

## Lobbying, Discussion, and Contact Strategies for MRAs

Matt Campbell, Men's Activism New Network (MANN) – matt\_at\_mann@yahoo.com  
<http://news.mensactivism.org/>

People new to lobbying officials or discussing MRM (Men's Rights Movement)-related issues sometimes have trouble coming up with ways to express their ideas or approach others on the topic. After all, once someone becomes aware of men's issues, it can feel like he or she now faces a big integrity challenge. As the MRM's positions are still unpopular (at least in public) due to the effects of nymphotrophism (see <http://www.merineews.com/article/perils-of-nymphotrophism/136341.shtml> and <http://en.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enwiki/10674641> ], it takes some courage to discuss ideas found in the MRM. After all, resources such as YouTube are filled with examples of feminists losing it on people who have the temerity to question even a single idea they promulgate.

Nonetheless, once the scales fall off your eyes, there's no turning back. Keeping silent seems like a mighty tall order, but how do you discuss such things without getting into an argument merely for suggesting that it's wrong to cut off part of a boy's penis without him even being able to consent and without a solid immediate medical reason? Or even to discuss how your friend at work has just been stuck with years of alimony and child support after his wife of X-many years, who insisted she be supported while she stayed home to do the back-breaking, thankless job of raising her own kids while your friend spent years in a job he didn't really like all to enable her to do so, decided to leave him for someone else -- and now he will maybe get to see his kids one week-end every two weeks? Never mind such things as the draft/selective service/conscription -- the barest suggestion of changing the law to have such things encompass women as well as men is enough in some quarters to get you thrown out of wherever you are.

So how does one live in integrity and pursue this cause without destroying personal relationships or worse yet, take a strategy for trying to get the word out that furthers and does not hinder nor set the cause back? This is not a question specific to the MRM. Other social or similar causes have the same challenge. Even expressing unpopular single viewpoints that are obvious to anyone analyzing the evidence can be vehemently denied, and those "speaking for Wolf" as the Iroquois Indians called it (<http://www.angelfire.com/mn/wolfluver/wolf/stories/speakforwolf.html> ) can find themselves in dangerous and unpleasantly unpopular circumstances very fast. Just ask someone like Nicolaus Copernicus who, if he had been born a few decades before he was, probably would have been hung, beheaded, excommunicated, or any number of other things for his practically heretical ideas about how the Earth was not in fact the center of the universe. (That he was wrong about the sun being so is neither here nor there. He was still taking a big chance even suggesting such a thing but somehow managed to avoid getting executed for it.) Other examples of unpopular social or

political movements or groups of ideas include animal rights arguments or the movement itself, any kind of rebel or political secessionist group (example: America's founding fathers, at least in the early years), trade unionists in countries where there is little support for them either initially or going forward, etc. The same thing is basically at play, though in the case of the MRM, men are not, like many kinds of non-humans, cute and fluffy. Trade unionists, though one may believe rightly or wrongly that they are likely to become corrupt or cause the prices of things to go up as go wages, are at least understood to be wanting their members to have better lives. It's hard to argue with that, even though one may not like the idea of collective bargaining for whatever reason. And rebels? It's about the cause. If the cause seems just, supporting it becomes easy. If not, that's also an easy decision to make. But what of men? Men are the last group that it seems the human race the world over, even members of the class of person known as men, seem ready and willing to vilify and gleefully watch get shafted. Even after something really bad happens to a man due to the effects of nymphotropic prejudice against him, he is frequently more likely to just try to put it past him and view himself less as a victim of anti-male bigotry and more as a victim of bad luck, or to put the blame on himself for some kind of poor judgment he made about who to fall in love with and marry some number of years prior.

Others have said it and I will repeat it: Men are, like women, an interest group – socially, politically, anthropologically, personally. Yet most of us are utterly oblivious to it. Women seem to have “gotten hip” as they used to call it in the 1970s here in the US, and in a short time created networks of sociopolitical activism all centered around their gender identities. In a few short decades, feminists claiming the right to speak for womankind have gone from seeking equity in particular spheres of public and private endeavors to demanding ever-increasing (and seemingly never-ending) privileges, concessions, and perquisites using their “special needs” as women to justify their demands. Sufficiently cowed politicians (usually men), believing that feminists speak for women, trip over themselves to appease them so they can get “the female vote”. They would be much less likely to act this way if men realized that they were indeed as much an interest group as women and were as assertive at counter-lobbying or better yet, lobbying and organizing around their own issues instead of remaining on the defensive. But most men do not understand this -- at least not yet. And it seems many are knee-jerk hostile to the suggestion that just maybe, feminism and feminism particularly as it manifests today has become a serious problem for men and boys.

So it remains: What to do?

The answer rests with being prepared to discuss topics of interest to the MRM better than most others. Learn as much as you can about issues that are particularly important to you. One cannot cover all bases, so pick the ones you have the most juice around and focus on them. There are many single-plank organizations already that address MRM issues, and a number of umbrella general interest groups. Anti-circumcision groups are increasingly more prominent as well as gaining membership. Fathers' rights groups were

among the first to form when the MRM started and it is easy to locate them via web searches. Another important thing to do is anticipate what sorts of things others are prone to say about particular subjects. Typically you'll find they'll express commonly-held beliefs about men and boys based on stereotypes and misattributions. Examining your own prejudices about men can help you not only deconstruct them in yourself but give you a place to start in terms of doing further research into particular issues. If you have a given prejudice or belief about men in general that you suspect or have been told isn't correct (either by an MRA you know or based on something you read on MANN or from another source), then validate that assertion. Show yourself based on evidence you uncover that the belief you have had or that others have expressed is or is not correct.

Having facts on your side is a big plus, even if someone you are discussing a topic with does not readily admit the error of their ways. When getting into arguments, calm or heated or something in between, there is always the ego at work for everyone involved. The key to getting your point across is to get your ego out of the way. If the person you are talking to gets upset and starts acting out, then guess who looks the fool? Not you. Plenty of encounters with feminists recorded on video show who in the debate is the one incapable of forming a rational argument. It is this inability to come from a place of factual assurance and to remain calm and centered that gives anyone in a debate a huge advantage over an opponent who cannot remain in control of him- or herself. The one carrying on may get more attention in the same way a child throwing a tantrum in a department store is getting attention, but it isn't the kind that brings praise nor wins converts to one's side of the debate. Witness the degree to which organized resistance to college campus feminists, for example, is taking hold. People are finally tiring of the shrill scream-a-thons feminists are known for having in the academy and the more rational of their peers are finally pushing back. It's the beginning of the end for campus feminists and they only have themselves to blame; that, and they are simply wrong about so much.

Being prepared to discuss the relevant topics and keeping your collectedness is the counter to the irrational shrillness and fallacious arguments feminists put forth (when they are in fact bothering to try to argue; typically, they just start berating people). But discussing things with feminists is not really where an MRA is best focusing his or her energy. It's the typical person that you are most likely to be able to talk to about MRM-related topics. Getting feminists to see reason is usually a futile effort. For all the energy one may put into trying to get a feminist to stop being one, you can get ten other people to see your point about something: circumcision, anti-father family courts, the mythical wage gap, the ludicrousness of a sex discriminatory selective service system, etc. Raising awareness and increasing the number of people involved with or sympathetic to MRM-related issues is critical; each person matters, whether they used to be a feminist or not. You are simply much more likely to bring people who are not currently feminists over to an understanding of MRM-related issues than you are an indoctrinated feminist. Fish where the fish can bite. (Feminist fish not only can't bite, they are likely to drag you into

the lake and puncture your eardrums with the sound of their shrillness. No one's got time for that.)

As for political actions, contacting legislators, governors, etc. and expressing a particular view on a particular topic that is relevant in the present (such as regarding a pending bill) is the most efficient way to get their attention, short of making large donations to re-election campaigns, of course. (That method, alas, works better, but most of us lack the money for such large amounts of donation cash; not that it would matter much if the cause is too unpopular.) Knowing a voter is paying attention to how they are voting and care enough to express a viewpoint about a given bill speaks volumes. Most voters or would-be voters pay little or no attention to their representatives' voting records; if you are among the few who do, it's easy to imagine you are a regular voter. Given the endemically poor turnout in ordinary local elections all over the country (speaking here of the USA), it's safe to say that one person who votes may in effect be "representing" as many as 15 or more of their fellow would-be voting citizens. In smaller districts, small numbers of votes in today's heavily divided and often closely-polarized electoral climate mean a lot. Don't think because you are just one person with one opinion that you can't sway a representative's opinion. It happens all the time.

That said, the way you present your opinion matters. Be respectful, but not fawning; the representative works for you, not the other way around, but don't forget that his or her office gives them certain powers ordinary citizens do not have. Saying anything hostile/threatening to a representative can get you into a lot of trouble; if anything you say or write can be interpreted as threatening (even remotely), it's a crime in the vast majority of jurisdictions in the US, if not all. Writing to a representative to complain that they did not vote on a matter as you desired is the most likely time you may slip up and let too much anger through, leading to a knock on the door by the police. But even if it does not cause that, the bad taste for you it will leave in the representative's mouth will cause future communications from you to them to be tossed away without consideration. That isn't the goal. So as in anything, how you say things is as important as what you say. Plenty of feminists learn this fact the hard way, or indeed, never learn it at all. This is why they are the least popular kinds of people anyone but one another want to be around.

To avoid coming across as bad as a feminist when writing about something that you have an emotional charge around (example: circumcision is a big one; a lot of men are really angry about that having been done to them, and have every right to be, but screaming and frothing at the mouth in written form will not win over a politician or most others to your point of view). Stick to the facts and cite sources. MRM-related planks are already starting from a place of unpopularity due to pervasive nymphotrophism and collective male denial over the degree to which men have been abused and exploited. (No one likes to admit he has been abused and exploited, right? Good quote from Carl Sagan: "One of the saddest lessons of history is this: If we've been bamboozled long enough, we tend to reject any evidence of the bamboozle. We're no longer interested in finding out the truth.

The bamboozle has captured us. It's simply too painful to acknowledge, even to ourselves, that we've been taken. Once you give a charlatan power over you, you almost never get it back." from *The Demon-Haunted World: Science as a Candle in the Dark.*) The best bet the MRM has is to bring people around through rational argumentation. It will take time, but this approach is already making headway, as can be seen from the resistance from the legal world to the abuses that the misapplication of Title IX is causing on college campuses. Chanting and screaming doesn't move the opinions of legal scholars and as more fundamental human rights and freedoms come under threat by feminist indoctrination and feminist-driven regulations, the more the resistance will coalesce into a force that is effective at not just stopping, but rolling back the damage. Letters to representatives, governors, papers, college administrators, etc., are a great tool to that end.

To write a coherent and cohesive letter, recall the basics from high school; start with an opening paragraph stating the subject of the letter and your opinion on the matter. For example, if a state bill number 123 titled "Supplemental Funding for Girls in Science" is being considered and you believe the funding ought to be open to both boys and girls based on merit and not gender, then your opening paragraph might read:

*I am writing to express my opinion on SB 123, "Supplemental Funding for Girls in Science", currently scheduled for vote in the Assembly within the next two weeks. Having read the bill's text, as a taxpayer and believer in equal opportunity based on merit, I disagree with the bill's criteria for funds distribution and ask that as long as it retains its current form, you vote against it. However if it can be referred back to committee and its language changed to become gender-neutral, it would remove my objection to it.*

In three sentences, your entire position has been stated. However that typically isn't enough to move most political leaders, though your opinion is loud and clear. The body of the letter, no more than two paragraphs, should state facts around the topic. For example, you could point out how females actually are already well-represented in the sciences, and that they out-earn men in college degrees generally, with an upward tilt in terms of science degrees continuing onward. Making mention of how there are more women in medical school today than men, and that a strong majority of veterinarians, for example, are women, and not men. You could include references to many studies showing much of the so-called STEM Gap is actually a product of women's choices in terms of lifestyle and not due to anything inherently biased against them, and so on. Finally, including a relevant closing quote from someone respected by the representative (or probably so) is a good way to help them re-frame the issue from a different point of view. In this example, possibly the following from Booker T. Washington would work: "You can't hold a man down without staying down with him." The relevance is pretty obvious; if you socially engineer a better-than-men scenario for women, then the satisfaction therefrom will be short-lived, as now, women must live with men of lesser education and means. Eventually, that situation will lead to the undoing of whatever

improvements women have seen in this process of social engineering that feminism demands. How you would work the quote into the letter is up to you.

The closing paragraph should be a re-statement of what you want to see done vis-à-vis the matter at hand, and then thank the representative for their time and attention to your opinion. At no time however, is it good to suggest even legal adverse consequences, as in, “If you don’t vote this way, I’ll vote for your opponent in the next election.” That isn’t really threatening language so you won’t get any knocks on your door because of it. However it’s a “sour grapes” thing to do, and makes you look like you’re a one-issue knee-jerk voter. Just plain being decent and pleasant in your writing while taking a firm point of view will itself be impressive, given how many such “sour grapes” letters representatives get regularly.

Calling representatives is fine provided you realize your chance to speak to them is small, unless you’re some kind of muckety-muck relative to the politician: a significant donor, a local business leader, etc. The most you can hope for is to simply state that you oppose/favor a bill, etc., and that you are calling as a registered voter. That is enough to get the idea across without sounding like a one-issue or knee-jerk kind of voter. Other than that, the person answering the phone probably doesn’t have the time or inclination to hear your viewpoint in detail and it may in fact work against your position to try to get them to hear the kinds of things you can detail in a letter. For this reason, letters are preferable. In addition, phone calls always have the possibility of becoming heated for some reason; for example if you feel like you are getting the brush-off from a hurried staffer, you might get annoyed and say something that is marginally or unintentionally threatening. (Believe me, the slightest kind of thing can be taken for “threatening”: a tone of voice, a stressed syllable, etc., and they are a lot more out to find MRAs threatening that feminists, despite the degree of bullying that feminism has been so good at doing.) Therefore under all circumstances, remain calm and respectful and if you find you are losing patience with, for example, being put on hold, etc., just end the call. Call back later, or take to using a letter.

Scheduled personal visits on particular issues can be useful vehicles as well. However one must have their facts in order and be prepared for the reality that they will get to speak only to a staffer and not the representative. But this is not time wasted. The staffers’ jobs include hearing the concerns of constituents and coalescing the general feel they have so that the representative can get an idea of where his/her constituency stands on a given matter, so sit down gratefully with the staffer, thank them for being willing to listen to your opinion, and then deliver it very much the way you would write a letter as I discuss above. Don’t be surprised if the staffer says little or nothing. Many are under orders from their bosses (the representatives) to say nothing; just listen and not engage. That way, the staffer doesn’t accidentally commit the representative to a position. This is especially a concern these days when any number of hand-held devices have recording capability, such as smart phones and MP3 player/recorders. To avoid getting into this kind of trouble, most staffers will say little or nothing back to you, even if they personally

agree or disagree with your position. Also bear in mind, you may be getting recorded yourself by the staffer. This is legal in many states in the union and is also legal even in ones where it isn't, with exceptions made for Congressional or assembly offices, whether in the main buildings of legislatures or executive buildings or not. Bear that in mind, also, when you are talking to the staffer.

Nonetheless, though it is unlikely, be prepared to answer questions from the staffer that may be put as challenges to your opinions. They may be seeing how knowledgeable you really are on the topic, and whether you seem genuinely concerned about it, or why. Every question or challenge you may get from a staffer, or indeed anyone you speak to about MRM issues, should be seen as an opportunity to educate and connect with the other party; it is not an invitation to a joust but rather an invitation to parlay. Friends and allies are made via mutual constructive communication, not hostile exchanges. This is why arguing with feminists is a no-win situation. Their hate for men, or society, or "the patriarchy", or social injustice, or whatever, is so great, that any disagreement or questioning of it is met with open hostility and at times, violence. MRAs distinguish themselves well in that we do not behave that way. And it's for this reason that we are making much faster progress against feminism than they are against the MRM.

I hope this has been a useful discussion/guide. Patience, brothers and sisters. Since we have no intention of ever retreating or surrendering, and since there is always among humanity, thankfully, sane people of good will and common sense, the MRM will be here so long as feminism remains. And we will eventually prevail due to this simple logic: There will always be MRAs so long as there are feminists, and we will, as Churchill said, never, ever, ever, ever give up. Therefore eventually, we must win – since anything short of complete and total victory is unacceptable to us. After all, once you give in on one of your human rights, the rest quickly follow. There can be no partial victory. It's all or nothing.