

Elizabeth Hobson  
March 30, 2019

The MHRM is a tradcon Trojan horse? This is what feminists would like everyone to believe.

A common misrepresentation of the [Men's Human Rights Movement](#) (MHRM) is that we are simply trad-cons attempting to turn back the “progress” made by women over the last century. According to *Hope Not Hate's* 2019 '[State of Hate](#)' report, “Improvements in gender equality in recent years, and the feminist campaigns propelling them forward, have been met by resistance and opposition in parts of society”.

In their estimation, we use a “human rights framework” to push for revocation of women's liberties – wanting women to be essentially [barefoot, pregnant and back in the kitchen](#)

Bill Whittle said that “conservatism is the conservation of liberal values” and he was right. Our modern Western societies are inherently *liberal*, enshrining principles such as: liberty, justice, equality, individualism and meritocracy. The MHRM can generally be characterised as having gratitude to the traditional liberal system for taking us as far as it has and building such a great civilisation – so we *don't want to smash it*. We're also often realists who want to see candid discourse on the [research](#) that indicates that traditional set ups do work best for most people (so they can make free but informed life decisions).

However, in my opinion, we're equally an inherently progressive movement who want to *build* on the liberal values that our societies have evolved. We seek an end to gynocentric legislation/administration of law and the extension of the rights, opportunities, choices and consideration, that women and girls receive, for men and boys. This will mean, in some ways, a '[step down](#)' for women – but in terms of privileges, not rights – and women will still be free to act autonomously, they'll merely be held responsible for their actions to a greater degree than at present.

We want to build on liberal values in the following ways:

- **Liberty** – Freedom is a good in itself, not a means to an end. John Stuart Mill argued, in 'On Liberty', that “Society can and does execute its own mandates: and if it issues wrong mandates instead of right, or any mandates at all in things with which it ought not to meddle, it practises a social tyranny more formidable than many kinds of political oppression, since, though not usually upheld by such extreme penalties, it leaves fewer means of escape, penetrating much more deeply into the details of life, and enslaving the soul itself.” The MHRM fairly consistently argues for freedom from the tyranny of *feminist* opinion. Despite being a minority identity, feminism dictates to society what is to be the (narrowly defined) accepted discourse and behaviour. Mockery of feminism can result in [deplatforming](#) and innocent behaviour on the part of men, if unwelcome, is referred to as '[entitled](#)', [on a continuum with rape](#) and potentially a [hate crime](#). This has a chilling effect on academic freedom (thus the search for truth itself), interpersonal relationships and individual wellbeing.

- **Justice** – The MHRM is absolutely committed to the principles of ‘innocent till proven guilty’ and ‘blind’ justice. In recent decades feminists have successfully promoted the idea of ‘believing the victim,’ in cases of alleged violence, harassment or sexual misconduct against women – regardless of available evidence. This has led to [kangaroo courts](#) in universities weighing evidence on a probability basis (51% likely), [miscarriages of justice](#) and even [deaths](#). There is also a glaring gender justice gap visible across the modern West with men receiving harsher sentences and treatment as compared to women. [In the U.K.](#) men account for around 95% of the total prison population despite only committing 3.4 times more crimes than women. Feminist activists (such as Women in Prisons, Baroness Corston and Julie Bindel) have committed themselves to widening the gender justice gap – enabled by myopic and sentimental authorities.
- **Equality** – The MHRM seeks nothing more than equality in terms of rights, opportunities, choices and treatment for men and boys, with women and girls. We pursue such policies as: an assumption of 50/50 shared parenting in the Family Courts. For men to have a right to opt out of fatherhood and the legal responsibilities. Prevention of paternity fraud – with compulsory paternity tests and proportional consequences if fraud is discovered later (reimbursement of costs plus therapy eg.). An equitable amount of money and effort expended researching cures for ‘male’ illnesses as ‘female’ illnesses. Male contraceptives. For men to be valued by society, and to see as little misandry as we see misogyny. Equivalent services available for male victims of DV. For men and women receive equal sentences for equivalent crimes. An end to affirmative action quotas to allow people to succeed on the basis of their merits. For governmental and supranational organisations (like the U.N.) to either drop their departments that focus solely on women’s issues, reinvent them so that they’re genuinely focused on inclusive gender equality or to compliment them with departments for men. To embark on concerted efforts to make the world safer for men, as well as women. For each sex to be protected from non-medically necessary infant genital mutilation. To classify ‘forced to penetrate’ as ‘rape’ in the criminal justice system and sentence perpetrators on a par with perpetrators of penetrative rape. For the non-feminist sector is given a representative voice in politics, academia and the media.
- **Individualism** – The MHRM sees people not as collectives to be promoted or punished for the actions of other people who share immutable characteristics with them. Moreover, we see individuality as sacred, each individual person unique and deserving of the kind of equality outlined above.
- **Meritocracy** – The MHRM believes that men and women can succeed in whatever fields are suitable and attractive to them and that it will benefit our entire societies when those most accomplished and desirous can rise to the tops of their fields.

The MHRM isn’t misusing a human rights framework. We are a critically important human rights movement that is pushing for change that is way past due – and if there is any life left in our liberal democracies, if conservatives *have* conserved liberal values, then we will make progress. ‘Conservative’ and ‘progressive’ are terms commonly applied in messy, inconsistent and misinterpreted ways. They’re actually mutually inclusive forces that work to further human well-being when balanced appropriately – and the MHRM achieves that humble balance well.

“Progressives” like *Hope Not Hate* are more aptly named: ideological collectivists. They don’t want our civilisation to make progress; they want to smash the system and they want to subvert our liberal values to establish an imagined social justice utopia. Standing against “progressives” like that does not a trad-con make. Onwards!



**Elizabeth Hobson**

[Prev](#)PREVIOUSThe deification of females

NEXTJoe Biden will never be president, however much he kisses feminist ass [Next](#)