

Why Britain Hates Men: Exposing Feminism

There follows an extract from my book *Why Britain Hates Men: Exposing Feminism* drawn from a chapter titled, 'Cultural Misandry: The Widespread Disrespect for Men'. I hope you enjoy it. Feel free to copy it, to print it, and to send it to anyone with an interest in the subject matter. It's available to order through the following link for £12.99 (+£2.95 p&p):

http://www.cpibookdelivery.com/publisher/The_Mens_Press

Best wishes,

Swayne O'Pie
The Men's Press

Email: info@exposingfeminism.com

Web: www.exposingfeminism.com

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.

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 female suicide rate. 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 misandric '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 another 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 Martin)

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 hatred 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're 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 seeped 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 and 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 and 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 people aware of how Feminism's Quiet Revolution is being cleverly orchestrated. Or they may purposely have 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 leaders 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.

Four out of five divorces are petitioned for by wives;²⁰ 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 misandric culture it is easier to demonise men than to face the wrath of Feminists by being truthful.

Or is Mr 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 (if not more) of young women who have had

children *by numerous fathers* and who refuse to live with any of them because this would reduce their single-parent benefits, including jeopardising their state-provided flat or house. In addition, there is extensive and compelling evidence to show that young women actually *choose* to become single-parent mothers.²¹ Senior research fellow Patricia Morgan states:

‘Most unwed mothers conceive and deliver their babies deliberately, not accidentally.’²²

Senior research fellow Geoff Dench:

‘The existence of state benefits as a source of economic security seems to be encouraging young mothers not to bother with male resident partners.’²³

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 the Social Justice policy group ‘Breakdown 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.’²⁴

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-wife (free legal-aided to keep him 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 misogyny is not only *cultural* but *institutional*. Here we see man-hating from the very top.

Why did Cameron perpetrate this deliberate hurt, this planned misogyny? 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.

xxxxx

This material is an extract from *Why Britain Hates Men: Exposing Feminism* by Swayne O'Pie.

© Swayne O'Pie (2011)

www.exposingfeminism.com