

Mike Buchanan's ICMI21 talk – FEMINISM SOWS THE SEEDS OF ITS OWN DESTRUCTION

Good evening. Today I'll be talking about the empathy gap, the growing unpopularity of feminism, feminism as a political force, and the seeds it's sowing, which will eventually destroy it as a political force.

Five years have passed since Paul Elam hosted the first ICMI in Detroit, in 2014. It was a pivotal event in the lives of many, including myself. Public understanding about men's issues and feminism has increased considerably over the past five years, in part BECAUSE of these conferences. I find myself becoming ever more optimistic about the future demise of feminism as a political force. Now that will come as a surprise to many, because feminism has never been more powerful as a political force, and it continues to become still more powerful with each passing year.

The two compelling objectives of influential feminists are to extend the privileges of women and girls – which inevitably requires the disadvantaging of men and boys – and to provide secure and often well-paid employment for themselves. They achieve both objectives not through merit, but by corrupting institutions.

To date, in the UK, while social media have made an important contribution to raising people's understanding of feminism and men's issues, they have had precisely ZERO impact on feminists' corruption of institutions. That corruption is close to complete in some institutions, as I shall illustrate with reference to the British Conservative party.

One of the key issues which has enabled feminism to become a powerful political force is the empathy gap. Many in this audience are already familiar with the work of William Collins, a British blogger, to my mind the most insightful blogger in the world on gender issues. His blog is called "The Illustrated Empathy Gap", the website is <http://empathygap.uk>. Two months ago LPS publishing, my modest publishing concern, published his book titled, "The Empathy Gap: Male Disadvantages and the Mechanisms of Their Neglect". It's almost 700 pages long. The reference section alone is 64 pages long. The first chapter starts with this:

"The primary purpose of this book is to present the evidence for men and boys being disadvantaged across a wide range of areas, including education, health, criminal justice, parenthood and safeguarding. Most data apply to the UK, so unless otherwise specified it is the UK to which I refer. Inferences from the situation in this country can then be drawn for other Western and Anglophone nations.

A secondary purpose is to examine why there is currently such a disconnect between what the evidence suggests and the popular and academic perception of the status of males. These two features – the male disadvantages together with the minimal societal concern which they provoke – constitute the Empathy Gap. Both women and men display this muted empathy towards males."

I urge you to buy the book, it's truly a tour de force.

I turn now to the unpopularity of feminism. Given the power of feminism as a political force, it's all too easy to forget how little popular support it has. The Fawcett Society is a British feminist charity, founded in the Victorian era. In 2016 it published a report, Sex Equality: State of the Nation Report. The charity had commissioned a poll of over 8,000 people, who were asked about their beliefs on a wide range of issues from gender identity and men in positions of power to support for women's equality. The poll found that only 9 percent of women, and 4 percent of men, described themselves as feminists. Overall, just 7 percent of British adults described themselves as feminists, one in 14 adults.

This unwelcome finding for the Fawcett Society forced some creative thinking, and on page 10 of the report they stated this: "There is a pro-equality majority in the UK today, including amongst men. These (finger speech marks) 'hidden feminists' don't necessarily use the term to describe themselves but support the key principle of feminism that there should be equality for women and men." Hidden feminists. Feminism seeks equality for men and women. Isn't that hilarious?

Hope not Hate is a hate-driven left-wing campaigning organization which has been deeply critical of the men's rights movement and our political party. The organization recently funded a poll which found that a third of British adults aged 18–24 agreed with the statement "Feminism is to blame for making some men feel marginalised and demonised in society", with 42 percent of men across all age groups agreeing.

Now it may be pushing things to say the people who agreed with the statement are anti-feminists, and I won't adopt the Fawcett Society approach and say they're "hidden anti-feminists", but at the very least we can say public support for feminism in the UK is weak, and public opposition to it is considerably stronger.

I turn now to feminism as a political force. For many decades feminists have been getting what they want in the public sphere largely by manipulating men, just as women always have in the private sphere. Their primary tactic is the same in both spheres – the shaming of men.

In the UK there's hardly a major institution which hasn't been corrupted by feminists in the course of the past 50 years, and I think it's important to be candid about the scale of the feminist victory, to better formulate our responses. A small number of radical feminists today wield ENORMOUS power and influence in government, the civil service, the judiciary, the Crown Prosecution Service, education, academia, the media, book publishing... and many other areas besides. Height and physical fitness requirements have been compromised in order to get more women into the police, the fire service, and the armed forces. Cressida Dick, the lesbian head of the Metropolitan Police in London, announced a long-term goal of 50 percent of police officers in London being female, without any criticisms from the mainstream media. The Royal Navy recently admitted that over the past few years, 35 pregnant women had been airlifted from its ships.

Feminist corruption of the wealth-generating sector, the private sector, continues unchallenged, with demands for ever more women in boardrooms, although a causal link between increasing female representation on boards and corporate financial DECLINE has been reported in longitudinal studies since at least 2008. The latest such study was published just two months ago.

The Conservative party, in sole power since 2015 following five years in a coalition, has completely surrendered to feminism, with the exception of Philip Davies, a Conservative MP and a speaker at this event. He also spoke at our 2016 London conference, on the justice gender gap. Following the recent resignation of Theresa May as Conservative party leader, there were 10 candidates for the position. Their teams were asked by The Guardian, a left-wing newspaper, if their candidates were feminists. Eight of the 10 candidates' teams said they were. Dominic Raab rather weakly said he "probably" wasn't one – this, from the man who many years ago had famously referred to feminists as "obnoxious bigots" – while Esther McVey, Philip Davies's fiancée, perhaps wisely declined to respond.

The 10 candidates were whittled down to two, in a series of MPs votes, to Jeremy Hunt and Boris Johnson. Party members then selected Boris Johnson as party leader, and therefore the new prime minister. Two weeks before the contest was over, the two men were asked questions on women's issues by Fleur Butler, the chair of the Conservative Women's Organisation, and Ella Robertson, the chair of Young Conservative Women. Afterwards the two women announced this. "Whoever the next Prime Minister will be, both men have shown that the Conservative Party is a modern, feminist organisation which is committed to equality." End of quote.

Boris Johnson is of a like mind with our former feminist prime minister David Cameron on gender political issues, and has few if any social conservative leanings, so far as I can see. At the last hustings before he became party leader, Johnson described himself as "absolutely a feminist", to applause from the audience of Conservative party members – and some groans. He said: 'A feminist is somebody who believes fundamentally in the equality of human beings and the equality of the sexes. That's what I believe.' I don't for a second believe that Boris Johnson, a very intelligent man, thinks that feminists believe that. He then stated he wouldn't support all-women shortlists to increase the number of female politicians in the Tory party, saying, 'I'm not certain that introducing quotas, which are by their nature discriminatory, are the way

to solve the problem.’ There is, of course, no problem to be solved. At the last count, men outnumbered women 10:1 as prospective MPs, and over 25 percent of MPs are female. By this measure, women are already considerably OVER-represented as MPs.

I remind you, this is the Conservative party I’m talking about. Most parties are to the left of them, and therefore even more in the grip of feminists. Sir Vince Cable, leader of the Liberal Democratic party, proudly stated during a House of Commons inquiry last year that it had women-only shortlists for winnable seats. We must assume the party has MEN-only shortlists for UNwinnable seats. Four weeks ago Vince Cable was replaced as party leader by a radical feminist, Jo Swinson, another miserable passive-aggressive men-hating harridan. I’m not a big fan.

In summary, the political class in the UK has utterly surrendered to feminism, an ideology espoused by just one in 14 British adults, and opposed by many more. I’d like to illustrate just how feminist corruption of the political system can play out in practice, with an example. The Ministry of Justice recently announced the launch of a Family Justice Panel. 10 of the 11 members of the panel are women. They include (fingers speech marks) “academics”, and a senior woman from Women’s Aid, a feminist organization which continues to espouse the long-discredited Duluth Model of domestic violence. The only man on the panel is Stephen Cobb, a senior High Court judge who seemingly consults only with women’s organizations such as Women’s Aid.

Philip Davies MP posted some written questions, as follows: “To ask the Secretary of State for Justice, what the criteria were for the selection of people to join the review on how the family courts protect children and parents in cases of domestic abuse and other serious offences. whether one of the criteria was equality of gender representation; for what reason that selection did not include representatives of fathers or men; and if he will make a statement.”

Paul Maynard MP, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Justice, replied: “The members of the panel established to gather evidence on the protections provided by the family courts in cases involving domestic abuse and other serious offences were appointed for their expertise on the issue. The panel includes the pre-eminent academics; senior judiciary; Women’s Aid to represent victims; the Chief Social Worker and the Association of Children’s Lawyers to represent practitioners. The panel will launch a public call for evidence open to all individuals and organisations, and is considering other mechanisms for gathering the full range of views on the issues.”

The pre-eminent “academics” on the panel are, of course, feminists. Paul Maynard declined to respond to Philip Davies’s questions concerning equality of gender representation, and why there were no representatives of fathers or men on the panel.

I turn now to the issue of HOW feminism sows the seeds of its own destruction. Feminists corrupt institutions, usually by shaming men to hand them power on a plate.

The feminist movement has an Achilles’ Heel, namely feminists’ insatiable appetite for female privilege. Often, that privilege is blatant and undeniable. One example is the lawn tennis championships at Wimbledon, in London, where we have the Wimbledon racket... pun intended. The racket has been going on for 13 years so far, with men and women being paid equal prize money since 2007, despite the money coming into the championships from broadcasting rights and ticket sales for the men’s game far exceeding that for the women’s game. The women’s game is a financial parasite on the men’s game in tennis, as it is in a number of other sports.

In the women’s final this year, Simona Halep beat Serena Williams 6:2, 6:2, in under an hour. A total of just 16 games. In the men’s final, Novak Djokovic beat Roger Federer after five sets, following a tie-break. The men’s final lasted more than four hours longer than the women’s final. There were a total of 68 games in the men’s final, more than four times as many as in the women’s final.

And what of the runners-up, Serena Williams and Roger Federer, who took home the same prize money? Serena Williams won 4 games in her final, while Roger Federer won 36 in his. 36. Nine games for every game Williams won. If nothing else, such cases bring it home to men just what feminist calls for gender equality are all about, they're demands for privilege. The Wimbledon racket is the term I use for the privileging of women in the name of gender equality, and it can be seen wherever and whenever feminists are at work.

The seeds that feminism sows, which will eventually lead to its destruction, are the impacts it has on institutions which affect the lives of individual men, women, and children. Feminists have no interest in the effectiveness or efficiency of institutions, their sole concern is that those institutions privilege women and girls in general, and feminists in particular, regardless of the consequences.

A major problem for feminism in the long term is the nature of women, and particularly how women ACT when faced with choices, rather than what they SAY in public, because few women are prepared to publicly criticise women as a class, or as individuals.

Women are increasingly refusing to march to the tunes of feminists, who they know are bitter, angry, delusional, dysfunctional, men-hating liars. (Other than that, they're no problem.) Feminists are the only group in society actively seeking to make women MORE anxious, angry, and bitter, in part through their lying narratives about rape and domestic violence. Every other Sunday I campaign with other MRAs at Speakers' Corner in London. I can always tell when feminists are approaching me, because they all have the same sour hangdog expressions. I understand that feminists are encouraged to chew on thick slices of lemon first thing every morning, to set their expressions for the day.

It hopefully goes without saying that feminists have no interest in the happiness of men, but they also have no interest in the happiness of women and children, who they regard as acceptable collateral damage in their war against men.

Women have had enough of being told by bossy feminists they're victims, being told what they should think, and how they should act and behave. They're sick to death of being told to hate men, to consider work as more emotionally rewarding than family life – they know damned well that it's not - and to be aggressive and assertive towards men.

I've already pointed to the fact that only 9 percent of British women – one in 11 women – identify as feminists. I'd also say that only a tiny proportion of feminists have a deep understanding of the ideology. I find this every time I engage with feminists at Speakers' Corner, in London, which is always like engaging with very dim-witted children. Their understanding of their own ideology is WOEFUL, certainly compared with MRAs' understanding of it.

I turn now to feminist corruption of the workplace. In the UK many fields of employment have become ever more feminised, and one consequence has ALWAYS been a reduction in effectiveness and efficiency. I'm thinking here of fields including politics, the civil service, education, the law, media, the police and medicine – including veterinary medicine.

Let's just consider the impact of feminist corruption of the medical profession. In the UK, medical schools have been preferencing women over men when selecting students for well over 40 years. Dr Vernon Coleman, the first British TV doctor, was warning in the mid 1970s of the inevitable consequences. He pointed to the reluctance of female doctors to work unsocial hours, and to work in the more stressful environments such as A&E. He pointed to women in general having a weaker work ethic than men. All the negative consequences he predicted would result from the feminisation of the medical profession have come to pass.

Today 70 percent of medical students are female. The average female graduate of a medical school will work half the hours over her medical career, compared with her average male counterpart – indeed, many

will never practise medicine at all, after finding a partner at medical school. Put another way, the taxpayer needs to fund the expensive training of two female medical students to get the same work hours as from one male student – and men in the UK pay almost three-quarters of the income taxes which fund that training. Most general practitioners today are women. 40 years ago, I could get an appointment with my GP within 24 hours. The last time I booked an appointment, I had to wait three weeks to see my GP. But of course women and children too are also experiencing a second-class service because of the predicted consequences of privileging women over men in entering the medical profession.

The more that feminists corrupt institutions, the more society becomes dysfunctional, the more people are unhappy and recognize feminism as the driving force behind so many of the issues which make them unhappy. Now of course institutions need not be formal organizations, in the sense of workplaces. Two key institutions which have been under attack by feminists for half a century, through the state and the justice system, are marriage and the nuclear family.

One consequence of the feminist destruction of marriage and the nuclear family is fatherlessness, a blight upon society. The negative consequences of fatherlessness are many and varied, and hardly need pointing out to this audience. But the scale of human suffering caused by denying children access to their fathers, grandparents, and others, is enormous – and child abuse, for one thing. We should not be surprised that the male suicide rate increases three-fold following divorce. We wouldn't be surprised to see the FEMALE suicide rate spiking as a result of mothers being denied access to their children in such numbers.

So feminists create problems which lead to ever more dysfunctional societies, and ever more human misery and suffering. More and more people are recognizing those problems stem from feminism, so public opinion is turning against feminism, and a backlash is inevitable.

There's a time lag between public opinion changing, and politicians and the mainstream media realising it's changing. As some have pointed out at previous conferences, politics is downstream from culture. Changing public opinions present both a threat and an opportunity to politicians, the class that can do something about the state's actions and inactions which assault the human rights of men and boys in so many areas. All the major parties court only the women's vote, and generally fail. It will take only one major political party to start reaping an electoral dividend by proposing non-feminist policy directions, perhaps by supporting the institutions of marriage and the nuclear family. Other parties will then have little choice but to compete with that party for votes.

Across the developed world we're seeing a swing away from progressive or liberal politics, and a revival of conservatism – and of course conservatism is no walk in the park for men, either. One defining feature of progressives is that they never accept they've been wrong in the past, despite all the evidence to the contrary, so they never slay the sacred cows they've created. In stark contrast, conservatives have changed their positions on a number of key issues, or at least most have, and are looking forward to slaying those sacred cows. Conservatives have been bludgeoned by their opponents for decades, but are becoming better at challenging progressive ideologies, including feminism.

The conservative revival will hopefully contribute to the destruction of feminism as a political force, in part through its opposition to abortion. Historians today estimate that over a hundred million people died as a result of the actions and inactions of communist governments. The number of killings we can attribute to feminist influence is FAR higher, if we include the killing of unborn children, and I think we SHOULD include those killings. Feminism is, among other things, a death cult. In the UK alone, over 10 million unborn children have been killed since the 1967 abortion act, and every year in the UK about 200,000 unborn children are killed in the place they should be safest, in their mothers' wombs. Abortion is, for me, a men's issue, although of course those killed are of both sexes. I consider it the responsibility of men to have the moral courage to end this slaughter of the innocents.

An increasingly important destroyer of feminism as a political force will be the men's rights movement, the MRM, so I'm delighted to report from this conference that the MRM is not wavering in its longstanding opposition to feminism.

The MRM has long been engaged with the task of raising public consciousness about feminism and men's issues, and we will be engaged with that task for decades to come. A metaphor I often use for the MRM is that we're trying to climb Everest. We may still be in the foothills, but we're making progress and climbing steadily, and there's been a strong sense of that at each of the five ICMI's to date.

Public understanding of men's issues and feminism is growing, largely due to social media, so, as we might expect, it's among younger adults in particular that the understanding is growing. In time that WILL inevitably feed into the mainstream media covering our issues. It's a question of when, not if, that will happen.

I think MRAs should be proud of what they've achieved online, but while online work is necessary, it's NOT sufficient. Feminist influence in the offline world – the real world – goes from strength to strength. Frankly, I continue to be disappointed by the reluctance of MRAs to get away from their keyboards, to meet up with other like-minded men and women, and engage in real-world campaigning. We refer to the men's rights movement, but the average citizen sees no evidence of the existence of this movement from one decade to the next. None. We're all but invisible to the general public, and we need to change that.

MRAs continue to spend WAY too much time in the online men's rights bubble, but only a very small proportion of the general public is in that bubble. To reach the general public will require far more MRAs to get away from their keyboards, leave the bubble, and engage with the general public. It's why I and others campaign at Speakers' Corner in London every other Sunday. Many people – usually men – will stop for a chat, and those chats are almost always positive.

To those of you who COULD go in for activism such as street campaigning, but DON'T, maybe because you'd be uncomfortable doing it, I say this. IT'S NOT ABOUT YOU, OR YOUR COMFORT. It's about the people who are suffering, people who sorely need your support. It's about the fathers who don't see their children after family breakdowns, all too many of whom commit suicide as a result. It's about the children who are emotionally abused because they're denied access to their fathers and grandparents. It's about the grandparents denied access to their beloved grandchildren. It's about the men who are battered by their partners, and find there's no support available for them. It's about the men who have their genitals mutilated as minors, on religious or cultural grounds. I strongly urge you to step outside your comfort zone, put your keyboard to one side, and engage in activism to support these people.

I don't know of a better way to meet up with like-minded men than through Network 4 Men, their website is <http://network4men.org>. They've enabled men to get together in many countries, not just in the UK. In the UK we also have Red Pill Connect – that's <http://red-pill.uk> – which caters for both men and women in the UK.

Finally, this year is, of course, the 50th anniversary of men landing on the moon, and returning safely. My final comments today were inspired by a famous speech given by President John F Kennedy to a large crowd gathered at Rice Stadium in Houston, Texas, in 1962. The speech was part of the drive to persuade the American people to support the Apollo program, the national effort to land a man on the moon. I say this to the men's rights movement. "We CHOOSE to destroy feminism as a political force not because it will be easy, but because it will be hard. Because that goal will serve to organize and measure the best of our energies and skills, because that challenge is one that we are willing to accept, one we are unwilling to postpone, and one we intend to win." Thank you very much.