women have been achieved. Swayne O'Pie refers to the feminist strategies of deliberately creating 'women's issues', 'inequalities' and 'discriminations' as the 'Feminist Fraud', leading to 'Forever Feminism' – a phenomenon found in many developed countries. He concludes that for feminists success will never be enough, they can *never* allow themselves to be satisfied.

O'Pie, often referred to in Britain as 'The Feminists' Nemesis', is a well-known and highly regarded speaker on feminism and sexual politics. *Exposing Feminism* explores in forensic detail and with examples the deceit that feminism has become. There is no war between men and women... but there has been a thirty years' war waged by feminists against men; and the majority of men haven't realised that they are *in* a war.

*Exposing Feminism* identifies feminism as the root cause of all the discriminations and disadvantages that men experience in western societies. Its analysis of the feminist agenda is applicable to the condition of men and women in all developed countries. The book is confrontational and O'Pie makes no apology for that. He's a brave man, addressing issues which other writers have feared to confront – the deliberate exaggeration of rape statistics, the widespread influence of lesbian feminism, the deliberate cheating and lying of feminist 'research', the feminists' psychological make-up and their *need* for anger. His honesty and integrity have made him a figure of hate and a target for the animosity of feminists; his motor home has already been attacked and seriously damaged three times by lesbian feminists (and *signed* by them).

Feminism has become a malign and highly influential ideology in contemporary western societies, and it's astonishing that it hasn't been seriously questioned and challenged... until now. *Exposing Feminism* is a powerful examination of how and why misandry (the hatred of men) spread so easily across the developed world; it shows why men are universally blamed, demonised, and whenever possible, punished. The book's evidence and research exposes the deceptions of modern feminism – issue by issue.

For all its serious content *Exposing Feminism* is extremely readable and inspiring, a 'must read' for men and women who've become disillusioned with the feminist movement and the ravages it has caused for thirty years in contemporary western societies. The book is a timely and valuable contribution to the critique of feminism in the modern world. Its eye-opening content is making waves; it deserves to become a bestseller.

*Mike Buchanan May 2012*

\*\*\*



# Author's Note

Exposing Feminism is in four Parts:

1. Part One looks at the spread of cultural man-hating in modern Britain: Spreading Misandry
2. Part Two exposes the Movement that has men-hating at its core: Feminism
3. Part Three exposes the mentality, the psychological make-up, of the women who hate men: Feminists
4. Part Four exposes every major Feminist issue, showing how each is a deceit, and how each is deliberately constructed to benefit Feminists and to blame, demonise and punish men: the Feminist Fraud

The Parts may be read independently, and in any order. In addition, each chapter within each Part addresses a separate issue and stands as a premise, an argument, in its own right. Collectively the Parts and chapters represent a devastating exposé of the fraud that Feminism has become. The reader will be made aware of how and why men in Britain are seriously disliked, how this is expressed and who is responsible.

Some of the chapters may not seem to be of interest to men; for example, 'Women Choose to Marry and be the Primary Parent' and 'Women Choose to Study the Arts and Humanities'. But they *will* be of interest; not only are they informative but they offer insights into the Feminist mentality, into the way governments favour and preference Feminists and their Ideology; they show the political influence that these people enjoy.

I should also like to record my appreciation for a fellow British writer on sexual politics, Mike Buchanan, for his input into this edition. He has to date written three books about feminism, which show notable insights into the ideology and its impact in the modern world. He runs a blog <http://fightingfeminism.wordpress.com> which I would recommend to anyone with an interest in feminism. We are jointly interested in publishing books on the subject through The Men's Press. Feel free to contact me if you have a book-related project you wish us to bring to fruition: [info@exposingfeminism.com](mailto:info@exposingfeminism.com).

*Swayne O'Pie May 2012*

\*\*\*

# Preface

For the past thirty years men have been under siege by a culture and State that too often has embraced the ideas that men are to blame for all society's ills, that men are 'bad people' by virtue of their DNA...whilst women have been cast as victims worthy of preferential treatment and special privileges. Feminism is responsible for this siege, for this mindset.

\*\*\*

This is an angry book. I have no personal axe to grind, no chip on my shoulder. But I'm angry at the continual deceit of Feminism, I'm angry at its relentless claims and demands, I'm angry at the way these claims and demands are believed and taken seriously, I'm angry at Feminism's continual manufacture of inequalities and discriminations, I'm angry at the way it blames and demonises men, and I'm angry at men for not confronting Feminism.

Feminism is not a fringe Movement from the 1970s. It is assumed that we are in a 'post-Feminist' society. Not so. Feminism is not only alive and well, it has entered the mainstream; our culture, society and State have all been affected by its power. Men, especially, have been negatively affected. Women, but mainly Feminists themselves, are the beneficiaries of this influential Movement; men are its target.

\*\*\*

Since 2000 there has sprung up a revitalised Feminism. Equality between the sexes has been achieved, most of it during the 1980s, but today's Feminists are *still* demanding 'liberation', *still* 'striving to advance women's rights'. These politically-driven women are constantly seeking out inequalities, constantly creating discriminations, constantly fabricating oppressions in order to justify their existence. Two active members of this latest breed of Feminists state:

*'Since the start of this millennium a staggering number of feminist organisations and campaigning groups have formed in the UK. A name has even been coined for this new activity: "third-wave feminism".<sup>1</sup>*

And having no opposition they are confident people:

*'The majority of feminists we surveyed were optimistic about feminism's future – with good reason. Feminism is a vibrant, living movement with an inspirational past and present...<sup>2</sup>*

\*\*\*

A microcosm of this modern forceful Feminism can be seen in higher education. The Professional Feminists Catherine Redfern and Kristin Aune are ecstatic at the success Feminism has had in our universities:

*'Feminism still holds a vibrant place in UK universities...Gender studies remains popular at M.A. and Ph.D. level, and feminist modules are available as options on most undergraduate degree courses in the arts, social sciences and humanities. The National Union of Students (NUS) Women's Campaign has been going for twenty years, and NUS women's officers are promoting women's rights in most universities. Student women's groups and feminist societies are also active in at least a dozen universities many of them having been set up in the last few years.'*<sup>3</sup>

\*\*\*

In 2009 male students at two universities, the Universities of Manchester and Oxford, attempted to set up a society for male students - Ben Wild at Manchester (the MENS Society) and Alex Linsley at Oxford (the Man Collective).<sup>4</sup> Feminists were livid that male students should want equality. Both groups and founders faced aggressive opposition from strident student Feminists and *their* long-standing established and officially sanctioned (and funded) officers and groups; promotional posters were defaced and torn down and personal attacks ensued. Feminist students attempted to justify their undemocratic behavior. Olivia Bailey, NUS national women's officer, claimed:

*'Discrimination against men on the basis of gender is so unusual as to be non-existent, so what exactly will a men's society do...To suggest that men need a specific space to be "men" is ludicrous, when everywhere you turn you will find male-dominated spaces.'*<sup>5</sup>

So outraged was Vicky Thompson, a Feminist student at Manchester, at men wanting to have equal rights with women, that she set up a Facebook group specifically to oppose the MENS Society:

*'Men's societies, groups and organisations represent nothing more than a backlash against the fragile gains made by the women's liberation movement.'*<sup>6</sup>

Thompson again,

*'There is no Women's Society at the University of Manchester Students' Union. There is a Women's Rights Collective who campaign exclusively for women's liberation. We live in a patriarchal society, women form an oppressed group and men do not. Therefore, not only does it create a huge imbalance to have a Men's Society and not a Women's Society, it actually makes a mockery out of the fight for women's rights...There's no men's liberation campaign because men don't need liberating!'*<sup>7</sup>

- It is aggressive, anti-male women such as these, the young Feminist gender-warriors, who will be entering the professions and carrying their bigotry with them, influencing decisions and policy. Their older university-educated Sisters have been doing so since the late 1970s

The above prejudice and inequality against male students is reflected throughout our society, culture and State. For example, there is a Minister for Women but no Minister for Men.

\*\*\*

Left-wing Feminist fascism is just as repugnant as Right-wing fascism; worse, in fact, because the Left claims to be the upholder of equality, liberty and freedom of speech; because of this, the intolerance and bigotry of Feminists is that much more repulsive. It is because this situation is widespread in Britain today, and has been for three decades with no one questioning or challenging it, that this book needed to be written. The Feminist confidence trick, the Feminist Fraud, its manufactured and synthetic 'issues', and particularly its man-hating, needs to be exposed.

In many areas of culture and policy-making today there is contempt for men. Men should set up specific political groups to promote their problems and issues, and to protect the erosion of their rights by an aggressive Feminism. I'm angry that they are not doing this. Ben's and Alex's milder work is a start; but the viciousness that they encountered shows that those with power will not give it up easily, and that the road ahead for men to gain respect and equal representation for their own specific issues and rights is going to be difficult. We have tended to forget that men are people too.

# CONTENTS

## Introduction - Exposing Feminism: A Brief Against Feminism 9

\*\*\*

## PART ONE - Spreading Misandry 14

Chapter 1 - Cultural Misandry: The Widespread Disrespect for Men 15

## PART TWO - What is Feminism? 42

Chapter 2 - Why Would Anyone Want to Disagree with Feminism? 43

Chapter 3 - Feminism's Devil Weapon 48

Chapter 4 - Jack and Jill are the Same: Except Where Jill's Better 60

Chapter 5 - Ms Marx and Her Brothers 67

Chapter 6 - The Power of Lesbian Feminism 76

Chapter 7 - So What Happened to Equality Feminism? 83

Chapter 8 - The Suffragettes: Early Man-Hating Feminists 91

## PART THREE - What is a Feminist? 100

Chapter 9 - Who *Are* These Women Who Make the World Worse for Men? 101

Chapter 10 - Is There a Feminist 'Personality'? 105

Chapter 11 - Anger and Rage: A Feminist Neurosis or Strategy? Or Both? 112

Chapter 12 - Is There a Feminist 'Pathology'? 121

Chapter 13 - Terrible as an Army with Banners 129

Chapter 14 - Everywoman, Feminism and Misandry 136

## PART FOUR - The Feminist Fraud 143

Chapter 15 - For Feminism Success Will Never be Enough: 'Forever' Feminism 144

### Section 1

Chapter 16 - How Feminism Create Issues 'from Nothing' 151

Chapter 17 - Everyday Scatter-Gun 'Issues' 162

### Section 2

Chapter 18 - Feminism's Grievance Gravy-Train Industries 176

Chapter 19 - A Typical Feminist Grievance Factory 186

### Section 3

Chapter 20 - Feminism and Women's Choices 190

Chapter 21 - Women Choose to Marry and be the Primary Parent 194

Chapter 22 - Women Choose to Study the Arts and Humanities 199

Chapter 23 - Women Choose to be Feminine and to be Seen as Sex Objects 206

Chapter 24 - Women Choose to be Involved in Pornography 219

Chapter 25 - Women Choose to Become Prostitutes	225
<b>Section 4</b>	
Chapter 26 - Women Choose Lower Pay and Lower Status	233
Chapter 27 - Women's Work Ethic and Choice of Options	236
Chapter 28 - Women Choose a Healthy Work-Life Balance	239
Chapter 29 - Women Choose to Take Career Breaks	241
Chapter 30 - Women Choose to Work Fewer Hours: And Fewer Unsocial Hours	245
Chapter 31 - Women Choose to Work in Fulfilling Jobs	252
Chapter 32 - Women Choose to Avoid Stressful Work	256
Chapter 33 - Women Choose to Avoid Promotion	262
Chapter 34 - Women Choose 'Women's Work'	271
Chapter 35 - Women Choose to Avoid 'Men's Work': The Unhealthy and Dangerous Jobs	276
Chapter 36 - The Pay-Off for the Pay and Promotion Gap	282
<b>Section 5</b>	
Chapter 37 - Feminism Changes the Rules: 'Equal Pay for Work of Equal Value'	287
Chapter 38 - Equality of Outcome	294
Chapter 39 - Top Jobs for the Sisters: Can Positive Discrimination be Justified?	307
<b>Section 6</b>	
Chapter 40 - How and Why Feminism Exaggerates Issues	317
Chapter 41 - Trafficked Women	320
Chapter 42 - Sexual Harassment	324
Chapter 43 - Domestic Violence	338
Chapter 44 - Rape	358
<b>Section 7</b>	
Chapter 45 - Cheating and Lying: The Dishonesty of Feminist 'Research'	380
Chapter 46 - Choosing to Cheat	383
Chapter 47 - Ethics, Propaganda and Feminist 'Research'	387
Chapter 48 - The Media and Feminist 'Research'	390
Chapter 49 - Universities, Social Policy and Feminist 'Research'	393
Chapter 50 - Examples of Feminism's Dishonest 'Research'	401
Chapter 51 - Housework: Do Women Work Harder than Men?	406
Chapter 52 - 'Daddy Doesn't Really Love You...He Only Wants to Bully Mummy'	416
Chapter 53 - Feminists are Allowed to Cheat and Lie: Because they are 'Special People'	422

\*\*\*

<b>Conclusion - Exposing Feminism: A Second Brief Against Feminism</b>	<b>426</b>
References	432

# Introduction

---

---

## Exposing Feminism: A Brief Against Feminism

Feminism has become a huge confidence trick, a 21<sup>st</sup> century deceit and fraud. We have become slaves to received opinions. Feminism is the modern political equivalent of the Emperor's New Clothes, it is devoid of any rational credibility, it is morally and rationally naked and we are all being conned. Feminism is the reason why the developed world hates men.

Feminism has been presented, and has been widely received by our conventional wisdom, as a liberating force, a view of the relations between the sexes that emphasises openness, 'gender equality', freedom from oppression, discriminations, inequalities, sexism and stereotyping. This presentation is a masquerade. The burden of this book is to show in a broad theoretical perspective and in practical detail that our conventional wisdom and State have been wrong to embrace this malign and dangerous Ideological Movement.

Modern British women are among the most cosseted, privileged groups of people in the world. Yet Feminism still promotes them as oppressed victims requiring preferential treatment and policy-favouritism. And where there are victims there have to be victimisers.

At the same time, although many women do not always approve of everything said by Feminists, or even identify themselves as Feminists, most have consciously or subconsciously absorbed the rhetoric, dogma, cant, and sound-bites of Feminism. Many men, the Male Feminists, have also consciously or subconsciously absorbed Feminist myths, accepting them as truths.

This book is not anti-women, but it *is* anti-Feminist and it *is* pro-justice. In Britain today we have a female elite that is more fiercely committed to the banner of Feminism and male-bashing than it is to the welfare and well-being of traditional women – except where the genuine interests of the latter happen to coincide with Feminism's own political and Ideological agenda. Feminism is taken to be the voice of women. It isn't.

- Critiquing Feminism is *not* attacking women. The battle of the sexes is not women versus men but *Feminists* versus men. And Feminists have been continually winning

There is no point in gently critiquing Feminism; it is a hard-nosed, thick-skinned Movement, with its adherents similarly mentally and emotionally endowed.

\*\*\*

People might see an example of Feminism 'having gone too far' here and there; or of men being discriminated against 'here and there...occasionally'. What they do not see is the *deliberate strategy* behind these observations, they do not see the *political pattern*, they are unable to join up the dots to reveal a concerted Ideological agenda, the progressing of a Quiet Revolution. The vast majority of us have been blind to this pattern, all examples of which 'coincidentally' benefit Feminists and Feminism and 'coincidentally' discriminate against men. There *are* no 'coincidences'. There has been a very clever, incremental, unnoticed Quiet Revolution to radically transform British society, culture and State.

- Feminism has carefully crafted cultural, economic and political strategies to manufacture problems and grievances 'suffered' by women, labelling these 'gender inequalities' or 'women's issues' in order to justify and legitimise its continuing existence, and thereby its misandrous agenda

Modern Feminism has an emotional, professional, egotistical, Ideological and financial investment in women's 'victimhood'. Furthermore, political correctness, introduced from the United States by Feminism as a device to be used as a 'gagging' mechanism, prevents us from investigating this fraud. Feminism has sunk into our national consciousness and is thereby given a free ride as a Movement advocating 'gender equality' and spreading misandry.

But any criticism, questioning of, or challenge to Feminism is taken as an attack on women. So it is hardly surprising that there is a universal reluctance and fear preventing Feminism's claims and demands from being subjected to an audit to assess just how relevant they are to changing realities. Political correctness and the deliberate creation of sexist sensitivities have done their job. Any serious critic or criticism is maligned – dismissed as a 'backlash', 'misogynist', 'Right-wing', 'sexist', 'reactionary', 'anti-progressive', or an attempt 'to take back women's fragile gains': so we all keep quiet - Feminism's desired response. It is noticeable that Feminism's reaction to even a *slight* questioning, even a slightly raised eyebrow at some of its absurd claims and demands, never includes addressing the *content* of the questioning (which it is morally and rationally incapable of defending) but focuses on a personal attack upon the critic.

- There must be something suspicious about a political Movement that does not allow itself to be questioned, challenged and analysed. Feminism has become an intellectual tyranny

This book dismantles Feminism, exposing it as a deceit, identifying and dismissing its issues, one by one – the pay gap, the glass ceiling, sexual harassment, domestic violence, rape, men treating women as sex objects, and so on. It shows how men are blamed for causing inequalities, discriminations and oppressions that have been deliberately fabricated to demonise and where possible, punish men. It identifies and analyses the mechanisms and strategies that Feminists use to produce these issues. It exposes as myths all Feminist claims that women in modern Britain suffer from 'gender inequalities'. Essentially, it offers compelling evidence that Feminism has caused modern Britain to hate men.

\*\*\*

The new emphasis on preferencing women, giving special privileges and protection to women and policy-favouring women, has dangerously eroded men's rights. There is an unspoken assumption that women's needs are more important than men's needs. More insidiously, Feminism's seeking out, creating and exaggerating inequalities, discriminations and oppressions, has necessarily been accompanied by a preoccupation with men's supposed mistreatment of women.

Blaming and demonising men is an integral part of the engine driving modern Feminism: there can be no discriminations without having discriminators, there can be no victims without having victimisers, there can be no inequalities and oppressions without something (the patriarchy) or someone (individual men) causing these.

- It is a vital point of this book that Feminism cannot exist *without* blaming and demonising men. It needs to spread misandry as a necessary device to justify its existence. Misandry is the fuel that drives the Feminist Ideology and agenda, and keeps its Grievance Gravy-Train Industries in business

\*\*\*

Since the 1970s the doctrines of Feminism have been introduced into our culture, conventional wisdom and political zeitgeist so quickly, so cleverly, and so subtly that most people have not recognised what has been happening; we can truthfully speak of a Quiet Revolution – advantaging women, where this coincides with the Feminist agenda, whilst promoting a systematic and systemic institutional discrimination against men, spreading misandry.

This book's purpose is to expose Feminism for what it has become – a selfish, self-serving Movement that needs to condemn men in order for it to continue enjoying its power and its individual and collective privileges. As long as Feminists can get moderate men and women to believe that they are fighting for 'gender equality', for 'women's rights' then they have a winning formula. I think that we need to inform men and women just what Feminism has become and what Feminists are now really like, not just for the sake of contemporary men's well-being but also for that of our sons and grandsons (and, indeed, our daughters and granddaughters).

- Privileging and preferencing one half of the population whilst demonising the other cannot result in a wholesome and healthy society
- Men have had to become the sacrificial victims of society because of Britain's neurotic and obsessive pandering to Feminist demands

Feminism has focused on the dark side of men and on the light side of women, resulting in a 'good women' / 'bad men' script - a script that has become the sole narrative for sexual politics and gendered social policy in modern Britain. And we have all bought into this script.

- The book will show that Feminism has not gone away. Feminism is more powerful today than it has ever been. A great many of its most radical principles have been internalised into the 'mainstream'.

## EQUALITY LAW GIVES WOMEN JOB PRIORITY OVER MEN

(The Daily Telegraph: Friday, 3 December 2010)

**'Employers will be able to reject male job applicants in favour of women who are not better qualified under new laws to promote equality at work.**

**Lynne Featherstone, the Liberal Democrat equalities minister, said yesterday companies that failed to promote a fairer deal for women could be named and shamed. She said sexism was present in too many workplaces.**

**Leading companies must promote more women to board level. They could be forced to disclose how much they pay male staff if they refused to do so voluntarily, she said.'**

\*\*\*

This book is an indictment of the Feminist establishment, which includes Male Feminists. To those readers who will be affronted and outraged by this book then I say 'good'. By exposing your erroneous statistics, your totalitarian tactics and your male-bashing falsehoods I will have succeeded. In addition, it is one of my goals to seriously disturb the views of the general public with regard to their unquestioned acceptance of Feminism.

Feminism has become a lucrative and powerful Movement. Many think that it went away and that modern Britain is a post-Feminist society. Not so. Feminist angst and self-righteousness manifests itself in every aspect of modern British life, our culture, the education system, the trade union movement, academia, the law, the media and the political system. It is driven by a self-serving desire to demonstrate that it is still needed, and it is animated by a spirit of resentment, the tactic of blame and the desire to triumph over men that is founded on a dogmatic assumption that women are the innocent victims of individual men, or of a male conspiracy. If you believe this to be a paranoid rant then read on, join up the dots; the hard evidence, the facts and examples, cannot be so easily dismissed. You are holding onto your beliefs tenaciously because the truth is so much less comfortable – we continue to show our gullibility (our bigotry?) by continuing to believe what can be shown to be a fallacy, a confidence trick, a fraud. We believe in Feminism because we *want* (and *need*?) to believe in Feminism. I hope to shake your belief. To do this it is necessary to expose Feminism for what it has become.

\*\*\*

Modern Feminism is an artificial construction with no rational or moral base and it has become a cultural and political taboo to criticise it. On the fortieth anniversary of the publication of Germaine Greer's 'The Female Eunuch' perhaps this is now the time. After four decades of craven passivity the time has come to stand up and confront Feminism's self-perpetuating strategies that cause cultural and institutional discrimination against men. Perhaps now is the time to break through the barrier of political correctness, and the fear of Feminism, that have closed the minds of the great majority of academics, politicians, media people, lawyers, the chattering classes, the policy-making fraternity – the Feminist-friendly coterie that makes the laws, passes the legislation, forms public, cultural and political opinions, and informs and teaches our young people.

*'There is nothing so powerful as an idea whose time has come'*

*(Victor Hugo)*

We claim that we want our rulers to be honest and genuine but in reality there are certain areas of our culture and politics that are too sensitive to encroach upon, they are honesty 'no-go areas'. We 'Know Things' but 'Are Not Allowed to Say'. Feminism and its dislike of men is a major player in this 'no-go' area. Political correctness and fear of Feminism are powerful censorship weapons, they draw cultural and political lines across which we dare not go, that we cross at our peril because if we did the pack of truth-deniers will spring at our throats. Read this book and let's cross that line together.

\*\*\*

*'If we are to be a truly healthy democracy we must exorcise the cultural and political taboo that prevents our questioning and challenging Feminism's issues and Ideology, and its claim to gender righteousness'*

*(Swayne O'Pie)*

\*\*\*

---

# Part One

# **Spreading Misandry**

---

# Chapter 1

## Cultural Misandry: The Widespread Disrespect for Men

Misandry: *'Hatred of or hostility towards men; man hating'*.<sup>1</sup> The opposite of misogyny.

Hate: *'To feel hatred towards, loathe, detest. To find deeply distasteful or disagreeable, dislike, odious.'*<sup>2</sup>

The reader may wish to keep this definition in mind whilst reading the book. The word 'hate' is a hard word and it needs to be used appropriately. I use the word to range from 'constant universal disrespect' through to a 'very serious dislike' to 'punish'.

Part One demonstrates the prevalence of misandry, the hatred of men, in modern Britain. It looks at some of its most objectionable cultural facets: how men are disrespected, insulted, ridiculed, belittled, disposable. It identifies misandry as a Feminist's sexual political weapon, showing how it influences social policy and how the hatred of men has a negative effect upon society as a whole.

It shows how cultural and institutional misandry are symbiotic, how they support and feed from each other. A society and culture that has no respect for men, whilst constantly focusing on women's issues, has led to a State that has no qualms about discriminating against men, about implementing institutional misandry.

The widespread cultural and institutional misandry in modern Britain is due to Feminism. Feminism expresses misandry wherever possible. Hating men is an integral ingredient of Feminism, and in Britain's post-1970s Left-wing/liberal/progressive political climate this aspect of Feminism has blossomed. Creating and spreading misandry greatly assists Feminism in implementing its agenda and achieving its aims.

*'Misandry has not unified all feminists, to be sure, but it has certainly unified enough of them – explicitly or implicitly, directly or indirectly, consciously or subconsciously – to create a powerful movement.'*<sup>3</sup>

In many areas of culture and policy-making in Britain today there is a widespread and accepted contempt for men.

---

---

It was a rainy November morning in 2003, and I was wet and weary. The library, my destination, was a dry haven. I quietly arranged my books on the table.

A young woman was studying two tables away. A few minutes after my arrival a black guy seated himself at the table directly between us. The librarian walked over to the girl and spoke to her quietly, "Are you comfortable with this black man sitting near you?"

I should think that almost everyone reading this would be shocked and disgusted that such a thing can happen in 21<sup>st</sup> century Britain.

The above story is true except in one respect: there was no black guy in the library – the librarian actually asked the young woman, who had the good grace to be embarrassed, "Are you comfortable with a man sitting near you"? You see, in my haste to get out of the rain and get myself settled I had inadvertently sat in the 'women-only' section of this particular library.

- I am an innocuous, white, heterosexual, able-bodied, male. And I refuse to apologise for that

Public libraries are publicly funded: yet as a male member of the public I'm treated like a leper. I suspect that this particular librarian was expressing a personal anger/hate toward men, and found relief, and perhaps pleasure, in being able to express this prejudice publicly, and legally, in a library system that supported and encouraged discrimination against men. So here we have an example of *personal, cultural and institutional* misandry.

Not only do we have special designated 'women-only' spaces in libraries, but public swimming pools have designated 'women-only' swimming times. There are 'women-only' car parks. As far as I am aware there are no designated 'men-only' spaces or swimming sessions. Why? Why are there special places and times designated solely for women but there are none for men? One thinks of apartheid in South Africa, or segregation in the American South.

- Having 'special spaces' and 'special times' for women-only is actually saying that 'men are bad people'. This is misandrous
- A serious dislike of men is just as abhorrent as racism, or anti-Semitism – or misogyny

## **BUSINESSMAN SUES BA FOR 'TREATING ALL MEN LIKE PERVERTS'**

(Daily Mail, Saturday, 16 January, 2010)

**'A businessmen is suing British Airways over a policy that bans male passengers from sitting next to children they don't know even if the child's parents are on the same flight.**

**Mirko Fischer has accused the airline of branding all men as potential sex offenders and says innocent travellers are being publicly humiliated.**

**Mr. Fischer, who lives in Luxembourg with his wife and their daughter Sophia, said: "This policy is branding all men as perverts for no reason. The policy and the treatment of male passengers is absolutely outrageous. A plane is a public place – cabin crew regularly walk down the aisles and passengers are sat so close to each other...I was made to feel like a criminal in front of other passengers".'**

- Mr. Fischer is a tad naive with regard to sexual politics (as are most people, except Feminists). 'The policy of branding all men perverts' serves Feminism well; it is a deliberate policy. Spreading misandry is, in fact, a political strategy crafted and cultivated by Feminism

But the Feminist strategy of cultivating misandry is damaging society. For example:

*'The repercussions of society's ill will toward men won't long be limited to individual embarrassment. Increasingly, innocent men are afraid to participate fully in society – whether leading Scouts or teaching school – for fear of being scrutinised as possible perverts, kidnappers, and murderers. Eventually, they'll simply stop showing up.'*<sup>4</sup>

- Discouraging males from participating in the voluntary sector, very few male teachers, one in five children living in a fatherless home...Is Britain telling us that it doesn't really like men?

\*\*\*

**Sugar and spice and all things nice  
That's what little girls are made from.  
Frogs and snails and puppy dog's tails  
That's what little boys are made from.**

In modern Britain this 18<sup>th</sup> century children's rhyme is taken literally, expressed culturally, expressed in courts of law and expressed in anti-male policies and legislation. 'Men are bad people' has become part of Britain's conventional wisdom.

In the early 1970s Erin Pizzey opened and ran the first refuge for battered women. She genuinely cared about the women who entered her refuge. In the mid-1970s Pizzey attended a Feminist meeting. She was appalled at what she found:

*'What I saw were groups of left-leaning, white, middle-class women gathering together to hate men. Their slogan was "make the personal political".'<sup>15</sup>*

Hating men, as we shall see in Part Two, is a central element of Feminism. And to a greater or lesser extent, as we shall see in Part Three, it is a personality characteristic of individual Feminists.

\*\*\*

Misandry can be expressed in numerous ways, and in varying degrees:

- In the way women talk about men
  - By claiming that women are 'superior' to men (more caring, co-operative, less aggressive, more empathetic, more sympathetic, more nurturing, more insightful...)
  - By using negative stereotypes to ridicule men in popular culture (television programmes, advertisements, films, books and plays)
  - By labelling men, as a group, as 'bad people', the cause of all wrongs in society (blaming, condemning and demonising men; for example, the unquestioning acceptance of the Feminist perspective on domestic violence)
  - By making men feel 'guilty' about the 'wrongs' they have done, and are supposedly continuing to do
  - By promoting women's issues and rights in policy-making - often at the direct expense of men's. In a dualist scenario, where there are only two groups, then if one is preferenced and advantaged then the other, logically, is being disadvantaged. Disadvantaging a group is an expression of seriously disliking that group; in this case an expression of misandry
  - By deliberately ignoring men's problems, issues and rights the State is further expressing a serious dislike for men. There has been no specifically male-friendly piece of legislation in living memory. The current policy of increasing paternity leave is not male specific; it is intentionally linked to the mother's return to full-time employment and is therefore a Feminist-friendly policy
- Misandry is a distinctive and *deliberate* sexual political phenomenon

There is a cultural transmission of dislike and disrespect for men: there is a process. Cultural misandry morphs into legal, educational and political misandry; in other words, into institutional misandry. Cultural misandry 'softens up' the public, the policy-making fraternity, the politicians, to accept and implement institutional misandry, allowing it to go unquestioned. And then, in turn, institutional misandry encourages cultural disrespect for men.

Pizzey noticed this link:

*'It was bad enough that this relatively small group of women was influencing social workers and police. But I became aware of a far more insidious development in the form of public policy-making by powerful women, which was creating a poisonous attitude towards men'.<sup>6</sup>*

- Both cultural and institutional misandry have become systemic in modern Britain, and both have become acceptable

*'Like misogyny (misandry) is often expressed as negative stereotypes of the opposite sex. But unlike misogyny, misandry is not closely monitored, because, from a gynocentric perspective, it is considered morally and legally acceptable. Even though misandry is clearly visible to anyone with eyes to see and ears to hear, it is not visible to many people as a problem. On the contrary, most people ignore it.'<sup>7</sup>*

Misandry, in whatever form it takes, or however trite it may seem, is a deliberate attack on men.

---

---

## Misandry and Popular Culture

Men are systematically depicted as fools in popular culture; they are ridiculed and belittled; examples include the anti-male messages presented on merchandise and the way men are negatively portrayed in situation comedies and in advertisements. This depiction has become widespread and acceptable. Insulting and ridiculing men is fun. It has also become big business. Until recently, W.H. Smith, the High Street stationers, sold a New Year Diary entitled 'All Men Are Bastards'.

These diaries were not placed on the top shelf, which contain the pornographic magazines that Feminists are so anxious to complain about, but were stacked along with other diaries at a very visible height. Child's viewing height. Imagine a young boy seeing this diary; would he ask if his dad was a bastard? Would he think that he might grow up to be a bastard? Would he know what a bastard was? Would he find out from his pals...and how would he then feel? When Feminists denigrate men they also hurt male children.

Substitute the word 'Pakistanis', or 'Jews', or even 'women' for the word 'men' and it becomes obvious that these diaries are insulting and would not be permitted. They would, in fact, now be classified as expressing a 'hate crime'. Yet it is permissible to say this about men. Why is this so?

When this nasty anti-male publication was brought to the attention of Macmillan (who published this diary) their senior editor, a woman, replied:

*'We regret that you find it offensive. It is, of course, intended to be a light-hearted look at the "war between the sexes" and we've found over the years that this is how most people take it. Please may I assure you that no personal offence is intended.'*<sup>8</sup>

- So really, then, it's my *own* fault for not having a sense of humour and laughing at my being insulted. There was no statement to say that the diary would be discontinued; there was no apology – only a 'regret' that I don't like being insulted and that the diary isn't targeted at me personally (but at all men)
- Sexism against men is 'fun', and 'light-hearted'...whilst sexism against women is condemned for being politically incorrect, and possibly illegal
- If the 'top shelf' magazines are offensive to women then being called a bastard is offensive to men. An example of Feminist hypocrisy and double standards

\*\*\*

Greetings cards that carry the 'Men Are Stupid' type of message are ubiquitous. Yet one does not see greetings cards, anywhere, that denigrate women. Fridge magnets and 'T' shirts that carry slogans that insult men are now commonplace.

*'Boys are STUPID; throw rocks at them'*

The makers and sellers of these cards and shirts defend them as harmless fun – playful products that one shouldn't take too seriously. Do a gender-switch. Imagine if someone had tried to sell the same shirts, but this time saying 'girls' rather than 'boys'. The reaction would be intense and immediate.

\*\*\*

The Moral Maze is a Radio 4 programme. On Saturday, 22 July, 2006, the moral question was 'Are Men Necessary'? Replace the word 'men' with 'black people', 'Jews', 'gays', or 'women'- would the reader find that offensive? Do you see how misandry has entered our cultural bloodstream to such an extent that we don't notice it even when men are so flagrantly insulted?

Would the BBC broadcast a programme entitled: 'Are Women Necessary?' The media would be in uproar, a documentary would be produced proving just how prevalent misogyny is, Academic Feminists would be frantically writing 'papers' denouncing men and the BBC, otherwise strong and aggressive women would faint, Jenni Murray, on the BBC's Woman's Hour, would declare a 'crisis' and an 'epidemic', a Parliamentary Commission would be set up...the Prime Minister would agree to be interviewed, and to apologise, on Mumsnet...

- Caring about *men's* feeling and rights is a step too far for the BBC's Equality and Diversity Mission Statement

\*\*\*

Feminists used to complain about the way women were depicted in the media. Feminism still complains about this:

*'If women are ever to be treated as equal members of society something must be done to change the way they are portrayed in the media. The media shapes our perceptions of each other. It influences our expectations and self-image. It helps create a climate where women are treated as inferior beings and where our needs and desires...come second-place to men's. It implicitly supports discrimination against women.'*<sup>9</sup>

- I agree with the argument made here – but it is not *women* who are the victims of negative media portrayal in today's Britain but *men*. The reader might want to keep the above, cogent, arguments in mind whilst reading the following examples of cultural misandry

\*\*\*

It is fashionable, and perfectly acceptable, for comediennes like Jo Brand and Kathy Lette to tell stories and jokes that ridicule and demean men. But male comedians are not permitted to make jokes where women are the butt. In the 1980s the national holiday camps Pontins and Butlins banned their entertainers from telling 'mother-in-law' jokes.

Benny Hill had his world-wide popular television shows banned on British television because Feminists deemed them to be too sexist and misogynistic. The comedian Les Dawson was similarly censored. Yet everywhere it is acceptable for *men* to be the target of sexist humour.

On Monday, 15 June, 2009, Kathy Lette, the misandrous comedienne, was interviewed on Radio 4's Today programme. The subject was erotic literature. Lette commented that 'men will have sex with anything living in the garden' (presumably any animal). She was not challenged about this obnoxious insult by the male interviewer, whose only response was an obsequious giggle.

\*\*\*

In modern-day sit-coms it's man's lot to be the butt of jokes and to be made to look ridiculous. Where women can be negatively portrayed as a bit crazy, or ditzy, or indecisive, men are made to look just plain dense. If their characters are not entirely stupid then they are at least incompetent – especially in undertaking housework, picking out clothes, or dealing with women. In contrast, their wives and girlfriends are always jazzy, witty and bright, and highly competent.

The popular cartoon The Simpsons portrays, in every episode, Homer and Bart doing stupid things and being embarrassingly dim, whilst Marge and Lisa are the balanced, sensible, characters, holding the family together and having a social conscience. There isn't *one* normal male character in The Simpsons. Every one of the male characters is dysfunctional.

- How many have noticed this anti-male prejudice in The Simpsons (or elsewhere in our culture)? We have become so conditioned to accepting misandry as 'normal' that we *don't* notice it. Yet, we have seen that even a Feminist admits that the media: 'shapes our perceptions...influences our expectations and self-image...it helps create a climate where women (now boys and men) are inferior beings...it supports discrimination against women (now boys and men)'
- Children and young adults, both male and female, being subjected to such a regular barrage of negativity about men, must subliminally take on board that, somehow, men actually *are* ridiculous and stupid...and inferior – and they will take this 'knowledge' with them into adulthood

\*\*\*

Current advertising may be even worse than sit-coms, if that is possible, when it comes to the negative portrayal of men:

*"Men (in advertising) are typically defined as useless fools, sexual predators or extreme action junkies", laments an article in the Australian Financial Review. Mike Morrison, the chief strategy officer of the American advertising agency Young and Rubicon, voices his protest in the same article: "As a marketer and a male, I see more ads that are offensive and demeaning to men than I ever did... Does every pay-off have to be at the expense of men?"<sup>10</sup>*

- In Britain we have similar television advertisements – the idiot husband who doesn't know how to wash his own clothes: the dishwasher that is so simple to use that even a man can use it: men who get themselves into silly situations and have to telephone for help...
- Do a gender-switch, showing women as bumbling incompetents, say, with a computer, or driving a car (which always used to be the typical 'cheap shot' at women) and all hell would break loose

## **TV ADS ARE TURNING DRAGON-SLAYERS INTO 'CASTRATED DWEBBS'**

(The Times, Friday, 30 June, 2006)

**'Every man has noticed it: we hunky males are slowly being emasculated by too much oestrogen in television commercials...**

**Virtual castration of the male is the topic of a bullish debate in 'Campaign', the advertising industry's weekly bible.**

**'Campaign' this week accuses the advertising industry of portraying men as "castrated dwebbs" who appeal to neither men nor women.**

**By portraying men as wimps, nerds and idiots, the advertising industry claims that it is trying to be more realistic.'**

- Well thanks a lot, Advertising Industry! Bastards

Portraying men as inferior to women in advertisements has now been officially sanctioned (whilst portraying women in a negative role is politically incorrect and unacceptable):

## **IT'S OFFICIAL: YOU'RE ALLOWED TO MOCK MEN IN ADVERTS. JUST DON'T TRY DOING IT TO WOMEN**

(Daily Mail, Wednesday, 20 May, 2009)

'A television advert that lampoons men as incapable of performing simple domestic tasks has been cleared by advertising watchdogs....

Industry observers said the prevailing view now appeared to be that it is fine to treat men as sex objects or fools, as this represents turning a stereotype on its head and is therefore ironic and funny.

In the Oven Pride advert, a man is shown throwing a tantrum at the thought of having to clean an oven.

A voice-over says "so easy, even a man can do it" as he is shown using the product with exaggerated delight while being watched by a disapproving pregnant woman.

A study from the Chartered Institute of Marketing in 2001 found two thirds of people believe women are now portrayed in adverts as intelligent, assertive and caring, while men are shown as pathetic and silly. Only 14 per cent said men came across as intelligent.'

Amanda Platell, a Daily Mail columnist, notes this widespread disrespect for men, this cultural and institutional misandry:

'Talk about double standards!...As a society, we have become so institutionally sexist against men that it is now accepted practice to treat them as second-class citizens. Think of the huge number of TV comedies in which the men are portrayed as under-performing dolts who are vastly inferior to the female characters...

Think of all those women's magazines that routinely reinforce the stereotype of men as being helpless inadequates who think only with their lower organs.

On a more serious note, think of the raft of legislation that has been put in place to benefit women, and indeed positively discriminate in favour of them, often at the expense of male interests.

In the supposed attempt to impose equality across the board there is – often quite literally – one rule for women and another for men. What's equal about that?'<sup>11</sup>

- Note the comment: 'think of the raft of legislation...'. Part Four will extensively address this institutional privileging of women and discrimination against men

\*\*\*

We see the same misandrous prejudice with plots and characterisation in dramas and films:

## MEN PORTRAYED BADLY

(The Sunday Times, 1 March, 1998, AA Gill and Nicholas Hellen)

'Just as it is standard casting on American cop series that the police captain will always be black, so in English drama the interesting, rounded, sympathetic characters are now nearly always women...

...certain types of male role have effectively ceased to exist. The respectable male hero can now appear only in costume drama..

And as John Mortimer, the creator of Rumpole, recently revealed, programmes that might mock female figures in the manner that has now become common for male figures do not get far...on screen men are now just risible Mr. Punch glove puppets.

It is now unthinkable for people to ridicule women. But it appears to be *de rigueur* to ridicule and verbally attack men. John Webster, who has created several of Britain's best-loved commercials, confirms that it is always best to laugh at men while... "It's pretty dangerous to poke fun at women".'

- Under the excuse-label of 'humour', men are ridiculed and made to be the target for contemptuous laughter

\*\*\*

However, when it suits our conscience there will be occasional exceptions; firemen, for example:

*'First responders don't count (in man-hating) as it's accepted wisdom post 9/11 that rescue-men are good, but only in a severe pinch and as long as they disappear after the flames are doused. Nice job, boys, now go home and shut up, and no pin-ups in the firehouse. Otherwise, in film and music, men are variously portrayed as dolts, bullies, brutes, deadbeats, rapists, sexual predators and wife beaters. Even otherwise easygoing family men in sitcoms are invariably cast as, at best, bumbling, dim-witted fools. One would assume from most depictions that the smart, decent man who cares about his family and who pets the neighbours dog is the exception rather than the rule.'*<sup>12</sup>

---

---

## Misandry and Belittling Men

A further aspect of misandry, akin to ridiculing, is the disparaging and belittling of men – making them look small and unimportant. Society, especially the media, now has a cultural licence to do this. It is a form of bullying, as are other forms of misandry.

## WOMEN'S KILLER INSTINCT

(The Sunday Times, 18 September, 2005: India Knight)

'A survey by JWT, the advertising agency, found that...Many men interviewed said they were tired of feeling belittled, especially in advertising. One in two men felt less sure of himself than he used to...'

It is worth repeating that children and young adults, both male and female, being subjected to such a regular barrage of negativity about men, must subliminally take on board that, somehow, men actually *are* ridiculous and stupid – and they will act upon this ‘knowledge’, taking it with them into adulthood, where it may well warp not only young men’s self-esteem but also their personal relationships with the opposite sex. Misandry in Britain has been prevalent since the early 1980s. Ask five women what they think of men and the majority will give a negative or ambiguous answer, especially if they have attended university. Try it.

\*\*\*

‘Bring Your Husband to Heel’ was a series of six television programmes broadcast on BBC2, that began on Monday, 22 August, 2005. Annie Clayton, a former actress and now a professional dog trainer, showed wives how to ‘train’ their husbands like she trains dogs. Here is one female commentator’s view of this disgraceful programme:

## THE TV TIDE AGAINST MEN

(Radio Times, Saturday, 20 August, 2005: Alison Graham)

‘Imagine a programme called “Bringing Your Wife to Heel”. Imagine that programme being transmitted during a prime evening slot on BBC2. Imagine the content of that programme – husbands being encouraged to use dog-training techniques to bring their lazy or untidy wives into line. They’d be given experience first on making dogs do their bidding, before being let loose on their partners. Their beloveds would have no idea that they were being subjected to this kind of subtle training – their reactions would be filmed by hidden cameras dotted around their home. All would eventually be revealed when the wife was shown the footage and realised that she was being trained as if she were a dog.

There’d be an outcry, don’t you think? Quite right, too, marches by furious women on BBC Television Centre, angry letters and emails, newspaper editorials – the lot. “Bring Your Wife to Heel” would be a programme beyond the pale, something that might have been given airtime in, say, 1955, but in these enlightened, post-feminist times, not a chance.

But what’s this on BBC2 on Monday evening? “Bring Your Husband to Heel”...

...It is just one more example of TV’s insistence on presenting men as saps.

We’ve discussed such portrayals on this page before, but “Bring Your Husband to Heel” also coincides with the start of a new series of polemics on Five, “Don’t Get Me Started”. In the first, Michael Buerk argues that men are increasingly being rendered obsolete. Naturally, he takes issue with his sex’s representation by television as “ineffectual, clueless and idiotic”. Gentlemen, he’s right.’

- Men are being portrayed as the inferior sex, a lesser version of the species that couldn’t cope unless handed directly from the care of their mother to the care of their wife

Why do men tolerate such programmes? A partial answer is that we don’t have a choice. Almost all forms of the media are now heavily influenced by Feminism, pursuing a Feminist agenda.

Many senior posts in the media are now filled by women. Nothing wrong with that – in itself. But the majority of these women will have been politicised into Feminism during their time at university; they will be gender-warriors. They carry into their profession the Feminist Ideology, a central tenet of which is the hatred of men (held to a greater or lesser degree) and will express this in the choice and commissioning of programmes, and in their general decision-making. So women in senior positions in the media (as in other professions, especially academia, the law and politics) will not simple be *females* in positions of power – but *misandrous Feminists* in positions of power. This has been a very unwholesome development over the past three decades and is one of the main causes of cultural and institutional misandry.

- British males, now in their 20s and 30s, have never experienced a culture in which men are respected

\*\*\*

The problem of misandry extends much further than the age-old battle of the sexes. It reaches into every area of public life in which a supposedly weaker group is entitled to mock or denigrate anyone or anything male...but must never, ever, be ridiculed or criticised in return.

How can this be right? Surely equality should be a two-way street in which the jokes, the criticisms and the views are allowed to flow freely in both directions without minority (but powerful) lobby groups dictating what is, and what is not, acceptable; without these groups dictating who should, and who should not, be targeted for ridicule, belittling and blaming?

People may notice examples of misandry, but they are unaware of its extent and how it has become a national cultural pattern; they are unaware of how it is employed as a major sexual political weapon in the Feminist armoury a) to be used to condemn and demonise men (punishing men), and b) to be used to facilitate the implementation of the Feminist agenda.

- People have not been joining up the dots in this concerted pattern

If what is routinely thrown at men were directed at any of our 'minority' victim groups – women, black people, ethnic minorities, gays – British society would be condemned for its prejudice and bigotry, discrimination and even persecution. In modern Britain there is a war against men, a war that has been quietly waged for three decades; few people realise that it's in progress. And fewer still realise that it is deliberate, orchestrated and Ideological.

- This war is not *women* versus men...it is *Feminists* versus men and it is unilateral; Feminists have no opposition...hence their power in today's Britain



## Misandry and Children's Literature

Even children's reading books, which ought to be innocent of politics and Ideology, carry misandrous messages. William Leith gives a long list of children's books that he has read to his son and realises that they all depict men negatively:

### WHY DO MY SON'S BOOKS TELL HIM ALL MEN ARE USELESS?

(Daily Mail, Tuesday, 2 June, 2009)

'As the penny dropped, I looked at all the other books I've been reading to my son... And something else began to strike me as I looked at these stories – the stories I use to introduce my son to the ways of the world. Not only were they full of bad male stereotypes – deadbeat dads, absent fathers, idiots, wimps and fools – but I have been totally colluding with them. It didn't bother me at all. Until I started to think about it, it had seemed normal to me.

What are men like? Dumb. I just accepted it.

And it never mattered to me that the one thing that defines Tinky Winky, the only definable male in the Teletubbies, is his general ineffectuality.

And it's also never bothered me that Iggle Piggle, in another children's TV programme In The Night Garden seems like a drunk, and that most of the Mr. Men are deeply inadequate.

Why has this never bothered me? Because it's all around us, everywhere we look. For years, men in our stories – not just for children, but adults, too – have been losing their authority. Not just years – decades. It's crept up on us and now it's everywhere.

And wherever you look, things seem to be getting worse for guys. In a survey of 1,000 TV adverts, made by writer Frederic Hayward, he points out that "100 per cent of the jerks singled out in male-female relationships were male."

- To William Leith Britain's culture of hating men appeared *normal* until there was a 'click' effect, until he started to join up the dots...' it's crept up on us and now it's everywhere'; this is the relentless progression of Feminism towards what I term its Quiet Revolution

\*\*\*

Others are also noticing the misandry in children's literature:

### WHERE ARE ALL THE NICE, NORMAL DADDIES?

Fathers in children's books are often stupid, wicked or absent. But with dads doing more childcare, isn't it time publishers took note, asks hands-on dad Damon Syson

(The Times, Tuesday, 26 May, 2009)

'The result was a shock. Not only did I find precious few role-model dads, I found hardly any dads at all. In all the picture books piled up around our house – more than 100 of them, in unsightly towers – mothers appeared in just under half and

were invariably portrayed in a positive light. Fathers cropped up in nine, of which only five took a positive role in parenting.

Of course, I shouldn't base my judgment on our collection of books alone. But academic studies confirm that men are underrepresented in children's books. When they do appear they are often withdrawn and ineffectual.'

\*\*\*

Women have a very high profile, and therefore power, in the publishing industry. Even Helen Kennedy's husband (Kennedy is a Feminist lawyer) was verbally abused at a Women in Publishing conference<sup>13</sup> and Doris Lessing remembers a striking scene from her past:

*'A building in London that houses a feminist publishing house has in it other offices, one of which is regularly visited by a friend of mine from the Middle East, as it happens an exemplary husband and father. It took him a long time, he said, to understand why it was that every time he passed the door of the (Feminist) publishing house, one of the females came out and deliberately stamped on his feet, as hard as she could...Not least depressing was that this kind of thing was thought of...as a political action.'*<sup>14</sup>

- Children's literature has become politicised, gender-politicised, by a culture that is driven by Feminist Ideology.
- And children will internalise these anti-male messages, taking this deliberately taught perception of 'good women' / 'bad and stupid men' with them into their student and then adult lives

\*\*\*

To sum up: 'All Men are Bastards' diaries, T-shirts, fridge stickers, greetings cards, radio programmes, comedienne, sit-coms, advertisements, television programmes, drama casting, children's literature...

For children and young people popular culture is an essential ingredient in their learning. The above areas of popular culture don't just get them to laugh at men, they teach them to view all aspects of men and maleness negatively. Culture is part of the process of how they learn about gender. In modern Britain this message is 'bad boys/men': 'good girls/women'.

And this sexual political cultural script is formally taught to children and young people in our education system.



## Misandry and Education

We teach young children to be kind to one another, to be thoughtful and caring to other people. And then, when they reach a certain age, the Feminist Fairy comes along and sprinkles boys and all things male with poo dust.

*'Somehow, its always men who are to blame. Even in the school yard, little boys suffer from puzzlement, pain, and ostracism as little girls make comments and express expectations they cannot quite grasp or respond to. Thus boys are trained into a lifelong awareness of inferiority.'*<sup>15</sup>

Education, in addition to the media, culture and children's literature, is also a major vehicle by which Feminism spreads misandry. Male-bashing has been introduced into the education system and cross-seeded back into mainstream culture.

\*\*\*

### A BAD TIME TO BE A BOY

(The Sunday Times, 24 November, 2002: Minette Marrin)

**'Illogical people...think that all men are awful and the root of all evil. Many more are doing so, and increasingly...**

**Even little children sense this prevailing orthodoxy in the playground. I will never forget the moment my nine-year-old daughter told my four-year-old son that men do all the bad and cruel things in the world and are wicked. But not girls. The poor little fellow looked at her in shame and horror. Since then he has been growing up in a climate of increasing misandry, the opposite of misogyny.'**

Since the 1980s school teachers, and lecturers in higher education, have become misandrous in their teaching and in their promotion of the Feminist Ideology and agenda. This proselytising is a serious mental conditioning of the nation's pupils and students – something that would not be permitted if it were of a macro-political nature. For example, if the education system presented and taught *only* a Labour perspective, or *only* a Conservative perspective in our schools and universities.

The author, Doris Lessing, is an Equality Feminist:

### LAY OFF MEN, LESSING TELLS FEMINISTS

(The Guardian, 14 August, 2001: Fiachra Gibbons)

**'Doris Lessing, who became a feminist icon with the books, *The Grass is Singing* and *The Golden Notebook*, said a "lazy and insidious" culture had taken hold within feminism that revelled in flailing men.**

**Young boys were being weighed down with guilt about the crimes of their sex, she told the Edinburgh book festival.**

**"I find myself increasingly shocked at the unthinking and automatic rubbishing of men which is now so part of our culture that it is hardly even noticed", the 81-year-old Zimbabwean-born writer said yesterday.**

**“I was in a class of nine- and ten-year-olds, girls and boys, and this young woman was telling these kids that the reason for wars was the innately violent nature of men. You could see the little girls, fat with complacency and conceit while the little boys sat there crumpled, apologising for their existence, thinking this was going to be the pattern of their lives”.**

**Lessing said that the teacher tried to “catch my eye, thinking that I would approve of this rubbish”.**

**She added: “This kind of thing is happening in schools all over the place and no one says a thing”.**

**It is time we began to ask who are these women who continually rubbish men. The most stupid, ill-educated and nasty woman can rubbish the nicest, kindest and most intelligent man and no one protests.**

**Men seem to be so cowed that they cannot fight back. And it is time they did.’**

- Universities have a great deal to answer for by producing Ideologically-driven teachers who prejudice the minds of children against their fathers and their brothers, against the male half of the population. Totalitarian States, fascist and communist, also used the education system to create an Ideologically-complicit populace, to create a compliant conventional wisdom. We don’t expect it to be so used in Britain
- I find it embarrassing that men need an 81-year-old woman to tell them to summon up the courage to ‘fight back’ against Feminism

\*\*\*

## **Pathologising Males in Education**

Boys are considered to be ‘problematic’ in school. The junior school is a world where mostly female teachers treat the playground boisterousness of young male pupils as deviant rather than healthy and normal.

Christina Hoff Sommers, in the preface to her book, ‘The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism is Harming Young Men’, comments:

*“This book tells the story of how it has become fashionable to attribute pathology to millions of healthy male children. It is a story of how we are turning against boys and forgetting a simple truth; that the energy, competitiveness, and corporal daring of normal, decent males is responsible for much of what is right in the world.”<sup>16</sup>*

Feminism has also succeeded in classifying adult males as ‘problematic’. The following is taken from ‘Fatherhood: Contemporary Theory, Research, and Social Policy’.<sup>17</sup> It describes the rationale behind the whole series of SAGE books on men and masculinities:

*‘Contemporary research on men and masculinity, informed by recent feminist thought and intellectual breakthroughs of women’s studies and the women’s movement, treats masculinity not as a normative referent but as a problematic gender.’*

- Here it is clearly seen who and what is responsible for driving educational and institutional misandry in Britain – ‘feminist thought’, ‘feminist breakthroughs’, ‘women’s studies’, and the ‘women’s movement’
- The books in this particular series of SAGE are set titles on many Sociology and Social Policy courses, and used to train social workers...teaching and training young people that men are ‘problematic’ – simply because they have been born male
- So it is being widely taught that men are ‘not normal’

By having men classified as ‘problematic’ Feminism has made it easier for itself to manipulate the State, governments and the professions into producing pro-female/anti-male policy and legislation. For example:

*‘A study by Newcastle-based Children North East in 2004 found that institutional sexism is damaging the educational prospects and social development of young people, and that unconscious practices disregard the needs of men and fail to recognise the role of fathers, in other cases, conscious discrimination labels men as “dangerous oppressors”, or “perpetrators”.’<sup>18</sup>*

- Such an observation of misandry is almost unique

Misandry, man-hating, has reached such a level in Britain that Feminists and Male Feminists can openly refer to men as being ‘the problem sex’. This truly bigoted attitude is reminiscent of the way men, prior to the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, thought about women being ‘problematic’ – their ‘frailty’, their ‘incapacity to benefit from education’, their ‘menstrual problems’. It is also reminiscent of the way black people were once thought to be ‘problematic’ in the American South.

- Our decision-makers have found it morally acceptable to use ‘hate legislation’ as a way of protecting women and minorities from negative stereotyping, but not as a way of protecting men from equally negative stereotyping

Labelling men ‘problematic’ also makes it easier for Feminism to introduce seriously anti-male policy in such gender areas as domestic violence, prostitution, sexual harassment, rape, child custody and post-divorce father contact with his children.

---



---

## Misandry and Social Policy

Establishing a misandrous culture and conventional wisdom has aided (as it was meant to) the generally held perception that compared with women men are ‘bad people’. This perception, in turn, facilitates the implementation of many pro-Feminist/anti-male policies.

- In Part Two we see how Feminism has created the perception of men being ‘bad people’

Creating and spreading cultural misandry is a Feminist aim in itself, but it needs to be noted that cultural misandry is a device used to ‘soften up’ the public and decision-makers to facilitate the introduction of *institutional* misandry. This ‘softening up’ process goes some way to explain the phenomenon of Male Feminists. For example, it explains why male MPs, judges and other male influentials consider it ‘morally’ easier to discriminate against men,

the 'bad people', than it is to be gender-neutral or to discriminate against women; and it explains why Male Feminists engage in institutional misandry.

Cultural misandry has made these men feel 'guilty' about being male; Male Feminists assuage their self-imposed 'guilt' by identifying and sympathising with Feminism and its aims and policies. Pro-Feminist decisions, and being prejudiced against your own group, are a kind of penance for these men, a pay-back, a form of compensation for all the supposed wrongs done by men to women. In addition, Feminists tap into and manipulates men's traditional chivalry, conditioning them to believe that women need protection from 'bad men', making preferential treatment, special privileges and policy-favouritism for women that much easier to secure.

And so we have institutional misandry:

## WHY DOES MODERN BRITAIN HATE MEN?

(Daily Mail, 10 June, 2000: Melanie Phillips)

'The Government assumes that all men accused of rape are guilty.

Anti-male prejudice, in fact, runs through Government thinking. Baroness Jay and her Women's Unit constantly bring out the old chestnut that one woman in four is assaulted by her partner.

In fact, most British domestic violence studies on which the Government relies for such claims are effectively rigged, they ask only women, not men, for their domestic violence experiences, mainly from self-selecting samples of abused women.

Yet reputable international research shows overwhelmingly that acts of domestic violence are initiated by women upon men as least as frequently as vice versa.

The courts are institutionally biased against husbands, ousting them from their homes on the slightest pretext, stripping the man of his children and his assets – even if the wife has gone off with a lover and his own behaviour has been exemplary.

The judges also accept a wife's claims that the man is violent on the basis of no evidence...

The majority of men are divorced against their will...

Most violence against children is perpetrated by mothers or boyfriends. A child's natural father is least likely to be violent towards it.

Many judges think mothers are intrinsically vulnerable and must be protected, as they are generally to be the parent with care of the children.

Yet why should this be? If a mother has gone off with her lover, jeopardising the well-being of her children and demonstrating infidelity to their father, promise-breaking, deceit and selfishness, why should she be automatically regarded as the fitter parent to bring up the children?'

- Here we see a litany of institutional discriminations against men. Widespread and deep cultural misandry has created a mindset that 'men are wrong' and that 'women are right', that 'men are bad people' and 'women are good people'. I don't claim this as a simplistic polemical sound-bite, Part Two explains why this is and Part Four offers extensive examples of this phenomenon. In modern Britain institutional misandry, like cultural misandry, is *political* and *deliberate*

\*\*\*

Widespread cultural misandry has resulted in systemic institutional discrimination against men. Discrimination against men is not merely an odd, isolated, occasional incident occurring haphazardly here and there. Anyone who wishes to look will see a concerted pattern of privileging women and disadvantaging men. These are not ‘coincidences’.

For example, positive discrimination for female prospective parliamentary candidates; equal pay policies, worse health-care for men than for women, harsher treatment for male than female criminals who commit a similar offence, maternal custody, child maintenance payments, sexual harassment, domestic violence. And rape – changing the court process in order to secure more (male) convictions, innocent or guilty, publicising the name of the accused (male) in rape trials whilst giving anonymity to the (female) accuser. In all cases women are preferenced while men are identified as ‘the bad people’ deserving of lesser consideration, deserving not to have *their* perspective addressed, deserving to be disadvantaged. Men’s rights (individual, human or natural) are never considered. This disrespect for men is Feminist-inspired man-hating.

*‘Feminist ideologues have found ways of embedding misandry in culture, ultimately in the form of law, without calling it that. Even men find it hard to see systemic discrimination against themselves, although that situation is changing, just as women once found it hard to see systemic discrimination against themselves.’<sup>19</sup>*

*‘Men have become the pariah sex; and cultural misandry gives the State  
a mandate to institutionally treat men badly’*

*(Swayne O’Pie)*

---

---

## Misandry and Men’s Lesser Worth

The stereotyping of a group as ‘bad people’ makes us callous to the death of its members.

### IT’S SO HARD BEING A MAN

(The Sunday Telegraph, 7 November, 1993)

**‘Last week the chief executive of the Samaritans drew attention to the growing number of young men committing suicide. There was little reaction...**

**Men are the last group that can be freely prejudicially denounced. It is perfectly acceptable to make general slurs about men that could never be made about an ethnic group and certainly not about women’.**

- That was written in 1993. Nothing has changed since – the male suicide rate is *still* four times greater than the rate of female suicide. Do a gender-switch...and imagine the media and political outcry that would ensue
- Suicide is overwhelmingly a male issue; deliberately ignoring it is a misandrous ‘policy’ (as is the neglect of other male issues)

On Monday, 22 March, 1999, the Bath Chronicle carried a small article (only about 8cm long by one column in width) entitled: 'Three bodies found in Bath over weekend'. During the course of one weekend three bodies – all male – had been found in different locations in Bath, all having died of ill-health and exposure.

- If it were three *women's* bodies that had been found in similar circumstances, in *one* city, over *one* weekend, it would have been a national news feature, questions would be asked in the House, Feminist MPs would be masochistically delighted at finding yet one further example of misogyny, a Commission would be set up. But these were only *male* corpses... so only 8cm in a local paper
- Widespread misandry dehumanises men. In numerous ways, men in modern Britain have become disposable, have become of lesser worth than women

A female columnist writes:

## **A HYMN TO HIM: MEN ARE SEXY, SMART, AND GOOD FOR WOMEN**

(The Sunday Times, 12 July, 2009: Minette Marrin)

**'Are men really necessary? That was the question that raised its ugly head following reports that scientists had created human sperm from embryonic stem cells. A team from Newcastle University claims to have produced fully mature, mobile sperm in the laboratory, which may soon be able to create a living child. If men are no longer needed for producing sperm, perhaps they are no longer needed at all – that was the suggestion humming in the media and the blogosphere last week, often rather nastily disguised as humour, with lists of ways in which men are worse than useless. Misandry – the dislike of men – is a powerful force.**

**With the feminisation of the media and of education and with decades of so-called positive discrimination favouring women, we have seen a growing female triumphalism; it has been accompanied by a growing bewilderment and displacement of men. There is an increasing sense that women can do well enough without them, and more and more women are embarking on a life to which men are only incidental.'**

\*\*\*

Misandry, demonising and dehumanising men, has devalued men's worth compared to that of women's; it has made society blasé about the disposability of men. It is responsible, for example, for the shocking bias in the lack of attention to men's health in general. It is responsible for our blindness towards domestic violence against men. Britain today cares more about saving whales than about saving males, more interested in the rights of foxes than in the natural right of divorced fathers to see their children.

- Almost anything can be said about men or done to men, without the expectation of a public outcry

## The Public are Unaware of Misandry

Both men and women fail to see misandry as a problem. This is because 'sexism' has been defined exclusively in terms of misogyny. So nobody is looking for 'sexism' against men, for misandry, and people don't find what they are not looking for (have they even heard of the word or concept?). Everyone would admit to noticing examples of men 'perhaps losing out', now and again, here or there, occasionally. But because Feminism has never been exposed to public debate, to questioning and analysis, people have failed to see the pattern, they fail to see the intended political strategy...because of this heavy censorship people have been *deliberately* denied the knowledge and the political insight to see Feminism for what it has become. After decades of society's and the State's relentless searching and probing, exploring in every nook and cranny of society, culture, education, the law, the media, employment, politics, to seek out misogyny and sexism against women, it can be very difficult for individuals, steeped in this conventional wisdom, conditioned in this monopolistic, blinkered search, to see the dangers of widespread man-hating.

- Here is one reason why this book needed to be written. Part Four offers the reader the knowledge, the insights, to see the pro-Feminist/anti-male pattern in sexual politics, to see how modern Britain expresses institutional misandry; to expose the Feminist fraud
- In the Preface we saw how Feminist students (already well entrenched in their *own* political groups) aggressively attempted to prevent male students at the Universities of Manchester and Oxford from forming even non-political, innocuous, Men's Societies

People have, so far, been unaware of how misandry has been employed as a major sexual political weapon in the Feminist armoury:

- in condemning and demonising men (and thereby legitimising the institutional 'punishment' of men via laws, policies and by ignoring male-specific problems and issues)
- how it is used to ease and facilitate the implementation of the Feminist agenda
- And neither are they aware of how Feminism's Quiet Revolution is being cleverly orchestrated

\*\*\*

Or they may have purposely chosen *not* to be aware of these aspects of misandry. Male Feminists are particularly deserving of opprobrium for their lack of concern for men, their obsequious refusal to address misandry, and their obdurate refusal to even acknowledge its existence. Male politicians, male trade union officials and male academics should be particularly singled out for condemnation.

## CAMERON: ABSENT DADS AS BAD AS DRINK DRIVERS

(The Sunday Telegraph, 19 June, 2011)

'David Cameron today launches a full-scale attack on fathers who abandon their families, calling for them to be "stigmatised" by society in the same way as drink-drivers.

The Prime Minister's intervention – in an article for The Sunday Telegraph to mark Father's Day – is one of the most outspoken he has made in defence of traditional family life... He says: "It's high time runaway dads were stigmatised, and the full force of shame was heaped upon them. They should be looked at like drink-drivers, people who are beyond the pale. They need the message rammed home to them, from every part of our culture, that what they're doing is wrong, that leaving single mothers, who do a heroic job against all odds, to fend for themselves simply isn't acceptable.

He says fathers must make the decision to support "financially and emotionally" their children even if they have separated from their mothers, spending time with them at weekends, attending nativity plays and "taking an interest in their education".'

This is an attack on men, not just fathers. Cameron chose Father's Day to make his words especially painful for those divorced men who are desperate to see their children but have been prevented from doing so, sometimes for many years, by vindictive ex-wives.

- 4 out of 5 divorces are petitioned for by wives;<sup>20</sup> it is *fathers* who are ditched and required to leave the family home. How can this fact possibly be construed as 'runaway dads'? Such dishonesty could only be alchemised in the warped perspective of the Feminist and the Male Feminist. It isn't *fathers* who are breaking up traditional families but wives and mothers...but this dare not be openly admitted in our politically correct culture. So men are used as the scapegoats; in a misandrous culture it is easier to demonise men than to face the wrath of Feminists by being truthful

Or is Ms. Cameron thinking of young men who irresponsibly impregnate girls and then refuse to commit? Well hang on, there are two sides to this story. Young women *are just as culpable* as young men with their sexual behaviour. For every male youth who impregnates a girl and then disappears from the scene there is an equal number of (if not more) young women who have had children by *numerous fathers* and who refuse to live with any of them because this would reduce their State single-parent benefits, including jeopardising their State-provided free flat or house. In addition, there is extensive and compelling evidence to show that young women actually *choose* to become single-parent mothers.<sup>21</sup> For example:

Senior research fellow Patricia Morgan:

*'Most unwed mothers conceive and deliver their babies deliberately, not accidentally.'*<sup>22</sup>

Again,

Geoff Dench, senior research fellow:

*'The existence of state benefits as a source of economic security seems to be encouraging young mothers not to bother with male resident partners.'*<sup>23</sup>

And Cameron's *own* research team, a body specifically set up to investigate the breakdown of the traditional family, reached the same conclusion. Iain Duncan Smith speaks for his Social Justice Policy group, Breakthrough Britain:

*'However, over the lifetime of this working group we have been concerned by the extent to which it appears that the current benefits system incentivises lone parenthood and acts as a driver towards family breakdown.'*<sup>24</sup>

- So young men *don't* leave single mothers to fend for themselves. Today, single-parent motherhood is mostly driven by young women, it is not caused by 'runaway dads'. By disregarding all the evidence, all the research, including his own, we can see that Cameron is bloody-minded in his determination to blame men, fathers, for the supposed 'victimhood', and the huge public cost, of the single-parent mother phenomenon

Cameron goes on to say that divorced fathers should be involved with their children and have an emotional input. He suggests 'spending time with the kids at weekends, taking them to football matches, going to the nativity play, taking an interest in their education'.

The man's an idiot. He has no idea just how difficult it is for the majority of divorced fathers to even *see* their children, let alone be permitted to participate in their emotional care (this ostracism is also experienced by many *unmarried* fathers). These loving fathers spend £1000s desperately trying to have some sort of meaningful contact – against the combined might of their vindictive ex-wives (free legal-aided to keep the fathers away from 'her' children), the Feminist-friendly Family Courts and successive Feminist-sympathetic governments (both the latter supporting and encouraging the cruelty of the ex-wife). Cameron offers not a word of comfort, in the form of father-friendly policy, for these seriously distressed and desperate men.

Cameron's statement is virulently anti-male. It is not *accidentally* insensitive; he deliberately chose Father's Day to inflict his cruelty on already-hurting divorced fathers. So not only is his attack on men delusional; it is despicable. And it encapsulates (and proves) the thesis of this book – that modern Britain hates men; and that this systemic misandry is not only *cultural* but *institutional*. Here we see man-hating from the very top.

Why did Cameron perpetrate this deliberate hurt, this planned misandry? Two reasons: by blaming and demonising men, by further hurting and tormenting divorced fathers, he appeased and pleased the Feminists. It is dangerous for a politician today to incur the wrath of the powerful Feminist lobby, sycophancy is a much easier policy to keep these influential Ideologues 'on side'. Secondly, by cuddling up to and flattering single-parent mothers he hopes to glean and secure the 'women's vote'. Cameron's motives were political, dishonest, devoid of integrity, insensitive and lacking in compassion.

- Cameron did it because he could. Today anything can be said about men, or done to men, and nobody protests. Men are the whipping boys, they are an easy target. Modern Britain hates men

## HOLD MAN-HATING PM IN CONTEMPT, SAYS MEN'S EQUALITY SPOKESMAN

(The Men's Press, July 2011)

'Britain should be made a genuinely "hostile place" for man-hating Male Feminists, says leading men's equality campaigner Swayne O'Pie. "These people are beyond the pale. It is time that those who express contempt for men were stigmatised and the full force of public shame heaped upon them. They are as despicable as drink-drivers and need the message rammed home to them that lying about men, demonising men, and punishing men in the court of public opinion, is wrong. They need to be made aware that men are people too". Mr. O'Pie was later arrested for expressing his "hate crime" views in public'.

- With regard to sexual politics Britain is no longer a democracy. It would be unwise for me to propose actions that I would dearly love to propose...but when men are constantly maligned and demonised, when they have been abandoned by the political and legal process, where else is there for them to turn...?

---

---

### The Social Consequences of Misandry

What is happening to men as a result of this massive assault on their identity? How do men feel about being depicted as bumbling fools to be ridiculed and laughed at? How do young men feel about being constantly portrayed as psychotics, wife-batterers, rapists and thugs? How do they feel about being classified as 'problematic people', as a group of victimisers and oppressors, as 'feckless fathers' or 'runaway, deadbeat dads'? How do young men feel about having their problems, issues and rights ignored whilst they see preferential treatment, special privileges and policy-favouritism widely given to girls and women?

Those who promote misandry, in all its manifestations, need to be aware of the consequences of what they are doing. Misogyny has been studied and taken seriously for decades; political pressure and political correctness have eliminated a great deal of it. Yet no pressure has been used to eliminate misandry; in fact, this phenomenon is State-encouraged and State-implemented. As a result Britain has become neurotically and pathologically focused on the needs and problems of women and the disrespecting and wickedness of men. Consistently maligning and attacking a major group in a population is an extremely dangerous thing to do.

\*\*\*

I suggest that the cultural and institutional misandry that has been experienced by men for three decades has been a driving force behind much of Britain's present social ills.

An observation from someone with first-hand experience of the problem, June 2010:

*'As a writer-in-residence at Huntercombe Young Offenders institution, best-selling crime writer Martyn Waites saw at first hand how boys would seek role models when none was available at home. It was one reason they were in trouble, he says. "There was such a lack of positive male role models in their lives, they would get what they could from TV, violent films and games," Waite recalls.*

*The boys he met needed examples to live up to, not ones to dumb down to. No wonder the father-of-two rages: "To men, promoting the image of men as juvenile, mean and stupid is cynical and exploitative".'*

*Which makes the tide of inverse sexism that has swamped out screens more appalling.'*<sup>25</sup>

In modern Britain boys and young men have a dire lack of good role models; especially if they are raised in a single-parent mother home (as one in five children now are). Teachers are overwhelmingly female. Dr. Jim Macnamara, an Australian professor of public communication who analysed *two thousand* mass media portrayals of men and male identities, found that men were depicted mostly as villains, aggressors, perverts, and philanderers. He wonders how boys will navigate their search for a good male identity:

*'Highly negative views of men and male identity provide little by way of positive role models for boys to find out what it means to be a man and gives boys little basis for self-esteem...In the current environment where there is an identified lack of positive male role models in the physical world through absentee fathers in many families, and a shortage of male teachers, the lack of positive role models in the media and presence of overwhelmingly negative images should be of concern...Ultimately such portrayals could lead to negative social and even financial costs for society in areas such as male health, rising suicide rates and family disintegration.'*<sup>26</sup>

- It is impossible to teach young people effectively that hatred and revenge are wrong, when they are learning directly and indirectly that this is apparently acceptable – when they are targeted at men

\*\*\*

If men are told over and over again that they are society's 'bad people' they are likely to say, 'so be it'; ignoring men's issues will inevitably lead to resentment – you lose your child after a divorce and *you have nothing else to lose*. Our governments should consider the danger of a self-fulfilling prophecy. Psychologists tell us that if we treat people badly, with contempt and disdain, then they will react in kind. Social order in Britain is not in good condition right now. Perhaps we have identified just one reason for this. If boys and men continue to be discriminated against, held in contempt, treated with disrespect, demonised and told, and shown, that they have little value or worth, disposable as husbands, as fathers and as people, then it might be understandable if they react by treating society in the same manner. They who sow the wind reap the whirlwind.

Observe the many dysfunctional socially behavioural trends in contemporary society and you will see that the whirlwind is gathering force. I put to you that a major causal factor is that Britain is now a misandrous society and State.

*'The symptoms of the male malaise are already showing as men of all ages become increasingly angry, suspicious, reactionary, and isolated. Men are opting out, coming apart, and falling behind. They are losing their sense of place in society and their direction as individuals. Trapped between unattainable ideals and a downsized reality, they risk morphing into muscle-bound weaklings who seek solace in the hypermasculine rituals of violence and aggression with an ugly undercurrent of homophobia, misogyny, and masochism.'*<sup>27</sup>

- What is not realised by these commentators is that this treatment of boys, juveniles and men is an intended Feminist *Ideological aim*, deliberately subscribed to and advanced, for three decades, by successive Feminist-friendly governments...especially Labour governments

By disrespecting men, treating men as having no worth, condemning and demonising men, modern Feminist Britain is encouraging a stropky male slouch towards Gomorrah. Enjoy.

### **NEWSFLASH: Britain, August 2011. Riots**

\*\*\*

## **Misandry and Girls**

The spread of misandry tells boys and men that they are stupid, inferior, and of little worth. This Feminist-cultivated view of maleness gives girls and women the legitimacy to think of themselves as superior, cleverer and more worthy of privileges, than boys and men. Here we see the origins of the sanctimonious righteousness that is an observable characteristic in young Feminists today. If we are to be a truly healthy democracy we must have the courage to face up to Feminism and exorcise the cultural and political taboos that prevent our questioning its claim to gender-righteousness.

Cultural male-bashing has been treated as a kind of retributive justice by women who have been disappointed and hurt by men. And some of that woundedness has been passed on to their daughters, who have absorbed the message that men are 'bad people', resulting in young women turning against their male peers.

In this particular context the use of misandry as a sexual political weapon has also resulted in young men and women having a distorted perspective of each other. Daughters have been especially wounded by the 'bad men/father' narrative they've heard from their mothers, the wider culture, the media and from politicians. How does a little girl reconcile her love of her first 'hero' with the anti-male messages all around her? This will play out negatively in her later personal relationships, as we can now see happening in dysfunctional courtships, marriages, co-habitee relationships, and the relentless and rapid increase in the number of single-parent mothers.

- Four out of five divorces are applied for by wives...and one in five children now live in a single-mother, fatherless, home
- Young women's hostility towards men is validated by an applauding misandrous culture

Feminism's creation of widespread misandry is rebounding against ordinary women. This is ironic, but not surprising. For all its cant and rhetoric Feminism doesn't represent women; it uses a facade of 'gender equality' to justify its existence and to sweeten and cleanse its public (and political) image. Its Ideology and agenda are of paramount importance, not women; only where women's genuine issues happen to coincide with Feminism's agenda and aims can Feminism accurately, but accidentally and by default, claim to 'represent women'.

*'Rendering women either unwilling or unable to see men as fully human beings, as people who can indeed be hurt both individually and collectively, might well be the single most serious flaw in feminism.'*<sup>28</sup>

It is my hope that we can destroy man-hating before it overwhelms and destroys our son's and daughter's relationships.

\*\*\*

And the Feminist's response to the disastrous social consequences of their spreading misandry?

*'We have come a long way, but we still have a long way to go'*  
(Feminist mantra)

## **Misandry and Feminists**

In the late summer of 2005 the Feminist Marian Salzman published her book, *The Future of Men*. On 4 September Jasper Gerard interviewed her for *The Sunday Times*:

*'The good news is that since writing the book Salzman has subtly changed her mind.*

*"I started as a feminist and came out much more realistic. Men should rise up. We have pushed men too far. They are going to have to shove back."*

*Since being in Britain she has been horrified by a television show that teaches wives to make husbands walk on a lead: "How is this allowed? The straight white male is the only one that doesn't have a royal society protecting his rights. If this programme showed maids rather than men it would be called slavery."*

*During her research she actually came to feel sorry for men. The trendsetter says it starts going wrong for us round about nursery time: "Schools are now populated almost entirely by women and boys are falling behind. If this were happening to girls something would have been done".'*

- If an American Feminist is appalled by how much disrespect and negativity men in Britain experience and is calling upon men to 'rise up and shove back' (as did another former Feminist, Doris Lessing) – then something, surely, 'must be rotten in the State of Britain'.

\*\*\*

I'll leave Part One by offering the reader the following comments:

- 'Looking how easy it is to treat men badly is oddly liberating' (the influential Feminist, Naomi Wolf)<sup>29</sup>
- 'How did we get to this point? Like misogyny, misandry is about hatred, not anger. And hatred is seldom, if ever, a grassroots movement. It is a culturally propagated movement.'<sup>30</sup>
- 'I watched the feminist movement build its bastions of hatred against men, fortresses where women were to be taught that all men were rapists and bastards, and I witnessed the damage done to the children in the refuges who were taught that men were not to be trusted.' (Erin Pizzey)<sup>31</sup>
- Marilyn French was a hard-line misandrous Feminist; she died in May, 2009. The columnist, Libby Purves, celebrated French's pathological dislike of men:

*'The human side of a man-hating feminist...Marilyn French was angry – and scary. But sometimes we need people to kick against the traces...she aimed a blowtorch straight at the collective groin of Man the Master...Salute her.'*<sup>32</sup>

- Salute a nasty, man-hating Feminist? Here we see a prime example of modern British Feminism's true colours; an instruction from a mainstream Feminist to recognise and respect a woman who spent her life hating men. It is indicative of modern Feminism's aggression towards men...note the violent imagery attacking manhood and masculinity

\*\*\*

*'Misandry has not unified all feminists, to be sure, but it has certainly unified enough of them – explicitly or implicitly, directly or indirectly, consciously or subconsciously – to create a powerful movement.'*<sup>33</sup>

What is this aggressive anti-male 'Movement'? Who *are* these unpleasant women who are determined to make the world worse for men? We will now turn to exposing this Feminist Movement, its ideas, aims and agenda: and exposing the mentality and psychological make-up of its adherents, the Feminists. Welcome to Part Two and Part Three.

---

# Part Two

## **What *is* Feminism?**

---

## Chapter 2

# Why Would Anyone Want to Disagree with Feminism?

Essentially, there are two kinds of Feminism. This chapter identifies the principles of Equality Feminism and shows why it was needed. Ideological Feminism is introduced, its elements identified and briefly discussed. It is shown that the Feminism we have in Britain today is a belief system that is ideologically-based, whereas Equality Feminism was firmly grounded within a moral and philosophical base of principles – justice, liberty, individualism and equality.

---

---

### Equality Feminism

Equality Feminism (often referred to as first-wave Feminism) began with Mary Wollstonecraft, who wrote 'A Vindication of the Rights of Women' in 1792. It continued, with tracts and low-key, middle-class meetings (including men as well as women) throughout the nineteenth century. The key words for first-wave Feminism were 'liberation' and 'emancipation' – freedom and release from the oppressions and constraints imposed on women by social, cultural and economic conventions. Such freedom was unquestionably necessary if women were to be treated as equal citizens to men. The centrality of 'liberation' and 'equality' in first-wave Feminism have led to some referring to it as Liberal Feminism. Essentially, its aims were equal rights and equality of opportunity for women.

There can be no doubt that women needed liberation, emancipation and equality. For example, a father had been, until recent years, the sole guardian of a child, deciding on its education, religion and residence; he was the only one who could consent to an operation for the child; he could take the child abroad without permission but the mother could not. Wives had to reveal their income and tax forms to their husbands (whereas husbands did not have to reciprocate). A woman had to get her husband's permission for a number of actions, for example, using an inter-uterine device to prevent pregnancy.

A woman couldn't buy a house without her husband's signature. She couldn't sit on a jury because a juror had to be a householder and few women were. Women were kept out of medical school, law school and business school. There were moral double standards, especially in sexual behaviour and adultery. Wives didn't have equal access to divorce: men could obtain a divorce if their wives merely committed adultery; women could only obtain a divorce if their husbands had committed incest or adultery combined with desertion, cruelty or unnatural offences. Some inequalities and discriminations persisted until the early 1970s.

- So there were many disadvantages and discriminations that women experienced and ought not to have experienced in a liberal society. Without doubt, there was justification for a women's equality movement

The original mid-19th century concept of 'liberalism' incorporated the principle of individualism; that is, the belief that all individuals are of equal importance regardless of sex, race or religion. So Equality Feminism naturally sprung from this liberal philosophy – pronouncing that women should have the same opportunities, respect, treatment and rights as men. Indeed, the 'father' of political liberalism, John Stuart Mill, strongly supported Liberal (Equality) Feminism. The liberal concept of 'individualism' is of importance to this book's narrative because modern-day Feminism is the opposite - it is a 'collectivist' political movement, as opposed to the 'individualism' of Equality Feminism. Conceptually, as well as in their tactics and aims, the two Feminisms are very different. For example, Equality Feminists assume that the sexes have different natures and inclinations; an example being that women 'naturally' lean towards the family more than do men.

\*\*\*

Equality Feminism has five basic principles:

1. Equal opportunities for women
2. Equal rights for women
3. Equal respect for women
4. Equal treatment for women
5. Equal choices for women

The above human rights are, or ought to be, fundamental to all citizens in a liberal democracy. However, before the 1970s these five concepts really did need to be addressed and fought for. I actively supported Equality Feminism and still believe in its principles, all of which have now been achieved.

---

---

## **Feminism Today**

During the 1950s and 1960s Equality Feminism gave way to a second wave of Feminism, which spawned numerous schools - Socialist Feminism, Marxist Feminism, Radical Feminism, Revolutionary Feminism, Postmodern Feminism, Lesbian Feminism, Separatist Feminism and even Psychoanalytic Feminism.<sup>1</sup> Unlike Equality Feminism which had a moral and philosophical base, second-wave Feminism, including all its schools, is based upon an Ideology, the central elements of which are:

- Men have all the power in society
- Men and women are basically 'the same', apart from their sex organs
- Socialist Marxism
- Lesbianism
- A belief system with ideological and political aims, and an agenda
- A desire to radically change society
- Ideological Feminism is the Feminism that we have in Britain today

Please note that henceforth, unless otherwise stated, it is Ideological Feminism to which I refer when I use the word 'Feminism'. This is the Feminism to which I was referring in Part One. In addition, any word or concept specifically related to this Feminism will begin with an upper-case letter in order to emphasise the connection; for example, Feminist Ideology and Male Feminist. Feminism itself I consider to be a political Movement, almost a 'Party' in its own right.

\*\*\*

Unlike Equality Feminism, which was based upon an individual's rights and opportunities, modern British Feminism is a *belief system*, it has a dogma of tenets, it is doctrinal. These are core criteria of any ideology, as has been shown by Claire Fulewider. Following standard social scientific usage, she defines 'ideology':

*'...an ideology is a system of beliefs (as opposed to a set of attitudes) "which describe present reality... explain present reality – that is, show how it has developed historically (and prescribe in what ways it is good or bad and posit a plan for changing present reality)".'*<sup>2</sup>

- It will be shown conclusively throughout the book that modern Feminism has a dogma of tenets, it is doctrinal and 'plans to change reality'; that it is Ideologically revolutionary in nature and wishes to radically change British society, culture and State

It has been widely assumed that modern Feminism is a continuation of Equality Feminism. This is not so. Equality for women is not a central element of today's Feminism, in spite of its rhetoric regarding 'gender equality'.

Two Equality Feminists confirm that Ideological Feminism has little concern with equality for women and that it has man-hating at its core, as an essential ingredient of its belief system. Feminism is:

*'...not merely about equal rights for women...Feminism aspires to be much more than this. It bids to be a totalising scheme resting on a grand theory...Feminist theory provides a doctrine of original sin: the world's evils originate in male supremacy.'*<sup>3</sup>

- So modern Feminism is Ideological – it has a 'totalising theory', is 'doctrinal' and is misandrous

Melanie Phillips, the social commentator, also notes that at the heart of modern Feminism and its driving force is the blaming of men:

*'The unifying factor has always been the belief that men oppress women. As Coote and Campbell observed, all feminists agreed the fight was against men...'*<sup>4</sup>

Others have also noted that Feminism is now Ideological, with its central tenet being the condemnation of men; for example:

*'This phenomenon (misandry) did not originate spontaneously at the grass-roots level but was initiated and is still promoted by a segment of the academic elite that is affiliated with one branch of feminism. We called that branch "ideological feminism" ...'*<sup>5</sup>

- Notice that 'ideological feminism' was initiated by the 'academic elite' in the universities

\*\*\*

Feminism's Ideological all-embracing grand theory and doctrine is that men are all-powerful and use this power to advantage themselves and to disadvantage women. This is the Feminist concept of 'patriarchy'. It is Feminism's firm doctrinal belief in the patriarchy that is at the root of present day, widespread man-hating.

Fulenwider notes the centrality of the patriarchal Ideology to Feminism:

*'...women are unjustly treated, that they are maintained in subordinate roles and positions, and that they are consistently removed from most vital decision-making opportunities of society. Furthermore, this discrimination against and exploitation and oppression of women are seen by feminists as rationally justified by a dominant sexist ideology...'*<sup>6</sup>

- The 'dominant sexist ideology' is the 'patriarchy'. Feminists claim that (all) men subjugate, exploit and discriminate against (all) women

These theorists conclude that 'equality' is not the central aim of modern Feminism, even though it regularly and hypocritically uses the term 'gender equality'. It has a quite different agenda:

*'What they want, and what they are in the process of achieving with the support of their allies and under the protection of post-modernism, is either utopian or dystopian, depending on your point of view: a radical reorganisation of society, one that requires either writing new constitutions or reinterpreting current ones.'*<sup>7</sup>

- Like all other 20<sup>th</sup> century ideologies, Marxism, communism, Nazism and fascism, modern Feminism is radical and revolutionary. *Unlike* all other 20<sup>th</sup> century ideologies Feminism has never been questioned, challenged, analysed or critiqued by academia, the media or politicians
- This is why I refer to present-day Feminism progressing towards a Quiet Revolution

Feminism, then, seeks revolution rather than equal rights for women, equal opportunities for women, 'gender equality' for women. So on this measure, all those marching under the banner of Feminism today cannot be counted as true friends of women, or speak on their behalf. It has its own Ideological agenda, and only when that agenda accidentally coincides with ordinary women's interests can it be said that today's Feminism speaks for, and represents, the interests of the majority of women. An example of this is the following in which Cristina Odone considers the Labour Government's plans to get all women into paid employment (an aim of Feminism, making women independent of men) referring to Feminism as 'the cosy careerists' club':

## **GIVE WORKING MOTHERS WHAT THEY REALLY NEED**

(The Daily Telegraph, Friday, 12 March, 2010: Cristina Odone)

**'If Labour had paid attention to its own national 1997-8 consultation, "Listening to Women", it would have seen that getting mothers into full-time work, and their children parked in state-run care centres, was never a vote winner.**

So if Labour was not “Listening to Women”, to whom was it listening? The cosy careerists’ club that for too long has monopolised the public debate on what women want. This tiny elite, devoted to their high-flying, remunerative careers, are totally unrepresentative of the ordinary woman.

They are work-centred, while the overwhelming majority of women want part-time work to support their family...Because of their status, these women wield immense influence, and have been able to shape the Government’s agenda. So we see Labour pumping billions of pounds of taxpayer’s money into a childcare system that is unpopular with ordinary mothers; and setting up a tax system that penalises the stay-at-home mum – despite evidence that the majority of mothers of children under five want to stay at home.

They rate career above caring and believe that self-realisation comes only through professional success.’

- Feminists do not represent women
- Modern Feminism is powerful and influential
- Ideological Feminism has been the monopolistic form of Feminism in Britain since the mid-1970s

What ordinary women in Britain today stand in most need of is not liberation from male oppression but from the intellectual and political tyranny that modern Feminism has become.

\*\*\*

To sum up: what we have in Britain today is *Ideological* Feminism, not Equality Feminism. There are five elements that constitute and define modern Feminism; these elements will be constantly confirmed throughout the book:

1. A belief system at the centre of which is the Ideology of patriarchy and the hatred of men
2. A belief system which claims that men and women are ‘the same’
3. A belief system that embraces Marxist Socialism
4. A belief system that declares heterosexual relations undermine Feminism (the influential element of Lesbian Feminism)
5. A belief system that is radical and revolutionary

In ‘Feminisms: A Reader’ Maggie Humm gives a glossary of terms. Humm is Co-ordinator of Women’s Studies at the University of East London:

*‘Feminism: the definition incorporates both a doctrine of equal rights for women (the organised movement to attain women’s rights) and an ideology of social transformation aiming to create a world for women beyond simple social equality.’<sup>8</sup>*

- What might constitute ‘beyond simple social equality...’?

These elements of modern Feminism will now be addressed in detail. The creation and widespread use of cultural misandry was observed in Part One.

## Chapter 9

# Who Are These Women Who Make the World Worse for Men?

A main aim of this book is to expose Feminism – its lies, its myths, its Ideology, its claims of inequalities, discriminations and oppressions that women suffer; these will be addressed in Part Four. Part Three exposes the mind, the emotional and psychological make-up of the Feminist.

It is possible to tell something of a cause from the people it attracts. Likewise, it is possible to tell something about a person from the cause they believe in. My objective in Part Three is to show that the Feminist is a certain ‘type’ of person.

My building a psychological profile of ‘a Feminist’ was triggered by something that Bob Geldof said during a short conversation a few years ago. He had been meeting Feminists in London, researching for a television programme he was producing on fathers and marriage. He related his encounter with Feminists, which resonated with numerous similar encounters of my own. The similarity in our experiences made me wonder whether there was a specific Feminist psychological/personality/mental/emotional profile.

---

---

‘Who is she that looks forth as the dawn,  
Fair as the moon,  
Clear as the sun,  
Terrible as an army with banners?’

(The Song of Songs 6:10)

Those involved with an Ideology in which there is a collectivist group-identity and where a targeted enemy is central to their cause always appear to have more aggressive personalities than the rest of the population. They are single-minded, determined and driven by their Ideology. Witness the behaviour of the communists and fascists in Europe during the inter-war years. Such people have ingrained attitudes in which intolerance, rage and anger predominate. Many people, women as well as men, who have dealt with Feminists will recognise these emotions as being common elements in a Feminist’s make-up. Some would say that there is a common ‘pathology’.

As far as I can ascertain no research has been carried out on the Feminist ‘personality’, presumably because such a study would be too politically incorrect. I contacted Psychology Departments in various universities for references to research and books on the subject, but no one wanted to get involved, even though I had only requested innocuous literature and had promised anonymity.

So I have had to rely on personal observations, encounters and experiences, and those of others, and the empirical and anecdotal research that I managed to find. I conclude that there *is* a psychological make-up that is specific to a Feminist. If the reader recognises any of the characteristics mentioned then this is a bonus proof.

\*\*\*

It may be thought impolite to investigate the psychological make-up of a particular group of individuals and classify them as a 'type'. However, these are the people, the female Ideologues, and their followers and sympathisers, who are not only responsible for spreading misandry, but who have formed, directed, and implemented pro-women/anti-men sexual politics and gendered social policy for the last three decades. Looking at their psychological make-up is not, therefore, patronising, it is an overdue necessity. Any group that has a collective dualist 'us and them' Ideology, especially where a moral dimension is involved ('we are better than them', 'we are victims of them'), and where the emotion of 'hate' is very much part of the Ideology (as with racism, white supremacy, homophobia, misogyny, anti-Semitism...and misandry) needs to have the psychological make-up of its members addressed and exposed.

Is there a certain 'type' of woman who enjoys disliking men; who freely voices her disdain of men; who wishes to preference and defend women under *any* circumstances, justified or not; who carries anger and rage against men within her; who is continually dissatisfied with political gains; who will instigate and implement anti-male policy? Yes, there is. There is a spectrum, of course, but *all* Feminists, to a greater or lesser extent, will exhibit what this Part of the book identifies as a Feminist personality, mentality, psychological make-up.

The spectrum ranges from the fascistic young Feminist students at the University of Manchester (and other universities) who wish to stop their fellow male students from having equality of expression and representation, to the Minister for Women and her Sisters in government (especially Labour governments) who are hell-bent on pursuing legislation that will either preference women or discriminate against men (or both). It includes those women who would not label themselves Feminists but nevertheless still embrace Feminist myths and lies. For example, it includes those women who believe that *all* divorced men who have been denied contact with their children by a vindictive ex-wife and a Feminist-dominated Family Court system, are wife-batterers or paedophiles (labelling these fathers as 'paedophiles' is a Feminist political strategy intentionally designed to prevent them receiving any public sympathy for their plight...a simple strategy - just *demonise* them). Many women are Feminists by proxy.

- There is a certain 'type' of woman who buys into an artificially created set of sexual political sensibilities in order that she can satisfy her emotional need for being perpetually 'offended'

In addition, it takes a certain type of person to constantly, and *deliberately*, seek out situations and incidents that, with a little bit of conjuring and linguistic skulduggery, can be construed as 'sexist', 'misogynist' or a 'discrimination against women'.

\*\*\*

So yes, it *is* possible to tell something of a person from the cause they believe in. It is in the context of the present chapter that I again refer to the Dictionary of Sociology for the definition of Feminism:

*Feminism: 1. A holistic theory concerned with the nature of women's global oppression and subordination to men. 2. A socio-political theory and practice which aims to free all women from male supremacy and exploitation. 3. A social movement encompassing strategic confrontations with the sex-class system. 4. An ideology which stands in dialectical opposition to all misogynous ideology and practices.<sup>1</sup>*

- This is the Feminist cause
- The reader will know that a dictionary is supposed to be a value-free, politically neutral resource. This is not the case with this dictionary; a very strong sexual political bias is evident. Sociology is a subject dominated by Feminism, from GCSE to postgraduate level
- Note the confrontational language, the expression of *anger* – ‘women suffer oppression and subordination by men’, ‘women are not free, they are enslaved by male supremacy’, ‘in this condition of slavery women are exploited by men’. The whole definition represents an Ideology that is confrontational, aggressive, angry, man-hating, which *intentionally* uses pejorative and emotive language; Feminism is defined as an oppositional Ideology, a group (‘collective’) enemy has been appointed (men)...which must be blamed and attacked

We see a similar type of confrontational aggression and emotion in an individual Feminist’s hyperbolic vocabulary: ‘subjugation’ (of women), ‘subordination’, ‘domination’, ‘oppression’, ‘victim’, ‘abused’. Only a certain kind of person, a certain kind of *mind*, would seek to use such words, words which are so obviously inaccurate and inappropriate to describe women’s everyday lives in today’s Britain.

\*\*\*

The above is the political cause. The following definitions provide reference points, a framework, a focus, by which the psychological make-up of those attracted to this cause can be identified and assessed:<sup>2</sup>

Psychology: *‘The scientific study of the human mind and its functions, especially those affecting behaviour in a given context. Capable of influencing the mind or emotions.’*

Personality: *‘The distinctive character or qualities of a person, often distinct from others. The pattern of collective behavioural, temperamental, emotional and mental traits of an individual. The psyche that animates the individual person.’*

Mentality: *‘Mental character or disposition: Cast or turn of mind; mental make-up or inclination.’*

\*\*\*

The following is taken from a Feminist website:

*‘Third Wave feminism encourages personal empowerment and action. Third Wave feminists like to think of themselves as survivors, not victims.’<sup>3</sup>*

- ‘Feminists like to think of themselves as survivors’? To be a ‘survivor’ one must obviously have had a traumatic experience (as in being a victim of a serious crime, for example, or having escaped a serious car accident). So Third Wave Feminists are ‘survivors’ of what, exactly? They are ‘survivors’ of being ‘female’ – and therefore, by definition (the Feminist definition), being a ‘victim’. So today’s Feminists are ‘women who have survived female victimhood.’ I ask the reader, what kind of mentality is it that would wish to classify oneself as a ‘survivor’ simple because one is born with a vagina. It’s pathetic, paranoid and neurotic...and the reason that this Part Three needed to be written
- Feminists bemoan the fact of being women. We will see later that Feminists abhor women being ‘feminine’

\*\*\*

If I were a Jew I would want to know what drives anti-Semites, as a black person I would want to know what type of mentality motivates the racist, as a gay I would want to know what gives rise to homophobic behaviour. As a man I want to know what mental process leads a woman to be a misandrist (a misandrist who locates at any point on the 'hating men – ambiguity towards men' spectrum).

\*\*\*

In Part Four we will see that Feminists have a political and Ideological need to find and create artificial inequalities and discriminations. In Part Three we will see that they also have a deep *psychological need* for this behaviour. Consequently, for the Feminist, there is a perpetual search for things to be 'offended' by.

I look at three areas of a Feminist's psychological make-up – personality (her behaviour, temperament and emotions), emotional expression (her anger, rage and dissatisfaction) and mentality (her disposition and mindset). I invite the reader to factor in their own empirical evidence of Feminists and assess whether my analysis rings true for them.

*'Left-wing fascism, including Feminism, is just as intolerant and pathological as Right-wing fascism'*

*(Swayne O'Pie)*

## Chapter 15

# For Feminism Success Will Never be Enough: 'Forever' Feminism

Apart from being a malign misandrous Movement Feminism is also a dishonest Movement. One of the aims of this book is to show how modern Feminism has become a huge confidence trick, a deceit, a fraud to which we have all succumbed. To this end Part Four looks at how and why Feminism creates, and needs to *continue* to create, 'women's issues', needs to indulge in synthetic outrage.

*'With most battles for equal opportunity won, feminism came to be dominated by other goals and creeds. One could say the movement had outlived itself and had to justify its existence.'*<sup>1</sup>

Women gradually overcame the legal and cultural barriers to equal rights and opportunities. This mostly occurred in the 1980s. Girls now get better GCSE and A level results than boys, more women than men now enter university, women are becoming physicians, lawyers, CEOs, and scientists, and women are founding their own businesses in record numbers.

British women today enjoy a range of opportunities unimaginable forty years ago, a time when Equality Feminism set the groundwork for a liberal society to address women's *genuine* inequalities. All its aims have been achieved – equal opportunities for women, equal rights for women, equal treatment for women, equal respect for women, equal choices for women. Feminism has now been left with no battles to fight. But for modern (Ideological) Feminists this success is not enough. Why?

\*\*\*

After it hijacked Equality Feminism Ideological Feminism (the Feminism we have in Britain today) became very successful. So successful, in fact, that it gradually became an intrinsic part of the fabric of Britain – the culture, media, law, education, academia, charities, the economy, trade unions, and most of all, the political system. It was reluctant to give up this power, and the status and financial benefits accruing from this power. A Quiet Revolution was being achieved. So the problem was, how could it now *continue* with this success and remain an established part of the British culture and State in perpetuity? The concept of 'Forever' Feminism was formed and put into practice. Part Four looks at how and why Feminism perpetuates itself, now that equality for women has been achieved.

\*\*\*

## Equality Feminism's Success Created Dilemmas

After equality was achieved Feminists were faced with a number of problems and predicaments:

1. How to justify Feminism's continuing existence.
2. How to 'flag up' their success to their constituents, women (in order to continue to recruit them to the Movement), whilst at the same time continuing to claim to the State (in order to justify its existence and retain its power) that their job has not been completed and there were still *more* inequalities, discriminations, oppressions, abuses to fight. So one of Feminists' problems was how to make it appear that they were working for their constituents (women) and making progress...without making *too much* progress, which would give the impression that their Movement was no longer needed. It is important to understand that equality is no longer an aim for Feminists – *their present, and long-term goal, is to justify their existence and to stay in business*, and by doing so to spread misogyny. The well-worn mantra 'gender equality' is a cover, a disguise, to achieve these goals.
3. A third problem Feminists faced was how to resolve these dilemmas. This was done by crafting strategies designed to ensure the existence of the Movement so that it could *always* be justified, would *always* be needed, and would therefore continue to be a powerful influence in society, culture, the economy and the State; and benefit the Movement's members.

Feminism resolved these dilemmas and problems by developing strategies to ensure that there would *always* be issues for it to address. The 'gender equality' rhetoric became a device to draw attention away from these fraudulent strategies and their intended aims.

\*\*\*

*'The feminist battle has evolved from a fight for legal and social equality to a fight for special treatment and affirmative action in education and the workplace.'*<sup>2</sup>

Feminism today is not a campaign to end inequality for women – that has been accomplished. Modern British Feminism is now about organisational and Ideological survival, not about securing rights for women, or achieving 'gender equality'. Feminism today is a continual search for more inequalities, more discriminations, more oppressions, more issues. In addition, old issues must be exaggerated and new issues concocted. Feminist Industries have been developed specifically to consolidate and implement these strategies; these are large businesses with their own public relations, Interest Groups, political delegates and bureaucracies.

- For it to continue to exist Feminism needed to have women thought of, and believed to be, perpetual 'victims'

*'But today to be classified as a victim is to be given a special political status, which has no necessary connection with real hardship or actual oppression. Victimhood as a political status is best understood as the outcome of a political strategy by some groups aimed at gaining preferential treatment.'*<sup>3</sup>

- For it to continue to exist and retain the benefits of its power Feminism necessarily needed to have men thought of, and believed to be, the 'bad people', the patriarchy who rule to advantage themselves and who *intentionally* disadvantage women

Where there are 'victims' there have to be 'victimisers', where there are 'discriminations' there have to be 'discriminators', where there are 'oppressions' there have to be 'oppressors'. So the concept of 'Feminism' presupposes and necessitates male blame. 'Forever' Feminism therefore requires perpetual man-hating. Spreading misandry is a central tenet of the Feminist Ideology (its patriarchal Ideology) and a major way of achieving this is through the implementation of its 'Forever' strategies.

- The result of 'Forever' *Feminism* is 'Forever' *misandry*: logically, Feminism cannot exist without man-hating

\*\*\*

So women always need to be thought of as 'victims'... 'victims' of men. Without the banner of victimhood to rally around, Feminist coffers would run dry, Professional Feminists would be unemployed, mortgages would go unpaid. Many thousands of Professional Feminists can't just declare victory and go home, because without the Feminist Movement they would have no homes to go to; they would have no jobs and no job prospects. And neither would they have a platform from which to bang their Ideological drum. The following aptly sums up the predicament of Feminism and the strategy behind 'Forever' Feminism:

*'Above all, seeking victim status encourages the invention and nursing of grievances. The underlying problem for victim groups is that once they have been given preferential treatment their power increases and, thereby, undermines the case for special treatment. As a result, some groups make strenuous efforts to maintain their victim status by exaggerating their suffering.'*<sup>4</sup>

- To continue to exist Feminists have to be perpetually and chronically dissatisfied (the reader may wish to refer to Part Three, the Feminist's psychological make-up and emotional and political need for 'anger'). Synthetic outrage has to be expressed; there is a need to be constantly 'offended'

For example, working women whose careers top out before the level of Chief Executive Officer are described as having hit a 'glass ceiling', whereas men in a similar situation have simply just peaked.

Feminists will *never* be satisfied with anything they achieve, they will never be appeased... they cannot *afford* to be satisfied. Success will never be enough if the benefits of the Movement are to continue in perpetuity, which Feminists wish them to do.

*'Accommodation to any particular demand will always be found unsatisfying and merely trigger further demands. Negotiations with feminists cannot terminate in compromise. Because she needs to believe that she is fighting a universal conspiracy.'*<sup>5</sup>

- And so we have a Feminist personality, a Feminist mentality, a Feminist permanent anger towards men

The irony of Feminism's 'Forever' Feminism is that the sense of perpetual victimhood (the condition that Feminism needs to describe women as always being in) precludes the concept that the members of the victimised group, women, could actually rise above their assigned position in society and meet that society, and be part of that society, on equal terms. To do that would mean taking personal responsibility for their own actions, behaviours and choices and the condition of their own lives. Instead, Feminism has designed an Ideological

position ('Forever' Feminism/perpetual victimhood for women) that leads not to the encouragement of personal development for women but to entitlement, 'collective' group rights, and the eradication of the individual.

- It is in this sense that Feminism discourages women from taking personal responsibility for the consequences of their actions, behaviours and freely made choices. In this way Feminism infantilises and patronises women. Many examples of this are seen throughout Part Four. This is 'Blame Men, the Patriarchy' Feminism (successfully achieved by various nuances and subtleties – and very often by more blatant and direct methods)
- If I were a woman I would be extremely angry at being designated a 'victim' ...or would I? The advantages are huge – preferential treatment, special privileges, policy-favouritism. But some women *do* jib and refuse to sell their souls to Feminism; such women should be celebrated

\*\*\*

So Feminism needed to invent 'Forever' Feminism for various reasons. Essentially, once equality of opportunity, rights, respect, treatment and choices had been achieved Feminists, especially Professional Feminists/Feminist Ideologues, felt that their Movement was too valuable to lose; they now needed to justify its existence, they needed it to survive, to continue indefinitely. No powerful group will give up its power easily; and neither will a powerful politicised group selflessly refrain from using whatever weapons its historical moment makes available in order to retain (or gain more) money, position, fame, and self-perpetuation; and in Feminism's case gain many more opportunities to promote its Ideology, including spreading misandry.

---

---

## **'Forever' Feminism's Strategies**

What are the strategies that Feminism uses to resolve its problems, predicaments and dilemmas, to justify its existence and to ensure that it is with us 'Forever'? Essentially, it has to continually produce never-ending grievances, inequalities, discriminations and issues, thereby justifying its demand for preferential treatment, special privileges and policy-favouritism and validating the blaming, demonising and punishing of men. It does this in various ways; essentially, there are six strategies:

*Strategy 1.* Feminists concoct and fabricate issues, inequalities and discriminations *from nothing*. Examples include public violence against women and Scatter-Gun everyday issues. Feminists euphemistically call these artificial issues 'women's issues' in order to glean public and political sympathy

*Strategy 2.* Feminists have established extensive Industries to ensure that Feminism remains a vital part of the economy, the culture and the political process – the Women's Sector (a make-work sector, producing nothing except grievances and issues). Feminist Industries have a number of essential functions, including seeking out inequalities, manufacturing artificial grievances, cultivating and nurturing discriminations, promoting these to the public and policy-makers, presenting them as 'evidence' of women's oppression and victimhood, and drawing attention to those responsible for these fabricated oppressions – men

*Strategy 3.* Feminists convert ordinary women's freely made choices into inequality issues (again tactically labelling them 'women's issues'). These are generally old issues re-jigged, smoothed with an up-to-date Ideological patina. Examples include: women's choice of family / parenting arrangements, women's choice to study the Arts and Humanities, women's choice to wear make-up and to be looked at by men, women's choice to enter the sex industry, women's choice to be paid less than men (the pay gap), women's choice to avoid senior positions (the glass ceiling). The downside of these choices (downside defined only by Feminists, not by ordinary women themselves) are then sold as 'inequalities' and 'discriminations' - presented as being the fault of men, men as individuals or as members of the patriarchy

*Strategy 4.* Feminists have changed the rules. Whenever an aim has been achieved this success creates a dilemma for Feminism: it resolves this dilemma by redefining the rules and definitions, by drawing new lines in the sand...a philosophical and linguistic sleight of hand. Examples are 'equal pay for work of equal value', and the concept of equality of outcome, sexual harassment, domestic violence and rape

*Strategy 5.* Feminists grossly exaggerate old-established bread and butter inequalities and discriminations. They encourage activists to portray numerous issues as having reached 'crisis', or 'epidemic' proportions. Examples include trafficked women, domestic violence, sexual harassment and rape. And so all men are demonised

*Strategy 6.* Feminists create their own 'research' to academically underpin the above strategies, claims, demands and policies. Feminist 'research' is also used to create new issues. Feminist 'research' is a fraud intended to give its issues and grievances intellectual authority and academic authenticity

\*\*\*

The above strategies can be summed up in the phrase Issue Creep; more inequality and discrimination issues continually being sought and creeping in, new issues being found, older issues creeping towards greater severity; issues becoming more common, issues being given regular publicity, issues being presented to governments by 'women's groups' (read Feminist Groups), and by Feminist MPs. Issue Creep is an extremely effective strategy because it guarantees, in our British Left-wing/liberal/progressive political zeitgeist, maximum political attention.

*'We have already referred...to two extremely effective strategies of ideological feminism: expanding the definition of one crime to include forms of behaviour that were once not classified as crimes, or reinforcing old claims with new ones, and eventually generating something that approaches hysteria. This strategy requires them to keep upping the ante.'*<sup>6</sup>

The above six strategies that are driving today's Feminism can be neatly summed up in the following:

*'Diana Furchgott-Roth and Christine Stolba call women's remarkable educational success, "the foremost example of feminists' 'dilemma' because it forces them to flail around looking for gender bias where plainly none exists.'*<sup>7</sup>

For the above strategies to be effective Feminists have had to convince Everywoman that she is a 'victim'. This has been an extremely successful policy; almost all women now regard womankind as experiencing some sort of sexism, misogyny, inequality or discrimination.

Three decades of constant educational and media conditioning have done their work. For example, whenever Feminism undertakes 'research' that entails interviewing Everywoman the desired Ideologically-correct answer will nearly always be given: 'Yes, I *do* feel that I'm being held back because I'm a woman', 'Yes, it *is* wrong that women should be paid less than men', 'Yes, there *ought* to be more women in senior positions', and so on. Women have been taught to think in Feminist dogma. Such 'research' will then be presented to the media and policy-makers as 'evidence' that the majority of women feel that there are inequality issues still to be politically addressed. Hence, we have 'Forever' Feminism. And Feminists, their demands being sympathetically received (what politician wants to ignore the opinions of Everywoman?), are repeatedly getting away with this fraud.

\*\*\*

Like the Left in general, Feminism must have an enemy. This is men and the patriarchy. But since equal rights and opportunities for women have been achieved a new, additional, enemy has arisen; anyone, male or female, who realises and dares to suggest that 'women have *made it*'. Such a person is anathema to Feminism because such a person (if listened to by the public and politicians) is capable of jeopardising the delicate balance between a) needing to appear successful to attract acolytes, and b) pretending to the State (and public at large) that 'we are only half way there...so Feminism is *still* needed.'

Warren Farrell worked for many years at national level as a Feminist advocate. He gradually became disillusioned, realising just how immoral and anti-men/pro-women Feminism had become. He left the Movement in disgust, triggering a huge loss in his earnings – by becoming 'politically incorrect' (that is, addressing issues from the male perspective *as well as* from the Feminist perspective) Farrell lost contracts, speaking engagements, magazine and newspaper columns and assignments, television work and academic sinecures. His crime? He had pointed out that women were making great strides in securing rights and equality. This observation did not go down well with Feminists:

*'I had naively believed that leaders as pioneering as I thought Gloria (Steinem) was would be delighted to hear of ways in which women were succeeding. Now I had to face a deeper fear: that some of my feminist colleagues might have an emotional investment in women's victimhood that went so deep as to prevent any discussion that might dilute women's victim status.'*<sup>8</sup>

- For Feminists *nothing*, and *no one*, must dilute women's 'victim' and 'oppression' status; no one must deny that our society is ruled by men, for men, to the intentional disadvantage of women

\*\*\*

Feminism is a self-perpetuating Movement. It will *never* be satisfied or appeased, it cannot allow itself to be. The Movement is a huge Grievance Gravy-Train for Feminist activists; in addition, as we have seen, many Feminists have an 'emotional investment' in the movement, their Political Community Club, so they have a 'psychological need' for it to continue. And, of course, entrenching 'Forever' Feminism will ensure the progression of its Quiet (Marxist-Socialist) Revolution...and the continuation and spreading of misandry. And so we have a Britain that will continue to hate men.

Forget the cant about 'gender equality', this is a disguise, a masquerade. For today's Feminists the key aims are to justify their existence, to hold onto their power and privileges and to ensure that the Movement continues in perpetuity. Today's Feminism has become a self-perpetuating make-issue Movement. Part Four shows how it is successfully doing this. Each strategy has been given its separate Section exposing Feminism, issue by issue, as a fraud, and showing how each issue impacts negatively on men. The pay gap and glass ceiling, even though they are part of the 'converting women's choices into issues' strategy, have been given a separate Section because (along with domestic violence) they are Feminism's flagship issues; as such, their fabrication and deceit need to be especially examined and exposed.

\*\*\*

Feminists themselves admit that in order for their Movement to progress they need to continually create issues:

*'As Germaine Greer wrote in The Whole Woman, it is the job of each generation to "produce its own statement of problems and priorities".'*<sup>9</sup>

As we have seen, today's generation of Feminists are just as angry, aggressive and man-hating as previous generations; and they are continuing in the tradition of seeking out and creating new, as well as retaining old, 'problems', 'inequalities', 'discriminations' and 'oppressions'.

## SECTION 3

### Chapter 20

## Feminism and Women's Choices

We have seen the Feminist strategies of (i) creating issues 'from nothing' and, (ii) the establishment of Industries to assist this and to promote and publicise these fabricated issues. This Section addresses the Feminist dilemma of women's non-Ideological choices and how it resolves this dilemma by actually converting women's freely made choices into inequalities and discriminations. So this is the third area of Feminism's strategy of Issue Creep, employed to justify Feminism's continued existence. Non-Ideological choices include mothers wishing to be the primary parent; young women choosing to study the Arts and Humanities rather than Mathematics and the Sciences; women choosing to look feminine; women choosing to enter the sex industry; women choosing to be paid less (the pay gap) and women choosing not to seek promotion (the glass ceiling)

- I would like to make clear at this point that when I use the phrase 'women choose...' I mean 'women *tend* to choose', or 'women *generally* choose'.

\*\*\*

### A Feminist Dilemma

One of the elements of Equality Feminism, ironically, was to extend women's choices. This has been achieved. However, the concept of 'choice' has led to a dilemma for today's Feminists. What if women choose something that Feminism doesn't think is right for them, or doesn't fit its Ideology and agenda? This is a problem for Feminism because it needs to have women seen as 'victims'; if women *freely choose* options that appear to have 'disadvantages' then they cannot logically be seen as, and presented as, 'victims'.

All choices made by women or men result in consequences. An integral part of freedom of choice is accepting the negative consequences as well as enjoying the positive consequences; this means accepting *personal responsibility* for the negative consequences of one's freely made choices...and not blaming other factors.

It is the difference in the choices that men and women make that allows Feminism to convert 'women's choices' into issues – it compares the *negative consequences* of women's choices (negative as defined by Feminists, not by women themselves) with the *positive consequences* of men's choices...and declares from this illogical comparison, that men are advantaged over women. This strategy has had tremendous success; we have all been fooled by this spurious comparison. This difference between the two extremes is the essence of what Feminism labels and promotes as 'discriminations against women', 'oppressions suffered by women'; that is, 'gender inequalities'. This deliberately deceitful Feminist comparison forms myths that have become firmly established in our conventional wisdom as 'truths'; for example, the 'pay gap' and the 'glass ceiling' are seen as inequalities. The universal and constant Feminist claim of 'gender inequality' suffered by women is fraudulent.

- It is important to note that the ‘negative consequences’ of women’s choices are *not seen as negative consequences by the women themselves* but are Ideologically interpreted as negative consequences by Feminists in order to create their necessary issues

*‘When it comes to choice, then every man or woman has to choose as an individual human being, and, like a human being, take the consequences’*

*(Dorothy Sayers, author)<sup>1</sup>*

\*\*\*

So how does Feminism convert women’s choices into inequalities and discriminations? To do this it employs the strategy of ‘blaming’; other factors are blamed for women making their non-Ideological choices.

Feminism’s Blaming Strategies:

1. Feminism blames discrimination and oppression by men (either individual men or the patriarchy) for the ‘negative’ consequences of women’s choices. For example, the fact that fewer women than men are in top jobs is blamed on discrimination by male employers rather than women choosing not to seek promotion; women who chose to be stay-at-home mothers (thereby earning less than their husband) is blamed on oppressive men who subjugate their wives.
2. Feminism seeks out personal factors to blame: a woman’s personal circumstances, ‘gender inequality’, an abusive husband, a difficult childhood, mental health problems. For example, the claim that one reason women go into the sex industry is because they were sexually abused as children.
3. Feminism blames socialisation, a false consciousness/learned response for women making non-Ideological choices and decisions (this will shortly be discussed in detail).

It is important to note that the ‘blaming strategy’ is absolutely essential for Feminism if it is to convert women’s choices into ‘women’s issues’ because:

- It cannot, rationally, create inequality issues if women have *freely chosen* to take a particular decision that ‘disadvantages’ them (as defined by Feminism)
- So Feminism needs to free women of personal responsibility for making choices that lead to ‘disadvantages’ so that it can *then* call these supposed ‘disadvantages’ inequalities and discriminations – which are caused by *other* factors (mostly by men)
- Men need to be blamed, wherever possible, for women making ‘disadvantageous’ choices

## **Socialisation, Sex Stereotyping and Free Choice**

Feminists believe that women cannot make 'free' choices because of their socialisation. The Feminist belief system of 'sameness and socialisation' was addressed in an earlier chapter and exposed as irrational and invalid. In this Section we will see how this irrational Feminist belief system is, astonishingly, being translated into government policies.

To remind the reader: The Feminist belief system of 'sameness' declares that boys and girls are born exactly the same except for their genitalia. But, the belief system goes, girls are *intentionally* socialised differently (by a patriarchal culture) to be inferior and to choose options that disadvantage them. Feminists claim that a false consciousness; 'learned roles', is *deliberately* socialised into girls. Feminist Ideology declares that it is men (via the patriarchal culture) who are responsible for the sexual differences in this socialisation process...and therefore are responsible for making women choose options and lifestyles that 'disadvantage' them ('disadvantage' defined by Feminists).

So according to Feminist doctrine, women learn their (female and feminine) roles through socialisation and these roles lead to sex stereotyping; sex stereotyping, Feminists claim, is a major cause of women's inequalities, discriminations, oppressions and victimhoods.

The belief system of socialisation (sex stereotyping) is an extremely useful gender-weapon for Feminism, lending itself to an easy explanation of why women make non-Feminist, non-Ideological choices. This is the reason why this concept has again become so fashionable in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It is a useful concept because it allows Feminists to claim that women cannot make a 'free' choice. 'Research' is produced to give this belief system some academic credibility:

### **MEN AND WOMEN ARE FROM THE SAME PLANET**

(Daily Mail, Monday, 16 August, 2010)

**'Scientists would have us believe that men and women are so different they could hail from different planets.**

**But a new book claims the difference between the genders is down to the way we are brought up. It says the idea we are hard-wired at birth, as promoted by 1992 best-seller *Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus*, is outdated.**

**In fact, it is nurture, rather than nature, that has the largest effect on skills, attributes and personalities. And girls don't come into the world able to multi-task and communicate better. Instead, we are steered towards gender-defined skills by parents and teachers.**

**According to the book, *Delusions of Gender*, by Cordelia Fine, a Melbourne University psychologist, there are no major neurological differences.'**

- We need to be sceptical about 'research' that is produced from a source that has an Ideology to promote and an agenda to implement. It will be shown in the chapter on Cheating and Lying: The Deceit of Feminist 'Research', that Feminist 'research' is never neutral but Ideologically-driven, produced solely to advance the Feminist agenda

## Blaming Socialisation for Women's Choices is Nonsense

The socialisation/learned roles/sex stereotyping Feminist argument to excuse women's non-Ideological choices has no basis in fact. If social forces and upbringing have such a profound effect and influence on *women's* choices then they must *also* have a profound effect and influence on *men's* choices. This means that nobody, anywhere, under any circumstances, is capable of making a 'free choice'. If we are to accept this Feminist belief system of socialisation/learned roles then *nobody at all* can possess or exercise free will. Either we are *all* victims of socialisation (in every single choice we make)...or *none* of us are. Feminism cannot logically claim that *only women* are victims of this concept. The concept is nonsense, if it had any validity then none of us could be held morally or personally responsible for the consequences of our chosen behaviours and actions. Think about this...

...A sane society could not operate on this belief system. Hundreds of thousands of men locked up in prisons could use the same defence for shooting, robbing, selling drugs and so on. Why not argue that socialisation (for example, the culture of masculinity, a background of poverty, a racist family) makes *them* behave in these anti-social ways? If men were nothing more than the creations of 'socialisation' then they could hardly be expected to take personal responsibility for their own (criminal) choices. And this defence would not only apply to crime in general but also to rape; men being absolved of personal responsibility for rape and escaping conviction using 'socialisation' as a defence for their choice to rape would *seriously* piss off Feminists. But individual men *are* held personally responsible for their choices, decisions, actions and behaviours. So how can Feminists legitimately claim that *women* should be exempt from personal responsibility when, for example, they choose to work in the pornography industry, or choose to be a prostitute, or choose jobs with lower pay, or choose not to seek promotion in their work? A selective application of the 'socialisation' doctrine (driven by Ideology) is irrational.

A selective application of this Feminist concept may be irrational but it is still (disturbingly) used in modern Britain to guide policy-making and legal decisions. For example, there are regular Feminist demands for women never to be imprisoned (and the State takes these demands seriously). Again, the Equal Treatment Bench Book (a moral guideline for judges), issued by the Judicial Studies Board (2009) specifically states that women offenders should be treated much more leniently than men (for a similar offence), because of 'women's special circumstances' (which it does not identify or define...because it *cannot*).

- It will be shown that many social policies and legal decisions are guided by the Feminist belief system of women's socialisation/learned roles/sex stereotyping, their 'special circumstances'

\*\*\*

But Feminism does more than blame other factors for the negative consequences of women's non-Ideological choices and decisions. It also does more than convert these choices into inequalities and discriminations...

...Feminism is so politically powerful it demands State programmes to *remedy* the negative consequences of women's freely made choices (negative consequences from the Feminist perspective, that is). For example, it demands positive discrimination and quotas to *remedy* the under-representation of women in senior positions; it demands State-provided wrap-around child care to *remedy* the *negative* consequences of women who choose to be stay-at-home mothers. Wraparound child care encourages such mothers to enter full-time employment (so that they can be independent from men – a Feminist aim).

## SECTION 4

### Chapter 26

## Women Choose Lower Pay and Lower Status

This Section addresses two important choices that women make and shows how Feminism converts these choices into inequalities and discriminations. They are the two most cherished, publicised and widely accepted Feminist issues – the pay gap and the glass ceiling. The two are closely linked; for example, people who are in more senior positions will earn higher salaries than those who are not. So more men being in senior positions is one explanation why men earn, overall, more than women.

\*\*\*

In a survey carried out among Feminists, reported in 2010, the question was asked: 'Please list the three feminist issues that most interest and concern you'. The first choice was a combination of work/home/education.<sup>1</sup>

Two Professional Feminists declare:

*'The pay gap between men and women is an enduring problem. Women's mean disposable weekly income...in the UK is less than 60 per cent of men's. For earnings done, the gap is still significant; the mean full-time hourly pay of men in 2009 was £16.07, compared to £13.43 for women. The pay gap is greater when we include part-time workers, who are predominantly female; when all workers' hourly earnings (including part-time and full-time) are compared the pay gap is 20 per cent.'*<sup>2</sup>

There can be no doubt that over the years sex discrimination occurred with regard to pay and promotion, particularly in some macho professions such as the police force (which is now probably why this profession is overcompensating with Feminist-friendly policies). But such a discrimination is no longer a problem in today's Britain...no more than it is with other groups, including white heterosexual males whose face, accent, culture or politics don't 'fit'. In fact, I would suggest that there is now *more* 'political' discrimination against those who are *not* Left-wing/liberal/progressive (especially in the 'liberal' professions – education, academia, the law, the media...) than there is against most other groups.

- Feminism wishes us to believe that we are still in the sex-discrimination dark days of the pre-1980s. And we have all succumbed to this belief

\*\*\*

The pay gap and the glass ceiling are Feminism's flagship issues and for this reason I have addressed them extensively. We know that choices often have negative as well as positive consequences. The pay gap and the glass ceiling are the negative consequences of women's choice not to prioritise pay and seniority in their jobs and careers. So the pay gap and the glass ceiling represent the negative consequences of women following their preferences (negative *only* from the Feminist perspective, not from that of women who make these choices). Feminism then compares the *negative consequences* of women's choices with the *positive consequences* of men's choices (who generally choose to seek higher earnings and higher status). This deceitful comparison of the two extremes is then Ideologically interpreted as the inequality and discrimination of the pay gap and the glass ceiling.

---

---

## Are Women Being 'Diddled Out of Equal Pay'?

There is no glass ceiling, I use the term simply for clarity. It is a Feminist invention, a Feminist myth. Women *are* under-represented in top jobs but there are rational reasons for this phenomenon. To call this phenomenon a glass ceiling, with its connotations of their being a *barrier* to women's advancement, is being deliberately deceitful. The glass ceiling is a value-laden and inflammatory phrase intentionally used to convert women's choices and preferences into an Ideological issue.

It is important for the reader to grasp that the pay gap and the glass ceiling are simply *numerical imbalances*; rather than inequalities and discriminations. They are *statistical disparities*, so in themselves are value-free phenomena; they are not unjust, they have rational explanations and ought not be interpreted with an emotive Ideological perspective...as Feminism continually does.

- Feminist dogma demands that all sex-related discrepancies (wherever men appear to be advantaged) are evidence of sex discrimination and inequalities. They are not

When a group has a weak evidential case from which to create or convert an issue it tends to minimise the importance of evidence. Instead, it employs the strategy of emotion; it replaces facts and evidence (because these would not substantiate its claims) with emotional appeals in order to distract the public's and politician's attention from the lack of supporting facts. This is what Feminists have been doing with the issues of the pay gap and the glass ceiling (and other issues, including domestic violence and rape):

*'The implication is that discrepancies are due to sexist discrimination against women, but discrepancies can be due to other factors. Given the educational patterns of earlier generations, for instance, older women are still less often part of the workforce than older men. Not all women, moreover, either have or want full-time jobs. When their salaries are factored in with all others, the resulting figure indicates only that women as a group earn less than men as a group. The fact is that women themselves have made choices to have children or not to have children, to work or not to work, to work part-time or to work full-time...Because of the enormous sums of money at stake, a whole industry has grown up around pay equity: researchers, job evaluators, consultants, and so forth.'*<sup>3</sup>

\*\*\*

Whenever a discussion touches upon Feminism, or any aspect of sexual politics, the pay gap and the glass ceiling are always offered as examples of 'gender inequality' (Always. Without fail). I am constantly astonished at how naive people are with regard to sexual politics and Feminism (particularly men), at how easily they have allowed themselves to become indoctrinated with Feminist rhetoric and cant – never questioning, never challenging, never analysing, never critiquing...sponges soaking up the platitudes and when squeezed for an opinion unthinkingly leak out the dogma and mantras that have been Ideologically poured in. I find this Gradgrindian process truly depressing and saddening. It is particularly distressing when university 'educated' people soak up Feminist propaganda (a childlike innocence? A laziness of thought? Or a bizarre psychological 'need' to believe that women really *are* victims and a 'minority'?). But ought I to be so surprised? Feminism has never been questioned, challenged, analysed or critiqued in the media, in academia, by politicians, so how can the public possibly *know* that it is a fraud, a confidence trick?

The pay gap and the glass ceiling should *never* be given as examples of 'gender inequalities'. They are converted from women's freely made and rational choices into issues in order to justify the continuing existence of Feminism, to promote its agenda and to fuel its Grievance Gravy-Train Industries, allowing it to soap-box its Ideology and continue to salary its gender-warrior personnel. This conversion is accomplished by Feminism's Blaming Strategy – again it is men, individually or as the patriarchy (the 'male system') who are blamed. For example, it is the patriarchal male culture that intentionally socialises women into having learned roles (sex stereotyping), that instils attitudes and values into women which makes them feel that they ought to, and are expected to, choose roles and occupations that will 'disadvantage' them (lower pay, not wishing to pursue promotion, choosing to be stay-at-home mothers and housewives). Women *themselves* do not feel that their choices lead to negative consequences or 'disadvantages', these are defined as 'negative' only by Feminists.

Blaming women for the negative consequences of their choices would not fit Feminism's Ideology, its patriarchal template. If it were admitted that women *themselves* were personally responsible for their choices then the pay gap and the glass ceiling could not logically be used as inequalities and discriminations. So blame has to be sought elsewhere.

*'We need to know why women are being diddled out of equal pay'*

*(Jenni Murray: Feminist presenter of Radio 4's Woman's Hour: Monday, 26 February, 2006)*

The persistent fable that women are denied equal pay for equal work is a never-empty tank of gas that fuels Feminism.

\*\*\*

Feminism doesn't represent women. With the pay gap and glass ceiling we see again the Professional Feminist's wish to impose her belief system and values on *all* women. This will be observed in every chapter in this Section. The values and choices of the vast majority of women are very different to those of Feminists. But Feminists *need* inequalities and discriminations to justify their existence. Ordinary, decent women have other values and interests in their lives to those of their career-oriented and Ideologically-driven Sisters.

## Chapter 39

### **Top Jobs for the Sisters: Can Positive Discrimination be Justified?**

Equality of outcome is not about 'gender equality' but about putting Feminists into senior positions – in effect, giving them trouble-free and effort-free promotion. Only 14 per cent of women are genuinely 'work-centred' and these women are likely to be Feminists. So it will be they, not ordinary women, who benefit from quotas, positive discrimination, preferential treatment and policy-favouritism for 'women'.

The previous chapter addressed the philosophical differences between equality of opportunity and equality of outcome. The present chapter is a continuation of this and will show that Feminism's arguments to justify the use of quota-type schemes are wrong, unfair and unjust, and are philosophically and morally invalid.

*'Last night, at a Left-wing meeting on Women in The Recession in Parliament, Ms. Harman said so-called "positive action" would be "there for us" to put women on the boards of bailed-out banks..... "Sometimes we have to take scary methods in order to achieve worthwhile results", she told a mainly female audience. "It's about saying, 'because you are a woman I'm going to put you in this promotion'"(2009).<sup>1</sup>*

Businesses are confronted with quota-type systems that require them to preference women over men...in order to show that they are treating women the *same* as men. This is a contradiction in terms (not surprising with Feminism's track record of double standards and hypocrisy) and obviously flies in the face of the very concept that it is meant to promote – equality.

\*\*\*

Feminism (and Left-wing, liberal 'progressives') advance numerous arguments to justify quotas and positive discrimination. Their most common arguments are:

1. The 'role model' argument
  2. The 'social and economic good' argument
  3. The 'retrospective justice' argument
  4. The 'ideal of equality' argument (already dealt with but will be briefly readdressed in the present context)
- 
-

## The 'Role Model' Argument

Is there any young woman in Britain today who does not know that she can become a head teacher, a judge, an MP, a cabinet minister, the Prime Minister? No, there isn't. The 'role model' argument, perhaps valid before the 1980s, is self-evidently nonsense in 2011.

Even so, when giving talks to students this argument is still advanced by Feminist teaching staff. Truly, I am forever amazed at how shallow the thinking of many Feminists really is. They have a front of self-righteousness, have been taught that Feminism is 'right'. For many Feminists their belief is built on nothing more than a diet of dogma, platitudes, cant, invalid statistics and sound-bites taken from the never-empty larder of the Feminist Lexicon; they are bloated with self-sanctification. Like a religion, Feminism is an *emotional* belief as well as an Ideology, a set of political doctrines. Faced with rational arguments the Feminist will either use the escape route of saying 'I take offence at that' (and then people will back off), or they will get angry (a Feminist 'need').

---

---

## The 'Social and Economic Good' Argument

We are told that if there were more women in the boardroom profits would increase. We are told (by Feminists and the trade unions) that by not using women's talents in positions of seniority Britain is losing X millions of pounds each year. We are told that if there were more female MPs then Britain would be a better place in which to live. We are told that there would be better justice in Britain if more judges were women. And so on. All this is unprovable nonsense.

Because there are so many variables and incalculable factors involved in measuring these claims they cannot in any way be proven; they are sugar-coated myths wafted toward organisations to tempt them to place more women (Feminists) in top jobs. They are the carrots to the Government's legislative sticks.

*'Nor is it possible to identify whether organisations are more profitable and successful if they employ women...Studies can only identify associations at a single point in time, because longitudinal data are simply unavailable, or are impossible to interpret when they do exist...There is no hard evidence at all that female quotas per se improve profits in the private sector. Similarly, there is no evidence that all-male boards make a company more successful or profitable.'*<sup>2</sup>

There is no non-ideological, objective evidence to support the Feminist claim. If any Feminist 'research' does purport to show that more women on boards of directors improves business then this 'research' needs to be rigorously questioned and its methodology analysed. One must always be cynical about 'research' findings that 'just happen' to reflect the Ideology and aims of the 'researcher'. To examine the dishonesty of Feminist 'research' I refer the reader to later chapters addressing this subject.

\*\*\*

The reader may want to speculate on the long term consequences to society of using a quota system based simply upon the possession of a womb, rather than upon individual merit, skills, expertise and experience, as the standard by which to allocate influential and senior jobs. Preferential policies drive a wedge between individual talent and economic success and efficiency. So it is difficult to understand how this wedge enriches society.

Another criticism of the 'social and economic good' argument is that it forces employers to prefer women *over* men. One cost is that those groups who are being discriminated against – in this case, men – will be understandably resentful and they may translate this resentment into heightened sexism against women.

*'For affirmative action to be effective, the individual rights of men must be sacrificed in favour of the collective rights of women.'*<sup>3</sup>

Further, the effect of preferential policies *on women* could be devastating. In rushing to appear unbiased, employers will tend to promote women prematurely into jobs that they are not experienced or talented enough to handle; or they will promote women into whatever senior vacancies occur within the company, whether or not the women have the qualifications or necessary experience. This will seriously damage the effectiveness and efficiency of the company, political party, judicial system. It will also damage the health of the women themselves.

## **BBC HIGH-FLIER WITH AN "IMPOSSIBLE" JOB KILLED HERSELF AT SEA**

(Daily Mail, Saturday, 17 May, 2008)

**'A BBC executive walked into the sea and drowned herself after struggling with what she felt was an impossible job.**

**The 53-year-old had spent 30 years at the BBC in a succession of senior roles before being headhunted for the post of international operations director at its World Service Trust.**

**But shortly after the move, in October 2006, Mrs. Boto developed anxiety. She was unable to eat or sleep and would weep before going to work.**

**In early 2007, she was diagnosed with job-related anxiety and prescribed anti-depressants.'**

Also, a point to consider is that when these women fail, or perform in only a mediocre manner, it will be seen as confirmation that women cannot handle senior positions, and therefore reflect badly on *all* women, particularly those women who have gained promotion because of their *genuine* and *individual* talents, skills, experience and hard work.

- The Feminist Jacqui Smith was promoted by Gordon Brown to the position of Home Secretary. Later, after losing the post, she admitted that she was ill-suited for the job, not having the requisite experience, skills and talent

\*\*\*

A quota-type system will stigmatise every woman in a senior position as inferior. In the past it was assumed that women succeeded in business by using their sexuality – sleeping with the boss (and Feminists demanded that they wanted women to succeed by virtue and merit, not on their sexuality). Now it will be assumed (and quietly *is* being so assumed) that women are rising in their profession not by personal merit, skills, expertise or experience, but by sexual political privilege; because of her *sex* again. Ironic. The woman who achieves excellence on her own merit will never receive the recognition she deserves.

- Positive discrimination increases the very prejudice (sexism) that it is supposed to eliminate – at the expense of the group (women) that it is designed to benefit

Positive discrimination, promoting someone simply because they are a member of a particular group (in order to claim ‘diversity’) may have unpredictable results for the person promoted, for their work colleagues, and for the organisation itself. Efficient organisations strive for stability, not for unpredictability.

*‘Those who initiate preferential policies cannot sufficiently control the reactions of either preferred or non-preferred groups to ensure that such policies will have the desired effect...in the desired direction.’<sup>4</sup>*

---

---

## The ‘Retrospective Justice’ Argument

A third argument that Feminism advances to justify quotas, positive discrimination and preferential treatment is ‘retrospective compensatory justice’. Feminism is not in the business of repealing cultural practices and laws that once restricted women’s choices and were blatantly discriminatory (as Equality Feminism was). Today’s Feminism goes much further; it requires laws, practices and policies that *actively preference* women. Apparently, only by being *preferred* can women be *equal*.

\*\*\*

In law, the principle of compensatory justice means that anyone causing an injury to an innocent person must rectify the damage. The innocent party must receive compensation. Fine, but Feminism goes one step further than this and claims that the *descendants* of those injured (the inequalities experienced by women in previous generations) must receive compensation because either a) those descendants are still living with the consequences of these inequalities (how the effect of these consequences is still ongoing is never explained), or b) ‘it is only fair’ that if one group *once* faced inequalities and discriminations then that group should *now* enjoy preferential treatment as a form of compensation. This is an argument of righting historical wrongs.

*‘In order to overcome the effects of past practices which resulted in discrimination, companies must now seek out those who were formerly ignored.’<sup>5</sup>*

I occasionally stay in monasteries (I know, don’t ask). A few years ago I was having a discussion with a monk regarding women and retrospective justice. He was adamant that because women had been discriminated against in the past then they should be compensated for this now, in the present. What really surprised me was that this chap had once taught philosophy. Male Feminists are found everywhere.

Women were once barred from the medical profession. It is the heirs (females as a group) of these previously 'victimised' women who, Feminism says, now have a rightful claim to compensation, to receive preferential treatment. Here we have a further example of Feminism's collectivist Ideology – women *as a group* in the past and women *as a group* in the present.

Yes, in the past some professions did bar entry to women, and that was wrong. *But this was not the fault of 21<sup>st</sup> century men* (as individuals or as a group) and these are the men who will now be facing discrimination because of the positive preferencing of present-day women. And the women who *receive* the benefits of preferential treatment and positive discrimination today *are not the same women* (as individuals or as a group) who suffered the earlier inequalities.

The 'retrospective justice' argument is invalid.

- The women receiving the benefits have not been victims *themselves* and have never been
- The men forced to provide the compensation *have done no wrong*; it is talented and experienced men who are being replaced by equally talented (or even less talented and less experienced) quota-assisted women (Feminists)

Even compensation granted to victims of the Holocaust didn't include payments to *future* generations.

- Morally, guilt cannot be inherited, and neither can compensatory claims in the form of quotas, preferential treatment and positive discrimination, for perceived past inequalities

*'Given the mortality of human beings, often the only compensation for historic wrongs that is within the scope of our knowledge and control is purely symbolic compensation – taking from individuals who inflicted no harm and giving to individuals who suffered none.'*<sup>6</sup>

\*\*\*

And what of today's rich, wealthy, well-positioned women? Do *they* also deserve 'retrospective compensatory justice' as well as their less well-off Sisters?

A gender and generational switch highlights this inappropriate 'justice'. Where does the 'retrospective justice' argument leave Feminism with the question of the privileged, rich, wealthy and well-positioned *women* in past generations? Working class men were in much more disadvantageous positions than these women...so we could claim that many lower paid / unemployed men *today* ought to be given positive discrimination and preference at the expense of today's well-educated, rich, wealthy, privileged and well-positioned women.

Take another generational gender-switch: National Service. From 1946 to 1956 all 17-year-old men were conscripted into one of the armed services, the army, navy or air force, living away from home and given hard training for two years. They had no choice, they lost two years of their lives, whether macho or delicate souls, they were forced to comply. Young women were exempt from this conscription. As an historical example of inequality and sex discrimination this takes some beating. Using Feminist logic it could be claimed that young men today require compensation for this past inequality and discrimination. Or that young women today, in order to balance the inequality and sex discrimination book, must be conscripted into...what? Working away from home and given hard work caring for the elderly, sick people, the disabled...for two years?

- 'Retrospective justice' cannot in any way validate positive discrimination in favour of present day women. It is illogical and immoral

Retrospective justice may be illogical and immoral but it is regularly used by Feminists to justify implementing their own discriminations against, and denigration of, men: 'Women have suffered discrimination for years...now its men's turn. Good. Tough.' The following is from the misandrous Feminist Kathy Lette:

*'Women have endured centuries of sexism. Men have been the butt of the odd joke for a nanosecond and they're already whinging about it. But tough, because it's our turn to go straight for the jocular vein.'*<sup>7</sup>

- And the problem is, she's not joking. This is the woman who said on national radio that men will have sex with anything that moves in the garden (apparently because they are so carnal and gross). It's fun when men are belittled and denigrated; its 'sexist' and illegal when *women* are belittled and denigrated. Lette, and Feminists like her, have man-hating running through their veins. I refer the reader to Part Three
- Feminists are not benign nice people who are concerned about 'gender equality'

---

---

## The 'Ideal of Equality' Argument

The fourth Feminist justification for positive discrimination and quotas is 'equality'. This concept was addressed in the previous chapter so a brief reminder in the present context will suffice.

'Equality' is an ambiguous word. People using the word often mean different things or intentionally choose to use it in different ways when a benefit accrues from such sophistry.

To some people any 'difference' at all between human beings – social, physical, economic, and so on – constitutes an 'inequality'. This is the Feminist interpretation. Others contend that such differences are natural and even healthy. They might assess the situation as being 'different but equal'. Two examples of people being different but equal are the differences between those with brown eyes and those with blue eyes.

- A 'difference' only becomes an 'inequality' when a value judgement is attached. If we say that people with blue eyes are superior, then having brown eyes ceases to be a 'difference' and becomes an 'inequality'

But when does a 'difference' become an 'inequality' in a *society*? In order to create an Ideological issue Feminism introduces an artificial 'value judgement' to the numerical imbalance between men and women in senior positions which it can then claim to be a 'gender inequality', a discrimination, allowing it to create the mythical but emotive issue of the 'glass ceiling'. This fraud is wilfully immoral. It is also a collectivist (Socialist-Marxist) construction focusing on the *rights of groups* rather than on the *rights of individuals*.

- Statistical differences *do* exist between men and women in the top jobs. However statistics *in themselves* carry no value judgement, they are neither right nor wrong. They are not an 'inequality'. A numerical imbalance, *in itself*, has no moral dimension, and therefore cannot be a 'gender inequality'. The many rational reasons for the under-representation of women in senior positions have been addressed, centring around women's work ethic and the vast majority of their work-life balance choices

For example, women freely chose to avoid promotion. The negative consequences (as defined by Feminists) of this choice cannot be labelled an inequality. It is not the State's job to be the agent of an Ideology by 'remedying' these negative consequences by using artificial mechanisms of positive discrimination (in any form), quotas, and preferential 'women only' schemes.

\*\*\*

So none of the Feminist arguments to justify quotas and positive discrimination are valid. If only 14 per cent of women are 'work-centred' then it is fair and reasonable that only 14 per cent of women will be in the top jobs (and there is nothing to guarantee that women in this 14 per cent will be the most able women). Any other interpretation is Ideological skulduggery and philosophical sophistry.

- And in today's Britain approximately 14 per cent of top jobs *are* inhabited by women, an *equitable proportion* of women for whom work is central in their lives. This is just and fair. There is *no* 'gender inequality', there is *no* 'glass ceiling'. Quotas and positive discrimination are unnecessary. They are social engineering devices designed to progress the Feminist-Socialist Quiet Revolution

Feminism is a confidence trick. The concept of equality of outcome, quotas, positive discrimination, preferential treatment and policy-favouritism are Feminist devices used by the State to give, to hand over, high-status and highly remunerated jobs/sinecures to middle-class Feminists (Ideologues with a serious Left-wing and misandrous agenda). The 'glass ceiling' is a fraud, it is a righteous Ideological myth designed to disguise the pursuit of individual aggrandisement, personal gain and advancement. It is social engineering designed to preference and privilege articulate and educated Feminists – and to increase their political power. It has nothing to do with 'gender equality' for ordinary women.

## FIRMS GIVEN QUOTAS FOR WOMEN STAFF

(The Sunday Times, 9 May, 2004)

**'Labour is to bring in a new anti-discrimination regime that will impose a fresh "duty" on employers to promote equality between men and women, leaked cabinet papers reveal.**

**It could lead to all-women shortlists and quotas for jobs as well as fast-tracking women into senior management, according to legal experts.**

**Jacqui Smith, the deputy minister for women and equality, said: "I believe that we should now signal our intention to take practical steps to introduce a duty to promote equality of opportunity between women and men, for which there is strong and mounting pressure from the women's lobby and the Equal Opportunities Commission."**

- For 'equal opportunity' read 'equality of outcome'; for 'women's lobby' read 'Feminist Industries and Interest Groups': for 'practical steps' read 'quotas, positive discrimination', 'preferential treatment': for 'Equal Opportunities Commission' read 'Feminist non-governmental organisation'; for 'duty' read Marxist dictat; for 'Labour (Government)' read 'Feminist Government'

\*\*\*

All the Feminist arguments to justify quotas and positive discrimination schemes are invalid and immoral; they are a philosophical quagmire, and there ought to be no stepping-stones for only women (Feminists) to claim special privileges, preferential treatment and policy-favouritism.

## Postscript

In 2010 Lord Davies of Abersoch was commissioned by the Coalition Government to investigate why so few women were in boardrooms. Lord Davies is a Socialist. He reported in February, 2011. There was a Feminist media frenzy...one couldn't move without stepping in platitudes and dogma. The Times (which has now become The Guardian in drag) was particularly in its element.

*'Lord Davies of Abersoch...demanded that businesses do more to break the glass ceiling that has historically shut women out of the boardroom...Lord Davies wants companies to overhaul their boards in the next four years so that at least 25 per cent of their directors are women.'*<sup>8</sup>

One can assess from which Ideological camp Lord Davies was operating by his Feminist sound-bite hyperbole:

*'On the current trend...it would take 70 years for women to hold half the FTSE 100 directorships'*<sup>9</sup>

- It was threatened that if the 25 per cent target was not met then quotas would be introduced. In the meantime, businesses would be bullied to 'comply'

Our marxist-lite Prime Minister, and leader of the Conservative Party, is delighted with this Socialist aim:

*'At a Downing street launch for the report on women in the boardroom, David Cameron will warn that the government plans to impose a quota and legislate in future if firms do not respond to the challenge.'*<sup>10</sup>

So there we have it, a political 'closed shop'...a 'progressive' Feminist-dominated State implementing a section of the Socialist/Feminist agenda.

\*\*\*

I cannot find any evidence that Lord Davies's report was informed by 'preference theory'. This is the theory that women *freely choose* their work-life balance, with the majority eschewing promotion. And only 14 per cent of women being work-centred. If the Socialist Lord Davies did not consult preference theorists then this would suggest that his findings and recommendations were based purely upon Feminist/Socialist Ideology. Coincidentally, in the same week that the Davies report was published, the Institute of Leadership and Management produced their own research on why there are so few women in boardrooms:

*'The glass ceiling may be all in the mind. A lack of ambition and self-confidence, rather than overt male sexism, is holding women back from senior management roles, according to research...Women of all ages are likely to set their career goals lower than men, are more hesitant about putting themselves forward for top jobs and more frequently admit to self-doubt, according to the study by the Institute of Leadership and Management.'*<sup>11</sup>

The reader will be aware of similar research findings that were noted in the chapters on the pay gap and the 'glass ceiling'. The following, a response to the Institute's findings, is a neat personal summary of 'preference theory' with regard to 86 per cent of women (17 per cent 'family-centred' and 69 per cent 'adaptive'):

*'Carol Doherty, 44, an NHS project support manager from Derham, Norfolk, said: "But I am not sure I am a directorate person. I probably know I won't get there, but I am confident where I am. As long as I can show I am motivating people and working to the best of my ability, I am happy doing that and looking after my family.'*<sup>12</sup>

- Like the majority of women, Carol Doherty has found the optimal work-life balance and level of status that suits her personal work ethic, life aims and values

So if Lord Davies had been *genuinely* seeking the truth behind the phenomenon of fewer women in the boardroom he would have acknowledged Preference Theory. He could also have visited Amsterdam:

*'Here women aren't on the board because they don't enjoy working that hard... Women in the Netherlands have less professional status, a big gender pay gap, sponge off their men and... they love it. Their secret? Living in an ever more hectically busy culture, they work less. If this is what happens when you give free choice to a nation of women counted among the most liberated, nay bossy, people in the world, is this, deep down, what all women want, no matter the feminist vision of equality in the highest echelons of power?... Dutch women can have it all: a man, a job, children and time off for themselves.'*<sup>13</sup>

- And we know that 86 per cent of British women feel the same as Dutch women, they do not desire or seek promotion. If *fewer women put themselves forward* for promotion then logically there will be fewer women *in* senior positions, including in the boardroom
- There can be little doubt that Lord Davies's 'findings' and recommendations were driven by Socialist and Feminist Ideology

\*\*\*

So who actually *will* be filling these 'free' senior posts that the Socialist-Feminist Coalition Government is determined to create? We know, of course, that they will be the Feminists... the very people whose Ideology demands that more 'women' should be on boards of directors. Reader, are you joining up the dots... are you becoming aware of what's happening and seeing a pattern emerging? There are no 'coincidences' that 'just happen' to benefit women (mainly Feminists); there are no 'coincidences' that 'just happen' to discriminate against men. There is a concerted and carefully orchestrated Quiet Revolution in progress.

- Yes, of *course* there are mediocre men in senior positions who are only there because 'they know someone'. And that is wrong. But to actually convert this type of 'wrong' into *policy*, into a similar type of 'favouritism', is just downright stupid. And just as immoral

What can be done to stop this Ideological nonsense? All the three major political parties are now Feminist-driven in their social policies and social engineering so it is doubtful if there will be a political solution. This being the case, I suggest the following.

Whenever you encounter a woman who is in a senior position assume that she is a 'token woman', grant her no respect, do not take her seriously. Hold the view that she is only in that position because she is a woman, not because of her abilities and experience. Respect her as a *person*, of course, don't be rude: but do not respect her position or her seniority. Feminists wouldn't care too much about this strategy – they only want the status, the high salary and the chance to promote their Ideology – but ordinary, decent, non-Ideological senior women will be furious when they, too, are looked upon and treated as 'token women'.

- Lack of respect leads to lack of credibility...and lack of credibility leads to an inefficient business. With the 'no respect' strategy businesses will think twice about complying with the Government's bullying to give Feminists unearned places on their boards

Non-Ideological women will seethe with resentment at my suggestion. Good. Because they will then be motivated to fight the Ideological idiocy of quotas, of giving Feminists 'free' top jobs. These women will quite rightly wish to be acknowledged and respected for their individual qualities, skills and talents. It is these women who will fight the Feminists and the Male Feminists, and hopefully it will be *they* who will put a stop to this particular aspect of the Quiet Revolution.

*'Our girls must fight their girls: our women must fight their women'*

*(Swayne O'Pie)*

I have no problem at all with women being in senior positions: I *do* have a problem with *Feminists* being in senior positions of authority, influence and power, especially if they have been shoehorned into those positions. So assume that *all* women in authority are 'token women', unworthy of your respect...Judges, managers, directors, heads of schools, MPs, wherever you encounter them. Decent women themselves will then rise up against their pushy, bullying Ideological Sisters, it is *they* who will stand up to the Feminists. Men haven't done so for thirty-five years and don't look as if they will ever get off their knees and do so. And led-by-the-nose political Male Feminists, the 'grovelling' men, whether in the Lords or in the Commons, are past redemption.