

BIOGRAPHY

Mike Buchanan (1957-) is a writer, publisher, and men's human rights campaigner. As well as leading **Justice for Men and Boys**¹ he runs Campaign for Merit in Business² and Anti-Feminism League.³ His last three books^{4,5,6} have largely focused on the impact of militant feminism in modern Britain.

Justice for Men & Boys (and the women who love them)

A few weeks ago a new British political party was established, **Justice for Men & Boys (and the women who love them)**.¹ I'm the party's leader, and later in this article I'll explain the thinking behind forming the party, and how we plan to change the face of British politics.

I'll start with the 'big picture'. The interests of men and boys have been ever more assaulted in the UK for more than 30 years, the trend accelerating after Margaret Thatcher, a true meritocrat, resigned as prime minister in 1990. Terrified of the prospect of alienating the 'female vote' politicians have enacted legislation, and issued guidance for civil servants, which have been ever more influenced by militant feminist thinking. *They have had no democratic mandate for doing so.*

A small example of the phenomenon may illustrate the point. In 2008 Harriet Harman – surely the most influential militant feminist politician of her generation – introduced a piece of legislation which hadn't been trailed in the Labour party's 2005 election manifesto. The legislation enables political parties to employ all-women prospective parliamentary candidate ('PPC') shortlists for the subsequent five elections, i.e. *25 years*. I worked as a consultant for the Conservative party (2006-8), but when David Cameron announced his intention in the autumn of 2009 to employ all-women PPC shortlists, I cancelled my party membership in protest at his anti-meritocratic and unConservative decision. I was told I was far from alone in having done so.

One implication of all-women PPC shortlists is that the least qualified female potential candidates are automatically given priority over the most qualified male potential candidates. Had such shortlists been in place when Winston Churchill first sought to become a politician, the course of European history after 1939 would arguably have turned out very differently.

Since being elected party leader in 2005, David Cameron has proved himself relentlessly pro-female and anti-male in his public statements and policy directions, yet even he faces accusations of being biased against women because of the low number of women in his cabinet. He appears incapable of articulating an obvious truth – for every cabinet position, the number of well-qualified men considerably outnumbers the number of well-qualified women. So Cameron is left agreeing that he should have more women in his cabinet, yet failing to appoint them. This is an absurd position, and inevitably attracts charges of anti-female bias.

So why *do* men tend to dominate the political scene, the boards of major companies etc.? The key to the phenomenon was outlined by the renowned sociologist Dr Catherine Hakim, in a paper published in 1990. Her research revealed that while four out of seven British men of working age are 'work-centred', only one in seven British women is.⁷ Put simply, if the proportion of women in the Cabinet, on major company boards etc. is increased, this will entail the appointment of women who are less well-qualified than the best male candidates for such positions. The inevitable consequence of these social engineering exercises will be declines in performance.

Over the past 12 months I've worked almost full-time running Campaign for Merit in Business.² We campaign against the government's initiative to force major companies (through a threat of legislated quotas) to increase gender diversity in the boardroom ('GDITB'). Longitudinal studies all show unequivocally that the consequences of such initiatives are declines in corporate financial performance.⁸

We've done all in our power to persuade the Conservative-led coalition to engage with our arguments. We offered a written submission to a House of Lords inquiry – 'Women on Boards' – and I gave testimony to a House of Commons inquiry, 'Women in the workplace'. Video footage of that session is available online.⁹

So, what has our campaign achieved? We've succeeded in discouraging prominent advocates of GDITB from publicly claiming that one consequence of GDITB will be enhanced corporate financial performance – the formerly claimed 'business case' has been proven to be without any foundation. Prominent advocates of GDITB include David Cameron and the Business Secretary, Vince Cable. We've attracted some national newspaper coverage of our campaign, and I recently appeared on the BBC television show *Daily Politics*.⁹ But we've yet to persuade a single government minister – even a Conservative one – to meet with us, or engage with our arguments.

The House of Commons inquiry report is forthcoming, but the House of Lords report was published in November 2012. Despite our having provided compelling evidence showing that GDITB leads to declines in corporate financial performance, the report included the following remarkable statement:

'It should be stressed that we reject any suggestion that improved diversity would be to the detriment of company performance, as was argued in some submissions we received.'

I wrote to the chair of the committee, the Conservative peer Baroness O'Cathain, asking for the basis on which our evidence had been rejected. She failed to answer that simple question. In December, after dwelling on the matter for some time, I had a 'light bulb moment'. What can a citizen do when the democratic process fails, when politicians refuse to engage with compelling evidence which *proves* their policy direction to be dangerous (in this case assaulting the freedom of companies to appoint directors solely on the grounds of merit)? With the question framed in that way, the answer was obvious. I had to register a new political party which would contest the incumbent administration's marginal seats, winning enough votes so that some politicians lose their comfortable livelihoods. *Then* the main political parties may start to compete with each other for men's votes, by starting to repeal anti-male legislation and cease anti-male initiatives. The party was recently registered with the Electoral Commission, and we've started a public consultation exercise¹⁰ with the aim of developing an election manifesto in due course.

The party will raise public awareness of the discriminations and poor life outcomes experienced by men and boys in modern Britain, many of them partly or wholly attributable to successive governments' actions or inactions, including:

Suicide

For every woman who commits suicide, over three men do. Disadvantaged men in mid-life are at particular risk. The government is doing virtually nothing to address the high male suicide rate.

The workplace

Nearly two-thirds of public sector employees are women, yet the Equality Act (2010) enables public sector bodies to favour women in their recruitment processes. This drives up male unemployment.

Unemployment

For every three women who are registered as unemployed (1.08 million), four men are (1.44 million). Unemployment is known to be a more serious risk factor with relation to suicide for men than for women. Women can more reliably expect their partners to sustain them financially through periods of unemployment than men can. Indeed male unemployment is a risk factor with relation to divorce (most divorces in the UK are instituted by women) and men are ten times more likely to commit suicide after divorce than women.

Healthcare provision

Almost as many men die from prostate cancer as women die from breast cancer, yet the state spends less than half the amount of money on early diagnosis of the former as it spends on early diagnosis of the latter.

The justice system

When convicted for the same crimes as women, men face higher rates of incarceration and stiffer sentences.

Paternity fraud

It's estimated that for 10% - 30% of births in the UK, the man who's been led to believe he's the father of the child – and may in consequence work for 20+ years to financially support it – has been misled. In 2008 the Child Support Agency reported it was aware of over 1,200 cases of attempted paternity fraud. Paternity fraud is a criminal offence, yet no British woman has ever been convicted of it.

Personal enrichment through divorce

In an era where women have the same employment opportunities as men, this is clearly unjust. Enrichment through divorce almost invariably favours women, since women rarely risk their personal wealth by marrying relatively less well-off men.

Domestic abuse / violence ('DA/DV')

It's long been known that female-on-male DA/DV is almost as common as male-on-female DV, yet state support for male victims is miniscule compared to that for female victims.

Parental access to children following relationship breakdowns

The justice system continues to fail to enforce contact orders when the parent with custody of the child is the child's mother.

Homelessness

Almost exclusively a problem for men.

Retirement age

On average men die earlier than women, yet they have to wait longer for their state pensions.

Why does our party name have the subtitle, 'and the women who love them'? We're seeking to appeal to women who *genuinely* believe in gender equality, rather than relentless special treatment for women and girls regardless of the cost to men and boys. Women are increasingly recognising

that state-sponsored militant feminists assault the nuclear family, and the majority of women, as well as men. Women are mothers of sons, and they see their sons' futures blighted from the moment they enter the feminised education system. They have husbands, brothers, and fathers, as well as male friends and acquaintances whose interests are assaulted by state-sponsored feminists throughout their lives.

I recently wrote to David Cameron¹¹ outlining our intention to contest the 30 most marginal Conservative seats in 2015, where majorities in the 2010 general election ranged between 54 and 1,692 votes. In 23 of those seats, Labour was the runner-up party.

We're looking forward to changing the face of British politics in 2015.

Mike Buchanan

REFERENCES

¹ <http://j4mb.wordpress.com>

² <http://c4mb.wordpress.com>

³ <http://fightingfeminism.wordpress.com>

⁴ *David and Goliath: David Cameron – heir to Harman?* (LPS publishing: Bath)

⁵ *The Glass Ceiling Delusion: the real reason more women don't reach senior positions* (LPS publishing: Bath)

⁶ *Feminism: the ugly truth* (LPS publishing: Bath)

⁷ <http://c4mb.wordpress.com/2012/07/19/dr-catherine-hakims-preference-theory/>

⁸ <http://c4mb.wordpress.com/improving-gender-diversity-on-boards-leads-to-a-decline-in-corporate-performance-the-evidence/>

⁹ <http://j4mb.wordpress.com/2013/02/19/youtube-videos-of-mike-buchanan-at-a-house-of-commons-inquiry-and-his-daily-politics-appearance/>

¹⁰ <http://j4mb.wordpress.com/our-public-consultation-exercise-2/>

¹¹ <http://j4mb.wordpress.com/2013/03/03/an-open-letter-to-david-cameron/>