

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
COUNTY OF NEW YORK**

-----X  
Roy Den Hollander,

Plaintiff,

-against-

Tory Shepherd, Political Editor of The Advertiser-  
Sunday Mail Messenger;  
Advertiser Newspapers Pty Ltd., d/b/a The Advertiser-  
Sunday Mail Messenger;  
Amy McNeilage, Education Reporter for The Sydney  
Morning Herald; and  
Fairfax Media Publications Pty Ltd., d/b/a The Sydney  
Morning Herald;

Defendants.

Index No. 152656/2014

Justice Moulton  
E-File

Motion Seq. No. 4

-----X

**MOTION REQUIRING DEFENDANTS TO WITHDRAW ILLEGALLY OBTAINED  
DOCUMENT FROM THE RECORD**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that upon the affidavit of Roy Den Hollander, sworn to on January 23, 2015, and upon the exhibits attached to the affidavit and all the pleadings and proceedings herein, the undersigned will move in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, located at 60 Centre Street, New York, in the Submissions Part, Room 130, on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., for an Order requiring Defense Counsel Katherine M. Bolger to (1) withdraw a document that she submitted to this Court as part of her Affirmation ¶ 2 (Exhibit A of Plaintiff's Affidavit) that was obtained by the Rupert Murdoch newspaper and defendant The Advertiser or by attorney Bolger or by one of the other defendants by hacking into Plaintiff's personal computer or his digital cloud; (2) that attorney Bolger and Defendants turn over to Plaintiff all paper and digital copies of Exhibit 1 and any other material obtained in the same manner that they are in possession or control of, (3) that attorney Bolger identify all the parties involved in obtaining Exhibit 1 so that they may be referred to the proper authorities, (4) that Bolger and Defendants be prevented from publicizing the document or other materials they

obtained in the same manner, and such other and further relief as may to this Court seem just and proper, for the reasons stated in the attached affidavit of Roy Den Hollander.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that pursuant to CPLR 2214(b), answering affidavits, if any, are to be served on the undersigned so that they are received no later than seven days before the return date of this motion.

Dated: January 23, 2015  
New York, N.Y.

Respectfully,  
  
Roy Den Hollander, Esq.  
Petitioner and Attorney  
545 East 14<sup>th</sup> Street, 10D  
New York, N.Y. 10009  
(917) 687-0652  
roy17den@gmail.com

To:  
Katherine M. Bolger  
Attorney for defendants  
321 West 44th Street, Suite 1000  
New York, NY 10036  
(T): 212-850-6129  
(F): (212) 850-6299  
Email: [kbolger@lskslaw.com](mailto:kbolger@lskslaw.com)

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
COUNTY OF NEW YORK**

-----X  
Roy Den Hollander,

Plaintiff,

-against-

Index No. 152656/2014  
Justice Moulton  
Motion Seq. No. 4  
E-file

Tory Shepherd, Political Editor of The Advertiser-  
Sunday Mail Messenger;  
Advertiser Newspapers Pty Ltd.;  
Amy McNeilage, Education Reporter for The Sydney  
Morning Herald;  
and Fairfax Media Publications Pty Ltd.,

Defendants.

-----X

**AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION REQUIRING DEFENDANTS TO  
WITHDRAW ILLEGALLY OBTAINED DOCUMENT FROM THE RECORD**

STATE OF NEW YORK        )  
  ) ss.:  
COUNTY OF NEW YORK     )

Roy Den Hollander, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1.       The Rupert Murdoch newspaper, Defendant The Advertiser-Sunday Mail Messenger, or its attorney, Katherine M. Bolger, or the other Defendants, acquired a document from Plaintiff's personal computer without his authorization or from a computer that requires authorization codes in order to access the remote computer-server that also contains the document.

2.       The document was filed by attorney Bolger as Exhibit 1 of her Affirmation in Opposition to Plaintiff's Standing Motion for a Trial on the issue of personal jurisdiction. Plaintiff brought the motion because of Defendants' numerous perjuries and attorney Bolger suborning those perjuries concerning personal jurisdiction.

3. By hacking into Plaintiff's personal computer or the remote server—both of which were not viewable to the public with the remote server requiring authorization codes, by copying a document from Plaintiff's personal computer or the remote server, and by eliminating the authorization codes on the remote server, the Murdock newspaper or attorney Bolger or the other Defendants not only violated Plaintiff's right to privacy under the U.S. Constitution but violated the following laws, both Federal and New York, concerning the unauthorized access and use of a computer:

- a. Unauthorized use of a computer, N.Y. Penal Code § 156.05;
- b. Computer trespass, N.Y. Penal Code § 156.10;
- c. Unlawful duplication of computer related material, N.Y. Penal Code §§ 156.29, 156.30;
- d. Computer tampering, N.Y. Penal Code § 156.20;
- e. 18 U.S.C. § 1030(a)(2)(C) that proscribes intentional unauthorized access to a computer and obtaining information from a protected computer where the conduct involves interstate or foreign commerce.

4. Attorney Bolger also tried to cover up her or Defendants' criminal activity of hacking by committing perjury.

5. Attorney Bolger's Affirmation ¶ 2, which she made under penalty of perjury, states that "A true and correct copy of the 'Media Release' available at Plaintiff's MR Legal Fund website . . . is attached hereto." (Ex. A).

6. The document, which is clearly a "talking points" document and attorney work product, is not a "Media Release," the document is not titled "Media Release." The term "Media Release," of course, infers the document was made public to the press, however, it never was.

7. Plaintiff previously worked as an assignment editor, writer and field producer at Metromedia TV News and Eyewitness TV News in New York City. He knows what the term “Media Release” means, and that no one ever submits a 17 page “Media Release” in the form of the document Bolger or Defendants hacked. Given Bolger’s experience in representing news organizations, she knows that as well. <http://www.lskslaw.com/attorney/katherine-bolger>.

8. Bolger actually refers to the document as a media release nine (9) times in her Memorandum of Law in order to make sure her lie takes root. Such conduct infers that she intentionally misquoted the title and mischaracterized the document in order to trick this Court into believing the hacked document had actually been presented to the media, and, therefore, was a public document. Just another incident in her and Defendants’ pattern of lying and deception in this case.

9. Plaintiff uses his digital cloud, which is technically an evolving non-public website located on a remote server, in pretty much the same way that people use their Apple iClouds—to store on a remote server both personal and business related material, such as, attorney work product, financial information, security codes, writings, ideas, contacts, photos, music, videos and emails. Plaintiff keeps the same information on his personal computer, which is connected to the Internet.

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff requests an Order requiring attorney Bolger (1) withdraw the document, Exhibit 1, (2) that attorney Bolger and Defendants turn over to Plaintiff all paper and digital copies the document and any other material obtained in the same manner that they are in possession or control of, (3) that attorney Bolger identify all the parties involved in obtaining the document, (4) that she and Defendants be prevented from publicizing the document or other

materials they obtained in the same manner, and such other and further relief as may to this

Court seem just and proper.

Sworn to before me on  
23rd day of January 2015

  
Notary Public

  
Roy Den Hollander  
Plaintiff and Attorney  
545 East 14 Street, 10D  
New York, N.Y. 10009  
917 687 0652

ROBERT FRANCIS PINARD  
Notary Public - State of New York  
NO. 01PI6236893  
Qualified in New York County  
My Commission Expires 3/1/2015

# **EXHIBIT 1**

## Responses to Media

Do you have a copy of the Complaint? You can take anything you want from the complaint and attributed it to me as a quote.

*Why bring the suit?*

To have fun fighting these bimbo book burners who think they are the chosen ones. [I like the alliteration. Of course given Tory's apparent age, she's really a bimbat and Amy a bimlette].

There were Feminists to the right of me, Feminists to the left of me, Feminists in front of me volley'd and thunder'd from down under, so I decided to sue.

Tory the Torch and Amy McNeuter are just like Joseph McCarthy and Roy Cohn from the 1950s. They targeted the guys involved in the course for our political beliefs.

It's another witch hunt; only today the witches are doing the hunting.

If these two Feminist book-burners had not jumped on their broomsticks and scared the bejesus out of the University of South Australia, students would have had an opportunity to acquire information and consider views not available anywhere else in higher education.

Reporters like Tory and Amy have taken the place of the 1950s "loyalty review boards" that carried out investigations for universities, governments and businesses to certify that their employees were not Communists or lefties. Only today, those who are not politically-correct are excluded.

If this case is successful, the private pinklisters, similar to the blacklisters of the 1950s, and those who use them will be put on notice that they are legally liable for the professional and financial damage they cause with their falsehoods and interference in business relations.

*Bimbo?*

The term bimbo refers to Tory the Torch and Amy "McNeuter." McNeuter because she wants to neuter men, unless she's in bed with them, assuming she's heterosexual.

In 1920, composer Frank Crumit recorded "My Little Bimbo Down on the Bamboo Isle", in which the term "bimbo" was used to describe an island girl of questionable virtue. Australia's an island, isn't it? Considering how Tory and Amy operate as reporters—they're of questionable virtue.

*How do you view what happened or what's the big deal?*

Under the Nazis, it was the German Student Union's Office for Press and Propaganda that started the book burning of those writers who opposed Nazi ideology.

At the Nazi book burning in 1933, Joseph Goebbels said, “The era of extreme Jewish intellectualism is now at an end.” Tory and Amy can’t wait to say the same about any intellectualism that isn’t pro-Feminist.

So what’s the difference here with Tory and Amy stopping the teaching of a course on men and the law by claiming it expressed “radical” and “extreme” male views?

So they didn’t go into the University and take knowledge, ideas and facts in the form of books and throw them on a bonfire. Instead they used the modern-day torch of the electronic media to incinerate opposing views.

The end result is the same—censorship of ideas, or verbal mutilation.

Why should anyone who does not believe in this Feminist mumbo-jumbo be punished for their beliefs, speech or actions, unless they commit a crime or are running for office. As to beliefs, there are no crimes and as to speech very few, such as yelling “bomb” in Times Square.

As President Truman wrote, "In a free country, we punish men for the crimes they commit, but never for the opinions they have." Not so in Australia.

*Are you comparing them to the Nazis?*

Yes. I guess that makes them Feminazis.

I’m also comparing them to the Commies. The Soviet Union ostracized anti-commies into Gulags. The Feminist just keep anti-Feminists out of the universities. What are they afraid of? I thought they were strong and independent females.

Tory and Amy wrapped themselves in the rag of Feminism to justify the imposition of a unitary belief-system of Feminist orthodoxy for dictating the thought, speech, and conduct of members of the educational community and society-at-large.

*Were you surprised?*

Yes, but I should have expected such from yellow, female-dog-in-heat journalists and the press in a penal colony.

Wasn’t Noonien Singh Khan born there?

*Did the articles anger you?*

Of course they did, but at least I’m in touch with my feelings.

Although, one thing Tory does not realize is that insults from an opponent is the highest form of compliment for an attorney.

In these causes of action, it's not what I think that matters, but what Tory caused others to think.

*Are you out for vengeance?*

Hey, what's wrong with a little quid pro quo—one bad turn deserves another. I'd call it justice.

*Sounds like vengeance.*

So what's the difference.

*Do you feel persecuted?*

Not if the Feminist is hot, she can walk all over me in her stiletto heels. Hmm, maybe I'll contact the dominatrix trio I ran into the other night?

Anyway, Feminists, assuming they are human beings, which has yet to be proven, can do whatever they want so long as they stay off of my rights. If they don't, which they don't, then it's a fight.

And I'm going to fight them to my last dollar and last breath, and, if there is anything after death for eternity.

*Sounds like hate?*

I don't hate the Feminists—I despise them. It's a great motivator.

Do you think the people who rose up in the Ukraine loved their President? No, they despised and hated him.

*What did the Feminists do to you?*

Just because they are unable to accept that Mother Nature condemned them to mood swings, do they have to make life trying for the rest of us.

VAWA

At least in the Inquisition you got to appear before your judges, although you were probably tied to the rack, with VAWA you never know who your judges are, and they skip the rack and go right to finding you did what the alien says you did.

The Edgar Allen Poe tale of horror divorce I went through before a Lesbian judge (Joan Lobis) who was probably jealous that my face had been where she wanted to put hers.

All cost me a lot of money, time, and possibly a job with the CIA. Such would not have happened but for the Feminists.

*Do you consider Feminists witches?*

I thought NOW stood for the National Organization of Witches?

Most of them are. The witchcraft label has been applied to practices people believe influence the mind, body, or property of others against their will.

Did you ever censor your speech because it wasn't politically correct? Isn't that constraining your will to be free?

Feminist linguistics is an obvious effort to control thought, speech, and action. As George Orwell wrote, "if thought corrupts language, language can also corrupt thought," *Politics and the English Language*, 1946, and once thought is corrupted, so is a person's beliefs, and corrupted beliefs are the real power for controlling people against what otherwise would be their free will.

*What are the falsehoods?*

It can be false or misleading.

Tory: "member of extreme right-wing groups," from an email; "linked to extreme views on men's rights," second headline 1/12/14 article

Amy: "hardline anti-feminist advocate[]," "hardline" may have been a Freudian slip when she becomes emotional over men; "published on radical men's rights websites," 1/14/14 article.

Tory's disparaging and libelous publications

1/9/14, on information and belief - "[RDH] identified as belonging to extreme right wing groups in the USA." 1/9/14 Gouws wrt Tory questioning Gary Misan.

1/12/14 article: ***Lecturers in world-first male studies course at University of South Australia under scrutiny***

"LECTURERS in a 'world-first' male studies course at the University of South Australia have been linked to extreme views on men's rights and websites that rail against feminism." Second headline 1/12/14 article.

"The lecturers' backgrounds are likely to spark controversy." 1/12/14 article.

"Two lecturers have been published by prominent US anti-feminist site A Voice for Men, a site which regularly refers to women as 'bitches' and 'whores' and has been described as a hate site by the civil rights organisation Southern Poverty Law Centre." 1/12/14 article.

"One American US lecturer - US attorney and self-professed 'anti-feminist lawyer' Roy Den Hollander - has written that the men's movement might struggle to exercise influence but that

‘there is one remaining source of power in which men still have a near monopoly – firearms’.” 1/12/14 article.

“He also argues that feminists oppress men in today’s world and refers to women’s studies as ‘witches’ studies’.” 1/12/14 article.

“He has likened the position of men today to black people in America’s south in the 1950s ‘sitting in the back of the bus’, and blames feminists for oppressing men.” 1/12/14 article.

“The course, which has no prerequisites . . . .” 1/12/14 article.

“Dr Michael Flood, from the University of Wollongong’s Centre for Research on Men and Masculinity, said these types of male studies ‘really represents the margins’.” 1/12/14 article.

“ ‘It comes out of a backlash to feminism and feminist scholarship. The new male studies is an effort to legitimise, to give academic authority, to anti-feminist perspectives,’ he said.” 1/12/14 article.

“Flinders University School of Education senior lecturer Ben Wadham, who has a specific interest in men’s rights, said there was a big difference between formal masculinity studies and ‘populist’ male studies.” 1/12/14 article.

“He said there were groups that legitimately help men, and then the more extreme activists.” 1/12/14 article.

““That tends to manifest in a more hostile movement which is about ‘women have had their turn, feminism’s gone too far, men are now the victims, white men are now disempowered’,’ he said.” 1/12/14 article.

“ ‘I would argue that the kinds of masculinities which these populist movements represent are anathema to the vision of an equal and fair gendered world.’” 1/12/14 article.

“Dr Wadham said that universities needed to uphold research based traditions instead of the populist, partisan approach driven by some.” 1/12/14 article.

1/14/14 *University of South Australia gives controversial Male Studies course the snip* Headline

“CONTROVERSIAL aspects of a Male Studies course will not go ahead” Second headline 1/14/14 article.

“The Advertiser revealed yesterday that some of the lecturers listed for the professional certificates had links to extreme men’s rights organisations that believe men are oppressed, particularly by feminists.” Emphasis in 1/14/14 article.

“US ‘anti-feminist’ lawyer Roy Den Hollander . . . .” 1/14/14 article.

“National Union of Students president Deana Taylor said a course like that proposed for the university provided ‘a dangerous platform for anti-women views’.” 1/14/14 article.

1/14/14 ***Pathetic bid for victimhood by portraying women as villains***

- a. “Pathetic bid for victimhood by portraying women as villains”
- b. “Big ups to UniSA for having the sense to reject anything linked to those at the very fringe of the men's rights spectrum . . . overseas ring ins. (“Ring in” is a gang term meaning persons that are called to help in gang wars/fights—sounds a little like Tory).”
- c. “They are - misogynists, I mean. And we're talking old-school misogyny - the hatred of women - as well as the new-school misogyny - entrenched prejudice against women.”
- d. “Not just harmless condescension or unthinking stereotypes, but some serious anger.”
- e. “The problem is, the circle (Tory is referring to “circle-jerk misogynists”) is no longer closed, no longer just a bunch of angry guys in a basement. They're trying to get up the stairs and into the light.
- f. “They want to play outside with legitimate experts in men’s issues . . . .”
- g. “It's a classic tactic, used by pseudoscientific fraudsters . . . [to create] a Hannibal Lecter-style creation that mimics valid inquiry.”
- h. “Try to sound like the real deal, and look enough like them to fool some people, some of the time.”
- i. “[T]rying to make women into villains . . . .”
- j. “It could be dismissed if they weren't trying to creep in where they are not needed, or wanted.”
- k. “But these guys drown out any real discussion with their endless angry spittle. And that's the real bitch.

6/18/14 ***Men’s rights campaigner Roy Den Hollander attacks The Advertiser’s Tory Shepherd in bizarre legal writ filed in New York County***

- a. “[B]izarre legal writ . . . .”
- b. “UniSA was planning a course in men’s studies that included men with links to US men’s rights extremists . . . .”
- c. “Mr Den Hollander thinks he was in line to be paid \$1250 to lecture.”

- d. “Mr Den Hollander is a proudly “anti-feminist” lawyer with a fairly unsuccessful track record.”
- e. “WATCH: THE COLBERT REPORT ON ROY DEN HOLLANDER”
- f. Roy believes in “censor[ship of] a journalist . . . .”
- g. Roy is “an extremist by sounding like an extremist.”
- h. Tory sarcastically demeans Roy’s legal complaint against her as “Brilliant, no?”
- i. “He [Roy] also talks of his concern that ‘alien wives and girlfriends’ are making up phony abuse cases against men, and that men are being targeted by feminists because they were trying to escape said feminists by going overseas for girlfriends.”
- j. Tory communicated that Roy does not believe in equality for women because he demeans males who do by calling them “girlie-guys.” Tory wrote “In the men’s rights vernacular, ‘girlie-guys’ are usually known as ‘manginas’. The terms refer to males who believe in equality for women . . . .”
- k. “Why on Earth give such a man more publicity? But it’s important, I think, to remain aware and wary of people like Mr Den Hollander.”
- l. “I suspect the people at UniSA who flirted with the idea of bringing him over to teach may not have really understood his philosophy.”

Tenor and innuendos of the two articles are false, and use the same tactic as Joseph McCarthy and Roy Cohn did in the 1950s. Back then, certain words were used to label persons as sub-human, anathemas, and not deserving of rights—“communist sympathizer,” “fellow traveler,” and “red,” while today Tory and the Feminists use the opprobrium associated with words such as “antifeminist,” “right winger,” “hardliner,” and “masculine.”

Both used the description “anti-feminist” the way a reporter for *Pravda* in the old Soviet Union would have used the term “anti-communist.” At least the Russian commie reporters could point to intellectuals such as Marx and Lenin to define “Communism,” who can Tory and Amy point to for a definition of Feminism—their fellow groupies at consciousness lowering sessions?

Amy uses “radical” the way Tory uses “extreme,” to depict Plaintiff as a dangerous loony because she knows her readers will never realize that the following were also called “radicals”: America’s founding fathers, abolitionists, the South Australian Fabian Society, Australian Lucy Morice, Radical Women of Australia, the Paris Commune, anti-Vietnam War demonstrators, Environmentalists.

*Where’s the malice?*

These two don't hate all men, just the ones who stand up for their rights and don't bow down to the pedestal on which they delusionally believe they recline.

They hate, loathe and fear men's rights advocates, so when they learn that a bunch will be teaching a course, they jump on their electronic broomsticks railing demon men are invading the college and will convince all the pretty young co-eds to drop their pants.

With Amy, look at the cartoon in the beginning of her article that mocks men. Why include it? It's an expression of an unreasonable desire to see someone else suffer denigration = malice.

With Tory, she headlined her second and last article dated January 14, 2014 with "University of South Australia gives controversial Male Studies course the snip." Why did she use the word "snip"? Snip means to make a quick cut. Were her hate-filled fantasies of male emasculation or circumcision at work? At the very least, it connotes feelings of malice toward men and the guys involved in the course.

Reckless disregard with both is that neither interviewed me before their initial articles and, to my knowledge, never reviewed the content of the proposed course.

They saw the term "men's studies" and jumped on their broomsticks to attack.

There are militantly anti-male groups out there that are led by man-hating females. Tory and Amy most likely belong to such.

With injurious falsehood, malice is presumed if the statement was published, was false and injuries resulted.

*You use the reporters' first names, why?*

An expression of my disrespect for such rag journalists.

Also an expression of my opinion that they are stupid little girls wagging their tongues to harm people they don't like. It's how girls in high school fight, only these two have the power of the press which they use for their personal vendettas.

*Are you anti-feminist?*

Of course, I'm anti-Feminist; I'm too intelligent not to be.

So what's wrong with that? I speak out against a snake-oil ideology and that's my right.

Feminist have come to believe in their exceptionalism and their sense of being the chosen ones. That they can decide the destinies of men; that it is only them who can be right—just like a bossy wife.

Opposition to the ideology Feminism is not a crime—not yet anyway. My freedom of speech is not limited to parroting pro-Feminist propaganda as desired by self-appointed members of the PC Ministry of Truth.

I'm also anti anything that infringes my Constitutional rights.

I'm an anti-feminist, and proud of it, while they are man-haters or misandrists, and I'm sure they are proud of it.

I define Feminist as a person who believes that all men are guilty and all females innocent until they are proven guilty—but even then a man is at fault.

A collection of people many of whom could hardly bake a cake, fix a car, sustain a friendship or a marriage, or even solve a quadratic equation, yet they believe they know how to rule the world. They justify any reprehensible act so long that it's committed by a Feminist.

*Are you a right winger?*

No, unless you consider Students for a Democratic Society and the New Democratic Coalition as right wing organizations.

In the 1960s, I was accused of being a communist because of my SDS membership. Today, I'm accused of being a right wing extremist. So have my political views changed or just the epithets that conformists use to make others agree with their weak minded beliefs?

I know what I like and what my rights are. I'm not about to sacrifice either just to satisfy some special interest group that only has my harm at heart.

*A number of experts also criticized the course.*

You call those girlie-guys Tory enlisted experts or are they sexperts? Those androgynies are simply scared of being hexed by the Feminists.

Dr. Flood obviously sides with Tory, and if he lived in America in 1776 would have also sided with the Tories, since the founding fathers were responding to injustices and clearly on the “margins” of the British Empire.

Dr. Ben Wadham surely would have opposed the progressive programs of Teddy Roosevelt because they were “populist,” and would have gleefully “crucif[ied] mankind upon a cross of gold” because William Jennings Bryan was a “populist.”

Amy used an alleged female, Eva Cox, who said, “men who want to complain that they haven't had enough attention as victims, and that does worry me.” What, Cox worry? Absurd, no man would want attention from her, now Amy is a different story.

I don't consider myself a victim but a target. Hopefully a moving one.

*Weren't you published on the Voice of Men website that calls girls "bitches"?*

Yes, but I don't use that term. I think it gives girls too much credit.

So what? You're published in \_\_\_\_\_, and I am sure it has used some language you may disagree with.

*Your comment on guns?*

A girl's tongue is her gun, so why should men disarm unless females are muzzled.

My comment is true—isn't it?

Mostly men exercise their right to bear arms, so how can the exercise of a right be extreme or even subject to criticism. When the media starts criticizing the exercise of rights, it deters people from exercising them, which is the same as not having them.

The power of the Second Amendment is to give people a fighting chance against unjust state violence, such as the revolution that occurred in Kiev.

*Tory and Amy?*

They're like the pigs in *Animal Farm*, squealing about equality when they really mean they're more equal than others, and the others are men.

I'm sure they bring a lot of joy whenever they leave the room.

They're ideologically corrupt, and not unlike a *de facto* cult preventing the spread of what they deem are heretical ideas.

They're prime candidates for natural de-selection.

*Misogynist?*

When I go out to nightclubs or my hip hop class, believe me, what's in my heart is not malice.

I like music, I like dancing, I like drinking, and I like pretty young ladies. But as with drinking, a guy has to be careful with the young ladies.

Look, would you rather drive a new car or a used one? And if you are the car, would you rather be driven by a student driver or one with a license.

Girls aren't rated Double X for nothing, which is why I chase them.

*Why bother bringing these cases?*

There are some people who will do anything for money, but there are others who will do anything for justice. I like to think I'm the later, but that just might be my ego talking.

*What's at stake?*

Universities were supposed to be open to differing views, but today under Feminism the winds of a cult-like conformity blow through the halls of academia when centers of learning and the press believe they have discovered the one and only truth.

The message is clear. On college campuses, everybody's freedom of speech is limited to parroting pro-Feminist propaganda as determined by the self-appointed members of the PC Ministry of Truth.

Freedom of speech. It is key to the flow of ideas and forbids treating differently those with unpopular viewpoints by suppressing their speech in favor of popular speech. Tory, Amy and the Feminists are out to eradicate discussion of the currently unpopular masculine perspective beneficial to males.

“To impose any strait jacket upon the intellectual leaders in our colleges and universities would imperil the future of our Nation. No field of education is so thoroughly comprehended by man that new discoveries cannot yet be made. Particularly is that true in the social sciences, where few, if any, principles are accepted as absolutes. Scholarship cannot flourish in an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust. Teachers and students must always remain free to inquire, to study and to evaluate, to gain new maturity and understanding; otherwise our civilization will stagnate and die.” *Keyishian v. Board of Regents of University of State of N. Y.*, 385 U.S. 589, 603 (1967)(Brennan, J.).

*Are you advocating revolution?*

I've been advocating that in one form or another since I was a member of SDS—Students for a Democratic Society.

I almost joined the Weathermen, but couldn't see the relevance in blowing up bathrooms.

As Abraham Lincoln said, “The people of the United States are the rightful masters of both Congress and the Courts, not to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the men [and now females] who pervert the Constitution.”

For me, it is just about time for civil disobedience.

Sure that can include violence, but I have not decided to start up the Eliot Ness truck yet. It's a figure of speech.

The only way to stop the discrimination against men is for 100,000 armed guys to show up in Washington, DC demanding their rights. The problem is there are perhaps only 200 men left in America.

What are they going to do to me—send me to Guantanamo? I like warm climates, besides if I escape, I get to drive around in 56 Chevys with hot Latinas and smoke Cuban cigars.

Or, they take away my license to practice law. So what? The only reason I got it was to defend my rights, but that's impossible in a judicial system prejudiced against men. So my law license is pretty much as useless as basing arguments on the Torah in a court of the Third Reich.

My allegiance is to the Constitution and Declaration of Independence—not to a government that's been corrupted by ideological Feminists, nor a government that sacrifices men's rights to give girls preferential treatment.

Feminism has created a de facto tyranny over men by government. As James Madison said, a tyranny exists when one group controls the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. The belief system of Feminism now has an overriding influence in all three. America is now a Feminarchy that tramples the rights of men.

Insurrection seems better than living as slaves to the Feminists and a government that enforces their male-hating policies. If we fail, we'll be gone, and then the ladies can fight among themselves and with the androgynies who are left.

Throughout history the failure of governments to uphold individual rights have caused violence—not prevented it. Today, the preferential treatment of girls violates the rights of guys, there's no justice within the system because the Feminist Establishment prevents the institutions in this country from upholding the Constitution as it applies to men seeking equal treatment.

“[W]here there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence.”  
Gandhi.

Sometimes a social evil is so egregious, so entrenched, that violence is the only answer. Violence is often necessary in the name of a principle, and is admirable when waged in the name of democratic principles.

Never underestimate the influence of violence.

*How do the laws discriminate?*

Currently, just look at the three anti-feminist cases I brought:

Ladies Nights: The suit would have ended guys having to subsidize girls to party. I think that's called prostitution.

The owner of the China Club told me that he held Ladies Nights to get a lot of guys to come to the club thinking there would be plenty of girls. To which I added that when there wasn't, they'd console themselves by drinking.

Religion and Women's Studies case: Religion requires irrationality and acting against one's self-interest. So think irrationally and do something stupid and you've got a trait of femininity.

“‘[I]ntensely personal’ convictions which some might find ‘incomprehensible’ or ‘incorrect’ come within the meaning of ‘religious belief’ ....” *Welsh*, 398 U.S. at 339 (internal quotes *Seeger*, 380 U.S. at 184-185):

Amy harps on the innuendo that allegations of Feminism as a religion are absurd. To Feminists and those scared of them, yes, but the U.S. Supreme Court and Court of Appeals cases on religion indicate otherwise.

Academic freedom does not give any University the right to provide a wide range of benefits to one group based on sex but not the other as a result of stereotyping. “Fairness in individual competition for opportunities ... is a widely cherished American ethic. Indeed, in a broader sense, an underlying assumption of the rule of law is the worthiness of a system of justice based on fairness to the individual,” which still includes males. *Regents of University of California v. Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265, 319 n. 53 (1978).

By 2016 in the U.S., females will receive 64% of the Associate's Degrees, over 60% of the Bachelor's Degrees, 53% of the Professional Degrees, and 66% of the Doctor's Degrees. National Center for Educational Statistics, *Digest of Educational Statistics*, Table 258.

VAWA: The reputation and careers of Americans, usually men, are destroyed by secret, Star Chamber like hearings in which aliens testify but not the accused.

*Why did the Feminist get VAWA passed?*

Why do females squeeze their feet into tiny shoes with stilts on one end, constrict the lower part of their bodies in panty hose, interfere with their respiration with tight push-up bras, paint their faces with cancer causing dyes, pluck their eyebrows, glue fake eyelashes to their eye lids, conduct chemical reactions on their heads to change hair color? To catch a guy.

If they are willing to do all that to land a guy, they are sure willing to use the government to violate a guy's rights if it increases their chances.

*You lost that case?*

And every case I brought where the rights of men conflicted with the preferential treatment of females.

The chances of the courts upholding the rights of men are about equal to some pretty young lady paying my way on a date.

One of these days the courts may do what they are supposed to—then again, maybe they never will.

*Give me some examples of how the laws discriminated in the past?*

1. The British Factory Acts in the 19<sup>th</sup> century limited the hours beyond which no woman was to work during any one day, the time which was to be allotted to meals, the sanitation of the workrooms, and other matters of a similar nature. Cleveland at 250-51.
2. In America in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, statutes existed in all the States with a view to regulate and prescribe for the employment of women in hazardous occupations. Such laws forbid the employment of women in excess of a specified number of hours per day and per week. A few of the States had also established a minimum wage to be paid to women engaged in stated occupations.
3. In England females could not vote for members of Parliament but could vote on county and local matters. Cleveland at 254.

*Flogging*

4. An 1820 English Act forbade the flogging of women either in public or private, but not men. It was also okay to flog school boys with a cane but not a school girl.

*Paternity Fraud*

5. Under the 19<sup>th</sup> century common law when a mother had a child while married, the husband was presumed to be the father. Of course that was not always the case, but only lately has DNA testing been able to disprove such, but in around 30 states, it does not matter.

*Liability for wife's acts*

6. In England, marriages before 1870, the husband was liable for his wife's contracts, torts or civil wrongs before they were even married.
7. In America in the 1800s, if a wife rented and occupied premises, her husband would be liable for the rent.
8. A suit could be brought by or against a married woman only for contracts made by her previous to her marriage. And even in such cases she had to be joined by her husband as co-plaintiff or defendant.
9. A wife could not be sued for receiving stolen goods, if she received them from her husband.
10. In America in 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, if a husband abandoned his wife, even with justification, he was nevertheless liable for her support.
11. In America in 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, when a husband refused to supply his wife with necessaries suitable to her rank and condition, the wife could obtain them from any tradesman or tradesmen, and the husband had to pay the bills.

*Liability for support of wife*

12. Tradesman could supply a wife with goods which she had been in the habit of purchasing, whether the same be necessaries or not, and the husband had to pay.
13. In America in 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, a woman could complain of her husband's laziness, and compel him at court to give bonds for the support and also for the maintenance of his children.

*Liabile for wife who left*

14. If a wife, who had left her husband, offered to return and the husband refused to receive her, the wife could, then purchase necessaries in his name without his consent, and the husband was liable for all necessaries so supplied.
15. Any man who shall unlawfully neglect or refuse to support his wife or children, unless owing to physical incapacity or other good cause, might be convicted of a felony in some States, but liable to punishment in every State.
16. In America in 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, an unmarried adult woman who becomes poor and unable to support herself, might, by legal process in some of the States, compel her father, mother, grandfather, grandmother, or any one or more of them, to furnish such support or to contribute towards it. If these relatives are not able to do so, the State, town or municipality would support the woman as a pauper.

*Restriction on husband's property but not wife's*

17. In America in the 1800s, during the life of a wife, a husband could not sell nor make a conveyance of his real estate either in whole or in part without her knowledge and consent. She had a one-third interest in his real estate and in NY one-half his personal property.
18. In America in the 1800s, except for five states, every woman possessed at marriage of property or acquired property during marriage by any means held it and all rents, profits and income from, to her separate use, free from the control of her husband and from attachment by creditors for his debts. A married woman could without her husband's consent sell, convey, and devise her separate estate, or any interest or interests in any and every part thereof, the same as if she were single.
19. In England, The Married Woman's Property Act of 1882 allowed married women to acquire, hold, and dispose of property in the same way as could a single woman, which except for primogeniture, was the same as a male. All property belonging to a woman at the time of her marriage, or which came to her after marriage, including earnings and property acquired by the exercise of any skill or labour, was absolutely her own, and the husband had no rights whatever over the property of his wife.
20. In England in 1870, under the Married Woman's Property Act:
  - a. All the earnings of a married woman were her own property, as also were her deposits in any Savings Bank.
  - b. Every married woman was allowed to insure her own or her husband's life for her separate use. This opened the way for wives taking out insurance on their husbands and then killing them.
  - c. Where husband and wife are both liable, the property of the husband must first be taken to satisfy the liability.

*Debtors' prison*

21. In England, under the Married Woman's Property Act of 1882, a married woman trading on her own account could be made a bankrupt, but she could not be committed to prison for non-fulfillment of an order under the Debtor's Act of 1869. Arthur Rackham Cleveland, *Woman under the English Law the Landing of the Saxons to the Present Time*, at 282, London: Hurst and Blackett, 1896. For 1837-1895. Husbands, however, could be committed to prison for failing to pay certain debts.

- a. Under the 1882 Act, every married woman had the same remedies, civil and criminal, against all persons, including her husband, for the protection of her separate property, as if she were a single woman. *Id.* at 283.
22. In 19<sup>th</sup> century England, judicial separation or divorce courts could grant alimony only to the wife and direct that the custody of the children of the marriage be given either to the innocent party.
23. In 19<sup>th</sup> century America, a wife was legally entitled to alimony, except for adultery, but not the husband, and the husband had to pay for the wife to bring a divorce action against him. Today in America with no-fault divorce, the entire structure of American marriage and divorce is geared to financially supporting faithless females. Men are 4 times more likely to lose their homes. One million American men are preemptively ordered out of their homes each year, even when no physical abuse is even alleged.

#### *Heart balm*

24. In the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries in America, where a woman, who was of age, is seduced under a promise of marriage, she could personally sue the seducer. When the seducer was a single man, the latter would be compelled to make reparation by marriage. Where this could not be affected, exemplary damages would generally be obtained. If the seducer was a married man and the girl did not know it, she could obtain aggravating damages.
25. By 1929, with very few exceptions, women could hold any office in any of the States. They may have been members of a State legislature and they may have been members of Congress.

#### *Sentencing*

26. For the 41 classes of crimes to which the Federal Sentencing Guidelines apply, the average sentence for males is 278.4 percent greater than that of females (51.5 versus 18.5 months). David Mustard, *Disparities in Sentencing: Evidence from U.S. Federal Courts*, Journal of Law and Economics, vol. XLIV (April 2001).
27. Males not only receive longer sentences but also are less likely to receive no prison term when that option is available; more likely to receive upward departures, and less likely to receive downward departures. When downward departures are given, males receive smaller adjustments than females. *Id.*

#### *Female value greater*

28. A drunk driver will receive an average of a 3-year higher sentence for killing a female than for killing a male. *Unconventional Wisdom*, Washington Post, Sept. 7, 2000.
29. Black widows: Chicago female homicide cases resulting in non-convictions by 1914 had become a national scandal. Illinois State's Attorney Maclay Hoyne, declared that: "The manner in which women who have committed murder in this county have escaped punishment has become a scandal. The blame in the first instance must fall upon the jurors who seem willing to bring in a verdict of acquittal whenever a woman charged with murder is fairly good looking and is able to turn on the flood gates of her tears, or exhibit a capacity for fainting."
30. Female Defenses unavailable to males:

Menstruation and PMS, or I kill whomever I want and blame it on my biology:

At four o'clock in the afternoon on January 30, 1865, Mary Harris fired two shots at her former fiancé, as he walked down the hallway of the U.S. Treasury Building leaving work for the day. Burroughs fell dead and Harris was tried for murder.

Mary's prior fiancé had broken off their engagement and married another girl, so Mary followed him to D.C. and shot him dead. Mary tearfully testified that Burroughs had promised to marry her but married someone else. After a 12-day trial in which she pleaded "not guilty by reason of being 'crossed in love and suffering from painful dysmenorrhea at the time of the shooting' or what is now called premenstrual syndrome, Mary was acquitted.

N.Y. Times, July 20, 1865 printed: The verdict only furnishes a new illustration of what must be regarded as a settled principle in American law—that any woman, who considers herself aggrieved in any way by a member of the other sex, may kill him with impunity, and with an assured immunity from the prescribed penalties of law.

Battered Female Syndrome or he's dead so I can say whatever I want about him and the courts will believe me.

Svengali Defense or the devil, a man, made me do it.

Contract killing or get a guy to do it and then blame him.

*Injurious Falsehood (form of interference with economic concerns)* [Defamation protects a person's reputation while Injurious Falsehood protects economic concerns; it is an economic tort].

Intentional publication

Of false and misleading information

Malice = done with intent to interfere with another's interests or done without regard to consequences. A reasonably prudent person would anticipate economic damages [if show statement made and false then there exists presumption of malice]

That results in special damages, including loss of prospective economic advantage

*Tortious interference with prospective contractual relations* [Protects person in acquiring property. Where a contract would have been entered into but for malicious conduct of 3P].

Relationship with 3P that creates expectancy of future contractual relations

Defendant interferes with that relationship

Malice = Defendant's sole purpose is to harm plaintiff or defendant engaged in fraud

Economic injury, which includes loss of opportunities for profit

# **Exhibit A**



3. A true and correct copy of the first affidavit of Michael Cameron originally filed in this Court on August 29, 2014 in support of Defendants' original motion to dismiss is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**.

4. A true and correct copy of the first affidavit of Tory Shepherd originally filed in this Court on August 29, 2014 in support of Defendants' original motion to dismiss is attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**.

5. A true and correct copy of the first affidavit of Richard Coleman originally filed in this Court on August 29, 2014 in support of Defendants' original motion to dismiss is attached hereto as **Exhibit 4**.

6. A true and correct copy of the first affidavit of Amy McNeilage originally filed in this Court on August 29, 2014 in support of Defendants' original motion to dismiss is attached hereto as **Exhibit 5**.

7. A true and correct copy of the second affidavit of Michael Cameron originally filed in this Court on October 27, 2014 in support of Defendants' operative Motion to Dismiss is attached hereto as **Exhibit 6**.

8. A true and correct copy of the second affidavit of Tory Shepherd originally filed in this Court on October 27, 2014 in support of Defendants' operative Motion to Dismiss is attached hereto as **Exhibit 7**.

9. A true and correct copy of the second affidavit of Richard Coleman originally filed in this Court on October 27, 2014 in support of Defendants' operative Motion to Dismiss is attached hereto as **Exhibit 8**.

10. A true and correct copy of the second affidavit of Amy McNeilage originally filed in this Court on October 27, 2014 in support of Defendants' operative Motion to Dismiss is attached hereto as **Exhibit 9**.

11. For the convenience of the Court and counsel for the parties, attached hereto as **Exhibit 10** is a true and correct copy of a decision in *Salfinger v. Fairfax Media Limited, et al.*, No. 13-cv-0100081 (Wis. Cir. Ct. Dec. 8, 2014).

Dated: New York, New York  
January 12, 2015

  
**KATHERINE M. BOLGER**

# **EXHIBIT 1**

## Responses to Media

Do you have a copy of the Complaint? You can take anything you want from the complaint and attributed it to me as a quote.

*Why bring the suit?*

To have fun fighting these bimbo book burners who think they are the chosen ones. [I like the alliteration. Of course given Tory's apparent age, she's really a bimbat and Amy a bimlette].

There were Feminists to the right of me, Feminists to the left of me, Feminists in front of me volley'd and thunder'd from down under, so I decided to sue.

Tory the Torch and Amy McNeuter are just like Joseph McCarthy and Roy Cohn from the 1950s. They targeted the guys involved in the course for our political beliefs.

It's another witch hunt; only today the witches are doing the hunting.

If these two Feminist book-burners had not jumped on their broomsticks and scared the bejesus out of the University of South Australia, students would have had an opportunity to acquire information and consider views not available anywhere else in higher education.

Reporters like Tory and Amy have taken the place of the 1950s "loyalty review boards" that carried out investigations for universities, governments and businesses to certify that their employees were not Communists or lefties. Only today, those who are not politically-correct are excluded.

If this case is successful, the private pinklisters, similar to the blacklisters of the 1950s, and those who use them will be put on notice that they are legally liable for the professional and financial damage they cause with their falsehoods and interference in business relations.

*Bimbo?*

The term bimbo refers to Tory the Torch and Amy "McNeuter." McNeuter because she wants to neuter men, unless she's in bed with them, assuming she's heterosexual.

In 1920, composer Frank Crumit recorded "My Little Bimbo Down on the Bamboo Isle", in which the term "bimbo" was used to describe an island girl of questionable virtue. Australia's an island, isn't it? Considering how Tory and Amy operate as reporters—they're of questionable virtue.

*How do you view what happened or what's the big deal?*

Under the Nazis, it was the German Student Union's Office for Press and Propaganda that started the book burning of those writers who opposed Nazi ideology.

At the Nazi book burning in 1933, Joseph Goebbels said, “The era of extreme Jewish intellectualism is now at an end.” Tory and Amy can’t wait to say the same about any intellectualism that isn’t pro-Feminist.

So what’s the difference here with Tory and Amy stopping the teaching of a course on men and the law by claiming it expressed “radical” and “extreme” male views?

So they didn’t go into the University and take knowledge, ideas and facts in the form of books and throw them on a bonfire. Instead they used the modern-day torch of the electronic media to incinerate opposing views.

The end result is the same—censorship of ideas, or verbal mutilation.

Why should anyone who does not believe in this Feminist mumbo-jumbo be punished for their beliefs, speech or actions, unless they commit a crime or are running for office. As to beliefs, there are no crimes and as to speech very few, such as yelling “bomb” in Times Square.

As President Truman wrote, "In a free country, we punish men for the crimes they commit, but never for the opinions they have." Not so in Australia.

*Are you comparing them to the Nazis?*

Yes. I guess that makes them Feminazis.

I’m also comparing them to the Commies. The Soviet Union ostracized anti-commies into Gulags. The Feminist just keep anti-Feminists out of the universities. What are they afraid of? I thought they were strong and independent females.

Tory and Amy wrapped themselves in the rag of Feminism to justify the imposition of a unitary belief-system of Feminist orthodoxy for dictating the thought, speech, and conduct of members of the educational community and society-at-large.

*Were you surprised?*

Yes, but I should have expected such from yellow, female-dog-in-heat journalists and the press in a penal colony.

Wasn’t Noonien Singh Khan born there?

*Did the articles anger you?*

Of course they did, but at least I’m in touch with my feelings.

Although, one thing Tory does not realize is that insults from an opponent is the highest form of compliment for an attorney.

In these causes of action, it's not what I think that matters, but what Tory caused others to think.

*Are you out for vengeance?*

Hey, what's wrong with a little quid pro quo—one bad turn deserves another. I'd call it justice.

*Sounds like vengeance.*

So what's the difference.

*Do you feel persecuted?*

Not if the Feminist is hot, she can walk all over me in her stiletto heels. Hmm, maybe I'll contact the dominatrix trio I ran into the other night?

Anyway, Feminists, assuming they are human beings, which has yet to be proven, can do whatever they want so long as they stay off of my rights. If they don't, which they don't, then it's a fight.

And I'm going to fight them to my last dollar and last breath, and, if there is anything after death for eternity.

*Sounds like hate?*

I don't hate the Feminists—I despise them. It's a great motivator.

Do you think the people who rose up in the Ukraine loved their President? No, they despised and hated him.

*What did the Feminists do to you?*

Just because they are unable to accept that Mother Nature condemned them to mood swings, do they have to make life trying for the rest of us.

VAWA

At least in the Inquisition you got to appear before your judges, although you were probably tied to the rack, with VAWA you never know who your judges are, and they skip the rack and go right to finding you did what the alien says you did.

The Edgar Allen Poe tale of horror divorce I went through before a Lesbian judge (Joan Lobis) who was probably jealous that my face had been where she wanted to put hers.

All cost me a lot of money, time, and possibly a job with the CIA. Such would not have happened but for the Feminists.

*Do you consider Feminists witches?*

I thought NOW stood for the National Organization of Witches?

Most of them are. The witchcraft label has been applied to practices people believe influence the mind, body, or property of others against their will.

Did you ever censor your speech because it wasn't politically correct? Isn't that constraining your will to be free?

Feminist linguistics is an obvious effort to control thought, speech, and action. As George Orwell wrote, "if thought corrupts language, language can also corrupt thought," *Politics and the English Language*, 1946, and once thought is corrupted, so is a person's beliefs, and corrupted beliefs are the real power for controlling people against what otherwise would be their free will.

*What are the falsehoods?*

It can be false or misleading.

Tory: "member of extreme right-wing groups," from an email; "linked to extreme views on men's rights," second headline 1/12/14 article

Amy: "hardline anti-feminist advocate[]," "hardline" may have been a Freudian slip when she becomes emotional over men; "published on radical men's rights websites," 1/14/14 article.

Tory's disparaging and libelous publications

1/9/14, on information and belief - "[RDH] identified as belonging to extreme right wing groups in the USA." 1/9/14 Gouws wrt Tory questioning Gary Misan.

1/12/14 article: ***Lecturers in world-first male studies course at University of South Australia under scrutiny***

"LECTURERS in a 'world-first' male studies course at the University of South Australia have been linked to extreme views on men's rights and websites that rail against feminism." Second headline 1/12/14 article.

"The lecturers' backgrounds are likely to spark controversy." 1/12/14 article.

"Two lecturers have been published by prominent US anti-feminist site A Voice for Men, a site which regularly refers to women as 'bitches' and 'whores' and has been described as a hate site by the civil rights organisation Southern Poverty Law Centre." 1/12/14 article.

"One American US lecturer - US attorney and self-professed 'anti-feminist lawyer' Roy Den Hollander - has written that the men's movement might struggle to exercise influence but that

‘there is one remaining source of power in which men still have a near monopoly – firearms’.” 1/12/14 article.

“He also argues that feminists oppress men in today’s world and refers to women’s studies as ‘witches’ studies’.” 1/12/14 article.

“He has likened the position of men today to black people in America’s south in the 1950s ‘sitting in the back of the bus’, and blames feminists for oppressing men.” 1/12/14 article.

“The course, which has no prerequisites . . . .” 1/12/14 article.

“Dr Michael Flood, from the University of Wollongong’s Centre for Research on Men and Masculinity, said these types of male studies ‘really represents the margins’.” 1/12/14 article.

“ ‘It comes out of a backlash to feminism and feminist scholarship. The new male studies is an effort to legitimise, to give academic authority, to anti-feminist perspectives,’ he said.” 1/12/14 article.

“Flinders University School of Education senior lecturer Ben Wadham, who has a specific interest in men’s rights, said there was a big difference between formal masculinity studies and ‘populist’ male studies.” 1/12/14 article.

“He said there were groups that legitimately help men, and then the more extreme activists.” 1/12/14 article.

“‘That tends to manifest in a more hostile movement which is about ‘women have had their turn, feminism’s gone too far, men are now the victims, white men are now disempowered’,’ he said.” 1/12/14 article.

“ ‘I would argue that the kinds of masculinities which these populist movements represent are anathema to the vision of an equal and fair gendered world.’” 1/12/14 article.

“Dr Wadham said that universities needed to uphold research based traditions instead of the populist, partisan approach driven by some.” 1/12/14 article.

1/14/14 *University of South Australia gives controversial Male Studies course the snip* Headline

“CONTROVERSIAL aspects of a Male Studies course will not go ahead” Second headline 1/14/14 article.

“The Advertiser revealed yesterday that some of the lecturers listed for the professional certificates had links to extreme men’s rights organisations that believe men are oppressed, particularly by feminists.” Emphasis in 1/14/14 article.

“US ‘anti-feminist’ lawyer Roy Den Hollander . . . .” 1/14/14 article.

“National Union of Students president Deana Taylor said a course like that proposed for the university provided ‘a dangerous platform for anti-women views’.” 1/14/14 article.

1/14/14 ***Pathetic bid for victimhood by portraying women as villains***

- a. “Pathetic bid for victimhood by portraying women as villains”
- b. “Big ups to UniSA for having the sense to reject anything linked to those at the very fringe of the men's rights spectrum . . . overseas ring ins. (“Ring in” is a gang term meaning persons that are called to help in gang wars/fights—sounds a little like Tory).”
- c. “They are - misogynists, I mean. And we're talking old-school misogyny - the hatred of women - as well as the new-school misogyny - entrenched prejudice against women.”
- d. “Not just harmless condescension or unthinking stereotypes, but some serious anger.”
- e. “The problem is, the circle (Tory is referring to “circle-jerk misogynists”) is no longer closed, no longer just a bunch of angry guys in a basement. They're trying to get up the stairs and into the light.
- f. “They want to play outside with legitimate experts in men’s issues . . . .”
- g. “It's a classic tactic, used by pseudoscientific fraudsters . . . [to create] a Hannibal Lecter-style creation that mimics valid inquiry.”
- h. “Try to sound like the real deal, and look enough like them to fool some people, some of the time.”
- i. “[T]rying to make women into villains . . . .”
- j. “It could be dismissed if they weren't trying to creep in where they are not needed, or wanted.”
- k. “But these guys drown out any real discussion with their endless angry spittle. And that's the real bitch.

6/18/14 ***Men’s rights campaigner Roy Den Hollander attacks The Advertiser’s Tory Shepherd in bizarre legal writ filed in New York County***

- a. “[B]izarre legal writ . . . .”
- b. “UniSA was planning a course in men’s studies that included men with links to US men’s rights extremists . . . .”
- c. “Mr Den Hollander thinks he was in line to be paid \$1250 to lecture.”

- d. “Mr Den Hollander is a proudly “anti-feminist” lawyer with a fairly unsuccessful track record.”
- e. “WATCH: THE COLBERT REPORT ON ROY DEN HOLLANDER”
- f. Roy believes in “censor[ship of] a journalist . . . .”
- g. Roy is “an extremist by sounding like an extremist.”
- h. Tory sarcastically demeans Roy’s legal complaint against her as “Brilliant, no?”
- i. “He [Roy] also talks of his concern that ‘alien wives and girlfriends’ are making up phony abuse cases against men, and that men are being targeted by feminists because they were trying to escape said feminists by going overseas for girlfriends.”
- j. Tory communicated that Roy does not believe in equality for women because he demeans males who do by calling them “girlie-guys.” Tory wrote “In the men’s rights vernacular, ‘girlie-guys’ are usually known as ‘manginas’. The terms refer to males who believe in equality for women . . . .”
- k. “Why on Earth give such a man more publicity? But it’s important, I think, to remain aware and wary of people like Mr Den Hollander.”
- l. “I suspect the people at UniSA who flirted with the idea of bringing him over to teach may not have really understood his philosophy.”

Tenor and innuendos of the two articles are false, and use the same tactic as Joseph McCarthy and Roy Cohn did in the 1950s. Back then, certain words were used to label persons as sub-human, anathemas, and not deserving of rights—“communist sympathizer,” “fellow traveler,” and “red,” while today Tory and the Feminists use the opprobrium associated with words such as “antifeminist,” “right winger,” “hardliner,” and “masculine.”

Both used the description “anti-feminist” the way a reporter for *Pravda* in the old Soviet Union would have used the term “anti-communist.” At least the Russian commie reporters could point to intellectuals such as Marx and Lenin to define “Communism,” who can Tory and Amy point to for a definition of Feminism—their fellow groupies at consciousness lowering sessions?

Amy uses “radical” the way Tory uses “extreme,” to depict Plaintiff as a dangerous loony because she knows her readers will never realize that the following were also called “radicals”: America’s founding fathers, abolitionists, the South Australian Fabian Society, Australian Lucy Morice, Radical Women of Australia, the Paris Commune, anti-Vietnam War demonstrators, Environmentalists.

*Where’s the malice?*

These two don't hate all men, just the ones who stand up for their rights and don't bow down to the pedestal on which they delusionally believe they recline.

They hate, loathe and fear men's rights advocates, so when they learn that a bunch will be teaching a course, they jump on their electronic broomsticks railing demon men are invading the college and will convince all the pretty young co-eds to drop their pants.

With Amy, look at the cartoon in the beginning of her article that mocks men. Why include it? It's an expression of an unreasonable desire to see someone else suffer denigration = malice.

With Tory, she headlined her second and last article dated January 14, 2014 with "University of South Australia gives controversial Male Studies course the snip." Why did she use the word "snip"? Snip means to make a quick cut. Were her hate-filled fantasies of male emasculation or circumcision at work? At the very least, it connotes feelings of malice toward men and the guys involved in the course.

Reckless disregard with both is that neither interviewed me before their initial articles and, to my knowledge, never reviewed the content of the proposed course.

They saw the term "men's studies" and jumped on their broomsticks to attack.

There are militantly anti-male groups out there that are led by man-hating females. Tory and Amy most likely belong to such.

With injurious falsehood, malice is presumed if the statement was published, was false and injuries resulted.

*You use the reporters' first names, why?*

An expression of my disrespect for such rag journalists.

Also an expression of my opinion that they are stupid little girls wagging their tongues to harm people they don't like. It's how girls in high school fight, only these two have the power of the press which they use for their personal vendettas.

*Are you anti-feminist?*

Of course, I'm anti-Feminist; I'm too intelligent not to be.

So what's wrong with that? I speak out against a snake-oil ideology and that's my right.

Feminist have come to believe in their exceptionalism and their sense of being the chosen ones. That they can decide the destinies of men; that it is only them who can be right—just like a bossy wife.

Opposition to the ideology Feminism is not a crime—not yet anyway. My freedom of speech is not limited to parroting pro-Feminist propaganda as desired by self-appointed members of the PC Ministry of Truth.

I'm also anti anything that infringes my Constitutional rights.

I'm an anti-feminist, and proud of it, while they are man-haters or misandrists, and I'm sure they are proud of it.

I define Feminist as a person who believes that all men are guilty and all females innocent until they are proven guilty—but even then a man is at fault.

A collection of people many of whom could hardly bake a cake, fix a car, sustain a friendship or a marriage, or even solve a quadratic equation, yet they believe they know how to rule the world. They justify any reprehensible act so long that it's committed by a Feminist.

*Are you a right winger?*

No, unless you consider Students for a Democratic Society and the New Democratic Coalition as right wing organizations.

In the 1960s, I was accused of being a communist because of my SDS membership. Today, I'm accused of being a right wing extremist. So have my political views changed or just the epithets that conformists use to make others agree with their weak minded beliefs?

I know what I like and what my rights are. I'm not about to sacrifice either just to satisfy some special interest group that only has my harm at heart.

*A number of experts also criticized the course.*

You call those girlie-guys Tory enlisted experts or are they sexperts? Those androgynies are simply scared of being hexed by the Feminists.

Dr. Flood obviously sides with Tory, and if he lived in America in 1776 would have also sided with the Tories, since the founding fathers were responding to injustices and clearly on the “margins” of the British Empire.

Dr. Ben Wadham surely would have opposed the progressive programs of Teddy Roosevelt because they were “populist,” and would have gleefully “crucif[ied] mankind upon a cross of gold” because William Jennings Bryan was a “populist.”

Amy used an alleged female, Eva Cox, who said, “men who want to complain that they haven't had enough attention as victims, and that does worry me.” What, Cox worry? Absurd, no man would want attention from her, now Amy is a different story.

I don't consider myself a victim but a target. Hopefully a moving one.

*Weren't you published on the Voice of Men website that calls girls "bitches"?*

Yes, but I don't use that term. I think it gives girls too much credit.

So what? You're published in \_\_\_\_\_, and I am sure it has used some language you may disagree with.

*Your comment on guns?*

A girl's tongue is her gun, so why should men disarm unless females are muzzled.

My comment is true—isn't it?

Mostly men exercise their right to bear arms, so how can the exercise of a right be extreme or even subject to criticism. When the media starts criticizing the exercise of rights, it deters people from exercising them, which is the same as not having them.

The power of the Second Amendment is to give people a fighting chance against unjust state violence, such as the revolution that occurred in Kiev.

*Tory and Amy?*

They're like the pigs in *Animal Farm*, squealing about equality when they really mean they're more equal than others, and the others are men.

I'm sure they bring a lot of joy whenever they leave the room.

They're ideologically corrupt, and not unlike a *de facto* cult preventing the spread of what they deem are heretical ideas.

They're prime candidates for natural de-selection.

*Misogynist?*

When I go out to nightclubs or my hip hop class, believe me, what's in my heart is not malice.

I like music, I like dancing, I like drinking, and I like pretty young ladies. But as with drinking, a guy has to be careful with the young ladies.

Look, would you rather drive a new car or a used one? And if you are the car, would you rather be driven by a student driver or one with a license.

Girls aren't rated Double X for nothing, which is why I chase them.

*Why bother bringing these cases?*

There are some people who will do anything for money, but there are others who will do anything for justice. I like to think I'm the later, but that just might be my ego talking.

*What's at stake?*

Universities were supposed to be open to differing views, but today under Feminism the winds of a cult-like conformity blow through the halls of academia when centers of learning and the press believe they have discovered the one and only truth.

The message is clear. On college campuses, everybody's freedom of speech is limited to parroting pro-Feminist propaganda as determined by the self-appointed members of the PC Ministry of Truth.

Freedom of speech. It is key to the flow of ideas and forbids treating differently those with unpopular viewpoints by suppressing their speech in favor of popular speech. Tory, Amy and the Feminists are out to eradicate discussion of the currently unpopular masculine perspective beneficial to males.

“To impose any strait jacket upon the intellectual leaders in our colleges and universities would imperil the future of our Nation. No field of education is so thoroughly comprehended by man that new discoveries cannot yet be made. Particularly is that true in the social sciences, where few, if any, principles are accepted as absolutes. Scholarship cannot flourish in an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust. Teachers and students must always remain free to inquire, to study and to evaluate, to gain new maturity and understanding; otherwise our civilization will stagnate and die.” *Keyishian v. Board of Regents of University of State of N. Y.*, 385 U.S. 589, 603 (1967)(Brennan, J.).

*Are you advocating revolution?*

I've been advocating that in one form or another since I was a member of SDS—Students for a Democratic Society.

I almost joined the Weathermen, but couldn't see the relevance in blowing up bathrooms.

As Abraham Lincoln said, “The people of the United States are the rightful masters of both Congress and the Courts, not to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the men [and now females] who pervert the Constitution.”

For me, it is just about time for civil disobedience.

Sure that can include violence, but I have not decided to start up the Eliot Ness truck yet. It's a figure of speech.

The only way to stop the discrimination against men is for 100,000 armed guys to show up in Washington, DC demanding their rights. The problem is there are perhaps only 200 men left in America.

What are they going to do to me—send me to Guantanamo? I like warm climates, besides if I escape, I get to drive around in 56 Chevys with hot Latinas and smoke Cuban cigars.

Or, they take away my license to practice law. So what? The only reason I got it was to defend my rights, but that's impossible in a judicial system prejudiced against men. So my law license is pretty much as useless as basing arguments on the Torah in a court of the Third Reich.

My allegiance is to the Constitution and Declaration of Independence—not to a government that's been corrupted by ideological Feminists, nor a government that sacrifices men's rights to give girls preferential treatment.

Feminism has created a de facto tyranny over men by government. As James Madison said, a tyranny exists when one group controls the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. The belief system of Feminism now has an overriding influence in all three. America is now a Feminarchy that tramples the rights of men.

Insurrection seems better than living as slaves to the Feminists and a government that enforces their male-hating policies. If we fail, we'll be gone, and then the ladies can fight among themselves and with the androgynies who are left.

Throughout history the failure of governments to uphold individual rights have caused violence—not prevented it. Today, the preferential treatment of girls violates the rights of guys, there's no justice within the system because the Feminist Establishment prevents the institutions in this country from upholding the Constitution as it applies to men seeking equal treatment.

“[W]here there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence.”  
Gandhi.

Sometimes a social evil is so egregious, so entrenched, that violence is the only answer. Violence is often necessary in the name of a principle, and is admirable when waged in the name of democratic principles.

Never underestimate the influence of violence.

*How do the laws discriminate?*

Currently, just look at the three anti-feminist cases I brought:

Ladies Nights: The suit would have ended guys having to subsidize girls to party. I think that's called prostitution.

The owner of the China Club told me that he held Ladies Nights to get a lot of guys to come to the club thinking there would be plenty of girls. To which I added that when there wasn't, they'd console themselves by drinking.

Religion and Women's Studies case: Religion requires irrationality and acting against one's self-interest. So think irrationally and do something stupid and you've got a trait of femininity.

“‘[I]ntensely personal’ convictions which some might find ‘incomprehensible’ or ‘incorrect’ come within the meaning of ‘religious belief’ ....” *Welsh*, 398 U.S. at 339 (internal quotes *Seeger*, 380 U.S. at 184-185):

Amy harps on the innuendo that allegations of Feminism as a religion are absurd. To Feminists and those scared of them, yes, but the U.S. Supreme Court and Court of Appeals cases on religion indicate otherwise.

Academic freedom does not give any University the right to provide a wide range of benefits to one group based on sex but not the other as a result of stereotyping. “Fairness in individual competition for opportunities ... is a widely cherished American ethic. Indeed, in a broader sense, an underlying assumption of the rule of law is the worthiness of a system of justice based on fairness to the individual,” which still includes males. *Regents of University of California v. Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265, 319 n. 53 (1978).

By 2016 in the U.S., females will receive 64% of the Associate's Degrees, over 60% of the Bachelor's Degrees, 53% of the Professional Degrees, and 66% of the Doctor's Degrees. National Center for Educational Statistics, *Digest of Educational Statistics*, Table 258.

VAWA: The reputation and careers of Americans, usually men, are destroyed by secret, Star Chamber like hearings in which aliens testify but not the accused.

*Why did the Feminist get VAWA passed?*

Why do females squeeze their feet into tiny shoes with stilts on one end, constrict the lower part of their bodies in panty hose, interfere with their respiration with tight push-up bras, paint their faces with cancer causing dyes, pluck their eyebrows, glue fake eyelashes to their eye lids, conduct chemical reactions on their heads to change hair color? To catch a guy.

If they are willing to do all that to land a guy, they are sure willing to use the government to violate a guy's rights if it increases their chances.

*You lost that case?*

And every case I brought where the rights of men conflicted with the preferential treatment of females.

The chances of the courts upholding the rights of men are about equal to some pretty young lady paying my way on a date.

One of these days the courts may do what they are supposed to—then again, maybe they never will.

*Give me some examples of how the laws discriminated in the past?*

1. The British Factory Acts in the 19<sup>th</sup> century limited the hours beyond which no woman was to work during any one day, the time which was to be allotted to meals, the sanitation of the workrooms, and other matters of a similar nature. Cleveland at 250-51.
2. In America in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, statutes existed in all the States with a view to regulate and prescribe for the employment of women in hazardous occupations. Such laws forbid the employment of women in excess of a specified number of hours per day and per week. A few of the States had also established a minimum wage to be paid to women engaged in stated occupations.
3. In England females could not vote for members of Parliament but could vote on county and local matters. Cleveland at 254.

*Flogging*

4. An 1820 English Act forbade the flogging of women either in public or private, but not men. It was also okay to flog school boys with a cane but not a school girl.

*Paternity Fraud*

5. Under the 19<sup>th</sup> century common law when a mother had a child while married, the husband was presumed to be the father. Of course that was not always the case, but only lately has DNA testing been able to disprove such, but in around 30 states, it does not matter.

*Liability for wife's acts*

6. In England, marriages before 1870, the husband was liable for his wife's contracts, torts or civil wrongs before they were even married.
7. In America in the 1800s, if a wife rented and occupied premises, her husband would be liable for the rent.
8. A suit could be brought by or against a married woman only for contracts made by her previous to her marriage. And even in such cases she had to be joined by her husband as co-plaintiff or defendant.
9. A wife could not be sued for receiving stolen goods, if she received them from her husband.
10. In America in 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, if a husband abandoned his wife, even with justification, he was nevertheless liable for her support.
11. In America in 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, when a husband refused to supply his wife with necessaries suitable to her rank and condition, the wife could obtain them from any tradesman or tradesmen, and the husband had to pay the bills.

*Liability for support of wife*

12. Tradesman could supply a wife with goods which she had been in the habit of purchasing, whether the same be necessaries or not, and the husband had to pay.
13. In America in 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, a woman could complain of her husband's laziness, and compel him at court to give bonds for the support and also for the maintenance of his children.

*Liabile for wife who left*

14. If a wife, who had left her husband, offered to return and the husband refused to receive her, the wife could, then purchase necessaries in his name without his consent, and the husband was liable for all necessaries so supplied.
15. Any man who shall unlawfully neglect or refuse to support his wife or children, unless owing to physical incapacity or other good cause, might be convicted of a felony in some States, but liable to punishment in every State.
16. In America in 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, an unmarried adult woman who becomes poor and unable to support herself, might, by legal process in some of the States, compel her father, mother, grandfather, grandmother, or any one or more of them, to furnish such support or to contribute towards it. If these relatives are not able to do so, the State, town or municipality would support the woman as a pauper.

*Restriction on husband's property but not wife's*

17. In America in the 1800s, during the life of a wife, a husband could not sell nor make a conveyance of his real estate either in whole or in part without her knowledge and consent. She had a one-third interest in his real estate and in NY one-half his personal property.
18. In America in the 1800s, except for five states, every woman possessed at marriage of property or acquired property during marriage by any means held it and all rents, profits and income from, to her separate use, free from the control of her husband and from attachment by creditors for his debts. A married woman could without her husband's consent sell, convey, and devise her separate estate, or any interest or interests in any and every part thereof, the same as if she were single.
19. In England, The Married Woman's Property Act of 1882 allowed married women to acquire, hold, and dispose of property in the same way as could a single woman, which except for primogeniture, was the same as a male. All property belonging to a woman at the time of her marriage, or which came to her after marriage, including earnings and property acquired by the exercise of any skill or labour, was absolutely her own, and the husband had no rights whatever over the property of his wife.
20. In England in 1870, under the Married Woman's Property Act:
  - a. All the earnings of a married woman were her own property, as also were her deposits in any Savings Bank.
  - b. Every married woman was allowed to insure her own or her husband's life for her separate use. This opened the way for wives taking out insurance on their husbands and then killing them.
  - c. Where husband and wife are both liable, the property of the husband must first be taken to satisfy the liability.

*Debtors' prison*

21. In England, under the Married Woman's Property Act of 1882, a married woman trading on her own account could be made a bankrupt, but she could not be committed to prison for non-fulfillment of an order under the Debtor's Act of 1869. Arthur Rackham Cleveland, *Woman under the English Law the Landing of the Saxons to the Present Time*, at 282, London: Hurst and Blackett, 1896. For 1837-1895. Husbands, however, could be committed to prison for failing to pay certain debts.

- a. Under the 1882 Act, every married woman had the same remedies, civil and criminal, against all persons, including her husband, for the protection of her separate property, as if she were a single woman. *Id.* at 283.
- 22. In 19<sup>th</sup> century England, judicial separation or divorce courts could grant alimony only to the wife and direct that the custody of the children of the marriage be given either to the innocent party.
- 23. In 19<sup>th</sup> century America, a wife was legally entitled to alimony, except for adultery, but not the husband, and the husband had to pay for the wife to bring a divorce action against him. Today in America with no-fault divorce, the entire structure of American marriage and divorce is geared to financially supporting faithless females. Men are 4 times more likely to lose their homes. One million American men are preemptively ordered out of their homes each year, even when no physical abuse is even alleged.

*Heart balm*

- 24. In the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries in America, where a woman, who was of age, is seduced under a promise of marriage, she could personally sue the seducer. When the seducer was a single man, the latter would be compelled to make reparation by marriage. Where this could not be affected, exemplary damages would generally be obtained. If the seducer was a married man and the girl did not know it, she could obtain aggravating damages.
- 25. By 1929, with very few exceptions, women could hold any office in any of the States. They may have been members of a State legislature and they may have been members of Congress.

*Sentencing*

- 26. For the 41 classes of crimes to which the Federal Sentencing Guidelines apply, the average sentence for males is 278.4 percent greater than that of females (51.5 versus 18.5 months). David Mustard, *Disparities in Sentencing: Evidence from U.S. Federal Courts*, Journal of Law and Economics, vol. XLIV (April 2001).
- 27. Males not only receive longer sentences but also are less likely to receive no prison term when that option is available; more likely to receive upward departures, and less likely to receive downward departures. When downward departures are given, males receive smaller adjustments than females. *Id.*

*Female value greater*

- 28. A drunk driver will receive an average of a 3-year higher sentence for killing a female than for killing a male. *Unconventional Wisdom*, Washington Post, Sept. 7, 2000.
- 29. Black widows: Chicago female homicide cases resulting in non-convictions by 1914 had become a national scandal. Illinois State's Attorney Maclay Hoyne, declared that: "The manner in which women who have committed murder in this county have escaped punishment has become a scandal. The blame in the first instance must fall upon the jurors who seem willing to bring in a verdict of acquittal whenever a woman charged with murder is fairly good looking and is able to turn on the flood gates of her tears, or exhibit a capacity for fainting."
- 30. Female Defenses unavailable to males:

Menstruation and PMS, or I kill whomever I want and blame it on my biology:

At four o'clock in the afternoon on January 30, 1865, Mary Harris fired two shots at her former fiancé, as he walked down the hallway of the U.S. Treasury Building leaving work for the day. Burroughs fell dead and Harris was tried for murder.

Mary's prior fiancé had broken off their engagement and married another girl, so Mary followed him to D.C. and shot him dead. Mary tearfully testified that Burroughs had promised to marry her but married someone else. After a 12-day trial in which she pleaded "not guilty by reason of being 'crossed in love and suffering from painful dysmenorrhea at the time of the shooting' or what is now called premenstrual syndrome, Mary was acquitted.

N.Y. Times, July 20, 1865 printed: The verdict only furnishes a new illustration of what must be regarded as a settled principle in American law—that any woman, who considers herself aggrieved in any way by a member of the other sex, may kill him with impunity, and with an assured immunity from the prescribed penalties of law.

Battered Female Syndrome or he's dead so I can say whatever I want about him and the courts will believe me.

Svengali Defense or the devil, a man, made me do it.

Contract killing or get a guy to do it and then blame him.

*Injurious Falsehood (form of interference with economic concerns)* [Defamation protects a person's reputation while Injurious Falsehood protects economic concerns; it is an economic tort].

Intentional publication

Of false and misleading information

Malice = done with intent to interfere with another's interests or done without regard to consequences. A reasonably prudent person would anticipate economic damages [if show statement made and false then there exists presumption of malice]

That results in special damages, including loss of prospective economic advantage

*Tortious interference with prospective contractual relations* [Protects person in acquiring property. Where a contract would have been entered into but for malicious conduct of 3P].

Relationship with 3P that creates expectancy of future contractual relations

Defendant interferes with that relationship

Malice = Defendant's sole purpose is to harm plaintiff or defendant engaged in fraud

Economic injury, which includes loss of opportunities for profit