

Interview Questions

Matt Campbell, Men's Activism New Network (MANN) – matt_at_mann@yahoo.com
<http://news.mensactivism.org/>

1. What are the focal topics of MensActivism?

MensActivism.org focuses on news stories and topics that are of interest to or are germane to men's rights issues. These include but are not limited to:

1. Father's rights as pertains to equitable treatment under the law when child custody/support issues are part of either a divorce or non-cohabitational living arrangement between a father and mother that is brokered by a court of law. In the case of non-cohabitation, there is at this time a push for "refutable presumed joint custody" that removes the presumption that one of the two parents will get sole or primary custody (or primary residence) and that instead, both parents will have equal custody and claims of domicile. In essence, the old model of man-as-provider, woman-as-providee is outdated, and the courts need to catch up. If two people together have one or more kids, they are both financially responsible for them and should be substantially treated as such under the law.
2. The right to retain the product of one's labor, even after the contractual obligations of marriage that presume a sharing of the couple's resources between one another have been terminated. Currently, many states and countries award spousal support (a.k.a. alimony) paid by one former marriage partner to another, usually from the ex-husband to the ex-wife, for some determined amount and period of time. While there may have been a time that this was fair given the generally limited economic opportunities for most women and the social and political barriers to their economic independence (it could be done—but it was a lot harder for women than men, even though it has historically also been hard for men to change economic classes upward), that day is past. There are still countries and states in the US that award alimony for either an unnecessarily long period of time or for amounts unnecessarily large, or both. In addition, there is today the question of whether or not alimony as such makes sense given the change for the better in terms of women's opportunities. Some states have come a bit more up to speed on this topic, but others are still working on it and have a ways to go.
3. The right to fair relief from the effects and obligations resulting from paternity fraud, and to have an absolute right to a paternity test should the purported father request it; ideally, it ought to be standard procedure in hospitals after a baby is born.
4. A comparable right to terminate parental obligations (the "paper abortion" option suggested in the 1970s) wherever women have the right to an abortion, and under the same terms. Thus if women have three months from conception to get a legal abortion, the purported father should, for three months after he is informed he is the purported father of a child, born or not, get the same period of time to decide if he ought to assume parental obligations for the child.

5. The right to be presumed innocent in fact in all venues and in all cases involving alleged offenses, as guaranteed in the US Constitution, yet even regarding offenses alleged to have been committed against females. In addition, alleged offenders should have the right to have their reputation protected from arbitrary destruction via a double-standard in some jurisdictions that allows their accuser to go unnamed but the accused's name to be published. By "all venues", this is meant courts of law as well as committees, tribunals, etc., that act with the consent of the law, such as college judicial councils and hearing panels. Basically, no one should be summarily branded some kind of criminal and then, with a scarlet letter, sent off to deal with it as best he (usually "he") or she can.
6. The right to equal access to the same legal and governmental resources that can be of assistance personally and professionally as women have. This includes access to government-supplied health care currently limited to women, social service benefits restricted to women or geared toward women (e.g.: domestic violence assistance and outreach programs), and job and business programs that are currently limited only to women. This is especially important given the slow economy and high rate of unemployment among men.
7. Equal access to educational opportunities and resources, including government programs that currently single out females for benefits. This includes mis-use of Title IX enforcement as well as the implementation of agendas by public and private schools at all levels that single out women/girls for preferential treatment or special programs of any kinds.
8. The right to equal treatment under the law as pertains to involuntary military servitude, or the requirement to register for it. In the case of the US, there has been no draft since Vietnam, but all males at age 18 are required to register for Selective Service or else face a number of repercussions, including loss of qualification for federal student loans, unemployment benefits, and eligibility for federal employment. In addition, should the government choose to for whatever reason, a man who fails to register for the draft faces a fine and imprisonment. Women are not placed in this kind of legal jeopardy. (It is also entirely questionable that forced military service ought to be considered acceptable in any case, regardless of who gets forced into it.)
9. The right to be sentenced equally as women for the same offense, or to bear no greater sentencing jeopardy as compared to women. Studies have confirmed that women are much less likely to see jail time for offenses that are also committed by men, especially those involving statutory rape or other sex-related crimes; they are also less likely to be found guilty of offenses even when the same or very similar evidence is presented in criminal cases. While adult women frequently get away with "having affairs" with teenage boys with either only a warning or a light or suspended sentence, men doing the same thing frequently see jail time, sometimes a lot of it. In these or in any other criminal cases, whatever the sentences are, they ought to be roughly the same for defendants in the same circumstances regardless of sex.
10. The right to bodily integrity throughout life from birth to death. Currently in the US and many other nations, the practice of circumcision on male infants is legal. While the cutting of the genitalia of female infants and girls is rightfully outlawed, the same

protection is not given infant males. The practice of removing parts of an infant's flesh without a medically compelling reason is a violation of the infant's human rights. Contrary to some belief, the foreskin is not a vestigial part of a human male's body. Removing it places the infant at risk of infection and has been shown to contribute to other kinds of problems men and boys may develop; in some cases, it has resulted in permanent disfigurement of the penis and death by infection or uncontrolled bleeding. The argument from religion doesn't hold up to scrutiny; one's religious rights vis-à-vis another person end where that other person's human rights begin, and this is a principle well-established in the western world's legal canon, but is suspended, strangely, when it comes to male circumcision.

Aside from the foregoing issues, MANN runs stories that are meant to disillusion the reader from stereotypes around women that simply do not hold up to scrutiny. These include stereotypes that say women are categorically non-violent, categorically better parents, etc. We also run stories that expose overt displays of misandry (i.e., the loathing, contempt, or abject dislike of masculinity or of males) and point out the double-standards they represent. There are more issues or double-standards that could also be listed, but for the sake of the reader's time, they are not pursued here.

2. Do you feel women do not have equal rights/are discriminated against in any way (in modern-day American society)?

There are definitely ways in which women receive discrimination in modern-day American society. Women are generally expected to pay more attention to their personal appearance than are men, and this includes not just clothing but body weight (though it can be said that these days, people who are substantially overweight do not seem to be getting promoted as much anymore, regardless of sex), and this places women in the position of having to pay more for their personal grooming and clothing generally than men. Failing to do so may result in unfair bias against them in terms of getting hired, promotions at work, etc. They are also more expected to fulfill care-taking roles that men either are less-expected to do or not expected at all. For example, while it may be good that many employers don't balk at giving a woman maternity leave, they often balk or look askance at men who want paternity leave—or they don't offer it at all to men (which can be considered a men's right issue). This sends a none-too-subtle signal that women are expected to be the care-givers of the child(ren). While many women like this option, it is not unlike a being a very good sculptor: you like what you do, but when you look around and ask others what they may be interested in hiring you for other than sculpting, you suddenly get the cold shoulder. Sure, there's always sculpting, and you're good at it, and it pays the bills nicely—but wouldn't it be good to be able to go into something else if you wanted? Obviously, the analogy isn't perfect. Women are not limited by any means to being stay-at-home moms. It's just that the presumption still seems to be that the mother will be the child's primary care-giver, at least for the youngest portion of a child's life. By keeping this presumption around (and people of both sexes seem to fall

back on it a lot), this contributes to the things that cause women to fall behind in their career paths while also contributing to circumstances that separate fathers from the daily lives of their kids. No one wins, really.

There are other ways also in which women face discrimination, and the list could be quite long. Typical MRAs do not deny that women face discrimination from both men and other women; they simply also say that men do, too, from women and other men.

3. Do you feel men do not have equal rights/are discriminated against in any way (in modern-day American society)?

Yes. But as above, so do women. At this point, what has been lacking for men is the telling of “the other side of the story”. The list of issues in the first question in this document discusses some of the ways on which men face discriminatory treatment or unequal rights. Discrimination is a problem that people of many identities and categories face. Gender discrimination is just one kind of it, and it manifests itself in different ways across societies, eras, and populations.

4. What are your thoughts on feminism?

The term “feminism” means different things to different people. As originally conceived, feminists sought equal rights under the law (referring specifically to the US in the 19th and early 20th centuries) in critical areas, such as access to voting in all 50 states, inheritance rights, the legal right to retain property (and fruits of labor) under the law, etc. While there is a good amount of evidence that early feminists held beliefs about men that some modern-day feminists hold, in all movements, one finds those on the fringe who may espouse some clearly extreme opinions, and this was true back then, too. It is easily forgotten though that the early feminists were in many ways as much a product of their times as people are today, and in the same way we look back on commonly-held beliefs in the 19th century as repugnant (for example, as pertains to how many viewed non-whites), undoubtedly there will be people in the 22nd century who will feel the same way about commonly-held beliefs in the 21st century. Still, the feminists of that time by and large were simply seeking fundamental equal political and personal rights for women as addressed by the legal system(s) of the times.

Today, feminism has become something that most early feminists probably would not recognize. As Christina Hoff Sommers wrote about in Who Stole Feminism, the 1960s and ‘70s saw the more fringe element of feminism assert dominance over the political and organizational machinery of the feminist establishment (organizations such as NOW among them) and began to pursue a new set of goals, ones that sought not ways necessarily to create equality for women in other areas of life where it appeared to be lacking, but instead to seek dominance or to undercut the well-being of men’s basic

rights. As the actor and feminist Alan Alda said in a speech in Seneca Falls, NY in the 1980s, quoting Susan B. Anthony, “Men their rights and nothing more; women their rights and nothing less!” This quote became the battle-cry of the feminist movement as it re-organized itself in the late 20th century. To consider the implications of such a statement, imagine a court of law wherein two parties to a civil suit meet and both are equal under the law. However one is well-to-do and can hire a team of very good lawyers while the other is not as well-off and can hire a single second-rate lawyer. Assuming that the arguments (claims of right) are essentially equal around the case, who is most likely to win the case based on a preponderance of the evidence and arguments made in court? The first party clearly has rights—but nothing less than them. In fact, he or she has the privilege of having very good legal support. The second party also has rights—but not the privilege of very good legal support. The most likely outcome to the case will be of course that the first party will win. Similarly, if men and women have equal rights but men have nothing more (no privileges) and women can have more (as many privileges as they can find a way to acquire), in a given conflict of interest, whether interpersonal or categorical, who is likely to “win out”? By categorically extolling a better world for one class of person and a lack of one for another but keeping all other fundamentals in place, in practice, the first class of person in essence does have more rights than the second. This is what feminism today looks like. In addition, there are also active participants in the feminist establishment who are serious about the idea of seeking ways to curtail men’s civil and personal liberties significantly and even to find ways to reduce significantly the male population of the planet for whatever set of reasons. While even mainstream modern feminists think such people are “out there”, bear in mind that 100 years ago, the kind of feminists we have running the feminist establishment today (and making big wins for their points of view) were considered “fringe”, too. Feminism, if allowed to continue unchallenged, represents a serious threat to the well-being of men and boys.

5. What laws exist that are discriminatory to men?

Laws that specifically mandate welfare, health, or other benefits for women and not men in comparable and relevant ways discriminate against men. In addition, laws that allow gender discrimination to take place in public services or benefits that are otherwise open to all possible applicants (e.g.: college scholarships, etc.) discriminate against men. And of course, mentioned above was Selective Service registration.

Women-only facilities are appearing in places all over the world (women-only hotel floors, train cars, etc.). Such would probably be successfully challenged under the law if they were for men only, but not for women. There are also some states that have laws specifically aimed at prosecuting men for a crime if the victim is female. For example, N. Carolina has a law “Assault on a Female” (see <http://www.volokh.com/2011/10/05/north-carolina-crime-of-assault-on-a-female/>) that classifies it as a Class A1 misdemeanor, while other assaults that may be committed by

the same man on another man are Class A2 or less. Still others have defined a crime in such a way that only men can commit it (i.e., many states still have forcible rape defined in such a way that a female can't be prosecuted under it), even though a woman could commit the same or equivalent act given the "right" utensils and conditions. In those cases, the law isn't adequate to prosecute as fully the female offender as it would the male, and in any case, female criminal offenders are, as noted above, less likely to see jail time or to see as much as male offenders. The phenomenon isn't confined to the US but found all over the world and in many places, it is more pronounced there.

The issue is not just around laws, however; it is around prosecution of alleged offenders and the level of certainty required in fact by judges, juries, and prosecutors with regard to coming to conclusions or making decisions. This ties in with the issue of men being actually presumed innocent yet even in cases where the alleged victim of a crime is female.

6. What is your perspective on the wage gap?

The wage gap issue has been repeatedly addressed and shown to be a result of women's personal choices around how much time they choose to spend at work and what types of work they elect to go into. (See Why Men Earn More by Warren Farrell.) As many have pointed out, business owners and managers do not pay people because they like to; they seek to hire the best talent they can for as little as possible. If women categorically represented a better deal to employers for the same jobs and truly commanded less, the US workforce, though already a majority of females (but only recently, as of 2010) would have become far more populated by women a long time ago, or if not a long time ago, then by now. It is more accurate to say not that women earn less than men but that men are far more likely to subsidize women's lifestyle choices. For example, if a woman is working part-time so she can stay at home more to take care of a child or children by her own desire, then to make up for the loss of her full-time income, her husband or partner has to be able to earn not just the difference but more so that the child(ren) are also supported as well as her. True equality in society would not see men subsidizing women's lifestyle choices, nor vice versa should that dynamic be in play. (Such does happen, but not nearly as often as men subsidizing women.)

7. In what instances have you witnessed gender discrimination of either or both genders?

There is the kind of gender discrimination that is the topic of people concerned with the matter of equal rights/responsibilities under the law, or in access to "the goodies" available in society at large. Then there is the type of gender discrimination that is often part and parcel of human social interactions. This includes the tendency of men to be acknowledged by people of either sex in basic social interactions if they are seen as

powerful, influential, well-off, confident, etc., and the tendency for people to do likewise but instead if the woman is seen as attractive or attached to a man “of significance”. These kinds of responses from people cross cultures and are probably a result of the human brain’s limbic system in overdrive. There is not much we can do about those and probably will have to just live with them until we as a species actually evolve some more. Check back in 50,000 or so years.

However the first kind of discrimination is viewable in the many ways already discussed, and more as well. Honestly, it seems there can be too many to count if one thinks about it too long. As with a lot of things though that can get people into trouble, if they do it, they are likely not to do it overtly. So undoubtedly instances of discrimination against people of both sexes arise that simply don’t get noticed because, to stay out of trouble, the discriminator isn’t talking about his/her motivations.

8. Do you believe that the double standards held by modern society should be removed? If yes, please explain which double standards.

As much as practicable, the legal statutes governing permissible behaviors ought to be categorically interpreted not to permit a consideration of gender when there is a conflict of interest and/or a doling out of “goodies”, or an infliction of punishments. The cost of re-writing US federal and state statutes would be prohibitive, so court cases and enforcement using such a new doctrine of current laws would be required. This is a very tall order, however, and would encounter severe resistance, mostly by feminists (who seem to realize that by and large, women as a group gain from a double-standard in laws, especially as pertains family law issues) and possibly also from highly-conservative groups who feel that the more “old-fashioned” notions should be kept. (Politics makes for strange bedfellows.) But there are particular matters which deserve urgent attention. One is regarding sexual assaults of different kinds. Men charged with and convicted of sexual assaults are rightly and routinely given significant jail sentences and fines. Women on the other hand, much less so. The light or non-existent sentences given to women in positions of trust (e.g.: teachers) around minors when this trust is violated are a good example. In addition, women and girls who are sexually assaulted by members of their own sex also often do not get the justice they deserve simply due to the denial society has around the idea that women can be sexual predators. A documentary on this topic is called [She Stole My Voice](http://www.rmdglobal.net/she-stole-my-voice/) and is discussed here: <http://www.rmdglobal.net/she-stole-my-voice/>

9. Have you been a victim of gender discrimination? If so, may I ask about the details of this incident?

I am pretty certain I have been discriminated against when pursuing job opportunities. There has to, after all, be some reason why my gender (and ethnicity) is of such interest to potential employers when filling out applications for work. In addition, socially, the presence of men who are not considered of extraordinary social or political value within a certain context is not valued, while the presence of women (but even more specifically, attractive women) is. There are other kinds of situations that include categorical anti-male discrimination that of course affect me directly. For example, where I live there is a chain of gym locations owned by the same entity, three of which are for women only and the other two are for both men and women. One of the women-only gyms has a pool and both have a lot more classes scheduled, such as yoga, etc. Because I am male, despite having a membership that would be good for all five locations if I were female, my membership is only good for two. In addition, the two “co-ed” locations have no pool. So access to what would otherwise be common resources is denied me because I am male. Other examples exist, such as “Ladies Nights” at bars and clubs where female patrons don’t pay for one or more drinks during the evening, possibly none. True, I don’t go to bars or clubs much, but if I were younger and lived in a place where nightlife was an integral part of people’s entertainment, this would affect me a lot more directly. (Generally speaking, granting a benefit to one category of person while withholding it from another based on indelible characteristics while especially the benefit is still relevant to both categories of people is simply discriminatory. It does not matter who is the discriminated-against party.) As for other ways, there are the categorical ones that were discussed above, as pertains the availability of government program assistance, etc. Actual and potential acts of discrimination against me as a man are if not too numerous to list, then too tedious to do so.

Overall, I suspect I have not had quite the same kind of social life as I would have had I been female. But this is hard to conjecture about because I have no full-scale way to experiment with the idea. (But interestingly, I saw this just a day or so ago about a female model who after hitting “a certain age” was getting less work – a clear form of discrimination against her, if not models in general – and decided to breath new life into her career by becoming a “male model”. She found that walking around passing for a man, suddenly, she was getting treated differently, and not for the better. Story:

<http://nypost.com/2013/10/17/gal-finds-success-as-a-male-model/>

I also once read a story about a woman who decided to pose as a man for a month to see what it would be like and she found that the kind of treatment she thought men got that was better than what women received wasn’t there, though she did say she appreciated how “other men” took her at face value more right away and she didn’t feel like she was being scrutinized before being accepted, as she said she felt when among women as a woman. But she said she missed all the deference she had received and now also found people expected her to pay for things a lot more and had not appreciated how much as a

woman she was getting “treated”, by people of both sexes. In the end, she said, she was glad to go back to being a woman. I would like to send you a link to that story but alas, cannot find the article now via Google. It was some time ago that I read it, possibly over 5 years now.

10. Which conflicts between feminism and the men's movement are avoidable, and which are bound to happen. Is there a way for them to coexist?

The basic conflicts between MRAs and feminists are not readily reconcilable since the basic fundamental underpinnings of feminism do not acknowledge that men have issues other than those identified by feminism as being men’s responsibility to remedy. These issues are oriented around granting further deference and consideration to women when the interests of men and women come into conflict as a group or as individuals. MRAs reject these underpinnings and have no intention of compromising to conform to them since the demands require a discarding of consideration of men’s issues as MRAs see them and an adoption of feminists’ ideas of what men’s issues are. But the same could be said in reverse. In short, the ideological underpinnings and goals of the two groups are as fundamentally divergent as those of theists and atheists. However there may be individuals within both groups who can agree to work toward a few common goals that are quite specific and oriented around specific issues. As an example, I can imagine that a person calling him- or herself a feminist and another calling him- or herself an MRA could both agree that, for example, a particular gender-segregated area in what is otherwise a public venue should not be so segregated, and so together could cooperate to put pressure on the venue-owner to change the policy. By way of analogy, there may be theists and atheists who agree that everyone should have the right to choose to believe in what they do regarding religion, and so can form a coalition to try to ensure religious choice freedom, while avoiding such topics of just whose opinions on God are right. (As in any matter involving people who are not in general agreement, sometimes a temporary coalition approach oriented around a specific matter is the only practical way to get two or more people working together for any length of time.)

11. Since a lot of discrimination is not visible unless you're looking for it, how do you know where to look?

This is a good question. People can and sometimes do get overly preoccupied with looking under every rock for not just discrimination of some kind, but perhaps other things as well. It can become an unhealthy obsession for some. The better approach to this topic is the same as with anything that may get under one’s nerves: don’t let the topic preoccupy you. It’s unhealthy, personally and interpersonally. Any preoccupation or topical obsession can get in the way of one’s enjoyment of life, and can interfere unnecessarily in relationships that would otherwise be just fine. With regard to questions

around feminism or men's rights, the only time (I think) the personal ought to be political is when a fundamental personal boundary is at stake (such as not tolerating abusive behavior, i.e.: foul name-calling, physical violence, consistent and measurably exploitative behavior, etc.) or where issues that are critical to one's political and human rights are at stake. For example, say two married people have divergent opinions about the "paper abortion" idea. The man approves of it and the woman does not. This is a difference in opinion and one close to the heart of both, perhaps, but two things are true: the law currently does not have a "paper abortion" option for men and the woman (we presume) is not currently pregnant, and if she were, her husband would have no intention of exercising a "paper abortion" even if he could (let's assume that). So in point of fact, where is the practical conflict between them? There is none. So this issue need not be turned into an unnecessary wedge of division between the two, especially if otherwise, their relationship is fine.

12. Do you feel male victims of domestic violence in the US are discriminated against because they are male?

Yes. The vast majority of attention in media and from government and charitable organizations is given to female DV victims while male ones are all but ignored, or indeed, made fun of or refused acknowledgement. A few media outlets and a very small number of organizations now exist that attempt to address this disparity but they are very underexposed to the public and certainly under-funded. Government and private studies have shown most DV is mutual and that men are as likely to be battered in relationships as women. However because men are raised to avoid complaining or even to acknowledge that they are being abused by a partner, the amount of reporting is kept down. In addition, all but a few facilities for DV victim services are set up with the presumption that the victim will be female and the perpetrator male. That is simply not the case. The prevalence of DV in non-heterosexual relationships is actually higher than in heterosexual ones, and this includes lesbian relationships. A couple good resources on the topic include but by no means are limited to:

1. <http://www.saveservices.org/2012/06/fiebert-dv-bibliography-now-includes-286-scholarly-investigations/>
2. <http://www.batteredmen.com/>

Erin Pizzey opened the first DV shelter for women in the US. (See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Erin_Pizzey) She discovered that feminists did not want to hear her talk about male DV victims who asked for her assistance. By continuing to insist that DV is exclusively or nearly-exclusively an issue of men trying to dominate/control women, feminists are working actively to de-legitimize the complaints of male victims (in hetero- or homosexual relationships), women in homosexual relationships, children, elderly people, and siblings and other family members. The denial is both willful and politically-motivated.

13. Do you feel men and boys are targeted by perpetrators as victims of domestic violence or political violence because of their gender?

Yes, insofar as they receive more media attention and are far more likely to be prosecuted as compared with women when accused of the same or similar offenses. Additionally, women are much more likely to get away with making or using false accusations of violence, whether they are “routine” or sexual, than are men, for whatever reasons they have. The idea that men can be victims of sexual assault by women much less DV victims is still routinely dismissed by most people, and law enforcement and the political establishment reflect and perpetuate these false notions. Additionally, when or if a woman’s false accusation of sexual or other violence against a man is exposed for what it is, the liar is often not prosecuted for such offenses as making false statements to the police or swearing a false affidavit, or if they are, the punishment is frequently very mild and rarely includes time in jail.

14. Do you consider men or women “privileged” in any way in regards to their gender?

Discrimination entails an implied privilege relative to the non-discriminated-against class(es) that is not available to the discriminated-against class. (Say that five times fast!) In addition, there is a kind of “golden discrimination” that entails a negative discrimination against other group(s) but may or may not entail a “beneficial” discrimination for the discriminated-against (or for) class. A good example was mentioned above, having to do with maternity leave.

Women (at least here in the US) have many privileges as compared to men based on the level of deference they receive from others as well as women-only benefits from public and private sources alike. The tendency to view women’s interests in a more favorable light than men’s and especially to discount men’s interests or even deny their right to them in favor of women’s interests, even in the face of evidence that such consideration is undeserved or unjust, is termed “nymphotropism”. The more well-known term of “chivalry” has been used in the past, and while chivalry is part of nymphotropism (i.e., it is a facet of it), it does not encompass the entire phenomenon. In addition, pre-modern notions of chivalry entailed a presumption that women were less capable than men in many areas and so required assistance and deference for their well-being. This aspect of chivalry is no longer in place and what remains of it is simply a prejudicially-based knee-jerk set of reactions around what kind of behavior is expected of men relative to women. This behavior uniformly includes self-deprecating, self-sacrificing, providing-for, or other deferential behavior while entailing no expectation of consideration from the recipients (i.e., women) of this behavior.

Men can be considered privileged in that they are less expected to fulfill many uncompensated care-taking roles in society as compared with women. In addition, when men reach a high level of personal success (financial, political, etc.), people of both sexes by and large treat it as routine and to be expected. For example, while Bill Gates may be envied and people may have at times criticized his management style or how he was using his personal wealth, no one complained that he was as a result of his success, obligated to be charitable, or to champion causes viewed as “progressive” in many quarters. Women who are successful in these ways are often expected to use their position or success to further such causes and if they don’t support them, they get criticized extra-heavily. Examples include female politicians who have beliefs or values that are not considered stereotypically “feminine” (e.g.: Sarah Palin supports less-restrictive gun control laws generally; she is more aggressively criticized by fellow females for holding this position than she would be by those same females if she were male). Another example is the recently-minted CEO of Yahoo! (Marissa Mayer) who got rid of work-from-home because she felt it was getting in the way of productivity. A new male CEO may have been criticized somewhat but probably a lot less aggressively than a female one.

Of course there are others as well for both sexes. I could write forever on this topic.

15. In what ways can people work to end gender discrimination?

Start with the law and the application thereof. Simply become aware of the ways in which people are singled out and treated differently under the law because of their sex as compared with the “other sex” and insist that a uniform standard be applied. It need not be “treat men as you do women” or “treat women as you do men”, but instead, a uniform way of treating everyone. Decide on an equal standard and apply it. After all, isn’t that what the US Constitution says to do, anyway? As for private businesses and institutions, simply speak up. Write letters to businesses advertising single-sex benefits or that have sex-based discriminatory policies and tell them you don’t approve. Lobbying for laws that do not allow businesses to get away with such things is also another possibility. With the media, let them know that when they use gender-baiting advertising or publish such stories, call them out on it. Your letter may not get published, but someone will be reading it.

As for interpersonal discrimination, simply ask yourself at key points, “How would I treat this person if they were (the other sex)?” It isn’t a lot different from trying to uncover one’s own subconscious knee-jerk prejudices he or she may have with regard to people of other ethnic groups, classes, etc. As mentioned above, this need not become a preoccupation, but if you do this just a couple times a day, it helps create new cognitive and then behavioral habits. But realize some “discriminatory behaviors” will never go away for you, especially if they are based on your sexuality, nor should they go away (after all, you don’t want to send the wrong signal to

someone, right?). If you find another person attractive, you will likely want to interact with them more than others and in a different way than others (e.g.: by flirting or asking about their availability to meet some other time, etc.). Such behavior is naturally discriminatory because of what it entails, but it ought to stay that way; some things are just dictated by one's very personal nature and that's a necessary thing.