

Amos Nouvelle



A brief look at the damage done to society by fifty years of feminist activity

I BLAME FEMINISM

I chose the title for this book advisedly after - unfortunately - coming across one of those "dolly diatribe" blogs entitled "I blame the Patriarchy". The banner was in an appropriate washed out green, but the title was discernible.

Judging by the blog's contents, the writer is obviously some feminatric who attended a mid twentieth century course on women's studies and is still using the notes she made at the time.

Her "style" impinges on the English language from time to time but is mostly confined to diatribish with such offerings as "I wouldn't give him the steam off my piss". The blog is full of such academic and uplifting "thinking" and is about as high as it gets.

The sycophants who read her blog quite naturally agree with her every utterance, and everyone who falls into this predictable mould is allowed to have their say; but there is a warning that no dissent is allowed. This has always been a feature of feminism and one of its many failings. It has never countenanced a differing point of view.

You might remember that in January 2005, the President of Havard University, Lawrence H. Summers, caused something of an uproar at an "academic" conference when he said that innate differences between men and women might be one reason why fewer women succeed in science and maths careers. In this connection he also happened to mention the dearth of female professors in science and engineering at elite American universities. These are two facts have been amply illustrated by school and university staffing, and results, over past decades but, sadly, it does not accord with feminist "thinking" which declares that there is very little difference between men and women - this despite clear DNA evidence that the difference genetically between men and women is about 2%, the same sort of gap as between a woman and a female chimpanzee.

One female teacher, from an institute of technology, felt compelled to walk out of Summers' talk saying that, if she hadn't done so, "I would have either blacked out or thrown up". I would have thought that anyone so academically parochial and unstable that she is unable to appreciate a point of view which differs from her own would be eminently unsuitable to teach young people how to study and how to think; but such is the sad state of American education at the moment. Feminists, such as the writer of the blog I refer to, totally justify the comments made by Robert H. Bork in his outstanding book "*Slouching Towards Gomorrah*":

"Radical feminism is the most destructive and fanatical movement to come down to us from the sixties . . . by now it certainly deserves its own place in the halls of intellectual barbarisms".

In true feminist style, the blog blames everything in the world, from big business to religion, for having taken part in "the oppression of women". But fortunately there are some women who think clearly on these social issues. Midge Decter, for instance, in her article "*You're on your own baby*" in The Women's Quarterly, asks:

"Why should there have been an explosion of angry demand on the part of women who as a group were the freest, healthiest, wealthiest, longest-lived and most comfortably situated people the world has ever yet laid eyes on?"

Decter anwers this question by stating that it is her freedom that frightens today's woman:

"The appeal to her of the women's movement is that in her fear and disorientation, the movement offers her the momentary escape contained in the idea that she is not free at all; that she is, on the contrary, the victim of an age-old conspiracy that everything troubling to her has been imposed on her by others."

Think of all the freedom and choice available to modern woman: whether to take up a career in any field she chooses, whether to get married; and if she marries whether to juggle both or to make the choice of becoming a career mother and wife, and so on. In short, today's woman has to take responsibility for her own actions and decisions. How much easier it must be to retreat into victimhood and "blame the Patriarchy". Hence white, heterosexual men have become the universal blamees.

The most constructive comment I've ever read about feminism was by a woman, Phyllis Schlafly, who said: "Let's face it, girls, feminism was a mistake".

FEMINISM - THE BIG LIE

Hans Christian Andersen's story, *The Emperor's New Clothes*, is a vivid illustration of how people can easily be deluded. You will remember that two tailors told the emperor that they had manufactured a really marvellous cloth, very fine and more beautiful than any other. They told the emperor that it was so special that only very intelligent people could see it; ordinary people couldn't. This great con trick was swallowed in wholesale fashion by the emperor and all his subjects. When the tailors ostensibly made him a magnificent outfit from the cloth the emperor paraded down the street in it admired by all his subjects who said they could see the cloth. It wasn't until a small boy, who wasn't taken in by the trick, cried out that the emperor had no clothes on, that everyone came to their senses and realised they had all been party to a big lie.

Such was the case when feminism was introduced in the second half of the twentieth century. Women were told that for centuries they had been dominated by an evil patriarchy and that they were a downtrodden section of the community that needed to fight for freedom and equality. Some people say that women never invent anything; I disagree; feminists have been inventing, or rewriting, their own version of history - which some of the sillier sisters referred to as "herstory" - for half a century. In doing so their total ignorance of true history stands out like a sore thumb.

Back in the Middle Ages women were much better cared for than the feminists would have us believe. Joseph and Frances Gies' book *Marriage and the Family in the Middle Ages* records that "*Widows were given half or full provisions of their husband's estate after his death.* (*The children were sometimes given the other half.*) *This includes monies, land and houses. Children were also explicitly cared for in their fathers' wills, with guardianship entrusted to the widow.*" In cases of adultery men were charged equally with women.

Paintings from that time show us wives chasing their husbands with

broomsticks. Modern surveys clearly show that women are just as violent in the home as men; perhaps they always have been.

It was always assumed that only men were promiscuous, and fathers always assumed that the children borne by their wives were always their offspring. With the advent of modern DNA tests it has now been proved beyond all question that one in five children in all developed nations are not the children of the man claimed to be the father by the woman. Mothers today are having to repay many thousands of pounds to men who have discovered that they are not the fathers of the children as claimed by the mother.

The alleged "oppression" of women by men in not allowing them to enter certain jobs and professions such as the medical and legal professions were attempts to shield women from danger within society. Women were forbidden to work down coal mines on the ground that it was "too dangerous". However, it wasn't too dangerous for men and thousands were killed doing the job.

So successful were feminists with their "emperor's new clothes" trick that we have now reached the stage of "let's pretend" by allowing women into the military on an alleged equal footing with men; equal except that the standards expected of men are not the same as the watered down standards expected of women. Also women do not share the same dangers as men. If they did they would share the same percentage of casualties. Of course, women *can* be casualties but they are few and far between as the following facts clearly show:

Men represent 90% of the armed forces but 98% of the casualties. Women represent 10% of the armed forces but only 2% of the casualties.

Something else that feminists have invented are false statistics and, by infiltrating the media over the last four decades, they have managed to get those false figures accepted by a gullible public. Many people today are convinced that domestic abuse is something perpetrated by men on women whereas the truth is that women are equally as violent in the home as men.

Child abuse is another case in point. Aided and abetted by the BBC and the National Society for the Prevention of cruelty to Children (NSPCC) the impression has been given in the UK that men are responsible for most child abuse. This is hypocrisy of a very high order as the *figures published by the NSPCC* show that the vast majority of child abuse is perpetrated by mothers. Figures from Scotland show that over half child abuse there is perpetrated by mothers.

The only area where child abuse has increased from 2002 to 2003 is that by mothers. All the others have decreased or remain the same. As recent figures

in the UK show that violence by women has doubled in the last five years, one can only suppose that child abuse by women has increased also. This is probably the reason why I couldn't find an up-to-date table of child abuse on the Scottish Government website. It's been well and truly hidden. The statistics on domestic violence on the website are truly antique. I think they are about as old as Edinburgh castle!

But the game is up! Feminism is now known as one gigantic lie. The empress is found to be wearing no clothes!

DATE RAPE - THE FANTASY OF SO MANY WOMEN

The girl who accused Mike Tyson of rape received a telephone call from him at two o' clock in the morning, got out of bed and went to his bedroom where she took off her clothes and got into bed with him. Did she think he wanted to play tiddlywinks? Of course Tyson was a rough character and also the "wrong" colour, so he was found guilty. It was one of the many outrageous miscarriages of justice in the American system.

America is designed around women and run by feminists of both sexes so that Tyson never stood a chance once the cry of "rape" went up. Given that feminists scorn all men, even those who have given their lives to preserve free speech - but for "feminists only" – the "sistas" seem eternally ungrateful.

Over the last forty years the people of America have had political "correctness" blasted at them from TV presenters anxious to keep their jobs, politicians trying to gain votes, and advertisers trying to sell to women, with the result that it is now the "received wisdom" in society in general and in the police force in particular, that "a woman would never lie about something like rape". The truth is that women do - frequently.

Surveys have proved beyond doubt what the reasons are for false allegations of rape. These are the most common ones given by women who have made false rape allegations:

1. They agreed to have sex but thought they might be pregnant

2. They didn't want their husband or boyfriend to know they had been unfaithful

3. They had second thoughts afterwards and wanted to blame the man

- 4. They wanted to get revenge on a man
- 5. They felt ashamed and didn't want the blame
- 6.To test a partner's love.

The Times in the UK reported the case of Julie Renouf who wasted 2,000 hours of police time and was responsible for a man being unjustly questioned for 15 hours by police. Her lame excuse was that she didn't want her husband to know that she had betrayed him. She was jailed for a mere six months!

In the USA a former stripper made a false accusation against some Dallas cowboys and was charged by police with filing a false report. She received a derisory 90 days in jail and was fined \$1500.

There are many other reasons why women cry rape falsely. All women like to be thought of as "desirable to men" and "lusted after" etc. even though many don't qualify in any way in this direction, so if she can tell her friends that "he took me against my will" she can imply that she's hot property.

Even the late Andrea Dworkin tried doing this. She claimed that a young waiter working in a hotel had tried to rape her. Can you imagine that? Andrea Dworkin being raped! I recently read a hilarious article on this on the Suffragents website. If you want to read it put this URL in your address bar - but hold your sides! –

http://suffragents.freehostia.com/articles%20file/feminism.html#dworkin

Then there is the messy divorce where the wife wants the children but the husband also wants to see them. A rape charge will influence the judge to hand over the children to the wife, despite the husband being totally innocent. Wil Hetherington was caught by his wife in this way which resulted in his being incarcerated for 30 years. His wife visited him voluntarily, agreed to having sex and then cried rape.

The answer to this social evil of lying women is to punish them - really punish them - by giving them the same jail sentence the man would have received if he had been found guilty. We are talking 10 to 20 years! In the case of Mrs Hetherington, 30 years.

The tragic aspect of this problem from the point of view of normal women is that it detracts from the case of a woman who has been genuinely raped; but one thing's for sure, any woman who goes to a man's bedroom, takes off her clothes and engages in sexual activity, only to cry "No!" at the last moment, cannot expect to be treated seriously by the police, and it is certainly not a matter for the courts

THE CONVENIENT MYTH OF THE GLASS CEILING

At the REAL Women of Canada's 25th Anniversary Conference held in Ottawa, Canada on 20th September 2008, the columnist, Barbara Kay, gave an excellent address summing up the effect of feminism on Canadian society and the damage it has done to that country. Whilst speaking about misandry, she also mentioned one of the many myths perpetuated by feminism: "*The Glass Ceiling*". Here is a quote from her address:

"I would add one other characteristic of misandry: a penchant for many halftruths about men's lives that amount in the end to a lie. How many times have we heard the expression the "glass ceiling? Why do we never hear about the dirt floor, below which most men's working lives take place.

There is a reason we now call a chairman a chairperson, but never refer to a manhole cover as a personhole cover. It is because women aspire to become, and have become, the chairs of any number of committees. But when was the last time you heard a woman express an interest in sewer work? It is difficult to take seriously a revolution for equality that demands air-conditioning and power suits for its 'victims,' but baulks not only at assuming the physical risks and unpleasantness that real equality with men implies, but even baulks at expressing gratitude for the fact that only men volunteer for the high-risk and physically demanding work upon which society depends to function at the most basic level. The privileges of manliness are relentlessly publicized. The sacrifices and hardships remain literally and figuratively out of sight."

If you want to read the whole of this excellent speech just click here:http://www.barbarakay.ca/speeches.php

Several years ago I wrote a poem for a magazine on the mythical glass ceiling. It was a send-up, drawing attention to the fact that it was used by some women as an excuse for their ineffectual performances within society. I append it here:

WHAT GLASS CEILING?

This source of feministic hate -Is it of frosted, clear or plate? And for all those who work below, Is looking up a shocking show? I sought it here, I sought it there. I sought that structure everywhere. Yet never once twixt earth and sky Th'alleged barrier did I spy.

So afterwards I thought it wise To look through other people's eyes. Amongst my friends I did enquire To see if it had roused their ire. The inspector of police did posit That she had never come across it. A fire-fightress known to me Said she was quite glass ceiling free. Executrixes far and wide Had never once that 'thing' espied. In fact all those who'd found success Knew of the ceiling less and less.

The object of this female scorn Must parallel the unicorn -A myth of literary fame -With this glass ceiling just the same. It is the quintessential yell Of every failing, thick, dumb belle; Of all who fail to climb the tree Because of being n... b... g... Only a 'fact' to every dame To whom life is a losing game. So let us all with one intent Just bury 'it' without lament, Consigned, for all to plainly see, To legendary history.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MEN ALIVE AND WELL IN WALES

Misandry of the Welsh Assembly

In the *Western Mail* (a Cardiff, UK newspaper) on18th February I read an article on domestic abuse by Nerys Evans who is a member of the Welsh Assembly. The title was "Open up the domestic debate" which was more than a little misleading as the writer dealt only with one side of the problem. It was in typical "femmyspeak" with all the usual feminist myths shining through. She mentioned "women" no less that 17 times not seeming to realise that domestic violence is something which is suffered and perpetrated by both men and women. To deal with only half of this important problem is certainly not "opening up" anything. So, let's deal with the other side of the issue, thus giving both sides of the picture. One would assume that any responsible newspaper would do just that, but the *Western Mail* still seems to be in the grip of twentieth century feminism, as their daily output shows.

The writer's opening remark was to state that it was the 70th birthday of Erin Pizzey who opened the first women's refuge in the UK, in London. To ostensibly celebrate Erin Pizzey's 70th birthday with an article such as Nerys Evans's would, I have no doubt, be a bitter disappointment to Erin. I have known her for a number of years. Several years ago, it was my privilege to present an award to her for her work on men's issues. She is now one of the Patrons of a leading UK men's charity.

Censorship of books in the UK

Nerys Evans mentioned the fact that it was Erin Pizzey who opened the first refuge for women in Chiswick in 1971. That is a matter of recorded fact, but a corollary of that fact is that in her book "*Prone to Violence*" Erin Pizzey stated that, of the first 100 women who entered that refuge, 64 of them were as violent or more violent than the men they were allegedly running away from. This so enraged the feminists at that time that they even issued death threats against Erin and she was forced to flee the country for some years. It's also interesting to note that feminist pressure was instrumental in getting the book censored in the UK. When I tried to borrow it from my local library, there was

not a single copy in any library in the country. Fortunately I was able to borrow a copy from the National Library which, by law, has to have a copy of every book published in the UK. As it is now freely available on the Internet, anyone can read it. It is available as a free ebook on the ManKind Wales website at <u>http://www.mankindwales.org.uk</u>. Simply click on the orange box on the home page to go to the literature page, then click on the title "*Prone to Violence*".

Massive neglect of men's charities by Welsh Assembly

Nerys Evans also mentioned that the Welsh Assembly has just finished a review of domestic abuse services in Wales. I do hope the Assembly took note of both male and female victims. Unhappily, the Assembly's track record of giving any help to men is appalling. I have recently acquired from the Welsh Assembly itself, official figures showing how much money has been granted by the Assembly to organisations and charities which support only women or mainly women (such as Women's Aid) and charities which support only men or mainly men. The figures speak for themselves:

£13,049,872 given to women and a mere £208,442 given to men.

How can the Welsh Assembly possibly justify giving almost **63 times as much** money to women as to men? The men of Wales might like to take account of this fact at the next Assembly elections!

The help available for women all over Wales was referred to by Nerys Evans. She is correct; it's available all over the UK with millions of pounds being spent on the provision of over 500 refuges for women and also helplines etc. And how many refuges are provided for men? Just five, and only **one** of those is in Wales.

Why men do not report domestic abuse by women

Another truth came out in the statement: "*Statistically of course, we know there are likely to be more experiences than the survey exercise showed.*" Absolutely correct, but, sadly, most of those "experiences" would have happened to men. The BBC survey in the "*Here and Now*" TV programme showed conclusively that men are eight times less likely than women to report domestic violence against them. Men know that they'll get very little help from the police, and might end up being blamed even when the perpetrators are their wives or partners. Even when injured, it is usually the man who is

arrested.

The hoary old figures of "*1 woman in 4 will experience domestic violence in her lifetime*" is quoted, yet again, in Nerys Evans's piece. The fact that some of this is woman on woman violence she conveniently ignores. But the real howler committed by the writer is the question: "*Does this mean that 1 in 4 men in Wales commits domestic abuse?*" Her ignorance of the mathematics of probability shine through brightly here and the simple answer to her question is: "*No, it does not!*" What she also fails to mention is that, in the same survey that gives the "1 in 4" figure, it also states that 1 in 6 men will also suffer domestic violence in his lifetime. Nerys Evans seems good at "selective" factfinding. But, to use her particular brand of mathematical logic, does the fact I have given mean that 1 in 6 women are perpetrators of domestic violence? and to further use her logic, does it mean that some women in the Welsh Assembly could be perpetrators?

I can absolutely agree with Nerys Evans's final point:

"The time has come to extend the debate about domestic abuse. We all have a vital role to play in making sure these behavioural patterns and attitudes change, so we break the silence about, and the acceptance of, domestic abuse in all our communities in Wales."

I hope the facts I have given above help to extend the debate just as she suggested and that male victims of domestic abuse by women will be taken into account.

There is currently some talk about the possibility of a Welsh referendum to decide whether the Welsh Assembly should have full law-making powers. Having regard to the figures I have given above, and taking into account the Assembly's misandric attitude and discrimination against men for years past, I imagine that all Welshmen will assume that the idea is some sort of sick joke.

ST VALENTINE'S DAY - FOR SO MANY WOMEN, A TIME OF FORLORN HOPE

Several years ago I read an account by a woman who owned a large New York flower shop; she said that 25% of all the flowers she sold on St Valentine's Day were paid for by women who sent the flowers to themselves. How sad! These women must feel so alone and unwanted by any man. Truly we live in unromantic times.

But romance was another casualty of the feminist attack on society, and on marriage in particular. I recently saw the results of a poll on chivalry in the workplace which aimed at getting women's views on the matter. So many said they'd love men to open doors for them, to pull out a chair for them in a restaurant, to offer their seat on a bus or to help them on with their coat. In mid-twentieth century such acts of courtesy were common but in the sixties feminism was let loose and "equality" was the watchword. I remember in an episode of one of the very early Australian "soaps", a man opening a door for a young woman, only to be told, "*I'm quite capable of opening a door for myself thank you!*" It was thus that the feminist media killed off chivalry.

Today, with marriageable women outnumbering marriageable men in the UK, the well-known jewelry chain, H.Samuel, have just launched a new type of engagement ring – *for men!* It's called the Tioro ring - a titanium band embedded with a diamond which costs £80.

Samuel's based this launch on the well known fact that today women have to make a lot of the running if they want to get a man; it's women who have to shape up. Many are now so desperate in their chase for a mate that they are often the ones who "pop the question", and if his "yes" is forthcoming, they buy him a ring. Of course it's also a way of warning other women that their man is spoken for, though rings can easily be removed in some circumstances. Who knows? The way things are going, we might soon hear of some men making a collection of engagement rings like some women have in the past. Could diamonds end up being a **boy's** best friend?

I know of one man who, every year, has been getting a Valentine card from the partner he's been living with for over twenty years. Every card carries the request to him to marry her but they are still just living together. It's possible that this year she might offer to buy him an engagement ring.

WE CAN'T AFFORD FEMINISM IN A RECESSION

Three women lived in the same house. One was a judge, one was a lawyer and one was a feminist. One day they went shopping in an antique shop looking for a large mirror. Eventually they bought one and asked the shopkeeper whether it had any special qualities.

"Oh yes," he replied. "If you stand in front of it and tell a lie you'll disappear in a cloud of smoke."

The trio took the mirror home and hung it on the wall. The lawyer stood in front of it and said, "I think I'm the fairest thinking person in the world." Immediately she disappeared in a cloud of smoke.

The judge then stood in front of the mirror and said, "I think that all my judgments are perfectly fair to all parties in my court." Then she disappeared in a cloud of smoke.

The feminist stood in front of the mirror and said, "I think . . ." And she disappeared in a cloud of smoke.

Most women and practically all men now realise what an utter waste of money and time feminism has been. Thinking and feminism are not even on nodding terms! As things started to fall apart in the 1960s, feminism rode in on the wave of liberalism created at the time. Even feminists have now been forced to admit that feminism was one of those things that seemed a good idea at the time, but it has backfired to such an extent that it has caused grave damage to men, women and children. This quote from Phyllis Schlafly's article *Academia's war against marriage*, published in 1997, proves the point:

"The Independent Women's Forum has just published an issue of its Women's Quarterly that is guaranteed to enrage the feminists. Called 'Let's Face It, Girls: The Sexual Revolution Was a Mistake,' it levels a broadside attack on feminists for teaching young women that liberation and fulfilment come from romping around like men in casual sex while building their allimportant careers.

They are angry because they discovered too late that the cost of uncommitted sexual relationships is that the window for getting married and having children is way smaller than one can possibly foresee at age 25.

So, we hear the anguish of babyless, fortyish women frustrated by their

inability to get pregnant, spending their money and tears on chemicals and on clinics dispensing procedures with high failure rates. They've even realised that a lot of female infertility comes from exposure to sexually transmitted diseases, and that's a high price to pay for those dead-end serial relationships.

In this Women's Quarterly, Carolyn Graglia exposes the consequences of the foolish feminist notion that men and women are equal in their sexual desires. This myth, which is contrary to all human experience, has deprived women of the societal support they need to refuse to engage in casual sex.

Far from being empowered in their relations with men, women have lost control over ordinary relationships. Adult, educated women are now demanding that the government (or plaintiff attorneys) protect them from "date rape" and "sexual harassment" in situations that, in the pre-feminist era, unsophisticated high school girls could handle with confidence, knowing that a No would be respected."

We are now faced with the most severe recession for many decades and things will soon get much worse with mass unemployment in all countries, and, as ever, when any country is in a position of danger it's always the men of that country who have to sort things out. It was ever thus; all the pictures of men in TV adverts as being incompetent and bungling idiots with terribly smart wives are forgotten. The fictitious "G.I. Janes" and "Superwoman" are put on hold while the solid ability of men is trusted to sort out the problems.

For years past, under the guise of getting equality for women, men of higher calibre have been by-passed in favour of the promotion of less able women. Consequently, we have had the building up of inefficiency in teaching, the police, banking and many businesses in order to give the appearance of political "correctness". Equal outcome has been the order of the day. All that inability has now translated into disaster; we now need the efficiency of men to sort it out.

While businesses were flush with cash it was all very well to employ women of child-bearing age who at any time may say they want a year off on pay to have a baby while someone else is paid to do their jobs, but, with so many workers being laid off, that luxury can no longer be afforded; businesses can no longer carry such passengers who are unproductive.

It has been all very well in past years training female doctors who, when qualified, only work part time so that it takes two of them to cover one practice, but now we will have to rely on one man to do the job thus saving a lot of money on training which is not efficient. Feminism has been an increasingly dying concept ever since we entered the twenty-first century. The recession will, for certain, be the final nail in its coffin.