



Equal Rights for Men and Women

Patrons:

Sir Peter Bottomley Former MP

Mr Mark Brooks OBE

**Registered Charity No.
1107795**

Email: secretary@parity-uk.org

Website: <https://parity.charity/>

HAPPY NEW YEAR TO ALL OUR READERS

1. Victory in Europe - (VE Day) 8 May 1945 and Victory Over Japan - (VJ Day) 1945 2
2. Prostate Cancer – Sound Advice? 4
3. Scottish Misogyny Bill 5
4. Equal Rights and the Realities of Domestic Violence: Freya Webster’s Story 11
5. Latest Statistics Regarding Domestic Violence Against Men and Male Suicide Rates in the UK 13
6. The Case of John Nicholson 14
7. An Equal Opportunity to Face Fire 16
8. International Men’s Day 19
9. Men’s Health Strategy for England Core Principles 21
10. The Two-Parent Privilege by Melissa Kearney:a Review 23
11. Title IX for All: Jonathan Taylor 31
12. Are Men Oppressed Now? 36
13. It’s a fact: prostate cancer now England’s most common cancer 40

HON. TREASURER VACANCY

This appears on our website – see URL below and back page:
<https://parity.charity/hon-treasurer-job-role-parity-charity-september-2023/>

Also it will be featured on the Reach platform soon.
Search for: Treasurer Area: EN6 5JT

<https://reachvolunteering.org.uk/i-want-volunteer>

VICTORY IN EUROPE- (VE DAY) 8 MAY 1945 AND VICTORY OVER JAPAN – (VJ DAY) 1945 BY JOHN MAYS

Last year we celebrated the 80th anniversary of D-Day on the 6th June. This year 11 months later we will be celebrating VE day on the 8th May signifying the end of hostilities in Europe. An instrument of surrender was signed by General Eisenhower on behalf of the Allies and Hitler's successor as head of the German Government Admiral Donitz.

While this was not unexpected it was a huge relief after six years of war and scenes of excitement and joy spread throughout the Country. Princess Elizabeth and her sister Margaret joined the excited throngs in front of Buckingham Palace. Winston Churchill, the Great War leader (soon to lose power at the General Election) was on the Balcony with the Royal family.

There will be celebrations throughout the UK but it will not be a public holiday. In Wimbledon they will start in the village with a fish and chip supper (Fish and chips were the only meal not rationed during the war) to be served probably at the Rose and Crown followed by a service of remembrance at the Village War Memorial and the lighting of a VE DAY Beacon.

This will be followed by the Mayor of Merton and the piper leading the congregation from the War Memorial to the Windmill. There the celebration will include the reading of the VE Day Proclamation by the Mayor followed by spoken

contributions and the National Anthem. At the time of going to press details are still being worked out.

South East England had had a particularly bad few months prior to VE Day; the so called V1 (nicknamed the doodlebug) and V2 rockets had been devastating for civilian morale. The first was a slow burning rocket which could be heard and whilst you could still hear it but when it cut out you knew it would fall in your vicinity. The V2 was even worse; it was supersonic and thus arrived without warning.

These two weapons were on top of the devastation of previous years, in Wimbledon 150 civilians were killed and over 1000 injured. 14,000 homes were destroyed or damaged. For the whole of Merton 770 servicemen and women were killed while the figure for Wimbledon is estimated at 61.

The war, of course, was not over and in a sense the celebrations were premature. Japan did not surrender and in fact the fighting in the Far East continued as fiercely as before. British troops in Burma (the Chindits) were engaged in the same desperate struggle as hitherto. Prisoners of war who were treated with appalling brutality continued to suffer. It seemed likely in the aftermath of the 8th May celebrations that we would continue to fight for years rather than months.

We knew nothing of the Manhattan Project until the 6th August when news broke of a new and dreadful weapon, the atomic bomb which was dropped on Hiroshima on 6th August. In some ways this is perhaps the most significant event ushering in a new era in the worlds' history of warfare. The second bomb on Nagasaki on the 9th August reinforced the effectiveness of the weapon. Casualties in each case ran into hundreds of thousands.

Japan surrendered on the 15th August although it took some time for the fighting to cease and in fact in some parts of the world eg; The United States the surrender is celebrated later on the 2nd September.

These events were by any measure the most significant of the 20th century. World War 2 killed more people and ravaged

more countries and more lives than any previous conflict. The world was a different place after it finished. We were not to know at the time but the Iron Curtain (Churchill's vivid phrase) divided the world for the rest of the century and the effect is still felt in our lives today.

It seems a pity that the events of May 1945 are not being celebrated with a Public Holiday.

PROSTATE CANCER – SOUND ADVICE? BY REX BOURNE

Across the health economy, a number of health conditions can be monitored. There are screenings available for a range of conditions as patients are encouraged to be proactive in assessing. Prostate cancer has recently overtaken breast cancer as the most common cancer in the UK

In the case of Prostate cancer, no screening programme exists. Many men die living with it. Men need to be checked for Prostate cancer, certainly men from 50 years old and beyond. The first port of call is the GP surgery where you can book a PSA test. The important thing is to get the test even if you are completely symptom free. One in eight will be diagnosed with Prostate Cancer in our life-times. Staggeringly, 12,000 men die from it every year. Early diagnosis is absolutely crucial as early tumours can be monitored and treated.

Why is there no national screening programme one wonders? The breast cancer screening vehicles turn up in your supermarket car park every few months. We can though get a private MRI scan even if you just want reassurance.

Prostate cancer UK/NHS data shows cases have increased by 25 per cent in the last 5 years partly accounted for my men living longer with more cases of men in their eighties being diagnosed.

Benign prostatic hyperplasia is common in older men. A GP may undertake some tests but other will be done in a hospital setting. Your GP may advise lifestyle changes such as drinking less alcohol, caffeine and fizzy drinks, limited use of sweeteners, drinking less alcohol in the evening and increasing exercise.

So to summarise, whilst no national Prostate Cancer screening currently exists it is incumbent on men to be checked, initially with their GP and remembering early testing is the way to go.

SEE ALSO ARTICLE ON PAGE 40

SCOTTISH MISOGYNY BILL

BY ANDY BUTTERLY

Parity is setting up a working group to develop a strategy to challenge the Scottish Government's proposed "Misogyny Bill."

The proposed legislation is explicitly a gendered law: *"This Act will also depart from the established practice of having law that is neutral with regard to gender ... Treating as equal those who are not yet equal only furthers inequality."*

We find this legislation deeply troubling. It is explicitly discriminatory towards men and boys by design, being based on ideological grievances and rhetoric rather than empirical evidence of harm experienced by both sexes.

The justification for a gendered law is presented as the unequal nature of the harms and injustices suffered by women and girls: *"Treating as equal those who are not yet equal only furthers inequality."*

However, this framing of unequal suffering of women and girls is achieved by completely ignoring the harms and injustices suffered by men and boys.

This exclusion is explicit: *"By necessity, ... 'Misandry' has not featured. A parallel between misogyny and 'misandry' is immediately problematic when considered within the Working Group's definition of misogyny. ..."*

In other words, the working group concluded that the dictionary definition of misogyny was insufficient for their purposes, so they constructed their own ideological definition which they claim cannot be applied to men and boys.

Consequently, the male experience is effectively erased from the legal narrative.

If enacted, this bill would undermine the foundational principle of equality before the law. Setting a dangerous precedent for

legally sanctioned, ideologically driven discrimination – even beyond legally mandated anti-male discrimination. The potential ramifications of such a shift are profound.

Background

The proposed *Misogyny and Criminal Justice (Scotland) Bill* seeks to introduce new criminal offences to "address gender-based violence and harassment against women." These offences are gendered, meaning the gender of both the perpetrator and the victim will determine whether a crime has occurred or not.

In 2020, Scotland passed the *Hate Crime & Public Order (Scotland) Act*. However, the decision to include sex as a characteristic in this legislation was deferred, instead of doing so, the Scottish Government set up a review specifically and exclusively focusing on "misogyny".

In 2021, the Scottish Government established the *Working Group on Misogyny and Criminal Justice in Scotland*, led by Baroness Helena Kennedy KC.

<https://gov.scot/publications/misogyny-human-rights-issue>

The Working Group recommended the creation of new criminal offences, including:

Proposed Offences

1. **Public Misogynistic Harassment** - Despite the title, the Administration is proposing this apply in public and private places. The proposed offence had originally been intended to cover public sexual harassment, behaviour which the UK Government research found comprised about a third male victims. It includes but is not limited to things such as degrading comments or catcalling.'

<https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/LLN-2023-0033.pdf>

Example: A man tells a woman she is fat, ugly, and sexually loathsome in the presence of others. The man is charged with the proposed offence of misogynistic harassment. The maximum penalty for this offence is up to seven years'

imprisonment. Should a woman make the same comments to a man, in the same circumstances, then no crime would have been committed.

See: [Reforming the criminal law to address misogyny: consultation - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](https://www.gov.scot/consultation/Reforming-the-criminal-law-to-address-misogyny-consultation) (Chapter 1).

2. **Misogynistic Behaviour or Communications** - This offence is intended to cover behaviour, where the action is reckless as to whether it might cause a woman or girl to suffer fear, alarm, degradation, humiliation or distress.

Example: A group of men at a stag party loudly discussing graphic sexual topics about women in public could be charged with misogynistic behaviour. However, a group of women at a hen party having a similar conversation about men is deemed acceptable under freedom of speech.

3. **Stirring Up Hatred Against Women** - This offence would criminalise stirring up hatred against women.

Example: A preacher who says that women should be physically punished for adultery could be charged with stirring up hatred against women. If the same preacher later says that men should be physically punished for adultery, no crime would have been committed.

See [Reforming the criminal law to address misogyny: consultation - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](https://www.gov.scot/consultation/Reforming-the-criminal-law-to-address-misogyny-consultation) (Chapter 4).

4. **Threats or Invocations of Rape or Sexual Assault** - This offence would criminalise threats or invocations, which reference rape, sexual assault, or disfigurement, whether made in person or online.

Example: A man tells a woman, "I'd love to watch you get your f*****g teeth kicked in," and is charged with threatening communications. A woman makes the same statement to a man, and it is deemed to fall under freedom of speech as it is considered an expression of preference, not a direct threat.

See: [Reforming the criminal law to address misogyny: consultation - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](https://www.gov.scot/consultation/Reforming-the-criminal-law-to-address-misogyny-consultation) (Chapter 2).

Additional Measures

- **Aggravation of Existing Offences:** *Supposed* misogyny could be treated as an aggravating factor in other crimes, resulting in harsher penalties for offences motivated by misogyny (no aggravation for misandry).

See [Reforming the criminal law to address misogyny: consultation - gov.scot \(www.gov.scot\)](http://www.gov.scot) (Chapter 3).

- **Data Collection:** There is a proposal to enhance data collection on misogynistic crimes to improve monitoring and enforcement efforts.

Support for the Bill

- **Scottish Human Rights Commission (SHRC):** The SHRC is largely supportive of the bill, though it cautions that any interference with freedom of expression must be proportionate.

[misogyny-bill-consultation-response-final-version-commission-approved-28june23.pdf \(scottishhumanrights.com\)](http://scottishhumanrights.com)

- **Law Society of Scotland:** The Law Society is also broadly supportive but raises concerns about definitions and suggests extending the bill further to address certain non-threatening conduct by men.

For example, where a man who makes conversational request is:

- a. Polite, and
- b. Does not say anything which could be reasonably construed as threatening, and
- c. Does not say anything sexual.

[23-06-02-crim-equ-reforming-the-criminal-law-to-address-misogyny-final-002.pdf \(lawscot.org.uk\)](http://lawscot.org.uk)

Summary of Issues

- **Discriminatory Nature:** The bill proposes criminalising certain conduct by men toward women that would be legal if performed by women toward men.

For example:

- "You are fat, ugly, and sexually loathsome" could be illegal when said by a man to a woman but legal the other way around.
- Implied threats such as, "I'd like to watch you get your f*****g teeth kicked in," depending on the gender of the speaker and the target, would be treated differently.
- Statements suggesting physical punishment for adultery are treated differently based on whether men or women are the subject.
- **Disparity in Sanctions:** The proposed law could result in harsher penalties for men, even when the same conduct is performed by women.
- **Broad Scope:** The bill applies to both public and private conduct and may cover speech or conduct not specifically directed at any individual. This raises concerns about overreach.
- **Severity of Penalties:** Sentences of up to 5-7 years may be disproportionate to the offences in question, particularly where freedom of speech protections are unclear.
- **Exclusion of Misandry:** The deliberate exclusion of misandry as a criminal offence, despite evidence of gender-based hostility toward men, further highlights the gender imbalance.

Other Points

- As mentioned above, Baroness Kennedy's Working Group has explicitly departed from the dictionary definition of misogyny, adopting its own definition, making it more accurate to refer to this as a *Gendered Law Bill* rather than a *Misogyny Bill*.
- The premise of the Working Group of "*treating as equal those who are not yet equal only furthers inequality*" requires no evidence and can be used to justify virtually any form of discrimination under the guise of justice.

- The report dismissed the need for protections against misandry, stating, "There is no pervasive male equivalent to misogyny." However, this can be argued this position is an expression of systemic misandry itself.
- It is concerning that these views are largely unchallenged and accepted as fact by organisations and institutions.

Working Group

Parity has set up a Working Group to develop a strategy to challenge this legislation. Key concerns for the working group include:

- **Overreach of Criminal Law:** The proposed law disproportionately targets one gender (men and boys), while offering protections only to the other gender (women and girls).
- **Gender Discrimination:** Men and boys may be excluded from legal protections in situations where their human rights are violated, including under Articles 2 (Right to life), 3 (Protection from degrading treatment), and 8 (Right to private life).
- **Unequal Treatment:** The bill creates a framework where men and women are treated differently for the same behaviour, leading to potential violations of equality before the law.

The Working Group will review what avenues are available to mount a challenge and investigate opportunities for funding.

We are committed to challenging this discriminatory legislation and will keep you updated on our progress in future newsletters.

One thing we can be sure on is that challenging this legislation will require considerable financial resources, well beyond Parity's current means. If you would like to support this effort, donations can be made at the following link and would be most gratefully received:

<https://cafdonate.cafonline.org/12864#!/DonationDetails>

Please consider sharing this article and encourage interested parties to donate using the link.

EQUAL RIGHTS AND THE REALITIES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE: FREYA WEBSTER'S STORY **BY GABRIEL OBREMPONG NYANTEH**

In a striking Daily Mail article published on 3 February 2025, Freya Webster shared her harrowing account of a childhood marred by domestic abuse—a narrative that challenges the traditional stereotypes surrounding gender and violence. Today, I am here to relay her story, one that not only exposes the complexities of abuse but also underscores the urgent need for equal rights and comprehensive support systems for all.

Freya's early years were spent in a seemingly respectable middle-class household. Yet behind closed doors, the warmth of family life was replaced by a chilling reality. Her mother's violent outbursts, which saw her and her siblings battered relentlessly, painted a picture far removed from the nurturing care society often expects from a parent. Freya recalls how, on one fateful morning before school, her mother's use of a chunky walking stick left her in a state of dread—so much so that she truly believed she might not survive the ordeal.

This poignant recollection is a reminder that domestic abuse does not adhere to a single, easily identifiable form. In Freya's experience, the perpetrator was her own mother—a fact that disrupts the conventional narrative that primarily associates domestic violence with male aggressors. Her story serves as a powerful testament to the notion that abuse, regardless of the gender of the abuser, inflicts deep and lasting harm.

Throughout her narrative, Freya highlights the pervasive silence that often surrounds domestic violence. The cycle of abuse was maintained not only by the physical brutality but also by an emotional isolation that rendered the victims helpless and complicit. Even her father, a silent witness to the cruelty at home, was trapped by societal expectations and

found himself unable to intervene or even fully comprehend the extent of the torment.

In sharing her painful journey, Freya also reflects on the complex bond that exists between a child and their abuser. Despite the brutality, there remained an inextricable connection—a love that was as confusing as it was painful. This ambivalence underscores the multifaceted nature of abuse and the long-lasting impact it has on a person’s ability to trust, form relationships, and feel safe in their own skin.

Freya’s story, as recounted in the Daily Mail, is not merely a personal memoir; it is a call for a broader societal reckoning. It is a plea to recognise that domestic violence is not confined to any one gender or class. True progress lies in dismantling outdated notions and ensuring that support is available to every victim, irrespective of their background.

A Call to Action: Support Parity

In the spirit of forging a society where every individual is accorded equal rights and protection, I urge you to support Parity, a charity dedicated to championing equal rights for all genders. Parity provides vital mental health support, advocacy, and education for survivors of domestic violence. Their work is essential in challenging harmful stereotypes and creating a safe environment where everyone can thrive without the threat of abuse.

By supporting Parity, you are not only assisting those who have suffered in silence—you are investing in a future where equal rights are a reality, not an aspiration. Let Freya’s story be a catalyst for change. Join the movement to ensure that domestic violence, in all its forms, is addressed head-on, and that every individual can live free from fear and violence.

Equal rights are not a privilege; they are a human right. Stand with Parity and help make a difference today.

Should you wish to help Parity and donate:

<https://cafdonate.cafonline.org/12864#!/DonationDetails>

LATEST STATISTICS REGARDING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AGAINST MEN AND MALE SUICIDE RATES IN THE UK: BY SAMAVIA ZAFAR

- **Prevalence:** According to the Office for National Statistics (ONS), an estimated 751,000 men (3.2% of the male population) aged 16 and over experienced domestic abuse in England and Wales in the year ending March 2023 (*Domestic Abuse Victim Characteristics, England and Wales – ONS, 2023*). *Domestic abuse victim characteristics, England and Wales - Office for National Statistics*
- **Lifetime Risk:** According to the Office for National Statistics (ONS), about 13.9% of men in the UK will experience domestic abuse in their lifetime. This is based on data from the year ending March 2023 *Domestic abuse victim characteristics, England and Wales - Office for National Statistics*
- **Reporting Rates:** A significant number of male victims do not report their experiences. In 2022/23, 21% of male victims did not tell anyone about the abuse they suffered (Mankind Initiative, 2023). *Statistics on Male Victims of Domestic Abuse - Mankind*

Male Suicide Rates:

- **Overall Rate:** According to ONS (office for national statistics) In 2023, the suicide rate for males in England and Wales was 17.4 deaths per 100,000 men, the highest since 1999. *Suicides in England and Wales - Office for National Statistics*
- **Age Group Most Affected:** Office for National Statistics provides that, men aged 45 to 49 had the highest suicide rate, with 25.5 deaths per 100,000 in 2023. *Suicides in England and Wales - Office for National Statistics*
- **Gender Disparity:** Males accounted for approximately 74% of all suicides in the UK in 2023, continuing a trend observed since the mid-1990s. (As stated by Office for National Statistics, 2023) *Suicides in England and Wales - Office for National Statistics*

These statistics highlight the significant challenges men face regarding domestic abuse and mental health. It's crucial to

raise awareness and provide support to address these issues effectively.

THE CASE OF JOHN NICHOLSON **BY DAVID HYATT**

The case of John Nicholson a few years ago is mystifying and depressing for anyone who cares about genuine gender equality and fairness.

The crown court in Carlisle heard the case of the 59 year old defendant from Dumfries who was found guilty of "coercive and controlling behaviour" during more than a decade of marriage. The "controlling behaviour" allegedly lasted from 2009 until 2021 and examples were given in court.

During arguments he would sit cracking his knuckles in an intimidating way. He called her unpleasant names and told her she could not have an overnight stay as part of her union work training (a particularly heinous crime that one!) He referred to her mental health issues in an unpleasant way.

The woman's impact statement claimed she had felt broken and worthless as a result of his cruelty. She told the police how she would sit for hours staring at the TV crying and trembling (perhaps the result of an oversensitive reaction to a harrowing scene from Coronation Street?)

A police investigation began after a police officer had spoken to the woman during a dispute with a neighbour (perhaps also involving allegedly "coercive and controlling behaviour"?)

After the arrest of Nicholson she claimed in court that she began to feel safe and calm in her home but she was still "looking over her shoulder".

At the end of the trial the judge said that "this case illustrates precisely the kind of controlling behaviour that the offence was created to deal with. Turning to Wilkinson the judge announced, "you controlled this woman to such an extent that her mental health collapsed".

But is it possible that her mental health was sadly already vulnerable at the time she originally met Nicholson and that this ultimately led to her making allegations against him? I suspect that the court wasn't interested in this sad possibility but was rather driven by a misandrist agenda from the start.

So Wilkinson was finally sentenced to 30 months in prison.

But wouldn't 30 days have been more appropriate? One could argue of course that he didn't deserve prison at all.

If there had been evidence of actual violence then a prison sentence would have been justified. A man hitting a woman (or for that matter a woman hitting a man) is a serious offence.

But THIS?! How serious is it and how easily manipulated by anyone dishonest or manipulative, in order to demonise someone who never really committed a genuine offence? Being "controlling" is such a complex and subjective allegation. Is it possible to feel "controlled" even when the alleged perpetrator is making no effort to "control" anyone.....

Actual physical violence is relatively easy to prove. It leaves marks and bruises. But how on earth can one prove "controlling and coercive" behaviour. As for cracking one's knuckles I must confess I am sometimes guilty of that myself. Does that mean a female in the vicinity could claim I am doing it in an intimidating way and am therefore guilty of an offence?!

There are clearly double standards here. If a man were to complain that he had been compulsively sitting for hours in front of the TV because of his wife's cruel behaviour, then they would laugh it off.

But it's impossible to laugh off the toxic influence of misandrist militant feminism on our society.

John Nicholson is apparently the real victim here. He may well be a toxic selfish and unpleasant individual but those are not grounds for imprisonment surely.

There's no doubt that "controlling and abusive behaviour" does feature in this case - but the real perpetrators are the powerful militant radical misandrists who campaigned to bulldoze this legislation through in the first place.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TO FACE FIRE

BY EDWARD CRABTREE

The new prospect of conscription being introduced in the West could provide a real litmus test of just how serious we are about sex equality.

Just last year a young South Korean man was convicted of trying to eat his way out of military conscription. With the encouragement of a friend he binge ate with the aim of gaining excess weight. He did so to make himself ineligible for the male only draft that all South Korean men aged between 18 and 28 have had to observe since the Korean war. It was only by promising that he would fulfil his military duties after all did the young man escape being jailed. Even his accomplice received a six- month suspended sentence.

The man's actions reflect a widespread sentiment. A recent poll revealed that 72% of South Korean men in their twenties hold the draft to constitute `gender discrimination`. Among other things, it is felt that its existence advantages women in the job market (*CNN World, 26th November 2024*).

A duty for men.

So much a part of the fabric of reality is male only conscription that we hardly ever stop to question it. Male conscription during war time and military service in peace time remains an ever-present option in Western societies, including those that regard themselves as beacons of gender emancipation.

Allies of ours, already in conflict, reinforce the draft in draconian ways. In the Ukraine all men between the ages of 18 and 60 have been banned from leaving the border of their country (*CNN World, 25th February 2022*). In Russia, meanwhile things for men are not much better. There is no legal ban on leaving the country but a Sword of Damocles forever hangs over men in the form of digital call ups enforced by facial recognition technologies.

Should you imagine that the threat of such things belongs to distant lands or the far future then think again. As of last year, the top brass has been positing the return of military service for men in America and Western Europe. Chairman of NATO's Military Committee Admiral Rob Bauer has been quoted as saying that military conscription might well be back on the agenda (*METRO, 11th January, 2024*). This view was then echoed by the Head of the British Army Sir Patrick Saunders who said that conscription should be `considered` (*The Mirror, 24th January 2024*).

Attempts at redress.

It was in April 2013 that the male equality pressure group National Coalition for Men made headlines by launching a legal challenge to the sexism of the male only draft in America. There, since 1948, a Selective Service System has required all men from the age of 18 to register with the military in case needed. Failure to do so can result in a 250,000-dollar fine or five years imprisonment. The N.C.F.M's lawsuit hinged on the new fact that there were a quarter of a million women in the armed forces and, as of that year, they were taking up full combat roles. In this way, the justification for a male-only draft had been rendered obsolete.

The response from the Supreme Court? They dodged the claim by saying that they deferred to Congress on matters military (*Reuters, June 8th 2021*).

A few years later, however, a Federal Judge - U.S District Judge Gray Miller - came out in agreement with the challenge.

`...if there ever was a time`, he said. `to discuss the place of women in the Armed Services the time has passed`. He also added: `combat roles no longer uniformly require sheer size of muscle`. His findings, though, were only `advisory`. (*Blaze Media, February 24th 2019*).

Articles in influential journals have also appeared calling for a universal draft. James Durso, writing in *The Hill* argued that:

`This is a necessary and fair step making it possible to draw on the talent of a unified nation in a time of national emergency` (*The Hill, 26th August 2022*).

Some women of the kind that might well identify as feminists have also added their voices to the mix. Armed Services Committee Member Rep. Jackie Spencer said:

`If we want equality in this country, want women to be treated precisely like men are treated...we should support universal conscription` (*ncr online.org, June 28th 2016*).

Even American public opinion seems to have shifted on this thorny matter. An Ipsos poll conducted in 2021 found that 55% of men and 36% of women felt that the time had come for a gender-neutral draft in America.

A reality now.

There already exist around twenty countries which conscript women in some form. Israel, Eritrea, Mali, Morocco, North Korea and Tunisia fully draft women. Benn, Cape Verde, Mozambique, Sweden and Norway require women to register with the military.

Leading the way among NATO nations, Norway was the first among them to introduce a universal draft of sorts in 2015. All of those born after 1997 are expected to sign up, although the ones who get to serve are selected (*securitywomen.org, 27th June 2017*).

Warrior women.

While the male-only draft must count as the Ground Zero of unequal sex legislation, the idea of women facing the hazards of warfare is often met with a visceral rejection. All the familiar appeals to how female input would enrich a once male-only domain tend to get forgotten here. This not only comes from feminist-minded people but also, and maybe in particular, conservative men who pale at the very thought of sending our daughters to the slaughter. Women, you see, lack the war gene.

How true is this really though? Take the controversial American military offensive in Kuwait and Iraq in the first Gulf War. 86%

of American men polled were in favour of this, but so were 76% of women (*National Coalition for Men, 17th November 2011*).

Nor are women bearing arms some contemporary deviation. Two decades or so ago, a group of archaeologists unearthed something unexpected. Excavating an Imperial tomb from the Han dynasty in the Shaanxi Province in China, they found a phalanx of fifty terracotta representations of warrior women with wooden chain mail and swords in their grasp. This was dated from 2,000 years ago. (*Medium.com, June 19th, 2021*).

What is it good for?

Warfare gathers few open advocates in our time. Yet, like a pustule it just keeps on breaking out all over the globe. The participants in this calamity will always claim that they would prefer peace but that their hands were forced.

No one should relish the possibility of women, as well as men, being expected to march toward the sound of gunfire. There is one way, however, in which real sex equality applied to military drafts could do us all a favour, beyond its immediate justice. The reality of our sisters, partners and daughters being called up to the frontlines could well motivate the governments of the world and their supporters, to feel anew the human cost of all the shooting and bombing – and seek out ways forward that are more jaw-jaw than war-war.

INTERNATIONAL MEN'S DAY 2024



On behalf of everyone at MBC (we run the UK International Men's Day platform) we would like to offer our wholehearted thanks to everyone who took part in #InternationalMensDay / International Men's Day yesterday. It was the best ever!.

It is also not 'over' as there are still lots number of talks and events this week and next – including a debate in Parliament.

Overall:

- At least 800 organisations were involved (it was so hard to keep up) with events, talks and positive messages about the contribution their male employees make. We have lots more to add to this list!
- 90/100k tweets and it was the third highest yesterday (any measures on other channels, please do feel free to send to us!).
- Landmark policy announcements especially Greater Manchester Combined Authority launched a gender-based violence plan for male victims of interpersonal violence (thank you to We Are Survivors for their work on this).
- Other policy announcements including the Victim Commissioner calling for a national strategy similar to the above – plus great domestic abuse research in male victims was announced in Northern Ireland.
- Plus more pushing on issues such as equal parenting and the importance of dads from the Fatherhood Institute, Elliot Rae, Lads Need Dads and others.
- Anniversaries such as Future Men's 20th, UK Men's Sheds Awards in Parliament and other awards for dads in Portsmouth and role models in Northampton. Even Enniskillen Castle was lit up.
- We found four male staff networks.
- Support from the Government plus lots of Government Department events too.
- Lots of fundraisers for men and boys' charities.
- ITV's Loose Men was a blast and TalkSport had a three hour men's mental health show.
- And of course, the public too with heartfelt messages to the men and boys in their lives.

Remember there's still lots more going on – check out our website or search on social media

We will be updating everything on the website and getting ready for 2025 in the new year.

Thank you from all the whole IMD UK Ambassador Team!

Ally, Ben, Caroline, Dan, Duncan, Geoffrey, Glen, Mark, Maz and Sonia

<https://www.menandboyscoalition.org.uk/newsevents/international-mens-day-2024/>

MEN'S HEALTH STRATEGY FOR ENGLAND: CORE PRINCIPLES

Two members of the Men and Boys Coalition have published a policy paper on the core principles of a Men's Health Strategy for England.

The paper has been written by Mark Brooks OBE and Associate Professor Caroline Flurey (published below). It aims to push forward a more detailed discussion on what a strategy would consist of and deliver in seeking to tackle the continuing crisis in men's health. It has been reviewed by Emeritus Professor of Men's Health, Professor Alan White.

Men's Health Strategy for England: Core Principles (pdf)

The aim of a Men's Health Strategy would be "improved men's health outcomes throughout their life course and a number of proposals in the policy paper include:

- A government minister, clinical director and ambassador with specific responsibility for men's health;
- Broadening health system 'opening times' and increasing points of access;
- Embedding men's health into health and social care training including at medical schools;
- Recruiting more men into health and social care employment roles;
- Ensuring society including communities and employers to better accept, empathise, acknowledge and encourage male help-seeking/vulnerability

- Tackling negative male-blaming tropes such as “toxic masculinity” and “men don’t talk.”

The crisis in men’s health that a strategy would seek to tackle can be seen by:

- One man in every five does not live until they are 65
- 88 men die prematurely every day from heart disease
- 33 men die every day from prostate cancer
- 17 men die every day from an alcohol-specific condition (more than double than women)
- 13 men die every day by suicide in the UK (three in every four) with a suicide rate increasing for the past three years (fifth highest this century). That is nearly 5,000 men every year
- Over ten men every month are killed in work-related accidents
- Men living in Birmingham, Ladywood are, on average, more than 3.5 times as likely to die prematurely than men living in Beckenham

Men’s health (which includes boys’ health) is now formally recognised as a distinct and specific part of health public policy, professional practice and public interest. It is recognised that both men’s health is in crisis and that gender-specific action is needed. This extends into social care.

There is a coalescence of opinion of the clear need for a Men’s Health Strategy. This is from within the political, professional practice and academic health community alongside the men’s health third sector.

The aim of a Men’s Health Strategy would be “improved men’s health outcomes throughout their life course”.

There has, however, been limited discussion on the actual shape, principles and deliverables in the context of a Men’s Health Strategy for England in achieving this aim.

This policy paper puts forward a broad Men’s Health Strategy based on five key pillars of delivery with an outline of key deliverables.

- Formal political and operational governance and accountability structures
- Improving accessibility, literacy and uptake
- Promoting men's health research, professional practice and employment initiatives
- Changing and challenging societal gender norms
- Addressing social determinants and intersectionality

The paper makes no distinction between men's mental and physical health, especially as they are so intertwined.

The proposals are broadly based on a range of policy and research papers/discussions within the men's health and wellbeing sector over the past three years. They are aimed at creating and pushing forward a more detailed discussion on what a strategy would consist of and deliver in seeking to tackle the continuing crisis in men's health.

Such a health strategy should, in principle, be also in place in the other three nations who have devolved responsibility for health.

For further information about this paper, please contact Mark Brooks via mark.brooks@marcommsformen.org.uk / 07834 452357

<https://www.menandboyscoalition.org.uk/uncategorized/mens-health-strategy-for-england-core-principles/>

THE TWO-PARENT PRIVILEGE BY MELISSA KEARNEY: A REVIEW

The subtitle of the book is, "How the decline in marriage has increased inequality and lowered social mobility, and what we can do about it".

Melissa Kearney is professor of economics at the University of Maryland. Her 2023 book [*The Two-Parent Privilege*](#) addresses the advantages to children of being raised in a family with both biological parents present – and, more specifically, the disadvantages to children being raised in single parent homes. She examines the causes of the hugely increased prevalence of single-mother families over the last 40 – 50 years. To do so

she holds strictly to solid empirical data. With her background this mainly involves quantifiable “resources”, of which income is the most readily available. The data relates to the USA. However, the results will be broadly similar in the UK – with the exception of the race issues, which may be specific to the American context.

She identifies the main reason for the rise of single mother households being the decline of marriage rather than due to divorce (which, I note, is also true in the UK, see [The Empathy Gap](#), section 13.3). Most single mothers were never married. Moreover she also emphasises that this decline of marriage is very strongly skewed to lower earners, which she aligns with those who do not have a four year college degree. This is again the same as in the UK (see [The Empathy Gap](#), section 13.4). In the upper socioeconomic strata, marriage has declined only a little. The decline of marriage drives fatherlessness which in turn causes multiple disadvantages to their children see [The Empathy Gap](#), chapter 14).

Kearney identifies the origin of the decline of marriage as being the falling relative earnings of non-college-educated men – relative, that is, both to the college educated (i.e., increasing inequality) and also relative to women in the same socioeconomic and educational category. This relative decline in male earnings results in such men being deemed less attractive as husbands by the corresponding women, even when they have a child together. The instability of unmarried cohabitation leads to single mother households even if this was not initially the case. In addition to those cases where the parents end up in conflict, and the father’s meaningful involvement with his child is frustrated by the mother, purely financial and logistical pressures also contribute to *de facto* fatherlessness.

The book describes how these factors, including the decline of marriage, are associated with increasing inequality and diminishing social mobility. (In my words, but not the author’s, feminism is the chief culprit here because [feminism deliberately set out to destroy the two-parent family](#) and so is responsible for all that follows in its wake). The book laments the vicious circle that arises as the reducing fortunes of boys from single parent homes then cause them to be less attractive “marriage material”, so that the situation is self-reinforcing in a form of positive feedback.

This situation is hardly a great deal for the single mothers, either, so men, women and children are all disadvantaged by these developments among the working class – and increasingly the lower reaches of the middle class. Again in my words, but not the author's, feminism – as a product of middle-class women – is a tool of the elites: the relatively wealthy, college-educated, do well enough while the rest sink.

Despite the clear relationship which Kearney demonstrates between the decline of non-college-educated men's earnings and the decline of marriage, and all that follows from that, the author also identifies evidence that these negative social effects will not now be reversed even if men's earnings were to be revived. She obtained evidence for this irreversibility from specific local instances of improved working class men's incomes, e.g., from towns with fracking booms, but these failed to be associated with an increased rate of marriage or a reduction in single motherhood. This she attributes to unidentified "social factors" which lie outside the reach of the data – and beyond the scope of issues she was willing to address.

She does, however, go on to discuss the reducing willingness of women to have children, especially when young. Undoubtedly this is a key contributory factor, though I wonder to what extent male reluctance is also involved. That fathers are routinely denied contact with their children by either belligerent mothers or hostile family courts is now well-known by young men and must surely influence their own willingness to father children.

Again, I must observe (though the author does not) that it is feminism more than any other factor which has driven the career-first ethos among young women. It has also been feminism that has energetically, and successfully, steered the family courts and associated legislation in a direction which facilitates the eradication of fathers. Among the working class, and increasingly much of the middle class, these feminist-driven socioeconomic changes have been bad for men, women and children, and have resulted in increasing inequality. Unfortunately, there are still too many people, of both sexes, who have failed to understand this and still regard feminism as synonymous with all that is lovely.

Early on, Kearney raises the question: "is it really the case that close to 40% of births in the US are to men who would not bring any positive resources (on net) into the home? Is it likely to be true that roughly 70% of births to non-college educate mothers are fathered by men with no positive resources to contribute to a family environment?" It is not clear to me that she ever answers this question. Perhaps in the context of earnings her answer is supposed to be implicit (and in the affirmative). But this is too limited an interpretation of "resources". Kearney makes clear in her own life that the "resources" a father brings is more than just cash. She writes, "I have a lot of resources to draw on, including a spouse who is a devoted dad to our children and a partner to me".

From that perspective the mothers' judgment regarding the "marriageability" of the fathers is, one could argue, rather unenlightened. The mothers' focus on financial issues alone, to the exclusion of "mere fatherhood", carries some culpability – as does feminism, yet again, for promoting the empirical falsity that fathers are unnecessary and often undesirable.

Whilst Kearney proposes remedially measures which appear reasonable to a degree, the "social factors" which prevent reversibility of the "marriageable men hypothesis" now create the principle barrier against returning to children being raised overwhelmingly by both biological parents. And what the solution may be regarding eradication of these "social factor" barriers is not addressed and yet this is probably even more difficult than the financial issues. It is worth noting here that [J.D.Unwin's anthropological analysis](#) unambiguously predicts that such situations are irreversible, leading to civilisational extinction.

Extracts from the book are as follows...

Disadvantage to children

"...a child born in a two-parent household with a family income of \$50,000 has, on average, better outcomes than a child born in a single-parent household earning the same income."

"...studies consistently indicate that children in stepfamilies tend to exhibit social and behavioural problems on a similar scale to children in single-parent homes, and more so than children living with continuously married biological parents."

"Researchers found that family structure was a key determinant of the gender gap in behavioural outcomes, more

so than early school environment...By eighth grade the gender gap in school suspension was close to 25% among children raised by single mothers, versus 10% among children from two biological parent families."

"The absence of dads from many Black families disadvantages not only the children in those families but also the other boys growing up in the neighbourhood."

Men's Decline in Relative Earnings Drives Decline in Marriage, Increases in Divorce and Increases in Single Mother Families

Referring to the impact of China joining the WTO on the economies of manufacturing towns in the USA, specifically the degrading of working class men's incomes, Kearney writes: *"This external change – not to the types of men who live in a place, but to the economic reality of the place – allowed the economists to investigate statistically whether a change in men's economic prospects can cause a change in marriage rates. The answer was yes."*

"Men without college degrees have seen their earnings stagnate and employment rates fall. Women, meanwhile, have experienced increases in average earnings regardless of their education level. This change has stripped many men of their traditional roles as breadwinner for the family and, in simple terms, made them less desirable marriage partners."

"The study found that the decline in US manufacturing jobs led to a decrease in wages, a decrease in employment, a decrease in marriage rates, and an increase in wage inequality." Kearney goes on to state that the effects also included increased single motherhood and increased poverty (for both black and white women).

*"The decrease in men's earnings **relative to** women's earnings has also led to a reduction in marriage."* (my emphasis).

"...the earnings of wives tend not to exceed that of their husbands, and when they do, there is an increased incidence of divorce."

Kearney observes that, as regards working class earnings, it is the intersection of being both Black and male that maximises the disadvantage, whilst being Black does not affect earnings or mobility rates for girls: *"In tracing the Black-White gap in intergenerational mobility rates for girls the researchers found that it was generally non-existent: Black and White girls who*

grew up with the same levels of parental income experienced similar levels of earnings as adults...In a similar comparison of Black and White men raised in households with similar incomes the researchers found that Black men had substantially lower wages (and employment rates) than White men as they aged into adulthood."

The Irreversibility of the Phenomenon: the "Social Factor"

*"The 'reverse marriageable men' hypothesis, which predicted that improvements in the economic circumstances of men would lead to an increase in marriage and a reduction in the share of births outside marriage, was **not** what the data showed."*

Why? Kearney writes, "One possibility was (and is) that the social norms surrounding childbearing and marriage have changed enough that men and women didn't feel the need to get married, or the desire to get married, even if the man had a well-paying job and the couple had a baby together."

The author confirms that social norms do indeed influence marriage rates and single motherhood rates. "Wilson and I proceeded to examine whether the response to the sudden economic shock was different in places where nonmarital childbearing was more and less common. It was. In places where very few births occurred outside marriage before the start of fracking, the local fracking boom led to a sizeable increase in births only to married women, not to unmarried women. In places where a sizeable share of births occurred to unmarried women before the fracking boom, the economic boom led to relatively equal increases in births to unmarried and married women."

As further confirmation that there is a social, and hence cultural, factor at work beyond the purely financial, Kearney observes, "Asian men with and without high school degrees experienced very small increases in median earnings over this 40-year period; yet they experienced relatively small declines in marriage."

"While economic forces have been a key driver of the decline in marriage – and the corresponding increase in single-mother homes – it seems that we are now in a new social paradigm, where nonmarriage is common outside the college-educated class. This development has not been good for children."

The author concludes, "...in a time when an increasing share of kids are born to unmarried parents, there may be no going back – at least not through economic changes alone."

Women's Attitudes to Birth and Fathers

Kearney includes a brief nod to what is actually the true nub of the problem: "They (the researchers) observed that some of the fathers in the programs had highly conflicted or disengaged relationships with their children's mothers, and in some cases that mothers would serve as "gatekeepers", restricting a father's access to his child. The researchers suggested that programs may need to focus on helping parents improve their relationships with one another, whether amorous or not, in order to be able to help dads have more positive engagement with their children." Easy to say.

The author includes a chapter on decreasing birth rates...

"Each (birth) decade stamped women with a different experience, and our study found that each successive cohort was less inclined toward having children – and not because of economic or policy factors that were in play at the time...Our analysis investigated the role of changes in public policies and economic conditions on changes in birth rates. Neither of those sets of explanations could explain much of the decline at all...It seems there has been an attitudinal shift away from the desire to become a mother at a young age, especially as a teen."

"...the body of evidence led us to conclude that the source of decline in US births is likely something more fundamental – a set of shifts in priorities and experience across successive cohorts of young adults, as opposed to any readily identifiable economic or policy factor..."

Kearney's Suggested Corrective Policies

"The conventional mores in the US today are to treat matters of family and family formation with a dedicated agnosticism, avowing any suggestion that one type of family might be somehow preferable to another family type." This is the political denial that has been the norm for at least four decades.

"The decline in the two-parent family relates in part to the struggles of men, which is in turn contributing to the struggles of boys. This cycle is in desperate need of interruption: the US needs to raise boys who are fit to be reliable marriage partners

and nurturing, supportive fathers...Helping children in this country will require helping dads."

"Bolstering the well-being of children requires recognising the important role of fathers in children's lives and boosting support to both mothers and fathers."

In terms of policy, the author advises that we should *"Start with an acknowledgement that in most cases, two-parent, stable families are very beneficial for children...we can and should explore ways to boost the prevalence of (healthy) two-parent families...At the same time, we can collectively work to strengthen alternative family structures, so that more children in families in which the parents do not live together have the benefit of positive support and engagement from two parents."*

The latter provision aligns with the suggestion from [Richard Reeves](#) that (in my paraphrasing) we should accept that widespread parental separation is here to stay and concentrate upon bolstering greater involvement of fathers in their children's lives after separation – essentially a default of equal shared care. Again, easy to say, but neither author has tackled the barriers in the way of that objective, not least half a century of legislation, vested interests and entrenched political and ideological opposition.

Kearney also cautions that we should **not** *"Accept a new reality where the two-parent family is a thing of the past for less educated, lower-income Americans"*.

"Increasing the share of children born to married parents and strengthening families will require improving the economic situation of many men in this country, especially those without a four-year college degree." Unfortunately, the author has demonstrated that this, whilst necessary, is not sufficient. There appears to be changes in mindset which are not influenced by economic factors. It is not even clear whether it is the change in young women (towards careers rather than family) or the change in young men (away from fatherhood for fear of being subsequently rejected) which is the dominant factor.

"We need to foster a societal expectation that fathers be present in their children's lives and support them financially and emotionally...it might mean revisiting fatherhood rights and child support enforcement regimes." Yes, indeed, but it is far from clear how this can be achieved in the teeth of the

widespread social, political and ideological factors which are opposed to it.

This entry was posted in [book/film reviews](#) on [7th November 2024](#).

<http://empathygap.uk/?p=4623>

TITLE IX FOR ALL: JONATHAN TAYLOR

One of the more significant of the unsung heroes of the movement for men and boys has been the USA's Jonathan Taylor. For nearly 15 years Taylor has been toiling away on what might most simply be described as "advocating for fairness". With his background in teaching at higher education level, Taylor has always focused on matters pertaining to education. But for a long time now – longer than the last three presidential terms – his focus has been on assisting those accused of sexual misconduct at college via his [Title IX for All](#) site. In a brief personal record Taylor summarises its purpose,

"...to make knowledge about the Title IX world more accessible to the general public by talking about what would otherwise only exist in obscure court records, and creating databases to track court cases, regulations, and OCR investigations. That's also why I decided to be an advisor for accused students, many of whom have no money tree to shake and are in need of affordable options." (OCR = Office for Civil Rights).

I shall clarify below what Title IX is. It is timely to raise this issue now because of a recent court ruling in the States which is, for once, good news. I'll come to that. Whilst I focus on allegations against students, Title IX and [Title IX for All](#) also cover allegations against faculty.

Readers of this blog will not need me to spell out the egregious nature of the status quo on university campuses as regards the handling of complaints regarding young men's sexual conduct. The problems of gross gender bias and the flouting of due process are endemic across the "western" world. In the USA these are specifically associated with a piece of Federal legislation, universally referred to as "Title IX". It is ostensibly about equal opportunities of the sexes in the context of education. The following is the opening of the [text of Title IX](#), which is followed by several exceptions and clarifications:

"No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

As always, the devil is in the detail – and in the interpretation and implementation of the statute. UK readers will be familiar with how legislation which appears to promote equality (e.g., the 2010 Equality Act) can be very effective in lending legitimacy to the opposite in the hands of activists – and the bias always goes one way. As an example, Title IX became infamous for its impact on men's college sports. Huge numbers of closures, or reductions, in men's sports teams on campuses across the USA [arose as a result of Title IX](#). But it has been in the context of allegations of sexual offences in universities that Title IX has been most destructive.

The interpretation and implementation of any legislation is everything, and the interpretation and implementation are products of the prevailing culture. As regards sexual offences within an educational context, [the dominant sentiment](#) which ran – and still runs – throughout virtually all influential bodies is that "when students suffer sexual assault and harassment, they are deprived of equal and free access to an education". The prevailing sentiment became manifest in virulent form in April 2011 in the form of the now-infamous "Dear Colleague Letter", issued by the Department of Education's [Office for Civil Rights](#) during the Obama administration. It reminded us that "the sexual harassment of students, including sexual violence, interferes with students' right to receive an education free from discrimination and, in the case of sexual violence, is a crime".

As always with political policies deploying moral coercion, there is a legitimate issue here – though there may be some overstatement. But what is unacknowledged is that allegations are only allegations. The prevailing ethos was – and still is – to believe the accuser (often referred to immediately as a "victim"). It fails to acknowledge that being thrown out of university on the basis of an unproved allegation also – and rather more directly – "interferes with a student's right to receive an education". And here the prevailing culture impacts on political policy which in turn impacts on collegiate policy, namely that their broader obligations to truth and justice can be ignored – for young men.

The “Dear Colleague” letter stated that it is the responsibility of institutions of higher education to “take immediate and effective steps to end sexual harassment and sexual violence” and makes clear that, should an institution fail to fulfil its responsibilities under Title IX, the Department of Education can impose a fine and potentially deny further institutional access to federal funds.

You see how that works? There is no threat of fines or withdrawal of funding if a university expels a young man without due process and without any meaningful examination of the allegations. Emanating from the highest Federal levels, the threats push the college in only one direction. As [Taylor’s advisory guide](#) for accused students puts it,

“Some accused students think that their situation will work itself out if they just tell the school the truth about what happened because schools generally prioritize truth and fairness. Unfortunately, this is not how Title IX proceedings work. A school’s primary interest is not in determining the truth of what happened but in minimizing its potential liability. This bias exceeds the rest.”

Taylor’s [Title IX for All](#) has been active in supporting accused students for over a decade. The site maintains database of nearly 900 lawsuits raised by former students (or faculty) who consider themselves as unfairly dismissed, plus a database of nearly 1,000 resolved OCR Title IX investigations. There is also a database of about 1,800 US attorneys who have assisted accused students and school employees in Title IX grievance proceedings and litigations. The site also hosts a range of valuable relevant information, articles and advice. (My own February 2015 article “[Feminism and the Decline of Physics A Level!](#)” appears on the site, [here](#), under authorship “John Doe” – presumably they lost the authorship).

And so to the recent developments. The first Trump administration made various changes to Title IX guidelines that were implemented during the Obama administration. These changes shifted the standard of evidence used in Title IX investigations from “preponderance of the evidence” to a “clear and convincing” evidence standard. Trump’s administration sought to limit the scope of Title IX to sex only, excluding gender identity and sexual orientation, and in February 2017

the Departments of Justice and Education withdrew the guidance on gender identity.

On 22 September 2017, US Department of Education Secretary Betsy DeVos rescinded the Obama-era guidelines which had prodded colleges and universities to more aggressively investigate campus sexual assaults. On 7 May 2020, the U.S. Department of Education released regulations governing campus sexual assault allegations and investigations under Title IX, the first Title IX guidance published by the OCR to go through a formal notice-and-comment process since 1997.

In the area of sports, the first Trump administration's Department of Education contended that the rights of biological women were being infringed by transgender women and so started to withhold federal funding from schools which "affirmed the identities" of transgender athletes, i.e., allowed them to compete in women's teams and/or against women.

Most importantly, the Trump administration imposed due process protections, perhaps the most important change of all to the interpretation under Obama given that the principal method of unfair dismissal was simply to disallow any meaningful investigation or defence.

Contrary to any idea that the Trump era changes to Title IX were legally unsound, they have actually [withstood five legal challenges by state attorneys general, women's groups, and accuser advocacy groups](#). One is tempted to conclude that the previous (Obama) rules were those that were legally fragile.

Unsurprisingly, the Biden administration which followed Trump's first term sought to reverse the changes his administration made and to further entrench the authoritarianism, bias and injustice that had been the direction of travel hitherto. Under the Obama administration, Title IX had been interpreted as applicable also to transgender students, so that a self-identified trans woman must be treated as a woman and a self-identified trans man must be treated as a man. These interpretations had been reversed under Trump. But in June 2022 the Biden administration issued a proposed rule to reverse the changes made under Trump and to expand coverage regarding gender identity and pregnancy.

But most seriously, the Biden proposed "Final Rule", which was due to come into force on 1st August 2024, was to introduce

further assaults on due process, such as (paraphrasing [Taylor's own account](#)),

- Re-institution of the “single-investigator” model in which one person is both the investigator and decision-maker;
- Denial of accused students’ (or faculty members’) full access to the evidence against them;
- Expansion of schools’ obligation to investigate misconduct regardless of whether it occurs outside educational programs or activities, in another state, or even another country – indeed, anywhere;
- Violation of the Constitution on First Amendment grounds by requiring schools to “compel affirmation of a belief” – in this case, the belief of a self-identified gender identity;
- Adoption of a new definition of harassment that is both vague and overbroad.

But these attempted Biden-era changes have been subject to legal challenge, and [the court has now given their ruling](#). The Plaintiffs were the States of Kentucky, Virginia, West Virginia, Indiana and Tennessee, and the Christian Educators Association International. The court’s memorandum states clearly the complaint and the background,

“...this case concerns the US Department of Education’s attempt to bypass the legislative process and completely transform Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 through sweeping new regulations. On June 17, 2024, this Court granted the plaintiff-States and Intervenor plaintiffs’ motions for a preliminary injunction and stay, which prevented the challenged Final Rule from going into effect with respect to the plaintiffs as planned on August 1, 2024. Now, the Court considers the plaintiffs’ and the Department’s competing motions for summary judgment.”

The outcome of their deliberations is clearly stated, *“Because the Final Rule and its corresponding regulations exceed the Department’s authority under Title IX, violate the Constitution, and are the result of arbitrary and capricious agency action, the plaintiffs’ motions for summary judgment will be granted and the Department’s motion for summary judgment will be denied.”*

However, the victory as regards due process – the most important matter of all – appears to have been merely

incidental because this issue was not mentioned in the judge's summing-up. Nevertheless, the judge struck down the Biden "Final Rule" in its entirety, for the reasons evident in the above quotes, so what the judge thought of the due process issues is a moot point.

Jonathan Taylor waxes bullish in his write-up of the ruling, suggesting that we are witnessing the beginning of the end of "progressivism". He writes,

"The bloodthirst and fanaticism of ideologies opposed to due process on the basis of sex—[MeToo, extreme feminism, and their various offshoots](#) – are increasingly falling out of favour, meeting harsher and more [public opposition](#), and finding defeat (one way or another) in court."

He also claims that,

"...companies and educational institutions are scaling back on "DEI," States are passing laws banning DEI in government institutions..."

and he notes that Trump, "who is more of a reflection of the shifting winds of public opinion than its cause", has just been re-elected.

I am rarely given to optimism, but I think he may be right.

This entry was posted in [education](#), [sexual assault on 15th January 2025](#).

<http://empathygap.uk/?p=4635>

ARE MEN OPPRESSED NOW?

Two Controversial Views That Epitomise the Growth of Anti-Feminism Among the Young

In recent years, we've witnessed a growing divide between generations regarding gender equality, with many young men feeling alienated and marginalized by the feminist movement. A groundbreaking survey commissioned by Secrets & Lives reveals some startling truths about the sentiments of young British men, particularly in the 16 to 24 age group, as they face the increasingly complex landscape of gender relations. Two views, in particular, encapsulate the rise of anti-feminism among this demographic: the belief that feminism has gone too

far, and the assertion that men are being unfairly blamed for societal issues. These perspectives paint a worrying picture of a generation that feels increasingly distanced from the very ideals of equality that feminism strives to achieve.

Feminism Has Gone Too Far – A Concern Over Male Disadvantages

A significant number of young men believe that the feminist movement has “gone too far,” with some claiming that it has left men at a disadvantage. Among those aged 16 to 24, a striking 51% feel that feminism has crossed a line. Jasdeep Singh, a 23-year-old sales professional in London, is one of the many who feels that the scales have tipped too far in favour of women. “Things have gone too far in favor of women,” he asserts, expressing frustration at what he sees as gender-based discrimination against men in the workplace. According to him, women seem to get special treatment, from being given lighter tasks to being treated with extra caution by male colleagues who fear being accused of sexism.

This belief that men are now discriminated against in favor of women is echoed by a broader portion of the surveyed group. Almost 56% of young men think that, due to the promotion of equality for women, men are now being unfairly discriminated against. This sentiment is reflected in complaints about social interactions, with many young men expressing the view that they must constantly walk on eggshells to avoid being accused of sexism, even for simple actions like offering a woman a coffee.

The underlying issue here appears to be a sense of victimhood. Some young men seem to believe that the push for women’s rights has created a world where their own struggles are either ignored or belittled. This view, though controversial, represents a growing perception that the battle for gender equality is being waged at the expense of men’s rights.

The Feeling That Men Are Unfairly Blamed for Societal Problems

Another prevalent view among young men is the belief that men are unfairly blamed for society's problems. Over half of all men (51%) surveyed agreed with the statement, "men are unfairly blamed for problems in our society," with the sentiment being even stronger among 25 to 34-year-olds (61%). Jasdeep, again, reflects this viewpoint when he comments on how male behavior is often scrutinized and criticized, even in cases where he feels it is unwarranted. This perspective contributes to the growing rift between men and women, where some men feel unjustly vilified for issues that they feel they have no part in, such as instances of male violence and toxic masculinity.

The survey highlights that this belief is particularly entrenched among younger generations. It's clear that for many young men, discussions about male violence or the concept of toxic masculinity are perceived as a form of collective guilt, one that lumps all men together and fails to acknowledge the nuances within these complex issues. In their eyes, the growing spotlight on male misdeeds has left them feeling disempowered and attacked, rather than given the opportunity to evolve and address these concerns constructively.

The Role of Influencers and Social Media

These controversial views among young men are often amplified by influential figures online, particularly social media personalities like Andrew Tate. A self-proclaimed misogynist and former professional kickboxer, Tate has amassed millions of followers, many of whom are young men who see him as a voice that validates their frustrations. According to the survey, 36% of young men aged 16 to 24 view Andrew Tate favorably. Tate's rhetoric promotes an exaggerated form of masculinity that rejects the notion of toxic masculinity while also undermining women's autonomy and rights.

For young men like Jasdeep, Tate's focus on hard work, discipline, and self-improvement resonates. However, while these messages may seem beneficial on the surface, the influence of figures like Tate also fosters deeper anti-feminist beliefs. These personalities have created a vacuum where young men, feeling misunderstood, seek answers in extreme ideologies that reject modern gender equality altogether. In many ways, social media has become the breeding ground for this backlash, offering young men a sense of community, validation, and purpose, albeit in a toxic form.

The Divide Between the Sexes

The growing divide between young men and women is also contributing to the rise of anti-feminism. As revealed in the survey, a large proportion of young men report feeling uncomfortable around women, especially in social settings where interactions can be misinterpreted. This discomfort stems from the fear of being accused of sexism or harassment, leading to a retreat into male-only spaces. In fact, 56% of men aged 16 to 24 have mostly male friends, and many openly admit to feeling more comfortable in male-dominated environments.

This self-imposed segregation has further entrenched their views, as men in these groups often reinforce each other's opinions, creating an echo chamber of anti-feminist sentiment. The lack of female friendships and open dialogue about gender issues only exacerbates the misinterpretations that fuel these beliefs.

Moving Forward: Rebuilding Dialogue

Despite the alarming rise of these anti-feminist sentiments, experts believe that it's not too late to shift young men's perspectives. As feminist scholar Jemima Olchawski points out, a more nuanced understanding of feminism is crucial. Feminism, at its core, is not about diminishing men but about creating equality for all genders. However, this message often

gets lost in the noise, especially when young men are bombarded with extreme viewpoints online.

To address this issue, we must work toward fostering open and honest discussions about gender equality, where both men's and women's struggles are recognized. The aim should be to build a world where both genders are seen as equals, rather than pitting one against the other. Only then can we hope to bridge the gap between the sexes and move toward a more inclusive and harmonious society.



IT'S A FACT: PROSTATE CANCER NOW ENGLAND'S MOST COMMON CANCER

A huge increase in cases shows that more men than ever before are checking their risk of prostate cancer - and taking action.

<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2025/jan/28/prostate-cancer-becomes-most-common-cancer-diagnosis-in-england>

Tobi Thomas *Health and inequalities correspondent* Guardian
Tue 28 Jan 2025 00.01 GMT

PROSTATE CANCER BECOMES MOST COMMON CANCER DIAGNOSIS IN ENGLAND

Prostate cancer has now become the most commonly diagnosed cancer in England, surpassing breast cancer for two consecutive years. According to Prostate Cancer UK's analysis

of NHS England data, in 2023, there were 55,033 prostate cancer diagnoses compared to 47,526 breast cancer diagnoses. This shift highlights the increasing awareness and detection of the disease, thanks in part to targeted awareness campaigns and improved screening measures.

The Rise in Prostate Cancer Diagnoses

The rise in prostate cancer diagnoses can be attributed to several key factors. One of the most significant influences has been the awareness campaign launched by Prostate Cancer UK in collaboration with the NHS in 2022. This initiative led to an estimated 3 million men using the charity's online risk checker tool, increasing early detection and proactive healthcare decisions.

The Covid-19 pandemic created a backlog of undiagnosed prostate cancer cases, with over 14,000 men who should have been diagnosed and treated not receiving timely intervention. However, by April 2024, this gap had been closed, ensuring that more men received the necessary diagnosis and treatment.

Understanding Prostate Cancer

The exact cause of prostate cancer remains unknown, but it is most commonly diagnosed in men over the age of 50. Black men face twice the risk of developing the disease compared to their white counterparts, making awareness and screening particularly crucial for this demographic. Genetic predisposition also plays a role, meaning men with a family history of prostate cancer should be especially vigilant.

Challenges in Diagnosis and Treatment

One of the significant challenges of prostate cancer is its silent progression. Unlike other cancers, prostate cancer does not usually present noticeable symptoms in its early stages, making early detection difficult. Symptoms, when they do appear, often include:

- An increased need to urinate
- Straining while urinating
- A feeling that the bladder has not been fully emptied

These symptoms typically only become evident once the prostate has grown large enough to affect the urethra, which is why proactive screening is vital.

Improved Screening and Early Detection

Prostate Cancer UK and NHS England have emphasized the importance of early detection. Professor Peter Johnson, NHS national clinical director for cancer, highlighted that the increased number of early-stage diagnoses has given men better chances of receiving effective treatment.

One of the most common ways to test for prostate cancer is through the PSA (Prostate-Specific Antigen) blood test. This simple blood test has become a critical tool in screening, and awareness efforts are now dispelling outdated fears about invasive testing methods. As Chiara De Biase, director of health services, equity & improvement at Prostate Cancer UK, explains:

“The good news is that the way prostate cancer is diagnosed is safer and more accurate than ever, and the first step is a simple blood test – not a ‘finger up the bum.’”

The Role of Awareness Campaigns

The success of awareness campaigns has played a major role in increasing early diagnoses. These initiatives have encouraged more men to:

- Learn about their risk factors
- Speak to their GP about the PSA blood test
- Take proactive steps towards early detection

By empowering men with knowledge and accessible screening options, more individuals can receive early treatment, which significantly improves survival rates.

Current Treatment Options

Prostate cancer treatment varies depending on the stage at which the disease is detected. Common treatment options include:

- Active Surveillance: For slow-growing prostate cancers that may not need immediate intervention
- Surgery: Removal of the prostate gland in more advanced cases
- Radiotherapy: Using radiation to target and kill cancer cells

- **Hormone Therapy:** Blocking the hormones that help cancer cells grow
- **Chemotherapy:** Used for advanced or aggressive prostate cancer cases

The earlier prostate cancer is detected, the more treatment options are available, and the better the prognosis.

Encouraging Proactive Health Measures

For men over 50, or those in high-risk groups (such as Black men or those with a family history of the disease), taking a PSA test and discussing options with a healthcare provider is strongly recommended. Prostate Cancer UK continues to encourage men to take their online risk checker, which can provide an initial assessment of their likelihood of developing the disease.

The Future of Prostate Cancer Diagnosis and Treatment

With continued advancements in medical research, prostate cancer detection and treatment are expected to improve further. Innovative diagnostic tools, such as MRI-guided biopsies and AI-assisted screening, are enhancing accuracy and reducing unnecessary procedures.

Furthermore, new treatment strategies, including targeted therapies and immunotherapy, are showing promise in providing more effective and less invasive options for patients. The combination of these technological advances and increased awareness ensures that prostate cancer will be diagnosed earlier and treated more effectively in the future.

Final Thoughts

Prostate cancer's rise as the most commonly diagnosed cancer in England is both a concern and an opportunity. While the increasing numbers indicate the prevalence of the disease, they also highlight the success of awareness campaigns and improved screening processes. Early detection remains key to effective treatment, and the continued efforts of organizations like Prostate Cancer UK and the NHS are vital in ensuring that men receive timely and potentially life-saving diagnoses.

If you are concerned about prostate cancer, the best step is to take Prostate Cancer UK's quick online risk checker or speak to your GP about getting a PSA test. Awareness and early action can save lives.

Job Description for Hon. Treasurer

Overall

- Oversee the financial affairs of the organisation and ensure they are legal, constitutional and within accepted accounting practice.
- Ensure proper records are kept and that effective financial procedures are in place.
- Monitor and report on the financial health of the organisation.
- Produce necessary financial reports/returns, accounts and audits.

Specifically

- Liaise with committee members to ensure the financial viability of the organisation.
- Make fellow committee members aware of their financial obligations and take a lead in interpreting financial data to them.
- Regularly report the financial position at committee meetings (balance sheet, cash flow, fundraising performance etc).
- If required, oversee the production of an annual budget and propose its adoption at the last meeting of the previous financial year.
- Ensure proper records are kept and that effective financial procedures and controls are in place, as applicable ie
 - Cheque signatories
 - Purchasing limits
 - Purchasing systems
 - Petty cash/ float
- Appraising the financial viability of plans, proposals and feasibility studies.
- Lead on appointing and liaising with auditors/an independent examiner.
- Undertake bookkeeping duties and ensuring posting and bookkeeping is kept up to date.

Qualities

- Knowledge and experience of current and fundraising finance practice relevant to voluntary and community organisations.
- Knowledge of bookkeeping and financial management (as necessary).
- Good financial analysis skills.
- Ability to communicate clearly

Time Commitment

5 or 6 Trustees meetings in Central London on weekdays plus an AGM on Saturday afternoon in June. Meeting attendance can be via Zoom/GoogleMeet/Teams

If you think you are a good fit for the role advertised and our organisation, please feel free to email us with your application.

We welcome all applications.

Please send your application to secretary@parity-uk.org with your cover letter and CV.

Any questions or queries about the role, please email at: secretary@parity-uk.org.

Parity takes care to ensure that the details contained in here are free of errors and omissions. However, should you find any major errors, please advise us: secretary@parity-uk.org