

The Men's Human Rights Movement - Key Issues in Brief

Last Update: 13/7/16

- The education system is failing boys and young men. When girls did less well than boys at school (as they did when I was young) it was axiomatic that this must be discrimination. Now the reverse is true, no one dares blame discrimination. Instead it is said to be the boys' own fault - for being boys.
- There are now ~35% more women graduates per year than men in the UK, and the difference is growing. (In the USA and Canada women students are approaching double the number of men. In the USA, Canada and Sweden positive discrimination has been widely exercised to favour women in obtaining university posts). Women are massively dominant as university under-graduates in teaching, nursing, law, psychology, veterinary medicine, languages and medicine. 76% of undergraduates are studying subjects dominated by women. Women now dominate even in STEMM.
- There are huge, well funded programmes, with the backing of leading politicians, unions and professional institutes aimed at encouraging more women into traditional male occupations, e.g., STEM areas. In 2014 Google announced \$50M funding to encourage women into coding. The UK government spends tens of millions of pounds encouraging women into engineering. In contrast, nothing is being done to get more men into female dominated areas, e.g., primary school teaching where they are currently 12% of the staff and decreasing. But gender balance in the classroom is more important than in STEM occupations. The latter only benefits the individual, since it makes no difference to society whether a bridge is designed by a man or a woman, whereas the whole rising generation is affected by education.
- One in four children in the UK is raised in a single parent household, in 90% of which the parent is the mother. These children then attend a primary school with few, possibly no, male teachers. Even at secondary school there are now twice as many female teachers as male teachers. Huge numbers of children, both girls and boys, are growing up having never had a personal relationship with any adult male. The impact on children of being raised in a single parent family is seriously adverse on every metric: educational attainment, employment prospects, exposure to abuse, gang involvement, criminality and drug taking. The phenomenon of absent fathers is often blamed on the men themselves ("deadbeat dads"). But this ignores the fact that the ideology driving the social changes over the last 50 years, feminism, had removal of men from the family as its principle objective.
- Partner abuse of men by women is as common as the reverse, and yet this is little recognised and receives almost no public sympathy or government support. Instead the narrative is of solely male perpetrators and female victims, contrary to the empirical truth. This contributes to the "men bad, women good" myth which drives the general misandry. It also provides huge levels of funding to feminist organisations (which many have claimed are misappropriated for political activities).
- Men's life expectancy is shorter than that of women and yet far less is spent on research into male-only diseases than into female-only diseases (e.g., both breast cancer and prostate cancer kill ~10,000 people per year each in the UK, but the latter receives one-third the funding of the former. Prostate cancer has no national screening programme, unlike breast cancer).

- Men's suicide rate is increasing, women's decreasing, with men committing suicide at nearly four times the rate of women, and eleven times the rate following break-up with a partner. If these statistics were reversed, there would be a vigorous and well funded programme to help the unfortunate women. As it is, the facts are well known but no action is taken. To put this in context, in England & Wales, the number of women killed by their partners in 2013 was 76; the number of men committing suicide was 4,035 (and 1123 women suicides). Whilst I would not wish to minimise the seriousness of domestic violence, it is reasonable to question whether society has these issues in proper perspective.
- Men have no paternity rights. It is a woman's "right to choose" regarding abortion, a principle with which I agree. But that currently leaves the man with no choice. He may be obliged to become a father to a child he did not want, and face a major financial liability for 18 years as a result. The equitable arrangement would be for men to have the choice whether to accept paternal responsibility or to decline it ("legal paternal surrender"). The expectant mother should not be entitled to expect financial support from an unwilling father, as at present. Women should exercise their choice responsibly, which includes not bringing a child into the world unless they have the means of financially supporting it without relying on the state to be a surrogate father - or relying on the state to force fatherhood on an unwilling man.
- At least 10% of fathers are helping to raise a child which they believe to be theirs but is not. Paternity fraud is unique in being an extremely heinous crime and also extremely common but never prosecuted. The financial fraud involved is huge, but the emotional abuse is worse still. Imagine the sociological explosion if 10% of mothers discovered the hospital had sent them home with the wrong baby. But oddly men are supposed to just accept this - despite the fact that a reliable, cheap and very simple DNA test will establish the truth. But in the UK the *de facto* position is that a man cannot get a legally accepted DNA test without the mother's permission. (And a man who does not already have parental responsibility is breaking the law if he carries out an informal DNA test). In short, a man is not permitted to know if a child is his - an outrageous human rights violation. A man, whatever his suspicions, will be disinclined to ask the mother for a DNA test because this would be an admission of lack of trust. The solution is simple: the law should require a DNA test automatically for every man who plans to accept paternal responsibility. At present the state colludes with women to get a man - any man - to pay for child support to avoid the state having to do so.
- Feminists insist that we live in a "rape culture", referring, of course, exclusively to female victims. Whilst rape of women certainly happens, our culture is not one which condones rape, even covertly, since rapists are universally regarded as the vilest of creatures. Rape cultures do exist, in three places. Firstly, in certain war zones (where men and women are both victims). Secondly, in men's prisons in some countries. In the USA, more men are raped than women, due to the prison rape culture. Australia is similar. I believe the situation may not be as bad in UK prisons, though this is unclear since no one cares enough to collect the data. The third rape culture of which I am aware is that of street boys in Afghanistan and Pakistan.
- In English law, rape is defined as non-consensual penetration with a penis, hence women cannot rape. No element of force whatsoever is required. Rape hinges upon consent. It is no defence against an accusation of rape to claim that the penetrated party gave no sign of lack of consent. The onus is on the man to proactively obtain explicit consent. The mere absence of any indication to the

contrary is not sufficient to avert the crime of rape. Advice on the interpretation of the law has been given by the Crown Prosecution Service, "*the Law imposes an evidential burden on the defendant to adduce sufficient evidence that the complainant consented*". This effectively means that every man is a rapist on every sexual encounter since such evidence is never available in practice. Sex is therefore not legally advisable for men - at all, ever, even in marriage - unless extreme precautions are taken such as video evidence of verbal consent or a signed contract. Even these would be legally challengeable. There is much talk of better sex education in schools. The most important fact that boys should be told is that sex for men can become rape simply because the woman chooses to regard it as such. Rape has become a crime which is not objectively verifiable, even if expert witnesses were present throughout. This is how the law now stands, incredible though that seems.

- Women force or coerce men into having sex with them equally often as the reverse. The latter is rape whereas the former is not. Women's sexual coercion of men could technically be claimed to constitute the offence of "causing a person to engage in sexual activity without consent", but in practice there would be scant likelihood of a man bringing a successful case against a woman. This is simply discrimination on grounds of sex, since reversing the sex roles would be rape. It reflects the societal prejudice that women and girls are vulnerable and precious, but that men and boys are not. In practice, if not in theory, a man's consent is not required; a woman can force sex upon any man with impunity. And it happens frequently. US data indicates that the prevalence of non-consensual sex imposed on men by women is 1.1% per year (the same as the incidence of rape of women). No comparable UK data are available since the surveys have not asked the relevant questions regarding male victimisation.
- US and Canadian data indicate that boys and girls are raped equally often, and that the rape of boys is committed by women about 50% of the time (female rapists are recognised in the USA). Similarly, about half of boys reporting to UK Childline of being sexually abused by a parent are abused by their mothers. But women are rarely prosecuted for sexual assault. In the UK, less than 3% of people on the sex offenders register are women, and for every 130 men in prison for sexual offenses there is only one woman in prison for a sexual offense. On the other hand, between 60% and 80% of men convicted of sexual offenses against females have a history of being sexually abused by women in their childhood (US and Canadian data). There is a wild inconsistency here, implying that female sex offenders are going undetected. This is aided by the societal prejudice that "women do not do such things" ("men bad, women good").
- The treatment of men in the (laughably named) family courts is outrageously inequitable as regards the custody of, or access to, their children. Women initiate divorce in 2 out of 3 cases and are given residential custody of the children in 90% of cases. 40% of divorced women admit that they have no intention of allowing their ex to ever see their children again. (The children are used as a means of exacting retribution on the ex, known as "parental alienation"). Court orders to permit the ex-husband visiting rights are routinely ignored with impunity by the mother. The mother can easily make it impossible for the man to visit (not being in, moving to another city, etc). Such court orders are never enforced nor the mother punished for flouting them. Men fighting for custody or visiting rights invariably have to pay their own legal expenses. Women generally get legal aid (as of 2015 this may have changed, but organisations such as Women's Aid will provide funding, but only to women). False accusations that the husband has been abusive in the marriage are common. No evidence is

necessary, the accusation alone is sufficient for an automatic order to be issued forbidding the man any further contact with wife or children. Nor is it required that there ever be an investigation of any kind to establish whether there was any truth in the accusations. This tactic is commonly deployed, often being encouraged by the woman's solicitor since it considerably accelerates and simplifies the process of syphoning everything to the woman and there is no possibility of being exposed. For this parade of discrimination the male victim receives the title "Deadbeat Dad" in the public consciousness.

- Feminism has been ideologically opposed to marriage from the start. The success of the movement is proved by the prevalence of single mothers in comparison to 40 years ago (25% of families with dependent children are single parent families, 90% of such parents being women). Not only does this disadvantage men, in excluding them from the family, but more seriously the outcomes for the children of single parent families is known to be emphatic and serious in respect of every metric.
- The criminal justice system treats men and women in a grossly inequitable manner. If men were treated like women, the male prison population would be less than one-quarter of its current size (UK data). Despite this the political emphasis (e.g. the Corston Report) is for a more lenient, caring approach for women only - and the closure of women's prisons to make way for increasing numbers of male prisoners.
- Feminists, and leading politicians, make much of the so-called gender pay gap which ostensibly favours men. But actually women under 35 years old and working full time have a higher median hourly pay rate than men of the same age. In view of the greater number of women graduates, this disparity in favour of young women is set to increase. Any pay gap in favour of men sets in only once a woman has children. This is due to the woman's diminished commitment to work due to preferring to prioritise child care instead (and the new father's increased commitment to work in order to earn more to support the family). The so-called pay gap is actually a parenting gap. That the much vaunted pay gap is not valid is now admitted even by some feminists, e.g., Hannah Rosin who has used the observation of women's higher pay to support her triumphalist cry of "The End of Men" (book title). When women earned less it was discrimination, now that men earn less it is because men are useless has-beens. Nice.
- Whilst the pay gap is prominent in the popular narrative, no one ever mentions the spend gap. Who has the power: he who earns, or she who spends? Data may not be reliable, but estimates are that women account for 70%-80% of personal spending.
- We hear a great deal about the glass ceiling. We don't hear much about the glass basement in which most men are condemned to spend their lives. Women are keen to be equally represented as MPs, Head Teachers, Consultants, professors, members of the Board of large corporations, etc. We do not hear women demanding they should be equally represented as bin men, builders, roofers, welders, agricultural labourers, road diggers, miners, sewer workers, or any of the other nasty, dirty and often dangerous jobs that are virtually exclusively male - the sort of jobs that most men do.
- 96% of workplace fatalities are men (UK data). But increasingly men choosing to do dangerous jobs receive no pay benefit as a result because of arbitrary rulings about job "grade" (e.g., "dinner ladies" being equated with "bin men"). Just who is it making these arbitrary rulings? The operation of the free market is being subverted by political control.

- Men are twice as likely to be made redundant as women (UK data)
- Men (or boys) are twice as likely to be the victims of violence than women (or girls), and yet there are constant exhortations that we should "end violence against women" without any such concern for men or boys - who are only presented in such policies as the perpetrators of violence.
- Around 90% of the homeless are men (UK data)
- 99% of war deaths and injuries are men. Despite women having won the right to join the armed forces, and now constituting around 10% of the armed services in the UK, they are generally kept out of harm's way - pseudo-equality. (In the USA, men are obliged to sign up for the draft or face prison. Women have no such obligation, despite having the right to join up if they wish).
- Destruction of male spaces: Feminists have systematically sought to gain access to every space which might previously have been all-male, whilst at the same time demanding they retain all-female "safe spaces" for themselves. For example, gentlemen's clubs have come under pressure to admit women, and are the subject of verbal abuse if they do not oblige - so almost all have done so. The Prime Minister has seen fit to hint that gentlemen's clubs should be banned. But there is no shortage of women's clubs, including the exclusive, Kensington type so much derided when they are all-male - and they never come in for any criticism. The cubs, the scouts and the army cadets have all long since admitted girls. But the brownies and guides steadfastly refuse to admit boys. Few boys would want to join, of course, but that is not the point. It is a double standard to insist that females have the choice of all-female or mixed sex spaces, as they wish - but boys will never be permitted spaces of their own. When I was at Cambridge the colleges were predominantly men-only, with a few mixed sex and three all-women colleges. There are now no all-male colleges, but there are still three all-female colleges. Most wicked of all is the refusal by the feminist dominated NUS to permit men's groups on university campuses. Men's groups will be tolerated by these totalitarians only if organised under the control of the Feminist Society. This outlawing of male spaces is one of the most pernicious tactics of the feminist hegemony. Men and boys are being denied even that most basic fundamental right - the right to be left alone. Ever wondered why fishing is so popular?
- Female genital mutilation is illegal (and rightly so). Contrary to popular belief, male genital mutilation is also illegal - but it is tolerated and generally regarded as fine and dandy. There is even an impression that it is healthy. Most people believe that circumcision affects only Jews and Muslims. But in all Anglophone countries the majority of men circumcised are not circumcised for religious reasons. In the UK 5% of the population is Jewish or Muslim, but 16% of men are circumcised. In the USA 2.7% of the population is Jewish or Muslim, but 56% of men are circumcised. The origin of the popularity of circumcision amongst nominally "white Christian" men was the Victorians' obsession with preventing masturbation. Circumcision was, in fact, always intended to degrade sexual function, despite the protestations that it does not do so. If you wish to discover the true effects of circumcision on men's sexual function you should ask the circumcised men themselves (see <http://nocirc.org/> and <http://www.circumcisionharm.org/>). Anyone can carry out genital mutilation of a boy in the UK. No medical qualification is necessary. Practitioners may use a pair of ordinary scissors. One woman, who charges £100 a go, caused a baby boy to bleed to death this way. Charged with homicide she got a suspended sentence. Switch the gender roles around: a man genitally mutilates a baby girl with a pair of scissors and she bleeds to death. How long would he get inside? 15 years? This

is equality? No, it is a measure of the relative worth of males and females. In the USA alone more than 100 boys die of entirely unnecessary circumcision operations annually - and these are done under proper surgical conditions, unlike those in most Muslim countries. Worldwide, no one knows how many boys die of botched circumcisions, but it must be in the order of tens of thousands per year. Many times more than this are permanently maimed. You want to see the photos? (no, you don't - gangrene is common).

- Finally, an issue I have not (yet) seen discussed on MRA sites. I am increasingly aware of the gender-bias of charities, e.g., a charitable event for breast cancer will not allow you to hand out fliers advertising a forthcoming event in aid of prostate cancer. Charities supporting third world countries increasingly have campaigns aimed specifically and solely at women and girls. Not only is this overtly biased but it has a pernicious effect. What poor African man, especially if he is also a refugee, can compete against an international aid organisation in providing for his family? He cannot, and hence men are being cut out of the picture altogether. Aid is given directly to the women and men are made irrelevant to the family unit. Consequently the men have no role. Alcoholism, suicide or joining armed gangs become common. Charities are not nice, benign organisations - they are political. Their effect in the third world is to play out the same scenario as here: to encourage women to replace husbands with the state, or, in this case, the aid organisation.
- Finally, if you ever talk about any of the above, you're a misogynist. But you must understand that "misogynist" no longer means "woman hater", it now means "heretic" against the religion that feminism has become.