

- [Home](#)
- [About](#)
- [Contact](#)
- [Commenting Policy](#)
- [Submissions](#)
- [Advertise](#)
- [Subscribe](#)

[The Spearhead](#)

# Being a Non-Custodial Father is a Civil Disability

by [W.F. Price](#) on September 9, 2012

Most readers probably aren't acquainted with the concept of civil disability. However, because most are American, they probably do have some instinctive understanding of the concept, because the United States was founded in large part in opposition to unfair civil disabilities. In fact, our Constitution prohibits more than a few of them.

A civil disability is, in effect, a punishment levied against someone for being a member of a certain class. For example, following the Jacobite uprising in Scotland and subsequent English conquest of the land, Scots were subject to a number of penal laws that imposed civil disabilities on the native population. They were not allowed to wear tartans, bear arms, or, in some cases, speak their native tongue.

In Ireland, civil disabilities targeting Catholics were introduced in the late 17th century.

In the American colonies, merely being a colonist subjected people to certain punitive, confiscatory laws.

Our founding fathers opposed these penal measures, and codified their opposition to them in our Constitution. The 1st Amendment of the Bill of Rights offers a stellar example: the right to freely practice one's religion.

This right was most definitely not guaranteed prior to the drafting of the Bill of Rights. In the late 18th century, and indeed in the early 19th century, Jews, Catholics and others were still [subject to civil disabilities in England](#). These took the form of financial penalties, forced registration with the state, inability to hold public office, and other pernicious limits to full citizenship.

Following the abolition of slavery in the United States, black Americans were subject to civil disabilities until the late 20th century under the Jim Crow regime. The Civil Rights movement was dedicated to overturning these legal barriers to full participation in society.

Today, it is only officially admitted that convicted felons are subject to them. Convicted felons, as it currently stands, have neither the right to vote nor the right to bear arms.

However, there is another class of Americans – a far more numerous one – that is also currently subject to civil

disabilities: the non-custodial parent.

Overwhelmingly male by design, non-custodial parents are – through no fault or crime of their own – entered into criminal justice databases. They are assized for plunder, and then ordered to turn over their income to another, regardless of fault, regardless of wrongdoing, regardless of consent.

They are denied public employment if they do not – or merely cannot – bear the burden of their unearned penalty. They face prison without trial, and they face seizure of assets without due process. The burden of proof is upon them, and they face the loss not only of their sustenance, but of their very issue.

Feminists, ruthless oppressors that they are, approve wholeheartedly of this state of affairs. Tyranny comes naturally to a feminist, whose notion of rights stops at her or his own benefit. Any excuse will do to deprive innocent Americans of their rights and livelihood.

Through their efforts, feminists have made a cruel mockery of the ideals of freedom and justice upon which our country was founded. They are perhaps the most successful of tyrants in our contemporary state, snatching children and property from innocent parents, and justifying their crimes against humanity with wild, unnatural assaults against nature, human decency and public order.

As Americans, we should despise these assaults against the underpinnings of our nation and civilization. We should be vociferously opposing the abuse of an innocent class of people, who are oppressed with the full force of the law to serve a shrill, spoiled and increasingly parasitic subset of our society.

It is time we stopped being timid lambs led to our own slaughter and took a stand against the feminists. We must let them know that we will not be consigned to subhuman status merely to effect their enslavement of the American man and consumption of the American family.

Enough is enough. It is time for us to be men again, and not merely beasts fit for the slaughter.

Share this:

Share

Tagged as: [civil disabilities](#), [fathers](#), [human rights](#), [non-custodial parents](#)

{ 49 comments... read them below or [add one](#) }



bruno [September 10, 2012 at 00:58](#)

Meanwhile, in France...

Socialist president Hollande gets criticized for his plan to tax the rich at 75%.

Now the media are writing maybe he wants to weaken this tax: he's thinking about focusing the 75% tax on rich. .... bachelors.

Like or Dislike: 0 0



bruno [September 10, 2012 at 01:12](#)

And you don't need to be a non-custodial father or a bachelor to be a second class citizen in the western world.

Just being a man is enough.

Every law that gives privileges to women, implicitly or explicitly, makes men a civil disabled, less free, less equal, less powerful person.

All family law and criminal law is clearly discriminating against men, by always assuming that the man must be punished, and the woman is the victim that must be protected.

This is ALWAYS the assumption of the law and the police and the court, whatever the situation is.

This is such a blatant and outrageous discrimination, in total contradiction with every idea of equality, yet women will not protest against it, because they profit from it, and white knights will not protest against it, because they are sadists, and they can use this excuse to destroy other men.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



ActaNonVerba [September 10, 2012 at 02:55](#)

Good article.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



Ode [September 10, 2012 at 04:56](#)

bruno

Now the media are writing maybe he wants to weaken this tax: he's thinking about focusing the 75% tax on rich..... bachelors.

In the USA, the preferred method of social engineering is giving a tax cut for doing something. However if we think about it for a minute, when the government gives somebody a tax cut for doing something that is NO different then raising taxes on somebody else for their refusal to participate in such an action. oops most people don't think of it that way.

For example giving people tax cuts to buy houses is no different then raising taxes on the people that refuse to buy houses. And who buys houses?.....why obviously married people do it much more so. This is a bachelor tax.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



ferret [September 10, 2012 at 05:34](#)

“All family law and criminal law is clearly discriminating against men, by always assuming that the man must be punished, and the woman is the victim that must be protected.

This is ALWAYS the assumption of the law and the police and the court, whatever the situation is.”

I was on the end of some motor vehicle aggression yesterday, went to block this fellers path and get out and have a little “discussion.”

It was the man-hater divorcee woman from next door who pistol practices with the Sheriffs.

Guess who has no equity in that situation?

Was lucky to escape.

Point being: entitlement engenders aggression.

Could have ended badly, at least next time I will be aware of “ghetto rules.”

Like or Dislike:  1  0



Johnycomelatley [September 10, 2012 at 05:36](#)

It’s interesting that feminists parrot about equality in all walks of life except custody. Men are expected to share domestic duties when in a marriage but magically lose that capacity when it dissolves. All of a sudden the tender years doctrine kicks in and we’re no longer equal.

If equality is what they want why not flip a coin for custody?

Like or Dislike:  1  0



Eric J Schlegel [September 10, 2012 at 05:39](#)

Education. Spread the word. Reach as many young men and boys as you can. There will always be those who, in their desire for comfort, will sell their soul through marriage for the presumed safety, acceptance, sensual mothering and a sense of worth they were unable to develop on their own, called Marriage and fatherhood.

We were all sold a false bill of goods where we thought we were going to matter, be loved for our essential self, be forgiven for our mistakes, and above all, be respected with our rights guaranteed by law.

Then the day came when it turned out we were merely a means to an end, when it turned out she was merely telling us all along what we wanted to hear. “I take thee as my husband” became “I’ll take you for all you have”. “I can’t wait to see you holding your baby” becomes “they are MY kids; any judge will agree with me...”

This is not a country where men are free, but where women are empowered. Never forget that. And never miss a chance to pass that truth on.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



Rebel [September 10, 2012 at 05:54](#)

IMHO, there is one and only one solution: expat.

It’s not that hard: I did it and I have fared fine.

That's the easy way out. Any other "solution" will not work when faced with a mighty powerful big brother.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



Avid Runner [September 10, 2012 at 05:54](#)

I am glad you mentioned convicted felons not being able to vote or bear arms, because you made a distinction between rights and privileges. A right is something you as a human being will always, or should always have, but a privilege is something granted to you, but can be revoked if you have proven yourself unworthy of it.

Also, feminists like to imply that if a woman does not get her way, then she has been discriminated against. I couldn't disagree more. I believe women shouldn't be allowed into professions which are entrusted with public/national safety. Putting people's safety first is more important than making sure women don't get their feelings hurt when they realize they aren't as capable as men when it comes to protecting people. A man who doesn't meet the physical fitness requirements for U.S. Army Ranger school will not be allowed to attend the school, not because he is a man, but because he has proven he can't meet the high standards of the Rangers, which means his presence in a Ranger platoon would only weaken it and make a mockery of it.

Like or Dislike:  1  0



Rebel [September 10, 2012 at 05:58](#)

... As a second thought, men can also vote with their feet and go their own way but I think that this solution does not solve the whole problem: you can always lose all your rights and be taxed to death.

And then there is living in rural areas while keeping a low profile.  
But that's no way of living for an ambitious individual.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



Lysander Spooner [September 10, 2012 at 07:48](#)

This is "Identity Politics", the Feminazis embrace it, just like Hitler did.

I pray that God will greet them with their just desserts as he did Herr Adolph.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



keyster [September 10, 2012 at 08:01](#)

It's already happening, yet no one seems to be too concerned.  
There have not been this many men not working in the US since 1948.  
Women dominate the work force in government and office admin jobs, while so many men have

disengaged from participating. Really, why should he? So he can marry and have children to support only to be fleeced later?

Look at the teachers striking in Chicago (95% female), because they don't like the way they're being evaluated and pressured to perform better; being held accountable to raise children brought up in fatherless homes.

Construction and manufacturing jobs that men dominated 10 years ago, no longer exist. And yet we still have affirmative action for women and a president that has pledged to initiate an equal pay act as part of his economic justice philosophy. If a man is making less than a woman do ya think HE'LL have a case? Didn't think so.

There is a man strike going on right now. He's barely subsisting, but he's getting by. He's certainly not lending his work to a misandrist culture that's so biased against him. This is the "Century of the Woman" and no one cares much what men think.

Galt's Gulch are single or divorced men that have given up contributing to a society that hates them, to go make a life of their own apart from it. Let women bear the burden of civilization for once. See how they like it. If they want to disenfranchise men writ large, let them do it and reap the cuntsquences.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



The Geezer [September 10, 2012 at 08:35](#)

Yuppers, all the above.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



Darryl X [September 10, 2012 at 08:54](#)

Wow, Price!! You nailed it.

"They are denied public employment if they do not – or merely cannot – bear the burden of their unearned penalty."

This is a great article. In reference to the line above, most people do not know that much public employment is discouraged or prohibited if a man owes child support and cannot pay it.

For instance, I am in arrears and have had my passport suspended. In addition, my arrears have been reported to the Credit Bureau. The problem: my job requires a passport but it has been suspended. In addition, my job requires a high level security clearance that cannot be maintained if there is record of any unpaid financial obligations. I take home less than \$15,600 per year. How do I pay any financial obligations? Answer: I can't. A man is not allowed to even apply for some public (government) jobs if they owe child support.

The governments, both state and federal, have legislated and adjudicated me and millions of other men out of a job and into prison or onto the street. All because of an order for excessive child support. Talk about civil disability.

Like or Dislike:  1  0



Rebel [September 10, 2012 at 09:06](#)

@keyster September 10, 2012 at 08:01

“It’s already happening, yet no one seems to be too concerned.”

But is it really happening? I see not much evidence of that in my little part of the world.

Maybe this is particular to the U.S.

Do you know where I could read on that subject?

Like or Dislike:  0  0



archmage\_lo [September 10, 2012 at 09:18](#)

As a non-custodial father, I can definitely agree with this, as well as Keyster’s comment. I’ve turned down higher paying jobs because I refuse to have more of my money taken to support somebody who never earned it. Let her live in the ghetto.

Like or Dislike:  1  0



Anonymous age 70 [September 10, 2012 at 09:29](#)

Drudge says Chicago teachers are among the higheast paid in the US. I cannot verify that, but doubt his link made it up.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



Anonymous age 70 [September 10, 2012 at 09:30](#)

I do agree teachers cannot compensate for the fatherless homes. My belief over many years is if the kids don’t get it at home, they are not going to get it at school.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



LysanderSpooner [September 10, 2012 at 10:21](#)

@Keyster

“Look at the teachers striking in Chicago (95% female)”

Hey, look on the bright side, the boys may now actually learn something 😊

Like or Dislike:  0  0



Nemo [September 10, 2012 at 10:36](#)

Keyster mentions a key point: women have essentially created a “glass ceiling” for men. Whenever men have a benefit or a good thing going, women can always claim half of it.

There is no “glass floor” for men – if women get 100% of a benefit, men have no corresponding right to claim half of it.

W0men are 57% of all college students. Men have no right to demand an increase in their share from 43% to 50%, even though it’s a clear case of gender imbalance.

W0men are less than 50% of all college students studying STEM subjects. The President of the United States is dropping hints that if he is re-elected, he’ll make it illegal for men to have more than 50% of all college slots for the STEM subjects, because it’s a clear case of gender imbalance.

Women outnumber men by 8:1 in elementary education. Men have no right to demand an increase in their share from 13% to 50%, even though it’s a clear case of gender imbalance.

W0men are less than 50% of all corporate board members. Norway has made it illegal for men to have more than 60% of all corporate board memberships, because it’s a clear case of gender imbalance.

I could go on and on, especially about college sports and alimony and child support and custody of children and tax credits and welfare, but you get the idea.

Like or Dislike:  1  0



justaloser [September 10, 2012 at 10:59](#)

From keyster:

“Let women bear the burden of civilization for once. See how they like it. If they want to disenfranchise men writ large, let them do it and reap the cuntsquences.”

I don’t like the MGTOW label. It makes it sound like we give up and accept it.

We should have a label that makes it clear that we understand the situation, are upset and fighting back.

According to Ester Vilar , women understand only animal emotion such as fear, hunger.

I think we should call yourself men not participating into the society (mnpits) or men leaving the system to women (mltstow),

or women are on their one. (waoto)

I am french canadian my english is not that good, maybe someone here could come up with something better and spearhead website site could try to push the label around.

We need a label that show we are not participating into it and we do it to harm the system.

my two cents for what it is worth

Like or Dislike:  0  0



Jaego [September 10, 2012 at 11:25](#)

From an evolutionary point of view, White Knights benefit by simultaneously getting close to women and destroying their competition: a successful mating strategy. But it destroys Civilization? Sure ultimately, but that doesn't change the fact that it works for these individuals. Who said that all of our genetic programs work in favor of Civilization? Most authorities have said the contrary – thus the importance of going against our own lower nature, which used to be called our fallen nature.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



Highwasp [September 10, 2012 at 12:08](#)

A few days ago someone wrote about the illogic behind our 'strong' vs. 'weak' masculine identity and the term used was 'An Appeal To Strength'. A simple phrase that stuck with me which basically describes a myth perpetuated in order to manipulate and control masculinity.

Here's the myth: If the man doesn't 'Man Up' to the opportunity to help the 'little lady' and thereby show how strong he is, well then, he's weak...

If you are strong then you don't mind giving the women what they want. You have plenty and women need your help, because, after all, "everybody knows" they are the weaker sex and have been oppressed by the 'evil patriarchy' forever... It's your obligation and 'duty' to help them.

If you are a weak man you resist and withhold what the 'weaker sex' needs and wants. Only a weak and hateful man would begrudge the poor dearies of all they need.

If you are a strong man you don't fear feminism stealing from you or destroying your life – you are strong – that won't happen to you – and so you gladly assist the 'little ladies' in their endeavors towards greed, control and corruption. Of course this assistance comes at the expense of other men, but why would the stronger man care about them? Those men who get run over by feminism are therefore weaker men... obviously. If they were strong they wouldn't have been run over in the first place. And how much more superior is the stronger man then, by comparison? And there you have it. It's simple – the Appeal To Strength myth resides in the fallacy:

Good things happen to good people, bad things happen to bad people.

Woman Good / Man Bad.

Of course – this myth is a shaming tactic which requires men to suffer in silence or be seen as weak. Therefore – The overwhelming silence we men are experiencing surrounding civil disabilities for men, the crimes against fathers and husbands, the silence around the destruction of the family, the lack of dissent regarding all forms of female advantage... is probably based on this Appeal To Strength myth which we

have internalized as the masculine identity.

Men have participated in this myth for so long it has become a basic assumption of our masculine identity and explains to a large extent why feminism has become so successful. We men are too busy policing the ‘male dominance hierarchy’, too busy competing with each other, too busy being the ‘top dog’ to realize we are destroying ourselves in the process. It’s time we change our masculine definition to become more brotherly and cooperative, supportive and compassionate with one another AS MEN FIRST, then all other secondary. Otherwise I predict an overwhelming majority of men will come to believe they are weak, if we haven’t already, which is exactly what feminism thrives on.

Just sayin’ – a major shift in masculine identity is happening – judging by the success of feminism it seems many men have come to believe they are weak. I used to be one of them. Therefore I am becoming the change I want to see – and one of the first things I have changed about myself is my attachment to a masculine identity based on Strong vs. Weak. Superior/Inferior. Dominant/Subordinate.

I am now a part of TEAM MAN.

Like or Dislike:  1  0



Mr. J [September 10, 2012 at 12:23](#)

quote:

“it is time to stop being lambs being led to our own slaughter”

I agree, but more to the point>>>>> It it time for men to PAY ATTENTION ONE HUNDRED PERCENT OF THE TIME so they are AWARE of what is going on instead of being so concerned with “touchdowns” and “superbowl” and that whole string of mindless timewasting crap.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



Mr. J [September 10, 2012 at 12:27](#)

This whole state-of-affairs exists SOLELY because American men have had their heads up their ass for 50 years.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



Darryl X [September 10, 2012 at 13:54](#)

@ justaloser -

“I think we should call yourself men not participating into the society (mnpits) or men leaving the system to women (mltstow), or women are on their one. (waoto)”

How about women can go fuck themselves (WCGFT)?

Like or Dislike:  1  0Darryl X [September 10, 2012 at 14:11](#)

@ Rebel -

You can only expat if you have a passport. Also, depending upon when you expatted, many countries today unlike even just five years ago will not allow you to work in them if you are an expat. They require a minimum investment (usually between \$150,000 and one-million dollars) in the country before you can stay there as an expat. And the US gov't has become increasingly aggressive at seizing those investments if you have financial obligations. Expats more and more are having to pay taxes to the US AND the country in which they reside. The cost of living is as high or more than the US in about half of countries anymore AND they have just as many problems with feminism and misadrous laws as the US. If you're rich, you'll do fine. If not, forget it.

Like or Dislike:  0  0Darryl X [September 10, 2012 at 14:15](#)

@ Reberl -

The average man in the US cannot legally expat to almost any other country. After you eliminate the ones who do not have passports and do not have a critical amount of funds to meet the minimal investment required AND support himself. You must be exceptionally wealthy to have been able to have done so. Or you just did it a long long time ago – LOL.

Like or Dislike:  0  0Avenger [September 10, 2012 at 15:20](#)

I am glad you mentioned convicted felons not being able to vote or bear arms, because you made a distinction between rights and privileges

@Avid-Both are actually rights protected under the constitution and voting rights acts passed by Congress. So in effect a felon is considered less than a citizen and has his Rights revoked.

I can see no reason for revoking a felon's right to vote or other things like having a driving license or other licenses.

There may be better reason to ban him from owning weapons especially if he is a violent criminal but most felons are not. Some felon who has committed a financial crime is not going to be any more dangerous if he owns a pistol than anyone else. In fact, he may need it more for protection from the people he defrauded. Imagine if Madoff was let out of jail, there are still people who would like to kill him. 😊

Like or Dislike:  0  1Avenger [September 10, 2012 at 15:44](#)

@Daryl-all countries that I know require a passport to enter and today even Canada and Mexico do as well as all of those offshore islands that in the past didn't require one from tourists from the US. Of course, you could probably cross the border and sneak into bordering countries and get lost but what good does that do. You can do that right in the US. And without money you're pretty much fucked regardless of where you live so get this idea out of your mind. In most of these countries if you're found working illegally and caught they just throw you out of the country with no hearing like in the US. In England, officers from the Home office just take you to the airport and put you on a plane to your home country if you're an illegal worker. They also have agreements with other countries where you must pay for that ticket or your own country throws you in jail.

If you were to sneak over the border and go to Mexico City what would you do there to survive if you have no money? Do you speak Spanish or know anyone who could help you to earn some money? It would be worse than being in NY or other US cities where at least you may find some off the books job or manage to get some money out of the many charitable organisations. Things that Mexico doesn't have. And living in some one donkey town there would be suicide because there are no jobs someone like you would be likely to get.

Disappear in the US, it's easy.

Like or Dislike:  0  1



Avid Runner [September 10, 2012 at 15:57](#)

@Avenger

I know the second amendment gives American citizens the right to bear arms, but I also know the nineteenth amendment granted women's suffrage, and if I had my way, I would use a mulligan and do away with women's suffrage. Anyways, appreciate your input.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



keyster [September 10, 2012 at 15:57](#)

*I could go on and on, especially about college sports and alimony and child support and custody of children and tax credits and welfare, but you get the idea.*

Don't forget free health care; because women are different, except when they're the same. Our precious little gestational carriers don't have to pay for doctors visits, exams, medicals, etc. -- regardless of whether they choose to gestate our young or not. "Reproductive Health Care" is code for abortion on demand -- because babies can such a nuisance to deal with.

Men?

We're on our own.

More of us die on the job every year than women do from endometrial (uterine corpus) cancer. Don't worry about us, we'll be fine.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



Avid Runner [September 10, 2012 at 16:02](#)

Just to be clear, I think the second amendment is extremely important. I don't want anyone thinking I am someone who thinks law-abiding citizens shouldn't be allowed to bear arms. I am very-pro second amendment.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



Avenger [September 10, 2012 at 17:30](#)

@Daryl-have you ever thought of joining the Mob? All off the books money that you could easily use a small of part of to pay the child support. 😊

Like or Dislike:  0  1



Avenger [September 10, 2012 at 17:44](#)

@ Avid-just remember that it was men who passed the 19th amendment. Females couldn't vote at that time. But I'm not so sure that until reently that females voting meant anything. Females generally lived with their parents until they got married, even females who went to some Uni usually came back after they graduated and they voted just like their parents. After marriage they voted like their husbands with few exceptions on either side so it really made no difference if they voted. Even before females were allowed to vote there were always men who voted things in to protect females(usually from her own foolishness where she would marry some man who was after family money)

It was not until recently where we have the welfare State and a large % of female or female/hildren households where there is this female block voting for a particular candidate who promises them stuff or more laws that are in their favour.If we still had a society where the norm was man/woman marriage and divorce was not so easy to get I doubt if female voting would be much of a problem.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



Highwasp [September 10, 2012 at 23:32](#)

well then maybe female voting and no fault divorce are a sociological experiment combined to empower the self absorbed, narcissistic, solipsistic females in order to elect to power the same sort of sociopaths who will 'lead' us into a global economy... world wide slavery for most of us – extremely lucrative lifestyles for a few. Women are useful tools of the powerful elite... let it crash and burn – it's the only way through.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



walking in hell2 [September 10, 2012 at 23:51](#)

I don't think most men really get what it means to be a non-custodial father. What it means is that you

have already lost your children; on top of losing your children, it means you are treated like a criminal and your future financial security is destroyed.

The goal of the child support agencies is to make awards as high as possible so the state can receive matching Federal funds and Usury interest rates (10 to 15%) through arrears.

The arrears magic number is \$2500. Typical child support awards are \$1000 per month. You can go over \$2500 pretty quickly.

Remember that it is very difficult to get an award modified downward, even if you lose a job.

Here is what happens when you go over \$2500:

- 1) Passport is suspended
- 2) Reporting to credit bureaus ( even below \$2500).
- 3) Possible incarceration
- 4) No security clearances
- 5) Liens go into affect on any property (house, car, bank accounts). Your car and bank account can be seized at will.
- 6) Any federal benefits (social security, military pension, federal pension) are intercepted by the state leaving men in arrears to starve to death.
- 7) Any private pensions are intercepted.
- 8) Food stamps and other welfare are disallowed if you have arrears.
- 9) Drivers license is suspended

Even if you are not in arrears, wage garnishment makes it very difficult to get a job. Also any child support order automatically comes up on a background check, raising questions that you might be a problem employee.

The fact that this system exists is evidence that America is the sickest and most evil country on the planet. Men who were once patriotic quickly realize how rotten their country is when they have experience with the divorce industry and child support system.

Now the word is out. The only people who immigrate to America are Haitians, Kenyans, El Salvadorians, and Asians who don't know any better. No Europeans come. Mexican immigration is now net zero. Even applications for Hb1 visas are down for Indians.

I spoke with many Indian men and they simply do not want to risk family destruction to earn a little extra money working in America. They know better.

It is very unlikely that a man can have much quality of life in America. The MGTOW movement is a defeatist victory. While other men in the world have jobs, families, children, and retirements, most American men will never be able to achieve this. MGTOW is simply therapy; not a cure.

The best thing a man can do is to expat out of America when he is young. The best thing we American men can do is shine a light on the disgusting evil practices of America; especially the child support and divorce industry.

Let the world know how rotten American women are and how rotten America treats its men.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



kuis [September 10, 2012 at 23:56](#)

i tried to explain to a woman today about the problems of custody that face men and know what her response was? that compared to the thousands of years of oppression that women faced, the fact that a FEW men get treated badly in divorce court is just a blip on the radar.

When i explained to her that almost every insignificant female ‘problem gets air time while a serious men’s problem does not, suggesting that it was unfair, she said that it is just collateral damage and

Like or Dislike:  0  0



walking in hell2 [September 11, 2012 at 01:50](#)

@kuis

“i tried to explain to a woman today”

Why did you try?

Like or Dislike:  0  0



BCDad [September 11, 2012 at 03:04](#)

Rebel September 10, 2012 at 05:54

IMHO, there is one and only one solution: expat.

It’s not that hard: I did it and I have fared fine.

I’m currently in China, I’d like to know what happens when my passport expires.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



W.F. Price [September 11, 2012 at 03:17](#)

I’m currently in China, I’d like to know what happens when my passport expires.

-BCDad

If you’re an American and you owe arrears of \$2,500+ (or ever owed that much and didn’t get cleared by the state court for a new one), the Dept. of State will only offer you one that allows only a one-way trip back home.



Mikediver [September 11, 2012 at 11:38](#)

There is one other way to expat, but I know it will not be liked by many. You have to do it while not in

arrears on CS. You can marry a local woman and go for citizenship in her country. The tax man will still come after you even if you repudiate your US citizenship, but it will be harder if they do not have some hold over you.

I will retire to my wife's native land on a permanent resident basis. I am trying as hard as I can to get my two college age sons to consider expating as soon as they have a viable skill/degree to get employment in another country. All of this and I am, or was, as patriotic as anyone could be, I served nine years in the US Navy.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



Gilgamesh [September 12, 2012 at 11:31](#)

@avenger, if disappearing in the US is easy then why don't you tell us how to do it?

Like or Dislike:  0  0



crypter27 [September 12, 2012 at 13:18](#)

This piece tells it like it is, men are treated as 2nd class citizens!

Like or Dislike:  0  0



JLK [September 19, 2012 at 08:25](#)

Am I missing something. Are you talking about Alimony or Child Support?? As a man you should want to support your children and pay child support. If you can no longer pay what you agreed to pay then get it modified, which is your legal right to do. The children are innocent in this and do not deserve to be put in the middle of whatever happened between you and your ex-wife. But a man should never be denied their children and should be active in their childrens lives both for their daughters and sons. Fathers are the most important man their children will ever know especially for daughters. You are who she will model every man she meets against. Men provide so much that women cannot to their children and it is a shame more women do not see that. A woman can never teach a boy how to be a man. One example: A father will push limits where a mother will say don't do that, he'll get hurt. But that is part of learning to be a man. Women too often don't think a man can do the job of parenting better than she can so she denies her husband the opportunity and then complains that their husbands don't help with the children but these women are wrong. Too often wives deny their husbands the right to raise the children with them, I think it's because they see their own husbands as a threat to their own inadequacies. Men are loving and nuturing just as women are. Many men want to take that role as caregiver; unfortunately too many men just walk away because it's easier. I know it's because they don't want to deal with the ex but remember it's not about her, it's about the children. I know several men who have custody not because they don't want to pay child support but because their ex-wives were and are unfit to parent and they have to pay child support to their ex-husbands.

Now if you are talking about alimony. I believe she should support herself and do her part in supporting the children and not live off of her ex-husband. The only exception is if she gave up her job to raise the

family and the husband with her help and support was able to build a successful business. But even then alimony should be limited. She should be able and willing to stand on her own.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



Darryl X [September 21, 2012 at 05:15](#)

@ JLK -

“As a man you should want to support your children and pay child support.”

Almost all men have historically and continue to support their children the best they can without interference by mothers or the governments. Child support is child trafficking and abuse and slavery for fathers. It has nothing to do with supporting children as child support orders on average exceed cost of raising a child by a multiple of two to three and what a father should be paying (if a proportionate contribution by the mother was considered) by a multiple of between four and six. What makes the problem of child support so egregious is that there is at least one much better alternative in most instances that is ignored: shared parenting. Child support is just a mechanism by which mothers and the governments satisfy their addiction to power and control. It's a mechanism for abusing innocent men, particularly fathers. It is a primary mechanism by which governments exterminate men – condemn them to prison and the street and death and exile. It is a tool of extreme oppression by a tyrannical government out of control. Nothing more. And it uses children as an excuse. To facilitate the profit motives and adultery of mothers. Governments kidnap children and hold them hostage and exchange the ransom and federal subsidies attached to it with mothers and other women and feminists for votes and political power and control. Child support is institutionalized malignant narcissism and psychopathy.

Like or Dislike:  0  0



DeadBeat Father [February 7, 2013 at 11:38](#)

The problem with the ideal of “We Should Support Are Childreen” because they are not a part of whats going on between you and your ex, but are victims of it” Most fathers agree to this noble ideal. I would love to work 2 fulltime jobs and provide everything my daughter would need or want! Why wouldn't I? I love her so much! And i wouldn't even care if my weasel of an ex gets to benifit of a life style increase from it! Why should i? She takes care of our daughter when im not around, and lets face it! We can't be with our kids 24/7.

The problem with this ideal isnt that “We don't or should want too support our childreen?(Why wouldn't we! its in there best interest!) Its the message and actions and policies of the family court, that leave you with the feeling that your there for nothing more then “To be responsible” Childsupport, and just 2 to 4 hr visits and no say in how our child is raised! Is what i protest! Otherwise i wouldn't care if i was poor for my daughter. If they just want someone “To be

Like or Dislike:  0  0



DeadBeat Father [February 7, 2013 at 11:45](#)

Responsible!" Then don't bother im not interestted! But if you want a dad, or a parent? Then Be Responsible!" Then im your guy! Otherwise i would rather be a Deadbeat! Father! Enough said peace!

Like or Dislike:  0  0



[joseph pratt](#) [March 22, 2013 at 16:42](#)

Your comment is awaiting moderation.

People! The only people who are free are those who know the law and how to use it. They do not teach it in school and they don't really teach it in college. They definitely do not teach it in law school. Most attorneys are incompetent to practice. The laws and courts are structured to fleece the sheep en mass. I encourage all of you to study the law. This is the answer and I cannot say more because my name is attached. But I plan to dedicate the remainder of my life to this end. However I first need to finish up with my own problems. I intend to create a brotherhood and a think tank that will produce some very standard easy to duplicate procedures we can use to kill litigation making child support collection by state agencies extremely unprofitable. The object is to either win or wear out. While I am totally against refusal to pay support, I am totally against the state sticking its nose in the business of profiting from the unfortunate circumstance of others. With the state out of the picture one will find the custodial parent far more willing to negotiate and compromise. For just \$5 a month, if we could get every noncustodial parent to pay that we could literally create a very private information sharing system that could be used to destroy the fleecing of the noncustodial parent. The mission will be two fold. Educate to give the legal weapons to destroy the process in place and then to change laws nation wide on two fronts. One the national and two the worst state.

Like or Dislike:  0  0

Leave a Comment

Name

E-mail

Website

Previous post: [Growing Pains](#)

Next post: [Prostitution Stings, and What They Say About Our Society](#)

- **Login**

Username:

Password:


Remember me

Login »

[Lost your password?](#)

- **Search Site**

To search, type and hit enter



- [Erotica for the straight, unapologetic man and the women who love him](#)

- **Contributor Blogroll**

- [Dalrock](#)
- [Pro Male/Anti-Feminist Tech](#)
- [Whiskey](#)
- [Chuck Ross](#)
- [Jack Donovan](#)
- [Elusive Wapiti](#)
- [Wikimannia](#)
- [Hawaiian Libertarian](#)
- [Chateau](#)
- [Welmer](#)

- **Categories**

- **Recent Posts**

- [Could Enforcement Act of 1871 Defend Fathers' Rights?](#)
- [25 Year Feminist Career Ends in Flight from Law](#)
- [British Columbia's solution to marriage strike: doublespeak](#)
- [Steubenville and the Resurrection of the Lynch Mob](#)
- [Family Destruction as Consolidation of Power](#)

- **Support The Spearhead**




Or send check or money order to:

Price Content  
PO Box 28282  
Seattle, WA 98118

To support The Spearhead on an ongoing basis and obtain access to extra content and features, [sign up as a supporting subscriber](#).



- **Spearhead Author Jack Donovan**




[The Way of Men](#)  
Jack Donovan

Buy from 

[Privacy Information](#)

- **Buy Warren Farrell’s Seminal Book**



- **Archives**

 ▼

Get smart with the [Thesis WordPress Theme](#) from DIYthemes.

[WordPress Admin](#)

☺