

CONTENTS

The essays in this e-book are on the theme of Masculism, i.e. men's lib. What do men have to be liberated from? Well, many things, but the most important one is from female financial parasitism, plus many other legal and social discriminations against men.

Masculist Essays

- 1. FLUFFIES, FEMINISTS, MGTOWS, and MASCULISTS
- 2. DEAD BEAT MOMS
- 3. MGTOWs LACK SOLIDARITY WITH MEN
- 4. FLUFFIE MOMS AND THE MASCULISTS
- 5. MGTOWs are POLITICAL WIMPS
- 6. GRANDFATHERLY MASCULIST ADVICE TO A 17 YEAR OLD FLUFFIE
- 7. MASCULISM
- 8. MASCULIST POWER
- 9. ASIAN FLUFFIES
- 10. IF THE GENDER POLITICIANS DON'T GIVE THE MASCULISTS WHAT THEY WANT, THE MASCULISTS WILL WIPE OUT WHOLE POPULATIONS BY CRASHING THE BIRTH RATE
- 11. MENFAIRING THE DIVORCE COURTS
- 12. MGTOW "CASTLES", MASCULIST "POLICE", A MASCULIST GROUP IN EVERY UNIVERSITY

1.

FLUFFIES, FEMINISTS, MGTOWS, AND MASCULISTS

Prof. Dr. Hugo de Garis

profhugodegaris@yahoo.com http://profhugodegaris.wordpress.com

Abstract

MGTOWs (Men Going Their Own Way) i.e. men refusing to have relationships with women, are merely reacting to the status quo, rather than taking the more assertive approach of the masculists to change that status quo through political and ideological action. This essay shows what masculists can do to change society so that the MGTOW reaction is no longer necessary, and the two sexes can get along better.

If this is the first essay you have ever read on the topic of masculism (mens lib) then perhaps I should initially give a quick rundown on the main ideas of the masculists. Firstly, masculism is not male feminism. It is a social movement by men for men, doing for men what feminism does for women, i.e. it aims to liberate men from customs in our cultures that oppress and

enslave men. In essence, masculism is a rebellion by men against working for women.

After men invented the contraceptive pill, household gadgets, and higher education, it became possible for women to control the number of kids they had, and to go out to work, thus sharing equally with men the burden of earning the living for the family. When the industrial revolution came, families had to be mobile to seek employment. This led to the growth of the nuclear family. Better hygiene, particularly public sewers, allowed babies to survive, so families became bigger. The father then became the sole breadwinner, while the mother stayed at home to raise the many children.

Once the Pill arrived in the 1960s, women have been having only one or two children, so that western populations are now falling. When women started moving into the workforce in huge numbers they were confronted with traditional males who had trouble adapting to this historic tectonic shift in gender roles. The feminist movement grew up to push hard for women's rights, the right to abortion, to equal pay, to equal work opportunities, for day care centers, to be treated as equals by men, etc.

Women organized politically, creating such organizations as NOW (National Organization of Women) in the US, and Women's Issues committees in national parliaments across the world. They were largely successful in achieving their goals. In

the 1980s, men started waking up to the idea that "Now that women can work, they must work otherwise they remain financial parasites on men!" The masculist movement grew up, at least in Europe, to push women to become careerists equally with men, so that the burden of earning the living for the family could be shared out equally.

Unfortunately, the masculist movement did not grow anywhere near as large as the feminist movement. This was due mostly to the fact that the major push of the masculists, namely to get "fluffies" into careers, was already being pushed by the feminists for feminist reasons. (A "fluffie" is a masculist label for a traditional woman who expects to be able to parasite off the money of a man. It is based on the word "fluff" i.e. light, not serious, not adult, not mature, not responsible.)

Due to the feminist pressure to get women into the workforce so that women could be financially independent, the wind was blown out of the sails of the masculists, so it never really grew into a major social force. But now something new is happening between the sexes that requires that the masculist movement needs to be revived. Feminists have now largely taken over the legislation on gender issues, to the detriment of men. The masculist movement is needed to restore the balance, so that both sexes are given a fair shake.

Once feminists started becoming politicians, divorce court judges, etc, they brought with them their feminist attitudes, and their ignorance of masculist attitudes, since they were never educated in the latter. As a result of this, men are now being screwed badly, to such a point, that men in their millions, are opting out of traditional marriages and refuse even to live together with women. Correspondingly, millions of women, who have done well in their early careers, are finding a desperate shortage of men who are willing to put up with the status quo. Millions of men are becoming MGTOWs (Men Going Their Own Way, i.e. without women) who refuse to love women and to give them children, thus making millions of women very unhappy.

How did this situation come about? Once women became FIPs (a "FIP" is a masculist term for "financially independent person", the type of woman masculists want women to be) they became much easier to divorce. If you look at photos of your great grandparents, many of them look sad and bitter, because they were stuck in marriages that had failed, but they did not attempt to get out of them, the way we do today. The divorce rate in many countries is now around half. One in two marriages end in divorce.

So for the past few decades men have been screwed in huge numbers by both their ex-wives and by the legal system that has been set up by feminists who are incapable of thinking along masculist lines, since they are women, and have not been exposed to masculist political pressures and ideology. In the divorce court, millions of men were forced to continue paying for their fluffie ex-wives after divorce became easier. This created real bitterness in men. Feminist divorce courts would often deny fathers the right to see their own children. This created more male bitterness.

Women are genetically wired to want children and to raise them. Men are genetically wired to want to penis women. That is the strategy that has evolved in nature to ensure the creation of the next generation. However, women's fertility drops off badly in their mid-thirties, so many women get desperate to have children at that age, once their careers have been well launched. But they run up against a serious lack of men who are prepared to marry and be fathers, because of the very negative experiences they have had in the past with feminist dominated divorce courts, alimony laws, men-dumping feminists, societal putdowns of men, etc.

MGTOWs take the attitude, "Im tired of being shafted. I'll go my own way from now on. Screw women! or rather, let some other sucker screw them and then be shafted. I'm done with women." Many of these "MGTOWed" women then get bitter at the lack of available men and take matters into their own hands. They have a child as a single mother, which they can do because they have a career and can afford to raise the child, but in

practice, due to the mothers time commitment with her full time job, she tends to have her child raised by a child-minder who is often of a lower class and intelligence as herself. She then misses out on the full experience of motherhood because she is working so much. Little boys now are often raised in fatherless homes, and in primary schools dominated by careerist feminist women teachers, who alienate these little boys. The boys have no male role models, so grow up lost. They feel dumped on by their female feminist teachers who continue to criticize men as rapists, chauvinists, oppressors etc.

Feminist women still have fluffie attitudes towards men, which is something a revived masculist movement needs to address. These fluffie feminists still see men as cheque books that they can exploit, which is a carryover from the traditional gender roles prior to the 1970s. Masculists need to educate women, and society in general, that women have a powerful moral obligation to pull their weight financially and not parasite on men's money. The masculists have a very effective strategy to force women to be FIPs, and that is, masculists simply refuse to have relationships with fluffies.

When I was one of the masculist leaders in the 1980s in Europe we used to say to men on the media "Rather a FIP than a fluffie!" "A fluffie will parasite on you before the divorce and after!" To fluffies we said "If you want to have a man, have a career!" "Fluffies can rot on the shelf!" "A fluffie can only be a

fluffie, if she can get her financial claws into some robot male. But as the supply of robot males dries up as they become influenced by masculist ideas, fluffies will be forced to convert themselves into FIPs if they want to eat." (A "robot" male is a masculist term for a traditional male who expects to be parasited upon by a fluffie, but he does not see himself as enslaved, since he has been unconsciously brainwashed into that role, as is still the case today in Korea, and Japan, whose gender roles are half a century behind the western countries.

No wonder Japanese men look so miserable in the train commuting 3 hours a day to their 11 hour a day jobs, while their fluffie wives with teenage kids play tennis and cards with their fluffie friends.) Masculists need to get active again, and get on the media and change legislation to restore the imbalance that has grown up due to the virtual monopoly of feminists controlling gender issues in politics. At the grass roots level this could take the form of the following little exchange. Imagine a group of women in a bar trying to pick up some good looking men. The women go up to the men and say "How about you men buy us ladies a drink?" Imagine their shock if the men are masculists are hit back with "How about you ladies buy US a drink, you fluffie parasites!"

Women need to be taught that men are not to be exploited financially as was the custom with traditional gender roles. A woman who does not get off her arse and become career competent and simply expects some male to relieve her of that burden, will simply remain manless, and hence unloved and unsexed (since 99.5% of women are hetero.)

The masculists lash out at the many legal discriminations that still exist against men. The most blatant discrimination concerns the lack of a male equivalent to the Marer (maternity rejection right, commonly known as abortion). If a woman gets pregnant and does not want to go through with the pregnancy, she can get an abortion. She has a legislated Marer, thanks to feminist political pressure in the 1970s, but men have no equivalent Parer (paternity rejection right) so that if a couple gets pregnant, and the man does not want to be a father he should be given the equivalent right to reject fatherhood.

He should be able to go to a JP (justice of the peace) and deposit a formal rejection of fatherhood form, before the legal time limit before an abortion becomes illegal because the pregnancy has continued too long. If the woman decides to continue with the pregnancy, then the child is her financial responsibility. In today's feminist dominated gender legislation system, the man is still seen as the bread winner, and feminist judges argue that "for the good of the child, the father MUST pay."

To fight this attitude, the masculists need to create a formidable political force to stop it, and change the legislation. Women are

to be powerfully persuaded that they are to be FIPs, who cannot rely on a man to pay for her children. Masculists say cynically, that "the life plan of a fluffie, is to seduce the richest and most handsome man she can, fuck him long enough that he sticks around, and then stay at home to have HER kids, and have HIM pay for it all, both before and after the divorce."

Masculists utterly reject this attitude and spit on such women, treating them as slavers, enslavers of men. Masculists push women to be as career competent as men, so that when a woman does want to continue a pregnancy when the father rejects fatherhood, she can cope financially. A woman who is career incompetent and gets pregnant and then expects her boyfriend to pay for the child, ruins that man's life. The feminist biased court system agrees with the woman and also ruins the man's life. This injustice has to stop, hence the masculists need to have the legislation changed. As males, with our much higher testosterone levels, we can get a lot angrier than a bunch of angry feminists.

That collective masculist male anger needs to be directed at the feminist biased gender legal system to bring fairness to males. Laws need to be changed. Masculists are also angry at the lack of respect that feminists give men in general. Too many feminists feel that have the right to dump on men, given that they are well informed of the way men abuse women, but are not well versed in the reverse case. Masculists need to stop such

feminists in their tracks when they dump on men in public to mixed audiences.

Masculist leaders who are brilliant and articulate should get on the media and give men the intellectual tools to counter these feminist dumpings on males, for example – imagine some feminist woman making some snide remark about men during a meeting, and unfortunately for her, the audience contains a highly articulate, brilliant minded, masculist scientist, who then cuts her to pieces with well-reasoned, scientifically based facts that no one can refute. He puts her in her place, so that next time she will think twice about making her feelings about men public, through fear of being confronted again by a superior male who crushes her ego.

To be more specific, imagine the masculist scientist interjecting – "Hey lady, if you're going to dump on men in public to a mixed audience, I as a masculist will dump on you right back, you "fat unfuckable!" (which is the direct translation of the French "grosse imbaisable", a commonly used term in French culture.) Men are the superior sex. We have a 4 IQ point greater average IQ score than women (says Prof Philippe Rushton). We have a 10% greater IQ variance than women. The male IQ bell curve is shorter and fatter than women's, which is thinner and taller, so that at the extreme fringes, the left and the right, i.e. the morons and the genii, are males, so it's not surprising we males win 99% of the science Nobel prizes.

We make up 95% of the CEOs of Fortune 500 companies, 95% of presidents and prime ministers of countries, our testosterone levels are a lot higher than women's so we are more aggressive, more dogged, more persistent, and ambitious, so we greatly outperform women in virtually all fields, so it's to be expected that in nearly all cultures, men are more respected than women, hence boy babies are more valued than girl babies, who traditionally were often left out in the cold at birth to die. So if I were you lady, I'd refrain from dumping on men in public, because there might be a brilliant articulate masculist in the audience who fights back and hurts you personally, by telling you in public that you are rather fat and ugly, about a 3 out of 10, and hence most men reject you, so you have learned to hate men, and lock yourself into a vicious circle - the more you express your hatred of men publicly, the more men reject you, thus increasing your hatred of men."

Masculists need to organize politically. We need to remove the many legal discriminations against men. There is quite a list of them, e.g. many countries have a difference in retirement ages. Most countries do not put women into combat, arguing women's bodies are more valuable than men's bodies. Masculists need to botch that attitude, so blatantly unjust. There is a life expectancy difference between the sexes of about 6 years in many countries.

Masculists need to fight the tobacco companies who have killed men in the hundreds of millions by targeting them in their ads. Tobacco killed about 100 million people in the 20th century. If men did not smoke, the life expectancy difference would be a lot less. If both sexes were in wars, then the difference would be lower again. Women need to do half of the dangerous jobs as well, so that they too fall off buildings. On the psychological side, masculists need to lash out at female sexual cowardice. Even most feminists are afraid to take sexual initiatives, so it's not surprising that feminists talk about a rape culture, and claim that all men are rapists, which is about as stupid as masculists claiming that all women are parasites on men.

With women taking half of the sexual initiatives, there will be as much talk of sexual harassment of men by women as vice versa, so that women will learn to feel how sexual rejection hurts. Imagine some woman going up to an attractive intelligent man, propositioning him, and getting the reply "No thanks, you're too fat, too ugly, too dumb, too low class. Try some man of your own level." Men go through this kind of rejection all the time, because women are such sexual cowards, which makes masculists not respect most women on the sexual front, even most feminists.

Masculists understand the reaction of the MGTOWs, but do not agree with the latter's politics. MGTOWs simply react to the status quo, rather than fighting to change it the way the

masculists do. Once the masculists have been successful in returning the pendulum to its middle position, where both women's and men's rights are both fairly addressed, when men are not extorted in divorce courts, treated as exploitable cheque books by fluffies and fluffie feminists, and are respected for being the superior sex on genetic grounds, then MGTOWism will disappear. To be happy, the two sexes need each other, for companionship, love and sex.

The prefeminist period was unacceptable. The current feminist period is unacceptable. Hopefully the future feminist-masculist period will be better balanced, where the two sexes respect each **Feminists** will have both their other more. feminist consciousness raised and their masculist consciousness raised. because they will have been taught by brilliant masculists whose intellects are superior to theirs (being male) that men outclass women on nearly all counts, and therefore should be respected. To men, and to MGTOWs, your task is only beginning, so get to it. Start organizing and ideologizing, to change the misandronist psychology of women, and to change the laws that discriminate against men.

DEAD BEAT MOMS

Prof. Dr. Hugo de Garis

profhugodegaris@yahoo.com
http://profhugodegaris.wordpress.com

Abstract

Dead beat moms are divorced mother fluffies who have been given sole custody of the kids. Dead beat moms expect their exhusbands to help pay for those kids whom the dead beat moms see as theirs. Dead beat moms are one of the enemies of the masculists as this essay shows.

I'm a great believer in the power of labels. Where would Marx be without his "capitalists" "proletariat" "surplus value" "alienation" "exploitation" etc. Labels put new concepts into people's minds. The best ideologists know this and create new labels to sell their ideologies. A two or three syllable label that slips easily off the tongue has real sticking power in the memory and is easily used. It becomes a meme that is easily transmitted

from one human brain to the next. I've been watching feminist, antifeminist, masculist, MGTOW etc videos lately, and kept hearing the term "dead beat dad" coming from fluffie feminists who were angry at their ex-husbands who resisted giving their ex-wives money to pay for the kids to whom she had been given sole custody.

(Fluffies, for whom the term is new, are traditional women who expect to be kept financially by a man. The primary aim of the masculist movement is to wipe out fluffies, by forcing them to become FIPs (financially independent persons.) With fluffies removed from the scene, including fluffie feminist attitudes, life would be so much pleasanter for men.) As a masculist (I invented the term in the early 1970s) I expect a woman to be a FIP who has the career skills to be able to pay for the kids on her own if she is given sole custody of them. I disliked the term "dead beat dad" due to its traditional gender role assumption bias, namely where men were expected to pay for both the kids and the parasitic wife, the fluffie.

When feminists started divorcing in large numbers, they still kept their traditional fluffie attitudes towards men's traditional role, as payer for the kids. They were "fluffie feminists." They had had their feminist consciousness raised but had not had their masculist consciousness raised due to ignorance. They had not heard of masculist ideas and had not felt any political pressure coming from the masculists. So I started thinking about a better label from the masculist perspective than "dead beat dad." My first attempt was "resistant dad" but that seemed rather lame and still lay within the scope of the traditional gender role assumption bias. I wanted a label that pointed the accusatory

finger at fluffie ex-wives who expected their ex-husbands to pay for "her" kids if she gets sole custody of them. I had an epiphany and the term "dead beat mom" was born.

Masculists are pushing politically for new gender political laws that are much fairer to men, because under the current system where fluffie feminist judges rule the divorce courts and fluffie feminist politicians make the laws in women's rights committees in parliaments, men are now getting so badly extorted and financially ruined, that a massive reaction in the form of MGTOWism is growing and growing. MGTOW (men going their own way) means that millions of men are simply refusing to marry and have kids because they don't want to be financially screwed and denied equal custody of their kids by fluffie feminist dominated divorce court rulings.

So, correspondingly, millions of women are facing a massive shortage of "good men" i.e. men who are prepared to marry and pay for kids. Masculists label such men contemptuously "robot" males, because their primary function is to work for females. In the past, that made a lot of sense, because there was no contraception, so families had lots of kids. The industrial revolution forced families to scale down to the nuclear family to be able to move to new jobs when previous employers went bankrupt. The mother raised the many kids, and the father earned the money.

But in the 1960s one of the greatest social revolutions of all time occurred, namely the invention of the contraceptive pill which allowed women to control the number of births they wanted.

Higher education for women, and household gadgets allowed women to have careers, so a flood of women entered the work force and the professions. This female careerism had a liberating effect on men. They could now afford to work less, so a new ideology for men grew up in the 1980s called masculism, which pushed women to have careers equally with men, and not parasite on them financially as was the case with the traditional gender roles. Since I was one of the principal theorists of the European masculist movement in that decade, I dreamt up a label for traditional women who continued to expect that men should pay for them. I labeled them "fluffies" based on the word "fluff" i.e. light, not serious, not adult, not responsible, and labeled the new careerist women who did pull their weight financially, FIPs (financially independent persons).

As masculists we got onto the European media (British, German, French, Dutch, Belgian) and started haranguing the fluffies to become FIPs, with such slogans as "If you want to have a man, have a career!" "Fluffies can rot on the shelf!" "A fluffie can only be a fluffie if she can get her financial claws into a robot male, but as the supply of robot males dries up as more and more men are influenced by masculist ideas, and see their fluffie wives as parasites, then fluffies will be forced to become FIPs if they want to eat!" and to robot males we said "Rather a FIP than a fluffie!" "A fluffie wife will parasite on you before the divorce and after!"

An important component of the masculist movement was the fathers' rights movement. Divorced fathers were fighting mostly for joint custody of children after a divorce. Many fathers were strongly attached to their kids and were deeply hurt when fluffie

feminist judges almost automatically gave custody to the mothers. Many countries did set up joint custody default laws, but from the point of view of the masculists, this did not resolve fully the problems men were having in the divorce courts. When a divorced couple has joint custody of the kids, the masculists agreed that both the father and the mother should pay roughly equally for the upkeep of the kids.

Fathers who have regular interaction with their kids care for them and are willing to help pay for their upkeep. A problem arises when the mother wants sole custody of the kids and then demands that the father pay either entirely or partly for the kids' upkeep. Research shows that when the mother gets sole custody of the kids, and the father then moves to another city, then after 5 years, 90% of those fathers have lost contact with their kids. That's the reality. Masculists push very hard for women to become FIPs. If a woman is a fluffie, i.e. not career competent, incapable of earning good money because she did not invest in her education to the limit of her ability, then she is utterly eschewed by masculists.

Masculists simply refuse to have relationships with fluffies, because when the divorce comes, which is pretty much a fifty fifty event in many countries, a man married to a fluffie will get destroyed financially by the divorce courts now largely controlled by fluffie feminist judges. In many advanced countries, fluffies have virtually died out. Women know that if they are fluffies, men will not look twice at them as marriage material, since men know that fluffies are very bad news in the divorce court. The fluffie feminist judges will often give sole

custody of the kids to the mother and force the father to pay for both the kids and the parasitic wife.

Naturally, the fathers resent this deeply and try to avoid paying. They will often reduce their earning power by working less, or moving to another state or country. Many divorced men end up in jail for not paying their fluffie ex-wives money for the kids whom the fathers rarely see. From the perspective of the fathers, they are throwing money into a black hole and get no benefit back from their efforts. They are the victims of "dead beat moms" who are fluffies, career incompetent, who look on men as cheque books whom fluffies can exploit. They are the type of women whom masculists spit on, and aim to wipe out. They are enslavers of men.

In most cases now, in many countries, joint custody is the norm, even the legal default decision in the divorce courts, so fathers are usually quite willing to continue to help pay for the upkeep of the kids, since they do get a benefit back from their efforts, namely the love and companionship of their kids due to the joint (shared) custody. But, when a FIP mother insists on taking sole custody of the kids for whatever reason, and the judge gives the mother sole custody of the kids, then the father should NOT be legally obliged to help pay for the upkeep of the kids, since he gets no benefit from them. He is seen simply as a cheque book by the FIP ex-wife and the fluffie feminist divorce court judge.

Traditionally, a father paid for the (many) kids AND a parasitic wife. A divorcing FIP mother who gets sole custody, has only the (one or two) kids and NO parasitic husband to pay for. Its much easier for her. So if she pushes for sole custody, for whatever reason, and gets it, then she pays all the costs of the

kids. Such laws will make her think twice about the idea of pushing for sole custody, because she will then have the full burden of the cost of the kids. In the US, it costs about \$200,000 to raise one kid. Studies show that kids who grow up in fatherless homes are much more likely to drop out of high school, be delinquents, become drug addicts, get arrested, and go to jail.

So a FIP mother should keep this in mind when she's thinking about pushing the judge for joint custody. It's not good for her kids to deprive them of joint custody. The real problem however remains, the fluffie ex-wife who has not bothered to become sufficiently FIP to pay for both herself and her kids if she gets sole custody. Masculists put enormous pressure on women to be FIPs so that robot men do not get screwed by the divorce experience, which is often so bad for men, that their suicide rate skyrockets to about 100 times the usual male suicide rate (which happens to be 4 times the female rate.) Masculists are also pushing for new principles that are fair to men in the divorce courts.

Fluffie feminist judges need to be replaced by feminist-masculist judges and new divorce laws need to be made that balance men's and women's rights equally. The most effective method of the masculists to force fluffies to become FIPs is simply refusing to have relationships with them. Masculist men do not want to go through the financial horrors of the divorce courts biased against them by ignorant fluffie feminist judges. What we are now seeing is a mass exodus from marriage by men, who no longer tolerate the financial risks of divorce from fluffie wives.

As a result, millions of women around the world are really suffering, because their deepest visceral needs of having a baby are not being met. Often they feel themselves obliged to become single parents, and raise the child alone, which then causes the child to suffer from being fatherless, especially with little boys who get no male model at home nor in female dominated primary schools. There are now millions of MGTOWs (men going their own way) who refuse to marry and have kids. Some avoid women altogether.

Others look on women as vaginas and nothing else. They see getting married and having kids as stepping through a mine field, never knowing when they will step on a mine and have their financial lives blown up in the divorce courts that are ruled by fluffie feminist judges and feminist biased divorce laws. The solution to all this misery seems fairly simple, and is what the masculists are pushing for both ideologically in society at large, and specifically in the divorce courts and in the parliaments. It can be presented in a multistep plan.

- 1. Socialize all girls, in the home, and in the schools, to be FIPs, no more of this feminist garbage of "freedom of choice to be a housewife or a careerist." That kind of feminist thinking is oblivious to the cost to some future robot husband. It is selfish on the part of feminists, who do not take into account the male side of the issue. A fluffie housewife can only be a fluffie housewife if some robot husband is prepared to be parasited upon. Such robot males are dying out fast, thank god.
- 2. Teach society the ideas of masculism, of men's lib, so that everyone is just as well informed of men's issues as women's issues.

- 3. Change the divorce laws so that joint custody is the default decision, and if sole custody goes to the mother, she pays the total cost of the kids. In other words, remove the divorce mine field from men, so that they are not seen as cheque books by fluffie ex-wives and fluffie feminist divorce court judges and politicians.
- 4. Restore respect for men in society. Men are the superior sex as judged by virtually any scientific criterion one chooses to use. The genii are males because men have a 10% higher IQ variance than women. Men win 99% of the science Nobel prizes. Men dominate in politics, in business, in finance, in the arts, in literature, etc. Men have much higher testosterone levels which makes them more aggressive, more ambitious, more dogged, more single minded, more persistent, so they perform better, outperforming females in virtually all fields, so they should be respected.
- 5. Encourage both sexes to see each other as equally respect worthy, so that men become much more willing to have kids with women, who are now FIPs who are conscious of both men's and women's issues. Then millions of women will become a lot happier because they will be able to have husbands who love them and sex them, as well as have kids who are not fatherless. 6. Put enormous moral pressure on dead beat moms. Wipe them out. Ostracize them so that virtually all women feel the enormous moral pressure on them from all branches of society to be FIPs. "Fluffies don't eat!" Fluffies are a burden to themselves, to society, and particularly to their stupid robot husbands who get dragged over the coals in fluffie feminist

divorce courts. No wonder they are deserting marriage in their millions and choosing not to have children.

MGTOWS LACK SOLIDARITY WITH MEN

Prof. Dr. Hugo de Garis

profhugodegaris@yahoo.com http://profhugodegaris.wordpress.com

The following short essay was written to "Sandman," the pseudonym of a prominent Canadian daily internet blogger on MGTOW themes. (MGTOW = men going their own way, i.e. men who refuse to marry and have kids, who spend their money on themselves, who take the "red pill" (alluding to the Matrix movie) referring to the idea that women do not love men for themselves but rather for their money which is used by women to pay for their children and themselves so that they do not have to work outside the home, that women are genetically hypergamous (i.e. will drop her current male provider for a better one if the opportunity arises.)

Dear Sandman,

I watch a lot of your videos because you are quite gifted with female psychology, but I don't agree with you at all in terms of your politics. I'm old enough to have seen the rise and rise of 2nd wave feminism to the point of it going main stream and being relabeled 3rd wave feminism. This happened because a lot

of 2nd wave feminists pushed their ideology onto society and got laws and social attitudes changed. As a masculist I see that men need to do the same.

I ideologize by pointing the finger at fluffies (traditional women who expect to parasite off a man's money) and put enormous moral pressure on them to become FIPs (financially independent persons) by saying such things as "if you want to have a man, have a career' "fluffies can rot on the shelf" and say to robot males (traditional males who expect to work for a fluffie wife, e.g. as in Korea or Japan) "rather a FIP than a fluffie" "a fluffie wife will parasite off you before the divorce and after" Fluffie feminists have had their feminist consciousness raised (equal rights for women) but not their masculist consciousness raised (equal obligations for women, i.e. sharing the burden of earning the living).

Fluffie feminist divorce court judges and politicians have now financially massacred men in divorce courts to such an extent (e.g. divorce rate = 50%, 20% chance of getting joint custody for men, forced child payments from men = slavery for decades paying money to kids they rarely see) that millions of men have washed their hands of traditional gender roles and women in general and have simply walked away, hence the rapid rise of the MGTOW phenomenon (men going their own way, i.e. refusing to marry, and refusing to have kids).

If western men reach the proportion of young Japanese men under 30 who have refused the traditional male role of being slaves for women (Japanese men work 11 hour days, 3 hour commute times, get home so late they orphan their kids, while

their fluffie wives play tennis with their fluffie friends) i.e. about 30%, then that alone will cause a political tsunami in the west. The primary aim of the masculists is to wipe out fluffies, and to educate society to socialize girls that they are to become as career competent as boys so that they do not parasite on a man as an adult.

Fluffies are to be spat on as immoral slavers of men. The most effective way to wipe out fluffies is by men refusing to have relationships with them thus forcing them to become FIPs if they want to eat. The masculists need to push their ideology onto society in the same way feminism did, so that everyone is familiar with the basic masculist ideas, so that fluffie feminists also die out, so that custody of kids is automatically joint and that the divorcing mother is expected to pull her weight financially just as much as the father when it comes to child payments.

When the crazier middle browed 3rd wave feminists lash out at men unjustifiably (e.g. all men are rapists, which is about as stupid as masculists saying all women parasite on men's money) then they should feel the same rage against them, to make them realize that equal rights and equal obligations go both ways, are applicable to both sexes. If a feminist dumps on men in a mixed audience, she can expect to be dumped on right back by the masculist men in the audience, until she learns to shut up or take a more balanced approach. Masculism is distinctly ideological and political.

It sees MGTOWism as a useful tool to achieving masculist goals. If millions of men drop out of the traditional role, then obviously

society will change, but in the meantime, half of married men will continue to be financially massacred in the fluffie feminist dominated divorce courts, because the fluffie feminist judges have not been educated into masculist ideology and values. They still see men traditionally, i.e. as check books. All that has to change. Politicians have to be taught that if they ignore mens issues masculist men will vote them out. Masculists have to get on the media and sprout masculist ideas so that everyone is familiar with them and absorbs them, the way the feminists did in the 70s.

There would be no 3rd wave feminists without the ideological work of the 2nd wave feminist thinkers who pushed for feminist changes in society and the laws. Now is the time for masculists to do the same for men. MGTOW alone will certainly shake up society and get it thinking, but thinking what. Masculism is needed to give society clear goals on what men want and need, which is justice, fairness and respect (men are after all the superior sex, we outperform women on virtually all fronts).

FLUFFIE MOMS AND THE MASCULISTS

Prof. Dr. Hugo de Garis

profhugodegaris@yahoo.com

http://profhugodegaris.wordpress.com

The following essay was also written to "Sandman." In one of his blogs he used the term "dead beat dads" which is a feminist term that I object to, as explained in this essay.

Dear Sandman,

I object to your use of "dead beat dads" for men who don't pay for their kids whom they lose after a divorce. This is an abusive term coined by feminists who expect men to "pay up." Masculists (men's libbers) focus attention instead on the "dead beat moms" or "fluffie moms" who expect to get sole custody of HER kids and use fluffie feminist legislation to force divorced fathers who lose joint custody in 90% of cases, to pay child support often against their will. (A fluffie is a masculist term for a traditional woman who expects to be able to parasite

off a mans money e.g. as in Korea or Japan). Masculists see that many of men's problems stem from the existence of fluffies, so their primary goal is to wipe them out by refusing to have relationships with them, thus forcing them to become career competent FIPs (a masculist term for a Financially Independent Person) whom masculists want all women to be, otherwise they are parasiting on men. If women with kids insist on getting sole custody of the kids after a divorce, then the masculists insist that these fluffie mothers pay the full cost of the kids, otherwise custody of kids after a divorce should be joint, by default, as is the case in the US in some states. Those career incompetent fluffies who are unable to pay this full cost, are labeled "dead beat moms" or "fluffie moms" by masculists. In the past, robot husbands paid for the kids and a parasitic fluffie wife. A divorced mother today has only to pay for the kids, but no parasitic husband. It's easier for her financially than for the traditional robot husband of the past.

Masculists put enormous moral pressure on fluffies to become FIPs, otherwise they will not get a man. A woman who gets the reputation of being a fluffie in her social circle, gets the kiss of death in terms of her getting a man. No masculist or MGTOW will go near her. A fluffie will parasite on a man before the divorce and after. Fluffies are toxic, they are parasites, they are immoral, they are slavers of men, they are vermin, they are to be wiped out. Now that women can work (thanks to male invented contraceptive pills, household gadgets, higher education, etc) they must work. Anything else is parasitism on men. Since

fluffies can only be fluffies by getting their financial claws into a robot male, it will be easy for masculists to wipe them out. (A robot male is a masculist term for a traditional male who expects to be parasited upon by a fluffie wife, as in Korea and Japan (except for the young herbivore generation in Japan - a third of young Japanese men under 30 refuse the traditional male role of being a robot male slave (with a daily 14 hour work and commute time) to a fluffie jap wife.)

Masculists push their ideology onto society and advise young men not to have relationships with fluffies ("Rather a FIP than a fluffie" "A fluffie will parasite on you before the divorce and after" "Fluffies can rot on the shelf" and push young women to be FIPs. "If you want to have a man, have a career" "Fluffies are the enemy of the masculists and will be wiped out by them"

Masculists are political, unlike MGTOWs who are political pygmies, who simply opt out of the traditional robot male role. Masculists brow beat feminists with masculist rhetoric and educate the media and society with masculist ideas, so that men's issues are listened to equally with women's issues. Masculists raise masculist consciousness in society, and counter the fluffie feminist bias in the divorce courts, where men are being financially massacred in their millions by fluffie feminist divorce court judges and fluffie feminist divorce lawyers, who have had their feminist consciousness raised but not their masculist consciousness raised, so still have traditional fluffie expectations of men, namely seeing them as exploitable check books.

Masculists need to get gender laws changed. The biggest legal discrimination against men is the lack of a legalized PARER, i.e. a paternity rejection right, equivalent to the legalized MARER (maternity rejection right, aka abortion). This is blatant sexual discrimination against men. Women can reject unwanted maternity, but men can't reject unwanted paternity. When a woman gets pregnant and the father doesn't want the kid, he should have the right to reject payment for that kid, and the women should be FIP so that she can afford to support the kid on her own if she decides to complete the pregnancy. The lack of a PARER is one of the major reasons why masculists push so hard for women to be FIPs. When nearly all women are career competent FIPs, then the PARER will be legislated and the social expectation will be that women are NOT to parasitize on men. There are many other legal discriminations against men retirement age differences, suicide rate differences, different and conviction rates for identical crimes, punishment conscription for men only, life expectancy differences etc.

Masculism I see as a superset of MGTOWism. Masculism = MGTOWism + gender politics. I have mixed feelings about the MGTOWs. I applaud their rejection of fluffies, since fluffie rejection is a major plank of the masculist agenda, but I deplore the political wimpiness of MGTOWs when it comes to solidarity with their own sex. Masculists have a lot to do. Masculists change attitudes in society towards traditional male and female gender roles. Fluffies need to be wiped out. The divorce courts need to be purged of fluffie feminists, and gender laws need to

be rewritten, so that they are "men fair." A lot of gender political work needs to be done but the MGTOWs are wimpy about such things, so I condemn them for that. But, the net result will be the same, with or without masculist political pressure, if MGTOWs can grow in large enough numbers. If so, then society, and politicians, will be forced to look at the discriminations against men, and the attitudes of fluffies, and then make changes, otherwise society dies out. Look at Japan, a third of young men under 30 refuse to be robot males and thus cause a third of fluffie young women to rot on the shelf. Japan will die out given the catastrophic birth rate decline. So its only a question of time before society seriously listens to men. So many men are being financially massacred in the divorce courts that marriage is seen as toxic, to be avoided by young men. (The divorce rate = 50%, joint custody goes only to 10% of couples with kids, divorced men are expected to pay alimony and child support to fluffie ex wives, who are not pressured by law or by social attitudes to stop parasiting become **FIPs** and on men). The masculist/MGTOW message to young men is out, "don't marry," "don't have kids," "marriage is toxic," "fuck women, but don't marry them, and certainly don't give them kids, that only you will end up paying for."

MGTOWs are POLITICAL WIMPS

Prof. Dr. Hugo de Garis

profhugodegaris@yahoo.com http://profhugodegaris.wordpress.com

Here is another (short) essay I wrote to Sandman. You will see in the essay below that I have mixed feelings about the MGTOW movement.

Dear Sandman,

God I have mixed feelings about you. I admire your psychological insight and listen regularly to your psychological lessons on women, but I become increasingly angry at your political wimpiness regarding your passive acceptance of the gender status quo, and especially of the fluffie feminist takeover of the divorce courts. I get the impression you are apolitical and just don't seem to see that men need to fight back politically to purge the divorce courts of fluffie feminist judges and lawyers, and to scare the gender politicians shitless that if they are not "men fair" then they will be voted out by millions of very angry men who are fed up with being financially massacred by the

divorce courts, parasited upon by fluffies, and harangued by fluffie feminists.

Masculists fight. They literally hit back. They harangue the fluffie feminists, they refuse to have relationships with fluffies and push the media to address men's issues. Masculists attack, they fight, they politicize. You MGTOWs are gutless. You simply bow out. I don't deny that that will have a significant effect on society, if multimillions of men become MGTOWs, but it's only half the story.

For men to stop fighting as masculists, the divorce courts will have to be made men fair, the fluffies will have to be wiped out, by forcing them to rot on the shelf by not being able to have relationships with masculist men who refuse to be parasited by them, society needs to be educated into masculist issues, fluffies need to be strongly morally pressured to become FIPs (financially independent people) otherwise they starve, and fluffie feminists need to have their masculist consciousness raised so they don't concentrate only on women's problems. In short, there is a lot of masculist political work to do, but you MGTOWs just seem to be blind to what needs to be done, which is why masculists have mixed feelings about you. In my own case, I both admire you (for your psychological insight), and despise you (for your political impotence) at the same time.

GRANDFATHERLY MASCULIST ADVICE TO A 17 YEAR OLD FLUFFIE

Prof. Dr. Hugo de Garis

profhugodegaris@yahoo.com http://profhugodegaris.wordpress.com

The following trialog occurred between me (67) and a (possibly pretending to be) young woman (labeled as "WhiteAngel") half a century younger than me, who is obviously a fluffie, and someone else on the internet (labeled as "Human Scale") who predicts that MGTOWs will wipe themselves out by not reproducing. I hope you will find it interesting and if you are a young woman, enlightening, if not a bit scary.

WhiteAngel

You think you are safe from paying money to us if you just stay away from women? :D Then you don't understand why governments exist! Or who is the government. You will pay taxes for us! If you don't guess what? We send you into jail or we let you men kill each other like we women have done in the past. Kings, presidents, criminals and politicians and other

powerful men are our drones. We will deal with MGTOWs fast. How about 3 world war?

Human Scale

If mgtows don't have children, then they will die in 100 years anyway. The one who rocks the cradle wins. Without children, mgtow has no future. This is a fad that will die when they die, and all men who are mgtows today, will die within 80 years from today. So, while others are breeding and keeping society going for many years to come, mgtow will be dead. Problem solved.

profhugodegaris

Dear Humanscale,

You are logically correct for the first generation of MGTOWs and masculists, but how about the subsequent generations!? The rise of masculist values, as they go as main stream as feminist values, will influence most young males, so that they too utterly refuse to be parasited upon by fluffies, resulting in nearly all women becoming career competent FIPs (financially independent persons). Then the sexes can get back together again and make babies.

Today's fluffie feminism is a historical anomaly, it will not last. The fluffie feminist dominated divorce courts and gender politicians cannot financially massacre men in their millions for too long. It is inevitable that men will rise up and become collectively very angry, and god help women and the politicians when that happens. This is the decade of male rebellion. We masculists will force fluffies to become FIPs, we will purge the fluffie feminists from the divorce courts, we will vote out and destroy the reputations of male feminist and fluffie feminist politicians, and make males be respected again. Remember we males outperform females on virtually any criterion you choose. Women should respect us, because we can do things they cant do, like write symphonies, invent math, the computer, the transistor, we build the skyscrapers, we make the world run. If women want to be as respected as men, they will have to perform at male levels, pull their weight, and not parasite on men.

Five years from now being labelled a fluffie will be the kiss of death to young women. They just won't get a man.

profhugodegaris

Not so dear WhiteAngel,

I'm assuming you are a legit female, and that you are in your 20s. Your photo might be false. The first category of women that masculists refuse to have relationships with are the misandronist male dumping feminists like yourself, followed by the fluffies who parasite on men, whom the masculists are working towards to wipe out, by forcing them to rot on the shelf until they become FIPs (financially independent people) who feel morally obliged to be FIPs. In your case, if you are in your

20s, try to imagine your future as manless, loveless, sexless, and especially childless. You will be punished by the masculists and MGTOWs by them simply ignoring you. A decade from now you will be an avid antifeminist competing hard for the very few available robot males who still exist who are prepared to be parasited upon by fluffie parasites.

Scared? So go fuck yourself, because men won't, or they might, but that's all they'll do with you. You should FIPup or rot on the shelf, you fluffie vermin, to be wiped out.

WhiteAngel

I am 17. But Mr Humanscale has absolute right. There is no danger in that. You MGTOWs can't reproduce. :D This is why there will be always men that will fall in love with us. This information relieves my mind very much. I feel sexy and cute again.

profhugodegaris

Dear WhiteAngel,

Jesus, you're still a kid, half the age of my daughter, so some grandfatherly advice to you. Look at the CURRENT situation in Japan. A third of young men under 30 today refuse to have relationships with young women. Look up "herbivore men." The west is going the same way, so by the time you are in your thirties and your biological clock is ticking hard ("baby rabies")

if you are not a FIP (financially independent person) who can afford to buy your own middle class house and have a kid as a single mother (which is horrible for the kid) then probably you will start looking around desperately for a robot male (a traditional male who expects to be parasited upon by a fluffie wife - a fluffie is a traditional woman who expects to parasite on a man's money) to parasite upon so that you can afford those things.

BUT, with the exponential rise of MGTOWism and masculism, the supply of such robot males is drying up fast. Thus you will either be forced to be a FIP (by studying something that is career competent at university) or you will be competing in panic mode with many other fluffie women for the few robot males who can "save" you. Of those fluffie women, only those who are VERY nice to men will be chosen to be "saved." A decade from now you will be an antifeminist if you remain a fluffie in your mentality.

So, at school, don't drop math, study something that will make masculists respect you, so that they know that you will not parasite on them, and that you have a strong sincere conviction that a fluffie is a parasite, immoral, a slaver of men and deserves to rot on the shelf - then some masculist might be interested in you as an equal partner. But if you don't become a true FIP, then you may be doomed to a lonely, miserable, poor, childless, manless, loveless half life.

I hope you are scared and convert yourself into a true FIP before it's too late for you, and I hope you will persuade your fluffie friends that the male rebellion is growing and growing. The days of the fluffies are numbered. The primary masculist goal is to wipe them out and we can do that easily simply by refusing to have relationships with them. If fluffies want to eat, they will be forced to become FIPs. Pretty soon, for any woman who gets the reputation amongst her friends that she is a fluffie that will be the kiss of death for her in terms of getting a man.

MASCULISM

Prof. Dr. Hugo de Garis

profhugodegaris@yahoo.com http://profhugodegaris.wordpress.com

Masculism is men's lib. It does for men what feminism does for women. Masculism removes those things that oppress men, largely female financial parasitism, and a string of other legal discriminations against men, the largest one being the lack of a legislated PARER (paternity rejection right) equivalent to women's MARER (maternity rejection right, a.k.a. abortion). Women can reject an unwanted pregnancy, but men can't and will have to pay for decades for an unwanted kid, and have their lives

Masculists label traditional women who expect to parasite off men's money as "fluffies". Masculists refuse to have relationships with fluffies, forcing them to become FIPs (financially independent persons) warning "robot males" (traditional males who expect to be parasited upon by fluffie wives) "rather a FIP than a fluffie" "a fluffie will parasite on you before the divorce and after the divorce" "fluffies can rot on the

shelf" "fluffies are parasites, fluffies are immoral, fluffies are slavers of men" "fluffies are vermin" "fluffies are to be wiped out" "fluffies can rot on the shelf."

Masculists recognize that so many of men's problems stem from the existence of fluffies and fluffie feminists. Feminists have had their feminist consciousness raised, but not their masculist consciousness. They still have traditional fluffie attitudes when it comes to men, i.e. they still see men as check books who have to pay alimony and child support, even when in the US, a divorced father will only get joint custody in 10% of cases. So many men have been financially massacred in the fluffie feminist dominated divorce courts that a massive men's movement (masculists, MRAs, MGTOWs (men going their own way, paying only for themselves and eschewing relationships with women)) is causing millions of women and especially misandronist, male dumping feminists to be left on the shelf millions of men simply refuse to have relationships with them. Marriage and kids are toxic. The divorce rate is 50%, and millions of men are learning that fluffies and fluffie feminists are to be avoided for the sake of their own male health and wealth.

Look at Japan, where this male rebellion has developed furthest. The Japs are not a creative people. Their creativity scores are a standard deviation and a half lower than other materially advanced nations. It is therefore not surprising that their gender roles are half a century behind the west. Jap women will drop

out of the work force in 70% of cases after the first kid. A THIRD of young Jap males, under 30 now refuse to have relationships with women. They look at their fathers, who worked 11 hour days, 3 hour commutes, who got home so late they orphaned their kids, who handed over their pay checks to their fluffie wives who played tennis and cards with their fluffie friends. These young men are appalled and refuse to adopt the same gender role and look on young fluffie women as toxic, parasites,

to be avoided.

Masculists are political, they are angry, they harangue fluffie feminists (the third wave type who have moved on beyond 2nd wave feminism which was about equal rights, to third wave feminism, which is about gynocracy, e.g. the fluffie feminist takeover of the divorce courts, and the financial massacring of millions of men). Masculists get on the media and educate young men not to marry, don't have kids, and avoid fluffies like the plague. Masculists destroy the reputations on the media of fluffie feminist and male feminist politicians who go along with the fluffie feminist agenda of gynocracy.

Ten years from now, there will be such a shortage of traditional robot males, that today's fluffie feminists will be declaring themselves antifeminists so that they can be more competitive with the millions of other fluffies all competing for the dwindling supply of robot males so that they can exploit them, to rob them of their money in the divorce courts.

In short, the 2010s is the decade of male rebellion. It is the decade of the masculists and MGTOWs, who refuse the traditional robot male role of paying for women. Soon, there will be so many millions of masculists and MGTOWs that any woman who gets the reputation of being a fluffie in her social circle, will be given the kiss of death in terms of her getting a man. No masculist or MGTOW will go near her. They will see her as toxic and will cause her to rot on the shelf.

Masculists push the idea that men are the superior sex, based on scientific findings. Men outperform women on virtually any scientific criterion you choose. Men have a 10% higher IQ variance than women, so it is to be expected that 99% of science Nobel prizes are won by men. Men have a much higher testosterone level than women, so are more aggressive, more ambitious, more persistent and complete tough tasks better than women. Men build the world, and invent everything. We are the superior sex and should be admired for that. We can do things women can't, e.g. write symphonies, win Nobels, invent the transistor, the computer, build the skyscrapers, we make the world run. The only critical function women play in the world is to grow the next generation, but soon male inventive genius will create sex robots that males will prefer to fuck rather than real women, and invent artificial wombs, so that men can create their own babies without the toxic risk of the divorce courts controlled by fluffie feminist judges and lawyers. These divorce courts need to be purged by the masculists, as well as the fluffie

feminist gender politicians who changed the divorce laws to favor women, and to wipe out men financially.

Men are waking up in their millions and getting very angry. God help women and politicians when men get collectively angry. A few weeks ago I was at a meeting where a feminist was talking. She was dumping on men publically, to a mixed audience. It was obvious to me that she had never been confronted by an articulate, informed very angry masculist before. I blew her away in a 10 minute tirade. She was utterly demolished, deeply profoundly hurt, as I said to her that she was an example of the type of woman that masculists and MGTOWs first choose to reject, followed of course by the fluffies, who are the main enemy of the masculists. I turned to the audience and addressed myself to the young women in the audience and said that I pitied them, because they would be the main victims of male rebellion. Men would simply not go near them if they were career incompetent fluffies. I told them about Japan. I could see from the reaction of these young women, that they were truly shocked. There was a deathly silence after I finished my tirade. The masculist message had penetrated. It was clear to me that women are scared of the rise of male rebellion against the traditional robot male (slave to women) role. They could see that they would have to be FIPs and pay their own way or be manless. That scared a lot of them, because so many of them are studying economically useless (career incompetent) subjects. (The talk was at a local university.)

Feminism teaches women equal rights. Masculism teaches them equal obligations (i.e. sharing the burden of earning the living with men, and not parasiting on them.) The heavy price that women are increasingly paying for dominating the fluffie feminist divorce courts is that men are simply refusing to marry, refusing to give women kids. Today, a THIRD of young Jap men are doing this, and the west is going the same way. Soon it will be a half of men, forcing women to adapt or be left rotting on the shelf. Soon, men in audiences will be literally throwing rotten tomatoes at fluffie feminists and angrily shouting them off the stage, and rightly so, because this is the decade of male rebellion. We are angry, we are fed up, and we are militant.

MASCULIST POWER

Prof. Dr. Hugo de Garis

profhugodegaris@yahoo.com

http://profhugodegaris.wordpress.com

I give a brief synopsis of the main masculist ideas and then explain why they have such potency. I need to start with some masculist terms. Masculist = men's libber. Fluffie = traditional woman who expects to parasite off a mans money. FIP = financially independent person (what the masculists want all women to be). Robot male = traditional male who expects to be parasited upon by a fluffie wife (e.g. as is still the case in Korea and Japan). Fluffie feminist = feminist who is ignorant of masculist ideas so still has traditional attitudes towards men, seeing them as check books, and exploitable.

Masculists are strongly ideological, political and moralistic. They put enormous moral pressure on fluffies to become FIPs ("If you want to have a man, have a career", "fluffies can rot on the shelf"). Masculists tell robot males, "rather a FIP than a fluffie", "a fluffie will parasite on you before the divorce and after the divorce") Masculists get on the media and push their ideology to change social attitudes and raise awareness of men's issues (e.g. the financial massacring of men in the divorce courts, the lack of a legislated Parer (paternity rejection right), etc.). They harangue fluffie feminists, they lobby male feminist gender politicians, they perform direct actions against fluffie feminist divorce court judges and lawyers, they get on the media and preach masculist ideas so that feminists and fluffies and robot males have their masculist consciousness raised.

Masculists particularly push the idea that a woman who is not a career competent FIP will simply not get a man, and since 99.5% of women are heterosexual, they are dependent on men to be loved, to be sexed, and to be given kids. In Japan, a third of young ("herbivore") men under 30 refuse to have relationships with young women, so a corresponding third of young women ("the dry fish ladies") are now utterly miserable, because they have no man, no love, no sex, and especially no babies. These young men look at their fathers who worked 11 hour days, 3 hour commute times, who got home so late they orphaned their kids, who handed over their pay checks to their fluffie wives (who played tennis and cards with their fluffie friends), and are appalled.

So they rebel. They go their own way, and spend their money on themselves. Western men are going the same way, but are called MGTOWs (men going their own way) but MGTOWs are politically and ideologically passive as distinct from the masculists who are very political, ideological, media conscious, angry, and in your face. Masculists are forcing women to become FIPs and pull their weight financially, or they don't get a man. This masculist force is scaring women shitless and making them learn to be nice to men again. As the supply of robot males continues to dry up, fluffies and fluffie feminists are competing harder and harder to find such men whom they can parasite upon, forcing many women to become FIPs or remain poor if earlier in their lives they did not shift their arse to become career competent.

Masculist ideologizing creates a strong moral pressure on women to be FIPs. Young fluffies are increasingly shunned and spat at by young men, who will not look twice at a young fluffie. If a young women gets the reputation of being a fluffie amongst her social circle that is the kiss of death for her in terms of getting a man. Fluffies are being wiped out by the masculist influenced young men. The number one aim of the masculists is to wipe out fluffies, because so many of men's problems stem from the continued existence of fluffies. However, the first category of women that masculists reject is the misandronist, male dumping feminist. They too will continue to rot on the shelf.

Men are not masochists. They want to be liked, and a male dumping feminazi is utterly repulsive to men, as are fat feminists. Fat women are "fat unfuckables" to masculists and to most men in general. In short, masculism has the power to transform society, the way feminism did in the 70s. We force fluffies to become FIPs, or they rot on the shelf. We force women to be nice to us, or they rot on the shelf. We force the divorce courts to become "men fair" or they (divorced women) rot on the shelf. The 2010s is the decade of male rebellion. By 2020, society will have had its masculist consciousness raised and that new consciousness will translate into political and cultural changes as extensive as those caused by feminism.

At the end of the day, if women and the fluffie feminist dominated government do not change their tune towards men, then masculists will destroy society, by causing the birth rate to plummet so much, that society dies out. Look at today's Japan. Jap politicians are pulling their hair out, trying to figure out what went wrong and why the Jap birth rate is dropping so catastrophically.

ASIAN FLUFFIES

Prof. Dr. Hugo de Garis

profhugodegaris@yahoo.com http://profhugodegaris.wordpress.com

I lived 8 years in Japan in the 90s and have currently lived 9 years in China, so I think I know something about Asian women. The Asians (Japs and Chinese) are not a creative people. (I call Japs Japs as a way of punishing them for their murdering of 30 million Asians in the 30s and 40s when they went fascist and still today do not have guilt feelings about what they did.) The Japs score a full standard deviation and a half lower on creativity tests than do comparable cultures, and Chinese culture is even worse, being intellectually sterile (zero science Nobel prizes, no world class intellectuals pushing original ideas on the world stage, the only country in the world that does not use an alphabet) due to its lack of freedom of speech, still living in a primitive one party dictatorship, when 90% of people in the world living outside China live in democracies - SO it's not surprising that the Japs and the Chinese are decades behind the west when it comes to the level of development of gender role

expectations. In short, these Asian women are still fluffies (i.e. traditional women who expect to be able to parasite off the money of a man) who have the attitude that "the man who penises, pays."

I had two very negative experiences with Asian women regarding gender role expectations, one in Japan, the other in China. In Japan I had a Japanese girlfriend for 7 years which was the best relationship I ever had. She was the prettiest, the most fun, the most passionate and she was as smart (but not as educated) as I was. When I moved to the US, she came to see if she could live in the US and casually remarked to me that she could if I paid for her to do so. That pressed my masculist "fluffie button." Once I was convinced she was dead serious, I exploded "Go back to Japan you fucking Jap fluffie parasite, go murder some Chinese!" and that was the end of that relationship.

Some years later in China, I married (I would prefer to just live with a woman, but then I would never get long term resident status, a "green card") a Chinese daughter of a general who was on the long march with Mao Zedong, who handled all my admin things that were in Chinese writing (a writing system that insults my intelligence since it is an ancient pre-alphabetic script of the kind that the rest of the world abandoned long ago, except for the ultraconservative Chinese, which reflects very negatively on their culture).

After 4 years with her I had lost patience. This woman turned out to be a rather mindlessly middle class thief who read the Chinese equivalent of Readers Digest, and certainly did not work towards getting a PhD as she told me she would. Looking

back, I think she was very happy to be hitched to a high status western male (PhDed full prof) who took her as a traveling companion to foreign countries, after she had been single and rather poor for over a dozen years. As my contempt grew towards her intellectual laziness and lack of ambition, the arguments mounted until we separated. I then started trying to collect my finances and discovered that this "chink fluffie thief" had put 4 years of my savings into shares in HER OWN NAME. I then got a lawyer to get a divorce and to get my money back, but the Chinese government favors its own citizens and her sister was a lawyer and a CCP (Chinese Communist Party) member, and thus also a daughter of a general who was on the long march with Mao Zedong, so I did not get my money back, so this chink fluffie thief is now set up for the rest of her life, not having to work, living off the labor of some western, (stupidly) trusting, sucker.

No wonder I have a hatred of fluffie parasites and aim towards wiping them out as a masculist by pushing the idea that it is in the self-interest of masculists/MGTOWs to refuse to have relationships with fluffies. If fluffies want to have a man, they must become FIPs (financially independent persons), and have a career. My current Chinese wife is a true FIP, who is also a professor with her own apartment and car, whose self-image is of being a FIP.

I learned my lesson, to avoid fluffies like the plague. A fluffie will parasite on you before the divorce and after. Fluffies must rot on the shelf. So, to you younger men reading this, don't have relationships with fluffies, choose FIPs, they are much easier on

your wallet. A FIP is much less likely to parasite on you the way a fluffie will, stealing from you and stripping you of half your assets after a divorce, taking your kids (with 90% probability), forcing you to pay alimony and child support in a fluffie feminist dominated divorce court system (in North America, etc) which is a major crime against men and needs to be politically purged (one of the many tasks of the masculist movement that is yet to be completed.)

IF THE GENDER POLITICIANS DON'T GIVE THE MASCULISTS WHAT THEY WANT, THE MASCULISTS WILL WIPE OUT WHOLE POPULATIONS BY CRASHING THE BIRTH RATE

Prof. Dr. Hugo de Garis

profhugodegaris@yahoo.com
http://profhugodegaris.wordpress.com

A quiet revolution has been taking place over the past decade or so. In Japan today, a third of young men under 30 refuse to have relationships with women, causing a catastrophic decline in the Japanese birth rate, which is now at 1.3 children per woman. The replacement birth rate is 2.1 which means that if this 1.3 rate continues for a century, Japan's population will fall to about a sixth of what it currently is, i.e. a decline from roughly 120 million to 20 million (1.3/2.1 = 0.62, i.e. each generation is only reproducing about 60% of itself, so after 4 generations, the population will be about 0.62 to the 4th power = 0.15, i.e. 15%.) After 8 generations, the Japanese population would be 2% of its current figure, i.e. effectively wiped out, so that the Chinese could colonize Japan easily.

A similar story is also happening in the US, where 70% of young men under 35 are refusing to marry and have kids. A similar calculation would show that, except for US immigration, the US white population would also be wiped out in a shorter period than in Japan.

What is causing this calamity? In a phrase, the "fluffie feminist dominated divorce courts." I need to explain a bit. A fluffie is a masculist term for a traditional woman who expects to be able to parasite off a man's money. Most feminists are in fact fluffie feminists, who have had their feminist consciousness raised, but not their masculist consciousness raised for the simple reason that they know nothing about what the masculists want.

Feminism in its modern form has been around for nearly half a century, so has expanded into the general population, which means that the gender politicians and divorce court judges and lawyers are mostly fluffie feminists, who thus have traditional non-masculist attitudes towards men, treating men as exploitable check books to be abused. The injustices committed against men over the past few decades in the divorce courts have been so horrific, and extensive, namely against tens of millions of US men, that the idea has grown up with the younger generation of US men, that traditional marriage is "toxic."

These young men have seen with their own eyes what the divorce courts have done to their older male friends, and especially to their fathers. Typically, a divorcing man will lose his house, his kids (who with 90% probability will be given to his ex-wife, as sole custodian), he will have to pay child support for up to two decades, and if his ex-wife is a career incompetent fluffie, he may also have to pay her alimony, perhaps for the rest of her parasitic life, with no legal or moral obligation on the fluffie ex-wife to get off her bum and become a FIP by getting an education and having a career. Half of today's women on campus are studying economically useless, career incompetent, topics that will then cause them to look for "robot male" husbands to parasite upon (when they are in their 30s with their biological clock ticking hard) who can give them a middle class house and lifestyle that they, with their career incompetence, are incapable of providing for themselves.

The emotional trauma felt by these divorcing men is so great that their suicide rate screams up to about 100 times the usual rate. These men have lost their wives (women initiate 70% of (no fault) divorces) their kids, their homes, and are made paupers by the fluffie feminist attitudes of the divorce courts, so it is not surprising that men in their millions are voting with their feet and refusing to marry. The attitude of these young US males, is "Why play Russian divorce roulette when there are only two chambers in the barrel?" i.e. why enter into an institution (i.e. marriage) when the odds are nearly 50/50 that the man will be financially massacred. Men are not fools, so during the coming

years necessary for the fluffie feminist dominated divorce courts to be purged, they refuse to marry.

The masculists are men's libbers, who do for men, what feminists do for women, i.e. they aim to liberate men from those institutions and attitudes that oppress men. The divorce court system, is one obvious example, of something that is screaming out to be reformed, but nothing happens, because the gender politicians who make the laws are afraid of the power of the women's lobby. For example, there have been states in the US, which started to implement automatic (default) joint custody of children after a divorce. The fluffie feminists (with emphasis on the word fluffie) then went on the war path against the politicians who made the proposal of joint custody, to the point that they lost the next election and were eliminated from power. Since then, nearly all gender politicians have not dared to counter the wishes of the feminist lobby, even though the legislation desired by the feminists has such catastrophic effects on men. The gender politicians simply haven't cared about the interests of men up to now, but that is all about to change.

Feminism has changed over the past half century. It used to be about equal rights for women (i.e. 2nd wave feminism - the 1st wave being the push for votes for women early in the 20th century), e.g. equal pay for equal work, the right to an abortion, equal rights to employment, etc. Most liberal males agreed with this and did not oppose it. However, feminism has spread from

the sages (intellectuals) to the peakers (the masses) so that most feminists today are non-sages, and hence a lot less intelligent than the sages and a lot more irrational and uncaring about the wellbeing of males. These average women who are feminists are quite happy to see their ex-husbands be forced by law to hand over his house to them, have him pay her alimony and child support, so that she can remain being a career incompetent fluffie. She is very happy with this.

But the men are not, and they are not remaining passive, or at least not entirely so. They are angry and recently have formed a variant of the masculist movement called MGTOW (men going their own way) which consists of millions of men who refuse to marry, and certainly refuse to have kids, spending their money on themselves and avoiding fluffie feminists like the plague.

The essential difference between the masculists and the MGTOWs is that the latter are apolitical, they do not organize political events nor apply political pressure on gender politicians to get the laws changed that are so egregiously unfair to men. MGTOWs simply drop out of the marriage market. They quietly refuse to marry and have kids. They often decide to work less, since they need to earn less money to cover their own modest life styles, and hence have a lot more free time to pursue their own dreams and interests. Many MGTOWs are so disgusted by the "entitlement" mentality of young women (i.e. they feel they are entitled simply because they are young women at the peak of

their sexual attractiveness) that these young MGTOWs refuse even to have sex with such women. They totally ignore them, as do the herbivore men in Japan.

Many MGTOWs feel much freer than the average "robot male" (a masculist term for a traditional male who expects to be parasited upon by a fluffie wife) who gets trapped into paying for a fluffie wife who will live off his money both before and after the divorce. To the masculists, a fluffie enslaves a robot male, so it is not surprising that masculists advise men strongly to prefer having relationships with FIPs (a masculist term for the type of woman that masculists want all women to be, i.e. financially independent persons) rather than fluffies.

To force fluffies to become FIPs, masculists refuse to have relationships with them, so that if a fluffie wants to eat, she will have to become a FIP. A fluffie can only become a fluffie by getting her financial claws into a robot male, but the supply of robot males (or "good men" as the fluffie feminists label them, i.e. passive, exploitable, gullible men) is drying up, so together with the MGTOWs, millions of young women now are going manless, childless, and hence are becoming utterly miserable, since the number one biological imperative of women, is to raise the next generation. In Japan, the third of young women who are manless are referred to as "dry fish ladies" an allusion to the dryness of their vaginas.

There is some heated discussion between the masculists and the MGTOWs over the most desirable strategy the men's movement should take to alleviate men's suffering. The MGTOWs are politically passive, political pygmies, yet indirectly, they will have a major political impact on society, if there are many more millions of them.

The masculists on the other hand, need to become a LOT more politically aggressive, learning a lesson from what the feminists have done. The masculists need a *manifesto* to help guide them in their implementation of the following political/social agenda.

MASCULIST MANIFESTO

1. Masculist Ideology

Masculists need to spread their ideology, especially using the internet, YouTube, and the conventional mass media, so that masculist ideas are widely spread throughout society.

2. Enormous Moral Pressure against Fluffies

Masculists need to put enormous moral pressure on women to be FIPs otherwise they will not get a man. This message needs to be taught in the media and in schools, so that girls grow up with the expectation that they are to be as career conscious as boys. Women are to pull their weight financially or they will be punished by being left manless, and hence childless. Masculists need to label fluffies in the media as parasites, immoral, slavers of men, vermin, and to be wiped out by men refusing to have relationships with them.

3. "Men-Fair" Divorce Court Reform

The masculists need to reform the anti-male gender laws, of which there are many, e.g. the divorce courts need to be made "men fair" e.g. custody of children needs to be given by default to both parents (joint custody) with the ownership of the house remaining with the original owner(s). The two parents can live in a big city and both have jobs locally, so that for a week or a month, one parent could have the kids, while the other lives in a small nearby apartment or rented room. With both parents being FIPs, this is doable, and the man gets to keep his house, he pays no alimony and gets half the custody of the kids.

4. PARER

Another major discrimination against men, is the lack of a PARER (paternity rejection right). Women have had a MARER since the 70s thanks to feminist political pressure. The Marer is usually called the abortion right, but men have no such right and are routinely forced to pay paternity money to kids they never wanted in the first place, thus having their lives ruined. The masculists want a man to be given the right to say that he doesn't want the kid in the case of a pregnancy that he does not agree with. If the

woman goes ahead and has the child, it is her sole financial responsibility.

5. Lobbying of Gender Politicians

Masculists need to lobby the gender politicians far more aggressively than they have done so far. For example, if the male governor of a US state refuses to pass "men fair" legislation, due to his fear of the feminist reaction, then the masculists could use French "direct action" techniques which the French farmers have developed to a fine art, which are extremely effective, e.g. the masculists could dump a truck load of cow shit at the entrance of the governor's office, then call the national media to explain why, using the event to abuse the governor on the national media as a "male feminist" "a traitor to his own sex" since he refuses to listen to what the masculists want. The publicity would be so effective that the governor is then tainted as "man unfriendly" in his state and loses the next election. This would send a message to other state governors that they need to listen to the masculists equally with the feminists, and to try to diffuse the sex war.

6. Other Legal Discriminations Against Men

There are many other legal discriminations against men, that need to go, e.g. differences in retirement ages; conscription for men but not for women; only men involved in military combat, but not for women, giving men the message that men are disposable, and women are precious; penalties and conviction rates for identical crimes

for men and women should be made the same; levels of research funding into men's diseases e.g. prostate cancer, should be made much the same as for breast cancer; parliaments should have both men's and women's gender issues committees; universities should have government supported men's studies programs, etc. There are many such legal discriminations against men.

7. Birth Rate Crash Ace Card

The masculists and the MGTOWs combined can play their ace card in giving a dire warning to the gender politicians, and to the media, that unless the grievances of the masculists and the MGTOWs are met, then the following slogan becomes true (i.e. the title of this essay) "If the gender politicians don't give the masculists what they want (i.e. the above list) then the masculists (and the MGTOWs) will wipe out whole populations by causing a crash in the birth rate."

This reality, that is already causing Japanese politicians to tear their hair out, will only become more apparent as time passes. Gender politicians in Japan are totally missing the point, when in their traditional, conservative, unimaginative culture, are telling young men to "man up," "become carnivores" (i.e. traditional robot males) rather than "herbivores" (grass eaters, as they are known in Japan).

Japanese young men look at their fathers who work 11 hour days, 3 hour commute times, who get home so late they

orphan their kids, who hand over their pay checks to their fluffie wives who play cards and tennis with their fluffie friends. These young men are so appalled at the life styles of their fathers they want nothing to do with them. They also want nothing to do with parasitic traditional fluffie females whom they let rot on the shelf (the "dry fish ladies.")

Masculists recognize that even if they do nothing and simply react as MGTOWs themselves, then eventually they will force the hand of the gender politicians and society in general to give the masculists what they want — either that, or the whole population dies out, so sooner or later, the masculists/MGTOWs will win. Fluffies have no power if men refuse to pay for them. Men have the power to wipe out fluffies by refusing to have relationships with them, and by applying enormous moral pressure against them. Any young woman who gets the label "fluffie" in her social circle will be given the "kiss of death" in terms of getting a man. She will be severely punished, because she will be manless, loveless, sexless, and especially childless and shunned from society — "Oh, that woman deserves to keep rotting on the shelf, she's a fluffie!"

Young women in the west are really starting to take an interest in the MGTOW movement because there are so many MGTOWs, millions of them, across North America. There are more MGTOWs than masculists, since it is much easier to be a MGTOW than a masculist. It takes a masculist more energy to organize political actions and create social pressure on fluffies

than it takes to simply walk out passively on marriage MGTOW style. So many men now are going MGTOW that women will soon be turning their attention towards the main source of the MGTOW problem, namely the fluffie feminist divorce courts. I wouldn't be at all surprised if radical fluffie feminists start assassinating divorce court judges and lawyers, reasoning that it is these judges and lawyers who are the ultimate cause of their manlessness and their childless misery.

Feminism itself will become increasingly unpopular with women, as they see that the fluffie feminists are the FIRST category of women to be rejected by the masculists and the MGTOWs. The current "third wave" feminism is more about creating a gynocracy than about equal rights, which was the focus of the 2nd wave. 3rd wave (gynocratic) feminism will have a short life, since it has been very short sighted regarding men's interests. Fluffie feminists are very unwise to think that men will not react against their gynocratic attitudes. Men are voting with their feet in refusing to have relationships with fluffie feminists, and especially fluffies.

Given the growing war between the sexes, with tens of millions of men in the US being financially slaughtered in the fluffie feminist dominated divorce courts, and the rejection of fluffies by millions of MGTOWs, it is likely only a question of a few years before gender politicians start being assassinated by the "sex war warriors" (of both sexes) and the public tide against fluffie feminism turns as society wakes up that the birth rate is plummeting. Soon the alarm bells will start ringing in

parliaments around the world, and men's issues will finally start being seriously addressed, and about time.

MENFAIRING THE DIVORCE COURTS

Prof. Dr. Hugo de Garis

profhugodegaris@yahoo.com
http://profhugodegaris.wordpress.com

Abstract

This essays presents ideas on how to "menfair" the divorce courts, i.e. ideas on how to reform divorce law, so that the divorce courts treat men fairly, unlike the case today, where divorces in the US are so toxic to men, than 70% of young US men under 35 refuse to marry and have kids. This marriage strike on the part of young men will force the gender politicians, and the fluffie feminist dominated divorce court judges and lawyers to change their attitudes towards divorcing men, otherwise whole populations will be wiped out due to crashes in the birth rate. But, in rather concrete terms, just how could the divorce laws and divorce courts be made fair to men, i.e. how to "menfair" the divorce courts?

I begin this essay with the current state of affairs in the divorce courts in western countries, concentrating on the US, as seen from the perspective of divorcing husbands. Decades ago, when a couple divorced, the children were usually given to the husband, since he had the money to pay for them after the divorce, which is still largely the case today in China for example. But since the rise of modern feminism, the women's organizations have lobbied the gender politicians so successfully that now divorce has become so toxic to men that they are now rebelling in massive numbers.

The gender politicians fear the women's lobby, since it is one of the biggest in the US and gives women what they want, to such an extent that the men's movement is now talking about a "gynocracy", where men's interests are simply ignored, which is something the masculists (men's libbers) are now organizing to change, which is one of the major topics of this essay, especially as it concerns divorce.

In the US today, typically a divorcing husband will be financially slaughtered in the divorce court. He will lose custody of his children in 90% of cases, he will usually lose his house, he will have to pay child support for a decade or two until the children are 18, and if his wife is a fluffie (a masculist term for a traditional woman who expects to be able to parasite off a man's money) he will also probably have to pay her alimony, because she is career incompetent and incapable of earning her own money.

This divorce experience is so devastating for men that their suicide rate sky rockets to about 100 times the usual male suicide rate. These financially massacred ex-husbands feel they

have lost everything, i.e. their wife (since about 70% of divorces are initiated by the wives in the US), their children, whom after the divorce they may be allowed to see according to the decision of the divorce judge, only a weekend or two a month, their house that they have been working hard to pay for, and forced to pay alimony to a fluffie ex-wife who is not obliged by law to get off her parasitic bum, and become career competent so that she can pay for herself. It is an overwhelming experience for millions of men, and makes them feel that society does not care about them.

As a result of this divorce trauma on a massive scale, given that the divorce rate in the US and many other countries is about 50%, several men's movements have grown up that address this massive problem (and other social and legal discriminations against men). They are the masculists and the MGTOWs (men going their own way). Masculists are men's libbers, the male equivalent of feminists, fighting to liberate men from laws and customs that oppress and enslave men. Masculists aim to change attitudes in society so that fluffies die out, due to men refusing to have relationships with them.

MGTOWs on the other hand, while agreeing with a lot of the aims of the masculists, are politically passive. They do not spend energy fighting for fairness for men, they simply drop out of the traditional male role of working for women. They, like many masculists, refuse to marry and work for women. It is obviously easier to be a MGTOW than a masculist, because it takes less energy, less political commitment, so there is a certain hostility against MGTOWs coming from the masculists, who see

MGTOWs as lacking solidarity with other men, as not bothering to make the effort to help other men solve their collective problems that are largely political in nature, e.g. the massive injustices committed against men by the fluffie feminist dominated divorce courts, the lack of a paternity rejection right (parer), men only in combat, etc.

Once second wave feminism became main stream, women's movements then threatened gender politicians with political annihilation if the latter did not do what the women's movements wanted. This was particularly true in the case of the divorce courts. In some states in the US, joint custody of children after a divorce was proposed to be made the default option, i.e. unless some unusual circumstance arose, the custody of the children would go automatically to both divorcing parents.

The women's organizations objected furiously to this and managed to wipe out several politicians who proposed it. Gender politicians soon learned to fear the women's organizations. Obviously to counter this negative force from the male perspective, will require comparably strong men's organizations to restore balance, and fairness to both sexes, which is one of the themes of this essay.

One of the main drivers of the MGTOW and the masculist movements has been the financial massacring of men in the divorce courts, so that young men now see traditional marriage as toxic, as way too risky to be acceptable, so they are simply refusing to marry and have kids. They may date and sex women, and even be friends with them, but they refuse to marry them, and they certainly refuse to have kids, because they have

witnessed the treatment of their older male friends, and especially their fathers, in the divorce courts. This has made them very wary of marriage. There are now millions of MGTOWs, to such a point that the feminists and women in general are talking about "where have all the good men gone?" meaning men who are prepared to pay for a fluffie wife to stay at home, not be career competent, so that she can raise HER kids and have him pay for it all, both before the divorce and after the divorce. Masculists label such men "robot males" and see them as slaves to fluffies. Masculists advise men not to have relationships with fluffies, because a fluffie will parasite on a man before the divorce and after.

Masculists put enormous moral pressure on fluffies to convert themselves into FIPs (financially independent persons), and on society in general so that girls are socialized to be FIPs and to be as career competent as are boys. The masculists are creating a real stigma against being a fluffie. They push the idea that fluffies are immoral, that they are slavers of men, that they are vermin to be wiped out, not by killing them of course, but by refusing to have relationships with them, thus forcing them to become FIPs if they want to eat.

Masculists are aware that fluffies can only be fluffies if they can get their financial claws into some robot male, but as the masculist and MGTOW message spreads, the supply of robot males is drying up, hence the complaint of feminists and fluffies about the lack of "good men," who, from the masculist and MGTOW point of view, are seen as fools, as exploited, as gullible slaves to parasitic fluffie women.

Having introduced some of the main ideas of the masculists and MGTOWs I can now start addressing the more concrete questions concerning reforms of the divorce laws and divorce courts, to make them menfair. To do this, I will break down the suggestions into two categories, namely when a man divorces a FIP wife, and when he divorces a fluffie wife.

Divorcing a FIP wife.

The advantages of divorcing a FIP wife are so great compared to divorcing a fluffie wife (under present divorce laws) that it should be obvious to readers that if you are a man, and you want to have kids and marry, then you should insist that your wife be a FIP.

A FIP wife will have her own career and earn a comparable salary as the husband, so that if there is a divorce, she will not need alimony. She can pay her own way. What about the kids? The two parents should be given joint custody automatically (unless there are exceptional circumstances, e.g. one of the partners is an alcoholic, or violent, or psychotic, etc), so that the burden of paying for the kids is shared more or less equally between the two parents, and time spent raising them is also about equal. Having two parents of both genders is also shown by extensive research to be far healthier mentally for the children.

For example, the children could be raised in the same house, with the two parents sharing alternately and weekly a nearby apartment that they both pay for. (The extra expense required on

the part of both divorcing partners (i.e. the house, plus a one person apartment) would motivate them to think twice about divorcing in the first place.) When one of the divorced parents is looking after the kids in the house, the other parent is living in the apartment. This is possible if both have jobs in the same large city. Keeping custody of the kids would motivate each exspouse to remain in the same city with the kids.

What if the kids are very young and need constant attention? Then a compromise could be made, so that the mother does not work (while she has maternity leave from work) and can breast feed in the house and the apartment, equally, but only for a limited amount of time, say a year, then she returns to her career.

The above suggestion is based on the principle that the needs and rights of the ex-husband are taken into account equally with those of the ex-wife and the kids. In the current system, the fluffie feminist dominated divorce judges and lawyers see men as check books to be exploited, and abused. This is a crime on a massive scale, given the tens of millions of men who are divorcing and being financially massacred.

Divorcing a fluffie wife

Men are much more likely to be financially massacred when they divorce a fluffie wife than a FIP wife. As mentioned earlier, he will likely lose his kids, his house, and pay child support and alimony. Divorcing a fluffie wife is usually a total financial and emotional disaster for him. So how can divorcing a fluffie be made menfair? If the divorcing husband is a robot male and he is divorcing his wife who is a real fluffie, who has minimal career competence if any, then how can the divorce laws be made such that the fluffie ex-wife can be converted into a FIP?

Since the ex-wife is a fluffie, the house prior to the divorce is the husband's that he has worked hard for by paying the mortgage. So he should not lose it as a result of the divorce. What the masculists are trying to avoid is the "gold digger" phenomenon, in which women marry in order to fleece an affluent man's wealth by taking advantage of the current divorce laws that give half of the wealth and property of the man to the woman, so that a lazy fluffie can enter a marriage with nothing, and leave it affluent at her ex-husband's expense. Divorce laws need to be set up in such a way that gold digging becomes a thing of the past, that it is no longer even possible, given the nature of the reformed divorce laws.

So, a similar arrangement can be envisioned as for the FIP wife case, i.e. the divorcing couple buys or rents a cheap room or apartment and uses it alternately as in the FIP wife case. Since the ex-wife is a fluffie, there will only be the ex-husband's money to pay for the house and the extra apartment initially.

The ex-wife, by law, will not be allowed to parasite off the exhusband's money. She will be legally obligated to find a job and pull her weight financially, so that she becomes a FIP and doesn't parasite on her ex-husband's money. If she makes little effort to educate herself and to get a good job, then she will be poor. There will be no alimony. Alimony will be made illegal as a matter of principle. Alimony is slavery for men. Joint custody of the kids will be the default option, i.e. the norm. The law will push the ex-wife into the work force, so that she no longer parasites on her ex-husband's money, she earns her own, and pays equally the costs of the kids.

Of course, the longer term goal of the masculists is to so morally pressure society that it is taboo to be a fluffie, that fluffies simply die out, that all women become FIPs, otherwise they will go manless, loveless, sexless and especially childless, and be shunned as pariahs in society, seen as immoral slavers of men, as vermin to be wiped out and spat at. Fluffies are man-slavers and man-slavery is a sex-war issue. The masculists and MGTOWs are at war with the fluffies and fluffie feminists (who are feminists but still have fluffie attitudes towards men, i.e. still seeing them as financial slaves to be exploited in traditional marriage and to be financially gouged in the fluffie feminists dominated divorce courts.)

It may take several generations for fluffies to die out, so the masculists need to lobby the gender politicians hard now, doing to them, what the women's movements did, i.e. threatening them with political annihilation if they do not give the masculists and men in general what men want. With the women's and the men's movements applying roughly equal pressure in opposite directions, the two forces should cancel each other.

Actually, that is not true. The masculists and MGTOWs have an ace card that the feminists do not have. Women are genetically wired to want to have and raise kids. It is their primary genetic

imperative, whereas men are genetically driven to penis women's vaginas. Evolution has used this bipolar strategy to ensure the next generation is generated.

So, if men decide in their millions not to marry and have kids, then the birthrate will fall, as is now already happening in Japan. The traditional robot male role of the average Japanese salary man, (who works 11 hour days, 3 hour commute times, who comes home so late he orphans his kids, and hands over his paycheck to his fluffie wife who stays at home playing cards and tennis with her fluffie friends) is seen as so repulsive by their sons, that now in Japan, a third of young Japanese men under 30 refuse to have relationships with women. They are labeled "herbivore men" or "grass eaters" as distinct from "carnivore men" who are the traditional salary men. As a result, the birthrate in Japan has now fallen to a catastrophic 1.3 children per woman, compared with the replacement rate of 2.1, so this means that each generation from now on will shrink by a third. Over a century, Japan's population will drop to about 20 million, and over two centuries it will be effectively wiped out.

This masculist/MGTOW threat of "give the masculists what they want or they will wipe out whole populations by crashing the birthrate" will ring alarm bells in gender politicians' ears. They will be forced to listen attentively to what the masculists are demanding. If they don't listen, then the population they live in will disappear. The feminists do not have such an ace card, so sooner or later, the masculists will get what they want.

But this ace card, is a centuries' long solution. The masculists want our cultures to be menfair now, so they will need to get on the media and harangue society that women must be FIPs, that schools must teach girls to be FIPs, and to put enormous moral pressure on fluffies to become FIPs or they will be ostracized in the sex war. The masculists need to employ direct action political tactics (e.g. French style) against the gender politicians who pass menunfair legislation, e.g. by dumping a truck load of cow shit in front of the state governor's office, then calling the national media to dump verbally on the governor as a "male feminist", as a "traitor to his own sex", so that at the next election, men don't vote for him since he has been tainted as "menunfair."

The masculists have a lot of work to do. They are aided indirectly by the MGTOWs but most of the political work will be done by the masculists. Of course, if there are many millions of MGTOWs, the birthrate will collapse, forcing the gender politicians to act. From the masculist perspective, masculism sees MGTOWism as a useful tool, because if a large proportion of the male population of reproduction age refuses to marry and have kids (e.g. the 70% of young men under 35 in the U.S.) then that "marriage strike" will help the masculists get the legal and social changes they want.

MGTOW "CASTLES", MASCULIST "POLICE" A MASCULIST GROUP IN EVERY UNIVERSITY

Prof. Dr. Hugo de Garis

profhugodegaris@yahoo.com http://profhugodegaris.wordpress.com

I'm constantly struck by the political passivity of MGTOWs, who simply accept the gender status quo as a given, rather than seeing it as a parvenu (a recent interloper) that needs to be removed as a cancer from men's bodies.

I suppose this is to be expected given that most MGTOWs are young, 20s, 30s, so have grown up with feminist gynocentrism, rather than seeing it as a rather recent (dating from the 70s) social movement. In the 70s I was a young man in my 20s and an avid male feminist, because I was hoping that feminism would make women "interesting" i.e. that I could share my intellectual passions for physics and math with women, but it never happened.

Half a century later men still win 99% of the science Nobel prizes and women continue to make a negligible contribution to

world intellect, so I've come full circle. I'm as condescending of women's intellects today as I was growing up in the Australian suburban doldrums in the 50s and 60s. I looked at my school friends' housewife mothers and found them as paralytically boring as my own mother, who nagged my father constantly while watching stupid TV movies every evening.

Then in the 70s, after the rise of the contraceptive pill, the greatest social revolution in history, women could reliably control the number of kids they had and swarmed into the work force to become FIPs (financially independent persons), well, a lot of them, not all, and that is part of the problem I will now address.

Masculists (men's libbers) are very conscious that there are still far too many fluffies around (fluffies, based on the word "fluff", i.e. light, not serious, not adult, not responsible, not career competent - are traditional women who expect to be able to parasite off a man's money) who still look on men as exploitable check books. Masculists' primary political aim is to wipe out fluffies, by refusing to have relationships with them, thus forcing them to rot on the shelf and be poor, unless they convert themselves into being FIPs.

Masculists are aware that ridding the world of fluffies will solve many of the gender issues that afflict men, e.g. the financial massacring of tens of millions of men in the US divorce courts that have been taken over by fluffie feminists (i.e. feminists who still have fluffie attitudes when it comes to men), the lack of a parer (paternity rejection right) which is a major and blatant sexual discrimination against men, lots of other legal and social discriminations against men, etc.

To rid the world of fluffies will require a political, ideological, social, legal organization that will place enormous moral pressure on women to become FIPs, and to make the gender laws "men fair." This is where the masculists come in.

EACH UNIVERSITY SHOULD HAVE A MASCULIST GROUP that educates its male students not to marry and have kids in today's fluffie feminist dominated divorce courts. These masculist groups should teach young men that marriage is toxic, that if they marry they will have a fifty fifty chance of being financially massacred, of losing their kids, their house, and having to pay child support for decades and if their ex-wife is a fluffie, maybe even alimony, with no moral or legal obligation on the fluffie ex-wife to get off her parasitic bum and get a job.

These university masculist groups should push for the making of men fair gender legislation, and harangue the female students, half of whom are studying career incompetent majors, who in their 30s, when their biological clocks are ticking, will start looking around for some robot male (a traditional male who expects to be parasited upon by a fluffie wife) to parasite upon, who can pay for her to live in a middle class house and raise HER kids.

The universities desperately need masculist groups to restore the balance against the feminist dominated atmosphere. If a feminist harangues a male student about rape or whatever, he can slam back, with an accusation that that women is a future "career incompetent" who will later try to enslave a robot male financially. He can use real moral anger against her and silence her with the force of his conviction, and scare her that maybe she will never get a man, because of her fluffiness and her negative attitude towards men.

The above reasoning seems all so obvious to me, yet the MGTOWs simply accept the status quo, and do not try to change it. Instead, they just walk away, refusing to have relationships with fluffies, fluffie feminists, and often with any kind of woman. The disadvantage with this strategy of just walking away, is that those social forces and ideas that are creating these male dumping feminists, and especially the fluffie feminist dominated divorce courts, will CONTINUE TO EXIST.

There will be little to stop them, whereas with large numbers of university masculist groups, one in every university, a collective masculist consciousness will arise, and society, and the laws will change, which is what the masculists want.

To make an analogy, and hence the point of the title of this comment, the MGTOW approach of passive resistance, of simply walking out of marriage and not having children (70% of young men under 35 in the US refuse to marry) will not solve men's problems at its source, i.e. feminism and fluffie feminist laws will continue to exist, and hence continue to afflict men, so men will need constant protection against them, i.e. men will need MGTOW "castles" to protect them against the feminist "pillagers" of men's lives and money.

The masculists on the other hand see the bigger picture and argue that building MGTOW "castles" is not necessary if there are no feminist pillagers, no fluffie feminist dominated gender laws, by installing a masculist "police force", that destroys the feminist pillagers and the fluffie feminist dominated gender laws. (Historically, castle building died out, once nation states arose, with their national police forces which were set up to arrest the pillagers.) In essence, the MGTOWs react to the feminist dominated gender status quo by building "castles," whereas the masculists destroy that status quo by installing a masculist "police force."

When nearly all women have a powerfully socially conditioned expectation (created by the masculist "police force") that they are to be FIPs or they will not get a man, then men's lives will be a lot better than they are today, where nearly half of men are being financially massacred in the divorce courts.

So, to you young men reading this, if you are university students, my strong advice to you is to set up masculist groups at your universities, and build up a powerful national and international men's movement to create a masculist "police force" rather than building MGTOW "castles."

Destroy the enemy at its source, by wiping out fluffies, and fluffie feminists, masculist style, with a masculist "police force", rather than just protecting yourself against fluffie feminist pillaging with MGTOW "castles."

FIPPING THE FEMALES

Prof. Dr. Hugo de Garis

profhugodegaris@yahoo.com http://profhugodegaris.wordpress.com

I've been giving a bit more thought to the longer term consequences of the rise of MGTOWs, masculists, women becoming FIPs (financially independent persons) and the growing moral pressure of masculists on women to be FIPs (or they won't get a man.) In many countries, the proportion of women at university is higher and becoming a lot higher, than men, e.g. in the US it is now about 65% or more and constantly rising. Admittedly, about half of these female university students are studying career incompetent, fluffified subjects (a fluffie is a traditional woman who expects to parasite off the money of a robot male (a traditional male who expects to be parasited upon by a fluffie wife)) but generally speaking women are becoming more and more FIP, which is great, it is what the masculists really want.

Being a FIP, and having the self-image of being a FIP, is a necessary but not sufficient condition for a masculist to have a

relationship with a woman. MGTOWs don't even do that, they simply refuse to have relationships with women, period. Masculists are prepared to have relationships with women and have kids, provided that their female partners are FIPs and that the gender laws have been made menfair, which is far from being the case today, given the takeover of the divorce courts by fluffie feminists (feminists who have had their feminist consciousness raised but not their masculist consciousness raised, who still have traditional fluffie attitudes towards men, i.e. seeing them as exploitable check books.

There is still a lot of reform in the gender laws that is needed before masculists will consider having relationships with women, e.g. the creation of a parer (paternity rejection right) equivalent to the female marer (maternity rejection right, aka abortion), and a host of other legal and social discriminations against men. Sooner or later men will have to get back to having babies, or our populations will die out, as is already happening with the young generation (70% of young men under 35 in the US refuse to marry or have kids.) Women are becoming more FIP every year, and acquire the habit and self-image of being FIPs. FIP women are much less likely to parasite on men, and fleece them via the fluffie feminist dominated divorce courts.

Once the fluffie feminists have been purged from the divorce courts, as must happen by the gender politicians, or populations get wiped out, then having a relationship with a woman, and having a kid with her will become a LOT LESS TOXIC for a man, so they will become more inclined to see women as less toxic, less dangerous, so after a divorce they will not fear losing

their kids, their house, their income and having to pay for a parasitic fluffie ex-wife who has no moral or legal obligations on her to force her to get off her fat parasitic arse and pull her weight financially by getting educated and earning a good salary, and stop leeching off a man.

So, with more women becoming FIPs, and more and more men becoming masculists and MGTOWs, the days of the fluffies are limited. They are dying out. They are being seen increasingly for what they are, as immoral, as parasites, as slavers of men, as vermin, to be wiped out. The message is getting out. "If you (a female) want to have a man, have a career" "Fluffies will rot on the shelf" Women are hearing this message and want in increasing numbers to be FIPs. They know that men are less and less inclined to be robot males. They know the supply of robot males is drying up, so if they want to eat, they will not be able to parasite off a robot male the way their mothers did. They are now more and more conscious that the choice is between becoming a FIP or being poor and manless, loveless, sexless and especially childless - a bleak choice, so they become FIPs.

Soon, there will be so few robot males, that the competition amongst fluffies and fluffie feminists for them will be so fierce, that those fluffies and fluffie feminists who start declaring themselves anti-feminists will be at an advantage in attracting robot males, as robot males do not want a relationship with a male dumping misandronist fluffie feminist bitch. A decade from now nearly all fluffies and fluffie feminists will be declaring themselves (publically at least) to be anti-feminist, (but perhaps remaining crypto-feminists privately.) Masculists

will increase the moral pressure on society that women are to be FIPs or women will be shunned morally by an increasingly hostile culture that sees fluffies as slavers of men, and hence indirectly as exterminators of whole populations, since it is the toxicity of marriage and the fluffie feminist dominated divorce courts that has caused the birth rate to crash.

So, longer term, fluffies will die out. Fluffie feminists will die out. Women will nearly all be FIPs, and the gender politicians will have made the gender laws menfair, so that the population can stop crashing, due to men being more willing to have relationships with women and have kids. How long will all this take? Hard to say. I suspect that within a decade being a fluffie will be considered TABOO by society. To be labelled a fluffie will be the kiss of death to a woman who hopes to get a man. Everyone will be educated into the idea that women must be FIPs or rot on the shelf, or be spat at by both sexes as being slavers of men, as being immoral parasites.

How long before the gender politicians reform the gender laws, the divorce courts, create a parer, etc? That depends on how quickly the masculists can organize and put real political pressure on the gender politicians, and can influence the broadcast media strongly. So the timing depends on the level of political commitment of the masculists. The MGTOWs are political pygmies, who just walk away quietly and individually from the marriage market, so they cannot be relied upon to push the gender politicians to make society menfair.

BUT, as millions of men go MGTOW, that will have political consequences, because sooner or later the gender politicians will

wake up and ask, what's happening to the birth rate? These MGTOWs are the greatest threat to humanity that has ever existed, because they have the power to wipe out whole populations. This trend MUST BE STOPPED, so sooner or later they will start to address men's problems. Sandman, although an archetypical MGTOW is very political, because he devotes his life to churning out a MGTOW video daily, influencing a growing number of men to become MGTOW, and indirectly, putting the fear of god into fluffies, who are afraid that they will not be able to find a robot male to parasite upon, because the supply of them is drying up fast due to the ideological influence of the masculists and MGTOWs.

In short, the days of the fluffies and the fluffie feminists are limited. Their ideologies will become a historical backwater, as the real power of the masculists and MGTOWs to crash the birthrate takes center stage and forces the necessary reforms to make society menfair.