

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 ex-spouse 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 ex-husband'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.