

Evolutionarily Correct Cyclopedia

(Ammunition for fighting the PCers or Political Commies as well as the Feminists, a.k.a. Feminazis, their sycophants, appeasers, and Feminist opportunists.)¹

The sole author, Roy Den Hollander, of this document by making it public on the Internet abandons all his copyrights in this document. Anyone may copy, distribute or use it or sections freely without violating any copyrights of the author once this document has been made public by the author on the Internet.

Preface

Whenever one group of people believes they are better than another, the result is always the same—oppression.

<i>Index</i>	<i>Page</i>
Abortion	4
Acting	5
Affirmative Action for Females	5
Age	8
America	9
Anger	10
Attitude	10
Badgering by Interviewer	11
Bankruptcy	11
Beauty	12
Been-Scammed.com	12
Bigotry	13
Biography	13
Bitch	14
Character Assassination	14
Circumcision	14
Civil Disobedience	14
Color	15
Compassion	16
Competition	17
Corruption	17
Courage	17
Crazy	17
Credit Card Companies	18

¹ The terms Feminists, Fanatical Feminists, Rabid Feminists, or Feminazis, are used interchangeably. Some people use the terms Ideological Feminists, Radical Feminists, or Militant Feminists. It doesn't matter what you call them; they intend to create and perpetuate a legal, social, and economic substratum occupied by men toiling in a Fritz Lang "Metropolis" underworld.

Criticism	18
Culture	19
Death	19
Debtor's Prisons	19
Decline and Fall of Empires	21
Defamation Lawsuits	21
Differences Between the Sexes	21
Discrimination	24
Divorce	29
Domestic Disputes, Family Fighting, a.k.a. Domestic "Violence"	31
Duel	35
Economics	36
Education	40
Enemies	43
Environment	43
Equality	43
Evil	44
Evolutionarily Correct or Genetically Correct	45
Fear	45
Federal Bureau of Investigation	45
Female	45
Female Frauds	47
Female Harm	48
Female Hatred of Men	48
Female Parasites	48
Feminazi or Fear Fascist	49
Feminazi Establishment, Feminarchy, Estrogen Tyranny (E.T.), State Supported Religion, <i>de facto</i> Inquisition	51
Feminazi Newspeak & Doublethink	53
Feminazi Objectives, Strategies, Tactics	54
Feminazi Power	57
Feminazi Voodoo Science	59
Fights	59
Finance	59
Firearms	59
Freedom of Speech	60
Generality	66
Gentlemen	66
Girlfriend	66
Glass Ceiling	67
Glory	67
Help	67

Hip Hop Class	68
Hos	68
Hypocrisy	69
Infidelity	69
Immigration	70
Immigration Marriage Broker Act	70
Jihada for Justice	71
Jokes	72
Judges and Bureaucrats	75
Justice	79
Ladies' Nights Lawsuit	80
Lawsuits Loses	90
Liberals or Lying Lefties	92
Liberty	92
Love	93
Man	93
Manhattan	94
Man's World	94
Marriage	95
Masculinity	95
Media	95
Media Appearance Tips	97
Men's or Male Studies	97
Men's Rights Movement	97
Ministry of Truth	97
Misandry	98
Misogyny	98
Miss Columbia	99
Money	108
Mother Nature	108
Motivation to Fight the Feminazis	109
Movies	115
MR Legal Fund	115
Murder	115
Objective	115
Ownership	115
PAP Girls	116
PBS	116
Peace	116
Police, Lawyers, and Broads	116
Political Correctness or Political Correctionalism	116
Politics	116
Power	118
Predator	118
Princess Syndrome	118

Princess Syndrome Multiple	
Choice Test	119
Problem	120
Promiscuity	121
Prostitution	121
Publicity	122
Rape	122
Religion	125
Reporters	126
Responsibility	126
Revolution	126
Rights	129
Rulers	130
Self Defense	131
Sex	131
Sex and Money Objects	133
Sexist	133
She-male	133
Socialism in America	134
Solutions	134
Sports	134
Temporary Restraining Orders	135
Terrorism	135
Threaten	135
Truth	136
Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) or Violence in Aid of Women	136
VAWA Mafia	151
War	151
Women	152
Work	152
World Problem	152

Content

Abortion

Kill a Feminazi—save a child.

Feminists justify abortion with the usual female whine, “I’m not responsible for controlling my bodily urges.”

They use lingo to absolve them of the evil they’re doing. These aren’t fetuses they’re murdering, they’re incipient human beings.

Roe v. Wade gave American females the unilateral right to opt out of parenthood. Since that Supreme Court decision, females have murdered over 50 million incipient human beings. Guttmacher Institute, *Fact Sheet, Induced Abortion in the United States*, 2014. That’s more than all the men who have died in all the wars America has fought.

Some argue that girls make mistakes, such as forgetting to take the pill. Over 50 million since 1973 are a lot of mistakes. Even assuming all of those were mistakes, sex is a repetitive activity, so people have fair warning to “be prepared,” as the Boy Scouts say. When a cognitive human being chooses not to be cautious or is negligent, then she is responsible, not the innocent she destroys. If I get into a car drunk and hit a 16 year-old cheerleader, I’m the one to blame, I’m the one who must pay.

No one wants to interfere with a girl’s freedom except her freedom to act irresponsibly when it harms others. If she harms herself—who cares.

The federal government awarded \$450 million in grants and contracts to Planned Parenthood in 2014. While the money cannot be used for abortion or butchering baby parts, it does free up private contributions for such.

Feminists are nothing more than aiders and abettors of murder, self-serving concubines of evil itself. On the other hand, murder does reduce the surplus population.

Acting

Acting is lots of fun and everybody is civil. Unlike the legal profession, where if I get through a day without being insulted or threatened, I figure it’s because I missed an appointment.

I often work as an extra because TV and movie producers are usually the only ones who will hire me.

Actors and actresses are simply people who do what other people all around the world do all the time. Only they don’t mind other people watching.

Why would I want to watch reality shows? I have too much reality already.

Affirmative Action for Females

Feminazis are using the cry of affirmative action to receive preferential treatment, but preferential treatment only for the most desirable positions in society. They want jobs above the glass ceiling but not in the Tombstone basement.

Girl bosses often get their position based on the “Paula Principle”—that’s the female corollary of the “Peter Principle”—incompetence rises to the top.

Feminists claim females are oppressed. Oppressed, compared to whom? Princesses in fairy tales?

If you want to know who the real oppressors are, look at who lives longer, controls a greater percentage of a nation’s wealth, on whom a nation spends more money for health care, who serves less time for the same crimes, and who is proportionately more overweight.

The assertion that American females are disadvantaged is nothing more than the “big lie” strategy. For example:

- a. In 2007, females earned more per unit of time at work than males. The average man spent 44% more time working or doing work related activities than the average female. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Time Use Survey 2007*, Table A-1. So for every hour a guy worked, a girl worked 42 minutes, but the average female made 77% that of the average man. If the two were paid equally per unit of time actually worked, then the pay for the average female would have been 69.5% that of the average man—not 77%.

- b. Females working part-time earn 115% that of part-time male workers. Denise Venable, *The Wage Gap Myth*, National Center for Policy Analysis, April 12, 2002.
- c. Females control over a majority of the assets in America. See Lucie Schmidt and Purvi Sevak, *Gender, Marriage and Asset Accumulation in the United States*, University of Michigan, 2005.
- d. Females make 80% of the purchases in America, Marc Rudov, *Why Women Don't Negotiate*, 2007, which include 53% of stock, 51% of sports equipment, 66% of computers, 47% of home improvements, 81% groceries, 75% over-the-counter drugs, 94% of home furnishings, 65% of cars, 80% of health care, 88% of medical supplies, and 86% of toilet paper, Bernice Kanner, *Pocketbook Power*. Females select four out of five homes in America, write 80% of the checks, and by 2020 will control most of the money in America. *Id.*
- e. The 25 most dangerous occupations in America are 90% occupied by men—it's called the "Tombstone Basement."
- f. Males are 20 times more likely to be killed or injured on the job.
- g. Over all occupations, men suffered 92% of the job related deaths while making up 49% of the work force. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Current Population Survey, *Employment and Fatalities by Gender of Worker*, 2006.
- h. Females, but not men, have various excuses that permit them to significantly lessen their punishment for murdering their newborns (Postpartum Depression), their husbands or boyfriends (Battered Spouse Syndrome or Paroxysmal Insanity), and even their children in which case society often blames the husband.
- i. Females are generally not punished for perjury in family actions, sexual harassment, rape cases, or paternity suits.
- j. In some jurisdictions, the husband of the mother of a child born during the marriage will be responsible for child support even though the wife cheated on him, conceived with another man, and DNA evidence proves it.
- k. Wives received child custody ten times more often than men, Geoffrey P. Miller, *Being There*, N.Y.U. School Law, Public Law and Legal Theory Research Paper Series, No. 22, July 2000, p. 11, n. 17, while initiating 70% of the divorces, Marc Rudov, *Why Women Don't Negotiate*, 2007.
- l. Debtor prisons for nonpayment of child support incarcerate mainly men.
- m. Males generally receive more prison time than females for any crime. David Mustard, *Disparities in Sentencing: Evidence from U.S. Federal Courts*, Journal of Law and Economics, vol. XLIV (April 2001).
- n. The life expectancy for females in America is five to seven years longer than males.
- o. Breast cancer kills around 41,000 females a year and prostate cancer 27,000 males, yet there is twice as much Federal money dedicated to breast cancer than prostate cancer, and there are seven breast cancer drugs for every one prostate cancer drug. Catherine Arnst, *A Gender Gap in Cancer*, Business Week, June 13, 2007.
- p. The United States has an office dedicated to female health while there is none for men.
- q. Nearly every boy born in America has one of the most sensitive parts of his genitalia removed at an age when he cannot object and without anesthesia. It's called circumcision.
- r. The majority of the costs for Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and welfare programs are paid for by male taxpayers while all have a majority of female beneficiaries.

- s. Females still do not have to register for the draft.
- t. Females make up 57% of the nation's college students but just over 51% of the population.
- u. Nightclubs often allow ladies in for free or a fraction of what they charge men, or require guys to pay more for drinks, which over time adds up to a significant transfer of wealth from males to females.

Feminists argue that females deserve affirmative action for past mistreatment just as people with a darker skin shade did. There's no comparison between the discriminations. When was the last time a white female was lynched, shot dead on the front stoop of her home, or on the balcony of the motel she was staying in? For the past four centuries, the institutions of this nation have had their boot heels on the back of the necks of blacks. Over that same period, white females have received largely preferential treatment.

Watch someone stumbling out of the Copacabana in New York City at three in the morning and trying to hail a cab if he happens to be black. Then watch the cabbies play bumper cars as a white female hails one.

Both groups have been discriminated against, but one to its detriment and the other mainly to its benefit.

Girls today believe guys always victimized them, but now they're finally being treated the way their superiority deserves. The problem with such a belief is that it is illogical. How can the inferior person victimize the superior person?

In childhood, adolescence, dating, marriage, and divorce, females are the ones *being pleased*—not the ones doing the pleasing.

Sir William Blackstone said in the 1765, "Women are the favorites of the law."

In 1865, Mary Harris went on trial for murdering her former fiancée. Mary's fiancée broke off their engagement and married another girl, so Mary followed him to D.C. and shot him dead in the corridor of the Treasury Building where he worked. After a 12-day trial in which she pleaded "not guilty by reason of paroxysmal insanity," Mary was acquitted. The New York Times editorialized, "the verdict only furnishes a new illustration of what must be regarded as a settled principle in American Law—that any woman who considers herself aggrieved in any way by a member of the opposite sex, may kill him with impunity...."

Under old English law, when a wife over-spent the family budget, it was the husband who went to debtor's prison. During the 1800s, if an American female committed a crime, it was her husband who did time.

Over 52,000 American servicemen died in Viet Nam, many of them were drafted, but only eight (8) females from the armed forces died even though 1.8 million more females voted for Lyndon Johnson than males.²

Fifty years ago, females may have been economically discriminated against, but that is no longer true today. *See Economics* below.

Even accepting the Feminazis' argument that females were in the past harmfully discriminated against—two wrongs don't make a right. The men living today had nothing to do with any past harmful discrimination, so to punish them for misdeeds they did not commit is wrong. It's the same type of lunatic thinking, called "group guilt," that every evil, ignorant, power hungry tyrant like Hitler and Stalin used to justify their atrocities.

² 59 civilian American females also died in Viet Nam.

We don't live in the past; we live today. And today it's the wholesale violation of the rights of men that threatens the founding principles of this country. What we have today is what the U.S. Supreme Court has warned against many times: a dictatorship of the majority and that majority is female.

Living 5-7 years longer than men does not qualify females as being vulnerable, disadvantaged, or harmfully discriminated against. In 1900, the sexes had the same average life span: 46 years.

Despite the preferential treatment society gives girls, the courts have decreed them to be a "suspect class." I agree; every time a girl opens her mouth, I begin to suspect something.

Suspect class or not, girls should not receive positions of influence based on their sex because: (1) it's discrimination that will assure an even higher level of incompetence than institutions already have because they'll be hiring less qualified persons to meet sex based quotas, and (2) even if the females are qualified, they should not receive such positions because they have not yet paid their dues as guys have, since America has always given most females preferential treatment by securing for them a safe harbor in society.

The problem with affirmative action is that "[b]enevolent motives often shade into indifference and ultimately into repression."—Justice Scalia.

Age

Sometimes I think everybody in my generation grew up except me.

According to a research study by the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research, the younger a guy's girlfriend, assuming she's legal, the longer he will live. But for older females, the younger her boyfriend, the shorter her life will be. The older female with a younger guy is 20% to 30% more likely to die than a female married to someone her own age, and the greater the age gap, the more likely she'll die sooner.

Old enough to remember when girls were girls and guys weren't trying to act like girls. Or, when men were men and a woman brought out the best rather than the worst in her man.

To mitigate age, chase pretty young ladies. Nothing like perky pillows and firm booties to keep a man's hormones bubbling and him looking and feeling younger.

Time makes all things possible but destroys all possibilities.

When a pretty young lady asks how old I am, I use one of the following answers:

"Old enough to know better, but don't."

"Physically or emotionally? Actually, I'm younger than you. At least in emotional maturity."

"The same age as you: 13.7 billion years, the age of the universe—prove me wrong."

"Is that you talking or your mother because it's not Mother Nature."

"What does it matter, so long as I make you laugh and satisfy you by bring you to the point where you say 'I'm sore, I'm sore.'"

If a talk show host asks the same question, I use one of these answers:

"Older guys can be gentler, more kind and they last longer. They also usually have more money but less time to spend it."

"I respectfully decline to answer on the grounds that it'll prevent me from exploiting the infinite ability of pretty young ladies to delude themselves."

"What if a girl asked you how much you have in the bank?"

“If you consider my not revealing my age a game, then step over to the other side, and ask is she playing a game to get into my wallet. Was she that tall when she woke up this morning, is that her real hair color, are her lips that red, her eye lashes that long and dark, her legs that shapely or is it her panty hose, her pillows that large and perky or is it the structural engineering of her bra, and did she really sleep with only zero to three guys?”

You're an old man?

Yes, but I'm young at lust.

I know how old I am. I know how old I feel. I know what I like to do. I know what social convention tells me to do. But I don't give a damn for social convention, especially the PC-Feminist kind. After 15 years of rugby, 15 years of martial arts, and 30 years of litigation, I'm not going gently anywhere.

Girls don't age very well. At the 50th reunion of my high school class, I kept thinking when talking with a former beauty, “This can't be her,” but it was after 50 years got through with her.

America

Just like a banana republic—the criminals rise to the top. The only difference is the amount of wealth the upwardly mobile-dishonest steal.

In America, those who commit greater evils lord over those who commit lesser evils.

There are two Americas: the Hollywood version in which truth, justice, and liberty reign, and the reality, where lies, deceit and money rule.

“Under a government which imprisons any unjustly, the true place for a just man is also a prison.” Henry David Thoreau.

“The devil nestles comfortably into the laws of this country. The government itself is treason.” Ralph Waldo Emerson.

What's the difference between those who rule in dictatorships like Syria and those who rule in America? In Syria, the 1% turns its opponents into corpses. Here the 1% turns its opponents into the living dead. So it comes down to whether you're one of the honored dead or one of the living dead.

The Feminists have actually made America worst by turning it into a tyrannical monster that pretends it is not.

Americans have forgotten that the social contract grants full citizenship only to those who can protect the state. Since females can't protect the state, they do not deserve the full benefits of citizenship, such as the vote. Their vote should be reduced to three quarters or a half. (This may change when females are required to register for the draft).

The military is out of fashion, Americans undervalue manual labor, schools neuter male students, opinion makers deny the biological differences between men and women, and sexiness is dead.

American culture blindly idealizes history's defeated, such as Amelia Earhart, by attributing to them platonic qualities they never had.

America has become a nation of wimps that celebrates mediocrity and useless emotionalism.

America is turning into the former Soviet Union. If you are a PC-Feminist, whatever you say is considered true. In the Soviet Union, you'd be a card carrying member of the Communist party. In America, if you are not a PC-Feminist, then whatever you say is branded false, regardless of the facts.

Anger

I boil through my days and some of my nights, but at least I'm in touch with my feelings. I'm not angry, I'm seething.

An angry man is a Feminazis' worst nightmare, so she uses the traditional therapist trick of making a man feel ashamed of his anger. That's how the term "white male rage" originated. It's been given a derogatory meaning by the Feminist Establishment to make men feel guilty for being angry, and, therefore, prevent them from acting on it.

There's nothing wrong with anger. Anger is a great motivator; it drives people to stand up for their rights. Were you ever angry over an injustice and then did something about it? Whether you won or lost, you didn't feel like a skulking coward afterward.

Hate and anger toward injustice spur humans to fight for justice. And justice trumps everything else.

When criticized for my anger, I respond:

"It's more important to be in touch with reality than politically correct delusions."

"I don't like people violating my rights."

"I'm the proverbial angry young man, only now I've got gray hair."

"From hell's heart, I stab at thee. For hate's sake, I spit my last breath at thee."

Captain Ahab and Khan Noonien Singh.

"It's just cold blue steel anger, that's all."

As a result of the Violence Against Women Act ("VAWA"), *see below*, the federal government has 600 pages of false accusations and probably findings of fact that I committed certain evil deeds. Homeland Security made those findings in secret without notice to me and without allowing me to defend against the accusations. Would that make you angry, especially if the information was available to every law enforcement agency in the world and certain private Feminist organizations but not to you?

Attitude

Make no apologies and yield no triumph to your enemies. Attack, attack, attack!

Treat a person according to how they behave.

I will not be cowed, intimidated, or pushed around, since I have nothing to lose. And I have nothing to lose because of the Feminazis.

"There is an eternity behind and an eternity before, and the little speck in the center, however long, is but comparatively a minute. The difference between your tenure and mine is trifling." John Brown.

I try to fight anybody who violates my rights, and if that means fighting fire with fire then fine.

Why is anyone and everyone right—so long as it's not me? I don't think so.

Badgering by Interviewer

Boy you're a real nasty person. A court would never let you badger a witness the way you do your guests. A judge would hold you in contempt and lock you up in Riker's Island for a while where you'd be spending your time holding your ankles.

I cannot only be as nasty as you; I can be nastier. Do you want me to?

You interrupt me one more time, and I'm going to challenge you to a duel.

If you want to answer your own question, go ahead, don't let me interfere.

Right, when pigs fly and certain girls grow breasts.

Now, now, no reason to be nasty.

With all due respect, what you think doesn't matter. You have a right to think what you will, but I don't have to convince you of anything.

You're entitled to your opinion; just as I am entitled to ignore it—which I will.

Bankruptcy

Okay, so I borrowed money from today's loan sharks—the credit card companies whose fraudulent practices helped bring about the Great Recession. They wanted it back, but I didn't have it, so I filed for bankruptcy before they could break my legs, or push me into indenture servitude.

I fully intended to pay it back, but my Men's Rights lawsuits put me on the "virtual pink-list." Virtual as on the Internet, and "pink-list" as being opposed to preferential treatment for females when it violates men's rights. The publicity from the press, largely accurate, brought minor notoriety, or perhaps infamy, as the type of man the Feminists want to eliminate, which is true I'm proud to say. The Feminazis and their sycophant bloggers, often misleading, have marked me as a devil.

No one these days will hire an anti-feminist lawyer, unless by accident, because they fear being called an anti-feminist sympathizer. Just like the black-list in the 1950s when no one would hire lefties for fear of being labeled a commie sympathizer.

Even the courts rely on the Internet pink-listing in making decisions. An Internet expert friend of mine told me that someone in the U.S. Southern District Court of New York was searching my name on the Internet, and it wasn't for my telephone number or address because that information is on every paper I file with the court. The courts aren't supposed to do that. Judges should decide based on the law, not the personal or political beliefs of the lawyers before them. But in Feminarchy America, as the Third Reich and Soviet Union, dissent is punished, only not as egregiously—yet.

In the end, my clients evaporated and future clients went elsewhere. I can't blame them, given the level of today's intolerance wrought by the effete politically-correct elite. If I wanted to win a case, I wouldn't hire me either because the opposing side would make me the issue and use my dissident views to bias the judge.

As to my savings, I lost about half in the dot.com bubble thanks to a crooked female stockbroker at Salomon Smith Barney. The rest went to fighting the Feminists through four federal lawsuits, and a Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organization (RICO) action against my ex-wife whom the Feminists helped stay in this country by emasculating the immigration system through the Violence Against Women Act. She's a former Russian mafia prostitute, former mistress to a Chechen warlord, self-proclaimed black magic witch, devotee of the Anti-Christ,

and former stripper at Flash Dancers who committed federal and state felonies when she swore she was a U.S. citizen in registering to vote when she was still an alien. For more on that revolting story go to *Been-Scammed.com*.

Jihadis are expensive, and mine's been going on for 15 years. Unfortunately, it looks like a hundred years war, and it consumes most my time and any money I chance to make. The opportunity cost has probably been around a million.

Since this recession is not over, guess I'll go sell pencils.

Beauty

“There are those things that happen under the skin and are reflected in the eyes and set off the mouth that take all the beauty out of a girl's face.” Mike Hammer.

One of those things is age.

Been-Scammed.com

- She can accuse you of sexual harassment, cry and lie to win a fat court settlement.
- She can charge you with rape, cry, and lie to send you to prison for decades.
- She can even intimidate your boss into giving her your job.

Think it's time for a change?

Visit www.been-scammed.com: the Anti-Feminazi and Evolutionarily Correct website. (B.S. is what girls always feed men.)

The site was temporarily set up by me, then a middle-aged American lawyer, who in seeking justice against some Russian mafia members foolishly went for help to the Feminazi-infested American judicial system and the emasculated U.S. Government agencies. There I found only widespread discrimination against men in this modern-day, Feminarchy America.

The site tells that story, which started when I was managing a detective agency in Moscow, Russia. There I fell for a young, pretty, six-foot-one, vat-dyed blonde hair, wolf-eyed Russian girl who used black magic, narcotics, and feminine duplicity to play me for a ticket to America. I finally became suspicious, a little slow for an attorney with an MBA from an Ivy League Business School, and started an investigation using Russian Federal Security Services (F.S.B.), Ministry of Interior, and Russian Military Intelligence (G.R.U.) agents along with other sleuthing techniques that eventually took me through a Minotaur labyrinth of the international Russian sex industry in Moscow, Krasnodar, Cyprus, Mexico City, and New York. Along the way, members of the Chechen Special Islamic Regiment, or Baraev clan, step out of the shadows to threaten me, my informants, and witnesses, but no one violated my rights more than the Feminazi witches in American government institutions and the courts.

I sought justice through a Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organization (RICO) lawsuit. After all, I was fighting Russian and Chechen mobsters and molls, but because the key defendant was an alien female, the Feminists judges, including Justice Sonia Sotomayor, would have none of it.

Why didn't the courts rule in your favor in the RICO case?

Switch the sexes of the Russian mob moll that tripped and drugged me into marriage and me. Imagine I was a girl and my ex-wife an ex-husband who made money for the Russian mob pimping, laundering money, and smuggling drugs. Do you think the courts and federal agencies would have done something then?

Bigotry

Imagine you just left the Copacabana at 3 am with your buddy; the two of you are going in opposite directions. You try to hail a cab but they keep zooming by even though they are empty, so you turn to your buddy who is white and ask him to hail one. He steps out and the first one by stops. So what do you do with a society like that? Require affirmative action? No. You allow the ownership of bazookas, and the next time a cab doesn't stop, it gets blown into the Hudson—simple.

“Ethnicity” is the superficial classification of Homo Sapiens based on where the majority of their ancestors hung out.

Whenever the influential members of the predominant group in a society allow the members of a disfavored group to exercise power, the members of the disfavored group exercise power so as to wreck revenge against those members of the predominant group who are not influential.

“It always happens when you give these little people power. It goes to their heads like strong drink.” Maggie Smith, *Downton Abbey*.

According to F.B.I. statistics for 2015, Blacks killed 500 Whites and Whites killed 229 Blacks. True, there are more Whites to kill (77% of the population), but Blacks (23%) are killing twice as many people of a different color than Whites. On a proportional basis, Blacks kill 20 Whites to Whites killing three Blacks.

Biography

Lawyer with experience in civil litigation, investigations, and general corporate matters. You meet the worst kind of people in this profession—other lawyers and judges who are also lawyers.

Managed the private detective agency Kroll Associates in Russia where virtually anyone with money is a criminal—not unlike Wall Street.

After law school, worked as an associate for Cravath, Swaine & Moore. The partners there were more intelligent than me—a pleasant surprise.

Before law school, wrote, field produced, and did investigations for WABC-TV News and Metromedia TV News, now Fox News, in New York City. Surprisingly, most of the people in the media back then were honest.

MBA in finance from Columbia University Business School with honors, yes I understand what caused the Great Recession—fraud, but didn't see it coming.

J.D. from George Washington University with high honors, and yes judges are often arrogant, ignorant of the law, and ideologically corrupt.

Thanks to a trilogy of anti-Feminist cases I brought, I've already had my 15 seconds of fame. I'm satisfied. The trick now is to get a footnote in history.

Bitch

I don't use that term, it gives girls too much credit, and their heads are already swollen as it is.

Character Assassination

Think about how girls in high school fight—personal, mean-spirited, and through false verbal attacks against their targets.

The Feminazis are no different. They fight like girls because that is what they are. Even the guys who believe in Feminism try to emulate Feminazi character assassination. Those guys fight like girls because they are too scared to fight like men.

One way to deal with the personal attacks is “I don't use *ad hominem*s against you, why do you use them against me?”

If they keep it up, then personally attack them, but be vicious and never, never go on the defense.

Or, just challenge them to a duel. If that doesn't work then challenge them to a fist fight. No go, sue for defamation, but use the courts as the last resort, since they're inept and bias against men.

Circumcision

Nearly every man born in America will have one of the most sensitive parts of his genitals cut off when an infant, without anesthesia, and the decision will likely have been made by a female—his mother.

Circumcision was started in the early 20th century to prevent masturbation (girls want to reserve that for themselves) and alleged future harm to the health of men that has never been. Without the foreskin, a boy must use lubrication. The foreskin is one of the most sensitive parts of the male genitals. No anesthesia is used during the procedure as the baby boy yells in pain, which increases his heart rate to 200 beats per minute. The U.S. Pediatric association does not endorse the procedure.

“There's no medical reason for having it done, it's painful for days afterward, and there's a possibility of complications.” Prof. Trond Markestad, Norwegian Medical Association.

“The medical community believes circumcision harms the rights of children.” Dr. Rolf Kirschner, Rikshospitalet University Hospital.

The procedure is as absurd as going to the dentist and having your teeth pulled to prevent tooth decay. Mothers, however, keep putting their sons through it.

If girls have a right to control their bodies, then logically, so too do boys, but not in Feminarchy America.

Civil Disobedience

“If we desire respect for the law, we must first make the law respectable.” Louis D. Brandeis.

“Civil disobedience is not our problem. Our problem is civil obedience. Our problem is that people all over the world have obeyed the dictates of leaders . . . and millions have been

killed because of this obedience. . . . Our problem is that people are obedient all over the world in the face of poverty, starvation, stupidity, war, and cruelty. Our problem is that people are obedient while the jails are full of petty thieves . . . (and) the grand thieves are running the country. That's our problem." Howard Zinn

Most men are utterly helpless to affect public issues by the orthodox channels. They cannot depend on the courts to protect their rights for the judiciary has not shown an independence from the biases of the Feminists. "The traditional methods of dissent, the use of public platforms and electoral process [are] insufficient." Howard Zinn.

"Civil disobedience is the organized expression of revolt against existing evils The deliberate violation of law for a vital social purpose. It becomes not only justifiable but necessary when [] fundamental human right[s] [are] at stake, and when legal channels are inadequate for securing [those] right[s]." Howard Zinn.

"The purpose of civil disobedience is to communicate to others [And] violence is an important factor in change." Howard Zinn.

Don't underestimate the influence of violence.

Civil disobedience is resistance through self-education and physical force.

The frustrations of powerlessness have led some men to the conviction that there is now no effective alternative to violence as a means of achieving redress of grievances. "Government and its laws are not scared. They are not means to the ends of life, liberty, and happiness." Howard Zinn.

The breaking of human law in the name of science, militant individualism, and warfare against institutions are demanded by a higher law of justice and morality.

"In a time of immoral laws, patriotism looks like treason." John Brown

U.S. institutions allow the raising of an issue but not the resolving of it.

"When the public fails in its duty, private men must take its place." Ralph Waldo Emerson.

When government does violence to the rights of men, men are justified to do violence to government and its supporters.

As has occurred previously in America, it is now necessary to go outside the system's channels. Men are now the only dependable defenders of their own liberty—not the state.

"No man could have self-respect who would not fight for freedom." John Brown.

Color

The only difference between a black guy and white guy, other than his ability to play basketball, is that the black guy's skin absorbs more of the visible electromagnetic spectrum than the white guy's. The reason for that is more of the black guy's ancestors lived in tropical climates.

When the visible electromagnetic spectrum strikes darker colors, more of it is absorbed than when it strikes lighter ones. Or, saying the same thing a different way, less visible light is reflected from dark colors and more from light colors. The difference in skin absorption and reflection depends simply on the geographical location of where most of a person's ancestors lived. It's called adapting to ones' environment. In tropical climates, the sun's rays are more direct requiring a darker pigmentation to protect against ultra violet waves. In temperate climates, a light skin is required to absorb vitamin D from the sun.

This scientific reality, unknown for most of mankind's history, is what gave rise to the terminology: black, white, African-American, Euro-American. The reason for the differing skin absorptions or reflections is not different races, as many people ignorantly believe. Anthropologically and genetically there are no such things as different hominid races on the planet today. The only hominid race is homo sapiens, and the last time there were more than one was over 40,000 years ago before the Neanderthals died out. Although sometimes in court, I wonder if all of them really went extinct. Despite the modern teachings of science, many people, black and white, see others as a breed apart, as a different race, and, therefore, as inferior or evil, superior or good. Out of this stupidity has grown much ill will among people of different skin colors.

African-Am, Euro-Am, Asian-Am, Native-Am all infer a difference; whereas, black, white, brown, red all infer a distinction—a distinction without a difference. Color is superficial. There's no difference between a red Ferrari and a blue Ferrari—both are Ferraris. Whether you want to drive around in a red or blue one has nothing to do with the Ferrari but you. Same with girls, if there's a black one and a white one and both are equally good looking to me—I'll choose the black one. That's just a matter of taste. It doesn't tell me anything about the girls.

I'm an overly educated white guy and given the garbage I've had to deal with, I can't imagine what blacks have had to put up with. I'm just surprised they aren't all Nat Turners.

It's difficult to generalize about black and white cultures. Blacks seem more open minded, more tolerant, and they call a ho, a ho.

Compassion

The so-called compassionate Feminists and their male sycophants don't give a damn, don't care a whit for anyone but themselves. They are so full of self-righteous justification that they will slaughter children to prove their devotion.

Females know about compassion, but only when it's directed toward them. They genetically understand how to take advantage of a man's decency. Enough of these phony female hard-luck stories meant to manipulate a guy's compassion. "Mister, I met a man once when I was a kid, it always began." When it comes to females, mercy is not a quality that serves men well.

Men are by far the more compassionate. 74% of the females survived the Titanic but only 20% of the men. If females were the compassionate sex, the numbers would have been reversed. Of course, to a Feminist, none of the men should have survived.

Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and welfare programs—all were passed by largely male legislators and all have a majority of female beneficiaries.

Can you think of a single Congress lady who has pushed for funding to help boys who are falling behind in school? Do you know of any female-sponsored resolution that sympathized with the injustice done dads who are barred from seeing their kids? Can you name a law for prostate cancer research that was sponsored by a female? Sen. Ted Kennedy was the first to seize on the idea of championing breast cancer research, probably to increase his chances of fondling such glands.

I've played a few sports in my life and suffered my share of injuries. But whenever I was hobbling around on crutches or with a cane, never once, not once, did a girl give me her seat or move so I could pass.

Many females and all Feminazis have no concern for the thousands of men who die every year in gold and diamond mines as long as the ladies get their diamond and gold jewelry.

Let's say both husband and wife work. Wife gets in a car accident and is laid up for a while. Husband's primary concern is that she is okay and gets well. Husband gets into accident and is laid up. Wife's primary concern is the impact on the loss of income and cohabitation on her. So in a sense, husband and wife are equal: they both are primarily concerned about the wife.

Competition

Feminazis delusionally overlook the fact that they can only compete with men in tasks that Mother Nature made men for when men are operating under a handicap.

In order to allow female golfer Michelle Wie to compete in the U.S. Amateur Public Links, a male golf tournament, Wie got to tie-off closer to the hole than the guys.

Corruption

In an ideologically corrupt society, it makes no sense to obey the laws that protect the corrupt.

Courage

Everyone has to make the choice between what is right and what is easy.

Everybody's scared, but most people are really scared.

Being afraid of lots of things doesn't justify violating people's rights because of one's fears.

"Courage is doing what you are afraid to do. You don't need courage unless you are afraid." Eddie Richenbacher.

Fear of danger is a thousand times more terrifying than danger itself.

The brave may not live forever, but the cowardly never live.

The dragon is not out there but inside the individual, and its size and ferocity depends on the person's upbringing and will.

To surrender courage would be to lose faith in a cause.

"And while they're making you sweat, remember—you've helped the next fella." Inherit the Wind, Act III, Henry Drummond.

It's not intelligence or talent that makes the difference but guts and luck.

Tiredness is often a disguise for fear.

Politicians aren't exactly known for their courage.

For me, fighting the Feminazis doesn't take courage—it's fun. Just wish I had more money to wage this war.

"Fierce as a gun-lock, cool as a sword, John Brown made no apologies, and yielded no triumph to his enemies."

Crazy

In an insane society, to be sane, you have to be crazy.

Just think, some years ago, a lady who had recently been the mayor of a small town in Alaska might have ended up a heartbeat away from nuclear war, and Wall Street moguls were rewarded for being crooks—now that's nuts.

One favorite Feminazi attack is to accuse a guy of mental instability to which one response is, "Are you a psychologist? Have we met before? Then you'll excuse me for not giving your psychological analysis any credence."

Membership in a dissident minority is not crazy.

Credit Card Companies

Credit card companies are loan sharks. Back when men were men, their officers would have been locked up with organized crime. But today when defrauders on Wall Street are rewarded for stealing people's money, loan sharking is legal, if you're a bank.

Criticism

Not every old fashion idea is wrong.

Whenever the establishment of the day violates the rights of a group, and that group fights back, the establishment always mocks them in the hope they will give up.

People who fight for their rights are always called names by those who benefit from violating people's rights or those too scared to fight for their own rights.

If they can't love you, they might as well hate you.

Why should a man care what the Feminazis, their sycophants, their appeasers, and the opportunists say? They are the enemies of every guy who still has a spine left.

Judge Judy once claimed on a Fox news show that my motivation in bringing anti-Feminist cases was for 15 minutes of fame. 15 minutes! I thought it was only 15 seconds! If I had known that, I would have brought the suits a long time ago. Of course, Judge Judy is pretty much of a joke. "Judge Judy [is] a caricature of a judge," a former U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York in the 1990s said.

There's a lot of androgynies out there—guys who are scared of girls, so when they come across a guy who's not, they verbally attack him. Probably because it makes them realize they are trying to wear skirts.

Scoundrels always resort to name calling and personal attacks because they have no alternative.

I've been called on the air or in court: rapist, gay, misogynist, moron, murderer, jerk, impotent, pervert, loser, and malcontent—that last one is correct.

If a Feminazi talk show host gets nasty, simply respond, "You're nothing but a propagandist, a female Joseph Goebbels, a Leni Riefenstahl." That'll tick her off.

To other uncivil critics, say "Go back to your Feminazi, psychotropic, genderless hell." "You're a she-male; you look like a girl but try to act like a guy." "What good is truth to you? Addicted to illusion."—Goethe's *Faust*. "You're wrong, but that's okay; it's just your ignorance."

I'm uncivil to anyone who's uncivil to me. If they don't like it, then they shouldn't act uncivil in the first place.

"[C]ivility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof." JFK.

Since no publicity outside of an indictment is bad publicity, people can say whatever they want about me, so long that it's about me.

You're anti-Feminist!

It depends on how you define it.

I'm also anti-communist, anti-nazi, anti-klan, and anti-anybody who tries to violate my rights—so what.

Obie, Anthony and Smeagol, a.k.a. Jimmy Norton

Had I known they broadcast from a high school boy's room, I would have skipped the show.

I'll say one thing for those guys. They're the Feminists best argument for re-engineering men through lobotomies.

Those three should move to Alaska. I hear they need more girls or at least guys who act like girls.

Norton's got a foul mouth, since he uses his tongue to clean toilets for extra cash.

Norton thinks blacks aren't discriminated against. He should take out the dress and high heels he probably keeps in his closet and stumble out of a nightclub at three in the morning. Cabbies will play bumper cars just to give him a ride. Then try the same with his Al Jolson black face, which he probably also has. No way is a taxi stopping for him.

People can make jokes about me if the purpose is to get a laugh and it's not malicious. I do that myself. But Smeagol (Norton) was malicious; he just wanted to psychologically destroy me because I disagreed with him. Okay, I thought, let's see if he has any guts to back up his words and I challenged him to a duel—he declined; so I challenged him to a fist fight—he declined as do all loud-mouth cowards. So I sued; he couldn't decline that.

“Show me a shouter, and I'll show you an also-ran, a might have been, an almost-was.”
Inherit the Wind, Act III, Reporter.

Culture

In 21st century America, the nobler sentiments of humans are only found in 20th century movies.

Death

A life ends well only while fighting.

Debtors' Prisons

The Medieval practice of debtors' prisons is alive and well in America when it comes to locking up men over nonpayment of child support. So is the illogic. If a guy is in jail, how is he supposed to make money to pay child support? Maybe Feminarchy America is not so much concerned with children as it is with feminine revenge against men.

When the non-custodial parent, usually the husband, is unable to pay the amount set by a court for child support, he will still be imprisoned even though he may not have the actual means to pay it.

A Lockheed employee was held captive in Iraq for five months. Upon his return to North Carolina, he was arrested for non-payment of \$1,425 in child support that accrued while he was a hostage.

Cocaine dealers—half of whom ironically grew-up fatherless, serve 20 days out of 30-day jail sentences; a father in support arrears serves the full 30.

According to the Urban Institute, more than 19 in 20 non-custodial parents who suffer substantial income drops cannot get courts to reduce their child support payments. In such cases, the amounts owed mount quickly, as do interest and penalties.

Courts consistently refuse to lower child support fees when the father's income drops. Known as the *Bradley Amendment*, this law forbids any reduction in child support arrears, even if the father is disabled.

The *Bradley Amendment* takes America back to the cruel old days of debtors' prisons. It requires that a child-support debt cannot be retroactively reduced or forgiven, and states enforce this law no matter what the change in a father's income, no matter if he is sent to war, and no matter if he is ever allowed to see his children.

Military reservists typically assume a sizeable pay cut when they are transferred into military life. But child support is based on their civilian salaries and the *Bradley Amendment* effectively blocks readjustment of that debt.

A U.S. Government Accounting Office survey of custodial mothers who were not receiving the support they were owed found that two-thirds of those fathers who did not pay their child support failed to do so because they were indigent.

Data from the Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement shows that two-thirds of those who owe child support nationwide earned less than \$10,000 in the previous year.

States put out "wanted parents" lists of those who fail to pay child support. The lists are almost exclusively comprised of poor and working class men who do low wage and often seasonal work, and who owe fantastic sums of money that they could never hope to pay off. The lists are similar to newspapers running ads with photos of bank robbery suspects. It is illustrative of the hysteria over child support that these types of ads are reserved for two groups of people—violent criminals and low-income dads.

If a man remarries, his new wife's income can be used as proof that the man can pay child support. If the ex-wife (the mother) remarries, however, not a cent of her new husband's earnings can be used to show that child support should be reduced.

The U.S. Census Bureau has reported that fathers with joint custody pay 90.2% of all child support ordered, fathers with limited visitation rights pay 79.1%, and 44.5% of those fathers with no visitation rights still financially support their children. Additionally,

30% of custodial mothers not receiving child support have never asked for or do not want child support;

25% of custodial mothers do not receive child support because the father is unable to pay;

20% of custodial mothers not receiving child support have made other financial arrangements with the father;

11% of custodial mothers not receiving child support do not have a child support order; and

of ten million custodial mothers only 7% (one out of fourteen) do not receive child support because of a guy refusing to pay.

Decline and Fall of Empires

British officer, Sir John Glubb, wrote a pamphlet on the rise and fall of empires. A sure sign of an empire's decline and impending fall is the rise of Feminism.

In sociologist Carl Wilson's *Our Dance Has Turned to Death*, he traces the seven stages of societies in decline. Near the end, the country reaches Stage Five where the affection between husbands and wives is replaced by suspicion and hostility. Stage Six is marked by selfish individualism that fragments society into warring factions. Sound familiar?

Defamation Lawsuits

For a lawyer, when my opponents are reduced to calling me names—that's the highest form of compliment. Doesn't mean I won't sue them, which is fun and really ticks-off the ones being sued.

Lots of ignorant, uneducated, biased, brain-dead bureaucrats and corporate employees make judgments about a person's character, and those judgments are supposed to be accepted as definitive when these bozos don't even have a PhD. in psychology? I don't think so.

I've brought a few defamation cases because I wasn't going to put up with any bureaucrat, government or corporate, or low-life lawyer trying to push me around by publishing for the general public their intentional falsehoods about me.

The dumber lawyers and judges resort to personal attacks in the belief that their girl-like tactic of name-calling will deter someone from fighting for his rights.

A sure way to put a stop to such defamations is to sue the jerks. The odds of winning are slim, especially if you are a public figure, even a minor one, but it'll cost them a ton of money in legal fees. Since I'm a lawyer, it only costs me the money to file the papers.

You don't have to win a case to win a case.

Differences Between the Sexes

“Man's love is of man's life a thing apart,
‘Tis woman's whole existence.” Lord Byron
Guys need girls in order to party and that's it.

Girls, however, need guys not just for partying but security, ego, and for someone to boss around.

A female is born, a man must become.

Girls can't keep their nails clean doing what men do.

Girl think: “What's mine is mine, and what's his is mine.” For her, it's about “me, myself, and I.”

Most females are takers, isolated from the pains of failure, so when failure comes, they blame men, not themselves.

While females experience physical pain more intensely than men, men experience emotional pain more strongly. That's why to a man, a girl's tongue is her gun, and for a female, a slap upside the head hurts more than a guy assumes.

Scientists at Bath University have found that men and females feel pain in different ways, with men focusing on how to get through it as quickly as possible, and females becoming so consumed with their emotional response to an injury that they feel the pain more intensely.

As for physical differences between the sexes, they don't end with the skeletal-muscular system, but include the brain.

The correlation between brain region size in adults and sex steroid action in utero show that some sex differences in cognitive function do not result from cultural influences or the hormonal changes associated with puberty—they are there from birth.

Meanwhile at puberty, the increased amounts of testosterone in men accounts for the onset of different physical and mental developments, not environmental factors. High-level intellectual activity is related to testosterone.

The existence of widespread anatomical disparities between males and females and the difference in sex on many areas of cognition and behavior, including memory, emotion, vision, hearing, the processing of faces, and the brain's response to stress hormones means the brains of guys and girls work differently.

The prevalence of depression among 13- to 17-year-old boys is 4.3%; among girls of the same age group, it is 12.4%. National Institute of Mental Health

Females are more capable of controlling their emotional reactions. A study for the Yorkshire Building Society revealed that females were better than men at dealing with all the stages of a break-up, 61 per cent saying that, in the first two years after a divorce, they were happier than before the relationship ended. 51 per cent of men felt the same way.

The article, *Love, Sex and the Male Brain*, by Dr. Louann Brizendine, a member of the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology, the National Board of Medical Examiners, and a clinical professor of psychiatry at the University of California, San Francisco, states:

- brain differences make men more alert than women to potential threats;
- the “I feel what you feel part of the brain”—mirror-neuron system—is larger and more active in the female brain, so females can naturally get in sync with others' emotions by reading facial expressions, interpreting tone of voice and other nonverbal emotional cues;
- men have stronger emotional reactions than females;
- as men age, testosterone goes down, which can cause tiredness, irritability, and depression;
- older male brains are more sensitive to loneliness, sixty percent of divorces in couples over the age of 50 are initiated by women, leaving their husbands shell-shocked and devastated; and
- because of the way their brains are wired, men use their analytical brain structures, not their emotional ones, to find solutions.

Other experts say the male brain is wired to be systematic and analytical, appreciative of order and detail. Men have a better ability to follow a logical thread while female brains are better tuned to emotions.

British research and a University of Western Ontario psychology study show that men have higher IQs than females by four to five points, which may explain why chess grandmasters and geniuses are more likely to be male.

So the “glass ceiling” is probably due to inferior intelligence and logic in girls, rather than discrimination or lack of opportunity.

Until late adolescence, females have the advantage over males because they mature faster, which masks the underlying difference in IQ. Men have larger brains even when you take into account their larger body size. That means there are more neurons, which probably gives guys an advantage in processing information. The difference may date back to the Stone Age, when females sought out men who were more intelligent than them in a bid to pass on the best genes to their children.

Female brains, however, have more connections between the two sides of the brain (probably to handle all the gibberish that is going back and forth). The increased connections between the logical and emotional sides of their brains lead to the emotional clouding of girls’ logical reasoning. For guys, only one part of their brains becomes active when performing most tasks while in females numerous parts of their brains become active. This may vindicate the old assertion that females are scatterbrained, since the research confirms the wisdom born of millennia of observation by millions of individuals. For every million miles driven, females get into more crashes.

Males average higher on tests of “spatial ability” and females higher on verbal tests. In men, parts of the parietal cortex, which is involved in space perception, are bigger than in females. Females, however, possess a greater density of neurons in parts of the temporal lobe cortex associated with language processing and comprehension. The boost in density in the female auditory cortex of the temporal lobe relates to their enhanced performance on tests of verbal fluency.

In evolutionary terms, females are designed to be sociable because they were the ones socializing the children. They have communication skills that men don’t have, which allow them to talk through their feelings and be comforted by their friends and family. Girls need more verbal reassurance than men.

The amygdale is larger in men than in females and may explain why anxiety disorders are far more prevalent in girls than boys.

A study by Mirko Diksic and his colleagues at McGill University showed that serotonin production was a remarkable 52 percent higher on average in men than in females, which might help clarify why women are more prone to depression and drug addiction to alleviate that depression. Men also learn better under stress than females.

“After almost 40 years of gender neutral pronouns, it is still men who are more likely than women to run for political office, start businesses, file for patents, tell jokes, write editorials, conduct orchestras, and blow things up. Males succeed and fail more spectacularly than females: More males are Nobel laureates and CEOs. But more males are also in maximum security prisons. Males commit most acts of wanton violence, but it takes other men to stop them.” *Oh, Come On, Men Aren’t Finished*, Christine Sommer.

“We sleep soundly in our beds only because rough men stand ready in the night to visit violence on those who would do us harm.” Winston Churchill.

Men are more competitive and adventuresome. Females shun risk to a greater extent and they perceive risk more readily.

Masculinity is a quality that causes individuals to stand for something.

Men tend to be more utilitarian, objective, unsentimental and tough-minded.

Girls are more likely to report that talking made them feel cared for and understood.

Boys, overall, found it to be a tedious waste of time.

Men are also far more likely than females to romantically fall head over heels because they will follow their instinct to pursue a girl they find attractive.

Females desire to make a nest more than men, since they need a man's help, they nag one into compliance. As such, men don't want to go home from work because they don't want to hear their wives carping.

It's more often men who want to make the rules, and women who try to bend them.

In the great majority of military specialties, females can't and don't meet the male standards. The institutionally self-confident Marine Corps doesn't mix girls and guys in its basic training because the girls can't meet the standards required for the guys.

The typical girl in her twenties or thirties has the aerobic capacity of a 50-year-old man.

Most females can't heave a grenade beyond its 35-meter burst radius.

Females in training suffer 2-3 times more stress fractures, back sprains, and broken ankles.

At the Marine Corps Officer Candidate School in Quantico, Virginia, female candidates wash out three times more often than guys.

When the 1990 Gulf War started, 40,000 females were ordered to report for duty at which time the ladies began to rediscover their inner-mom. Long-barren females became pregnant, and military mothers were suddenly the reincarnation of Madonna-with-child.

When a female pilot's jet crashed and burned on the USS Abraham Lincoln because she approached the flight deck at too sharp an angle—an error she had committed twice before, Navy officials tried to pin her death on “engine failure.”

Discrimination

Whenever one group believes it is better than another, the result is always the same—persecution.

For the past 40 years, this society has given girls preferential treatment based on the evolutionarily incorrect belief that they deserve it.

Today, this culture believes that whatever harm is done men—they deserved it. Discrimination against men has gained a dangerous veneer of authenticity from the Feminists.

In America, local, state, and the federal governments have accepted the Feminist lie of the evil male and the supposed necessity for massive government action against him. Canada's former justice minister Martin Cauchon said, “Men have no rights, only responsibilities.”

Whenever a girl does worst than a guy at some task, it's “gender bias.” But when she does better, it's proof of her innate superiority.

The U.S. Supreme Court has made rulings that females deserve preferential treatment for past invidious, economic discrimination. Such a rationale no longer makes sense, if it ever did. Today, females comprise over 50% of the work force, control over 50% of the wealth, and earn more on a per unit of time basis, and each statistic is increasing at a faster rate than for men.

The U.S. Supreme Court erred in its reliance on past economic disparities by failing to balance off the invidious and harmful discriminations that have always existed in this society against men. For example, 58,209 American male soldiers died in Viet Nam but only eight (8) American military females. Over 300,000 men were injured, and since the end of that war, more than 58,000 who served committed suicide. It's rather difficult to pursue economic well being when one is psychologically traumatized, physically maimed, or dead.

Unlike females, men do not have hundreds of college male studies departments, research institutes, policy centers, and lobby groups working tirelessly to promote their causes.

There are few if any conferences, petitions, workshops, congressional hearings, or presidential councils to help men close the education gap, the health care gap, the insurance gap, the job-loss gap, and the death gap.

We are living in the anti-male age, where men are the new scapegoats for all of society's evils even though men have willingly carried the most dangerous and onerous roles in society to the primary benefit of females.

In the 25 most dangerous occupations in America, men make up 90% of the workers. It's called the "Tombstone Basement." (You don't hear the Feminists whining to get in there.) Over all occupations, guys suffer 95% of the job related deaths. In order to make up for such disadvantages, guys should receive breaks on medical insurance and health care. And more of the jobs above the "glass ceiling" should remain with men because of the greater chance of them ending up in the Tombstone Basement. Given a baby boy and baby girl born on the same day, the boy is nine times more likely to end up in the "Tombstone Basement."

If girls receive a break because they are in a less advantageous position, then guys deserve a break when they are in a less advantageous position.

Either treat the two groups the same on all matters, or differently depending on the situation and fundamental differences between the sexes as shown by science—not ideology.

Feminism gives discrimination against men a dangerous veneer of acceptability.

Stereotyping

Whenever one group wishes to dehumanize and sanction conquest, domination, or destruction of another group, they revert to a standard repertoire of images and metaphors that portray the enemy as aggressors, barbarians, liars, emotionless automatons, sadists, greedy, beastly, and conspiratorial.

In the 1800s, slavers relied on polygenesis and ethnographic sciences just as Feminazis today rely on various pseudo sciences voodooed up by college Women's Studies programs to claim that men are a lesser life form.

In America, the male stereotype is that men are the inventors of war, worshipers of destructive gods, death worshippers, genetically violent, barbarians, Neanderthals, genetic rapists, genetic murderers, responsible for pollution, genetic war mongers, and responsible for all injustices because they dominate females.

Females, however, are genetically peaceful, empathic, peaceful, and egalitarian.

The Feminists accuse men of raping the Earth. But go to any mall and watch the frenzied buying of the latest fashions, or any thrift store to count the discarded items of no longer stylish appliances and female clothes—all fruits of raping the earth and all demanded by females.

The Feminazis rationalize any harmful conduct of females by claiming they are an oppressed class. If that were so oppressed, then nearly half of the rich would not be females, and they would not have greater access to comfort and health care or live longer than their oppressors.

Men today live under the worst stigma that exists in society. If they do anything to protest their lot in life, or treatment under the law, they are summarily classified as "whiners," and told to "get a life," get back to work, or cursed with obloquies. To make matters worse,

because there are some men in positions of power, the rest are constantly having that thrown in their faces, and having that as the standard by which they are judged.

Crime

When a man commits a criminal offence, he gets a prison sentence. When a female commits the same offence, she gets therapy.

Men are 20 times more likely to be imprisoned, but don't commit 20 times more crimes than females.

Guys serve an average of 17 years for murder, girls 7 years.

If a female teacher has sex with one of her students, she will get 1-3 years, assuming she goes to jail at all. A man gets 15-20, even though female students are emotionally more mature than male students of the same age.

Men are more likely to be wrongfully arrested and wrongfully imprisoned.

This society allows females to reserve for themselves the right to commit any crime: to lie, cheat, and defraud in order to get what they want but don't deserve.

Females can, with impunity, engage in maternity fraud (lying about their fertility or use of birth control) and paternity fraud (lying about a child's real father—assuming they know which one).

Rarely in America or other westernized countries are females held fully accountable for sexual assault, child abuse, or for false accusations of physical violence by a man.

When females falsely accuse men of rape and domestic violence, thereby committing the felony of perjury, they are virtually never prosecuted.

Rape shield laws prohibit the use of evidence of the nefarious activities by a girl, such as working as a prostitute, but nearly everything about the accused, usually a man, is bandied about in court.

Judge to prostitute, "So when did you realize you were raped?" Prostitute, wiping away tears: "When the check bounced!" Judge, "Guilty!"

If a person accused of murder can use as a defense that the dead person had a tendency to violence, then a guy accused of rape should be able to show that the girl was a whore.

Females account for one-third of illegal drug use but only 15% of those arrested for drugs are female.

Females commit the majority of child abuse, elder abuse, partner violence, and most child murders—not counting abortions.

Violent females draw their Get-Out-of-Jail-Free card by claiming PMS, "battered woman's syndrome," or "postpartum depression."

The Feminazis have so perverted this society that they can now murder incipient human beings, newborns, children, boyfriends, and husbands with little or no punishment. I can't get away with murdering Feminists and claim it's because of PMS—persecuted male syndrome, hmmm, I wonder...?

When a man is arrested for killing his child, the community immediately labels him a monster and is ready to lynch him before he even gets to trial. But when a female kills her own flesh and blood, American opinion typically wonders what kind of difficult circumstances or mental anguish she must have endured from her husband before snapping.

If a male kills his spouse or girlfriend, he's a brute who should be forever locked away, but, if a female does the same, she must have been abused and suffering from "battered bimbo

syndrome.” One wife shot-gunned her preacher husband in the back while he slept and was freed after serving only 210 days because of some bogus psychological syndrome. Can you imagine what would happen to a guy that shotgun a priestess?

Taken together, the twelve female-only defenses allow almost any female to take it upon herself to exercise the death penalty. The government is not allowed to take it upon itself to kill someone first and declare later that the deceased deserved it—only a female can do that to a man.

People are supposed to be treated according to how they behave not who they are.

Employment

The unemployment rate for men is 2.7% higher than for females. *Chicago Tribune*, September 28, 2009.

The New York Times has reported that “82 percent of the job losses have befallen men,” since the financial collapse of 2008.

For every female who is discouraged from working, there is a man forced by social convention to work; and for every bored and unfulfilled female, there is a man burdened with the responsibility that only a primary wage-earner knows.

80 to 90% of the homeless are men.

Health

At birth, boys are six weeks behind girls in maturation.

Infant mortality is 23% higher in boys than girls.

More males than females die from all three major categories of death: communicable diseases, non-communicable diseases, and injuries. World Health Organization.

“We’ve got men dying at higher rates of just about every disease, and we don’t know why,” Dr. Demetrius J. Porche, Associate Dean, Louisiana State University’s Health Sciences Center School of Nursing in New Orleans.

According to Dr. William Pollack of the Harvard Medical School Center for Men, the general health of American males is in a state of serious crisis. Men spend more and more time at work, as compared to females, and many of their jobs are more demanding and dangerous.

American men are 4 times more likely to commit suicide, National Institute for Mental Health—it must be the American females. Boys commit 86 percent of all adolescent suicides.

Worldwide, men are three times more likely to commit suicide than females. China is the only country where men and females kill themselves in about equal numbers.

In 1999, females made up 62% of the subjects in research programs sponsored by the National Institutes of Health.

According to the National Institutes of Health, recent government grants for studying physical and mental health problems unique to females totaled \$3,400 million while the amount of grants for male health problems was only \$340 million.

There is no Men’s Health Initiative and no Office on Men’s Health in the federal government, but there is a female health initiative and a U.S. Government Office on Women’s Health.

In the United Kingdom, it is estimated that eight times as much money is spent on female health than men’s.

Females incur stress fractures, sprains, and strains more frequently than men.

Men are three times more likely to die in accidents, 13 times more likely to be killed at work, and three times more likely to be murdered.

End of life care is the most expensive and females survive to consume more of it. In addition, females visit doctors more often, so they should pay for these costs—not the other members of the insurance pool.

Under Obama Care:

- Girls are provided well-care visits without deductibles, co-pays, or out of pocket costs in order to obtain recommended preventive services. Guys have to pay.
- Breast cancer screening is fully covered without deductibles, co-pays, or out of pocket costs. Prostate cancer screening requires the guys to pay.
- Girls get all FDA approved contraceptives and sterilization procedures free. Guys have to pay.
- Many more Federal health offices will be set up that deal with girl specific problems. None for men.

Hollywood

The Orwellian doublethink of Hollywood and the media depict females as tough, brawny, brainy, independent, and beautiful while at the same time victimized damsels in distress.

Men are depicted as buffoons and evil.

Government

Executive Branch:

Men pay more of the taxes than females but receive less in benefits from government. For example, more tax dollars are spent on female health problems.

Men are required to register for the draft, or be penalized by the denial of government jobs and guaranteed student loans.

When the draft is again used to provide cannon fodder for another war—and it will—men, not girls, will be drafted to fight and die, since guys are considered the disposable sex.

After a man gives up two or more years of his life to the draft, he will then have to compete for jobs with females who have a number of years in seniority over him after his involuntary absence from the job market.

Female soldiers receive the same pay as male soldiers but suffer fewer deaths proportionally.

There are over 250 federal commissions for females but only two for males.

Legislative:

The Violence Against Women's Act and Family Violence Prevention and Services Act pump over a billion dollars a year into Feminazi, anti-male activities every year that result in the massive violation of the civil rights of men. *See below Violence Against Women's Act.*

Courts:

“[I]n times of repression, when interests with powerful spokes[persons] generate

symbolic pogroms against nonconformists, the federal judiciary ... has special responsibilities to prevent an erosion of the individual's constitutional rights." *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 58 (1971)(Mr. Justice Douglas dissenting).

The stories are always the same: she took his house, his car, and his kids. She accused him of physical abuse and the courts didn't even ask for evidence. She made more money than him, and he still had to pay hidden alimony that she used to buy gas to drive to clubs offering Ladies Nights where she got in free or drank for free.

Females receive preferential and special treatment in divorce court, child custody court, and criminal courts because they all give the testimony of females more weight than that of guys.

Adulteress wives receive child support from their former husbands as a reward for cheating even when DNA proves the ex-wife a slut. Men are even made to pay child support to a female they never met for children they never fathered.

When fathers protest their treatment by the courts that consider them merely walking ATM machines, they're denigrated as "deadbeat dads."

In my own divorce, I had this lesbian judge lusting to stick her face between my ex-wife's legs and jealous of me because I had. Not much chance for justice there.

Private Industry

Many businesses provide discount promotions for ladies but not guys.

A recent United Nations report, *Trafficking in Persons: Global Patterns*, noted, "it is men especially who might be expected to be trafficked for forced labor purposes. In many countries, the laws relevant to human trafficking are restricted in their application solely to women.... In addition, many service providers limit their support and protection only to female and child victims. Thus, exploitation through forced labor is often quite unlikely to come to the attention of those dealing with victims."

Men are the majority of persons trafficked into forced labor.

Only men are not permitted to sit next to unaccompanied minors on airplanes.

Men pay more for car insurance.

As of April 11, 2011, in the U.S., 9.3% of guys over 16 were unemployed while only 8.3% of girls were unemployed.

Divorce

The divorce machinery has become the most predatory and repressive sector of government today and is the greatest threat to constitutional freedoms.

The fundamental constitutional right to make marital and family decisions has been compromised by family courts and vast, federally funded social services bureaucracies that wield what amount to police powers.

The advent of "no-fault" divorce has given rise to a system that strips fathers of their children, accelerates the breakdown of families, and makes a mockery of the marital contract.

Divorces initiated by females climbed to more than 70% when no-fault divorce was introduced, according to Margaret Brinig of the University of Iowa and Douglas Allen of Simon Fraser University. These divorce prone females are invariably "entitled" to child custody, child support, alimony, and the house, so mothers "are more likely to instigate separation, despite evidence that many divorces harm children."

The entire structure of American marriage and divorce is geared to financially supporting faithless females. Men are 4 times more likely to lose their homes. One million American men are preemptively ordered out of their homes each year, even when no physical abuse is even alleged. Men now make up 80% of the homeless.

85% of divorce-related abuse allegations are manufactured by females (or urged upon them by their lawyers) to gain sole custody. Courts believe a female over a man, just because she is the mother. Many females also pressure and brainwash children into saying their fathers were abusers.

Expectation of sole custody is the main reason a large number of divorce cases are initiated by women. Men are 5 times more likely to lose their children when families break down.

According to the Children's Rights Council, a Washington-based advocacy group, more than five million American children each year have their access to their non-custodial parents interfered with or blocked by custodial parents. 90% of custodial parents are the mothers.

No evidence exists that nearly half of American children were voluntarily abandoned by their own fathers. Feminist organizations and writers have propagated the myth that females are victims of an oppressive patriarchal society and that marriage is an inherently abusive institution.

Numerous studies have concluded that children under shared parenting do significantly better on all adjustment measures than those in sole custody. Contrary to the claims of Feminazi consultants to family courts, peer-review data shows that over time shared parenting decreases parental conflict, increases co-operation, and boosts support compliance. By 85 percent to 15 percent, a ballot initiative in Massachusetts in 2005 approved equal legal and physical custody of children whose parents are divorced.

A father shouldn't have to fight a biased legal system so he can stay involved in the lives of his kids. Solving many of America's most vexing social problems—delinquency, drug abuse, teenage pregnancy—requires a recognition of the essential role of fathers in promoting safe and stable families.

Absence of a father is the single biggest predictor of criminality for boys and low self-esteem for girls.

Children from a fatherless home are 5 times more likely to commit suicide, 32 times more likely to run away, 20 times more likely to have behavioral disorders, 9 times more likely to drop out of high school, 20 times more likely to end up in prison, and 10 times more likely to abuse chemical substances.

71% of teenage pregnancies happen to girls who reside in fatherless homes.

63% of youth suicides are from fatherless homes, 90% of all homeless and runaway children are from fatherless homes. U.S. Dept. Health and Human Services, Bureau of the Census.

85% of all children that exhibit behavioral disorders come from fatherless homes. Center for Disease Control.

71% of all high school dropouts come from fatherless homes. *National Principals Association Report on the State of High Schools*.

75% of all adolescent patients in chemical abuse centers come from fatherless homes. *Rainbows For All God's Children*.

70% of juveniles in state-operated institutions come from fatherless homes. U.S. Dept. of Justice, *Special Report*, Sept 1988.

Many children end up being raised by chemical-abusing mothers who are far more likely to abuse or neglect them.

Domestic Disputes, Family Fighting, a.k.a. Domestic “Violence”

True Equality Network spent almost five years in courthouses interviewing over 15,000 female plaintiffs in domestic violence cases just before they entered the courtroom. The overwhelming number of those interviewed did not attempt to mask the real reasons they filed a domestic violence claim: control, money, and revenge—for everything you could possibly imagine, everything except acts of domestic violence.

Protecting victims and punishing violators are laudable goals and may be the founding principle of civilization—but to do so require the truth.

Feminists have substituted political ideology for facts and the scientific method.

Like the cross to the vampire, science has always threatened the domestic violence industrial complex, its twisted worldview, its fear and loathing of men, and its appetite for government funding.

“The term violence, if undefined, can mean anything [a person] conjures up in [her] mind.” Howard Zinn.

Girls are over twice as likely to perpetrated violence against their boyfriends or husband. *Partner Abuse State of Knowledge Project*, 2013.

Guy v. Girl

“Violence” under the law once meant the use of physical force that caused injury. Not something that a female conniving for some advantage says it is or what Feminists who hate men claim it is in order to get revenge for past slights whether real or imagined.

Today, in the realm of domestic relations, violence “has become whatever the man does that the woman doesn’t like. Finding out she is having an affair and demanding she stop is seen as ‘abuse.’ This often triggers the woman to file for a restraining order, where no real evidence is required.” Family Court Attorney Lisa Scott.

Only five states define domestic violence in terms of overt actions that can be objectively proven or refuted in a court of law. The rest of the states have broadened their definition to include fear, emotional distress without physical manifestations, and psychological feelings.

The 1,500 new domestic violence laws enacted by states from 1997 to 2005 are largely the handiwork of targeted lobbying by Feminists funded by the multi-million-dollar federal boondoggle called the Violence Against Women Act (“VAWA”). VAWA is blatantly sex discriminatory, as its title proclaims. It is designed to address only complaints by females.

VAWA provides taxpayer funding to Feminists to indoctrinate legislators, judges, and prosecutors with the stereotypes that men are batterers and females are victims. Females know (and their lawyers advise them) that making allegations of domestic violence (even without proof or evidence) is the fastest and cheapest way to win child custody plus generous financial support in the form of alimony and child support payments. The financial incentives to lie or exaggerate are powerful.

The Feminazis have created a judicial world in which the distinction between severe offenses and trivial annoyances is erased, so long as a man is accused of the misdeed, and any accusation against a man equals guilt. Meanwhile, females commit all the maternity fraud and

paternity fraud, and the overwhelming majority of parental alienation and false accusations all of which satisfy the legal definitions of domestic violence, but females are rarely found to have violated the law because they are considered inherently innocent.

False accusations gain advantage in divorce, child custody and child support disputes. Estimated rates of false accusations run 40 percent to 90 percent, depending upon the type of accusation(s).

Many advocates of men's rights point out that females initiate physical violence as often as or more so than men. *Second National Family Violence Survey in 1986*.

My ex-wife came at me twice with a knife, but so what. It was no problem taking it away from her; she's a girl. Even a girl trying to aim straight with a gun is somewhat laughable unless it's a shotgun or the guy is asleep or she's behind him. You're never going to stop a girl from using violence. The problem is when these hate-filled harpies get behind the wheel of something like a Mercedes Benz, and then claim self-defense, which the man-hating courts buy into.

The Department of Justice's survey *Murder in Families* analyzed 10,000 cases and found that females make up over 40 percent of those charged in familial murders. Females generally use less detectable methods to murder than men do, including poisonings, which are often mistakenly recorded as "heart attacks" or "accidents." Females often employ the element of surprise and weapons to compensate for men's greater strength. Also, females are much more likely than men to convince their extramarital partners to do the killing, or to use contract killers, who often disguise murders as accidents or suicides. There are five times as many unsolved murders of men as there are of females.

Criminologist Coramae Richey Mann found that 60% of female murders of male boyfriends were preplanned, and 70% of the killings were done while the victim was asleep, bound, helpless, or inebriated.

Convicted Texas murderess Susan Wright stabbed her husband 193 times while he was bound at the hands and legs. Michigan educator Nancy Seaman ambushed and killed her husband with a hatchet. Convicted Texas killer Clara Harris ran over her husband repeatedly with her Mercedes Benz as the fallen man's daughter begged her to stop.

A 1984 study of 6,200 cases found that 86% of female-on-male violence involved weapons, contrasted with 25% in cases of male-on-female violence. McLeod, *Justice Quarterly* (2) 1984 pp. 171-193. One-fourth of the men killed did not use violence towards their homicidal partners—perhaps they'd be alive if they had.

Between 1976 and 1996 there were 20,311 male intimate murder victims and 31,260 female intimate murder victims.

Male Victims

- 62% murdered by wives
- 4% murdered by ex-wives
- 34% by non-marital partners

Female Victims

- 64% murdered by husbands
- 5% murdered by ex-husbands
- 32% by non-marital partners:

Family fighting accounts for only 1% of physical injuries to females, well behind accidental falls, motor vehicle accidents, and even animal bites.

According to the Center for Disease Control, 13.6% of injuries to females seen in emergency rooms are from car accidents—a total of nearly 2 million or almost 10 times the number of injuries from physical domestic violence. CDC numbers show that more than twice as many females visit emergency rooms due to being injured by an animal (459,000 a year) than by a male partner.

The Justice Department 2007 survey found that males experienced higher victimization rates than females for all types of violent crime except rape and sexual assault.

So while guys kill more females than vice versa and experience a lower percentage of physical violence in domestic situations than females, since the courts believe females and not males, and the term violence is the result of a female saying she experienced fear, no matter how irrational, the lives of more guys are destroyed by females using the deadly weapon of ideologically corrupt courts—an aspect of state violence wholly endorsed by Feminists.

Females now have a monopoly on the use of state violence against men. A girl commits perjury in court and the court takes away a guy's house, his children, his bank account through legal costs and alimony, and his reputation, which means his career. When the courts find out the girl lied—nothing happens to her. So who causes more harm: a guy using his physical strength or a girl committing perjury in court?

Indiscriminate state violence batters men not just when a girl lies about physical abuse, but when she claims some nebulous psychological distress. Females are the masters of the intentional infliction of emotional distress, but the state never punishes them for it. Girls incessantly berate men when they don't say or do what a girl's whims of the moment want.

If a girl can use the ability that Mother Nature gave her to cause harm, then a guy can use what Mother Nature gave him in self-defense. After all, a girl's tongue is her gun, so why should a man disarm unless she's muzzled.

What's the difference between a life destroyed by a lying tongue and one destroyed by a gun?

In India, 98% of domestic violence allegations are believed to be false.

The U.S. Centers for Disease Control (CDC) 2011 *National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey* found that the most extreme domestic violence is male-on-female, but hard-core batterers and outright killers are rare. In violence of the mild to moderately severe variety that constitutes most of Intimate Partner Violence — shoving, slapping, hitting, punching, throwing objects, even stabbing and burning — both genders initiate and cause harm in equal measure. The survey's central finding is that men and women inflict and suffer equal rates of domestic violence, with 6.5% of men and 6.3% of women experiencing partner aggression in the past year. More men (18%) than women (14%) suffer psychological aggression (humiliation, threats of violence, controllingness). Feminists often define domestic violence as a “pattern of power and control,” and the survey finds that men were 50% more likely to have experienced coercive control than women (15.2% vs. 10.7%).

Canada's 1999 General Social Survey, found not only that most male and female violence is reciprocal, but also that the younger the sample, the more violent the women relative to men. A meta-analysis of more than 80 large-scale surveys notes a widening spread: less male and more female domestic violence in the dating cohort.

Personality disorder, culture and a background of family dysfunction, not sex, are the best predictors of partner violence. University of British Columbia psychology professor Don Dutton, *Rethinking Domestic Violence* (2006).

Children

Physical violence by females against children is a different story, since kids cannot defend themselves as a grown man can.

It's mothers, not fathers, who are far more likely to abuse and neglect their children, according to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Mothers are responsible for 65 per cent of the physical abuse of children.

Mothers kill children at twice the rate that fathers do.

The Department of Justice's *National Violence Survey* found that mothers physically abuse children in 43% of the cases, fathers 28%; mothers are the killers in 48% of deaths, fathers 12%.

Monster moms routinely drown, boil, hang, put in clothes dryers, throw in dumpsters, and shake to death their children.

Mothers are also experts at using fear tactics to manipulate their children. How sick and twisted is it to raise a child to be scared of doing something that if he does it, he will find it worthwhile and fulfilling.

The most harmful legacy of the Feminist Matriarchy is its tendency to view children as a costly impediment to Feminist self-fulfillment and worldly achievement.

Family Courts

The Canadian National Association of Women and the Law said, "Courts may treat parents unequally and deny them basic civil liberties and rights, as long as their motives are good." Good, of course, means harming a man.

In many jurisdictions, it is a crime to criticize family court judges or otherwise discuss family law cases publicly—sounds like the old Soviet Union.

Censorship of speech and press by judges is only the tip of the iceberg and serves to cloak even more serious constitutional and human rights violations in family courts.

Family courts violate due process rights with impunity by seizing children and railroading innocent husbands into jail. They deny trial by jury, deny poor defendants free counsel, deny the right to take depositions, lack evidentiary hearings, fail to provide adequate notice, and decide based on improper standards of proof.

Dean Roscoe Pound wrote "the powers of the Star Chamber were a trifle in comparison with those of our juvenile court and courts of domestic relations." Practices include mass incarcerations without trial, summary expropriations, presumptions of guilt, coerced confessions, *ex post facto* provisions, bills of attainder, and more. The family courts are by far the greatest violators of constitutional rights in America today.

Canadian Liberal MP Roger Galloway, who chaired the *1998 Report of the Special Joint Committee on Child Custody and Access*, commented that "Justice, if it occurs in a divorce court, is accidental."

Every so often, however, a court gets it right. In a case where a man who was not the father of two children was still found by a lower court to be liable for child support. The Court of Appeals overruled:

“A profound mistake occurred here when appellant was charged with being the boys’ father...Instead of remedying its mistake, the County retreats behind the procedural redoubt offered by the passage of time since it took appellant’s default.

It is this State’s policy that when a mistake occurs in a child support action the County must correct it, not exploit it... Thousands of individuals each year are mistakenly identified as being liable for child support actions. As a result of that action, the ability to earn a living is severely impaired, assets are seized, and family relationships are often destroyed. It is the moral, legal, and ethical obligation of all enforcement agencies to take prompt action to recognize those cases...and correct any injustice to that person.

Despite the Legislature’s clear directive that child support agencies not pursue mistaken child support actions, the County is asking that we do so. We will not sully our hands by participating in an unjust, and factually unfounded, result. We say no to the County, and we reverse. *County of Los Angeles v. Navarro* (2004)

Statistics (S.A.V.E. False Accusations of Domestic Violence)

No district attorneys in the U.S. routinely prosecute false allegations of domestic violence.

25% of divorces include allegations of domestic violence.

32 states in civil proceedings define domestic violence subjectively as being afraid, fearful, apprehensive or emotional distress regardless of the time of the month.

48 states require a judge to consider allegations of domestic violence in determining child custody.

85% of restraining orders are issued against men.

50% of restraining orders do not involve allegations of physical assault.

70% of restraining orders, or 1.5 million a year, are trivial or false.

700,000 persons are wrongfully arrested for domestic violence every year

Duel

With the rise of the Feminazis, who consider the personal as fair game for public attacks and absolve their acolytes of responsibility for any despicable conduct, civilized behavior no longer exists in America. Ignorant, loud-mouthed, little people no longer fear what may happen to them if they don’t keep their virulent mouths shut.

When I encounter a venomous spewing individual who believes he or she can say whatever they want and get away with it, I simply challenge them to a duel by saying, “Peru turns a blind eye to dueling; it’s a short flight and no jet lag.”

If it’s a girl, she stands there in shock and I usually have to repeat myself: “I’m challenging you to a duel. You can even choose the weapons, so long as they are not T & A.”

So far my challenges have been declined, so then I suggest an old fashion fistfight, even if it’s a girl. After all, Feminists are strong, independent, and tough.

Once again, they usually decline, so I sue them for defamation. Victory in the New York courts for defamation is unlikely, but it’ll cost them a ton of money in legal fees. It’ll only cost

me, a lawyer, the money to file the papers, and it'll be worth my time because it's a lot of fun. You don't have to win a case to win a case.

Economics

Men are the more economically productive sex, yet since 1973, 90% of all new jobs have gone to females.

The Feminazis seek to upend basic economic theory by attempting to "equalize" the pay of men and females across the board regardless of occupation, work record, time in the work force, time worked, risk incurred, and ability.

If females really were paid so much less pay for doing the same job as effectively and efficiently as men, what company could afford to employ men? Who really believes bosses favor men so much that they'd take such a huge hit in profits? The wage gap figures cited by the Feminists deliberately blur distinctions of how many hours men work versus females and the risks incurred by men versus females.

Income

Girls don't make less than guys, if anything, they make more.

The Feminazis don't consider differences in occupation, years of experience, education, amount of travel required, level of danger (risk), distance traveled to the job, benefits, level of fulfillment, time worked, or any of the many other factors that affect earnings. Independent Women's Forum, *Equal Pay Day*. The average female has two years less work experience than the average male.

Females tend to avoid jobs that require travel or relocation, tend to *choose* lower-paying professions, tend to work for the government and non-profits, they take more time off, spend fewer hours in the office than men do, and choose to work part-time more often than men. 14% of the weeks worked by females were part-time compared to 5% for men. That's their choice and the Feminazis should respect it.

A study by the Center for Policy Alternatives and Lifetime television found that 71 percent of females prefer jobs with more flexibility and benefits than jobs with higher wages, and nearly 85 percent of females offered flexible work arrangements by their employers have taken advantage of this opportunity.

Data from the *National Longitudinal Survey* reveals that females between the ages of 18 and 34 have been out of the labor force 27 percent of the time, in contrast to 11 percent for men. Females ages 45 to 54 who have recently re-entered the workforce after a five- or 10-year break are competing against men who have had 20 years of continuous experience.

Dr. Warren Farrell says that if females chose careers that pay more, put in more time at work, and produce more value during the time they work, they would earn more than men. Females are less than half as likely as men to work more than 50 hours a week. And females are less likely to agree, every few years, to uproot themselves and their families to far-flung places to get the necessary promotions.

If a guy chose to place time with his family above the job, he wouldn't get those high paying promotions, so why should girls. They should accept the consequence of their choices.

Among professors who produce an equal number of journal articles, men are likely to be paid the same or just slightly less than females. The 1969 American Council on Education found

that girl professors who never married and never published earned 145% of their male counterparts.

Never married, college educated males who work full-time make only 85% of what comparable females earn. John Leo, *Of Men, Women, and Money*, (contributing editor U.S. News & World Report, citing Dr. Warren Farrell, *Why Men Earn More*). In 1960 it was 94%. *1960 U.S. Census of the Population*. In the 1950s never married workers' earnings were only 2% apart by sex while never married white females between 45 and 54 earned 106% of never married men, according to Dr. Warren Farrell.

Females are 15 times more likely than men to become top executives in major corporations before age 40. Female pay exceeds men in more than 80 different fields, a female investment banker starts at 116% that of a man, according to Dr. Warren Farrell. Female sales engineers earn 143% of their male counterparts.

Females hold 51.4% of all the managerial and professional positions. The Atlantic, Nov. 2011, *All the Single Ladies*, Kate Bolick.

Females who own their businesses net 49% of what male owners net—it can't be that male oppression in the workplace is holding them back. *IRS Statistics*.

In tennis, females whined about not getting paid as much as men despite the fact that their matches are generally 60 percent the length of the men's. The girls now receive equal pay but not equal work. What happened to the Feminist rant "equal pay for equal work?" Since "female tennis is an inferior product," according to sports columnist Alan Mascaren, the ladies are bringing in far less revenue but taking home just as much as the guys. Where is the money coming from—the male players. Of course, the girls do wear short skirts and bend over a lot.

In the \$9-billion-a-year pornography industry, guys earn 25% to 50% of what the females earn. If male tennis players can subsidize female players, then hos can subsidize guys in the porno industry.

In 2000, one-quarter of all female employees worked part-time, compared to less than 10 percent of men. Nearly 85 percent of females who worked part-time did so for non-economic reasons; e.g., to spend more time with their family or to further their education. In general, married females would prefer part-time work at a rate of 5 to 1 over what married men prefer.

Of all adults who work part time, females earn 115% that of men. *National Center for Policy Analysis*, Denise Venable. According to U.S. Department of Labor Statistics, among adult part-time workers, men make 90% of the income of females.

Among part-time workers who have never married, and who thus confront fewer outside factors likely to affect earnings, females earn slightly more than men.

75% of the jobs lost in the Great Recession were jobs held by men.

The median wages for men have been eroding since the beginning of the Feminist movement in the early 1970s. After accounting for inflation, median wages for men between 30 and 50 dropped 27% from 1969 to 2009. Prof. Michael Greenstone, M.I.T. Unemployed men are more likely than females to be among the long-term jobless.

For every \$1 the average guy makes, the average girl makes \$.77. The problem with this statistic is that it does not compare the amount of time each sex puts into making an income, the risk, or the quality of the product or service produced.

Income per unit of time

Despite the current Feminist myth, guys do not earn more per unit of time worked,

although they probably should because they bear greater risk.

According to the *U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics' 2007 Time Use Survey*, men spend 144% as many hours working as females do. So for every hour the average guy works, the average girl works 42 minutes. If both are paid \$1 for a full hour of work, then the guy should receive \$1 for each hour he is on the job, but the girl, since she only works 42 minutes out of the hour as compared to the guy, should receive \$.69. An appropriate number for girls, but less than the \$.77 they now receive. So girls are actually paid more than guys when measured on a per unit of time basis.

It's understandable the Feminists didn't figure this out, since math is not a female strong point.

In reality then, it's not a wage gap but an "indolence gap."

Income per unit of risk

The so-called wage gap should also be examined from a risk-reward perspective, which is what every astute investor does, and there's no more important an investment than one's occupation. Risky investments require a high enough return to compensate for the risk.

Current studies understate work compensation for men because the studies only count the hours devoted to a job without measuring the physical strain or danger associated with it. According to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, more than three million workers a year are treated in hospital emergency rooms for occupational injuries—the vast majority of them suffered by men.

Guys are 20 times more likely to be killed or injured on the job. Nine out of ten work-related deaths and injuries are suffered by men. Men suffer 95% of the job related deaths. In the 25 most dangerous occupations in America, men make up 90% of the workers. Low risk and, therefore, lower paying jobs are 95% occupied by girls.

Guys are at greater risk on the job than females. That's why they gross more—not because of some imagined discrimination. When risk is taken into account the wage gap probably reverses, and girls end up making more than guys for a unit of risk incurred. So it's not a wage gap but more accurately a "risk gap."

The government, therefore, should increase the taxes on females and transfer that money to guys. Guys can use it to buy more health insurance and provide security for their children when they die before their time. Since men are 50 times more likely to be the primary or sole breadwinner, Independent Women's Forum, *Working Girl*, their demise has a greater economic impact on the children. As far as the widow, she'll likely find another man to sacrifice for her. Men can also use the extra money to pay more to enter clubs and buy girls drinks.

Kim A. Gandy, former president of NOW (National Organization of Women) said, "I don't have to tell you that we have a long haul before women are truly equal." And she's right; females need a lot more risk to reach risk equality with men.

Wealth

A University of Michigan study showed that in 2001, households with a single female as head had a mean net wealth of \$113,000 and for single males of \$120,000. Schmidt and Sevak, *Gender, Marriage and Asset Accumulation in the U.S.* (2005). There are more single female heads of households, so multiply that number times the average net worth to get the total wealth

for single female heads of households, which is \$3.221 Trillion, for guys it's \$1.92 Trillion. So among single heads of households, females control 62% of the wealth, guys 38%.

Among married households, the wife at least generally controls 50% of it—she decides what house to buy, the furnishings, and so on.

Females end up controlling 60% of all the wealth in America. Allianz, *The Fragile Financial Superpower*, Constance Waschull.

In a divorce, most states have community property laws that give 50% of the assets to the ex-wife, with five states using a similar formula called “equitable distribution.”

Females make 80% of the purchases. Of course, many of those purchases are being made with a guys' money, but that's also a form of control over the wealth of the nation.

Females control billions of dollars through a slew of philanthropic organizations. Kimberly Schuld, *Guide to Feminist Organizations*.

Studies have shown that females who never have children enjoy lifetime earnings virtually identical to men.

Females over age 50 control a net worth of \$19 trillion and own more than 3/4s of the nation's financial wealth. Mass Mutual Financial Group 2007.

Girls born from 1946 to 1964 make 95% of the purchase decisions for their households. www.she-economy.com/facts-on-women.

Over the next decade, females will control 2/3s of consumer wealth in the U.S. and be the beneficiaries of the largest transfer of wealth in history--\$12 to \$40 trillion. Claire Behar, Fleishman-Hillard New York.

So who owns most of America? It's not men.

Government largess

Billions of taxpayer dollars are available for single custodial parents (90% mothers) for everything from milk to free legal services.

No money is allocated for non-custodial parents (90% fathers), not even for those who want to stay in their children's lives but are prevented from doing so by a hostile mother and her Feminist advocates, and the ideologically corrupt family judicial system.

Females in Feminist nonprofit, tax exempt corporations are generously paid with government grants and private contributions that reduce the taxes of the giver but result in increasing the taxes of others to make up for the revenue shortfall. Many large profit-making corporations reduce their taxes with such contributions while at the same time pandering to Feminist interests.

Quality of product or service produced

Another factor the Feminazi equal pay advocates fail to consider is that the real determinant in wages is the value created.

Only a dope would spend the same amount for a ticket to a professional female basketball game rather than a top NCAA college men's team or even a really good boys' high school team. Now, if the girls played in bikinis—that's a different story.

Pay should depend on the value created. Do all men in similar positions receive the same compensation? If you think so, you're naive.

If there's a labor pool out there that can create the same unit of value by doing the same quality work for \$.77 instead of a dollar, then business would hire only them, but it hasn't. Last I looked; lots of guys were employed with no thanks to the Feminazis.

Expenses

If a girl claims her expenses are higher than guys, meaning she needs more money than guys, ask her, "When was the last time a guy took you out? Who paid? Who's car? Who paid for the gas? Who bought the flowers? The time before that? Who paid? Who's car? Who bought the candy? And the time before that? Who paid? Who's car? Who bought the condoms?" And so on.

Do the same with expensive gifts. It's guys who give expensive gifts—not girls. Ask her who bought that bracelet, ring, or whatever expensive item she's wearing.

If she says she pays her own way, then respond, "Really! So what are you doing tonight?"

The economic logic that escapes the Feminists, of course girls and girlie-men aren't known for their logic, is that equal pay is measured on a per unit of time worked and per unit of risk incurred in creating equal quality and value.

Education

In 2010, for persons between the ages of 25 – 29, girls held:

- 58.2 % of associate's degrees
- 53.7% of bachelor's degrees
- 62.6% of master's degrees
- 50.8% of professional degrees
- 65.6% of doctor's degrees.

From 1967 to 2000, the number of females enrolling in college increased by 20% while the number of males decreased by 4%. 1.5 million more females than males graduate college each year.

One in four boys at the end of high school with college educated parents cannot read a newspaper with understanding. For girls, it's one in ten. Judith Kleinfeld, Psychology Professor, University of Alaska.

From kindergarten to graduate school, the curriculum and grading have been feminized, putting males at a severe disadvantage by gearing education to female psychology. There is an average 10 percent gap in achievement, as measured by feminized standards, in all subjects, including science, once the preserve of male excellence. Education has been hijacked by man-hating Feminazis who've stacked the system and the odds against boys by changing the system to learning styles that benefit only girls.

Content-based, top-down teaching was replaced with pop-culture, friendly, non-hierarchical, no accountability, Feminist flimflam.

According to a Duke University Study, the percentage of boys graduating from high school has dropped back below 1985 levels. Boys are far more likely than girls to be disciplined, suspended, held back, or expelled (probably because the Feminazis are doing the punishing).

Eight out of 10 pupils who drop out of school are boys. In the study, boys and girls fared equally in six of the 28 categories studied by the researchers, but girls fared better than boys in 17 of the remaining 22. So it's 17 to 5 girls.

Today boys toil under elaborate affirmative-action initiatives in schools that subordinate merit to the equal representation of girls in every field of endeavor, including sports.

Boys are biologically predisposed to competition, but in today's "progressive" schools, cooperative experiences and groupthink are preferred to individual achievement.

Evidence abounds that boys thrive in a more disciplined and structured learning environment, but America's loosey-goosey schools shun discipline and moral instruction.

Open-ended, "reflective" thinking, organization, and presentation are good for girls, but it's not how guys learn, think, or use what they have learned. Males like clear rules, boundaries, structure, and organization. They like an orderly, clinical approach to learning. They tend not to see it as important to add finer details, such as neat borders to their homework.

Boys are falling behind in exams and the job market because teachers fail to nurture traditional male traits such as competitiveness and leadership. As a result, boys have inferior reading and comprehension scores and lower graduation rates than girls. They are much less likely to pursue secondary degrees and university graduate programs.

College education rates for men stopped growing in the late 1970s. The same time that state education departments started focusing on females and ignoring boys.

Schools celebrate qualities more closely associated with girls, such as methodical working and attentiveness in class. Boys are becoming disaffected and flunk exams and job interviews because their competitive instincts have been discouraged. Schools downplay competition and reward conscientiousness allowing girls to pick up marks as they progress through the course. Lessons and public exams with an emphasis on coursework and continuous assessment are more suit girls.

Education has beaten out of boys any enthusiasm for anything. If they sit quietly at the back of the classroom and don't interrupt, they are more likely to be rewarded than if they are restless. Young boys don't naturally thrive when forced to sit still at a desk for six hours a day. They don't learn as well as girls by sitting still, concentrating, multi-tasking, and listening to words. Recess time, which research shows is more critical for boys than for girls, has been cut back nationally.

Girls often complete a given project because they were "meant to" even if it was boring. Boys want to know there's a purpose for doing something.

Some boys may not be academic but have strong common sense and practical skills. The system no longer rewards those types of common sense skills. According to the U.S. Department of Education, vocational education suffered a sharp decline from 1982 to 1992 and has never recovered.

Title IX paved the way to revise all educational curricula so that it psychologically neutered boys in the process by ending dodge ball, taking out tether ball courts, destroying wrestling programs, dumbing down math and science courses, softening entrance requirements, re-writing text books to diminish the role of men in history, and implementing grading systems that reflect little or nothing to do with individual achievement.

Based on a false report by the American Association for University Women, Congress passed the Gender Equity in Education Act, which singled out girls as an "under-served population." The Act pumped tens of millions of dollars into advocacy research and Feminist-

inspired programs based on the fraudulent claim that girls were lagging in an all-encompassing patriarchal society.

“This PC gender politics thing—the way gender is being taught in the universities—in a very anti-male way, it’s all about neutralization of maleness. Upper-middle-class men are intimidated and can’t say anything. They understand the agenda. They avoid going certain sacred cows by never telling the truth to women about sex, and by keeping raunchy thoughts and sexual fantasies to themselves and their laptops.” Camille Paglia.

College disciplinary committees have replaced courts.

Today’s educational crisis for boys did not exist twenty years ago. True, boys didn’t do as well as girls in reading and spelling back then, but they compensated for that with higher science and math scores. Similar numbers of men and females graduated from college. All in all, things seemed pretty equal twenty years ago.

Now, however, girls get better grades and are much more likely than boys to graduate high school, enter college, and graduate from college. Girls outnumber boys in the prestigious A and B streams by a ratio of two to one at some schools. While more girls than boys enroll in high level math and science classes, boys score a couple of points better, but on reading tests, the girls score 10 points better.

Thomas Dee, an associate professor of economics at Swarthmore College and visiting scholar at Stanford University, found that having a female teacher instead of a male teacher raised the achievement of girls and lowered that of boys in science, social studies, and English. With a female teacher, boys were more likely to be seen as disruptive. Girls were less likely to be considered inattentive or disorderly. Nine percent of America’s elementary school teachers are male. Even fewer are men.

Boys in all male schools with the higher ratio of male teachers do better than in co-ed schools.

Female administrators claim small boys are hard to manage, which they are for females but not men. A fire breathing man scares a young boy more than another visit with a get-in-touch-with-your-anger female. Young males realize that a little bit of pain is a good thing, that life isn’t always fair, and that sometimes a kid deserves to be smacked in the mouth. Female administrators, because they are females, have no credibility to make any threats that will motivate a boy to focus on learning.

When boys bubble over with unbridled testosterone, instead of challenging, disciplining, and harnessing their energies, as teachers once did, they are emasculated or medicated. The former means being made over in the image of girls; the latter entails being diagnosed as “learning disabled” and drugged with Ritalin. One in five boys spends time on Ritalin. 8 out of 10 children being medicated for behavioral problems are boys. It is a consequence of the demonization of male biopsychology, but it makes a female administrator or female teacher’s job easier, which is what they are mainly concerned with.

73% of children diagnosed, mostly likely by Feminists, with learning disabilities and 76% of those classified as emotionally disturbed are boys. U.S. Department of Education.

Education needs real men, not androgynies, who will teach kids to get in touch with reality rather than with their feelings.

Go to any schoolyard, and you will find that more often it is the voices of boys who have become silent.

“Primary-school education is a crock, basically. It’s oppressive to anyone with physical energy, especially guys,” she says, pointing to the most obvious example: the way many schools have cut recess. “They’re making a toxic environment for boys. Primary education does everything in its power to turn boys into neuters.” Camille Paglia.

It is the tacit elevation of “female values”—such as sensitivity, socialization and cooperation—as the main aim of teachers, rather than fostering creative energy and teaching hard geographical and historical facts.

Enemies

I wouldn’t be so paranoid, if I didn’t have so many enemies.

Feminazis, Feminazi sycophants, Feminazi appeasers—all those androgynous guys who are scared of females, and the Feminazi opportunists who exploit the popular prejudice against guys are the enemies of every man.

They are the enemies of men because they will do anything, tell any lie, and violate anyone’s rights, usually a man’s, to amass all the benefits of society to themselves while leaving men with all the responsibilities. In other words, to steal the benefits and leave the burdens.

They are cowards who know very well on which side their bread is buttered.

Why should any man mourn over the demise of any Feminazi? He should remember the bitter wrongs men have received at their hands. So wide-spread and universal is misandry in this country that I never expect to find one member of the dominant sex of females true to the principles of human rights they hypocritically expound.

Environment

Females are responsible for over 80% of all purchasing decisions in the U.S. each year. *SheSpeaks*, CBS Market Research. They are therefore responsible for most of the pollution and depletion of natural resources.

The average girl consumes more goods than the average guy: fashions that go out of date almost immediately, cosmetics to assuage her vanity, a manic drive to possess the latest everything, and toilet paper that used to be trees. By causing more depletion of resources than the average guy, she is also the major cause of wars, which are usually fought to steal another country’s resources.

Females are also primarily responsible for over population. It’s usually the girlfriend or wife who wants to experience “motherhood.” The guy often goes along just to keep her happy. Over population, of course, is the source from which all the major problems of the world flow: pollution, depletion of resources, war, pestilence, and famine.

Equality

The presumption that reckless men are criminals while reckless females are victims makes a mockery of any notion that the sexes are equal.

Men have willingly carried the most dangerous and onerous roles in society to the primary benefit of females. If it weren’t for men, many American females would have ended up Nazi broodmares, Japanese comfort girls, or Commie secretutes. Yet over four decades, the

Feminists have turned men into second-class citizens before the institutions of this society. Our society is moving toward two societies, one male, one female—separate and unequal.

Feminazis want equal rights but unequal responsibilities, equal benefits but unequal burdens. Equality is supposed to work both ways.

Don't forget, the suffrage movement grew out of the temperance movement, and we all know what a mistake that was.

American females are the most privileged humans in history.

The Feminists have simply expanded the pedestal on which society places females. It's one thing to keep girls on a pedestal when they're only a nuisance. Another thing entirely when they are malicious.

Today, guys not only forgive females for smashing the car, but for smashing men's lives, ruining corporations, biasing the courts, and anything else a female is running that she's too incompetent to handle.

The Feminist notion of sex equality is seen as a one-way street, intended to benefit females while turning a blind eye to the social disparities visited on men. Mere mention of the words "men's rights" is a sure-fire strategy to attract amused expressions and derisive remarks—not to mention insults from judges.

Feminazis have been ranting about equality for four decades. It's time to take that equality and shove it down their throats. Let's see how the Feminazis handle going down with the ship. Give them 51% of the worst of this society, and they'll start whining, "Where's the kitchen?"

Do you believe a female's place is in the kitchen?

Depends on whether she can cook.

Evil

Evil has nothing to do with the Sun, the Moon, the stars, the planets, Mother Nature, or the supernatural. It is a particularly human trait that occurs when a person intentionally or with reckless disregard violates the rights of another in order to obtain something she does not deserve.

Evil exists and the courts are not immune from furthering its ends, such as helping vindictive girls destroy the lives of men.

It's always good and evil up against each other, and a man has got to take sides at sometime or another; otherwise, he'll end up in one of the hottest circles of Hell.

"Often there's just chaos and violence, random and unpredictable evil that comes out of nowhere." Dean Winchester.

There are a lot of people out there who want what they don't deserve and will violate a person's rights to get it, then rationalize or cover it up with one lunatic belief system or another.

Evil always does more harm than the harm done it because the scales are balanced in its favor.

"Allied with every human woe, she stole salvation with a kiss." *Parsifal*, Wagner.

Institutionalized evil and state violence in America now wears a Feminist face. Evil has a feminine scent about it.

Today's scoundrels dress themselves in the conformity of PC-Feminazism. Let's not forget that two young girls, other females, and cowardly males were the precipitating factors of the Salem witch trials.

The Feminists and their allies are nothing more than demons in human shape who pass abominably wicked and unjust laws doing what in their power lies to destroy confidence in legislative bodies, the judiciary, and to bring officers of the law into disrespect among men.

The essence of PC-Feminist evil is that they understood the goodness in men and exploited it to the harm of men.

Civility toward the uncivil is a waste of time.

Unfortunately, fighting malevolent people, such as the Feminazis, is often a losing proposition with the result that human freedom and republican liberty will soon be empty names in these United States.

Evolutionarily Correct or Genetically Correct

“Nature is imperial and we deny it at our peril.”

Mother Nature is not so stupid as to make half the humans devils and the other half angels.

Reasonable men can accept the limitations of Mother Nature's engineering, but the Feminazis can't.

The Feminists should be careful in their meddling with nature. There are 300 million firearms in this country, and most of them are owned by guys.

Fear

My fear is not doing what I have to do.

The dragon is not out there but inside, and its size and ferocity depends on the person's upbringing—the epigenome.

Tiredness is but a disguise for fear.

Fear drives the inclination of people faced with an oppressive environment to submit to it.

It is an emotion that is best dealt with by ignoring it. Not unlike a nagging girl friend.

Federal Bureau of Investigation

Also known as the Federal Bureau of Idiots, Incompetents, or just Indolence.

Female (a.k.a. girls, chics, babes, ladies, dames, bimbettes, bimbos, bimbats, hokettes, etc.)

“American women are the most fortunate class of people who ever lived on the face of the earth.” Phyllis Schlafly

“If civilization had been left in female hands, we would still be living in grass huts.”
Camille Paglia.

Look at what their bodies are built for. You don't use a car to fly the skies, a plane to sail the seas, or a boat to drive the highways.

Think of girls as pushers. They sell “feel good,” are mainly interested in money, have lots of customers, are never on time, and you don’t ask them for any advise on how to live your life.

All you need from them is “yes” or “no,” and never stay with just to one.

“The curse of Allah is upon the fools who depend on females for support or place the reins of power in their hands.” *The Arabian Nights*, King Shahryar and His Brother.

Girls are inconsiderate, insecure, and irresponsible.

Girls are skittish, scared, dependent little creatures, so they become upset when a guy doesn’t do what they want.

It isn’t girls’ fault that they act first and think afterwards; it’s the fault of the fools who humor them.

“Broad,” you know, broad across the chest, although some of them are small.

Girls are the perks of fame and fortune. Too bad all I have is infamy.

“They will do whatever we let them get away with.” Joseph Heller

Give a girl a little authority and right away she thinks she’s the Queen of Hearts.

Females aren’t here to soothe the savage beast; it’s the savage beast who is here to limit their infinite capacity for evil.

The wise man doesn’t expect females to quit. He expects them to harm all others just to save their own.

Who knows what evil lurks in the imbalanced electromagnetic-chemical reactions that go on inside the feminine brain?

Females don’t sacrifice for others. They trick others into sacrificing for them.

Females wait for men to do the hard work, spill their blood, and sacrifice their lives, then step in and say, “It’s mine, it’s mine!”

The four most common words a girl uses are I, me, my, and mine.

They don’t do favors. They take.

The most inconsiderate person is a girl with her kid. The second most inconsiderate is a girl with her boyfriend.

“Sweet wine often turns nice girls sour.” Charlie Chan.

“Pretty girl like lap dog. Sometimes goes mad.” Charlie Chan.

“Sometimes quickest way to a girl’s brain is impression on other end.” Charlie Chan.
They’re not satisfied no matter what a man does.

How does a guy know what they want him to do?

Why, he has to read their minds of course.

Girls want number 1—money and number 2—tyranny over men.

“It’s gold that counts, money that matters.” Gretchen in Goethe’s *Faust*

How many pretty young things out there would decline to rub their rear-ends against a Benjamin Franklin.

There lust for money comes from them having more desires than dollars.

Females were created in the image of Mary Magdalene, an alleged ho.

Girls are great for partying and entertainment, but for most other activities, they’re as useful as a lead weight on a sinking ship.

Since 1750 when the world’s population reached one billion, their function in procreation has turned into the bane of over population.

Look at the typical American female in her mid 30s or older, superimpose a Feminazi ideology, and then ask yourself, would you rather spend the rest of your life with her or alone?

Girls are arrogant in their ignorance.

They're always complaining, whining, and blaming others.

They take when they can and give nothing back.

A girl tricks a guy, then holds him to acting ethically so that he won't do what's necessary to get out of the situation she trick him into.

It's females who have always held the upper hand. That's because a female's advantage over a man is her total disregard of "some God of Abstract Justice" to which men are unable to be indifferent.

For a girl to answer truthfully is like asking the night to turn sunny.

5% of females have the borderline personality disorder of habitually making false accusations of some kind of "abuse" in order to seek revenge.

When a female has scholarly inclinations, there is usually something wrong with her sexually, as reflected in Gloria Steinem's remark, "A female without a man is like a fish without a bicycle." To which I can only reply, I'd rather be the bicycle, especially if some pretty coed is riding me. In addition, only a lesbian could make such a remark.

"No matter how bad someone is, [she] can always be worse," Justice Scalia, which is what the Feminazis are—the most virulent form of female.

Neuroses

Who cares about female neuroses? Men don't exist to cater to their lunacies. If they want to party and have some fun, find; otherwise, leave me alone—and stay off of my rights.

Generally speaking, girls get together with other girls because it is cheaper than a therapist.

Female Frauds

"Whenever you see something bright, shining, perfect-seeming, look behind the paint. And if it's a lie—show it up for what it really is!" Inherit the Wind, Act III, Henry Drummond.

"To go to bed with a man and then lie to him. She's a girl, she's got all the training she needs, what do you expect?"

Girls are "practiced in the art of deception." Rolling Stones.

"Man yet to be born who can tell what female will or will not do." Charlie Chan.

Fidelity is the charming girl's greatest hypocrisy.

It's a common misconception that goodness is equated with beauty.

Most guys at sometime in their lives played sports where they learned that if you cheat and get caught, you're punished. If you don't get caught, you still feel inferior to the guys you were competing against. Most girls, however, do not play sports. They spend their time trying to attract a guy in which cheating is the name of the game—high heels; body shaping panty hose; pushup, padded bras; painted faces; painted lips; false eye lashes; penciled eyebrows; hair color not their own; and lies that make Hillary Clinton look like a truth teller.

When it comes to pregnancy females often lie. They lie about being pregnant for revenge and power. They lie about using birth control and become pregnant for the same reasons, for financial gain, and to trap a man into doing "the right thing" because their internal clock is

ticking. They often want a child even though they're incompetent to raise one and it will just add to the world's over population.

They lie about who is the father of their child. If you trick someone into raising a baby not his own, and he puts 20 years of his life into an endeavor based on a falsehood, that is a crime of the highest order. Yet in many states, females are rewarded for such fraud by the corrupt courts requiring the defrauded man to pay child support for the kid that is not his.

The only way a female can best a man is by blind-siding him or with trickery.

Female Harm

Let's not forget all the harm those self-righteous prohibitionists caused.

Girls are always trying to get a guy to do what they want him to do—even when it's against his beliefs. They have absolutely no respect for a man's belief system if it differs from theirs, so they set out to destroy it.

Certain girls have an uncanny ability to make a man forget what he has to do.

If a female official, whether in government or private business, provides information that is contrary to a man's interest, the odds are that she's lying.

How sick and twisted is it for mothers to raise children to be scared of doing something that if they do it, it will be worthwhile and they will feel fulfilled.

Female Hatred of Men

When was the last time you met a girl who was satisfied with what a guy did for her?

Most girls have always hated men because they both fear and envy us. The Feminazis are using that hatred under the disguise of seeking equality and phony claims of past oppression to create a tyranny over men. To corruptly amass to themselves more power than Mother Nature granted them and to make lots of money—a girl's number one desire.

The average female is physically scared of the average guy, and that fear can easily turn to anger, and then hatred.

Girls aren't sexually satisfied by many of their trysts, which frustrates them, and leads them to angrily, and to an extent justifiably, blame men.

Girls are insecure about their attractiveness to guys, which insults their egos when a guy doesn't hit on them and causes more anger.

Girls are also angry because their genetic unconsciousness wants a man while their Feminist indoctrinated consciousness wants an androgyny. They want the classical man whom the Feminazis have pretty much destroyed—there might be 200 men left in America.

All this anger eventually leads to hatred of men—misandry, which the Feminazis have successfully exploited to their own advantage in terms of money, positions, and power.

As a result, the traditional battle of the sexes is now total war. Relationships in the traditional sense are on the wane, leaving only short-term sexual flings. Maybe that's as it should be.

Female Parasites

Most females are parasites; they live off of men, whether hos or Feminists.

Feminist organizations survive on government tax dollars, and most of those tax dollars come from men.

Feminazi or Fear Fascist

Feminists are females who tell everyone that men are to blame for the wrong they have done.

I never met a Feminazi who didn't blame men for all the stupid decisions she made.

They have come to believe in their exceptionalism and their sense of being the chosen ones. That they can decide the destinies of the world, that it is only them who can be right.

They believe their upbringing made them weak, illogical, emotional, and condemned them to hot flashes, but it was Mother Nature.

Feminazis are demonesses of self-justification, leftovers of humanity oblivious to the meaning of justice. They lamely believe men are incapacitated for the rights of liberty.

A Feminazi is a female who believes that an accident of nature, being born a girl, made her superior to men in all matters under the sun. She believes men are guilty until they prove themselves innocent, and that females are innocent until proven guilty, and even then a guy is still at fault for what she volitionally did.

The Feminist worldview focuses solely on girls: their needs, their wants, their desires, and their preferences.

Feminists are scientifically challenged.

Feminazi is a very descriptive term. What's a Nazi? Someone who tries to control your thoughts, speech, and actions to serve her interests. The Nazis used duress, intimidation, coercion and state violence to have their way. The Feminazis are the same, they use state sponsored physical violence, although not as much. For example, a man goes to jail on the mere say-so of a female and lawsuits based on lies. They've infected the courts with a procedural rule that females tell the truth and men only lie. They are responsible for laws that discriminate against men. They're able to destroy a man's career based on the vague and overbroad terminology "inappropriate behavior." They are responsible for fathers regularly losing their children in divorce but still having to pay to support both the child and the wife. If he falls behind in the court ordered extortion payments—it's debtor's prison. So basically, Feminazis are those who perverted America into a tyranny over men.

If someone objects to the term "Feminazi," then say, "how about Femi-commie?" The Commies and Nazis were pretty much the same.

For me, there is no distinction between the terms Feminist and Feminazi, and I use them interchangeably. Others make a distinction, which is a distinction without a difference. Sure some Feminists are more uncivil, more evil than others, but from a macro point of view, they all want preferential treatment at the expense of the rights of men.

Other synonymous terms are ideological Feminist, radical Feminist, militant Feminist, supremacist Feminist, demi-Feminazi, fanatical Feminist, serial misandrist, murderers of incipient human beings, intellectual concubines of evil, minions of the anti-Christ, or just plain stupid girls.

Whatever the term used, they're just a bunch of sniveling, self-centered, tantrum ranting females who are arrogant in their ignorance.

Fear is what compels them to demonize, denigrate, and defame men. They are attempting to make others fearful—so that they can cover up the fact that they are incompetent.

Nothing gives these philistines greater satisfaction than a man being upset, frustrated, in high dudgeon, or whining and nothing stops a Femi-fascist faster than being laughed at. So make her the butt of a joke.

The Feminazis have lots of allies: guys who actually believe the Feminist drivel, Feminist sycophants; guys who are scared of the Feminists, Feminist appeasers; and the hypocrites, males or females, who pretend to support Feminism to obtain something of value—tangible or intangible, Feminist opportunists.

Princesses believe they are entitled to what ever they want in return for looking good and showing some concern. Feminazis are the same, only they don't believe in looking good.

Feminists are a collection of people many of whom could hardly bake a cake, fix a car, sustain a friendship or a marriage, or even solve a quadratic equation, yet they believe they know how to run the world.

They are experts at duress. Duress is any means amounting to or tending to coerce the will of another that induces him into doing an act contrary to his free will. Black's Law Dictionary.

Behind the Feminist visage is a mass of insecurities and fears.

They are constitutionally (as in character trait) unable to tell the truth, genetically driven to abuse power, and possessed by cruelty and malice and a will to dominate men.

Feminists and their followers are sycophants to conformity, driven by the cowardice of the dependent minded.

Many Feminazis are nothing more than psychotropic doped up, sexless zombies who use drugs to feel good about their useless lives.

They believe a man should be grateful to them for violating his rights because they are the superior person.

A Feminazi is one of those mannish things that breed in the half-light of the so-called aesthetical.

They're she-males. They look like a girl but talk and try to act as they perceive guys do. Since their perceptions are warped by their delusions, the result is a caricature of men.

Feminazis are as delusional as Commies whose belief in their superiority overlooks the fact that they can only compete when their opponents are handicapped by obeying the rules.

Reality and truth have no bearing on their self-serving idiocy.

Feminists cannot accept the limitations of Mother Nature's engineering.

Feminazis see men the way Hitler saw the Jews. Just change the nouns in their rants against men to Jews, and they'd fit right in at a 1930s Gestapo function. They are hate mongers using power to destroy.

Other descriptive terms for Feminazis: harridan hos, vengeful harpies driven by mad fits and jealous rages; faded, fat, self-indulgent females; self-righteous, hypocritical bigots with no sense of justice; mean-spirited and contemptible; totalitarian in their methods and dishonest in their advocacy; reality-challenged; lack honor, tolerance, and honesty; hate filled ideologues; man-hating sociopathic pariahs; and those who have a perfect right to be killed.

Feminists have no concept of fairness or honor unless they are trying to talk someone into acting accordingly because it serves their interests.

The Unsex'd Female by Richard Polwhele (1798)

“Survey with me, what ne'er our fathers saw,
A female band despising NATURE's law,

As “proud defiance” flashes from their arms,
And vengeance smothers all their softer charms.”

If you mistakenly find yourself hitting on a Feminazi, say, “Gee I feel as though I’m talking to a guy. Excuse me; I’m going to look for some chicks.”

When some Feminazi starts propagandizing that she’s a “strong independent woman,” ask her to step outside.

When some Feminist goes on a rant, tell her, “Don’t blame me that you can’t handle your own insecurities. Every time a little stress flows in your direction, you probably act like it’s that time of month.”

I understand PC-Feminazis hate me—and I welcome their hate.

Feminazi Establishment, Feminarchy, Estrogen Tyranny (E.T.), State Supported Religion, *de facto* Inquisition

A tyranny has spread across the land that violates the rights of men and exalts feminine evil as the social good. It’s fueled by cruelty and malice and a will to dominate over men. It uses legal coercion by violence, which is the monopoly of the state.

Post-modern Feminism is the evil of the time. At its core, the ideological Feminist agenda is based on hatred of men because Feminists both fear and envy men. The Feminazi agenda is about power and control over men.

State-sponsored tyranny has re-appeared in our midst driven by Feminazism. “To exalt as an absolute is the mark of totalitarianism, and it is possible to have an atmosphere of totalitarianism in a society that has many of the attributes of democracy.” Howard Zinn

Feminism, like “[n]ationalism is a relatively recent phenomenon but at other times and places the ends have been racial or territorial security, support of a dynasty or regime, and particular plans for saving souls. As first and moderate methods to attain unity have failed, those bent on its accomplishments must resort to an ever-increasing severity. As governmental pressure toward unity becomes greater, so strife becomes more bitter as to whose unity it shall be.... Ultimate futility of such attempts to compel coherence is the lesson of every such effort from the Roman drive to stamp out Christianity as a disturber of its pagan unity, the Inquisition as a means to religious and dynastic unity, the Siberian exiles as a means to Russian unity, down to [the failed] efforts of [World War II’s] totalitarian [regimes]. Those who begin coercive elimination of dissent soon find themselves exterminating dissenters. Compulsory unification of opinion achieves only the unanimity of the graveyard.” *West Virginia State Bd. of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624, 640-41 (1943)(Mr. Justice Jackson).

It’s the same old story. Whenever one group thinks it’s the sole possessor of the truth and acquires some power, it uses that power to demonize those who believe differently. It’s the typical power grab to push out others.

The pestiferous breath of Feminist demons has spread throughout the land.

Feminism and political correctionalism are the established belief systems that direct people’s thoughts, speech, and actions. Such intolerant, self-righteous doctrines have always been the cause of most of the evil throughout history, and today is no different. Anyone deviating from Feminism and political correctness, especially in the lefty bastion of New York City, is demonized, denigrated, ostracized, and dismissed for “inappropriate” behavior and speech.

Previously, scoundrels wrapped themselves in the flag. Today, they dress themselves in Feminism.

The first wave of Feminism (beginning in the late 1700s) and the second wave (beginning in the late 1960s) achieved the goal of legal equity. The third wave (beginning in the 1980s), however, is now creating a world rife with intolerant and irrational terrorism targeted at men and females who don't subscribe to the belief system of Feminism and political correctionalism.

A new totalitarianism has blossomed in America. Under the seductive guise of sex equality, this ideological tyranny resorts to over-heated rhetoric, intrusive government, and intimidation tactics.

The Establishment today is a Feminist Establishment—a unitary belief system held by enough influential persons so that it dominates over other beliefs in this society, such as the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

The dominance of Feminism has created a tyranny in America because it controls the workings of government. “The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands ... may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.” James Madison.

This Feminazi tyranny is enforced by an informal or de facto inquisition that punishes anyone who publicly disagrees with or criticizes Feminism. Take as examples the Justice Thomas confirmation hearing, the proceedings everyday in every family court, pink listings of those railroaded for “domestic violence,” and the imprisonment of men based on perjured female testimony.

This tyranny or Feminarchy results from the feminization of American society. The female of the species has taken over many of the top jobs in broadcasting, academia, and government bureaucracies, but that's not the real danger to liberty. It is that the Feminist belief system has become pre-eminent and life is now lived in accordance with Feminist dogma. Feminism rules the media and education, which influence how people think and behave and has enabled Feminist ideology to infect every part of society. Control a person's beliefs and you control that person.

America is now a Feminist, man-hating culture. It is amazing the extent of the Estrogen Tyranny in this country, and the extent to which its supporters will go to subjugate others.

Men have been reduced to lap dogs, marginalized, and despised. Look at the many lifestyle programs aimed at a female audience that air at the expense of current affairs and documentaries. Look at how men are continually portrayed in advertisements, dramas, and sitcoms as clueless and idiotic.

Androgyny is the prevailing role model with girlie guys, metro-sexual males, preening, and fashion conscious wimps.

Emotion takes precedence over rationality where soma induced delusions have replaced reality.

Feminism is the State religion, and heresy leads to the destruction of a guy's career, loss of his children, loss of his house, and bankruptcy. Fanaticism and ignorance always need feeding, and in America their fodder is men.

If a guy doesn't pay lip service to the Feminazis and doesn't allow females to violate his rights with impunity, he will most likely fail at all his endeavors. The institutions of this society will not be impartial but actually work against him. Any guy who fights back will be banished to the Gulag of Un-persons or virtually (as in Internet) pink-listed by Feminist bloggers. Making a living will become near-on impossible because clients and employers use the Internet to research

anyone they might hire. On the other hand, private and public institutions favor females regardless of the harm they cause, so long as it is to men and the unborn.

If there is any question of whom the oppressors are in this Estrogen Tyranny, just look at who lives longer, who controls a greater percentage of the nation's wealth, on whom does the nation spend more money for health care, who receives less time for the same crimes, and who is more likely to be out of shape—it's females.

The institutions of this country aren't going to defend the rights of men if it means interfering with the preferential treatment of females.

The matriarchal tyrants will continue to rule because most guys are intimidated by Feminism, passively acquiesce to its diet of blame and guilt, and have forgotten the Declaration of Independence: "Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of the unalienable rights of the governed, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it. [A]ll experience has shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty to throw off such government and to provide new guards for their future security."

Feminazi Newspeak & Doublethink

George Orwell in his essay *Politics and the English Language* wrote about the importance of honest and clear language and warned that vague writing can be used as a tool of political manipulation. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four* he described how the state controlled thought by controlling language, making certain ideas literally unthinkable.

"Newspeak" is a simplified and obfuscating language designed to make independent thought impossible. Feminist Newspeak is political language used "to make lies sound truthful, murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure delusion." Such language is intended to hide the truth rather than express it, so the language used is necessarily vague or meaningless. This unclear prose is a "contagion," which spreads even to those who have no intent to hide the truth, and it conceals a person's thoughts from himself and others.

Feminist lingo is shrouded in weasel words and loopy logic as well as euphemized or overstated depending on what serves Feminist purposes.

When Feminists want to obfuscate sexual differences they use "gender" as in "gender" pay gap, but it's "sexual abuse," "sexual harassment" when attacking a man. Why not "gender harassment" or "gender abuse"? Because it communicates that girls are also engage in such conduct.

The Feminists use lingo to hide the evil they're doing, such as the term "choice" instead of "murder" when killing an incipient human being. "The great enemy of clear language is insincerity. When there is a gap between one's real and one's declared aims, one turns as it were instinctively to long words and exhausted idioms. In our age there is no such thing as 'keeping out of politics.' All issues are political issues and politics itself is a mass of lies, evasions, folly, hatred, and schizophrenia." George Orwell.

Newspeak is effective in controlling thought because humans think in words. Analyzing and trying to understand the world requires words with exact meanings. Think of all the times you had a vague thought about something, then went to the dictionary to find the exact word describing the thought. All of a sudden you understood clearly and could express that thought.

The Feminist are using linguistics to keep thinking muddled when it serves their purposes. If a person lacks the words to accurately describe his perception of reality, then that reality doesn't exist. So the control of language controls a person's perception of reality, controlling perception controls beliefs, and controlling beliefs means people are controlled. Why do you think the Feminists insist on the use of the word "women" all the time even though the individual maybe a slut, broad, bimbo, or ho?

Feminist Newspeak spreads by imitation. Like all ideologies, it is ready to relieve a person of having to think.

As George Orwell once wrote, "If thought corrupts language, language can also corrupt thought."

"Doublethink" means holding two contradictory beliefs simultaneously—a natural female ability. For example, girls should have jobs above the "Glass Ceiling" but not in the "Tombstone Basement"; guys should have to register for the draft but not girls, even though a girl can become the Commander-in-Chief; or guys are built differently, which qualifies them for the most dangerous occupations, but that physical difference does not apply to the brain, which according to science is also part of the physical body.

Feminist linguistics simply chains you mind and your tongue.

Then again, perhaps the Feminist Establishment is just "reality challenged." Never underestimate the infinite ability of a female to delude herself.

Feminazi Objectives, Strategies, and Tactics

Objectives:

The total transfer of power, control, and wealth from those who primarily create and earn it to those who don't.

Create a new world order based on the absence of all things patriarchal, including facts, logic, reason, truth, and scientific method.

Complete control of men so that they will do what the Feminazis want.

Man dragged this hominid race from the cave to the Moon. Now that life is relatively easy and relatively secure, bimbettes, bimbos and bimbats want to run the show.

To subjugate men under the cover of equality because men are a "malignant and vile" influence upon society.

The Feminists want to thoroughly politicize—place under the control of government—the last bastion of personal life in our society—the family. They argue for governments to economically recognize motherhood so that females will not be dependent upon husbands. That way government replaces the father and the husband or exercises coercive power over him to economically subsidize females.

The Feminazis want social androgyny even though the lack of masculinity is fatal to a society's prospects for greatness and even its survival. If you're on trial for murder, whom do you want defending you—an androgyny or a man? If the Communists are marching down your street, who do you want fighting them, the Marines or Feminists?

The Feminazis don't want a meritocracy, because they can't compete—fairly.

Feminists claim they want a quota-imposed unisex society regardless of the facts of life, voluntary choice, human nature, common sense, or documented merit. But in reality, they don't want a quota-ocracy. Like all prima donnas, they want a princessocracy or hypocrisy where the power of government is used to give females preferential treatment while hypocritically declaring all are equal.

If the Feminists were after a quota-ocracy, then 51% of American college students would be female instead of 57%, girl students in New York would earn 51% of the masters degrees instead of 63%, girls would get custody of their children 51% of the time instead of 90%, and girls would make up 51% of the workers in the 25 most dangerous occupations instead of 10%. They don't want a quota system because then it has to apply all the way down.

Feminazis simply want it all, and to keep men shackled to pay for it. To have men work to support their wives and daughters while their wives and daughters work to destroy them.

The Feminists aim is to hold in their hands the reigns of social, economic, and political power in order to fashion a tyranny in which men are serfs and females nobility.

When it comes to the benefits of society, the Feminazis want equality, but when it comes to the burdens, they want preferential treatment with guys shouldering the burdens. They only want equality of rights and benefits, but none of the responsibilities and burdens that go with such.

When a guy is born he has a greater chance of getting a glass ceiling job, but he also has a greater risk of landing in the Tombstone Basement. It's called the risk/reward scenario. More risk, more potential reward. The Feminazis want only the reward with guys picking up the risks—sounds Victorian, and it is. Traditionally, girls were protected from many of the risks of the world, but their rewards were limited as a result. Today the Feminazis want to be protected from the world's risks, but want all the rewards.

Strategies:

It's the same old story. Girls tricking some guys into doing stupid things, which other guys pay for.

The Feminists use a strategy of government-enforced intervention into the personal matters of private citizens.

Feminists exploit affirmative action to achieve supremacy over men by falsely claiming they only want equality.

Feminazis play the role of modern-day prophets, like those of Marxism and Leninism, repeating over and over that government must control our lives for the collective good and protect females from the newly exaggerated danger of domestic violence perpetuated by men.

"Make the lie big, make it simple, keep saying it, and eventually [people] will believe it." Hitler.

"All propoganda has to be popular and has to accommodate itself to the comprehension of the least intelligent of those whom it seeks to reach." Hitler.

"The art of leadership... consists in consolidating the attention of the people against a single adversary and taking care that nothing will split up that attention." Hitler. In America today, that adversary is men. The Feminazis have taken the creator of civilization, science, and the arts and turned him into the modern-day equivalent of the medieval werewolf.

In 1590, Peter Stumpp was found to have committed numerous murders that shocked all of Europe. Over the next 200 years between 150,000 and 200,000 innocent men were tortured to

death as werewolves. “Werewolf” became the epithet for someone a person didn’t like and wanted disposed of, just as abuser and batterer are today.

The Feminists depict men as abusers and batterers with females as the innocent victims by using false generalities supported by Voodoo science from Women’s Studies programs and the rare or made up tale of horror.

The Feminazis create a climate of fear for anyone who opposes their agenda. They successfully intimidate and coerce men into paying for and putting up with their totalitarianism. They bias and coerce government officials so that government favors females and harms men.

The Feminists acquire powerful bureaucratic and official positions in government in order to control the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the federal, state and local governments so as to prevent the enforcement of men’s rights whenever it conflicts with the preferential treatment of girls and affect the transfer of wealth from men to girls.

The Feminists strip men of their rights by successfully lobbying legislators to pass laws discriminating against men. For example, they use Congress to pass bills of attainders against men. A bill of attainder singles out individuals of a particular group for legislatively prescribed punishment. If you belong to that group, then you can be punished without a trial, and it does not matter whether the legislation actually names you or just describes you in terms of conduct, such as “abuser.” *Communist Party of United States v. Subversive Activities Control Bd.*, 367 U.S. 1 (1961). The Violence Against Women’s Act is a recent example.

The Feminists corrupt the courts with laws that threaten to reduce funding unless certain Feminist tenets are followed, training of court personnel that’s steeped in Feminist doctrine, and social opprobrium used to ruin a judge’s career. Then they use the biased courts to grant them benefits they don’t deserve and shakedown men.

The Feminists created a large network of sex-equity apparatchiks who work tirelessly behind the scenes to transform American institutions according to strict Feminazi specifications.

Feminists control major philanthropic organizations, gain positions of influence within the media, coerce textbook and dictionary publishers to feminize the language.

They dominate the media and education that are used to preach the message that men are by nature barbarians.

Feminists now pose as damsels in distress in need of rescue by chivalrous male politicians from brutal, “uncaring” and “insensitive” men. While at the same time, the Feminist strategy focuses on getting the average man to think like a girl because its prior efforts were unsuccessful at getting the average female to behave like a man. They claim that yet another spoonful of Feminism will actually make males feel better when they live like girls.

Tactics:

Feminism is just a public relations scam, like the “New Nixon” in 1968, to convince guys that girls are really angels.

From the most powerful leaders in the country, to the Feminazi tyrant next door, those who aim to exploit, control, and silence others predictably turn to personal attacks, lies, deception, and threats.

The personal is not political—it is private, but attacking the personal often gets results.

For example, Prof. Suzanne Steinmetz, University of Delaware, published a study that wives were just as likely as their husbands to kick, punch, stab, and otherwise physically attack their husbands. Feminazis began calling University of Delaware faculty members, deriding

Steinmetz's work as "anti-Feminist." Then they leveled threats against Steinmetz and her children. Sponsors of her speaking engagements started to receive threatening phone calls. Finally, a bomb threat was called into a meeting where Steinmetz was scheduled to speak. www.law.fsu.edu/journals/lawreview/downloads/304/kelly.pdf

Females always demean men for fighting for their rights in the hope that men will do what most guys have done—lay down and let girls drive over their civil liberties, perhaps in a Mercedes Benz. A Feminazi might drive over me in her Benz, but there's no way I'm laying down in front of it for her.

One favorite Feminazi tactic is duress, which is any means amounting to or tending to induce another to do an act contrary to his free will. [Black's Law Dictionary](#)

Feminazis often try to act tough by putting on the demeanor of the scolding mother and well-rehearsed outrage. Don't be deceived; it's just a show—a lot of bluff and bluster. Respond with the facial and verbal hostility of an angered man, and they will crumble. Why do you think they are trying to make you feel guilty over your justified anger? Because it scares the bejesus out of them.

Tantalized by the idea that belief was a form of power, Feminist scholars in Women's Studies Programs went on a rampage of replacing knowledge with beliefs. Anything can be true when you ignore the facts.

"If they can get you asking the wrong questions, they don't have to worry about the answers." Thomas Pynchon

Feminazis do not care whether their statements are true or not, so long as they can use it to their advantage and it will make them look good. They are masters of Ms.-information. If someone calls them on it, they'll just get emotional— feign indignation or cry like Hillary Clinton did to win the New Hampshire primary in 2008.

The Feminazis use the typical Commie routine of trying to elicit sympathy from someone and pretending to be trustworthy in order to manipulate themselves into a position from which they can sink a knife into a person's back.

Feminists take full advantage of men's gentlemanly reluctance to publicly oppose and thwart females. Time for men to stop yielding the right of way or wrong of way to them.

Feminists often use anecdotal examples to depict all men as barbarians rather than statistical sampling on which generalities are logically based. Statistical generalities are generally true in that they are about the average person within a particular classification. Anecdotal stories are meaningless, since any group has a few bad apples. But such cherry picked tales do overtime create a false impression.

The Feminazis, who regularly scourer the media for the worst anecdotal stories about men, are simply engaging in Goebbels type propaganda of guilt by belonging to a particular group.

When one group is depicted as evil, it's an easy step for others to tell everyone that the members of that group are actually to blame for the wrong that others do.

The Feminists tell everyone that men are to blame for all the wrong that they've done.

Feminazi Power

Money is power in America and the Feminazis have plenty of it from the following sources: government, wealthy widows, foundations, corporations, and wives writing checks on their husband's bank accounts. The money goes to nonprofit Feminist organizations that provide

free legal assistance, propaganda for the media, indoctrination of government employees under the guise of training programs, political contributions, and lobbying.

Under the Violence Against Women's Act, the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act, and other laws, Feminist organizations receive around \$1 billion dollars a year from the federal government.

Feminist organizations usually have two sides: one that allegedly does charitable and educational work for which government tax dollars largely pay for, and the other side that lobbies for legislation discriminating against men and for supporting Feminist political candidates. Since government money goes into supporting the educational side, it frees up private contributions for the lobbying and political side.

With tax dollars, mainly from the pockets of men, and private contributions, mainly from money earned by men, the Feminazis have remade this society over the past four decades. They have used the influence of money with all branches of the government—federal, state, and local, and their positions of authority within government and private organizations to corrupt and intimidate institutions into violating or ignoring the rights of men.

In addition to money, Feminazi power depends not on the number of true believers or the number of females in positions of power, but those intimidated into appeasing the Feminists or remaining neutral. In the former Soviet Union, 17 million members of the Communist Party ruled over 300 million people.

If the Feminist were powerless in Congress because only 16% of the members are females, then they'd never would have gotten the Violence Against Women's Act passed, or more money for medical reach on female health problems than male health, or the creation of a Women's Health Office even though they live longer than men.

Feminazism is supported by collective rights-dominated law school curricula; Feminism-riddled "cultural studies" that infect the humanities; women's studies departments, in reality Feminist recruitment and networking centers and ideological boot camps; politically powerful, tax-funded Feminist groups who extend strategic support to a wide substratum of female causes; and a critical mass of ideologically corrupt or fearful judges whose juridical archives—bristling with subjective, sex-biased judgments—discredit their vocation and make a mockery of the whole notion of equality under the law.

In effect, Feminazism has become a state supported religion with a *de facto* governmental inquisition to enforce conformity. *See Miss Columbia* below.

So influential are the pressure groups run by seriously vindictive females that female favoritism infests the judiciary. Family judges automatically believe the female over the man out of fear of being ostracized from the politically-correct, white-trash, effete Eastern intellectual elite. (White-trash as in they will end up on the "trash heap of history"). Judges know that if they examine the facts and find that the man is more capable of raising a child, the shrill alarms of Feminazism will ring loud and clear against him.

The Feminists also have networks of Internet bloggers for personally attacking anyone who disagrees with them (just search my name). Remember, to them the personal is political and their key weapon of attack.

The Feminists have producers and editors in television news and at newspapers who overtly and subtly skew stories in favor of females. NBC's Brian Williams in reporting on the 35th anniversary of the fall of Saigon said, "58,000 Americans died in that war." That creates a false impression that a lot of American females died in the war, which is false—only eight died in the

armed forces. NBC always gives females credit for their sacrifices, so it should give guys credit for theirs—but it doesn't because of the power of Feminist ideology.

If a reporter questions whether the Feminists control the power structure in this country, respond: "What do you mean the Feminists aren't in the power structure? You're a powerful guy and you wouldn't dare say anything against them."

With all the money, their media and political clout, the Feminists are pretty much getting what they want—a tyranny over men. Madison defined a tyranny as when one group controls the three branches of government. Feminists want a tyranny over men, so they'll be treated like princesses—do what I want, when I want, and read my mind before I have to tell you what I want, and make it quick!

Feminazi Voodoo Science

Feminism is an unholy spirit that endeavors to remake society by reshaping our view of reality, and it knows that nothing buttresses an agenda more than conjuring up a specious scientific basis that's Orwellian in its logic and inverted in its reason.

Like proponents of slavery who relied on polygenesis and ethnographic pseudo sciences, Feminists rely on pseudo facts and unscientific reasoning to claim men are barbarians, buffoons, and moronic brutes.

Feminists are as ignorant and blind to science as the prosecutors in the Scopes trial. For example, Feminists wrongly believe their upbringing made them weak, illogical, emotional, and condemned to hot flashes, but it was Mother Nature—it's in their genes.

"By denying the role of nature in women's lives, leading feminists created a denatured, antiseptic movement that protected their bourgeois lifestyle and falsely promised that women could have it all. Camille Paglia.

Feminism has frightened an entire generation of young men (millennials) into being confused about how they should behave around girls lest they be labeled misogynist.

Fights

A fight not joined is a fight not enjoyed.

Finance

Lack of financing is the key detriment to the men's movement. *See essay Why Can't the Men's Movement Get Its Act Together?*

Firearms

A girl's tongue is her gun, so why should men disarm unless females are muzzled.

If the teachers at the Newton School had been packing, the Looney Tune would not have gone to that school. He would have hit a McDonalds instead, and those who eat there don't have long to live anyway.

When a lunatic shows up with a gun, what do you want for a defense—PC ideology or a six-shooter?

Freedom of Speech

“The proponents of the First Amendment ... were determined that every American should possess an unrestrained freedom to express his views, however odious they might be to vested interests whose power they might challenge.” *Feldman v. United States*, 322 U.S. 487, 501 (1944)(Mr. Justice Black dissenting).

“An unconditional right to say what one pleases about public affairs is what I consider to be the minimum guarantee of the First Amendment.” *N.Y. Times v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254, 297 (1964)(Mr. Justice Black concurring).

The purpose of freedom of speech is to protect speech that is adverse and unpopular to those in power. It's not to protect trendy, acceptable speech because that type of speech doesn't need protection, since the establishment of the day will do all it can to make you say it.

The Feminazis don't respect the first amendment but mock it. They want to put chains on your mind and tongue. By limiting free speech, they distort our capacity to make choices of action.

When a Feminazi tries to censor your speech, respond: “What's more important, your freedom of speech or my subjective sensitivities, and yes I said that right.” The juxtaposition of what she expected will throw her off, and maybe, maybe make her think, although I doubt it.

Or say, “I don't try to censor your speech, why do you try to censor mine.” She'll deny it, so reply, “Oh yes you are. The legal terminology is trying to chill a person's speech, which is exactly your intent.”

Or tell her, “You're not the official American Censor. I don't have to justify the words I use to you. It's my right to choose the words I speak. The exercise of a right requires no explanation, no justification; otherwise, it would no longer be a right.”

If a Feminist says, “You mean ‘women’ not girls.” Respond, “‘women’” I'm not familiar with that term. What does it mean?”

Feminists often whine, “*But ‘women’ is a term of respect.*” To which I respond, “And I use it for those ladies I respect, but I don't respect Feminists or those who try to censor my speech.”

When Feminists criticize your speech as not “appropriate,” retort, “You use the term ‘appropriate’ by which, I assume, you mean to appropriate the freedom of speech of anyone who disagrees with you.”

When a Feminazi says she finds what you said “offensive,” tell her, “The truth cannot be an insult.” It's a quote from Charlie Chan.

Or say any of the following: “Grow up; the world does not revolve around your exaggerated sensitivities,” “Then cry,” “Tough,” “Offensive by whose standards,” “You find that offensive; how about this. How many incipient human beings have you murdered? I've murdered none,” “I've only been my most sensitive with you,” “I'm uncivil to anyone who's uncivil to me, and if you don't like it, then you shouldn't act uncivil in the first place,” “That's a phony feeling and exaggerated self-centered sensitivity,” “No man could make you blush, dear child.”

The Supreme Court has explicitly held on numerous occasions that speech cannot be restricted simply because it offends people. The purpose of freedom of speech is to protect offensive and unpopular speech.

In *Street v. New York*, 394 U.S. 576, 592 (1969), the court held “[i]t is firmly settled that under our Constitution the public expression of ideas may not be prohibited merely because the ideas are themselves offensive to some of their hearers.”

In *Papish v. Board of Curators of the University of Missouri*, 410 U.S. 667, 670 (1973), the court held that “the mere dissemination of ideas—no matter how offensive to good taste—on a state university campus may not be shut off in the name alone of ‘conventions of decency.’”

You don’t have to think what the Feminazis tell you to, you don’t have to say what they want, nor act in a way they deem acceptable. Tell them to go sell their Kool Aid some place else. (I got that expression from the husband of my former typists long before TV talk show hosts were using it).

The principle of free thought is not free thought for those who agree with a particular group, but free thought for those who disagree.

“Those who won our independence believed that the final end of the state was to make men free to develop their faculties, and that in its government the deliberative forces should prevail over the arbitrary. They valued liberty both as an end and as a means. They believed liberty to be the secret of happiness and courage to be the secret of liberty. They believed that freedom to think as you will and to speak as you think are means indispensable to the discovery and spread of political truth; that without free speech and assembly discussion would be futile; that with them, discussion affords ordinarily adequate protection against the dissemination of noxious doctrine; that the greatest menace to freedom is an inert people; that public discussion is a political duty; and that this should be a fundamental principle of the American government. They recognized the risks to which all human institutions are subject. But they knew that order cannot be secured merely through fear of punishment for its infraction; that it is hazardous to discourage thought, hope and imagination; that fear breeds repression; that repression breeds hate; that hate menaces stable government; that the path of safety lies in the opportunity to discuss freely supposed grievances and proposed remedies; and that the fitting remedy for evil counsels is good ones. Believing in the power of reason as applied through public discussion, they eschewed silence coerced by law—the argument of force in its worst form. Recognizing the occasional tyrannies of governing majorities, they amended the Constitution so that free speech and assembly should be guaranteed. *Whitney v. California*, 274 U.S. 357, 375 (1927) (Mr. Justice Brandeis concurring).

“Those who deny freedom to others, deserve it not themselves.” Abraham Lincoln

“[Free speech] is not complicated: Students and faculty have rights to invite speakers to the campus. Others have rights to hear them. Those who wish to protest have rights to do so. No one, however, shall have the right or the power to use the cover of protest to silence speakers. This is a sacrosanct and inviolable principle.” Lee Bollinger, President Columbia University.

As Oliver Wendell Holmes said, “We should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression that we loathe.”

The Feminazis are using their bloody tampon hands of editorial censorship to throttle the First Amendment rights of men.

The delusion of America today is in its claim that the citizens are engaged in free and open debate, all the while holding one of the parties gagged, blind-folded, and hog-tied. Try saying Feminazi on the airways or in the press.

In this country a man can be punished for what he thinks and what he says just because it criticizes the powerful special interest group of the moment. Now I know how a protestant felt in medieval Europe or a Catholic in Anglican England.

I'm not about to conform my thoughts, speech, or actions to any special interest group, especially the Feminazis, in order to serve their interests, which are not mine. It's called standing up to a bully. The Feminazis and their supporters have been coercing and intimidating lots of guys for decades into censoring their speech, and to my amazement, they have gotten away with it.

Anti-Feminazi Essays

Here's an example of how the Feminists try to censor speech.

A female, Feminist lawyer, and her Wall Street law firm took six of my anti-Feminazi essays and submitted them in federal court in the Ladies' Nights. None of the essays had any relevance to the case. She submitted the essays to prejudice the judge against me, which a federal judge concluded in a copyright infringement action I brought against the lawyer.

Some of the following arguments that I used against this lawyer may be of some help if you run into a similar situation in which you are being criticized for exercising your First Amendment right to think, speak, and write as you wish.

The italicized words set up various responses. Assume the italicized words are questions by a third party. The essays are at www.roydenhollander.com, under *Articles*.

Describe the essays.

Take your typical Feminist tirade against men, switch the sexes, add some facts, and reduce the emotionalism.

What I wrote doesn't compare to what the Feminazis have been saying about guys for the past 40 years. I guess they can dish it out but can't take it.

There's a double standard here in which females can say what they want about guys and receive applause and curtsies, but the moment a guy returns the favor—it's off with his head, or both heads.

One Feminazi, Sally Miller Gearhart, *The Future Is Female*, p. 271, advocates reducing the male population to 25%. I'm not advocating genocide against girls. In fact, I believe all pretty young American and foreign ladies should be given a one-way ticket to New York City, and I will personally escort them around town.

Did you write these essays?

Of course I did, my name is on them, and they're copyrighted under my name. Who'd you think wrote them George Sand?

Why do you ask? Does that make me guilty of a thought crime, of a speech crime?

If not, then why are you questioning me about exercising my right to free speech? Do you work for the Inquisition?

Are you telling me that when a man exercises one of his fundamental rights and the Feminists don't like it or disagree with it, he has to justify or explain to them why he exercised that right? I don't think so, not in the America where I grew up.

If I can't say what I want, write what I want, without justifying it to those who disagree with me, then I have no right of free speech and neither does anyone else.

Do you have to justify exercising the freedom of the press (if answering a reporter)?

Anyone demand to know why you practice the religion you do?

Anyone, other than your wife or girlfriend, demand a reason for the people you hang out with?

The exercise of a right requires no explanation, no justification; otherwise, that right will be coerced into disuse.

I'm not running for office; I'll speak the truth as I see it.

I don't claim to be a moderate—I'm a card-carrying member of SDS, Students for a Democratic Society, I'm a radical, a gray haired radical, but still a radical.

I don't care what the Feminazis think, I don't care what you think, and I don't care what everybody in this country thinks—it's my right to think as I will and speak as I choose—according to Justice Brandeis. If people don't like it—tough!

That Feminist lawyer tried and got a federal judge to rule in her favor because I chose to exercise my free speech. That's contrary to the very principle behind the First Amendment—you know that.

Starts to read excerpts:

You sure you want to read those, they're copyrighted. Gotcha, don't I. Go ahead read all you want.

Why did you write them?

To show the Feminists that there is at least one man in this county whom they cannot intimate into censoring his speech. Actually, there are probably around 200 men left in this country.

Give the Feminists a taste of their own medicine—hand back the apple, or is it the poison apple?

To show that females have free speech but guys don't, unless they say what the Feminists want them to say. Karl Marx would call it heightening the contradictions, or as I call it, exposing hypocrisy.

My intent was to be inflammatory, provocative, and to tick-off the Feminists. I didn't just sit down and scribble off a stream of unconscious rant. I put a lot thought, research, and work into those essays in an effort to so upset the Feminists that they would once again expose their hypocrisy—that girls have free speech but guys do not.

I tried to do what Frederick Douglas advised: “agitate, agitate, agitate.” To provoke, incite, and foment.

Stir things up in the culture wars—start a fight. To goad the Feminists and PCers into exposing their double standards. Apparently I was successful, because a large law firm used my criticism of Feminism and political correctionalism to convince a federal court to decide against me, not on the issues, but because my agitating against Feminist dogma doesn't conform to the predominant American belief system or that of judges.

My aim was and is to turn the tables on the Feminazis. Do to them what they've done to men. For the past 40 years, they have demonized, denigrated, demeaned and dissed men, and

they've been largely successful at it. They created an image that men are evil, the sole source of all the world's ills: poverty, injustice, violence, and warfare. Men are the great Satan and females the innocent virtuous victims—baloney!

I'm trying to take a cattle prod to the rear ends of the Feminazis, kick over the pedestal on which they've placed females with the same kind of denunciations they make against men but switching the sexes—girls are to blame for everything bad, and guys are responsible for everything good.

I simply switched the sexes to counter the false image of men by using the same strategy as the Feminazis. But I needed different descriptors, such as bimbettes, bimbo, bimbat, broads, ditz, dames, etc. in referring to them and describing the evil they do.

If it worked for the Feminazis maybe it will work for guys. And if it does, then the scales will tip back into balance to show the reality that both girls and guys are equally capable of evil and stupidity and that females have no a monopoly on virtue.

Feminazis try to excuse females of all responsibility and culpability for the ills of society. I'm trying to put the apple back into the hands of the one who offered it. She offered it and he ate it, so in reality both are culpable.

Attack the Feminazi stereotype of females as angels by showing that girls are more than capable of viciousness, evil, and stupidity and are not the innocent victims of a male conspiracy.

To counter the Feminazi ideology of sexual enmity and scapegoating that is animated by a spirit of resentment and a desire for vindictive triumph over men.

Confront the Feminazi worldview and their quest for total power over men. Just look at how your girlfriend or wife bosses you around the house—do you want that at work and in the society at large?

These essays are “inflammatory” and “misogynistic.”

They're inflammatory but not misogynistic. You can't hate that which you lust after. Now, that's not to say that I'm not wary of all those hot young ladies who have an uncanny ability to make me do something stupid, but they just require caution. As for the Feminists, whom I do not lust after, I do not hate them—I despise them.

The Feminazis have been hammering guys as modern day devils for so long that it has become acceptable. Okay, if it's acceptable to do that to guys, then equality demands that it's acceptable to do it to girls.

If someone said something against the Nazis in Germany, he'd end up in a concentration camp, or against the Commies in Russia, in the Gulag. Because I criticized the Feminists and their female supporters, federal judges ruled against me. Now that's not as bad as under the Nazis or the Commies, but it is the same totalitarian mind set—and in America over 200 years after the Constitution, it works in one of the allegedly more prestigious trial courts in the land—the U.S. Southern District Court of N.Y. and the second most prestigious appeal court—the Second Circuit Court of Appeals.

There's a lot of female epithets in these essays.

Feminists are always slinging epithets at guys: male chauvinist pigs, Neanderthals, brutes, genetic rapists, genetic murderers, etc. Nobody ever calls them on it, so why am I being singled out? Because I'm a man.

Broad: If 18,000 females can call themselves “broads,” as do the members of the organization 85 Broads, then so can I. See 85Broads.com.

You know, broad across the chest. Something I definitely don’t dislike but find desirable.

According to the *American Heritage Dictionary*, it’s slang for a girl, but I used it to refer to a Feminazi trying to do a man’s work or to hos.

Bimbette, Bimbo, Bimbat: according to *Wikipedia*, it means stupid, a state of mind that reflects a person who exaggerates the effort and value put into her physical attractiveness. I use it as a term for incompetence.

No one can believe, no matter how biased, that incompetent females don’t exist, especially when they are doing a man’s job.

Ditz, Airhead: same as bimbo.

Dames: took that from the movie *Laura* with Dana Andrews and Gene Tierney, means girls.

Madams and my ex-wife, I called *sluts* because they are prostitutes.

Why did the opposing lawyer introduce the essays into court in the Ladies’ Nights case?

To bias the federal judge against me.

The lawyer was trying to get the court to punish me for my freedom of speech by ruling in her favor, which the court did. Her success resulted from the judge treating the case as an inquisition to punish a modern-day heretic.

That attorney is like most people: conformists and sycophants who are too scared to do anything but go along with the crowd and unwilling to think for themselves. The Nazis and Commies would have loved her.

Conformity to establishment beliefs is always a refuge for scoundrels. Conformists believe others will respond like they would when charged with a thought crime or speech crime. Conformists simply cannot handle “diversity” of thought, speech, and action. They try to act cool and tough, but underneath their exteriors, they’re scared little girls.

If you reverse the sexes, these essays would not have been introduced in any court. No one would dare use essays that had nothing to do with court proceedings to sway a judge into deciding against a Feminist based on her speech against men.

In a sense, I should thank the attorney for doing what the essays were intended: pointing out the double standard in America.

What happened in the copyright action you brought against the attorney who used your essays without your permission?

The federal Judge decided to rule against me because he disagreed with the content of the essays, the ideas they communicated. Now copyright infringement actions don’t deal with content, only whether someone uses the same arrangement of words as the author wrote, which the attorney did. The judge, either a Feminist sycophant himself, or too scared to follow the law when it meant ruling in favor of a man, ignored the law and ruled the attorney’s unauthorized use was fair use. The judge, however, did say about the Feminist attorney that her “stated justification for her submission of the Essays to Judge Cederbaum appears somewhat

disingenuous. The relevancy of the Essays to Hollander's recusal motion is dubious, and she undoubtedly intended simply to prejudice Judge Cederbaum against Hollander."

One funny part of the copyright case was that this "tough and independent" female lawyer used the Nuremberg or the Geraldine defense. She actually argued that a male androgyny lawyer made her to it.

Generality

The criticisms of females and Feminist are generalities; i.e., generally true or talking about the average person.

Gentlemen

A man who is courteous and civil until you violate his rights. Then he's your worst nightmare.

Girlfriend

I've got a girl friend; we've been going together for over a decade now—her name is Jihada, or, in English, the never-ending war.

As for females, no more relationships, I've learned my lesson. Remember, men kill themselves 10 to 12 times more frequently when relationships end.

All I'm interested in now is partying—fleeting cavorts with pretty young demonesses—anything longer is too dangerous. I've danced with the devil once too often in a relationship and don't want to do that again. Now, it's just short flings.

What's your batting average? I don't keep track, I already have enough depression to deal with.

Do you live alone? It's just me and my demons. Demons are simply memories you'd rather forget but can't.

"When looking for the beloved, even monsters are welcome." Mephistopheles in Goethe's *Faust*

Relationships are not salvation but damnation. "For behind their cheeks as red as roses, I expect a sudden metamorphosis" once they've captured their primary beau. Mephistopheles in Goethe's *Faust*.

Girlfriends want to control you, and to do it, they use emotional intimidation, verbal assaults, and, today, threats of government intervention. It makes them feel powerful to make you feel bad. They engage in schoolyard name calling, psychopathologizing (armed with a superficial knowledge of psychology they use diagnostic terms to create a false impression they are an authority on the subject), criticizing, threatening, screaming, yelling, swearing, sarcasm, humiliation, and mockery. It all falls under the descriptive term—nagging.

Girlfriends demand you drop whatever you're doing and attend to their wishes. No matter the inconvenience, they come first. They have an endless list of demands that no mere mortal could ever fulfill.

They are chronic complainers: you're not romantic enough, you don't spend enough time with her, you're not sensitive enough, you're not smart enough to figure out her needs, you're not making enough money, you're just not enough period.

Girlfriends are pathological inventors of false imagines; that is, they're liars. Such as, "I didn't do that. I didn't say that. I don't know what you're talking about. It wasn't that bad. You're imagining things. Stop making things up."

Girlfriends, as with most females, swing back and forth emotionally with the disequilibrium chemical reactions bubbling in their bodies. They react differently to the same situation on different days or at different times.

Girlfriends intentionally create melodrama so as to believe their lives fit within the Hollywood requirements. They deliberately start arguments to keep you engaged or as a way to get you to react to her with hostility. With the later, she can accuse you of being abusive and play the victim.

They play on your fears, vulnerabilities, weaknesses, shame, values, sympathy, compassion, and other "buttons" to control you in order to get what they want.

They put down your ideas, suggestions, sports, and most things that are important to you.

Girlfriends verbally trash your friends and family, and start arguments in front of others to make it as unpleasant as possible for others to be around the two of you in an effort to isolate you from those who have your interests at heart.

I don't care if I don't have a steady girl friend—I don't give a damn. Only one night or two nights stands from now on.

Glass Ceiling

I don't have a problem with 18 million cracks walking around on a glass ceiling.

Glory

"The more confidently individualistic someone is, the greater the influence he is likely to have." Ralph Waldo Emerson

The vast, vast majority of people are irrelevant—surplus population, and those that are not, from the perspective of the universe, are still irrelevant.

Help

I receive a lot of calls and emails for help—mainly from guys but some from ladies. The Feminist establishment trampled their rights and treated them as though they were garbage.

The people making these requests for help don't have the power or the money to make it right—to win some justice.

Now I may have the power in my knowledge of the law and my lack of fear of the Feminists, judges, and government officials, but I too don't have the money; not money to live a lavish life style but to just survive.

I've been fighting the Feminist establishment for over a decade. The house is gone, the motorcycle is gone, the stocks and bonds are gone, and the gold and silver spent. If I win the lottery, I'll be able to help those crushed under the boot heel of Feminazism by setting up an

anti-Feminazi law firm. But if I don't, and it's not likely, then it's time for a stupid and futile act—civil disobedience.

Of course, all you guys out there, could go into your girlfriends' pocketbooks, take out all the paper with pictures of famous Americans and send them to me.

Hip Hop Class

Androgynies often call me various names for taking a hip hop class. Perhaps it's an expression of their fear of girls or innate insecurity. But no matter, they're the ones missing out on the pleasure of inhaling the pheromones of pretty young ladies and watching the beads of sweat roll down their enticing curves. A room full of pretty young sweating ladies and one middle-aged heterosexual male—me, what's not to like.

One class had over 80 pretty, young, sweating girls. I counted them. That's better than what Bin Laden offered, and you don't have to die for them, maybe deplete your bank account, but not die. Of course, they're not all virgins, but that's okay.

As bizarre as it might sound, girls are actually impressed when I do a few hip hop moves in a nightclub—much more so than when I tell them I'm a lawyer. I wish I had known that years ago. It would have saved me a lot of money and stupidities trying to impress them.

Hos

Ho means Gold-Digger.

"They hand you some words that are nice to listen to." Mike Hammer

I'm still waiting for the movie "Hos of 2010." Presumably, it will star my ex-wife.

Ludacris' song about my ex-wife, *Ho*, was so accurate, I thought he must have known her.

Hos are strictly poison below the gravy.

Hos are more than capable of ho-hosting many guys.

Nothing holier than a reformed ho. Of course, hos only reform when no one wants them anymore.

Time to muzzle these tattletale tarts disclosing secrets or inventing stories just to make a buck or demean a man.

If some ho quotes from Pink's song "I'm not here for your entertainment," put her down with: And I'm not here to buy you a drink/ You gold digging tarts are all the same/ Go fine another one to play your game/ We came here to drink and have some fun/ Not to make you think you're the only one.

You could also refer to Gretchen's Brother in Goethe's *Faust*, "You're a whore, so you might as well play it to the hilt." But a ho would never understand the literary significance of the reference.

The Arabian Nights story about King Shahryar and His Brother got it right:

"Rely not on women,

Trust not to their hearts,

Whose joy and whose sorrow

Are hung to their parts!

Lying love they will swear thee

Whence guile never departs:

Take Yasuf for sample
Ware sleights and ware smarts
Satan ousted Adam
See ye not through their arts.”

New Year’s Eve 2012, my buddy of mine and I hit a bar on Second Avenue. We’re minding our own business—well almost minding our own business. A couple of British dames, 23 and 25, are standing right behind us, so we took the opportunity. I ended up with the 23 year old who was a Jesus freak and daughter of a pastor. But she got so drunk, I refused to bed. So she resorts of fire and brimstone accusing me of liking boys. “No that’s not a problem I have,” I replied. She grabbed her friend and stormed out. I’m sufficiently vain to have an inflated opinion of my powers of seduction, but when a strange girl I just met wants to have sex, I worry about my physical health. Not my mental health because I don’t have any. If she’s willing to sleep with me, then there are literally millions of guys out there she’s willing to sleep with. And there’s always the threat that she’ll wake up in the morning with second thoughts and accuse me of rape.

Hypocrisy

Typical female, she wants her cake and to be eaten too. Did I say that right?

A girl takes a man’s job and then expects him to buy her a drink, flowers and trinkets.

When a Feminist claims she’s as good as a man in an occupation traditionally filled by men, tell her “Quit deluding yourself. Stick to a game you can win—T and A.”

Feminazis angrily proclaim they are strong and independent except when it is convenient to be weak and dependent. When society is handing out its perks, they play the tough-guy, but when society dispenses its worst, they suddenly transform into protected princesses.

Feminazis want equal rights but unequal responsibilities. They believe men should shoulder the responsibilities while females enjoy society’s benefits.

When a girl screws up and is rightly criticized, they whine, “gender discrimination,” because they believe in the Victorian adage, “Take it easy on her . . . she’s only a girl.”

The Victorian Era pedestal has not vanished. It’s simply been modified to include all the benefits of society but none of the burdens.

The Feminists preach equality, accept favoritism, win with stacked decks, pretend they had no advantage, and then flaunt their success.

The Feminazis promised sex liberation, but now people are dependent on the Nanny State. They claimed no fancy for special treatment, now they have affirmative action. They said they only wanted to give females a voice, now we’ve got speech codes. They claimed to be for equality in education, now boys are struggling just to keep up in school.

The personal is the political—only if the target is a man.

Feminists sound like Klaners calling Nazis white.

Better to live in Russia “where despotism can be taken pure without the base alloy of hypocrisy.” Abraham Lincoln

Infidelity

Guys cheat because girls do—read some anthropology.

I didn't cheat on my former girlfriends because I was ethical. I didn't cheat because I can only handle the stupidities of one girl at a time.

In their relationships, females follow a very predictable pattern: they push men for commitment, they get it, they lose interest in the guy, they become attracted to someone else, they start cheating, they become angry and resentful, they begin telling their boyfriends that they need time apart, they blame their boyfriends for their behavior, and, eventually, after making themselves and everyone around them miserable for an indefinite, but usually long period of time, they end their relationships or marriages. Michelle Langley, *Women's Infidelity*.

Immigration

There are so many illegals in this town (New York City); I'm surprised anyone can speak grammatically correct English anymore. The general rule now is "if it sounds wrong, then it's right."

I think every pretty young lady who wants to come to America should be given a one-way ticket to my hometown: New York City.

12 million illegals going through a legal process to become legal will generate a lot of money for the only people who will understand the process—lawyers.

Immigration Marriage Broker Regulation Act (2005)

The federal Immigration Marriage Broker Regulation Act ("IMBRA") is another Feminazi attack on the First Amendment right of U.S. Citizens, mainly men, to speak with and marry whomever they choose. Marriage is considered a fundamental right under the Constitution.

Any U.S. citizen searching for a foreign mate over the Internet or through a mail-order-bride firm must undergo a background check before he can even talk with a foreign girl via the Internet or mail. The alleged purpose is to protect foreign females from brutish American men, but the Feminists' real agenda is to restrict American men to the pool of American females.

The background check requires a U.S. male to provide intimate information to an alien female, such as the ages and residences of all his children under 18 and every place the citizen lived since he was 18 years old. In fairness, the alien should also be required to answer intimate questions but isn't. Questions such as:

- How many abortions did she have? (I don't know about you, but I'd like to know if the person I'm about to go out with killed any incipient human beings. Particularly, if she's a serial killer.)
- How many times did she cheat on a boyfriend or husband?
- How many times did she pretend to like a guy in a bar, so he would buy her a drink?
- How many times did she lie about using a contraceptive when she wasn't?
- How many times did she intentionally cause her boyfriend or husband emotional distress?
- What anti-American organizations is she connected with?

In addition, require alien females to take lie detector tests for each question given their propensity to lie in order to gain entry into the U.S. These types of questions should also be required for any American girl dating an American guy, since their propensity to lie is only minimally less than alien females.

IMBRA also effectively limits the number of fiancée visas a citizen can sponsor to two. Only U.S. citizens pursuing foreigners are so restricted in their First Amendment associational right to date and marry.

Since when is the federal government in the business of protecting alien hos? Shouldn't it be more concerned with protecting its own citizens and borders by requiring foreign girls advertising on the Internet to answer questions and obtain a doctor's certificate that they are free of venereal diseases before they can engage in commercial speech with U.S. citizens?

The reason the Feminazis intimidated Congress into passing IMBRA and VAWA was because no guy in his right mind would date an American Feminist. U.S. guys aren't looking for a serf or a slave—that's what the Feminists want. A guy wants a partner who can help and whom he can help. A partnership requires compromise. When was the last time you tried to compromise with an American female? It's impossible because the Feminists have convinced them that they are modern-day princesses deserving of anything they want. Guys, therefore, turn overseas looking for evolutionarily correct females. To curtail that, the Feminists got Congress to pass VAWA and IMBRA, which dramatically increased the risk under U.S. law for courting foreign babes.

Don't forget that Orwell's *1984* dealt with a government interfering with a relationship and disclosing information to a female in order to break up that relationship.

Jihada for Justice

That's "Jihada" with an "a." I wouldn't want to be accused of gender insensitivity in this day and age.

In English, it's the 100 years war.

I'm loving it, Moochie versus City Hall.

I fight the PC-Feminists and have a lot of fun doing it. It's almost as interesting as my past anti-Vietnam War days.

There's a higher authority than the law passed by those with much flesh or much office.

I will fight the Feminazis until my last dollar, my last breath, and if there is anything after death, I will fight them for eternity.

I'm a lawyer who fights malevolent people, and, as we all know, that's a losing proposition in this life.

Objective

I'm not trying to tell people how to live their lives—just stay off of my rights.

I won't bother you, if you don't bother me.

Besides being a lot of fun and laughs, the reasons for my campaign against the evils of Feminism is to do what little I can toward justice—not a lot, just a little. Try to influence the creation of a meritocracy and bring females some of the same "equality" that men have enjoyed in this country for the past 40 years. Have the institutions of this society treat females the way those institutions have treated men.

Girls have been riding for free on the backs of men for thousands of years. It's time they pay their own way, stand on their own two feet, and act like the "women" the Feminazis keep saying they are.

I'm trying to turn the tables on those who advocate a unisex society by taking the burdens of equality and ramming it down their throats. Throw the pie of equality into their faces. Then they'll change their tune, and we can get back to the reality of the differences between the sexes.

For over 40 years the Feminists have been ranting about equality. Let's give them 51% of the worst of society.

I'm not fighting girls; I'm fighting the Feminists and all those androgynous guys who are tricked or scared into doing their bidding.

Initially, I thought the first of the trilogy of men's rights cases, Ladies' Nights, was a sure win, since I knew of a case from the same court with a near identical fact situation, except the people discriminated against were females not males. However, I quickly learned that the courts consider men to have no rights when challenging the preferential treatment girls receive. At that point, the objective of the anti-Feminist or men's rights cases changed to "heightening the contradictions," in the words of Karl Marx, to show people the double standard and hypocrisy of Feminist and governmental claims to truth, justice, and equality.

If I had found the financing, I would have brought one lawsuit after another demanding that girls be treated the same way men are, but financing is just not available from the government, foundations, or even guys for litigating men's rights.

What is needed now is a really futile and stupid gesture that may set an example.

In the end, I know exactly where I'm going. The trick is getting there so that I can continue fighting the Feminazis.

Strategy and Tactics

Don't get angry—escalate. Attack, attack, attack.

"Agitate, agitate, agitate," Frederick Douglas exhorted a women's suffrage meeting on February 20, 1895. When he returned home, he died of a heart attack.

I try to fight them any way I can, which includes trying to boil the caldron of public opinion.

In America there are three roads to justice: lawsuits, legislation, and revolution. I tried lawsuits, but now I'm hoping for a revolution.

Often the most violent of actions may not be the act of someone trying to control others, but the act of a person who gave up on justice.

Jokes

I'm at my most serious when joking.

When you lose your power to laugh, you lose your power to think straight.

"Humor is the very essence of a democratic society." The Prisoner.

Sometimes it can be helpful to have people believe you are a joke.

The chances of the courts upholding the rights of men are about equal to some young lady paying my way on a date.

Hasn't that ever happened?

The closest was when the NYC Controller's mother paid for our dates, but then I was in

my 20s and she in her 40s and a member of the City Council.

Homeland Security declared you could not work in America. Are you an illegal alien?

No, my Spanish is not that good.

Are you a U.S. Citizen?

Yes, I'm the classic ugly American. I believe in the superiority of the Constitution over the barbarity of the Third World.

I may be naïve, but after a time I finally learn. Back when I was fighting for some justice against my ex-wife and her Russian mafia and Feminist associates, I learned a lesson. Whenever a man fights to vindicate his rights against females, and tries to use American institutions, it's best to ask for what he doesn't want. Then he'll have a chance at getting what he wants.

If I'm interested in a girl, I'm as gentle as a ram.

If ever interviewed by same girl twice on TV, "We've got to stop meeting like this in front of everyone."

At the close of a speech, "If any of you pretty young ladies have questions, then just give me your phone numbers."

This morning was good, then I got up.

Dumb man + smart female = marriage.

A man will pay \$20 for a \$10 item he needs. A female will pay \$10 for a \$20 item she doesn't need.

A female worries about the future until she gets a husband. A man never worries about the future until he gets a wife.

Every guy has been subjected to the intentional infliction of emotional distress by his girlfriend or wife—why do you think guys die sooner.

A successful man is one who makes more money than his wife can spend. A successful female is one who can find such a man.

Married men live longer than single men do, but married men are a lot more willing to die.

A man marries a female expecting that she won't change, and she does.

A female has the last word in any argument. Anything a man says after that is the beginning of a new argument.

Girls brains are smaller than guys because they don't need them; they can rely on their bodies.

The most inconsiderate person is a girl with her kid. The second most inconsiderate is a girl with her boyfriend.

Sounds like illegal alien English to me.

The following are various quotes:

"They're out there protesting what they actually wish would happen to them." Limbaugh
When a man steals your wife, there is no better revenge than to let him keep her.

After marriage, husband and wife become two sides of a coin; they just can't face each other, but still they stay together.

By all means marry. If you get a good wife, you'll be happy. If you get a bad one, you'll become a philosopher.

Women inspire us to great things, and prevent us from achieving them.

The great question, which I have not been able to answer, is, "What does a woman want?" It depends on the time of the month.

I had some words with my wife, and she had some paragraphs with me.

"Some people ask the secret of our long marriage. We take time to go to a restaurant two times a week with a little candlelight, dinner, soft music and dancing. She goes Tuesdays, I go Fridays."

I don't worry about terrorism. I was married for two years."

There's a way of transferring funds that is even faster than electronic banking. It's called marriage.

I've had bad luck with all my wives. The first one left me and the second one didn't. The third gave me more children!

Two secrets to keep your marriage brimming: 1. Whenever you're wrong, admit it, 2. Whenever you're right, shut up.

The most effective way to remember your wife's birthday is to forget it once.

You know what I did before I married? Anything I wanted to.

My wife and I were happy for twenty years. Then we met.

A good wife always forgives her husband when she's wrong.

Marriage is the only war where one sleeps with the enemy.

A man inserted an ad in the classifieds: "Wife wanted." Next day he received a hundred letters. They all said the same thing: "You can have mine."

First Guy (proudly): "My wife's an angel!" Second Guy: "You're lucky, mine's still alive."

First there's the promised ring, then the engagement ring, then the wedding ring...soon after...comes Suffer...ing!

Why is divorce so expensive? Because it's worth it!

Generic female descriptions

- She has reached rock-bottom and has started to dig.
- I would not allow her to breed.
- She is really not so much of a has-been, but more of a definite won't be.
- When she opens her mouth, it seems that it is only to change feet.
- This young lady has delusions of adequacy.
- She sets low personal standards and then consistently fails to achieve them.
- She is depriving a village somewhere of an idiot.
- She should go far, and the sooner she starts the better.
- She doesn't have ulcers, but she's a carrier.
- She's been working with glue too much.
- She would argue with a signpost.
- She brings a lot of joy whenever she leaves the room.
- When her IQ reaches 50, she should sell.

- If you see two people talking and one looks bored, she's the other one.
- She has a photographic memory but the lens cover is still on.
- She's a prime candidate for natural de-selection.
- She donated her brain to science before she was done using it.
- She's got two brain cells, one is lost and the other is out looking for it.
- If she were any more stupid, she'd have to be watered twice a week.
- If you give her a penny for her thoughts, you'd get change.
- She's one neuron short of a synapse.
- It takes her 2 hours to watch "60 Minutes."
- If it weren't for her body, she'd need a brain.
- It's a little late to start fighting for your honor.

An old, blind guy wanders into an all-girl biker bar by mistake. He finds his way to a bar stool and orders some coffee. After sitting there for a while, he yells to the waiter, "Hey, you wanna hear a blonde joke?" The bar immediately falls absolutely silent. In a very deep, husky voice, the woman next to him says, "Before you tell that joke, I think it is only fair, given that you are blind, that you should know five things:

1. The bartender is a blonde girl with a baseball bat.
2. The bouncer is a blonde girl.
3. I'm a 6-foot tall, 175-pound blonde woman with a black belt in karate.
4. The woman sitting next to me is blonde and a professional weight-lifter.
5. The lady to your right is blonde and a professional wrestler.

Now, think about it seriously, Mister. Do you still wanna tell that joke?" The blind guy thinks for a second, shakes his head, and mutters, "No... not if I'm gonna have to explain it five times."

Ways to be a good liberal

You have to be against capital punishment, but support abortion on demand.

You have to believe that businesses create oppression and governments create prosperity.

You have to believe that the aids virus is spread by a lack of federal funding.

You have to believe that the same teacher who can't teach 4th graders how to read is somehow qualified to teach those same kids about sex.

You have to believe that self-esteem is more important than actually doing something to earn it.

You have to believe that standardized tests are biased, but quotas and set-asides are not.

You have to believe that the only reason socialism hasn't worked anywhere it's been tried is because the right people haven't been in charge.

You have to believe that homosexual parades displaying drag queens and transvestites should be constitutionally protected, and manager scenes at Christmas should not.

Judges and Bureaucrats

Why do you think every courthouse has a statute of a girl blindfolded? To tell you that American justice is like the typical girl—blind to the truth.

Judges are as vulnerable to society's passions as other political leaders.

Judges in their fear of punishing females must join forces with the Feminists.

Courts should stand for true justice, not the legal coercion of the minority by the majority.

The courts are trying to impose an elitist value system on a country that is inherently not elitist. Newt Gingrich.

In their arrogance, judges overreach.

From the dungeons of family courts to the alleged lofty abode of the U.S. Supreme Court, the judiciary is useless for men. Better to resort to more effective means for redressing grievances.

“We may mystify anything. But if we take a plain view of the words of the Constitution, and give to them a fair and obvious interpretation, we cannot fail in most cases of coming to a clear understanding of its meaning. We shall not have far to seek. We shall find it on the surface, and not in the profound depths of speculation.” *Ex parte Siebold*, 100 U.S. 371, 383 (1880).

Never forget that judges work for the government—the employer of last resort.

Most judges are nothing more than bureaucrats.

Most bureaucrats have a can't do attitude. They don't want to do the work that's necessary because they know they can't.

Think back to the last time you dealt with a bureaucrat. Did she do what she was supposed to or just try to make her job easier?

Most judges are the same. They don't do what their oath of office requires. They do what they want or are afraid of not doing. As a result, they end up making decisions according to their personal beliefs, or whatever is popular at the time.

It does not matter that the U.S. Supreme Court once held, “No [person] in this country is so high that [she] is above the law. No officer of the law may set that law at defiance with impunity. All the officers of the government, from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law, and are bound to obey it.” *U.S. v. Lee*, 106 U.S. 196, 220 (1882).

The justice system is ideologically corrupt and often incapable of arriving at the truth.

What's important to federal courts and agencies is not the law or issues involved, but who the parties are.

The Supreme Court is still a branch of government, and in the never-ending contest between authority and liberty, the agencies of government, at their best, are still on the side of authority.

The Supreme Court often serves as the government ministry of propaganda with the meaning of its fine words routinely ignored.

Today, the courts are essentially useless unless you're a large corporation, rich, famous, or a girl. Then they will usually give you what you want—whether justice or injustice, unless you're up against another corporation, wealth, celebrity, or girl. If you're a guy fighting for your rights against a girl—then the courts are downright harmful.

When it comes to men's rights, judges act with an arrogance of power, ignorance of the law, and ideological corruption.

Cases advocating that men are human beings endowed with rights when in conflict with the preferential treatment of the opposite sex are irrelevant in the eyes of the federal courts. Although the importance and protection of individual constitutional rights is suppose to be a central part of the role under separation of powers assigned to the judiciary where “[t]he

touchstone to justiciability is injury to a legally protected right,” *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath*, 341 U.S. 123, 140-41 (1951)(citations omitted), constitutional and statutory rights in the courts no longer apply to men.

The rights of men are meaningless and constitutional law cases are decided based on the political climate rather than justice. The courts support the violation of the rights of men whenever it benefits females.

Men just don’t count to the courts.

Today, many judges demonstrate contempt for both fathers and the constitutional rights of men. Take the New Jersey Judge Richard Russell’s statement to his judicial colleagues at a judges’ training seminar in 1994, “Your job is not to become concerned about the constitutional rights of the man that you’re violating. Throw him out on the street, give him the clothes on his back and tell him, see ya around. We don’t have to worry about his rights.”

Not all judges, but most judges buy into the Feminist doctrine of men as evil incarnate. Such judges are too ideologically corrupt for them to rule according to the Constitution. So if these judges have a chance to punish a man—they will. It’s the same type of group demonization to which Hitler subscribed.

If a judge doesn’t believe Feminist dogma, then most likely the judge is as scared of the Feminists as the lefties and the Jews were of the Nazis. A judge’s fear of the Feminists means he will rule the way they want.

The legal system is now systemically colonized by the Feminazis.

If there is any question as to who runs the courts, the trilogy of men’s rights cases that I brought makes clear that the Feminists do.

Judges usually refrain from insulting a lawyer unless they are really personally opposed to a lawyer’s position or posturing for public opinion. In the trilogy of men’s rights cases, I was personally insulted by four judges out of a total of twelve—.333, not a bad batting average.

The courts have become synonymous with tragedy, injustice, and ignorance.

The justice system is largely corrupt and incapable of arriving at the truth in order to do justice for the rights of men.

Apparently, the Supreme Court is no longer there to do justice, but to assure that injustice is uniform throughout the land.

In the past, the American legal system was guided by the rule, “that no man [or female] may take advantage of his own wrong,” *Glus v. Brooklyn Eastern District Terminal*, 359 U.S. 231, 232 (1959). But now, hundreds of thousands of females replace that dictum with “Lie, steal, and cheat and you will win.”

It should be, but is not that “[u]nder our system the *people*, who [princesses] called *subjects*, are the sovereign. Their rights, whether collective or individual, are not bound to give way to a sentiment of loyalty to the person of the monarch. The citizen here knows no person, however near to those in power, or however powerful himself, to whom he need yield the rights which the law secures to him when it is well administered.” *U.S. v. Lee*, 106 U.S. 196 (1882)(Justice Miller).

One of the great U.S. Supreme Court Justices, Felix Frankfurter, declared, “[justice] must satisfy the appearance of justice.” *Offutt v. U.S.* 348 U.S. 11, 14 (1945). Today, however, judicial arrogance makes no pretense at rendering decisions in accordance with the law when men’s rights are up against preferential treatment for females.

Suit against federal Judge Frederic Block

Generally, you can't sue a judge. That's why they get away with making such blockheaded decisions.

In a copyright infringement action against a Feminist lawyer who published six of my essays without my permission, a federal judge ruled against me because my essays did not kowtow to Feminist ideology. The essays were evolutionarily correct rather than politically correct. So I sued the judge in his "official capacity" for ruling against me because I exercised my free speech in six essays the way I chose rather than the way he thought I should.

When suing a federal employee in their official capacity, the law interprets that as suing the U.S. Government, since it can only operate through its agents or employees.

The U.S. Government, however, usually has sovereign immunity, except when it violates a constitutional right. Since Judge Block violated my free speech right in the exercise of his government duties—allowing a Feminist attorney to infringe my copyrighted essays, my suit was really against the U.S.

When I first filed the complaint, I didn't put the U.S. down as a defendant because I was setting Judge Block up for some emotional distress. I figured he'd look at the complaint and forget it, thinking I'm suing him as a judge who has immunity. Only later would he realize that I'm only suing the U.S., and that juxtaposition in understanding may cause him emotional distress. After all, he intentionally tried to cause me emotional distress by including false statements about me in his opinion. In that opinion, Judge Block called into question my "gender identity"—whatever that means given that I'm not a part of speech. He also implied I was obsessed with bodies that were not like Marilyn Monroe's and posed a physical danger to females who were not Feminazis—all false, but he didn't care. There was no reason for his personal attacks against me other than to inflict emotional harm the way girls do. So I filed the suit to give him a taste of his own medicine. Naturally, the court threw the case out.

Here's an analogy to show how stupid Judge Block's decision was in the copyright infringement case.

Assume you write a freelance story on a controversial topic—say you travel with the Taliban, and you write an objective piece from the inside of their operations. A lot of judges or juries in this country might take that as showing sympathy when all you're doing is reporting the other side. Then let's say you're in a car accident and it ends up in court.

The attorney for the opposing side introduces the article in court because she knows the judge is a veteran of the Gulf Wars and the article might be just enough to sway the judge against you. The article has nothing to do with the car accident—it's irrelevant. It's simply introduced to prejudice the judge against you.

Let's also say you haven't sold the article yet, but by your opponents introducing it in court it ends up on the court's website. You submit the article to GQ, and they ask has it been published. You say it's on the court's website; what do you think the magazine's response will be? GQ won't publish it.

The judge then rules against you. So you not only lost the court case because the judge was swayed by her bigotry, but your article is now worthless, since it is on the World Wide Web. That's the rule of law that Judge Block created with his opinion.

Judge Block made his decision that there was no copyright infringement because he personally disapproved of my writings or didn't want to arouse ire in the Feminists.

There is no defense to copyright infringement that the works are unpopular with the eastern intellectual elite. For court decisions to depend on a party's political and social beliefs as expressed in his writings seriously deter the creativity protected by the Copyright Act and punish the expression of speech that the First Amendment was intended to protect.

Judges are not the thought police or the speech police because this democracy—unlike the Third Reich and Soviet Union—does not countenance such, or it did not previously. The evil of doctrines that require certain thoughts and speech is the ability of conformists and opportunists to avoid arguing the merits by simply using a person's words against him.

In reality, Judge Block ruled that based on the essays I was unacceptable, inappropriate, not like him, that I was what Feminism and political correctionalism is trying to eliminate—a man. So, regardless of what the Constitution says, to Judge Block, a ruling against me served the greater good of Feminism and political correctionalism. Marx and Lenin would have praised him.

Judge Block wrote free speech out of the Constitution, except for the speech that he agrees with or serves his interests of the moment.

Bureaucrats like Block don't realize that taking away the rights of those with whom they disagree eliminates the use of established institutions for settling disputes and drives people into the streets.

Judges like Block would better serve their oaths of office by remembering Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy's words, "[t]here must be a recommitment, a rededication to the Constitution in every generation," and that "[t]he Courts are suppose 'to protect unpopular individuals ... and their ideas from suppression—at the hand of an intolerant society.'" *McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Comm'n*, 514 U.S. 334, 357 (1995).

Justice

Not for men and not in American courts.

In America, justice depends on who you are. It has nothing to do with what's right or wrong under the law.

As a little kid, I learned that if you're going to be blamed for something—you might as well do it.

"Revenge is the act of passion. Vengeance is the act of justice." Samuel Johnson.

"The irreplaceable value of the power articulated by Mr. Chief Justice Marshall [*Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137] lies in the protection it has afforded the constitutional rights and liberties of individual citizens and minority groups against oppressive or discriminatory government action. It is this role, not some amorphous general supervision of the operations of government, that has maintained public esteem for the federal courts and has permitted the peaceful coexistence of the countermajoritarian implications of judicial review and the democratic principles upon which our Federal Government in the final analysis rests." *United States v. Richardson*, 418 U.S. 166, 192 (1974)(Mr. Justice Powell concurring). Nice words but no longer, if ever, true.

The U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York "sole motivation in this case, as in all cases, is to uphold the rule of law, protect victims, and hold accountable anyone who breaks the law—no matter what their societal status and no matter how powerful, rich or connected they are." U.S. Attorney Preet Bharara.

The laws and courts of America are concealed injustice for men:

Men receive 63% longer sentences on average than women and women are twice as likely to avoid imprisonment. *Estimating Gender Disparities in Federal Criminal Cases*, Professor Sonja Starr, October 3, 2016.

Women less likely than men to be detained before trial and are released on lower bail bond amounts. *From Initial Appearance to Sentencing*, Journal of Criminal Justice, August 2015, Col. 45.

The government and other institutions of this country are governed not by justice, but the whims of females. You can't get much more arbitrary than that.

Between right and wrong, there can be no compromise.

Moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue. Barry Goldwater.

Ladies' Nights Lawsuit

The suit challenged the constitutionality of nightclubs charging guys more for admission than girls. Just ask yourself, "Is that fair?"

The clubs violate the 14th Amendment constitutional rights of men, which require equal protection under the law for similarly situated persons. The clubs have no legitimate reason for treating males and females differently in their admission policies. The U.S. Supreme Court does not recognize profit as a reason for violating a person's rights through sex discrimination.

When I started thinking about this suit, I wondered, "This is NYC, the party capital of America. Hasn't someone challenged this practice?" Apparently not, so I did.

The case is dedicated to April. She should have given me her phone number.

In 1969, two girls from NOW, the National Organization of Witches, walked into McSorleys' Old Ale House in NYC. The bar refused to serve them. They sued the bar for discrimination under the 14th Amendment Equal Protection clause in the U.S. Southern District Court of New York.³ Clearly they were treated differently, discriminated against, but the Equal Protection clause only applies to private businesses acting as the agents of governments or doing what governments traditionally do. It's called "state action." The Court found McSorleys' was a state actor because New York's pervasive alcohol regulatory scheme made the bar an instrumentality of the State.

Nearly 40 years later, thanks in part to April, I sued a handful of nightclubs in the very same court for discriminating against guys by charging them more for admission than girls. All the nightclubs were under the same alcohol regulatory scheme as McSorleys', and the key issue, as in McSorleys', was whether the nightclubs were state actors. The only difference in the cases was that guys instead of girls were discriminated against. The avowed Feminist Judge, Miriam Cedarbaum, threw the case out by ruling there was no state action.

She found that state action only existed in the serving of alcohol but not in admission. So if a guy can make it to the bar, he's home-free because state action only exists at the bar. That means nightclubs cannot charge guys more for a drink than girls. The clubs can charge guys more for admission but not more for a drink. Neither the Judge nor the defense attorneys

³ *Seidenberg v. McSorleys' Old Ale House, Inc.*, 317 F. Supp. 593 (1970)(Judge Mansfield granted plaintiff's motion for summary judgment); *Seidenberg v. McSorleys' Old Ale House, Inc.*, 308 F. Supp. 1253 (1969)(Judge Tenney denied defendant's motion for a Rule 12(b)(6) dismissal).

realized that most Ladies' Nights charge girls less for drinks than guys, so the decision actually ended up outlawing most Ladies' Nights—if it's ever enforced.

It was a trap unknowingly laid by the defense lawyers and the Judge fell into it. The trap was obvious, but I wasn't about to call attention to it.⁴ After the one and only conference in the case before Judge Cedarbaum, I knew she was going to dismiss. Her ideology forbade her ruling in favor of men, especially when it would cost girls money. But she was faced with only two legal options: (1) overrule two other decisions from the court in which she sat that had found the unequal treatment of the sexes by clubs selling alcohol as unconstitutional, or (2) distinguish those two cases by saying the state was not involved in admitting people to clubs but only involved in the act of serving alcohol. She chose the second.

In her effort to create a distinction without a difference by limiting state action to the handing over of an alcoholic drink, Judge Cedarbaum opened the door for any servers of alcohol, under the Constitution, to charge guys or girls, say \$1,000 for admission, but let the other sex in for free. That would effectively keep the other sex out. Under New York State law, that would be illegal, however, not all states have laws like New York, and many, as with New York, do not enforce their civil rights laws when a guy is discriminated against.

I appealed to the U.S. Second Circuit Court of Appeals, another Feminist friendly court, which upheld the U.S. District Court decision. The Judges ignored that most Ladies' Nights charge guys more for drinks than girls and ruled constitutional the charging of guys more to enter a club. But in doing so, they had to implicitly recognize that it was unconstitutional to charge guys more for a drink. That's good enough for legal authority that guys cannot be charged more for drinks, and since it comes for the Second Circuit, not just a District Court, it has weight in every court in the country. So it was half a victory, half a defeat.

The District and Appeals courts' decisions in effect bring back the political versus social rights theory of the 18th century. In the *Civil Rights Cases*, 109 U.S. 3 (1883) and *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537 (1896), the U.S. Supreme Court justified discrimination against people of darker skin complexion on the theory that the Constitution only guarantees political or civic equality, which is the purview of government, but not equality in social rights, the area of private action and choices. The decisions parallel this bankrupt theory in the realm of sexual distinctions rather than color.

Today, males can be charged any price to enter the social mingling of a nightclub while females walk in for free because nightclubs, even though they carry on a state function and are pervasively regulated by a state liquor authority, can constitutionally choose to charge males more than females. Nightclubs would not dare charge females more because of the social climate in modern-day America. So nightclubs, and any other public accommodation, can now constitutionally ban males by charging them a steep enough price so that none other than Wall Street moguls could afford to attend.

The *Civil Rights* and *Plessy* decisions provided the legal basis for 70 years of ignorance and prejudice that institutionalized itself in every area of society where people interacted with each other. The Second Circuit and District Court's decision have laid the same foundation for

⁴ I also avoided it in the Second Circuit appeal, even though a lady judge picked up on it in the oral argument when questioning the defendants. I kept my mouth shut, and the Second Circuit's decision never addressed it.

discriminating against males in every area of society that is not directly under the control of government or in which state law does not explicitly prohibit discrimination.⁵

State Action

My argument was that state action existed in the discriminatory admission policies of nightclubs because (1) nightclubs exercise a public function—the selling of alcohol has always been a state responsibility; (2) the State controls nearly every aspect of a nightclub’s operations, and (3) the State and nightclubs are entwined, involved in a joint activity, so the State aids or encourages the discrimination, which it has the power to stop but doesn’t. *See Ladies’ Nights* case filings at www.roydenhollander.com.

(1) *Public Function*: “[W]hen private individuals or groups are endowed by the state with powers or functions governmental in nature, they become agencies or instrumentalities of the state and subject to its constitutional limitations.” *Evans v. Newton*, 382 U.S. 296, 299 (1966).

New York State chose to delegate some of its exclusive functions to nightclubs for operating premises where persons can purchase and consume alcohol. Nightclubs, therefore, exercise a public function by which they are entirely dependent upon State decisions to operate successfully.

(2) *Pervasive Control*: New York State controls the number of licenses, the locations for the clubs; sets conditions and prohibitions of operation; and delegates to the clubs the responsibilities to carry out the state’s policies concerning the sale of alcohol and promoting of temperance. The State’s control and responsibility reach well beyond the serving of an alcoholic drink to the level of a club’s lighting, the panorama within, advertising, reputation of the owners, citizenship of the employees, moral character of the customers, the interior floor plan, the exterior blueprint, block-plot diagram, the landlord, type of building, history of the building’s prior use, number and positioning of tables and chairs, manager, principals, principals’ spouses, the people with whom the owners associate, finances, waitress outfits, noise levels outside a club, parking and traffic congestion, and any other circumstances relevant to the “public interest” that “may adversely affect the health, safety and repose” of citizens.

(3) *Complicity*: Nightclubs receive a benefit from the State to operate a money making operation in selling alcohol. It’s a privilege that the State assures will not lessen in value; therefore, it’s a type of state subsidy.

Without a liquor license, nightclubs wouldn’t exist, so they could never discriminate. In effect, the liquor license becomes a license to discriminate. *Seidenberg v. McSorleys’ Old Ale House, Inc.*, 317 F. Supp. 593, 598 (1970).

“By its inaction, [New York] has not only made itself a party to the [discrimination], but has elected to place its power, property and prestige behind the admitted discrimination.” *Burton v. Wilmington Parking Authority*, 365 U.S. 715, 725 (1961).

If the case had been successful.

The nightclubs would most likely lower the price to guys and raise it to girls. That means every guy who entered a club would have more money to buy girls drinks. True the girls would

⁵ Only 28 states have some constitutional or statutory provisions against sex discrimination. 90 A.L.R.3d 158, §1; 14 C.J.S. Civil Rights, § 41.

have to manipulate more drinks from the guys to make up for their admission cost, but I'm confident in their genetic ability to separate a man from his money.

The girls would also end up drinking more, but then they'd have more fun and so would us guys. An added benefit is that in the morning, when the girls woke up with second thoughts about what they had done the night before, they could do what they always do—blame men, in this case me, rather than the guys they partied with. It's a win-win situation for the guys, girls, and the clubs.

Importance

Ladies' Nights are a microcosm for society. Guys shoulder the burden of paying while girls enjoy the benefits paid for by guys.

Charging guys more is just a transfer of wealth from guys to girls because the guys make up the price the girls don't pay. Take all those guys, over all those years who paid more, and compound the extra amount by the Treasury Note rate semi-annually. The result is a large chunk of change transferred from the wallets of guys to the pocketbooks of ladies. Is that fair, especially considering that girls enjoy dancing and sex more than guys—I don't think so.

The suit would have ended guys having to subsidize girls to party. Isn't that called prostitution?

The suit would have cost girls money by ending some of their free riding on guys' wallets.

The suit was on behalf of thousands of men—an endangered species in this country.

After 40 years of lobbying and intimidation, the special interest group Feminism, now the Establishment, has succeeded in creating a customary practice in governmental institutions at the federal, state, and local levels in which the invidious discrimination of men is the accepted and preferred mode of conduct. If there is any question as to the reality of this customary practice, just switch the sexes. Would the New York State Liquor Authority and the courts permit nightclubs to charge females more for admission than males?

While this case was not as important as what guys have been put through by institutions in this society catering to Feminazi and political correctionalist tenets, at its heart is the same issue: invidious discrimination against men. For instance, divorce courts taking away a guy's kids, then making him pay inflated child support to the wife who most probably instigated the divorce, and if he doesn't have the money, he goes to debtors' prison, even when the wife earned millions of dollars the old fashion way by marrying it in the form of her next husband. Of course, some of the child support or hidden alimony is often used to pay off the car and for the gas that females use to drive to Ladies' Nights.

Ladies Nights is a form of pre-marital alimony to compensate for the elimination of post divorce alimony, unless it's hidden in the child support payments.

Invidious discrimination is not petty—even against men. Bigotry in the south, from the perspective of the Black community was of great importance, but from the perspective of the White community at the time, it was of little concern.

The Ladies' Nights case exposed the all too common double standard in American society—girls matter, men are disposable.

The people who operate Ladies' Nights do not charge men more for admission because they do not like men. The sole reason is that they think such discrimination will make them more money.

Profits don't justify the violation of someone's rights. If they did, then King George III should have won and we'd still have slavery. Fundamental Constitutional rights cannot be infringed unless there is a compelling reason that is strictly served. Profits isn't one.

For a short time in the late 1950s and through the 1960s, the 14th Amendment did away with a second or third or fourth class of citizenship. Clearly that is no longer true today, since men can be denied the right of being treated equally with America's first class citizens—females, in not only places of public accommodation but in the courts that are suppose to assure there is only one class of citizenship.

The question here is basic to the way of life in this country and fundamental to its constitutional scheme—is this a country ruled by law or by the ideology of a powerful special interest group.

Criticism

Much of the media coverage of the case focused on what girls thought about it. Asking girls whether they're in favor of "Ladies' Nights" is like asking a beggar whether he's in favor of someone giving him money.

Those in favor of Ladies Nights claim guys can afford it, and girls can't since they make \$.82 for every dollar a guy makes. Most of the people at clubs are in their 20s or 30s. (I'm the exception that proves the rule). A girl in her 20s, working in NYC makes 117% of what a guy makes, and a girl in her 30s working in NYC makes the same. Girls in their 20s in Los Angeles, Dallas, Chicago, Boston, and Minneapolis also make more than guys in their 20s. Sam Roberts, *Income Gap*, August 3, 2007, New York Times. The same is true for other urban areas across the country. Conor Dougherty, *Young Woman's Pay Exceeds Male Peers*, September 1, 2010, Wall Street Journal.

Nationwide, girls control a majority of the nation's wealth and make more per unit of time actually worked. See *Economics* above. Using the \$.82 statistic, for every \$1 a guy makes per hour, a girl makes \$1.17.

Support for Ladies Nights is based on false assumptions: that girls don't hunt men, that they are unwilling to pay money on catching a guy—just look at the cost of fashions, cosmetics, hair styling. Girls will go to the ends of the earth to find a man; they'll just make it look like the guy's doing it.

If there's any doubt about the hunger driving females, even non-lesbian Feminists (assuming there are some), to find a man, go to a club and stay until two or three in the morning. Look at the expressions on the faces of many young ladies as they leave—crushed because no guy hit on them, or danced with them, or asked for a telephone number. Or talk to a Feminist that spent her youth denigrating, demonizing, and blaming guys for everything that ever went wrong in her life. If she's honest, she'll admit to waking up in the middle of the night crying because there's nobody in her bed other than her dog or cat.

Of course, some girls proclaimed they don't go to clubs to meet guys—true. They go to weasel free drinks from men, act the exhibitionist, and boost their ego by playing the desirable princess; otherwise, they wouldn't be taller than when they got up that morning, or their lips ruby red, or eyelashes dark and long, or eyebrows penciled, or hair a color not their own, or blouses tight and skirts short. For girls it's always about sex, because that's the power Mother Nature gave them, so, unless they are lesbian, they're always competing with other girls for either men or the attention of men.

While the nightclubs I sued were not run by the Feminists, there's a climate in this country, a belief that it's okay to violate the rights of guys so long as it benefits girls. The nightclubs were simply exploiting what Feminazism has wrought: girls count, guys don't; girls have rights, guys don't.

Also, many budding young Feminazis go to nightclubs and benefit economically as do the girls that don't consider themselves Feminists but will use Feminist tactics to get what they want but don't deserve; that is, Feminazi opportunists.

Economic view

Charging guys more is just a transfer of wealth from guys to girls because the guys make up the price the girls don't pay.

With girls controlling well over 50% of the wealth in America and making more per unit of time actually worked, if anyone should be paying to enter a club, it's them. Actually, all girls who go to Ladies' Nights owe all the guys who indirectly pay for their admission some form of reimbursement.

Further, who has the most discretionary income? Go look at your local shopping mall. You'll find three or more women's shops for every male one.

The U.S. Supreme Court has used the argument in sex discrimination cases that girls have been traditionally discriminated against in economic terms; therefore, they should receive economic breaks to make up for past discrimination. It's a type of affirmative action for females—taking money from guys and giving it to girls because in the past girls were disadvantaged financially. The Supreme Court is always full of attorneys and not businessmen, so the Justices never realized that to truly compare economic advantages, or disadvantages, requires a consideration of the risk-reward ratio. Men have always occupied societal roles that were more risky than those occupied by females, so by taking into account the risk, the economic rewards provided men were traditionally probably equal to those provided females or less. Today, of course, girls receive more on a risk-reward basis. *See Economics* above.

Ladies' Nights operate under the mistaken belief that more girls go if given an economic break. It's not such a faulty conclusion. The most important thing to girls is money. But girls aren't looking for chump change; they're looking for a chump to gold dig. Because girls can only understand the world in terms of Benjamin Franklins, they figure more guys will go to a club where the prices are less, and that's where the girls will go.

Another reason Ladies' Nights attract fewer girls is that guys have less money to spend on them because guys had to pay more to gain admission. One girl told me, "If men are getting in for free, they have more money to buy us drinks." While not all girls are driven by monetary gain, if you assume they are, you'll end up saving yourself a lot of grief and money.

Further, a girl is not going to a club where she believes there is a lot of competition. She'll go elsewhere even if it means spending more. Remember, girls are looking for a chump to gold dig. In NYC its 9 guys for every 10 girls and if you factor in the gay guys it's probably 7 to 10. Girls want to increase their chances of finding a guy. So, if anyone should be paying more to meet the opposite sex, it's girls.

The Club owners know that Ladies' Nights is just a trick to get guys into their clubs to spend money. A guy shows up, invests \$20, no girls, so he consoles himself by drinking and waiting for the girls who never show. One bar owner said he had ladies night, mostly as a way to attract men, which increased his sales of drinks—a club's real money maker.

Some guys view Ladies' Nights as an inexpensive date. Most guys, however, go to nightclubs to hit on girls, not to take a date. If a girl is on a date with a guy, he's already at second base; time to head for third—her place, his place, a hotel, backseat of a car, or under a bush. If a guy wants a cheap date, then take her to Shakespeare in the Park—she'll be more impressed.

Nightclubs claim Ladies' Nights serve a business reason. That it's a way of marketing. The law calls this a rational or legitimate objective, but when discriminating based on sex, any objective served must be an important one. That's a higher standard than rational, and under the law, marketing is not considered an important objective.

Substitute any other immutable characteristic, such as national origin, religious background, and let me know whether favoring one class of people over another is simply a "marketing strategy."

Look at it this way, if Hilton, Spears, or Lohan are in anyway deterred by having to pay, this could be a good thing in keeping the roads safer.

Mythological view

Hera asked Tiresias who had lived as both girl and guy who enjoyed sex more. He said girls, at which point Hera struck him blind and cursed him never to be able to disclose the truth about girls again.

If girls enjoy sex more, then they should pay for all the courting. If anything, the girls should pay guys to show up at nightclubs to satisfy girls' desires

Sociological view

Girls want to meet guys and guys want to meet girls. Girls spend their time, energy, and often some guy's money looking good, and then wait hoping to attract a guy they like.

Guys have mainly two ways of meeting a girl, assuming they don't go for prostitutes. (1) Intentional—a guy sees a girl he's attracted to and goes over to talk with her. He intended to do something and he did it. Of course, this could also be called reckless endangerment; he saw the warning signs but ignored them. (2) Accidental—a guy bumps into a girl or a girl standing next to him says something and he interjects a remark.

Many guys are shy about using the intentional approach—spotting the prey and going after it, so they hope to increase their chances through the accidental method by going where there is an overflow of girls. For those guys, Ladies' Nights are crucial, assuming they actually produce an overflow of girls.

Ladies' Nights, however, don't produce an overflow of girls, although most people believe they do.

A girl believing Ladies' Nights bring out lots of girls means she'll also believe she'll have to compete against more girls, and the more girls in a club, the less likely she'll attract guys. A girl is not going to a club where there is an overflow of competition. She'll pay an additional \$10 to the amount she has already spent on a manicure, pedicure, leg waxing, hair styling and dying, latest fashions, and sexy shoes that are too tight. She's going where there's less competition.

Take an informal sampling; go to clubs with Ladies' Nights and clubs without. See which has the highest percentage of girls. I've noticed there are more girls at the non-Ladies' Nights.

Motion to disqualify the Feminist Judge

Miriam Cedarbaum, an avowed Feminist and fan of Mary Wollstonecraft⁶, was the Judge in the Ladies' Nights case in the U.S. District Court. In an interview, she said she found no differences between male and female judges, but advocated that 51% of judges should be females. If there is no difference, then why should judicial selection depend on sex rather than the ability of those available for a judgeship?

The first and only time the parties appeared before Judge Cedarbaum was at a scheduling conference. It lasted 40 minutes in which she and I fought while the attorneys for the nightclubs mainly watched like sheep on the sidelines.

At one point during the argument, the Judge said that I must respect her to which I replied somewhat disingenuously, "I do. But you also have to respect me." At the end of the conference, I felt as though I had been in an argument with a girl I had gone out with too long.

The October 3, 2007 scheduling conference was originally set for the middle of the month, but the Court, in an unusual move, quickly moved the conference up following the filing of a motion to dismiss by one of the defendants. That gave me one day to prepare for the scheduling conference, no big deal, since my response to the motion to dismiss was not scheduled until three weeks later, according to the lady Judge's rules of practice. The Judge, however, pulled a fast one and used the scheduling conference as oral argument on the motion to dismiss. But little did she or the nightclub attorneys know that I knew more about the law than they, so her and their efforts, a subtle conspiracy, to intimidate me into withdrawing the case failed.

Unlike most Judges in federal court, Cedarbaum did not allow for the routine recording of her conferences—presumably the better to intimidate those who disagree with her Feminist philosophy.

The Judge denigrated the case and personally insulted me, all of which is against the Judicial Code of Ethics.

She started by mocking the case as "unpopular." To which I agreed, and responded, "So what," since popularity has nothing to do with constitutional rights. A higher court than hers once said, "The Courts are supposed to protect unpopular individuals ... and their ideas from suppression—at the hand of an intolerant society." *McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Comm'n*, 514 U.S. 334, 357 (1995).

I tried to answer her questions but she repeatedly interrupted me with another question the way talk show hosts do. I'm answering question 1, then I'm interrupted with question 2, so I try to answer question 2, then I'm interrupted with question 3, and I try to answer question 3, all the time trying to get back to finish my answer to question 1, but I never do because the questions and interruptions keep coming.

Then she insults me personally by calling into question whether I'm a lawyer at all in an apparently scripted effort with the nightclub attorneys to falsely accuse me of not being prepared to argue against a motion to dismiss that was filed 5 days earlier, and wasn't suppose to be argued until 3 weeks later. Of course the term lawyer may be an insult in and of itself, so by

⁶ Mary Wollstonecraft lived in the late 1700s, and wrote the book *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* in which she argued that girls don't need men. After achieving fame and fortune from her book, she proceeded to engage in a number of illicit affairs, all with men, including one with a married man for whom she pined. She did one thing of value, however, by giving birth to a daughter, Mary, who would later marry Percy Bysshe Shelley and write *Frankenstein*. One rumor says the daughter Mary was fond of having sex on her mother's grave.

questioning whether I was one might have been a compliment, although I doubt it. I responded that “was uncalled for.”

Despite the apparent scheduling trickery of the Judge and the nightclub attorneys, none of them knew about two decisions from the very same court we were in or a U.S. Supreme Court decision that supported my position that any nightclub activity involved state action. Twice, I had to tell the Judge about those decisions before she asked for the case cites.

So there I’m being grilled and insulted over a motion to dismiss at a conference that I had effectively one day to prepare for and still knew more about the case law than the nightclub attorneys and the Judge.

Taking into account the interruptions, insult, suspicious re-scheduling, along with her demeanor and tone of voice, and it all created an appearance of bias—that she was trying to intimidate me into withdrawing the case because it defended men’s rights.

It ticked me off, and I made a standing motion that she disqualify herself. Then she backed off. Probably also realizing her and the nightclubs’ strategy to catch me unprepared to argue the law and intimidate me into giving up on the class action was not going to work.

She did, however, unilaterally turn the putative class action into a *pro se* action, which the courts cannot do without going through the proper procedure, which she didn’t. A *pro se* action meant under her rules there would be no more occasions for oral argument. Presumably, she didn’t want to deal with me anymore—the feeling was mutual.

At the end of the battle, the Judge set a schedule for the submission of papers on whether to dismiss the case. By then, I knew she had made her decision to throw the case out before the conference had even started. All I could do with my papers in opposing dismissal was to put her in a legal corner, hoping she’d do something stupid, which she did.

She ruled that nightclubs could discriminate based on admission price because there was no sale of alcohol when a guy walked through a nightclub’s door. The implication, of course, is that when a nightclub charges men more for a drink, there is a violation of the Constitution because it involves the sale of alcohol. Neither Cedarbaum nor the nightclubs’ attorneys realized that most Ladies’ Nights charge guys more for drinks. Thanks to Cedarbaum’s decision, and the Second Circuit upholding that decision, there are now authoritative federal cases supporting the rule that nightclubs can no longer charge men more for drinks than girls.

After the conference, I checked Cedarbaum’s biography, and when I saw her age, I almost decided not to make a written motion that she recuse herself. Even though she denied my oral motion of recusal, under federal rules I could make a written motion because the conference was not recorded.

The genetic gentlemen in me and every man almost kept me from filing the motion. But a buddy of mine said, “She can handle it. If she couldn’t, she wouldn’t be in the position she’s in.” I also remembered that every time I ever showed a female compassion, I always ended up with a knife in my back—so I filed the recusal motion, and, of course, she ruled against me.

The only interesting matter to come out of the recusal motion was that a Feminist girl attorney for one of the nightclubs submitted a handful of my copyrighted, anti-Feminist essays in order to further prejudice the Judge against my case—typical Feminist tactic, and in this case, probably unnecessary, since the Judge was already biased against the case and me.

The Feminist attorney claimed the writings were guilty of “misogyny”⁷ and negatively stereotyping females. The attorney wanted me punished for what I wrote by having the Court

⁷ My response was “Personally, I disagree with the characterization: one can’t hate that which one lusts after. For example, I doubt [the nightclub] attorney hates chocolate, although she might not like what it does to her.”

sanction me, usually a fine, and deny my motion for recusal. The Court, however, is part of the government, so to punish me for the content of what I said in the writings is a violation of the First Amendment that prohibits government from “abridging the freedom of speech” of the persons. Of course, to Feminists I’m not a person, which was the real basis for the attorney’s argument.

There are two key reasons the Founding Fathers included “freedom of speech” in the First Amendment: (1) to keep government from preventing speech before it is made, and (2) to keep government from punishing speech after it is made, except in a few very restrictive instances, such as yelling “bomb” in Times Square. As Justice Brandies said, the Founding Fathers “believed that freedom to think as you will and to speak as you think are means indispensable to the discovery and spread of political truth; that without free speech ... discussion would be futile. *Whitey v. California*, 274 U.S. 357, 375-76 (1927)(Mr. Justice Brandeis concurring). But today in America, whenever dissent rears up to threaten the growing conformity to Feminism and the pedestal on which it has placed females, the intolerant Feminazis try to crush that dissent with a choir of vituperation and demands for punishment of any person who raises an alternative view.

The Feminist girl attorney also argued that my motivation for bringing the recusal motion was inappropriate, that I’m biased against girls, and my character is bad. Whatever the term “inappropriate” means is beyond me, and it’s surely not going to force me to curtail my speech.

As for “biased,” that requires a person hold an adverse opinion or judgment reached without knowledge or examination of the facts. I’ve done plenty examinations of girls and some of the worst of what I found are in the essays. But even were I a bigot and the devil incarnate, the only issue on a recusal motion is whether the Judge’s actions appear biased, not whether she is biased, but simply appears biased.

If there is any doubt that the Court conference created an appearance of sexual bias on the part of the Judge—just switch the sexes. Consider how I would have been treated had an accident of nature made me a female, and I was suing on behalf of thousands of other females because the defendant nightclubs charged ladies more for admission than guys on “Gentlemen’s Nights.”

As to “bad character,” a person’s rights do not depend upon his character traits or beliefs. (In fact, evidence of character traits is generally not permitted in court.) The Feminists, however, say they do—the personal is political—because that allows them to use the old Commie tactic that anyone who belongs to a disfavored group is guilty of the sins of the worst in that group. So because you are a guy, you have bad character, bad beliefs, and bad motivations; therefore, you have no rights because some guys you never knew did or might have done some bad things.

Sally Miller Gearhart has written that the male population should be reduced to 25% in order to reduce men’s contamination of the planet. That’s advocating genocide. If she were before a male judge and the judge acted in a way that created an appearance of bias, the judge couldn’t deny recusal based on Gearhart exercising her free speech to support genocide against men. Gearhart’s beliefs are irrelevant, her character traits are irrelevant, she’s human, presumably; therefore, she can say what she wants without punishment by the government.

Heightened Contradiction

The problem that the Ladies’ Nights case points out is not whether a few judges or

officials are biased against men—it's the institutionalization of discrimination against men. The Feminazis have demonized, denigrated, intimidated, and coerce men for so long that institutionalized bias is widespread throughout this country. The American culture has turned into a Feminarchy culture in which girls are good, guys are bad.

Imagine the outcry if men receive a service, product, admission, or something for free while females are relegated to paying an additional surcharge for no reason other than that they are the “wrong” sex.

40 years ago, two federal, male judges assured that females could not be treated differently by businesses serving alcohol for on-premise consumption. Since then, such businesses dared not discriminate against ladies but freely do so against men. Now, they will continue their discrimination against men at least in admission policies.

In America, as in Orwell's *Animal Farm*, some are more equal than others.

Lawsuits Loses

I didn't go looking for these lawsuits; they came and hit me on the head when I tried to get my ex-wife—a Russian mafia prostitute who secretly fed me drugs and was a former mistress to the Chechen warlord Ruslan Labazanov—out of my life.

Why'd you lose?

Can't beat the devil in the devil's own court, but you can show she's the devil. I'm 0 for 3 in men's rights class actions, which makes me feel like I'm back in Little League baseball.

It's a modern day witch-hunt—only today the witches are doing the hunting.

The government, from local to state to federal, treats men as second class citizens whose rights can be violated with impunity when it benefits females. Females are more equal than men.

What's important to the feminized American courts and agencies is not the law or issues involved but who the parties are. Just because I'm a troublemaker doesn't mean that absolves others of their violations of the law, although the courts think so.

In one sense, I was a fool for trying to win justice through the judiciary. I should have realized I'd have as much success as a lefty or Jew in the courts of the Third Reich or a capitalist in the courts of the Former Soviet Union. Still, it was a lot of fun.

These judges, especially the male judges, are afraid that criticism from the Feminist Establishment will harm their careers, prevent them from consulting for prestigious law firms when they leave the bench, or they'll lose their membership in the Effete Eastern Intellectual White Trash Elite. White Trash (just because your skin color is dark, doesn't mean you aren't white—look at President Obama's wife) because like the Nazis and Commies their decisions will end up on the trash heap of history.

Many judges also believe that people who dissent from the popular opinions of Feminism and political correctness do not have rights. It's the old plantation mentality. If you're not part of the majority—you don't deserve rights.

Legally, the trilogy of cases was correct, but politically, it was not, and that's the problem with justice in America today. Generally there is none unless you tote the Feminist line.

The judges aren't allowing us guys to fight for our rights within the system. They threw the trilogy of cases out before they even got to discovery. Discovery serves the purpose of producing admissible evidence needed to prove the allegations. So had the cases made it to

discovery, and the defendants obeyed the discovery laws, unlikely, then I could have proved the allegations.

The courts are in effect saying—get lost, drop dead, you’ve got no rights. They don’t even pretend that men have rights. Their Wall Street-like arrogance will eventually come back to haunt them because as Mr. Justice Frankfurter said, “justice must satisfy the appearance of justice.” *Offit v. U.S.*, 348 US 11, 14 (1954).

“[H]istory shows that people have a way of not being willing to bear oppressive grievances without protest. Such protests, when bottomed upon facts, lead almost inevitably to an irresistible popular demand for either a redress of those grievances or a change in the Government.” *Communist Party of United States v. Subversive Activities Control Bd.*, 367 U.S. 1, 167 (1961)(Mr. Justice Black dissenting).

Aren’t you discouraged?

It’s always nice to win, but far better to fight than not fight at all. Of course, I’d rather win after a fight, or even lose after one; just so long as there’s a fight.

“Success is going from one failure to another without a loss of enthusiasm.” Winston Churchill.

At least the trilogy of lawsuits makes clear that there are now two classes of people in America: one of princesses—females, and the other of servants—males.

What do you do now?

The Feminazis won and to the victors belong the spoils—me. There may be other actions in court, but I “do not trust to hope for it is forsaken there” for men.

Often, however, you don’t have to win a case to win a case when you’re a lawyer. Just by taking someone to court requires them to hire a lawyer, which is expensive; the allegations of their bad deeds are forever on the record; and they will go through significant emotional distress. But that doesn’t change society.

If I win the lottery, I’ll set up a law firm that hires lawyers across the globe to drag every Feminist, Feminist sycophant, and Feminist appeaser kicking and screaming into court to make their lives miserable.

If I don’t win the lottery, then the only alternative is the 3rd and 5th sentences of the Declaration of Independence—civil disobedience. After all, what good is a license to practice law when I can’t even defend my own rights in the system in which I’m licensed?

I didn’t become a lawyer to make a lot of money. If I were after money, then I would have become an investment banker. When I was first accepted to law school, I was also accepted to business school. Also, I didn’t become a lawyer to help the underprivileged. I became a lawyer to fight for my rights, but since courts are infested with Feminist ideology, it’s impossible to do that.

When the bureaucrats in the institutions of this country turn against your rights, then it is your right to use violence. “The purpose of civil disobedience is to communicate to others . . . [And] violence is an important factor in change.” Howard Zinn.

Need I say the courts are prejudiced, need I say they are useless, need I say it's time for men to take the law into their hands? Just like back during the Viet Nam War when I was in SDS. Maybe this is my second chance.

Aren't those judges smarter than you?

What good is intelligence if you're a coward?

Some of them are, but often lawyers who become judges do so because they graduated in the bottom half of their law school class and can't find work in the private sector. Since all law schools grade on a curve, the ones in the bottom half would have flunked out without the curve. So remember, the judge who ruined your life or is about to, is most likely a flunky.

Liberals or Lying Lefties

Wimps for believing self-preservation at all costs is a justifiable end. Clearly a female belief.

Liberals will tax citizens more because they believe individuals don't really know how to spend their money, will disarm people because they don't need to be able to defend themselves or determine when it is necessary, and will try to reverse the results of the 2016 Presidential Election because the Americans who voted differently than liberals did not know what they were doing.

Liberty

"Individual liberty is the first concern of every man for without it, life is not worth living." Clarence Darrow.

"Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. We didn't pass it to our children in the bloodstream. It must be fought for, protected, and handed on for them to do the same." Ronald Reagan.

"You don't suppose this kind of thing is ever finished do you? Tomorrow it'll be something else—and another fella will have to standup. And you've helped give him the guts to do it!" Inherit the Wind, Act III, Henry Drummond.

"Freedom comes in many forms ... it means the right to read what I want to read, to think as I please, and say whatever is on my mind. It is the right to disagree, if I wish, with the policies and actions of our government and to fight to change those policies. Every citizen who speaks out against moral wrongs helps our country become stronger and more responsive to the needs of all people." Harold Baer, Jr. U.S. District Judge, July 2, 1999.

Liberty is not surviving at any cost, but paying whatever is its price. "Take more care to end life well than to live long." John Brown.

The federal courts "should give a 'preferred position' to the First Amendment and other constitutional provisions guaranteeing the rights of the individual against the state because the other branches of government are sufficiently vigorous in looking out for the interests of the state." Howard Zinn

To hold a man enslaved to Feminism is to be guilty of robbing him of his liberty.

When a Feminist tries to tell you what to do, respond, "Who are you to tell me how to live?"

The rise of Feminazism may have the result that all of the guys who died for liberty in the past (and the ones who are dying now) basically died so that females can take over the entire planet and civilization to satisfy their own selfish whims.

When a girl talks about freedom and liberty, she means hoing.

Governments are suppose to be dedicated to liberty—not uniformity.

Love

It only exists as a verb—not a noun.

As a noun, love is an illusion created by females to manipulate men, just as religion is an illusion created by those in power to manipulate those who aren't.

To girls, love means a scheme to get what they want from men.

Love is very real for girls and of the utmost importance—just as frauds are to con artists. When a girl says she loves you, she's really saying, "I'm tricking you."

"I grasped at entrancing masks, and in my grip found creatures that made me shudder."

Mephistopheles, Goethe's *Faust*.

"Trouble like first love teaches many lessons." Charlie Chan.

Man

A man is a guy who's not afraid of girls.

A man is a Feminist's worst nightmare.

No man can have self-respect who will not fight for freedom.

The measure of a man is not how much money he makes, how many people he destroys, or how much media coverage he receives, but whether he pursued his first best destiny for that requires the most courage. Of course, his first best destiny might be to make a lot of money, destroy a lot of people, or receive a lot of publicity.

"Whosoever will be a man, must be a non-conformist." Ralph Waldo Emerson.

Men, not females, exhibit discipline in chaos, energy amid hopelessness.

What makes a man is the choices he makes. Not how he starts things, but how he finishes them.

"The true man wants two things, danger and play. For that reason he wants females, as the most dangerous plaything." Friedrich Nietzsche.

Many middle-aged men resent bitterly having been tricked by social mores into sacrificing their lives at a useless job they hate just because it paid enough to support their wives and their wives' children. Today, fathers are considered only as walking wallets and occasional au pairs.

Men are more competitive, rational, logical, and seek to understand how things work.

But men do have a weakness for a pretty face: "And lo man looked on the face of beauty and stayed his hand and since then he was as one dead." Paraphrase from *King Kong*. "The swollen braggart, so petty now, would be here melting at her feet." Mephistopheles, Goethe's *Faust*.

It's a pity how easily men can be fooled. They are like children—they believe anything.

"Stupid, idiotic man! Deluded, duped, seduced since Adam's first day! And age teaches them nothing! Nothing! Ah, men. Eternal fools." Mephistopheles, Goethe's *Faust*.

"A man paralyzed by Helen will not so readily reclaim his senses." Mephistopheles, Goethe's *Faust*.

When are you guys going to wake up? Just because they're pretty and their bodies are soft, doesn't mean they aren't hard and vicious when it comes to money and getting what they want.

Most of today's males still think girls are made of sugar and spice and everything nice when many, especially the Feminists, are composed of lies, avarice and hearts of ice, or are simply fakes, demons and snakes.

Luckily, most Feminazis look like dogs, but even so, most of today's males are too intimidated by the Feminazis to listen to Mother Nature and take back their rights. They expect to secure the favor of the Feminazis by tamely submitting to every species of indignity, contempt, and wrong. They think themselves highly honored when a Feminazi smiles approvingly on them.

Most guys are whining wimps who want others to fight for their rights because they are too scared or cheap to do it themselves.

Such guys are not men but androgynies whom females can walk over indefinitely, and all these guys will do is complain and whine like little girls. That's not to say, I wouldn't let a pretty young thing walk over me in her stiletto heels now and then. But when it comes to my rights—forget it.

There are basically two types male sellouts who submit to Feminist ideology, or Uncle Tims. The guy who agrees with Feminism and the one who is too weak to stand up for his rights. Both give up their manhood because they think that is what girls and society want.

Every man whose life is destroyed in this infernal business of the Feminists is an argument in favor of manhood.

Boys may never grow up, but girls die well before they grow old.

Manhattan

One of the few remaining communist territories on the planet.

Man's World

Hasn't been a man's world since the hunting and gathering days. Read Friedrich Engels's *Origin of the Family*.

Over the past 40 years, Feminist organizations, some funded by taxpayer money and some tax exempt, have skewed American justice to where a female can accuse a guy of sexual harassment, lie to the court, and win a fat award. She can accuse a guy of rape, lie to the court, and send him up the river for 20 years. And she can even intimidate a guy's employer into giving her his job. But she still can't make him love her.

If it's always been a man's world, then why didn't the men collude together and breed and domesticate females in much the same way that they did with cows and horses? It couldn't have been that difficult.

What kind of a world of privilege is it that honors a man with the duty to spend a lifetime supporting others, more often than not in an unsatisfying job?

In childhood, adolescence, dating, marriage, and divorce, females are the ones being pleased—not the ones doing the pleasing.

Marriage

“If we could survive without a wife ... all of us would do without that nuisance.” So said Roman general, statesman, and Consul Quintus Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus in 131 BC.

At some point, guys will realize that getting married is similar to playing Russian roulette with one chamber empty.

The Feminists have created hundreds of thousands of college-educated females for whom no college-educated husbands are available.

When the husband divorces his wife, it's hubby's fault. When the wife divorces her husband, it's still hubby's fault.

When it comes to men: marriage has become a gamble in which the odds are heavily against them.

Marriage is a legal contract among the husband, wife, and family court. That means guys are outnumbered 2 to 1.

Marriage is simply state controlled prostitution.

American men don't want a Feminist at home when they have to put up with Feminist bosses at work who vent their insecurities by creating mean-spirited and authoritarian work places.

Married females live longer than single females. The extra time is greater than that between married males and single males.

Masculinity

Masculinity: virility, valor, resoluteness, honor, gallantry, nobility, forcefulness, machismo, daring, chivalry, boldness, tenacity, potency, sturdiness, self-reliance, compassion, and courage.

Masculinity is a quality that causes individuals to stand for something.

Antonym: feminine, effeminate, ladylike, passive-aggressive, cowardly, duplicitous, hateful, and speaks with forked tongue.

Camille Paglia reminds her men-hating colleagues, masculinity is “the most creative cultural force in history.”

“Masculinity is just becoming something that is imitated from the movies. There's nothing left. There's no room for anything manly right now.” Camille Paglia.

It's a Massacre of Masculinity.

Media

“Through the years of the 20th century even the most mercenary of newspaper owners were, above all, conscious of their duty to inform the public and they backed their reporters to the hilt. It was not just a matter of right or wrong—but common sense. The ethics of good journalism in this era, alas, seems to have been forgotten.” Gabe Pressman

Most of what the news media reports are only allegations because such would not be admissible in court without more work being done. Balanced journalism, therefore, means presenting the allegations from both sides—not just one.

A man's reputation is often destroyed by the media's presumption that he is guilty, which results in news stories that are carefully crafted, consistently unreliable, and often just wrong.

Girls do well on TV because they're good at running off with their mouths. They don't think about what they're going to say, so they don't have to stop to think, which eats up media time.

Cable television is overflowing with loudmouth, know-nothing banshees. The success of many shows and the money they shovel into the pocketbooks of hosts and guests is based on a hatred of men, on demonizing men, and thereby justifying all the harm females cause men by blaming it on men. Essentially a bunch of Feminist Geraldines making a lot of money by whining, "A man made me do it."

Feminazi producers are burying us under fakeumentaries about domestic violence and perfecting bigotry-as-art.

One website states that "Every 15 seconds a female is battered somewhere in the United States." What it doesn't mention is that every 14 seconds females batter their partners, and probably every second a girl is intentionally inflicting emotional distress on a guy somewhere in the U.S.

The media is constantly aggrandizing some female for doing something mediocre, in a mediocre fashion with a mediocre result.

Television and movies overwhelmingly present men negatively and as something dangerous to be contained, attacked, denigrated, or ridiculed as inherently lazy, slobbish, and beer-drinking dimwits.

The University of Western Sydney in Australia did a study focusing on news, features, current affairs, talk, and lifestyle shows. It found that men are widely demonized, marginalized, trivialized, and dehumanized in non-fiction media that allegedly presents facts, reality, and the "truth." Sixty-nine percent of mass media reporting and commentary on men was unfavorable compared with just 12 per cent favorable and 19 per cent neutral or balanced. Men were predominately reported or portrayed in the mass media as villains, aggressors, perverts, and philanderers, with more than 75 per cent of all mass media representations of men showing them in one of these four ways. More than 80 per cent of media mentions of men were negative, compared with 18.4 per cent of mentions which showed men in a positive role.

The media almost exclusively portrays men as the perpetrators of violence against children even though the U.S. National Incidence of Child Abuse and Neglect report in 2000 found that "where maltreatment of children led to death, 78 per cent of the perpetrators were female."

Traditional masculinity has become a target of ridicule in many forms of mass media from TV shows to major newspaper opinion columns and cartoons.

The media and popular culture use violence against men to evoke laughs while sanctimoniously admonishing the use of such against females.

Hollywood gives females jobs they never do in real life, such as a dockworker who looks like a model, or a cop who stands her ground under fire. If terrorists come marching down my street and a female cop shows up, I'll take her gun and defend myself, thank you.

Personally, I don't care if girls sit around an air conditioned studio denigrating, demeaning, and dissing men; wallowing in their delusional victimization so that they can feel self-righteous and superior. But when they vent their psychotic hatred of men by turning it into programs and influencing the passage of laws that foster the discrimination of an entire class because of sex, then they are evil and evil has to be stopped.

Media Appearance Tips

“Thanks for having a serial anti-Feminist on your show.”

Don't rant, don't rave—just answer the questions ask.

Don't interrupt anyone, smile, keep head vertical—not at an angle, don't shift your eyes, look directly at the host all the time or the camera if they tell you to.

Talk slowly so they'll understand you, no “uhs,” lighten up, relax, be open, animated, honest, mocking, logical, merciless, defiant, and yourself.

You can't hear the audience laugh, so pause after you make a joke and imagine they are laughing.

Never say thank you at the end—just nod; otherwise, your words may be cut off.

Answer the question asked.

Button jacket, tuck under seat.

Men's or Male Studies

The courses that claim to be Men's Studies today are just teaching Feminism under another name.

Men's Rights Movement

I don't belong to that group of wimps and whiners. They're trying to win back their rights by acting like girls instead of men.

Most men's rights advocates act like little girls and behave largely as the Feminists tell them to. You can identify them by the politically correct lingo they use and their copying of Feminists tactics by simply changing the sex. For example, “A woman is more likely to physically attack a guy than vice versa.” True, but who cares, unless she's behind the wheel of a Mercedes Benz. Even if she has a gun, most girls can't shoot straight anyway, so unless it's a shotgun, she'll miss.

In one of my martial arts class, one Senshi always told us don't hit the girls and I don't. I let them hit me, which rarely hurts, unless it's low.

What the men's righters don't understand is that girls have different weapons for causing evil, such as fraud and the intentional infliction of emotional distress.

Ministry of Truth

There are two ways to lie: say something that is false or fail to admit something that is true. The last is called prevarication. Feminists and androgynies actually think prevarication is not lying.

The lying about female exploits in order to further Feminazi delusions of female abilities is not the exception but the norm nowadays, and it extends from the downright frivolous to matters of life and death.

Truth is not a mere matter of how many people believe it.

Private Jessica Lynch was quickly touted by the media and U.S. Government as a female “Rambet” protecting the men of her convoy in Iraq. The convoy she was in made a number of wrong turns thanks to the female driver of the lead vehicle. Lynch had no battle wounds but

only blunt force injuries caused when her vehicle crashed—don't know if she was driving the truck. Nine men in her company were shot in the head—execution style. This indicates that they were either trying to protect the females in the company or that Lynch's captors showed her a type of mercy that her male comrades never saw.

Girl golfer Michelle Wie won a mixed boys and girls golf tournament, but the girls were allowed to play from tees that made the course twenty percent shorter for them.

Heroic men of bygone days have been de-emphasized, often in favor of females of limited or even dubious accomplishment. These girls aren't truly great women like Mother Theresa and her Sisters of Mercy but rather are valkyries, masculinized figures who are exaggerated and often imaginary.

Misandry

Misandry is found in almost every genre: books, television shows, movies, greetings cards, comic strips, and commercials. It works in various ways: laughing at men, looking down at men, bypassing, blaming, dehumanizing, and finally demonizing men. As a result, the world view of our society has become increasingly focused on the needs and problems of females and the made-up evils and inadequacies of men. Simply put—a hatred of men.

Misogyny

Are you a misogynist?

No, I don't give messages.

You must hate girls?

Not at all, as with chocolate, girls are one of my favorite favors—regardless of the time of the month.

I don't hate all girls—just Feminazis, and them I despise. I guess that makes me a misogyn-a-feminist—although massaging a Feminist is not an act I would want to engage in.

I don't hate girls; they're perfect—from the neck down.

You can't hate that which you lust after. Take chocolate for instance. I like the taste, but it causes me to gain weight and increases my cholesterol, yet I still eat it. Same with pretty young ladies, only they cause high blood pressure.

Don't hate girls, just what they do to men.

I don't dislike girls. I merely distrust them between a twinkle in the eye and arsenic in the soup.

When I go out to a nightclub or my hip hop class, believe me, what's in my heart is not malice.

I don't dream about middle-aged Feminists but pretty young ladies.

How young?

Depends on the state I'm in.

I'll bet you don't have any girls who are just friends?

That's not true. Some of my best friends are ... no, come to think of it, none of my best friends are females. But that's not misogynistic—it's just smart.

Miss Columbia

“I'm trying to stop you bigots and ignoramuses from controlling the education of the United States.” Inherit the Wind, Act II, Henry Drummond.

The first suit, Miss Columbia I, was against Columbia University's Women's Studies Program, the New York State Regents for requiring the feminization of higher education, and the U.S. Department of Education for supporting the program. The case argued that it was unfair to have a Women's Studies Program but no Men's Studies.

In New York, 57% of all college students are female, 63% of the Master's degrees and over a majority of the doctoral degrees go to females.

Nationwide by 2016, females will receive 64% of the Associate's Degrees, over 60% of the Bachelor's Degrees, 53% of the Professional Degrees, and 66% of the Doctor's Degrees. National Center for Educational Statistics, *Digest of Educational Statistics*, Table 258.

American boys have lower rates of literacy, lower grades, and higher dropout rates. *Science Daily*, June 10, 2009.

If anyone today is in need of special programs dedicated to the furtherance of their education and employability, it's men—not females.

By using tax dollars to support the new-age religious doctrine of post-modern Feminism and the discriminatory enforcement of Title IX, New York State and the federal government have created two classes of citizens in New York's higher education: one of nobility—females and one of serfs—males.

New York's Regents began to feminize education in 1972 in order to increase the number of female students and graduates. In 1972, females made up 42% of all college students. *Bureau of the Census*.

The problem is that New York continues to use the same quota based policies it used 40 years ago, even though today males are now the overwhelming minority in higher education and graduates.

So why is this happening? Because the belief-system that initially drove equal opportunity between the sexes has turned into dogma—a religion that is now its own end resulting in institutionalized discrimination against men.

There's no other way to explain it. It's not affirmative action, since the results have gone far beyond equal treatment by the State's own measures. The purpose of affirmative action is to eliminate the effects of past discrimination and obtain equitable representation, *Johnson v. Transportation Agency*, 480 U.S. 616, 632, 637 (1987), which means it is now time for affirmative action for guys in higher education.

The Miss Columbia I putative class action case started in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of N.Y. The federal judge held that the Class Representatives did not have standing because the post-modern Feminism mandated by New York State and propagated

through the Women's Studies Program by Columbia's Institute for Research on Women & Gender ("IRWG") was not a religion.

Now that might be true, but there is no way of telling without competent evidence of which there wasn't any because the case never reached the stage where evidence is submitted to prove facts. The district court judge, however, simply declared it was "absurd and utterly without merit" that Feminism is a religion, and "Feminism is no more a religion than physics...." *Order* p. 2.

It's unlikely that any rational person believes the tenets of Feminism are as accurate as those of physics. Feminism believes that the differences between the sexes are the result of social conditioning. Science, which includes genetics, evolution, and physics, disagrees. What's more irrational (which is a characteristic of religion) than believing sexual differences have nothing to do with genetics or evolution or that because of sex, one group is entitled to preferential treatment. The Judge obviously never studied science.

The lower court violated the rules by pulling out of thin air a finding that Feminism was not a religion. The judge did this because any person who is considered a taxpayer and connected in some fashion with the impact of government aiding a religion can proceed to trial and will likely win if government activities benefit that religion. Obviously, I'm a taxpayer and connected with Columbia University as an alumnus. But had the lower court not made its fact finding of Feminism not being a religion, then the case would have proceeded to the gathering of evidence stage on the Establishment Clause issue.

Politically, the judge could not allow that or take the chance, so he intentionally ignored that civilization has progressed from medieval days when authority figures arbitrarily decided what was true and what was not without any evidence.

The district judge also called the claim of Feminism as a religion "frivolous." The only thing frivolous and absurd is men looking for justice in the courts of America. The judge simply gave the class of men the bum's rush out of court. What do you think his decision would have been if a college offered only Men's Studies but no Women's Studies?

The lower court Judge interjected his own factual and ideological beliefs or fear of Feminism in order to dismiss the case. Judges aren't supposed to do that, but it happens all the time, especially when taking on the Feminists in a system where men are considered subhuman.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit upheld the lower court's decision. On the Title IX and Equal Protection claims, the Second Circuit ruled that any harm caused guys by the lack of a Men's Studies Program was "speculative." Strange that federal courts don't say the same about the lack of a girl's sports team when a college only has a guy's team. Apparently the law is adjudicated one way for girls and another way for guys.

On the issue of whether Feminism is a religion, the Court of Appeals in its written Order simply did not address the lower court violating the rules by making a fact finding without evidence. During oral argument, however, the issue of religion was the main focus. The Court of Appeals zeroed in on whether I was a taxpayer, since a person with taxpayer status could bring the Establishment Clause violation to trial.

There were two judges in the Court of Appeals hearing. One personally insulted me twice, whom I simply dismissed as the typical male Feminist sycophant. The other, Judge Calabresi, probably the smartest judge in the Second Circuit and a believer in civility, raised two interesting questions. First, whether I had to specifically state in the complaint that I had taxpayer status. Perhaps a technical error, but one the court has the legal power to absolve with

judicial notice. The Court could also have sent the case back to the district court to allow me to add those four words, “I am a taxpayer,” which I requested but the Court refused. When it’s a “hot button” case, the Court apparently lacks the political will to exercise its power in a just manner. Second, whether a complaint alleging harm from a religion has to make a “plausible” argument that the plaintiff was injured by the belief system.

The Second Circuit’s decision was a Summary Order, which means that the law and arguments used by the Court to throw the case out cannot be used in other cases. Think of it as a medieval Queen free to make a decision in one case and a different decision in another case that is similar. Summary Orders are how the U.S. Courts of Appeals in similar fact situations can rule against parties they don’t like but later on rule in favor of parties they do like. It’s the exercise of arbitrary power. Such Summary Orders are near impossible to appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court because they have no juridical importance, since the law and arguments used can only be used against the parties of that particular case. So if a Court of Appeals doesn’t like who you are or what you stand for, it simply makes up some law and arguments and you lose under a Summary Order. The law changes depending on whether you are a dissident or conformist.

So I brought the case again just on the Establishment Clause issue in which the Complaint said four times that I was a taxpayer and I called it Miss Columbia II. The former district court judge declined to hear the case, guess he had enough of me, and the case was sent to another judge, this one a female. She dismissed it basically saying that, except for Columbia not being a party, all the other parties were the same as in Miss Columbia I, so having had my day in court once, I didn’t deserve another shot. It’s called *collateral estoppel*.

Luckily a couple of guys agreed to join the case after her decision and in time for me to file a motion to amend the Complaint by adding these two as plaintiffs. If the judge grants the motion, then *collateral estoppel* can’t apply because the two new plaintiffs weren’t involved in Miss Columbia I. However, she’s not going to grant the motion or if she does, she’ll come up with some argument to dismiss it. And she did just that.

She said the law didn’t allow for an amendment to add new plaintiffs after the original complaint was dismissed for lack of standing. Strange that in the Women’s Studies I case, a Court of Appeals Judge admonished me for not trying to amend the complaint in that case after the district court judge dismissed for lack of standing. Guess what the law is on post judgment amendments depends on whether it will rid the federal courts of men fighting for their rights.

The Women’s Studies II case was appealed to the Second Circuit, which said that if I am ever involved in another case invoking “feminism-as-religion,” I will be sanctioned. Sanctions for an attorney means the court can fine, refer for suspension or disbarment, have arrested, require representation of any indigent—whether citizen or not, demand an apology to Feminists, require posting a bond in future cases, require copying by hand sections of legal treatises, put an attorney into re-education, and demand he obtain court permission to bring future men’s rights cases.

I tried to get into the Supreme Court, which once again said get lost. Also tried with a mandamus petition to have the Supreme Court tell the Second Circuit to knock-it-off but the Supremes ignored the petition.

Feminism as a religion

According to the U.S. Supreme Court, religion does not require gods or goddesses at the center, a hierarchical structure, a church, or folks walking around in robes.

Except for a case in the late 1800s, the U.S. Supreme Court has never defined “religion” as requiring a belief in an omnipotent being or beings. Since the 1960s, the Supreme Court and Courts of Appeals have found religion when no godlike figure was believed in but rather moral or ethical convictions drove an individual’s actions and took a place in the individual’s life parallel to that filled by God or gods in a traditional believer.

Basically, secular beliefs that impose a duty of conscience may function as a religion, including intense personal convictions that may appear incomprehensible, irrational, or incorrect.

Feminists intensely believe themselves princesses by divine right and men the minions of the devil. That’s faith, which is the firm belief in something for which there is no proof. Feminism also asserts that sex roles are a result of upbringing, social conditioning, but science disagrees, which makes that belief incomprehensible, irrational, and incorrect—a characteristic of religion. *Welsh v. U.S.*, 398 U.S. 333, 339 (1970).

Feminists advocate a quota-ocracy as opposed to a meritocracy; want a female commander-in-chief but don’t want to register for the draft; demand jobs above the glass ceiling but not in the Tombstone Basement; believe that because they were born female, they deserve preferential treatment; complain about being disenfranchised, yet they are the majority in this republic; lobbied and got a Government office dedicated to female health when ladies live longer than guys. All infer an underlying irrationality.

Religion has the power to cause a person to act against her self-interest. For example, when a rich guy is hitting on a girl at a club, it’s in her self-interest to play up to him. If she’s a Feminist and the guy uses the term “girl,” she’ll try to censor his speech by nastily telling him to say “woman.” He’ll simply move on to a more agreeable babe, and the religion “Feminism” will have overcome her genes.

So think irrationality and doing something stupid and you’ve got Feminism, a religion.

A legal test for whether a belief system is a religion has been adopted by five Courts of Appeals, but not the Second Circuit. The belief-system (1) addresses fundamental and ultimate questions having to do with deep and imponderable matters, (2) is comprehensive in nature, (3) has formal and external signs such as structure, organization, efforts at propagation, and observance of holidays. Not all of the indicia need be satisfied for a belief-system to be a religion, but in the case of Feminism, they are.

Feminism provides followers with a faith-based certainty that they are the sole possessors of the highest form of truth to the answers of life’s persistent questions. The belief-system shapes the entirety of its followers’ lives with thought patterns that make possible the description of realities, the formulation of beliefs, and the experiencing of inner attitudes, feelings, and sentiments. It provides a conscious push toward an ultimacy and transcendence that provide norms and power throughout life.

Women’s Studies programs are “intended to introduce students to the long arc of feminist discourse about the cultural and historical representation of nature, power, and the social construction of difference.” IRWG’s *Fall 2007 Course Guide* at p. 1.

Columbia’s Women’s Studies program propagates the modern-day religion of Feminism through its lectures, seminars, consciousness indoctrination sessions, publications, career preparations, counseling, historical revisionism, propagandizing, unanimity of thought labeled “politically correct,” a pantheon of idols such as Mary Wollstonecraft, *de facto* disciples and apostles, and public lecture series.

Suppose Columbia University offered a program in Islam of the type that the Madras schools do. That brand of Islam says Christians are infidels. Feminism says the same about men. Do you think New York State and the U.S. Government could get away with aiding that? .

Women Studies Programs are nothing more than Matriarchal Madrases. They find revisionist history in obscure corners of myth and legend.

State and Federal aid for Feminism

The “three main evils against which the Establishment Clause was intended to [protect are] sponsorship, financial support, and active involvement of the sovereign in religious activity.” *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, 403 U.S. 602, 612 (1971).

The Establishment Clause’s purpose is to avoid the danger that “powerful sects or groups might bring about a fusion of governmental and religious functions ... to the end that official support of the State or Federal Government are placed behind the tenets of one,” *Sch. Dist. of Abington Twp. v. Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203, 222 (1963).

State educational program requirements along with Federal and New York State funds aid the proselytizing of Feminism in higher education in New York.

Statewide plans, policy statements, and the registering of Women’s Studies programs result in New York State sponsoring, supporting, and monitoring the propagation of Feminism in higher education, the work place, and society. For example, New York State’s major policy statement *Equity for Women in the 1990s* requires:

1. the N.Y. Education Department to be responsible for assuring:
 - a. changes in teaching strategies and cultural attitudes to female friendly ones,
 - b. changes in people’s thought patterns to further female interests,
2. statewide compliance with affirmative action policies for females,
3. implementing change through education and appropriate action to assist females,
4. college teachers to undergo training and their teaching regularly monitored and reinforced with female friendly strategies,
5. research on current issues facing females be developed, supported, and promoted,
6. major revisions in curriculum and teaching are necessary,
7. changes in teaching strategies and cultural attitudes,
8. N.Y. Education Department to collect data necessary to carry out the Regents’ action strategies,
9. N.Y. Education Department to conduct academic reviews at colleges and universities to assure teaching practices comport with the Regents’ Equity for Women policies,
10. N.Y. Education Department receives reports from college affirmative action officers to assure colleges comply with the Regents’ affirmative action for females in recruitment and promotion in professional and managerial educational programs,
11. N.Y. Education Department’s Affirmative Action Officer assures the replication of college practices and the monitoring of such practices that benefit females with support while all other practices are eliminated with particular care taken with curriculum in both content and methods of instruction,

12. females be given extra assistance,
13. appropriate textbooks be used in all courses,
14. those responsible to bring about the above changes are college faculty, administrators, staff members, students, deans, athletic directors, governing boards, and executive officers of all New York educational institutions, cultural institutions, N.Y. Education Department, employers, business, and industry in the State.

The federal government by delegating its college accrediting responsibilities to the State facilitates and aids New York in its policies of advancing Feminism in colleges.

Funds from the State and the U.S. Department of Education, which are not student aid, go directly into supporting the operation of Women's Studies Programs in New York State.

“The history of governmentally established religion, both in England and in this country, showed that whenever government had allied itself with one particular form of religion, the inevitable result had been that [government] had incurred the hatred, disrespect and even contempt of those who held contrary beliefs.” *Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421, 430-31(1962)

Dictatorship of the majority

Women's Studies have created a dictatorship of the majority—not just on college campuses but throughout the fabric of society by imposing a unitary belief system of Feminist orthodoxy that dictates speech and conduct.

“The classroom is peculiarly the ‘marketplace of ideas.’ The Nation's future depends upon leaders trained through wide exposure to that robust exchange of ideas which discovers truth ‘out of a multitude of tongues, [rather] than through any kind of authoritative selection.’” *Keyishan v. Board of Regents*, 385 U.S. 589, 603 (1967)(citing *United States v. Associated Press*, 52 F.Supp. 362, 372 (S.D.N.Y. 1943)).

Discrimination of men

“The vigilant protection of constitutional freedoms is nowhere more vital than in the community of American schools.” *Shelton v. Tucker*, 364 U.S. 479, 487 (1960).

The purposes of education to enlighten, elucidate, provide the practical means for furthering oneself in society, and to defend against unjust attacks are thwarted when doctrines favorable to the majority advocate discrimination against the minority, and administrators fail to provide programs helpful to the minority in countering such discrimination.

“Discrimination itself, by perpetuating ‘archaic and stereotypic notions’ or by stigmatizing members of the disfavored group as ‘innately inferior’ and therefore as less worthy participants in the political community, ... can cause serious noneconomic injuries to those persons who are personally denied equal treatment....” *Heckler v. Mathews*, 465 U.S. 728, 739-740 (1984).

Women's Studies are the varsity sport of choice for campus coeds in their never-ending war against men. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 has downsized or eliminated men's varsity teams, now it's time Columbia and other colleges do the same to their vociferous Women's Studies programs or provide equivalent benefits to men in the form of Men's Studies programs. When a college only has a guys' rugby team, the injury to girls who want to play

rugby is that there is no girls' team. The same logic applies to Women's Studies programs of which there are over 400 in America compared to perhaps 5 Men's Studies programs.

The discrimination in higher education is depriving male students and male alumni of an equal educational opportunity as compared with females. Men, the ones most likely to take courses providing contrary perspectives to Feminist Women's Studies programs, have no opportunity to do so.

For example, at Columbia University, there are no programs that provide males, a minority at the college, the opportunities to nurture their talents as females have in the Women's Studies program because there is no Men's Studies program.

Women's Studies programs with all their incidences of benefits give females a competitive advantage over males in education, the work place, the courts, the culture, and society as a whole. *Cf. In re U.S. Catholic Conference*, 885 F.2d 1020, 1028-31 (2d Cir. 1989)(citations omitted).

Men have no problem competing on an even playing field with girls, but Woman's Studies unfairly tilts the field in favor of females, which is the only way they can beat a guy unless it's in the area of T & A.

"Fairness in individual competition for opportunities ... is a widely cherished American ethic. Indeed, in a broader sense, an underlying assumption of the rule of law is the worthiness of a system of justice based on fairness to the individual." *Regents of University of California v. Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265, 319 n. 53 (1978).

New York State and college Feminist policies simply treat males unfairly, which is a discriminatory impact. *See International Broth. of Teamsters v. U.S.*, 431 U.S. 324, 335 n. 15 (1977). Equal protection under the Fifth and 14th Amendments do not permit programs with a discriminatory impact that are motivated in part by ill will toward a particular sex.

Sure men can take Women's Studies courses, but it is of no benefit to them; just like a girl taking a male sport—she'll spend her time on the bench. In a Women's Studies program, the guy will spend his time being walked over by the girls in the class and the teacher as a result of the institutionalized ill will toward men.

Slamming the door in a person's face is not the only way to keep him out. Another way is to make the environment within so hostile, traducing, and demeaning that it will deter his entrance. Women's Studies programs do not bar males from participating, but the opprobrious treatment males receive, the belligerence of castigations, the collective guilt heaped on them, and the denial to males of similar perks given females effectively locks the gates to all men but a few.

Separate but equal

Male athletic programs are geared toward benefiting men while Women's Studies programs are geared toward benefiting females with Feminist ideology, strategy, tactics, and training for exploiting the modern-day social bias against men. *See Equity for Women in the 1990s, New York State Regents Policy and Action Plan* (1993).

Science and even the courts recognize that fundamental differences exist between the sexes. *United States v. Virginia*, 518 U.S. 515, 533 (1996). Just as the physical differences between males and females allow for the constitutionality of separate but equal sports teams under Title IX, 34 C.F.R. 106.34(a)(1), so also should the mental differences that stem from those physical differences require separate but equal gender studies. Following New York

State's requirements presented in *Equity for Women in the 1990s*, Columbia University and other colleges' Women's Studies programs are built on the psychology of females in the same way the University's football program is built on the physical make-up of males.

Women's Studies programs use practices that benefit females with support, recruitment, and promotion; use teaching strategies that accommodate female learning patterns and leadership style; and institute the promotion of female friendly strategies. *Equity for Women in the 1990s*, pp. 2, 4, 8-10. If there are female friendly strategies, then logically there are male friendly strategies that could be used in Men's Studies programs.

The success of New York State and colleges psychologically tuning Women's Studies to females is indicated by the disproportional number of females and female teachers in the programs; females receiving financial support; female and Feminist organization networking contacts; career placements of females; and a curriculum focused on feminine needs and problems.

New York colleges also have sports programs geared toward females to balance off those for males, so it is only fair that colleges provide a gender studies program built on the different psychological make-up of males. Without a Men's Studies program, the sexes are treated unequally, which is an inequity that contributes to unequal career opportunities later on.

For example, men have a disproportionate share of the dangerous jobs, are frequently overqualified for their work, and do not get the same economic return per unit of time or unit of risk from their education as females. This disparity is harmful to individuals and to society. Men often find it difficult to provide for their families. Their opportunities are curtailed; and the nation, competing in the global marketplace, is deprived of much valuable talent.

Women's Studies programs give female students and female alumni an exclusive opportunity over their male competitors in the University and society by using federal and state resources to give girls a leg up over guys. A program from the male point-of-view would enable males to develop their abilities and skills for battling effectively in the ever-present "gender wars" raging in this society.

Impact of Women's Studies

The excuses for violating the rights of guys throughout society largely come from research conducted in Women's Studies programs. For example, Women's Studies support punishing men for speaking as they will and acting as they chose even when such actions do not violate any laws.

Women's Studies programs influence how people think, believe, and behave in a manner that leads to the violation of the rights of the minority—men.

Women's Studies preach a dogma rooted in the hatred and demonization of men. It depicts men as responsible for the world's evils from which the world can be delivered by simply filling positions of prestige and influence with females or androgynies.

Women's Studies have turned America's colleges into a breeding ground for the Feminist hatred of men. They've become boot camps for violating the rights of men in a society biased against men. Women's Studies programs turn out Feminist storm-troopers that go forth perverting American ideals, the rule of law, the Constitution, and destroying men with impunity.

The programs use lawyers and Feminist activists that teach females how to use tears, tantrums, fraud, threats of an unjust legal system, and, for the good looking ones, sex, to take advantage of men and any institution that involves men in order to get what they don't deserve.

The aim of Women's Studies is not equality, but to create and perpetuate a legal, social, and economic substratum occupied by men toiling in a Fritz Lang "Metropolis" like underworld.

The programs are trying to do the same thing that the Commies did in Russia—socially re-engineer men. Just look at the harm that red lunacy caused.

Recruitment & Networking

Woman's Studies programs function as Feminist recruitment and networking centers. Girls in the program have an inside track to jobs in academia, government, media, business, and nonprofit groups through Feminists already in positions in those fields. The Feminists in those fields are not about to hire men, while the men in those fields so fear the Feminists that they will generally hire a girl over a guy.

Training

Woman's Studies programs train a large network of acolytes to transform American institutions according to strict Feminist specifications. The programs provide practical training for Feminists to

1. obtain and use government tax dollars to rig the judicial system against men through VAWA indoctrination training programs;
2. exploit a court system biased against men through fraudulent sexual harassment suits and false accusations of domestic mistreatment to obtain custody, child support, and put a man in jail;
3. sway the media into reporting only the evils of men but only the good of females;
4. use government tax dollars for Feminist tax exempt nonprofit organizations, which frees up private money for Feminist lobbying and political action committees.

Murder and perjury

Women's Studies aid and abet murder by providing fatuous excuses for such. For example:

"Oh you were too lazy to go to the corner drug store to buy a contraceptive—abort."

"That baby is too much work—throw it in the garbage."

"Young sons don't listen—drown them."

"You found a new boyfriend, want a new husband—kill the old."

Where do you think all those lunatic female syndromes come from? Women's Studies voodoo them up giving females *carte blanche* to do whatever their irrational whims tell them, regardless of ethics or the law:

1. A girl wants to murder her husband and get away with it; Women's Studies pull out of the hat the phony psychological "Battered Spouse" syndrome.
2. A female wants to disappear the baby she just had because he's too much work and she'll have to cut back on her partying, Women's Studies programs magic up another fraudulent psychological get-out-of-jail-free syndrome, "Postpartum Depression."
3. A girl wants to lie to the court about who the real father of her child is, about her boyfriend mistreating her, about her husband abusing his children, about some guy raping her

because when she sobered up she had second thoughts—no problem. Women’s Studies schizoid paradigm of females as strong and independent when they want something they can’t handle and victims when they screw up will avoid any prosecutions for perjury, because Women’s Studies says it’s really the guy’s fault for feminine evil.

Ms. –Information

Woman’s Studies provide a body of shyster scholarship that universities foist on America as proven truths. The concepts are largely false and misleading, but no one outside of academia has the time to show them for the feminine deception they are. For instance, girls make less than guys, guys own most of the assets in America, guys kill more human beings than girls, fewer tax dollars are spent on girls’ health problems, girls shouldn’t have to register for the draft, girls are strong and independent persons—if so, let them register for the draft.

Ever take a Women’s Studies course?

No, I’m not that masochistic, but I’ve talked to a number of guys who have. What a horror they went through.

Why sue Women’s Studies at Columbia University?

As an alumnus of Columbia University, I tried to find courses to audit that would provide information and arguments to help me expose the duplicity the Feminists use to do evil to men. I went seeking the truth at Columbia but found none—only the one-sided, deceitful, irrational belief system of Feminism. But if I had found the other side, there would have been no lawsuit.

Also, to plunge a knife into the heart of darkness of Feminazism.

Money

If I had enough money, I could beat the Feminazis. I wouldn’t win most of the cases, but enough to mortally wound them. But I’m broke.

Half my assets disappeared in the dot-com bubble thanks to my crooked female stockbroker at Salomon Smith Barney, and the other half went to fighting against the Feminazis, including those who violated my rights in helping my ex-wife, the Russian mafia prostitute and former mistress to a Chechen warlord, remain in the U.S. making lots of money illegally, laundering it, and evading taxes.

“Money is great, but sometimes a guy just gets pretty damn sore and money doesn’t matter anymore.” Mike Hammer.

Money often interferes with higher pursuits.

Girls always cost guys money. It’s a fundamental law of the universe.

Some people will do anything for money; others will do anything for justice.

Mother Nature

“Mother nature cannot be fooled.” Richard Feynman.

The fruit of young girls will always strive to find that connection with a man, not an androgyny.

The Feminists' war against 6 million years of evolution is doom to failure—eventually. But like religious fanatics, they'll cause a lot of harm in the meantime.

From 1900 to 1950 the male/female ratio in the U.S. was above 100%, but since 1950, it's been in the lower 90% category—something's wrong.

Motivation to Fight the Feminazis

Justice! But I'll settle for vengeance.

So that, "They'll read in their papers . . . that [I] smashed a bad law. . . . made it a joke." Inherit the Wind, Act III, Henry Drummond.

Maybe I'm just suffering from PMS—persecuted male syndrome.

If females can have all these lunatic syndromes to excuse murdering the unborn, newborns, kids, boyfriends, and husbands, than I can have one to excuse me for fighting for my rights.

There's a lot of fun in fighting the Feminazis and it is almost as interesting as the anti-Vietnam War movement.

What started you on your anti-Feminist crusade?

Why, I married a Russian mafia prostitute who was a former mistress to a Chechen warlord, of course. I didn't know it at the time while working in Russia because my mind was so clouded by the drugs she was secretly feeding me. After bringing her to America, I realized she had used and tricked me, so I tried to find some justice. But the courts treated her like a saint because the Feminists had infested them or made judges fearful to do justice for any a man. As for the immigration system, the Feminists had so emasculated it that after finding she committed marriage fraud—a crime, she's still here over eight years later continuing her nefarious activities.

My ex-wife, the Ho, as my friends and I affectionately call her, secretly fed me drugs without knowing or caring whether I was allergic to them or what my tolerance level was. If something had happened to me, she would have told the Russian or New York police with the tears she can cry at will, "Oh you know these men with their drugs. I told him to stop, but he wouldn't listen." To females like her, such evil is justified. No wonder she's a practitioner of black magic and a devotee of the anti-Christ. It's not for nothing that the Bible depicts such females as doing the Devil's bidding.

Feminism started making the rounds when I was in collage, but I didn't make up my mind about it until the Feminists started plastering signs around campus saying, "It's not your heart he's after." What hypocrisy. It could just as well be said, "It's not your heart she's after but your wallet." At least guys are driven by Mother Nature, but with the females, it's greed. That's when I decided the Feminists were just another special interest group like the oil and gas lobby of the 1960s.

My Jihada against them, however, did not start until the Edgar Allan Poe tale of horror I went through in fighting for my rights against my ex-wife, her profit driven divorce lawyer, and Feminist advocates.

American law enforcement agencies and courts largely ignored or stepped on my rights in order to follow the Feminazi rule of "punish the man, leave the girl alone," for example:

- A lesbian-Feminist divorce judge forced my attorney into lying to me in order to prevent an annulment based on my ex-wife's prostitution activities.

- When entering the country from overseas, Customs detained and interrogated me because of a fraudulent Temporary Restraining Order my ex-wife took out against me which had been dismissed the previous year. Customs didn't treat me like a terrorist, however, because terrorists enter the country freely.
- The F.B.I., after tracking down the goon that my ex-wife used to threaten me a few times, refused to do anything because they were afraid of upsetting him and infringing his privacy rights. The agent warned me not to open my door to anyone I didn't know, duh, I live in NYC, and be careful out in public. He also said not to contact the F.B.I. again because it wasn't an investigative organization. So then what does the "I" stand for—idiots?
- The F.B.I., after testing the narcotics my ex-wife secretly fed me, refused to tell me what they were.
- On the other hand, my ex-wife falsely swore to being a U.S. citizen when she registered to vote—that's a federal and state felony. The New York City Board of Elections referred her crimes to the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of N.Y. and the District Attorney for Queens but in accordance with Feminism nothing happened because she's a girl and an alien. What do you think happens to me if I commit a federal and state felony?
- The F.B.I. ran me out of Milwaukee when I was investigating a Russian couple that operated one of Southern Russia's premier call-girl operations. The couple had apparently expanded their operations to Milwaukee and were defendants in a Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organization ("RICO") suit I brought against my ex-wife and her Russian and Chechen mafia associates. The F.B.I. arranged for a female associate of the couple to file a complaint with the local police that I was "harassing" her—typical Feminist tactic and lie. The police then threatened me with arrest, which effectively ended my investigation, since contacting any other potential witnesses against the couple would result in the F.B.I. telling them to also falsely accuse me of harassment.
- As for the RICO case, the federal judges, which included Justice Sonia Sotomayor when in the Second Circuit, threw it out by doing what "activist" judges always do—rewrite the law passed by Congress so as to reach a result consistent with Feminism.

The story behind the RICO case can be thought of as an Edward R. Murrow little picture of how the Russian and Chechen mafias expanded their sex industry into the U.S. with the tacit assistance of the Feminists and Feminist thinking courts and U.S. law enforcement agencies. The full story is at www.Been-Scammed.com.

The following is a summary:

While managing a private detective agency in Russia, I met and married this 6' 1", vat-dyed blonde with grey-blue wolf eyes. Brought her to NYC where she started stripping at Flash Dancers—that was a tip off even for me. With the aid of Russian Military Intelligence, her diary, my Russian lawyers in Moscow and Krasnodar, private detectives in Cyprus and Mexico City, and a bunch of interviews conducted by me, I found out she was a prostitute, a former mistress to a Chechen warlord, a drug smuggler, a money launderer, and had married me for a green card. So I kicked the slut out of my apartment.

Since the marriage did not last two years, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (now USCIS) would start deportation proceedings against her unless I committed perjury by

saying we were still happily married and agreed to sponsor her for a green card. Naturally, she and her immigration lawyer tried to get me to perjure myself and sponsor her. I declined their offer. That left her the Violence Against Women Act (“VAWA”), written by the Feminists, as her best hope for a green card.

VAWA requires an alien spouse in my ex-wife’s position to claim abuse in order to receive a green card without her American husband sponsoring her. *See VAWA below.* Homeland Security determines whether the American husband committed abuse based solely on information provided by the alien wife, her lawyer (paid for by the federal government) and her Feminist advocate (paid for by the federal government). Any information from the husband that he didn’t do what he’s accused of doing is thrown in the garbage.

It helps under VAWA for an alien to file false police complaints and acquire an *ex parte* (that means the husband is not present) restraining order in state court against the husband. Homeland Security accepts such documents as proof positive of the husband committing abuse even though the police and courts latter conclude there was no basis to the accusations.

My ex-wife and her immigration lawyer filed a complaint of extortion against me with the police and obtained an *ex parte* temporary restraining order (“TRO”) from the Queens Family Court by claiming I threatened her with a gun and a knife and bruised her arm. It didn’t matter that she was the one who came at me with a knife twice and the bruise on her arm was from my taking the knife away from her on one such occasion. The gun and knife allegations against me along with the extortion were pure fantasies. But in Feminarchy America, all of it meant an evil man was harming an innocent female.

In response, I filed for an annulment/divorce, and tried to obtain a temporary restraining order against her based on her threats to use her Russian and Chechen crime associates to do me harm. The Feminist judge and her female clerk in the Queens Family Court laughed at me. A Russian mafia-moll gets a TRO based on lies and I get derision.

To prove my annulment and divorce actions, I went to my ex-wife’s hometown of Krasnodar, Russia looking for evidence.⁸ Sounds logical, after all that’s where she started out as a prostitute, and since New York didn’t have no-fault divorce at the time, the evidence would help either for an annulment or a divorce. My going to Krasnodar, however, prodded the detective bureau of the 114th Precinct in Astoria, Queens to try to arrest me for violating the TRO.

Where did those idiots expect me to go for evidence—Buffalo? What alleged danger was she in by my questioning her friends, neighbors, former criminal associates, former professors, and sex customers in Krasnodar when she was 5,000 miles away in NYC? If anyone was in danger, it was me. A couple of Russian military intelligence guys told me to be careful in Krasnodar. As it turned out, the witnesses I found in Krasnodar were the ones in danger and subsequently threatened into silence. Even my Krasnodar lawyer’s children were threatened by my ex-wife’s Chechen gangster associates.

Thanks to a good male lawyer, the detectives at the 114th never arrested me because they had nothing to go on. The TRO against me had been dismissed for my ex-wife’s failure to prosecute because all she needed for VAWA was that she had gotten a TRO.

Over a year after the dismissal of the TRO when re-entering this country from overseas, my name came up on Customs’ watch list. Customs detained me for questioning because of the dismissed TRO. Customs doesn’t detain terrorists and repeat criminal offenders, but a citizen man, falsely accused by an alien Russian mafia prostitute, is pulled aside for questioning. Then

⁸ Krasnodar is a city of one million near the Black Sea and about 300 miles from Chechnya.

again maybe they thought me a potential threat to Feminarchy America—hope I can prove them right.

My first divorce lawyer, a female, treated me as though I was the culprit and there was something wrong with my wanting my wife to be faithful—”controlling” the lawyer called it—I fired her.

My wife’s attorney, probably paid for by the Department of Justice Office Against Violence to Women, tried to coerce me into not going to trial by charging me with the usual Feminist false accusations of battery. He claimed to have evidence, but he never produced it because he was lying. That was a violation of the attorney Disciplinary Rules, so I filed a complaint against him. The Disciplinary Committee, pretty much run by Feminists, did nothing.

My second lawyer, an androgyny, sold me out when the lesbian judge leaned on him not to go to trial. He agreed to a settlement without my okay. I wasn’t even in the room at the time because the lesbian judge told me to step outside. My lawyer lied to me about making any agreement, and as a result, I didn’t find out about it until a couple of months later. I fired him, and complained to the lesbian judge who said I could make a motion to rescind my lawyer’s agreement but it most likely wouldn’t succeed—Feminist justice.

Before I decided on whether to make the motion, I started receiving threats from some Russian mobster working for my ex-wife. His first threat told me not to make a motion to re-open my prior lawyer’s agreement, which I wasn’t going to do anyway, since it would have been a futile act given the Feminist judge. So, the marriage was legally over, but not the war.

My next move was to file a complaint against my sell-out attorney with the Disciplinary Committee, which dismissed the complaint because of lack of evidence even though I had a witness to my attorney lying to me that there was no settlement. The witness was an attorney who graduated Harvard Law School, but the Disciplinary Committee refused to interview him.

The threats from the Russian mobster started up again, this time telling me to stop providing the Immigration Division of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow with information on my ex-wife who the Embassy was investigating for possible deportation. I went to my local police, who laughed at me and did nothing, then to the FBI which found out who was making the threats but refused to tell me.

In the Manhattan Family Court, I filed for a restraining order against my ex-wife and her unknown gangster friend. The Feminist female judge refused to allow me discovery to find out who the threatening mobster was.

So, I filed a civil Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organization (“RICO”) case against my ex-wife for which the Office of Violence Against Women did not pay her legal fees and against her Russian and Chechen mafia associates, her attorney for which his lawyer’s insurance policy did not cover, and Flash Dancers where she stripped. My ex-wife and her attorney had to pay out of their own pockets for their own defenses—ain’t that a shame. I received another threat—so what.

The RICO complaint was nearly a hundred pages long. What do you expect? The main characters were a Russian slut, strip clubs, gangsters, and a law firm that makes money keeping Russian prostitutes in America. There’s bound to be a lot of illegalities going on.

The Russian and Chechen mobs, which often work together, are different from the Italian one. It’s almost as though the Russians and Chechens have an organized crime gene that turns on whenever two or more of them have the opportunity to make money violating the law. The entire former Soviet Union is essentially a land of RICOs.

I went to Milwaukee to investigate two of the Russian mafia defendants, a husband and wife team that ran the premier modeling and call girl ring in Krasnodar. The FBI basically ran me out of town by manipulating the local police into threatening me with arrest.

The RICO case was dismissed. 10% of federal cases are dismissed, but 65-70% of civil RICO cases are dismissed. I appealed, and the panel of Second Circuit judges, headed by Sonia Sotomayor, upheld the dismissal. Next I petitioned the U.S. Supreme Court to hear an appeal but it didn't want anything to do with it. *See Den Hollander v. Flash Dancers Topless Club*, 173 Fed.Appx. 15 (2d Cir. 2006)(Sotomayor), *cert. denied* 549 U.S. 829.

The federal courts dismissed my RICO suit against the Russian and Chechen mafias and my ex-wife, an associate of both, most likely because she was an alien girl and I an American man.

Just switch the sexes. Imagine I was a female and my ex-wife an ex-husband who made lots of money for the Russian and Chechen mobs by pimping, laundering money, and smuggling drugs. Do you think the courts would have done something then?

My ex-wife would follow a dollar to hell, and violate plenty of laws doing so. Yet government institutions, state and federal, laughed at me, refused to meet their responsibilities, ignored the law, and threw me out into the street like a bag of garbage.

On the other hand maybe I'm stuck in Dr. Caligari's cabinet, just unlucky, or the fates hate me.

Here are some other personal reasons for my fighting the Feminazis, after all the personal is political—or is that only when the target is a man.

Let's start with the most powerful country in the history of the world trying twice to send me half way around that world to use my life to protect rubber trees owned by Firestone in the Mekong Delta of Vietnam. At the same time, the other half of my generation, or a good percentage of them, were walking around in see-through blouses and mini-skirts having sex whenever they wanted while I was dodging the draft. But what I went through was nothing compared to other guys in my generation who were dodging bullets.

Then after beating the draft and the end of one of the longer wars in American history, a television news director tells me he couldn't give me a reporter's job because I'm not a girl.

Then after law school, 9 of 10 federal agencies I apply to turned me down. In all nine, the hiring decisions were made by girls and most were less prestigious than the job I finally obtained with the Treasury Department.

Why do you try?

What do you expect, I'm a Libra. I don't like having my rights violated. I don't like people pushing me around to give girls an advantage they don't deserve. Especially in a society that bends over backwards, or is it forwards, to give females more rights than men.

If all you do in life is to make yourself safe, then it's not a life worth living.

Best not to live a slow and boring life where the furies of regret and dawdling of delusions plague the conscious.

The choice is, as is always the choice, between them and you. What you want to do, and what they—all the hypocrites, cowards, and con artists—want you to do in order to serve their interests or their perceived interests.

If the people of this country want to pump themselves up on psychotropic drugs so they can feel good while others violate their rights—that's their choice. It's not one I'm going to make.

You've got to fight the powers that be because they can and usually do violate your rights.

If I was a cripple, female or gay, you wouldn't ask me that question. I'm fighting for my civil rights.

I don't like the hypocrisy of special interest groups that proclaim everyone is equal when they really mean the members of that special interest group are more equal than others.

I've had it with Feminazi stupidities, insecurities, incivilities, and malice. I'm tired of them venting their vindictive revenge on men.

I for one will fight the Feminists and their acolytes until my last dollar or my last breath, and if there is anything after death, then for eternity.

Make any money?

No. I didn't bring these lawsuits to make money, I brought them out of contempt and hatred for the Feminazis, and the climate they've created in this country where the standard operating procedure is to violate the rights of men.

Some people will do anything for money, others will do anything for justice. I like to think I belong in the latter category.

How far is anything?

You'll know when I get there.

Didn't you just have some bad experiences?

You're right. But I'm not the exception, rather the norm.

Let's start with the Nazi Ho my mother and work our way through all those other sluts up to the Commie Ho my ex-wife.

My mother was a ho, most the girls I went out with were hos, and my ex-wife is a ho. It's hos all the way down.

Aren't you out for vengeance—not justice?

What's the difference? Look up their meanings in the dictionary.

Isn't this a personal vendetta?

Absolutely, it's my personal jihada against the government and Feminists, and I will have my justice in this life or the next (to paraphrase a quote from the *Gladiator*).

The Edgar Allen Poe Horror of a divorce I went through was caused by the Feminists and their control of the government. Sure my ex-wife jeopardized my life, but she's paid for that—RICO legal expenses and public exposure in her hometown that she was prostitute. Besides, I'll be seeing her in hell for Round 2.

I've lost everything because of the Feminazis and the government treating me as less than human. The Feminazis, the courts, and the government can do their worst, it doesn't matter anymore. But I will not be cowed, intimidated, and I intend to go down fighting. I do no wrong, but right.

Movies

My favorites are *Milk Money* because it reminded me of when I was a kid, *Life Size* because it reminded me of when I believed the Hollywood illusions about girls, and *Constantine* because it reminds me of where I'm going.

MR Legal Fund

MR Legal Fund was a nonprofit corporation to raise money for cases fighting for men's rights. The fund ridiculously failed to raise money, so I closed it down. Guys are even cheaper than girls, or they've already been bankrupted by one.

Murder

Children are defenseless, but not as defenseless as fetuses, or incipient human beings. The outrage over the murder of either should be at least equal, but in Feminarchy America, outrage is usually reserved for a guy murdering a child.

Objective

To go down fighting.

All I want to do is fight my enemies, and the sooner I make it to the Eight Circle, the happier I'll be.

When a man has lost everything and there is no justice to be found; he finds himself on the road to Elyssian with nothing to lose.

I'm on my way to the exit. Why should I let anyone tell me what to think, say or how to act? Why should I buy into anyone's self-serving voodoo religion? I intend to do no wrong, but right.

I know what went wrong with my life, and I know why. But there's nothing I can do about that now. So I try to stay focused on the future, and my Don Quixote fight for my rights. Everyday reminding myself about what Camus wrote, "There's a chilled wind blowing from my future, leveling out all the ideas that people have tried to foist on me."

In this millennium, I've learned to fight anyone who violates my rights. Whether I win or lose doesn't matter because I'll probably get a second shot at them in hell.

I'm simply trying to be a man.

Ownership

If I owned a 1957 red and white DeSoto Fireflite Sportsman convertible with push button drive, I wouldn't want some other guy riding around in it picking up chicks. It's my car, and it's valuable to me, because it's hot, and there are so few of them. But there are hundreds of million

of hot girls. Why would a guy want to own anyone of them when he can rent dozens? So ownership and possessiveness of a girl makes no sense.

The entire concept of “ownership” of a girl comes from girls thinking they’re more valuable than they are—the princess syndrome.

PAP Girls

Post athletic prime.

PBS

Princess Broadcasting System. Always belittling and blaming men while aggrandizing and excusing mediocre females.

Peace

“There are other human values besides peace” Howard Zinn.
There will never be peace so long as female desires exceed their abilities.

Police, Lawyers, and Broads

Police, lawyers, and broads are constitutionally unable to tell the truth.
Most lawyers don’t advise what’s best for their clients, but what’s easiest for the lawyers.

You’re a lawyer?

I like to think of myself as the exception that proves the rule.

Political Correctness or Political Correctionalism

Political Correctness is the new McCarthyism or neo-Bolshevism—they both use the same tactics. At their root is the belief that human nature can be altered through coercive power of the state. Try wearing a Yamaka in 1930s Germany or a Make America Great Again hat in Stalin’s Soviet Union or New York City today.

The essence of the crime charged by PCers is belief.

I use the term “political correctionalism” to remind me that the “politically correct” and female libbers want to imprison my thoughts, speech, and actions that do not conform to their dogma.

PC-Feminism is the ideology of genocide against men.

The term “politically correct” is as ludicrous as “religiously correct.” Don’t forget all the lives destroyed by those who thought their religion was the one and only true religion—the correct religion.

If the politically correct had lived in Russia in the early 20th Century, they would have been the kind of apparatchiks that had no qualms about killing a few million kulaks for the good of the peasantry.

Sometimes I make mistakes, but usually the words I use are intentional and based on a reason rooted in facts and logic rather than self-serving delusions.

“These people don’t think in military ways, so there’s this illusion out there that people are basically nice, people are basically kind, if we’re just nice and benevolent to everyone they’ll be nice too. They literally don’t have any sense of evil or criminality.” Camille Paglia.

Politics

November 9, 2016, Trump wins the presidency—the tide has turned, maybe. Perhaps Liberty will walk free for a while. I did volunteer work for Trump’s campaign because I hate PC-Feminism more than I hate America. If I had hated America more, I would have worked for Hillary’s campaign.

The personal is not political—it is private, but attacking the personal often gets results.

“Madam you may vote but at a price, you lose the right to retreat behind a powder-puff or a petticoat [or tears].” Inherit the Wind, Act II, Henry Drummond.

There are 7 million more female voters in America than male, and as we all know, politicians are not exactly profiles in courage. So they pander to the majority.

The pusillanimous politicians have accepted the lie of the evil male and the supposed necessity for massive government action against him. In this country the rights of men are disregarded by wicked, cruel, and unjust enactments.

Most politicians are fiends in human shape who pass abominably wicked and unjust laws doing what is in their power to destroy confidence in the legislative bodies and to bring magistrates, justices, and other officers of the law into disrespect.

We are plagued by immoral laws, spineless politicians and timid compromisers.

I listened to the 2012 Republican and Democratic convention speeches about truth, honesty, fairness, fidelity, compassion, helpful neighbors, religious principles, good upbringing and wondered what dimension were these people from. America is all about lying, cheating, stealing and violating someone’s rights—just look at Wall Street and Baseball.

Various Feminist organizations such as the National Organization of Witches (they don’t need costumes on Halloween) and the Feminist Majority run get out the vote campaigns, endorse candidates, and their political action committees funnel money to politicians that support their agenda of preferential treatment for females.

After watching the 2008 Democratic Convention, I now know what to expect for the second coming.

When a guy tells’ me he voted for a female, I ask him, “How can you vote for someone who doesn’t care what happens to you and most likely would dance on your grave?”

America is a country of ignorance with not a few of its inhabitants driven by irrational beliefs exploited by tearful female politicians.

“There is only the vaguest connection between the issues debated in an election campaign and those ultimately decided by the government.” Howard Zinn

If a female does not have to register for the draft, then she shouldn’t be the Commander-in-Chief.

Think of all the syndromes that have come up in recent years that allow females to get away with murdering their husbands, boyfriends, children, and new born. If you put a female into the Presidency, how do you know the next syndrome wouldn’t be: “They offended me, so I nuked them!”

Power

Guys have to fight and struggle for power, but girls are born with it.

As toddlers, then continuing as adolescents, and even adults, girls perfect the art of manipulating their fathers with tears, whining, foot-stomping, and screaming tantrums. The savvy post-pubescent girl uses these tactics and sex to manipulate the other males in her life. She gets free meals, cars, tuition, vacations, homes, and jewelry, which she views as entitlements, by raising her hemline, lowering her neckline, shrinking her waistline, and leveling her spine.

It is females who have colonized men. Men work to provide females with the implements that persecute men. Men pay most of the taxes, and that money is used to support a government and Feminist organizations that violate the rights of men.

If girls can argue that various syndromes excuse them of murder and other reprehensible deeds, then guys can argue the same syndromes excuse females from holding positions of power where they are capable of doing even more harm.

Most girls are physically afraid of guys, and most guys are emotionally afraid of girls.

Girls fight using defamation, smears, *ad hominem*s, and sexual lies. A girl's tongue is her gun

Men's power has been overt, and has lain primarily in the physical, economic, and political realms, while feminine power—fully the equal of men's, has been covert and has operated in the realms of fraud, emotion, and sex. Most, if not all, females intentionally cultivate their sexual power to tantalize and influence men. Pick up a copy of *Cosmopolitan*, a how-to manual for worldly females who know what they want, and know how to get it.

Never satisfied with what they have, today females, through the Feminist belief system, are amassing to themselves the traditional realms of male power: politics, business, media, and academia.

American females comprise 54% of the electorate and graduate college 33% more frequently than men.

Predator

A predator is an animal that destroys another animal. So who is doing more of the destroying—Feminazis or men?

Females have been destroying men for thousands of years, only today it's organized under the banner of Feminism.

Make no doubt about it. Girls feel great when they ruin a guy's life and happiest when a guy kills himself because of her. It makes them feel powerful. So, if you're going to check out, do what's logical.

Princess Syndrome

American females believe now, more than ever, that they are princesses. They think: "I move for nobody, I say excuse me to no one, get out of my way, do what I say, and make it quick!"

All girls today think they're princesses. The problem is that they've convinced the government to use force to convince guys when guys know girls are really hos.

During the middle ages, a guy wouldn't dare mock or insult or raise his voice to a princess, and that's what the Feminazis Princesses want today—a return to yester-century.

Look at all those fat, faded, greedy females who think that because of their sex they deserve to be treated like princesses.

W.A.W. does not mean “women are wonderful” but that “women are wrong.”

There is nothing special about girls that deserves enthronement on a pedestal, unless they're young, good looking, and removing their clothes.

Girls simply believe that because they were born females, they are excused from civilized conduct. The only way to deal with their uncivilized behavior is to not yield them the right of way or the wrong of way.

Today, enforced by the delusions of Feminism, girls believe they are pedestal princesses. For example, I played an old boys rugby game. I like to call it an alumni rugby game, since it feeds my delusion of youthfulness. Anyway, I injured my knee, no big deal, just had to hobble around with a cane for a while. On my way home from my day job—that's the one that pays, during rush-hour, I was hustling to keep up with the crowd. A subway train pulls in and everyone is piling into the car except this prima donna in front of me. You know the kind, a young female who thinks she was born a princess, won't move for anybody, walking slow, thinking she's doing everyone a favor by giving them time to look at her. Okay, if she's going to be inconsiderate, I assumed her foot in a flimsy pump was part of the platform and planted my cane on her toes as I moved around her.

Princess Syndrome Multiple Choice Test

All the following are multiple-choice answers, (a) for male, (b) for female:

- You're sitting in a subway car, and there's about a foot of space between you and the person next to you. Someone with a two-foot wide rear-end shoehorns that rear-end into the one foot space. Is that person (a) male or (b) female?
- A person is walking fast in your direction, swinging their arms, you move halfway to make some room, but the other person who sees you doesn't move at all. Is that person (a) male or (b) female?
- The subway stairs are crowded and people are moving very slowly because someone has stopped in the middle of the stairs to talk on a cell phone or text a message. Is that person (a) male or (b) female?
- You're in a rush and trying to pass a person on the left; the person's peripheral vision sees you but refuses to give you any room to get by. Is that person (a) male or (b) female?
- Someone cuts in line at the deli-counter, and when you tell that person that there is a line, the person gets snotty and belligerent. Is that person (a) male or (b) female?
- Someone asks you for assistance connected with your occupation; you give it, and the person never says “thank-you” or repays the favor. Is that person (a) male or (b) female?
- On a crowded stairway, someone is holding the hand of a small child as the child slowly tries to climb the stairs. The person is capable of carrying the child but refuses. Is that person (a) male or (b) female?
- It's rush hour, a lot of commuters just exited a train and are heading for a stairwell to transfer to another train. A person is standing inside of the entrance to the stairwell not

doing anything other than making it difficult for the crowd to enter. The person does not move and is oblivious to the crowd trying to enter the stairwell. Is that person (a) male or (b) female?

- Rush hour and people are moving in one direction; suddenly, someone stops and turns to go in the other direction. Is that person (a) male or (b) female?
- Rush hour again and at the top of the stairs of an entrance to the subway an overweight person, taking up nearly half the width of the stairs, just stands there shuffling through the songs carried on an iPod. Is that person (a) male or (b) female?
- You're walking along and someone steps on your heel causing you to lose your shoe and that person fails to say "excuse me." Is that person (a) male or (b) female?
- Two people are conversing on the stairs that exit from the subway. They are oblivious to the crowd trying to get by. Are they (a) male or (b) female?
- An old guy hobbles on to a bus using a cane. There are no seats because many of the seats are occupied by young people. No one gets up to give the guy a seat. Are they (a) male or (b) female?
- You're sitting in the law library working on the computer with your papers right next to you on your section of a long desk that is shared with another computer. Someone goes to use the other computer and plops down right on your papers a Gucci bag. Is that person (a) male or (b) female?
- You're sitting in a bus in a seat facing the middle aisle. A person gets on the bus carrying a bag. The bus is not crowded. The person walks by you hitting your knee with the bag and doesn't stop to apologize. Is that person (a) male or (b) female?
- A person is sitting in a crowded subway with their legs crossed so that one of their filthy feet is protruding into the center aisle where people are standing or moving toward a space to stand and trying to avoid the filthy feet from rubbing against their clothes. Is that person (a) male or (b) female?
- Rush hour and there's a long line getting on the bus. One person stops at the toll machine to look for a metro card—holding up the entire line. Is that person (a) male or (b) female?
- Rush hour and there's a long line getting on the bus. One person steps out of line to let others go ahead while that person looks for a metro card. Is that person (a) male or (b) female?

Problem

Let's face it. The PC-Feminists are making life a hell on earth for most members of both sexes.

The problem is immoral laws enacted by spineless politicians thanks to the female hatred of men and their sycophantic beaus..

Manhood is in serious jeopardy in America. Our society is moving toward two societies, one male, one female—separate and unequal.

It's a modern-day witch-hunt. Only today the witches are doing the hunting.

Girls get guys to do something stupid, then other guys end up fighting the guys who did something stupid when they should fight the girls. The girls sit on the side lines laughing, just as when some high school tart intentionally causes a fight between two suitors.

A tyranny has spread across this land that violates the rights of men with impunity and exalts feminine evil as the social good.

Self-righteous, greedy, PC-Feminist zealots, intent on advancing a worldview antithetical to the one on which this nation was founded, have succeeded in fomenting a revolution. And that revolution amounts to a campaign against masculinity, maleness, boys, and men.

Promiscuity

Guys cheat because girls do.

The Kennedys did it, why can't I?

Only the genes of the promiscuous survive.

Researchers no longer believe that females were historically deterred from cheating because they had more to lose than a male if caught. Such only inspired females to perfect the art of secrecy and deception as they persistently snuck off in search of stronger genes, better feeding grounds, fall back providers, and protectors.

In 1999, a questionnaire in Britain found that most females tended to be unfaithful to their long-term partners around the time of the month that they were most fertile. Statistics showing that a significant percentage of children were not fathered by a girl's long-term partner exposes the myth of female monogamy and destroys the assumption that women are biologically driven to single-mate bliss.

Researchers at St. Andrew's University in Scotland concluded that females seem to desire different types of men at different times of the month. When they are most likely to conceive, they are attracted to men who have very masculine features, those who are intelligent, athletic, and rational, while preferring more feminine men when they are not ovulating. The researchers suggested that females may subconsciously feel that athletic, smart he-men make a better biological contribution to a baby, but softer features may signal a better father and someone more likely to accede to their wishes.

When humans lived in tribes, protein from meat was crucial for survival. Men provided the protein from hunting and females the other nutrients from gathering. Hunting was a high risk occupation, so a smart girl would hedge her bets by becoming a "special friend" or "good friend" with other guys in case her main beau did not survive. Now guys may not be too bright when it comes to pretty young things, but they always know when a girl is cheating. So they cheat too. It is more likely that the genes of cheating girls and guys will pass down to future generations than the genes of humans who are faithful. So today, we are all the descendants of tarts and playboys, and carry the same proclivity for promiscuity.

Prostitution

Despite the Feminazis' efforts to make prostitution respectable by replacing the terms ho, whore, hooker, and slut with "sex worker" or "businesswoman," prostitutes still spread diseases, which increases the premiums for health insurance for everyone; engage in economic frauds against businesses that recoup their losses by raising prices to all consumers; and on finding a rich guy, turn into self-righteous puritans annoying everyone with their new found morality.

The Feminazis also argue that prostitutes are forced into selling sex because they need the money. Baloney, they just want easy money. Those hos should try hard work for a change.

Romance as depicted in all those moon, June, swoon, love tunes, sonatas, books, and Hollywood movies are about nothing more than prostitution—girls trading sexual favors for material value.

Publicity

Didn't you bring the anti-Feminist cases just to get 15 minutes of fame?

15 minutes! I thought it was only 15 seconds. If I had known that, I would've brought the lawsuits years ago.

You just want attention?

Right, I thoroughly enjoy being pilloried by public opinion.

Actually, I'm loving it: Moochie versus City Hall. The only problem is making enough money to finish my Jihada—that's Jihad with an "a".

RDH.com is an exercise in vanity. [If female interviewer] You know about that don't you?

[Colbert Report] If you're unable to laugh at yourself, then you're no longer human. If a man can't laugh at himself, then he's turned into a girl.

Besides, it's important to be the one that laughs last.

Are you a celebrity?

Just a fool with a loud mouth.

Just a juvenile delinquent who never grew up and for some reason the media let me rant over the airwaves for a few years.

I have a little bit of notoriety, but not enough to attract the groupies while too much for the good girls—if there are any of them left.

Rape

It's not a rape-culture but a hook-up culture. Girls, however, often have second thoughts when they wake up in the morning, so to justify their stupidity, they call it rape.

Rape is not only foisting one's sexual desires on another without that person's consent but also pillaging and plundering—the specialty of many females. *American Heritage Dictionary*.

Girls raping guys.

Girls pillage and plunder a guy in two ways: (1) maternity frauds where they lie about being on a contraceptive or unable to conceive, or (2) paternity fraud where they lie about who is the biological father, of course, sometimes they are such tramps that they don't know who is the real father. In the U.S., 30% of the non-custodial fathers are paying for children who are not theirs. *WorldNetDaily*, February 18, 2006.

Feminine Reproduction Fraud (“FRF”) is an extremely serious and harmful crime. When a female forces her reproductive capacity on a guy by fraud, it is rape, just as when a male physically forces his reproductive capacity on a female. But Feminazis try to lessen the offense by girls simply because the perpetrator happens to be a female. The only difference between the two is the means that a particular sex uses to get what they want. It does not matter whether the means is by fraud or physical force because the act egregiously harms another human being. Both have their associational, privacy, and economic rights violated. But men no longer have rights in America, so they are actually forced by government to pay their own rapists for the acts the rapists committed.

The magazine *That’s Life!* polled 5,000 females and asked them if they would lie to get pregnant. 42% of the females said yes. Imagine how many really would.

The vast majority of illegitimacy is actually predatory reproduction by females for income or to control a man.

Duped dads deserve legal redress to protect themselves against maternity and paternity fraud. If a female lies to a man about her reproductive capacity to become pregnant, then takes his money or extorts him into marrying her; or if she tricks a guy into raising a baby not his own, sacrificing years of his life into an endeavor based on a falsehood, she should go to prison for decades or life.

Michael Gilding, sociology professor at Swinburne University in Australia, reviewed studies from around the world, and concluded that 1-3% of children were fathered by someone other than the man who believes he’s the daddy. Four million children are born in the United States each year, so using the mid-range 2% figure, that means 80,000 men become victims of paternity fraud every year. That’s 80,000 rapes a year just for paternity fraud compared to 95,000 rapes of females. Factoring in maternity fraud, girls rape more guys than *vice versa*.

The American Association of Blood Banks reports that 30 per cent of men who suspect they are not biological fathers are right. In the United Kingdom, one in six men who took a DNA test to challenge claims by females that they were the fathers of their children were not.

Even when the husband finds out the child is not his own and divorces his whoring wife, the courts in over 30 states still require him to support the child that’s not his. Those states rely on a 500-year-old English common law doctrine, which holds that a married man is always legally presumed to be the father of a child born during the marriage. Men are routinely forced to pay tens of thousands of dollars in child support, even after DNA tests prove they are not the biological fathers.

Guys allegedly raping girls.

The problem with the laws that protect females from rape and sexual harassment is that they rest on a false assumption that females who claim to be victims are almost always telling the truth.

A longitudinal study conducted by Professor Eugene Kanin concluded that over a period of nine years, 41% of rape allegations studied were fraudulent, concocted by the alleged victim to either create an alibi, seek attention and sympathy, or to seek revenge.

There is also the McDowell Study cited by Warren Farrell in *The Myth of Male Power*, which concluded that of 1,218 reported rapes on Air Force Bases around the world, 45% were discovered to be fraudulent.

According to a nine-year study conducted by former Purdue sociologist Eugene J. Kanin, in over 40 percent of the rape cases against men that were reviewed, the girls eventually admitted that no rape had occurred. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, Vol. 23, No. 1, 1994. Kanin also studied rape allegations in two large Midwestern universities and found that 50 percent of the allegations were recanted by the accuser. He also found that most of the false accusers were motivated by a need to compensate for feelings of guilt or shame or a desire for revenge; that is, the tart had second thoughts when she woke up from her drunk the night before, or the guy didn't call her back. It is true, of course, that not every accuser who recants had accused falsely. But it is also true that some who do not recant were not telling the truth.

80% of rape allegations in the United Kingdom are false, but the government still bases the number of rapes on just allegations that are then multiplied by a factor of 10 based on an unsubstantiated belief that only 1 in 10 alleged rapes are reported. So if there are two rapes, there will be allegations of 10 rapes and the U.K. government will report that there were 100 rapes—must be female math.

A *Washington Post* investigation of rape reports in seven Virginia and Maryland counties in 1990 and 1991 found that nearly one in four were unfounded.

According to a 1996 Department of Justice Report, of the roughly 10,000 sexual assault cases analyzed with DNA evidence over the previous seven years, 2,000 excluded the primary suspect, and another 2,000 were inconclusive.

Linda Fairstein, the author of *Sexual Violence: Our War Against Rape*, says, “there are about 4,000 reports of rape each year in Manhattan. Of these, about half simply did not happen.”

A Denver sex-assault unit commander estimates that nearly half of all reported rape claims are false.

Three quarters of female college students who were classified by the White House as victims of sexual assault by incapacitation did not believe they had been raped. Cathy Young, *The Whose House Overreaches on Campus Rape*.

Three peer-reviewed studies have found the rate of false accusations of campus rape to range from 41% to 60%. Suzanne Vanker, *An Open Letter to Joe Biden*.

Of course female and male rapists could be viewed as ardent propagators of the species.

Slut Shield Laws

State and federal laws consider all females angels by forbidding the introduction of evidence in rape trials that the girl engaged in past conduct that infers she was not raped. For example, a girl who engages in nymphomania, prostitution, or repeatedly makes false accusations of rape creates the inference that a sexual encounter was the result of her behavior pattern or that no encounter occurred.

The Arkansas Supreme Court denied an appeal by a man serving a 13-year sentence for rape. The court held that evidence of the victim's alleged prior false allegations of rape was inadmissible because it was considered sexual conduct within the meaning of the state's rape shield statute.

A young Wisconsin man was sentenced to eight years in prison for allegedly raping an older female. He was prohibited from revealing that she was currently facing criminal charges of having sex with minors, which meant she had a motivation to lie that the sex she had with him, a

minor, was rape. The evidence was deemed related to the female's sexual history and inadmissible.

In 1997, sportscaster Marv Albert was accused of assault and battery during a sexual encounter with a female with whom he had a 10-year sexual relationship. Albert sought to introduce evidence that his accuser, who had been in a mental hospital six weeks before the alleged assault, had previously made false accusations against men who had left her, as Albert, who was engaged to be married, was planning to do. Albert's offer of proof was denied, compromising his ability to defend himself. Facing a possible life sentence, he chose to plead guilty to misdemeanor assault.

The rape and sexual assault numbers of females throughout history are nothing compared with the murder of over 40 million incipient human beings by females in the U.S. since 1973. Why should the one group of humans who cause the most death be held unaccountable for their prior acts when trying to destroy the life of another human with the charge of rape?

Religion

"Girls think if [a guy] gives in on that score [religion], he can be brought round to yield on everything." Mephistopheles, Goethe's *Faust*.

Religion is always used by those in power to manipulate those who aren't.

What's your religion?

If I have any religion, it is science. But I've been wrong before, so I keep a Bible opened in my bedroom to ward off my ex-wife's curses. I'm also trying to get myself in shape for Dante's Eighth Circle.

How are you getting in shape?

Fighting the Feminazis and PCers, taking martial arts, and doing a little hip hop to impress the many girls down there.

But science makes mistakes?

True, but given a choice between somebody today making a mistake and someone 2000 years ago who thought the world was flat, walked around in robes, talked to burning bushes or lights in caves—I'll chose the contemporary error.

Of course, I'm not so arrogant as to think my philosophies cover everything out there or are always accurate. So, I've accounted for the possibility of heaven and hell. The management structure of hell most likely has the worst near the top with the chain of command descending through those lesser evil doers down to those who arguably shouldn't be there at all. Unlike Dante's Inferno, such a structure makes sense with the more adept at evil lording over the less adept. For example, a person who committed adultery three times would have as a direct report to her a person who did it only twice. The torment visited on that underling by her direct boss would be mild compared to those who really engaged in evil. Those persons would end up with Hitler, Stalin, or similar likes as their direct bosses, which would bode troubling times for

eternity. My task, is to insert myself in the management structure at the point where I'll have authority over those whom I want to torment for eternity—the Feminists among others.

Reporters

The best of which there are few always get both sides to a story, and keep their personal philosophies out, unless they notify their audience that they are editorializing as Walter Cronkite did about Vietnam.

Responsibility

It's time females start taking responsibility for their own actions, instead of passing the buck to guys. Perhaps that's not a good analogy; once a girl gets her hands on a dollar, it's unlikely she'll let it go, unless it's spent on her vanity.

Whenever a female causes a man harm, any type of harm, other girls dismiss the damage done as insignificant or claim she had no choice or the guy was really responsible.

Assume you're walking down the street late at night in a dangerous part of town and someone jumps out of the shadows, shoots you dead, and takes your wallet. You're partly at fault, but your stupidity does not excuse the evil done to you.

If the shooter was female and the dead person a man, most females would say the killer was justified because she needed the money. But when a man raises his voice to a nagging girl, females think he should go to prison for decades. Not exactly logical, but what do you expect from girls.

Mother's murder their children, their husbands, and boyfriends, which the Feminazis automatically excuse by blaming men through voodooing up a syndrome or attributing such harm to the delusion that society is a "patriarchy." In reality, society is more like a malicious matriarchy.

For example, Gilberta Estrada hung her four small daughters, three of whom died, but it was still her ex-boyfriend's fault for alleged domestic violence that was never proven.

Revolution

When a man loses everything, and there's no justice to be found; he finds himself on the road to Elysian with nothing to lose.

Now is no time for timid compromisers. Between right and wrong there can be no compromise.

"Extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice! And ... moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue." Barry Goldwater.

"The right to revolt has sources deep in our history." Justice William O. Douglas.

Rebellion and violence are necessary in the name of a principle. It does not matter whether a majority, no matter how large, opposes a principle. Often times the largest majority was nothing more than a mob.

Violence is admirable if waged in the name of democratic revolution.

Vigilante justice is necessary when the law itself becomes a mockery.

The best government is where everyman is armed for instant justice to be administered to each offense. (Paraphrase of Emerson).

Feminists have a right to speak stupidity. But when their speech turns to actions that cause irreparable harm, then guys have a right and a duty to oppose those harmful acts, with violence if necessary.

I'm not a terrorist, not yet. But if the courts keep violating my rights, I'm going to start attending that Madras school in Brooklyn.

As I learned in my anti-war days, you can't use establishment institutions to stop establishment wrongs, but you can use them to heighten the contradictions that may lead to revolution.

When a government puts forth its strength on the side of injustice—what a demonical force it is seen to be.

A minority based on principles will sooner or later in a republican government become the majority. A principled few can defeat an unprincipled horde.

“Individuals must never acknowledge laws and institutions to exist as of right if their conscience and reason condemn them.” John Brown.

“Rights cannot be restored except by force,” the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria.

Most Americans have a deep-seated faith in justice and the rule of law as protectors for the liberties they believe they enjoy. There is no greater shock than to find that, even with both law and facts in your favor, your constitutional rights are worthless because you can't get the courts or government to enforce them.

Throughout history the failure of governments to uphold individual rights have caused violence—not prevented it. Whether faced with the lack of due process or absence of equal protection in domestic violence, sexual abuse, or other proceedings, a man before today's courts and government agencies will find virtually no regard for his rights when up against Feminist beliefs. Emotions, feelings, and bias against men will take precedence over statutes, facts, and reason. Perjury by females and subornation of perjury by their lawyers will dominate the proceedings while the judges will hold themselves above the law, and will frequently invent it.

When the preferential treatment of girls violates the rights of guys, there's no justice within the system because the Feminist Establishment prevents the institutions in this country from upholding the Constitution as it applies to men seeking equal treatment.

Today there is little to no liberty left men because females and their androgyny male allies have gone too far. They've put guys in a corner, figuring they will submit, and many have. But they don't realize the underlying, boiling hatred that most men have for Feminism and its allies. Guys keep quiet around girls, but men are incensed over the federal, state, and local governments using them as pawns to give females preferential treatment as demanded by the Feminists. These are grudges that wouldn't go away.

Male androgynies in positions of authority are so afraid of losing their positions that they are even more zealous in enforcing Feminists tenets than females.

Feminism has created a *de facto* tyranny over men by government. As James Madison said, a tyranny exists when one group controls the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. The belief system of Feminism now has an overriding influence in all three. America is now a Feminarchy that tramples the rights of men.

Men are in a state of war waged on them by the Feminazis wanting to utterly enslave freemen to irrational female whims and fears.

Abraham Lincoln and Robert Kennedy said that “among freemen there can be no successful appeal from the ballot to the bullet.” The operative word is “freemen,” and without liberty, men are not free.

At some point enough guys will re-read the Declaration of Independence and follow its advice on replacing the present federal government that operates under Feminist tenets:

“When a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same objective evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new guards for their future security and well being.”

Or, “if there is something wrong, those who have the ability to take action have the responsibility to take action. To do what’s considered wrong in order to do what’s right.”
National Treasure.

“When unjust decisions become the rule, then the government and its officials should be toppled.” Howard Zinn.

“The people of the United States are the rightful masters of both Congress and the Courts, not to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the men [and females] who pervert the Constitution.” Abraham Lincoln.

“Often the most violent of actions may not be the act of someone trying to control another, but the act of a person who gave up on finding justice within a society’s institutions.”
John Brown.

A man has a perfect right to kill those who would destroy him.

“Do not delay one moment after you are ready; you will lose all your resolution if you do. Do not do your work by halves, but make clean work with your enemies—and be sure you meddle not with any others. Kill who pose a threat and then retreat.” John Brown.

Are you advocating revolution?

I’ve been advocating that in one form or another since I was a member of SDS—Students for a Democratic Society. I almost joined the Weathermen, but couldn’t see the relevance in blowing up bathrooms.

Today’s institutions are secondary to the higher law of justice.

The time is here for men to take to the streets to win justice. A man must fight for a worthy cause, and that cause is Liberty.

Isn’t that treason?

In a time of immoral laws; it’s patriotism that looks like treason. In a society with an ideologically corrupt government—it is the patriot who is the traitor.

“The devil nestles comfortably into the laws of this country. The government itself is treason. When the public fails in its duty, private men must take its place.” Ralph Waldo Emerson.

My allegiance is to the Constitution and Declaration of Independence—not to a government that’s been corrupted by ideological Feminists, nor a government that sacrifices men’s rights to give girls preferential treatment.

Besides, what are they going to do—lock me up in Guantanamo? I've always liked warm climates, and if I escape, I get to ride around in 56 Chevys with hot Latinas and smoke Cuban cigars. Not a bad way to live out the remainder of one's life.

Or, they take away my license to practice law. So what. The only reason I got it was to defend my rights, but that's impossible in a judicial system prejudiced against men. So my law license is pretty much as useless as basing arguments on the Torah in a court of the Third Reich.

Are you advocating armed revolution?

“The only way to stop the discrimination against men is for 100,000 armed guys to show up in Washington, D.C. demanding their rights.” *Columbia Spectator* quoting Roy Den Hollander.

Now, I'm not about to show up in Washington, D.C. by myself and demand the U.S. Government surrender. But, if enough guys out there are willing to join me—let's go.

There is likely only one solution to the present destructive ends of this federal government, to any tyranny—revolution.

“Men have always been compelled to hew their way to freedom.” Thomas Carlyle.

Sometimes a social evil is so egregious, so entrenched, that violence is the only answer. Violence is often necessary in the name of a principle, and is admirable when waged in the name of democratic principles.

The only avenue to liberty leads through a sea of blood.

It is better that a whole generation of Feminist pass off the fact of the earth than that the Declaration of Independence should fail in this country. (Paraphrase of John Brown).

Don't underestimate the persuasiveness of violence. “[W]here there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence.” Gandhi.

Remember, men still have a monopoly on firearms in this society, despite the Feminist efforts to ban guns, which will continue until they are successful because that is their one remaining fear and weakness. It makes no sense for men to disarm in the face of an evil that wants to exercise totalitarian power over them. They have a right to revolt against that tyranny, to take it down. It doesn't matter whether it's the tyranny of George III or the Feminists.

We've already lost our liberties under the Constitution, and as Clarence Darrow said, “Individual liberty is the first concern of every man for without it, life is not worth living.”

Insurrection seems better than living as slaves to the Feminists and a government that enforces their male-hating policies. If we fail, we'll be gone, and then the ladies can fight among themselves and with the androgynies who are left.

Violence is coming, and not the feminine softened type of violence defined in current domestic violence laws.

Rights

When someone violates your rights, they do so to gain something they don't deserve; otherwise, they wouldn't violate your rights.

There's no such thing as over-sensitivity to the violation of one's rights.

A person denied his rights has the natural right to fight with any means against those who seek to prevent his enjoyment of liberty.

For the past 40 years, the Feminazis have successfully used duress to push the government, academia, private industry, and the media into violating or ignoring the rights of guys.

The Feminazis menace freedom of speech, freedom of the press, equal protection under the law, due process, and other rights retained by the people in the Ninth Amendment.

The Ninth Amendment to the US Constitution states: “The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.”

The exercise of a right requires no justification—no explanation. To demand such is a violation of that right because it’s an effort to prevent the exercise of it in the future.

The Declaration of Independence talks about men—not females. So literally and explicitly, according to that document, I have rights. Just because I don’t believe what the Feminazis believe, or do what they want, doesn’t mean I lose those rights.

Next time some Feminist tried to tell you what to say or do, sing her the refrain, “You don’t own me. Don’t tell me what to do. Don’t tell me what to say. I’m free and I love to be free. To live my life the way I want. To say and do whatever I please.”

Rulers

Feminists push the delusion that female rulers will make the world a safer, more peaceful, and compassionate place. History disagrees.

Princess Olga, the first female ruler of Russia, burned down an entire city after promising them peace. She also held a peace conference where she had her enemies who attended thrown into a pit and massacred.

Mary, Queen of England, led persecutions of Protestants in her country and waged war on France until her death enthroned her sister Elizabeth, who redirected the persecutions against Catholics. This resulted in a war with Scotland and with Spain.

Isabella of Castile invaded Grenada, signed the Alhambra decree banishing Jews from Spain and eventually expanded that policy to Spanish Muslims. She presided over portions of the Inquisition and a treaty dividing the world with Portugal. I’m surprised she let Portugal have half.

Elizabeth Bathory, countess of Transylvania, murdered and bathed in the blood of hundreds of peasant girls. She was eventually arrested and tried by Emperor Matthias II of Austria.

Russia’s Catherine the Great began her reign with the overthrow and murder of her husband Peter III. With Prussia and Austria, she annexed Poland, effectively destroying that nation for more than 200 years. She fought two wars against Turkey and another against Sweden. When she died, Russia was bankrupt.

Isabella II of Spain kept her power through support of the army and started two wars during her reign: one against Morocco, and one against Chile and Peru.

Cixi, dowager empress of China, instigated the xenophobic Boxer Rebellion in 1899, leading to thousands of deaths.

Under Queen Victoria, concentration camps were perfected during the Boar War.

Golda Meir started the 1967 War.

Indira Gandhi waged war on a group of Indian citizens—the Sikhs.

Margaret Thatcher started the Falklands War.

Self Defense

Ever hit a girl?

Spanked a few, oh you mean in anger, no, but I should have.

Actually that's not exactly right. When my ex-wife came at me with a knife, I used a karate strike to make her drop it. When she got a temporary restraining order against me, she claimed, among other things, that I bruised her arm with the karate strike, which was correct, but she left out that she was wheedling a knife at the time.

In America today, when a guy defends himself against imminent physical injury or merely argues back with his girlfriend, he'll be blamed for "domestic violence." Therefore, he might as well slap her upside the head because he'll end up in the same position if he doesn't. As a kid, I learned if you are going to be blamed for something, you might as well go ahead and do it.

Besides, if a girl can use with impunity the power Mother Nature and society gave her to verbally batter a man with vituperative rants, vindictive railings, perjury, and threats of governmental violence; or to intentionally inflict emotional distress and psychological injury, then a man has the right to defend himself or kick the slut out of his life.

A girl uses her tongue as a gun and her body as a weapon, so I use martial arts to defend myself—what's wrong with that?

Sex

Girl is a four letter word.

Girls are always using their sex to extort a guy into doing something they want. It's called nookie coercion.

There are 3.5 billion girls in the world. Assume you are attracted to 5% of them, calculate in an average sexual life of 60 years, and you have over 7,000 babes a night! Like most guys, I'm still working on my first night.

For millions of years, hominid females have been attracted to one type of hominid male—guys who can sexually satisfy and protect them. Do you really think the past 40 years of Feminazism has changed that?

The last girl you want to date is one who studies Feminazism. And, if the girl student of Feminazism is the last girl on earth, you'd be better off with the Playboy archives.

I don't keep a batting average. I can do without any additional depression. I just keep trying. I only pursue pretty young things; why hunt a rattlesnake if you're not going to eat it.

Men hunt females while females lay traps for men. It's not the look of hot young babes that is dangerous but the touch of their bodies.

Females use sex to get what they want. Whether tarts or Feminazis, it's always about sex—sex to attract, sex to attack. Girls aren't rated double X for nothing.

We're all promiscuous but only girls are hos. Girls use sex and its accoutrements to get something of value: material, status, or an undeserved advantage. For girls, sex is a means to an end; for guys it's an end, although a repeated end.

For girls, sex is a weapon, for guys it's fun.

Girls spend a lot of time, energy, and some guy's money trying to look sexy. I'm not about to disappoint them by considering them genderey.

“If it weren’t for her body, she’d need a brain.”

I like music, I like dancing, I like drinking, and I like pretty young ladies. But as with drinking, you’ve got to be careful with the young ladies.

The reason Feminazis use the term gender instead of sex is that they don’t want to be reminded of what they haven’t had for years.

The only thing a guy needs a girl for is sex. Girls, however, need a guy not just for sex but to solve their problems, for security, and for someone to boss around.

Do you have a girl friend?

You mean am I in a relationship? No, I’ve learned my lesson. Just flings for me. All I’m interested in are transient, superficial, affairs with pretty young ladies—brain or no brain.

The reason is that I have no desire to unite with the Universe. When a guy and a girl are attracted to each other, have an ongoing relationship, and both know how to engender multiple orgasms in the other, that physical act transforms into a metaphysical experience where the apparent inner beings of both are commingled. They end up occupying the same quantum space and time, which is a unity with the underpinnings of the Universe. But when you’re one with the Universe, you’re no longer one with yourself, and it becomes difficult to fight the Universe. In particular, to fight that most virulent part of it called Feminazism.

When was the last time you were on a date? (If asked by girl reporter)

I’m a male, you’re a female. Do you find me attractive?

Answer the question.

I’m answering the unspoken premise of your question. So am I attractive to you?

No

(Look at camera). So ladies is she telling the truth—you decide.

Why do you only chase young girls?

Nobody wants a flabby over-the-hill female who has spent her adult life demonizing, demeaning, denigrating, and dissing men and will continue to do the same to any man dumb enough to date her.

Whenever I see a mother and her teenage daughter—I’m not looking at the mother.

There’s no crime in pursuing pretty young ladies, although it’s dangerous because they are at the height of their power over men.

They’re faces look young and innocent, but their bodies tell a different story.

Are you a pedophile?

Yes, I love to walk. Oh, you mean little girls, aren’t they missing a couple of strategic attributes?

Pregnancy

A female's choice includes abstinence, diaphragms, condoms, spermicides, the pill, injections, implants, the "overnight pill", intrauterine device, abortion, adopt-out, return baby to hospital, keep baby, give baby away, sell baby, contract to have baby for someone else, auction baby, name any man she chooses as father, and infanticide. A man's choice includes condoms, invasive surgery, cash, credit, bankruptcy, prison, and suicide.

Since a female can name any man she chooses as the father, in reality then, men have no choice at all, since abstinence and scientific proof does not necessarily prevent judicially forced fatherhood.

Sex and Money Objects

This isn't quantum mechanics, just look at how a hot 20-year-old girl's body is built. You don't use a car to fly the skies, a plane to sail the seas, or a boat to drive the highways.

Besides, why drive a used car when you can drive a new one? And if you are the car, would you rather be driven by a student driver or one with a license?

Regardless of what girls say, they are primarily attracted to guys for the money guys spend on them, their earnings potential, or their wealth. That's why guys pay for girls.

Regardless of what guys say, they are primarily attracted to girls' bodies. That's why girls risk injury to their feet and ankles walking in high heels, suffer the pain of waxing their legs and private parts, restrict respiration by wearing tight clothes, and use toxic chemicals on their faces and hair.

Sexist

Let's see, a conformist is one who conforms, so a sexist is one who has sex. Yes, I plead guilty, although not as guilty as I would like.

Are you a male chauvinist?

When it comes to logic and reason—yes, but not T and A.

Better to be a sexist than neutered.

Shouldn't the word be "genderist."

I'm just doing what Mother Nature tells me to do. Why should I go against her to satisfy the Feminist special interest group, which only has my harm at heart?

If a girl accuses you of raping her with your eyes, reply (1) don't blame me for your paranoia, (2) if she's a dog, say "Believe me, looking at you was an accident," (3) if she's good looking, say "If you don't want guys staring at you then wear a sack dress, maxie, or burka."

She-male

Many mothers today, mainly white, follow the Feminist line in raising their children. Their sons, they try to neuter.

Their daughters, they place on a pedestal of superiority to men in strength, courage, independence, and toughness, which, coupled with the self-serving Feminist belief that girls have a universal right to give free rein to their whims and desires, puts daughters in danger of the delusions their mothers created. The danger comes from situations that evolutionary correct girls can handle or would avoid, but Feminist daughters can't or don't because they believe they are superior to men. Basically, a Feminist mother convinces her daughter that she's Supergirl, gives her a cape but when the daughter tries to fly in the real world, it doesn't work.

Socialism in America

After Trump won in 2016, many Democrats turned to Socialism with the girls embracing Dionysus lunacy. They follow Lenin's teachings to incite contempt and hatred for those with whom they disagree.

Under the Socialists truth, due process and the rights of the accused are all swept aside to serve an ideology. State power is advocated to control all aspects of one's life in accordance with PC dictates.

As Captain Jean-Luc Picard said, "We think we've come so far. Torture of heretics, burning of witches, it's all ancient history. Then—before you can blink an eye—suddenly it threatens to start all over again."

Solutions

1. Feminism ends when girls are required to register for the draft and America uses the draft to again marshal cannon fodder for the next war, which will happen at some point in time.

2. Everything changes when 100,000 armed men show up in Washington, D.C. demanding their rights, which will result in the government obeying the Constitution, or going down to defeat (given the military's record since World War II against third and fourth rate powers, it's defeat at the hands of armed American men is a real possibility), or turning more totalitarian, which will likely lead to an eventual change in government.

3. Things begin to change when individual men start taking out those specific persons responsible for destroying their lives before committing suicide. When every life destroyed by a lying tongue is repaid with another destroyed by a gun.

"A key part of the remedy is a revalorization of traditional male trades—the ones that allow women's studies professors to drive to work (roads), take the elevator to their office (construction), read in the library (electricity), and go to gender-neutral restrooms (plumbing)." Camille Paglia.

Sports

Under Title IX, men's participation in sports is now capped at the level of females' interest in sports. The Feminazis, being females, aren't satisfied, so they're trying to eliminate all masculine sports because sports build men—not androgynies. So far they have not been successful, since public demand is for all-male sports, not female contests, unless it's wet T-shirt wrestling.

Temporary Restraining Orders (“TRO”)

Family court judges issue around two million temporary restraining orders (“TROs”) every year, half are routinely extended, 85 percent are against men, and half do not include any allegation of physical violence but rely on vague complaints of alleged psychological injury made without evidence. A female can simply accuse her husband or boyfriend of sexual or physical abuse or claim she’s afraid or there was a spat and instantly win a TRO.

TROs are issued *ex parte*, which means the husband is not before the judge to refute the allegations against him and only learns about the court order when served with it by the police, which often includes being forcibly evicted from his home and alienated from his kids. One million TROs a year evict a person, usually a man from the home that he paid for.

While hubby is barred from the house, the wife quickly files for a divorce, and requests temporary custody of the kids. The TRO paves the way for a near-automatic award of sole custody once the divorce is finalized, which usually includes child support in an amount that ends up supporting the wife—hidden alimony, or straight forward alimony depending on the state, which is often set at an amount to punish the husband.

TROs allow activist family court judges to criminalize a vast range of otherwise legal behavior, usually a father’s contact with his own children and entry into his own home. These are crimes only for the subject of the order, who can be arrested and jailed without trial for doing what no statute prohibits and what anyone else may lawfully do.

Ordinary citizens are arrested in the middle of the night, thrown in jail on false charges of violating the TRO, never see the inside of their homes again, found guilty in show trials with predetermined outcomes, and forced into treatment for “wrongful thoughts.” These are the types of evils identified with totalitarian governments, such as the Third Reich and Soviet Union. But today, thanks to the Feminists and domestic TROs, they are the staples of American injustice.

“When innocence has only itself to defend it, you will always hear the verdict guilty.”
Mephistopheles, Goethe’s *Faust*.

“Must men go to prison because they are at odds with the self-appointed [prophetesses].”
Inherit the Wind, Act II, Henry Drummond.

Terrorism

Terrorism is violence that avoids combat, is used against the unsuspecting, and is intended to shock and horrify with the aim of bringing about social change.

Threaten

Haven’t you threatened females?

Yes, I’ve threatened some—threatened to take them to court. I should have challenged them to a duel instead.

Actually, you’re confusing “warn” with “threaten.” They were warned to cease violating my rights or I would drag their fat, men hating asses all the way up to the U.S. Supreme Court. No way I would win in the Feminist infested judicial system, but I’d make their lives miserable for a few years and it’ll cost them a ton of money in legal fees.

Besides, when it comes to sluts, I don’t need threats—just money.

Truth

Truth is not a matter of arithmetic. Just because everyone says you're wrong doesn't mean you are.

“All truth passes through three stages.

First, it is ridiculed.

Second, it is violently opposed.

Third, it is accepted as being self-evident.” Schopenhauer.

“When you have eliminated the impossible, whatever remains, however improbable, must be the truth.” Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes.

“Facts do not cease to exist because they are ignored.” Aldous Huxley.

“You're such a liar. The only way you ever told the truth was by accident.”

Feminists twist the truth out of all sense to fit their selfish purposes.

The truth always seems to hurt the one who speaks it.

“The truth cannot be an insult.” Charlie Chan.

Violence Against Women Act or Violence in Aid of Witches Act (VAWA), a.k.a. the State Violence Against Men Act

The federal case three other guys and I brought challenged the constitutionality of certain provisions of the Violence Against Women Act, which was written by NOW—the National Organization of Witches, the Feminist Majority, and other man-hating, non-profit corporations that receive partial funding from U.S. taxpayers. The Act was sponsored by then Senator Joe Biden, and signed into law by former President Clinton, or was it Hillary Clinton, in 1994.

More aptly called the “Violence in Aid of Witches Act” (“VAWA”) or “State Violence Against Men Act,” it's a modern-day witch hunt against American men, only today the witches are doing the hunting.

“This law rises not to the level of the head or reason; its natural habitat is in the dirt. It was born and bred, and has its life, only in the dust and mire fit only to be tread upon like a venomous reptile.” Henry David Thoreau.

The Act causes massive federal government intervention into the personal relationships of Americans, whether in marriage or dating.⁹

It's like having Uncle Sam and the Feminists not only in your bedroom, but every room in your house, in your car, and wherever you go with your spouse or girlfriend.

40 years ago, the Feminists warned that the “personal is political.” Most people don't realize that they are making good on that warning, especially through the Violence Against Women Act.

VAWA is about one group trying to rule over another in domestic affairs by using the power of the federal government. The government uses VAWA to reshape social relations by

⁹ VAWA also hands out T Visas for alleged alien victims of commercial sex trafficking and U Visas for alleged alien victims of rape, torture, trafficking, incest, domestic violence, sexual assault, abusive sexual conduct, prostitution, sexual exploitation, hostage holding, female genital mutilation (nothing in the law about male circumcision), hostage holding, involuntary servitude, kidnapping, false imprisonment, blackmail, extortion, witness tampering, obstruction of justice, perjury. Homeland Security relies solely on the alien's word when she is making such accusations against the American guy she dated.

coercing private conduct in accordance with the Feminist Establishment's ideology. The conduct regulated need not amount to criminal or civil wrongs, but even if it does, its prevention and punishment more appropriately fall under family law—an area traditionally reserved for the states, *see U.S. v. Morrison*, 529 U.S. 598, 615-16 (2000)

VAWA adopted some of the totalitarian ways of the Communist Party from the trash heap of history to not only control romance but to funnel hundreds of millions of dollars into the pockets of private Feminist organizations. Think of it as a mini-bailout compared to what Wall Street got. Only this one continues to eternity—if you let it, and bankrupts not just your wallet but your heart.

Understanding the Violence Against Women Act

VAWA eliminates one of the founding principles of this country—procedural due process, or in plain English “fairness.” When the power of government is used against a person, there is a right to fair procedure, which means notice of the proceeding, an opportunity to be heard, and to present evidence before a neutral judge. VAWA provides none of those for U.S. citizens.

Now I don't mind a fight, actually I rather enjoy one, but I can't fight someone if the time and place are kept secret.

The way to understand VAWA is to keep in mind that it violates the rights of two groups of Americans: (1) Americans who date or marry foreigners, and (2) Americans who date or marry Americans, which pretty much covers everyone who's not a kid. It's a strategy of the Feminists to use the federal government to run the most personal part of your life.

The persons punished under VAWA are usually guys, but every so often an American girl has her rights trampled by it.

(1) Americans who date or marry foreigners:

If a citizen husband decides to divorce his alien wife within two years of marriage, the alien wife will be placed in deportation proceedings. If an American man who is dating an alien decides to break it off, the alien girlfriend will have to find another sucker to marry in order to avoid deportation when her temporary visa lapses. However, either the alien wife or girlfriend can use VAWA to escape deportation and become citizens. All they have to do is lie to Homeland Security and the Justice Department that their husband or boyfriend committed battery, extreme cruelty, or an overall pattern of violence against her.

The moment she makes her false allegations, a curtain of secrecy falls across the government's determination of whether the American guy committed abuse. The proceedings and fact-findings are kept secret from the American husband or boyfriend; he doesn't receive any notice of them; and if he learns about them, he can't submit evidence to refute the accusations—any evidence from him showing he didn't do it is ignored. The adversarial process is thrown out the window. It's as though your favorite sports team is not told what stadium the champion game is in or the time for its scheduled defeat.

VAWA has taken the “he said” out of the “he said, she said.” Not only is the husband or boyfriend presumed culpable, but he's not even allowed to prove differently, and that's the intention of VAWA: to railroad American men by denying them due process and equal protection.

Think a minute—would you want the U.S. Government listening only to your ex-wife or former girlfriend, her lawyer, and various Feminists, to decide whether you committed felonies and misdemeanors against her. You know they are going to find that you did—because you're not there to show differently.

Even the Inquisition allowed alleged heretics to appear before their judges, although they were probably tied to the rack. The Inquisition at least gave people an opportunity to prove they did not do what they were accused of, but not the U.S. Government. With VAWA, you never know who your judges are, and they skip the rack and go right to finding you committed certain wrongs. Under American justice today, the Feminists eliminated the need for the rack because confessions are no longer required—just the lies of aliens.

Stalin's show trials were fairer, since the accused at least got to appear before a tribunal, although, as with VAWA, the outcomes were fixed.

If I pulled out a gun and shot a Feminist, I'd have a right to a trial, to due process. Why is that denied me because an alien female accuses me of battery, extreme cruelty or a pattern of violence?

The citizen husband or boyfriend also can't find out what the federal government determined he did to his alien wife or alien girlfriend, how the federal government is using those fact-findings, or to whom it provides the results of those fact-findings even though he's the one found to have committed the modern day scourge of domestic violence. The fact-findings are kept in a government file on the citizen, which he cannot access, change, or correct no matter how false.

Even the Privacy Act is of no use to the American. The purpose of the Privacy Act is to allow Americans to find out whether the federal government has files on them and to obtain copies so that they can correct inaccuracies or challenge the government's reason for keeping the files. There are exceptions, for instance terrorists can't obtain their files. American men who married or dated foreign girls who falsely accused them of abuse can't obtain their files either.

After the federal government finds that a citizen committed various heinous acts, it promises that no harm will come to him because all its findings will be kept secret, except from (1) his ex-wife or ex-girlfriend, (2) federal agencies that provide her benefits, (3) state agencies that provide her benefits, (4) local agencies that provide her benefits, (5) private agencies that provide her benefits, (6) federal law enforcement officials, (7) state law enforcement officials, (8) local law enforcement officials, (9) Interpol, and (10) nonprofit, nongovernmental groups that provide other services to his ex-wife or ex-girlfriend. All of those organizations have access to the fact-findings while the one against whom the facts were found—the American—does not.

Oh, and by the way, if any of the federal government's decisions about a citizen committing crimes leaks to the general public, there is not a damn thing he can do—legally. There are no lawsuits or administrative proceedings he can bring to correct the false record or keep it from being published.

VAWA's secret proceedings not only violate an American's freedom of speech to speak up on his own behalf, right to fairness of procedure under due process, and equal protection under the law (VAWA is always used against citizens and usually against men), but it threatens the very foundation of this democracy.

“The heart of the matter is that democracy implies respect for the elementary rights of men, however suspect or unworthy those men may be; a democratic government must therefore practice fairness; and fairness can rarely be obtained by secret, one-sided determination of facts

decisive of rights.” *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath*, 341 U.S. 123, 170 (1951) (Mr. Justice Frankfurter concurring).

Protecting victims and punishing violators are laudable goals and may actually be the founding principle of civilization—but it cannot be done unless the truth is known. Under VAWA, it’s the truth about whether the citizen husband did what his alien wife or alien girlfriend accuses him of doing. The truth is hard to find, but in this democracy, it is done in open proceedings, by an impartial tribunal, listening to both sides—not in secret where the accused has no opportunity to be heard and the adjudicator remains anonymous. Secrecy “‘provides a cloak for the malevolent, the misinformed, the meddlesome, and the corrupt to play the role of informer undetected and uncorrected.’ Appearances in the dark are apt to look different in the light of day.” *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath*, 341 U.S. 123, 172 (1951)(Mr. Justice Frankfurter concurring).

When you cut through all the politically correct propaganda of protecting “innocent alien angels” from “barbarous” American men, the VAWA proceedings against citizen males are nothing more than Kangaroo courts out of the Wild West or a Star Chamber out of the middle-ages.

“Fear of serious injury cannot alone justify suppression of free speech [the right to speak on your own behalf] and assembly [the right to make marital decisions]. Men feared witches and burnt [people]. It is the function of speech to free men from the bondage of irrational fears.” *Whitney v. Cal.*, 274 U.S. 357, 375 (1927)(Mr. Justice Brandeis concurring).

Court Proceedings Against VAWA

Citizen husbands and boyfriends face a unique problem under VAWA, since everything is in the shadows where they cannot look, but where their alien wives or alien girlfriends can.

Three other plaintiffs and I brought a class action case in federal court challenging the constitutionality of VAWA as a result of Homeland Security instituting the VAWA process to secretly determine whether we committed “battery,” or “extreme cruelty,” or “an overall pattern of violence” against our alien wives—all of which was false. The case simply asked for fairness in procedures by allowing a citizen, of which all of us were, to (1) refute an alien’s charges, (2) challenge the government’s fact-findings against him, and (3) prevent the dissemination of false and private information about the citizen that could interfere in obtaining a job or initiate a baseless law enforcement investigation against him.

Because VAWA’s secrecy prevents any citizen from finding out exactly what the government’s fact-findings are and how they are being used against him, the U.S. Southern District Court for New York and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit ruled that our allegations of harm from VAWA were “speculative” and dismissed the case. Of course, the only reason the allegations weren’t more specific was because the very statute the case challenged as unconstitutional prevented us from finding out what was going on behind the government’s closed doors, which is why we challenged VAWA in the first place.

By the courts’ logic, proceedings authorized by Congress and carried out by the Executive Branch can make findings of fact against citizens, and those citizens cannot challenge the constitutionality of those proceedings or the accuracy of the findings because secrecy laws keep the proceedings and fact findings concealed from them. Senator Joseph McCarthy would

have loved that reasoning: there's no harm because Homeland Security violated your rights in secret and will not allow you to find out how its conclusions about you are being used to undermine your life.

The hidden hand of government can destroy just as readily as a dagger in the dead of night. The U.S. Supreme Court refused to hear the case, even though that Court has stated:

“The validity and moral authority of a conclusion largely depend on the mode by which it was reached. Secrecy is not congenial to truth-seeking and self-righteousness gives too slender an assurance of rightness.” *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath*, 341 U.S. 123, 171 (1951)(Mr. Justice Frankfurter concurring).

The framers of the Constitution “did not trust any government to separate the true from the false for us.” *Thomas v. Collins*, 323 U.S. 516, 545 (1945)(Mr. Justice Jackson concurring).

VAWA has also pretty much negated the government's policy of preventing marriage fraud under the Immigration Marriage Fraud Amendments of 1986, 8 U.S.C. 1186a, by allowing criminally prone foreign females a nearly no-fault, fraudulent prone route to citizenship that occurs in the shadows. “Democracies die behind close doors.” *Detroit Free Press v. Ashcroft*, 303 F.3d 681, 683 (6th Cir. 2002).

VAWA causes fraudulent ex parte state and local proceedings.

VAWA encourages fraudulent state and local temporary restraining orders and false police complaints that result in arrests because the documents generated by such are used as primary evidence by Homeland Security and the Justice Department that an American committed crimes or civil wrongs against his alien wife or alien girlfriend. It does not matter that the state and local courts eventually find the citizen innocent of the accusations because Homeland Security and Justice will never learn about such, since the American accused of evil deeds is shut out of the VAWA proceedings and the alien is not about to introduce evidence of the citizen's innocence.

Aliens, immigration lawyers, and Feminist advocates are therefore free to create a trail of official local and state documents filled with false charges against citizens so that those documents can be used as primary evidence by Homeland Security and Justice in the VAWA process. Of course, another foreseeable result is that the false charges will result in jail, harm to occupation, lost of employment, and pink-listing of the American husband or boyfriend—but aliens, lawyers, and Feminists are not known for their ethics.

Any arrests and TROs are listed with the Identification Division of the FBI. The information is gathered from federal, state, and local agencies, and the FBI disseminates it to all law enforcement agencies and to officials of state and local governments for employment and licensing purposes. 28 C.F.R. §§ 20.21(b)(2)-(3); 20.33(a); 50.12(a). TROs are also entered into the FBI's National Information Crime Center. All of the information concerning arrests and TROs are available for FBI security clearance checks that it conducts before the federal government hires someone.

When a citizen is found innocent of the charges in state or local court, he will have to go to federal court to have the damaging records erased, since the states and municipalities have no

power to prevent dissemination or to expunge federal records. The problem is that federal courts only erase the records in extreme situations of which false accusations by an alien spouse or girlfriend is not one. The result is that those fact-findings are forever in the federal government's records.

In addition, private detective agencies keep databases of public criminal and civil records and provide reports of arrests, TROs, and restraining order violations to potential employers as part of the routine background checks that employers conduct. Once a potential employer sees that a husband was arrested for a domestic crime, a temporary restraining order was taken out against him by a female, or he was accused of violating a TRO, the employer will likely deny him a job.

The false allegations will continue working relentlessly to clandestinely destroy an American's reputation, career, and inter-reaction with others until his life collapses—just as the invisible hand of the McCarthy lists in the 1950s destroyed many innocent persons based on unsubstantiated accusations.

“It is common knowledge that a man with an arrest record is much more apt to be subject to police scrutiny—the first to be questioned and the last eliminated as a suspect.” *Utz v. Cullinane*, 520 F.2d 467, 481 n. 35 (D.C. Cir. 1975)(quoted citation omitted).

“[E]ven to be acquitted may damage one's good name if the community receives the verdict with a wink and chooses to remember defendant as one who ought to be convicted.” *Michelson v. United States*, 335 U.S. 469, 482 (1948).

VAWA also interferes with a state divorce or annulment proceeding where the alien wife's credibility is an important issue. The wife's use of VAWA infers a motivation to make false accusations in state proceedings because those accusations require no proof by the immigration authorities, only affidavits by her, Feminist counselors, and state documents containing her assertions. The secrecy of the VAWA process, however, prevents the husband from acquiring evidence that his wife is using VAWA, so he is unable to use that information to impeach her credibility.

Another related harm caused by VAWA is the violation of the Sixth Amendment. In state criminal proceedings against the citizen, the prosecution's key witness is the alien wife or girlfriend. Since she knows whether she is using the VAWA process, the prosecution is in possession of information that the husband or boyfriend can use to impeach the alien's credibility, but VAWA secrecy prevents the prosecutor from revealing that the alien is using VAWA to gain permanent residency. That violates the Sixth Amendment right of the American to show that witnesses against him have a motive to lie.

Because of VAWA, a husband's right to end his marriage or a boyfriend's right to end a relationship now carries with it the threat of fraudulent police complaints, TROs, arrests, jail, and violation of basic constitutional rights just because he married or dated an alien, the marriage or romance failed, and the federal government created a rubber-stamp, fraudulent process for his wife or girlfriend to gain permanent residency. The VAWA provisions chill Americans' freedom of choice on whether to terminate their marriages or relationships with aliens and deter them from marrying or dating a foreigner in order to avoid a repeat of the VAWA hell they went through or might go through.

That, of course, is exactly what the Feminists want. Since not all Feminists are lesbians and most are physically or psychologically unattractive, they needed federal law to restrict American guys to the pool of American females.

VAWA simply and intentionally created a fraudulent track to permanent U.S. residency and citizenship for alien wives or girlfriends whenever the alien female alleges abuse. The Act doesn't focus on fraud prevention but fraud permission.

How ironic that today, America, which has consistently granted aliens within its borders rights similar to citizens, now deprives those citizens of rights granted aliens.

Solution

The solution to the federal government's violation of citizens' rights in order to give aliens, usually alien females, preferential treatment is to do what the British and American legal systems have done for hundreds of years—use the adversarial process.

Give American citizens the same rights terrorists have. Terrorists get to have a trial in federal court or a military tribunal to determine whether they committed some evil act. They appear before those who determine what they did, are presumed innocent until proven guilty, and are allowed to submit evidence on their own behalf. But there is no adversarial process for American men accused of abuse by an alien female, even if she is here illegally, running a con, works as a prostitute, deals in drugs, evades taxes, or belongs to the Chechen “Black Widows.”

What's a Star Chamber?

The British Star Chamber was used as a tool of political power in the 1500s and 1600s.

The Star Chamber acted as a court that imposed punishment for actions deemed to be morally unacceptable but not in violation of the law. This allowed the Chamber to punish anyone for any action that the Chamber felt should be illegal even when it wasn't. The Chamber's decisions were arbitrary and subjective, which allowed it to become an instrument of oppression. Hearings were held in secret, no indictments, no appeals. The accused was not permitted to appear and defend himself.

With each embarrassment to arbitrary power, the Star Chamber became emboldened to undertake further usurpations of authority. The Star Chamber finally summoned juries before it for verdicts disagreeable to the government and fined and imprisoned the jurors. It spread terrorism among all those who did constitutional acts.

The U.S. Supreme Court said, “the Star Chamber has, for centuries, symbolized disregard of basic individual rights.” *Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806, 821-22 (1975). Now America has its own in VAWA Star Chamber.

VAWA adjudications and fact-findings are made at the VAWA Unit in Vermont by government employees trained in Feminist ideology by Feminist nonprofit corporations. These corporations are kept secret from the American public while taxpayers pay for them to indoctrinate government officials in Feminism.

The VAWA adjudicators are not impartial; they do not treat both sides alike because one side, the American citizen's, is missing. Impartial adjudicators are necessary to preserve both the appearance and the reality of fairness “so important to a popular government, that justice has

been done.” *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath*, 341 U.S. 123, 172 (Mr. Justice Frankfurter concurring).

Isn't VAWA necessary to keep alien spouses from being abused?

Mistreated aliens have plenty of options—walk down to the local precinct or call the toll-free domestic violence hotline; it talks in many tongues, including a forked one.

A mistreated alien wife or girlfriend in America has recourse to state and local courts and numerous legal aid groups to deal with mistreatment and avoid deportation without the need of a fraudulent prone, rubber stamp process to permanent residency that violates the constitutional rights of U.S. citizens.

Why should the federal government involve itself in domestic disputes? It already can't do what it's supposed to in areas for which the Constitution gives it responsibility. The states have always had the job of dealing with domestic disputes and have developed the necessary expertise.

There are three possible scenarios under VAWA: (1) no abuse, but the guy discovers he was tricked into marriage, yet it's his rights that the government violates; (2) the alien wife abuses the guy who has zero recourse because Feminarchy America won't believe him, and the government will still punish him by violating his rights and ruining his life; and (3) the alien wife is mistreated, but just because an alien is mistreated doesn't mean we have to give her permanent residency and citizenship. There's no necessary connection between mistreatment and citizenship. The connection was made solely to intimidate American men out of taking foreign wives or girlfriends.

Let's say an American Feminazi marries an alien guy. Back in the U.S. she discovers he's a Russian mafia pimp, so she drives over him in her Mercedes Benz, and he survives. Is that a reason to give this guy a green card? I don't think so. Sure the Feminazi should be prosecuted for attempted murder, but why should the guy become a resident and then a citizen. There's no connection between his injury and residency. Should every alien in this country who is injured automatically gain a green card? I don't think so.

What if a mistreated alien is a member of Al Qaeda, or the Russian mafia, or she's a ho? Don't we have enough hos in this country already? Do we have to import them in addition to breeding them?

At some point people, even females, have to be responsible for their lives. If government takes on the task of protecting everyone from everything, then there is no liberty, no freedom for anyone. Remember the utopia, the new Soviet man and female created in the Soviet Union.

These alien girls who have been scheming to get to America for years also have the option of learning self-defense in a martial arts course.

VAWA probably causes more violence because if you're going to be blamed for something, you might as well do it. Had I known that the federal government would hold secret hearings to apparently find that I committed battery, extreme cruelty, or a pattern of violence, then I would have slapped my ex-wife upside the head.

You imported one.

I know, and I did everything I could to send her back, but the Devil didn't want her.

I don't think any girl would want to be your wife.

The feeling is mutual.

Why did the Feminists get VAWA passed?

VAWA is the modern day equivalent of making voodoo dolls of men and sticking them with pins, except that it works.

VAWA permits alien girls to do violence to the rights of citizen men and not only get away with it, but be paid for it by the government with taxpayer dollars that disproportionately come from men. Their legal fees, sometimes housing, and even daily expenses are often paid by the government.

VAWA is an example of using political power to control the purely personal when no criminal or civil wrongs have occurred but only a citizen choosing not to sacrifice liberty by conforming to the self-righteous dictates of the Feminist Establishment.

The Feminazis aren't stupid; they're cowardly and evil, but not dumb. By the early 1990s, they knew American guys were fed up with females exploiting Feminist ideology by always telling guys what to think, say, and how to act even when a guy's actions harmed no one. Guys started looking for ladies who were "evolutionarily correct" rather than politically correct, which often meant going overseas. The purpose of VAWA is to create an *in terrorem* effect so that American men will not look overseas for mates but choose from the pool of fat, flabby, over-the-hill, man-blaming females in America.

The Feminists didn't create VAWA out of bleeding hearts for alien females but to intimidate American men into shopping at home for wives and girlfriends.

Why do females squeeze their feet into tiny shoes with stilts on one end, constrict the lower part of their bodies in panty hose, interfere with their respiration with tight push-up bras, paint their faces with cancer causing dyes, pluck their eyebrows—ow, glue fake eyelashes to their eye lids, conduct chemical reactions on their heads to change hair color? To catch a guy.

If they are willing to do all that to land a guy, they are sure willing to use the government to violate a guy's rights if it increases their chances.

If females have the choice to butcher incipient human beings, then guys should have the choice to look for girlfriends overseas—but in reality they don't.

How were you harmed by VAWA

Besides the violation of my due process rights by the government's secret proceedings that apparently found I had committed battery, or extreme cruelty, or a pattern of violence against my ex-wife, there were the legal fees incurred in defending against a fraud based TRO taken out against me. The injury to my reputation by a false extortion complaint filed with the NYC police, which is now most likely in the data banks of Internet detective agencies.

Because I refused to commit perjury before Immigration by sponsoring my ex-wife for permanent residency, her immigration lawyer instructed her to go to state court and obtain the TRO by accusing me, without me being present, of the following crimes: assault in the second and third degrees; attempted assault, aggravated harassment, harassment in the first and second degrees; menacing in the second and third degrees; disorderly conduct, reckless endangerment, and stalking in the first, second, third, and fourth degrees. All false, but it all went into

government records and those of private detective firms that I cannot expunge. The Feminists have so corrupted the government and the court system that lies told by females are now considered the truth, and men don't even get a chance to refute the lies about them before they are disseminated.

It's not that I told the truth and was disbelieved—I didn't even get the chance to tell the truth because the extortion complaint was *ex parte*, the TRO was issued *ex parte*, and the federal VAWA proceeding that likely found I had committed some evil deed was *ex parte*. It's *ex parte* boot strapping on *ex parte*. That's the way the Nazis worked, and that's the way the Commies operated.

Think about it. A Russian mafia prostitute, stripper at Flash Dancers, former Mistress to a Chechen warlord, and a federal and state felon goes into an American court where it's just her and the judge. She cries her phony tears and presto a TRO is issued against an American lawyer who once worked for one of the most prestigious law firms in the country. It's done without my being there, I have no notice, and no opportunity to defend myself against the order that will harm my reputation, put my name on various government evil-doers' lists, and could land me in jail just on this prostitute's say so. What if I stepped into a subway car and she was on it—off to jail I go. The police have no discretion in the matter because the law created by the Feminists requires the police to make arrests on the say-sos of sluts who obtain TROs.

The TRO against me was later dismissed because my ex-wife and her lawyer failed to prosecute. Why? Because they didn't have to. She still got to use the TRO as evidence that I abused her because the Feminists created in VAWA an unconstitutional system that allows, and actually encourages, aliens to make false claims of threatened abuse as a reason for not pursuing a permanent restraining order.

Nearly a year after the TRO was dismissed, I'm entering the country from overseas and Customs pulls me into their detention room for 45 minutes. Why? Because of that TRO that had been dismissed. The information was still in their computer and probably still is to this day. The exact same thing happened to one of the other plaintiffs in the case against VAWA. Customs doesn't even detain terrorists. They come and go as they please. But Feminists have so perverted this country's institutions that Customs detains American citizens based on secret proceedings used by state courts to issue TROs against citizens who have no opportunity to defend, and the orders from those secret proceeding are actually dismissed.

In the future, I'll re-enter the country by way of the Rio Grande with all the other illegals.

Subsequently, I tried to obtain a job with the CIA through a recruitment session at my *alma mater* Columbia University's Business School. I wasn't hired, and my ex-wife using VAWA may have been the reason, but there is no way for me to find out. Who knows what other positions I tried to obtain but didn't because of VAWA? Who knows what false information is circulating in the shadows about me and will do harm without my realizing it? That's the danger of VAWA—just like the black listing of the McCarthy era.

U.S. taxpayers were also harmed because they likely ended up paying my ex-wife's legal fees. Imagine, taxpayers paying the legal fees of a Russian mafia prostitute without even getting any sex in return—what a scam.

Is VAWA a bill of attainder?

Congress bought into the zeal for Feminist supremacy over men by enacting VAWA, which amounts to a bill of attainder—punishment without trial.

VAWA singles out mainly men for legislatively prescribed punishment by describing in terms of conduct that which operates primarily as a stereotypical designation of the group of men—men abuse their wives and girlfriends but females do not abuse their husbands or boyfriends. Bills of attainder violate Article 1, § 9, cl. 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

Because of VAWA, thousands of men each year have been arrested, jailed, subjected to *ex parte* temporary restraining orders and *ex parte* complaints to the police that are false. They have lost houses, jobs, bank accounts, and were or are having their rights to freedom of speech, freedom of choice in marital relationships, procedural due process, and equal protection trampled by VAWA's Star Chamber provisions. They face ongoing non-compensable harm from defamations and invasions of privacy. Barriers prevent them from correcting false government fact-findings about them or limiting dissemination of such.

It must be remembered that these American men are not accused of terrorism, they're not planning to blow-up innocent civilians—all they did was fall for alien females.

You just want American men to have the right to use violence against alien girls?

Define violence.

I'll do it for you. It's the use of physical force that causes injury. Let's say you and a girl are rushing for a subway seat and you bump her out of the way. That's physical force but no injury.

Under VAWA, any mockery, insult, or yelling is considered violence.

The terms "battery," "extreme cruelty," and "overall pattern of violence" were intentionally left vague and over inclusive (legally called "overbroad"—how appropriate) so that a citizen husband can be accused of any of these evil-sounding deeds by just exercising his constitutionally protected speech that he may use in times of quarrels and even in times of making-up, such as kissing the alien if she does not want to be kissed at that particular moment.

Persons cannot know what not to do if there is no way of knowing what not to do. The insidious evil of VAWA is that the Feminists in the VAWA Unit in Vermont can arbitrarily decide what is violence under VAWA because the Feminists wrote the law to include almost any innocent act as violence if a female claims such.

Regardless of the overbroad nature of violence under VAWA, men should have the right to defend themselves against false accusations, and even if the accusations are true, they still have a right to defend themselves.

Any reason for filing the VAWA case on St. Valentine's Day?

It was my Valentine's Day gift to the Feminazis—too bad it wasn't a Chicago one.

Would I machine gun the Feminists? Hmmm let me think about that one.

It's a flippant remark that expresses my contempt for them. If I do machine gun a bunch of them, then you can use the statement against me.

(2) Americans who date or marry Americans:

VAWA provides: (1) hundreds of millions of dollars to state and local courts and law enforcement if they do what the law wants, which is the same as doing what the Feminists want, since they wrote the law; (2) money to state and local courts and law enforcement whose policies violate the Constitution; and (3) hundreds of millions of dollars to Feminist non-profit corporations that frees up private contributions for lobbying in favor of laws that discriminate against guys and for supporting political candidates.

Money for doing what VAWA wants:

(a) 23 states, including New York, have predominant aggressor policies that violate equal protection and probable cause.

When police show up at a domestic dispute, they are required to determine who is bigger, stronger, and more capable of physical activity—most likely the guy. Then they factor in who called 911, who's more fearful or the better actor—most likely the girl. The arrest isn't based on evidence indicating the guy did something wrong but that he's a guy.

The guy could be standing there bleeding from the head, and the girl holding a blood-dripping hammer, yet the police have to arrest the guy or the department loses money from VAWA.

The arrest information goes into the FBI identification data base that is available to all law enforcement agencies, officials of state and local governments for employment and licensing purposes, and to certain private contractors. 28 C.F.R. §§ 20.21(b)(2)-(3); 20.33(a); 50.12(a). Private detective agencies also obtain publicly available information that can be accessed on the Internet.

The guy then has to spend lots of money on legal fees, which often bankrupts him, to stay out of jail. Even when the state court finds the guy innocent, he's not going to get the arrest information erased from all the databases that hold it. The girl's lies will always be there to prevent him from obtaining one job or another and forever ruin his reputation, but the federal government doesn't care because he's a man, and men, the ones who created this country, no longer have rights, other than to die for it.

(b) No drop prosecutions

In two-thirds of the states, once the man is arrested, the state has to prosecute him. Prosecutors no-longer have the discretion in domestic dispute cases to drop prosecution of the arrested person.

Money for unconstitutional policies:

(a) All states have domestic temporary restraining orders (TROs) that violate free speech and due process.

A girlfriend or wife, alien or not, simply goes to court cries a few tears, tells a few lies, and presto the court, without notice to the husband or evidence, issues a temporary restraining order against him.

TROs, like arrest records go into an FBI database and the databases of hundreds of private detective agencies, which are available on the Internet.

Historically, TROs were used to prevent an immediate harm before both parties could appear in court.

For example, assume the Feminist next door is clearing trees from her property. Instead of cutting them down, she's using dynamite to blow them up, and parts of the trees are raining down on your property. You politely ask her to stop, but she replies she will not be intimidated by a male chauvinist pig. You jump in your car and go to the court. The clerk sends you before a judge because you are asking for a TRO to put a stop to the immediate damage to your property until there can be a full hearing on the matter.

The judge tells his clerk to try to reach the Feminist. (In domestic dispute cases the judge doesn't bother). The Feminist doesn't answer her telephone because she's doing psychotropic drugs with her girlfriend and sticking pins in voodoo dolls of every man she ever knew.

The judge issues a TRO directing the Feminist to stop dynamiting and to show up in court, usually seven days later to resolve the dispute. (In domestic dispute cases, it's often two months or more, and the husband is thrown into the street).

If the Feminist keeps dynamiting during the seven days, then the police, at their discretion, can arrest her, but usually a warning suffices.

(b) More than 34 states, including New York, require arrests for an alleged TRO violation, which violates due process and probable cause.

With a domestic dispute TRO, the wife or girlfriend has a "boyfriend goes to jail whenever I want" card. She can call the police, make up a lie that the husband or boyfriend violated the TRO and the police must throw him in jail.

The guy also could be stupid enough to send her flowers as a peace offering, and the police must again throw him in jail. He should have saved the flowers for his early grave.

Now he has an arrest record, which goes into the FBI database (available to all law enforcement agencies, officials of state and local governments for employment and licensing) and private detective firms' databases, and will cost him a lot of money to defend against.

Money freed up for lobbying and political candidates:

The numerous nonprofit corporations set up by Feminists receive hundreds of millions of federal dollars to train and preach their man-hating dogma to police, court employees and others. It doesn't matter whether state and local government workers buy into the Feminist doctrine just so long as they do what it requires; otherwise, their jobs might be in jeopardy.

Feminist nonprofit corporations usually have two sides: one that allegedly does charitable and educational work for which government tax dollars largely pay for, such as from VAWA, and the other side that lobbies for legislation discriminating against men and for supporting certain political candidates. Since government money goes into supporting the educational side, it frees up private contributions for the political side.

Rights violated by VAWA:

Free Speech, right to think what you will and speak what you think, especially on your own behalf in proceedings that make findings of fact as to your conduct.

Due Process, right to defend yourself when accused of crimes or civil wrongs; to submit evidence in your defense; to have notice that the government is holding proceedings concerning you; to know specifically what is prohibited, rather than having to guess about it.

Privacy, right to have access to government records concerning you, to challenge the accuracy of those records.

Equal Protection, right not to be discriminated against by the government because of an accident of nature.

Family Matters, right to marry or date whom you want, assuming she wants to marry or date you; to divorce or end a romance, and make other family and personal related decisions without fear of government retribution.

Bear Arms, right to own a gun—issuance of a permanent restraining order requires the surrendering firearms.

Probable Cause, right not to be arrested unless there is more evidence indicating you did something wrong than evidence saying you did not, cannot be arrested based on classifying you as a member of a particular group, as do primary aggressor laws.

“In a government like ours, entirely popular, care should be taken in every part of the system, not only to do right, but to satisfy the community that right is done.” *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath*, 341 U.S. 123, 172 n. 19 (1951)(Mr. Justice Frankfurter concurring)(quoting 5 *The Writings and Speeches of Daniel Webster*, 163).

Isn't VAWA needed to stop domestic abuse among Americans?

It depends on how you define “domestic abuse” or “domestic violence.” If you’re just talking about domestic disputes: squabbling, arguments, heart breaks, and tears concerning couples, you’re never going to stop that unless you create an Orwellian government like that in 1984, which VAWA is a good step toward doing.

What you want from government are laws and their enforcement that prevent intimidation or the use of physical violence in domestic situations that cause injury. Under our Constitution, that power has always existed in the states and with local police and local courts—not the federal government.

If you’re being threatened or battered by a lover, then call the police—not the FBI or Homeland Security. It’s the police and local courts responsibility to protect citizens from intimidation and physical violence used in relationships. And it’s the responsibility of the individual being harmed or threatened to call the police and testify in court. When the police show up at a scene of alleged physical violence or threats, they can’t read a person’s mind. The person in danger has to speak up—that’s their responsibility as a member of this society.

We’re not dealing with children here. These are adults, and adults have responsibilities under this type of government. Government cannot protect everyone from their own stupidities and fears. The Communists tried that and look at the harm they caused—the lives, hopes and dreams they destroyed.

The government can't protect everybody from everything. If it tries, like the Commies tried, then you have the wholesale violation of rights.

Example

Let's say I'm riding the bus and behind me are two young guys speaking in a Middle Eastern language. I become scared that they'll blow up the bus, and I call the police. When the cops show up, let's assume the law requires them to arrest the guys just because I became scared and they're ancestors grew up in a different part of the world than mine. That's the way VAWA works; only the person arrested on the mere say-so of another without any evidence is usually a guy because an accident of nature made him a guy.

Why did the Feminists write VAWA to control Americans in relationships with Americans?

Looks like the Feminists want to do away with marriage just as the Communists, Nazis, and Oceania in the novel *1984* wanted to.

The Feminists are like the Nazis, Commies, and every other group of tin-pot dictators and zealots in history; they want to force their ideology on everyone else. They believe they've discovered the "truth"; otherwise, why call themselves "politically correct." That's as nuts as "religiously correct."

They also want easy money from the government, which has substituted for husbands they can't get.

With taxpayer dollars, their media and political clout, the Feminists are pretty much getting what they want—a tyranny over men. They want such a tyranny, so they'll be treated like princesses—do what I want, when I want, read my mind before I have to tell you what I want, and be quick about it.

How can men be the ones who are suffering?

(a) American men dating or married to alien females.

In the case where an American man dates or marries an alien female, the Federal Government in deciding whether the man did something wrong or committed a crime does so without using the adversarial process. It's all kept secret from the American husband.

The reason for this part of VAWA is to create an *in terrorem* effect to keep guys from looking overseas for mates. After all, from 1900 to 1950 the male/female ratio in the U.S. was above 100%, but since 1950, it's been in the lower 90% category.

(b) American men dating or married to American females.

Because a fair amount of the funding that is provided to local courts and the police by VAWA is dependent on Feminist tenets, neither dare value a man's word to the same extent as a female's. Both refuse to believe what the man says; thereby, assuring further funding under VAWA.

VAWA uses Feminist organizations to train local court and law enforcement personnel, which means training government employees to do what the Feminists want. They warn that if an employee does his job their way, then he won't have any problems. But if he does his job consistent with the Constitution, then he'll have problems.

The training is also accompanied by indoctrination that men are dangerous and need to be contained and punished because they are men.

Doesn't the average female, who is physically weaker than the average male, need the government to protect her?

Sure, and she has always had it with the local police and local courts.

She can also go to her brother, her father, her uncle, the guy next door, or one of her many beaux, or take martial arts and learn to protect herself.

Don't sell girls short. They've been doing better than holding their own since the hunting and gathering days.

Females are masters of the art of deception and using the intentional infliction of emotional distress to get what they want. Ever try dealing with a crying or nagging girlfriend?

What I want to know is where's the Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress Against Men Act?

There are reports of females initiating as much domestic violence as males, but let's be real, guys can protect themselves from a female, right?

Assuming she's not driving a Mercedes Benz or feeding you poison, yes. Even if she's wheedling a gun, so long as it's not a shotgun, I wouldn't be too worried.

The problem isn't their use of physical violence; you'll never stop that, but that when a female causes injury, the courts believe the female's lie about self-defense. Even if the guy is still alive, the courts will believe her.

The Courts are predominantly biased against guys. For example, when the judge asked the prostitute at what point she realized she had been raped, the prostitute answered, "When the check bounced." "Guilty!" the judge declared.

VAWA Mafia

A Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organization of nonprofit corporations and government employees that violate the law in their efforts to exercise power and make money.

They suborn perjury, perpetrate fraud, obstruct justice, breach government contracts, suppress statistics on female-initiated abuse, and reach conclusions not supported by the data.

War

America's wars were fought, in part, to keep American females from becoming British trollops, Nazi broodmares, Japanese comfort girls, or Commie secretutes.

Since girls control a majority of the country's assets, in the next war, girls should make up a majority of the casualties in defending those assets.

A healthy society should not war against human nature, but there will never be peace so long as feminine desire exceeds its ability.

There is a state of war between men and the Feminazis—total war.
You may not be interested in war, but war is interested in you.

Women

Women are females who don't exploit the Feminazi pedestal. They understand the foibles and benefits of both sexes, see through the self-serving hype of the Feminists, use the power that Mother Nature gave them rather than pretending they are men, and are actually willing to help a guy to a point rather than whining what have you done for me lately?

“To be a real woman is to bring out the best in a man.” Gidget.

Work

If a person does it today, he won't have to do it tomorrow.

Work outside the home is often more interesting than work done in the home. Yet it is also true that work done in the home—particularly time spent with one's children when they are young—is often more satisfying and important than wage work.

The Feminazis have bamboozled men into giving them jobs for which guys are better suited.

World Problem

The key problem facing the world is over population and the key cause of over population is selfish females. Girls want above all else, except money, children. It's a key driving force for them, not so for most men who want a career.