

“Has bias pendulum swung against men?”

Summarized from article in WorldNetDaily, February 20, 2006

If you give more attention to the media, you will discover that men are more often maligned than magnified; and the general theme seems to be the denigration of dads as derelict and disavowed – rather than reliable and responsible. Perhaps some specific details will be offered in subsequent writings, but consider the possibilities and – I believe – you will agree that men are found to be less favorable in the media...and perhaps society at large.

This article points out that, while some social scientists may see these facts as harmless, others are beginning to conclude that men are the real victims of discrimination so virulent that it is:

- ‡ Shortening their life spans
- ‡ Causing them to be self-destructive and suicidal
- ‡ Crippling their educational opportunities
- ‡ Destroying a generation of fatherless children

Besides the general condition (of the media), some “sobering facts” are:

- ‡ Men are now dying 10 years before women (on average)
- ‡ Boys have inferior reading and comprehension scores, lower graduation rates...than girls
- ‡ Men are less likely to pursue secondary degrees and graduate programs
- ‡ Males (of all ages) have a suicide rate 10 times greater than females

In possible matters of discrimination and maltreatment, family law and courts is cited as a potential if not certain culprit. From my own experience in this court setting, the laws (and outcomes) are so apparently bias – so as to give discrimination a bad name.

In health matters, the occurrence of prostate cancer in men is about 9% higher than breast cancer for women; yet the federal government spends approximately \$550 million on breast cancer to only \$80 million on prostate (2006).

No where is the bias more apparent than in child custody; in this arena, women or mothers can have sole custody in at least 75% of the cases; whereas fathers, only about 10%...**But the courts don't stop at custody – according to the article; as charges of domestic violence are used as tools to place them at a distinct disadvantage in civil matters before family court.** *The word on the street*, is that a woman could readily gain immediate possession of children, home and other assets by filing an “emergency” ex-parte domestic violence petition...claiming to be in fear of her safety.

“Has bias pendulum swung against men?”

Summarized from article in WorldNetDaily, February 20, 2006

In my own experience, my ex-wife did just that: on declaring her intention of divorce, she had a restraining order issued; three months later, she moved back to our home at her own volition. By her choice to return to our home, she violated the order in principle – but that doesn't matter to the courts. Less than two years later, she moved back to the state where the restraining order was issued and had it re-activated. **This technique is what I call a “restraining order on retainer” – which means that she can violate it one day and use the next – she can claim fear and then contradict her claim through her actions and behavior.**