



Kemp House
152 City Road
London EC1V 2NX
Web: j4mb.org.uk
Email: mail@j4mb.org.uk
Tel: 07967 026163

Rebecca Hilsenrath
Chief Executive
Equality and Human Rights Commission
Fleetbank House
2-6 Salisbury Square
London EC4Y 8JX

23 November 2018

Dear Rebecca,

I am sending a copy of this letter, along with the attached document, to all 13 Commissioners at the EHRC. Along with Elizabeth Hobson, our Director of Communications, I wish to give a presentation to you and your colleagues, more on this later in the letter.

On your website, you claim this:

We are an independent statutory body with the responsibility to encourage equality and diversity, eliminate unlawful discrimination, and protect and promote the human rights of everyone in Britain.

To be truthful, you should add after “everyone in Britain”, the words “other than men and boys”.

The British state has long been deeply sexist, with an anti-male bias, and that bias is increasing as women take up ever more positions where they're able to implement pro-female (and therefore anti-male) bias. The human rights of British men and boys today are assaulted in many areas by the state's actions and inactions, *almost always to privilege women and girls*. Justice for Men & Boys (J4MB), the political party I launched in 2013, and still lead, explored 20 such areas in its 80-page 2015 general election manifesto.¹ They included:

Genital mutilation	Armed Forces veterans mental health
Reproductive rights	Homelessness
Fatherlessness	Suicide (#1 cause of death of men under 45)
Education	Criminal justice system
Employment	Paternity fraud
Denial of access to children	Anonymity for suspected sexual offenders
Domestic violence	Divorce settlements
Sexual abuse	Healthcare provision

The British state assaults the rights of women and girls *specifically* in no areas. None. Should the EHRC not be striving for men and boys to enjoy the same rights as women and girls?

¹ <https://tinyurl.com/V10manifesto>

Women and girls in Britain today belong to a highly privileged class, while men and boys belong to a highly disadvantaged class. Reading the evidence base in our manifesto should clear up any doubts you might have on that front.

The EHRC is institutionally sexist and anti-male. You should be holding the government to account for its assaults on the human rights of men and boys, but you signally fail to do so, year after year. Your focus on gender-related matters is limited to the interests and advancement of women and girls only, despite the inevitable cost to men and boys.

I cannot recall the EHRC, or its predecessor organizations, ever holding the government to account for turning a blind eye to the non-therapeutic circumcision of male minors, Male Genital Mutilation – a crime under the Offences Against the Person Act 1861, being at least ABH, and almost certainly GBH. It would require a parliamentary override to be legal, and that has never existed. MGM violates international human rights conventions, and *no exemptions from the law of the land are permitted for religious or cultural considerations*.

According to a Fawcett Society survey in 2016, only 9 per cent of British women self-identify as feminists, along with 4 per cent of men,¹ yet the work of the EHRC on gender matters stems from seeing the world only through a feminist lens. The views of the remaining 91 per cent of women and 96 per cent of men who are not feminists have no impact on the thinking of the EHRC on gender matters. For example, the EHRC is keen to see more mothers of children go into paid employment, and fathers carry out more childcare, completely at odds with the wishes of the majority of mothers and fathers.

The Government Equalities Office, your sponsor department, has three ministers, *all women*. Penny Mordaunt is the Minister for Women and Equalities, anti-male sexism being implicit in her title (and, of course, the title of the Women and Equalities Committee). There is not even a *pretence* to care about men and boys (likewise the Violence Against Women and Girls strategy). Yet the Minister for Women and Equalities appoints EHRC Commissioners. Needless to say, there's no Minister for Men – men being unworthy of state concern, despite paying almost 75% of the income taxes which largely fund the state.

William Collins, a prominent blogger on gender issues, published a lengthy critique of the EHRC in 2016.² The Finance Summary:

The only payments relating specifically to men were two to Families Need Fathers, in 2010/11 and 2011/12, and one to the YMCA in 2010/11. **The EHRC have spent nearly five times more in the last two years encouraging women and minorities into rugby and cricket than they have spent on all men's issues in six years.** [My emphasis]

It is difficult to give an accurate impression of all the recipients of EHRC funding. The above histogram resulting from numbCruncher's FoI enquiry is probably the best indication. A list of all recipients over the last six years (2010 – 2016) can be found here.³ (This relates to recipients in the categories Human Rights, Equality of Opportunity, Legal, Research, Disability, Grants and Discretionary Programme). **It is clear that the areas favoured by the EHRC are those conforming to the progressive / feminist / identity political agenda. Male issues are ignored.** [My emphasis]

Even if one were in agreement with the areas chosen for funding and campaigning, the fact remains that the EHRC is staggeringly profligate. About half their funding goes on

¹ <https://www.conservativewoman.co.uk/kathy-gyngell-cheer-up-only-7-per-cent-of-brits-call-themselves-feminists/>

² <http://empathygap.uk/?p=906>

³ <http://redpilluk.co.uk/RecipientsoffundingfromtheEHRCinthesixyearsApril2010toMarch2016.pdf>

staff salaries. Adding all premises, office, IT, expenses, admin and management costs means that, **over the last three years, only about 15% of the cost of the EHRC was expended on equality and human rights issues.** [My emphasis]

We were keen to provide feedback on your consultation document, “Draft Strategic Plan 2019-22”, in line with the requested mechanisms for doing so, but it quickly became clear that it would have been an exercise in utter futility, so blind is the EHRC to the human rights of men and boys, half the population, and their suffering. So we prepared this letter, along with the attached document, as our response.

Please find attached a document covering 17 of the 20 areas in our 2015 manifesto, where the state assaults the human rights of men and boys, through its actions and inactions.

J4MB is a prominent organization in the international Men’s Rights Movement (MRM), a rapidly-growing movement campaigning for the human rights of men and boys. Launched in 2013, we’ve enjoyed more mainstream media coverage than all other organizations in the world campaigning for the human rights of men and boys, *combined*. We are in an unrivalled position to help the EHRC start considering issues affecting men and boys.

The state, and the EHRC by extension, cares not a jot about the human rights of men and boys as a class. We think it’s time for the EHRC to *start* caring, and we’re available for meetings to help you start that long-overdue process. Along with Elizabeth Hobson, our Director of Communications,¹ I should like to meet with you and your colleagues, with a view to starting the process of putting men’s and boys’ issues firmly on the agenda of the EHRC. Perhaps this could start with our giving presentations to all 13 Commissioners.

In order to start informing the Commissioners about the crime of Male Genital Mutilation, we offer an exclusive screening of the award-winning film *American Circumcision*, which has not yet been made available for viewing outside North America.² I enclose a leaflet on the matter, which we handed to thousands of attendees at the last Conservative party conference.

We’ll be posting the content of this letter, along with the attached document, on our party’s website, on Monday, 10 December – as well as publishing a press release that day.

I look forward to hearing from you shortly.

Yours sincerely,

Mike Buchanan

Party leader

¹ <https://tinyurl.com/ElizabethHobsonJ4MB>

² <https://circumcisionmovie.com/>

**Justice for Men & Boys: Response to the EHRC Draft Strategic Plan 2019 – 2022, commentary from the party’s 2015 general election manifesto¹ and elsewhere
(N.B. Where references are not shown in this document, they can be found in the manifesto)**

Issues	Commentary from the manifesto and elsewhere	Manifesto pages
Genital mutilation	<p>Carrying out the non-therapeutic circumcision of male minors – Male Genital Mutilation, MGM – is a criminal offence under the Offences Against the Person Act 1861, being at least Actual Bodily Harm, and almost certainly Grievous Bodily Harm. Dr Balvinder Mehat, a circumciser based in Nottingham, was arrested by the police in May 2017 on suspicion of inflicting Grievous Bodily Harm with Intent,² a crime carrying a maximum sentence of life imprisonment. Predictably, the CPS declined to bring a prosecution.</p> <p>It would require a parliamentary override for MGM to be lawful, and that has never existed.</p> <p><i>No exemptions to the law of the land are permitted for religious or cultural considerations.</i> The overwhelming majority of male minors born into Jewish and Muslim families are circumcised.</p> <p>MGM violates several international human rights conventions.</p> <p>As an introduction to MGM, we recommend an article by William Collins.³ On our YouTube channel we have a playlist with 80+ audio and video files on the issue.⁴</p>	9, 10
Fatherlessness	<p>In only forty years or so, the entire institution of the family, underpinned by a lifelong commitment to marriage, has been overturned. This was driven by feminist politicians such as Harriet Harman and Patricia Hewitt, who wrote in a report “The Family Way: A New Approach to Policy Making” for <i>New Feminist</i> in 1992, ‘It cannot be assumed that men are bound to be an asset to family life, or that the presence of fathers in families is necessarily a means to social cohesion’.⁵</p> <p>Today, a father as head of a family – a leader, provider, and protector – is fast becoming an anachronism. In fact, fatherhood is being systematically removed from society by governments of all political hues who espouse the Harman/Hewitt political</p>	11 – 14

¹ <https://tinyurl.com/V10manifesto>

² <https://j4mb.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/46/2017/06/170623-Times-piece-on-Dr-Mehat.pdf>

³ <http://mra-uk.co.uk/?p=519>

⁴ <https://tinyurl.com/MGMplaylist>

⁵ https://www.jstor.org/stable/1395246?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents

	<p>doctrine, through the family courts in their decisions about child access after divorce, and through the widespread development of single parenting, usually single motherhood.</p> <p>Young adults who grow up not living with their biological fathers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are less likely to attain qualifications - Are more likely to experience unemployment - Are more likely to have low incomes - Are more likely be on income support - Are more likely to offend and go to jail - Are more likely to suffer from long term emotional and psychological problems - Are more likely to have children outside marriage or outside any partnership 	
Education	<p>The state education system is run with the objective of advantaging girls over boys from their earliest years.</p> <p>In an interesting analysis, William Collins wrote about the education gender gap (girls performing better than boys, on average) which emerged for the first time in 1987/88, when 'O' levels were replaced by GCSEs.¹ The gap resulted from the introduction of continuous assessment by teachers, their pro-girl bias predictably resulting in higher grades for girls than boys. Contrary to popular belief, there had been no gender gap previously in favour of boys, under the 'O' level system. Predictably, the gender gap – which remains with us to this day – led to women taking the majority of university places (almost 60% in 2017/18).</p> <p>The long-term trend for there to be less physical activity in schools is known to have a negative impact on boys' academic performance, contributing to the gap. A larger problem is the sexism of female teachers, which contributes even more. A study conducted by researchers at the London School of Economics found that boys have realised female teachers award lower grades to boys than to girls. They're demotivated by this, and don't work as hard.² Girls don't exhibit the same demotivation with male teachers.</p>	15 – 17
Employment	<p>Gendered differences largely account for differences in individuals' preferences to not work, to work part-time, or work full-time. A world-renowned British sociologist, Dr Catherine Hakim, published a paper on 'Preference Theory' in 2000.³ Among her findings was that while four in seven British men are 'work-centred', only one in seven British women is.</p> <p>This is intuitive, of course. Women make work/life balance decisions because of their role as mothers. Yet the existence of persistent differences in gender-typical work orientations is ignored by the state, which does all in its power to drive women</p>	18 – 23

¹ <http://empathygap.uk/?p=121>

² <http://cee.lse.ac.uk/ceedps/ceedp133.pdf>

³ <https://j4mb.org.uk/2015/05/12/why-most-people-at-the-top-of-major-companies-are-men-dr-catherine-hakims-preference-theory-2000/>

	<p>into paid employment, notably through the tax system which discourages ‘stay-at-home mothers’.</p> <p>Male unemployment has long exceeded female unemployment. The aim of the state has long been to increase female employment, despite knowing that results in higher male unemployment, as the social anthropologist Belinda Brown has explained.¹</p> <p>Unemployment is a major driver of male suicide, but not female suicide. Suicide is the #1 cause of death of British men under 45. The male:female suicide rate differential has more than doubled in the past 30 years, from 1.7:1 to 3.5:1.</p> <p>The bias towards recruiting women as medical students, which started in the 1970s, has led to a situation where today 70% of medical students are women. The state has to fund the training of two female doctors to derive the career work output of one male doctor. Many of the problems facing the NHS are directly attributable to the preference for training women rather than men to be doctors.</p> <p>An example of government driving anti-male employment directions is the Public Sector Equality Duty in the Equality Act 2010, which enables public sector organizations to favour groups with ‘protected characteristics’ which are ‘under-represented’ in lines of work, or in seniority levels. One protected characteristic is gender, so in theory men could be favoured in areas where they’re ‘under-represented’, but in practice the Act is only ever used to advantage women (and thereby disadvantage men) even though already two-thirds of public sector employees are women.</p>	
Access to children after family breakdowns	<p>Around one in four children lose contact permanently with their fathers following family breakdowns, mainly due to the failure of the family court system to ensure them reasonable access. This is emotional abuse of children, fathers, grandparents and others.</p> <p>More than 90% of the parents denied reasonable access to their children by family courts are fathers. The male:female suicide rate differential is normally around 3.5:1, but rises to around 10:1 following family breakdowns.</p>	24, 25
Domestic violence	<p>State support for male victims of domestic violence (DV) is close to non-existent. Some well-established facts about DV:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DV is a generational problem, not a gendered problem. Children with one or more violent parents are known to have a far higher likelihood of becoming violent partners, than children who don’t have violent parents. 	26 – 30

¹ <https://j4mb.org.uk/2013/10/27/belinda-brown-getting-women-into-the-workplace-encourages-replacement-not-growth/>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no evidence to support the male control theory of DV. A recently-published (in 2015) study reported, ‘Contrary to the male control theory, women were found to be more physically aggressive to their partners than men were’.¹ - Around two in five of the reported victims of IPV are men.² - The majority of abusive intimate relationships involve a degree of reciprocity. Both partners are to some extent perpetrators and victims at various times, both prone to provoke and/or initiate violence. - When IPV is one-way, the perpetrator is more likely to be a woman than a man. Only 4% of female perpetrators report ‘self-defence’ as a motivation.³ - Women are as physically aggressive as men towards intimate partners, or more aggressive.⁴ - When IPV-related suicides are added to IPV-related murders, men are more likely than women to die as a consequence of IPV.⁵ <p>When men leave their homes because they’re being physically abused by partners, and seek accommodation from a local authority, they’re categorised as ‘intentionally homeless’, and are not entitled to consideration for social housing. There are virtually no refuge places for battered heterosexual men in the UK, and none for men with children. IPV is therefore a driver of homelessness, which is overwhelmingly a problem for men rather than women. Homeless people are over nine times more likely than the general population to commit suicide. Street homelessness reduces life expectancy by 30 years, on average.</p>	
Sexual abuse	<p>It’s known from a major American survey⁶ that slightly over 25% of heterosexual sex offences are committed by women against men (with no male accomplices). We would therefore expect the male/female ratio of people charged with sex offences to be a little under 3:1. In the UK, in 2013, the ratio was 146:1.</p> <p>In 1984 two American researchers, Petrovich & Templer, reported that of a sample of 89 incarcerated (male) rapists, 49 (59%) had been sexually abused as children by one or more women.⁷ British psychologists recently came to a similar conclusion, following a study at HMP Whitemoor.⁸ There is a <i>de facto</i> correlation between female sex offences and male sex offending.</p>	31 – 37

¹ <https://j4mb.org.uk/2014/07/29/a-study-on-the-male-control-theory-of-intimate-partner-violence/>

² <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20160106160331/http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/crime-stats/crime-statistics/focus-on-violent-crime-and-sexual-offences--2012-13/rpt---about-this-release.html> (Table 4.03)

³ <https://j4mb.files.wordpress.com/2014/05/140514-mankind-conference-slough-2013-female-perpetrators-of-intimate-partner-violence.pdf>

⁴ <https://j4mb.org.uk/domestic-violence-women-are-as-physically-aggressive-as-or-more-aggressive-than-men-in-their-relationships-with-intimate-partners/>

⁵ <https://j4mb.org.uk/domestic-violence-more-men-than-women-die-as-a-result-of-it/>

⁶ <https://j4mb.files.wordpress.com/2014/09/140923-2014-cdc-report-including-material-on-sexual-violence.pdf>

⁷ <http://ww1.amsciepub.com/?subid1=f62e114a-e50f-11e8-9531-11beeb741fc2>

⁸ <https://j4mb.org.uk/2018/06/29/male-psychology-conference-2018/>

	The CPS has long had an anti-male bias, and nowhere has this been clearer than in the drives under Alison Saunders and her predecessor to drive up the number of convictions of men for sexual offences, with ever more miscarriages of justice coming to light.	
Armed forces veterans' mental health issues	<p>The MOD has no responsibility for the mental health of veterans, and an over-stretched NHS is ill-equipped to deal with them. Male veterans in particular, struggling to cope with their mental health issues, frequently turn to alcohol to cope, and this presents a problem. Alcohol is a depressant, and it requires more resources to treat someone with possible mental health issues as well as an alcohol dependency – a 'dual diagnosis'.¹ Provision of support for these people tends to be poor, although it's known that treatment for people with a dual diagnosis is likely to be effective.</p> <p>Veterans with this dual diagnosis are told to remain 'dry' for a lengthy period – often six months or more – before becoming eligible for treatment. This is an unrealistic expectation for many of them, and reveals a lack of humanity towards men who've put their lives on the line for their country. It leads to veterans committing suicide while they wait for treatment, sometimes when their problems have reached the level of leaving them homeless. Veterans make up a substantial proportion of the homeless population.</p> <p>Last month we linked to a <i>Sunday Times</i> piece titled, "Armed Forces chiefs take aim at 'shameful' neglect of veterans".²</p>	38, 39
Homelessness	<p>Almost 90% of the street homeless are men.</p> <p>Homeless people are more than nine times as likely as the general population to commit suicide.</p> <p>Homelessness reduces life expectancy by an average of 30 years.</p> <p>Armed Forces veterans are disproportionately represented in the street homeless community.</p>	40 – 45
Suicide	<p>Suicide remains the leading cause of death of men below the age of 45, in all age categories.</p> <p>Between 1985 and 2015 (30 years) the male:female suicide differential more than doubled, from 1.7:1 to 3.5:1.</p> <p>No government resources – or taxpayers' money – are being expended on exploring suicide as primarily a men's issue, with a view to reducing the male suicide rate.</p>	46 – 48

¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dual_diagnosis

² <https://j4mb.org.uk/2018/10/29/armed-forces-chiefs-take-aim-at-shameful-neglect-of-veterans/>

	<p>Government narratives on male suicide inevitably focus on mental health issues, whilst not recognizing that reactive depression results from issues partly or wholly outside the control of the men concerned, e.g. fathers' denial of access to their children following family breakdowns. In 2016 J4MB sent a written submission to the Health Select Committee inquiry into suicide prevention.¹ The document outlined how the state's actions and inactions are <i>directly</i> contributing to the high male suicide rate in at least 10 areas.</p> <p><i>International Business Times</i> published an article by Mike Buchanan on male suicide in 2015.²</p>	
Criminal justice system	<p>The justice system is institutionally biased against men, and is the direct cause of a scandalous 'gender justice gap'. The system is brutal towards men, and lenient towards women. The emphasis for male prisoners is punishment, while the emphasis for female prisoners is rehabilitation. More prisons for men are being built, while prisons for women are being decommissioned.</p> <p>The prison population in the UK is around 84,000. Over 80,000 of these are men. William Collins published a detailed article, 'UK prisoners: the genders compared'.³ It ends with the following conclusion:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Men are subject to massive gender discrimination in the criminal justice system. If male offenders were treated in the same way as female offenders, there would be only one-sixth of the number of men in prison. About 68,000 men would not be in prison if they were female, leaving a male prison population of only 13,000.</p> <p>Gender equality in prison sentencing would resolve the prison overcrowding crisis within a very few years.</p>	49 – 51
Paternity fraud	<p>Paternity fraud is an egregious assault on men's human rights – it is fraud. It is also a cruel assault on the children who are born into this arrangement, whether or not they later learn who their true fathers are. William Collins has written impressive articles on paternity fraud, touching on the iniquity of DNA paternity tests having no legal validity unless the mother agrees to the tests being carried out.^{4, 5, 6}</p> <p>In 2014, J4MB learned from a Freedom of Information Act enquiry that the Child Support Agency had for many years known of over 500 cases annually of paternity fraud, after women agreed to men's requests to have paternity tests carried out, and</p>	52 – 54

¹ <https://j4mb.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/46/2016/10/160907-submission-to-the-health-select-committee-of-the-house-of-commons.pdf>

² <https://www.ibtimes.co.uk/male-suicide-scandal-uk-men-are-paying-system-that-drives-thousands-them-death-1493340>

³ <http://empathygap.uk/?p=215>

⁴ <http://empathygap.uk/?p=238>

⁵ <http://empathygap.uk/?p=245>

⁶ <http://empathygap.uk/?p=258>

	<p>the men were found not to be the fathers of the children in question. None of these women were charged for their crimes. The reason given was usually that to prosecute would not be in the 'public interest'. As in other areas – women making false rape allegations being an obvious example – it is not deemed to be in the public interest to deter women from committing crimes that assault the human rights of men.</p> <p>The Crown has never prosecuted a woman for paternity fraud, but should be doing so under the Fraud Act 2006.</p>	
Anonymity for suspected sexual offenders	<p>In May 2010 the coalition government committed to reintroducing legislation to protect the anonymity of suspected sexual offenders, until and unless convicted, but later reneged on the commitment, following lobbying by feminist MPs and women's groups. The existing law is nothing less than a charter for malicious women to make false allegations, thereby ruining innocent men's lives, at little or no risk to themselves, because <i>they</i> are afforded anonymity. The reasons why false sexual assault allegations are common are well understood.¹ Janet Bloomfield, a Canadian men's human rights advocate, wrote an article entitled, '13 reasons women lie about rape'.² Hannah Wallen wrote articles on '6 dangerous rape myths'.^{3,4}</p> <p>The default position of men accused of sexual offences is that they're considered guilty, and needing to prove their innocence, which is not only a perversion of the principle of innocence until being found guilty, but also usually impossible in a practical sense, given the circumstances of most alleged offences. A series of cases in 2017 and 2018 indicated systemic failures of the police and CPS in their bid to drive up conviction rates, including the failure of the police to provide exonerating social media evidence to defendants' legal teams.</p> <p>There can be no doubt that the convictions of many men for rape over recent years (and historically) have been unsafe, leading to many innocent men languishing in prison for many years. The accusations alone – combined with media exposure – have led numerous men to commit suicide.</p>	55, 56
Divorce	<p>It cannot be fair and just that decades after women have had the same employment opportunities and earnings potential as men, women are still achieving personal financial enrichment through divorce, the state handing them much of the assets worked for by men over many years, and sometimes men's inherited wealth too.</p>	57 – 60

¹ <https://www.avoicemen.com/sexual-politics/ten-reasons-false-rape-accusations-are-common/>

² <https://www.avoicemen.com/mens-rights/false-rape-culture/13-women-who-lied-about-being-raped-and-why-they-did-it/>

³ <https://www.avoicemen.com/mens-rights/dangerous-rape-myths-part-1/>

⁴ <https://www.avoicemen.com/mens-rights/dangerous-rape-myths-part-2/>

	Men tend to invest disproportionately in their careers – in plain English, men are more likely to be full-time, whole-of-life workers. As a result men tend to earn more than their wives, and wives benefit from their husbands’ earnings in many ways. Why should those benefits continue after divorce?	
Healthcare provision	<p>More men die from prostate cancer than women die from breast cancer, yet the state spends around £250 million of its total expenditure of £350 million p.a. on national cancer screening programmes for women – cervical cancer (£150 million) and breast cancer (£100 million). The balance is spent on screening for a non-gendered cancer, bowel cancer (£100 million).</p> <p>There is no national screening programme for prostate cancer, and the government continues to spend less on research for prostate cancer than for breast cancer.</p> <p>There’s a severe shortage of specialist NHS prostate cancer nurses, and prostate cancer patients endure long waiting times, a lack of access to drugs, pain medication, and trials.¹</p>	61 – 65
Political representation	<p>We all have a vested interest in the quality of elected politicians, so prospective parliamentary candidates (PPCs) ought to be chosen solely on the basis of merit. The fact that a minority of MPs are women – the figure is currently around 25% – is a reflection of the smaller number of women who have historically sought to become PPCs. The reasons why women are relatively disinclined to seek careers in politics compared to men are well understood. Caroline Spelman MP was the Conservative party chairman in 2007. In a BBC radio interview in 2015, she admitted that during her term as chairman 10 times as many men as women were applying to become PPCs. On the basis of their relative disinterest in becoming MPs, women are <i>over</i>-represented as MPs.</p> <p>In December 1995, Peter Jepson and Roger Dyas-Elliott were prevented from standing on Labour shortlists because of their gender. They challenged the policy in court, supported by the Equal Opportunities Commission, claiming that they had been illegally barred from applying to be considered to represent the party, and that the policy contradicted Labour’s policy of aiming to promote equality of opportunity. In January 1996 an industrial tribunal found the Labour Party <i>had</i> broken the law, unanimously ruling that all- women shortlists were illegal under the Sex Discrimination Act 1975 in preventing men from entering a profession.</p> <p>A Labour government enacted The Sex Discrimination (Election Candidates) Act 2002 to allow political parties to select candidates based on gender. Most of the major political parties now employ all-women shortlists.</p> <p>All-women shortlists for PPCs are an abomination in a democracy.</p>	66, 67

¹ <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/health/news/11130248/Prostate-cancer-patients-discriminated-against-charity.html>

<p>Government interference in company director appointments</p>	<p>One of the cornerstones of capitalism is the freedom of companies to appoint directors as they see fit. Company boards carry the primary responsibility to the shareholders to ensure a worthwhile return on their investment, such that they continue to provide the capital needed to finance the company’s profit-making activities. Therefore, the quality of the Board is a key factor in achieving high corporate performance (as well as good corporate citizenship).</p> <p>Since 2010, the government has been relentless in shaming and forcing major companies to increase the proportion of women on their boards, despite knowing of the existence of a causal link between increasing the proportion of women on corporate boards, and corporate financial DECLINE, since 2012. The evidence of that causal link is here.¹ It was presented to House of Commons and House of Lords inquiries in 2012 by Mike Buchanan, in his role as the leader of Campaign for Merit in Business.² A video of the oral evidence given by Mike Buchanan and others to the House of Commons inquiry, “Women in the Workplace”, is available online.³</p>	<p>68, 69</p>
---	--	---------------

Document prepared by Mike Buchanan, party leader, Justice for Men & Boys – J4MB – 23.11.18. His contact details:

Email mike@j4mb.org.uk

Mobile: 07967 026163

¹ <https://c4mb.files.wordpress.com/2012/11/121113-v4-the-five-studies-showing-that-increasing-female-representation-on-boards-leads-to-a-decline-in-corporate-performance.pdf>

² <http://c4mb.wordpress.com>

³ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zwqTi6HN0pM>