

From Baby Killers to Wife Beaters

The Media Attack on Men, and Coverup of Violence by Women

by Michael Gilson De Lemos

The recent titillating spate of ghastly stories on military wife beating[1] carried by services as Reuters is part of the open hypnotism of the American Public now underway.

During the Vietnam war men were excitedly characterized as baby-killers — and no doubt there were shocking things covered up by military fat cats — but this has spread throughout the culture so by the mid-eighties police forces began training courses on the assumption that married men, especially any with guns, military background, or self-defense skills (though apparently not the police) were inherently abusers. In one course in Pittsburgh that I reviewed, that was the phrase: “...marriage is an inherently abusive male dominance relationship.”

The truth is the US is suffering an epidemic of husband beating, false accusations, robbery, abuse and murder of males by women with legal and cultural impunity. They no more view what they do as a crime than the old oppression of peasants was thought a crime, even by the peasants.

Many men, afraid of being accused as “abuse enablers” and led by false chivalry, are joining in their own destruction like Eloi running to serve the Morlocks. And beware — the US is exporting this epidemic of social hysteria to foreign countries through incessant TV shows, UN meetings, and scholarly blarney. This is not to say abuse of females does not occur. But that I have to make sure to include that disclaimer tells you that the culture waved bye-bye to rational discussion of these matters years ago, and is slowly dragging the rest of the world with it.

Take the most scary sounding feminist tract you can find, reverse the use of male and female, multiply by perhaps 10, and brother, you will have the truth. Like Blacks demeaned decades ago, men have become

accustomed, habituated to an open prison and constant indignities — while the Whites who inflicted them were convinced they were the Black's best friends.

An experiment: Show a video of a woman hitting a man to both sexes. Most will perceive male abuse, or justified female attack. Try it, take a scene from TV. My experience is that more men think they see the man hitting the woman.

When many, vaguely hearing the soothing voice of the hypnotist, look at a potato and see an apple, that is the classic definition of mass hypnosis.

Do You Believe Your Lyin' Eyes?

Forget the additional narcosis of academic studies, news reports, and endless government pronouncements. Use your head to observe. Try this experiment: Go to your cable TV tomorrow afternoon around 4 PM (prime time female viewing hours) and jot down on a legal pad, one line for each channel, a summary of what you see. Just look for 15 seconds or so per channel till you get the gist. This is what consultants call a "Gilson snapshot" — typically, you will find over 80 percent of the channels portray abuse, devaluing, or demeaning of men. See if you experience highlights similar to these as you flip the channels, one by one:

- An afternoon cartoon: the girls push around the boys, who somehow just can't get science. Barney appears afterward to say let's all be friends.
- A show on financial empowerment for divorced women
- A wife in a movie discovers her husband is involved in an affair and sets out to kill him to everyone's approval
- A man is slapped by a woman
- A woman screams at her son and calls him a loser. She is then praised by the talk show host for attending anger management class. The boy is told it is up to him to keep her calm by a guest therapist.

- A man is shot by a woman
- “The More You Know” series of ads warns abuse can happen to anyone, so call for help immediately when he, repeat he, does it
- A man says he is wildly in love with a woman who just kicked his testicles and insulted his father
- A news report on forced or fraudulent government castration of men in India — focus? The emotional effects on the women, unhappy with their subsequent sex lives ...but who are learning they can now remarry, and many of whom targeted their unsuspecting husbands for such “radical birth control” to government bureaucrats in the first place. “Improvements must be made based on experiments there before this can be rolled out to America,” says the commentator.
- A woman shoots her boyfriend for buying a stereo without consulting her
- A woman throws off her wedding veil and abandons the groom to have what looks like a personal erotic moment while driving a car
- Another abandons her boyfriend and steals his car after discovering a soft drink is all she needs in life
- A court case is interrupted when a woman begins to shampoo her hair and is happily pursued by sex maniacs, cheer-led by a psychotherapist
- A government panel determines more funds are needed for “violence against women”
- A man bursts on the screen saying "There is a plot by the government to use women to take over the world!" That one made me pause. Alas, it was an old comedy — the man is soon characterized as mad
- Barry Scheck is interviewed with his discovery that DNA shows, in apparently those few cases where the police did not screw up the evidence, that 1/3rd of those serving time for rape (in many states until recently still a capital offense) were falsely accused. The panel afterward speculates on the “growing problem” that this fact may discourage women from making domestic

violence accusations. The commentator continues, “Of course there is the rare case as we saw with Barry Scheck, maybe one in a million cases, where the woman lies.” “Or much more likely just made a mistake because she was upset,” says the other. The two women both nod, satisfied with the math that turns one third into a million to one shot.

- A rerun of Donahue. He says under no circumstances should you hit a woman, even if she attacks you or must fight back. This is followed by a news story of the pardon by the Governor of a woman who dug through several walls to beat her disabled husband to death while he repeatedly called police who felt his call was insignificant. She felt abused, said the Governor. It is a victory for women, said several women’s shelters and advocacy groups.
- A man comes home to discover his girlfriend has cleaned out the house and run off with a lesbian. He sets out to win her back after she hits him over the head with a bat
- A woman throws a drink at a man who says she looks better in the blue dress
- In the final episode of Star Trek, Captain Kirk finds his body stolen by a sympathetically portrayed woman
- A woman fakes a rape scene to frame her lover and makes off triumphantly with her husband’s money, whom she has just murdered. Her husband is bad as he deals drugs, unlike her, who wants a better life.
- Boys are embarrassed by a smug teacher because they can’t give the birthdate of Susan B. Anthony or name when votes happened for women. They are not taught when, or by whom, votes were won for men
- A man tries to help an eccentric and distressed visiting professor by inviting him to stay over. His wife leaves him
- On a nature show, a female praying mantis eats the male while mating
- In Afghanistan a desperate father whose home was destroyed by American bombing has his young

daughters take in piecework. This, says the reporter, is a vestige of Moslem male dominance the US is trying to correct. The reporter patronizingly asks the wife why she doesn't leave him since he won't send the daughters to school and continues luridly on the custom of polygamy. The reporter has apparently forgotten she also reported the US bombs had pulverized the school to flinders.

- A man is slapped and hit by his girlfriend and called an abuser because he did not tell her that he was adopted.
- Psychologists discuss the “controversial” proposition that fathers are beneficial
- A CNN reporter reveals the shocking fact that in Arab countries, women do not automatically get custody. Tune in tonight for the courageous story of a woman who kidnapped her son to America after leaving her husband to avoid the custom of the country where the boy has grown up.
- A man gets twenty years for consensual non-vaginal sex with his wife. She gets therapy
- A raped 12 year old boy is ordered to pay child support to the rapist, his teacher
- A story on deadbeat dads features a man who must, under antique laws, pay support even though the child was by the man with whom his wife was two-timing him. “Women are fighting back against the many men who seek to avoid their legal obligations,” intones the reporter
- “You worm!” a woman tells a befuddled Curly, slapping the icon of male power.

What message do young girls watching with their mothers, or police who work the night shift and watch this, get?

If some satirist came up with this it might be denounced as exaggerated and showing more the anxieties of the satirist. But it is normal US TV fare at the beginning of the Third Millennium. Some days are worse, others better. If one looks at the programming of 20 years ago

when cable first came out, it is hardly much different.

Is this TV fare, fed every day into homes, by current definitions the real pornography and feeder of sexual or domestic violence? Or is the attack on “pornography” in part an attack on any attempt by men to understand in images the social reality and define it independently?

In contrast, a recent show where a man dates a series of women with a prospect of marriage (or at least a 6 month relationship, they are legally the same these days in most States; uh, that wasn't a joke) — that is, the 20-odd women simperingly chase the man — is considered so daring it is a nighttime sensation. But it confirms the devaluing attitude of violence: What sort of female-dependent, short-sighted, uncritical, superficial, self-devaluing wretch would make a marriage choice — of the mother of his children to be — this way?

America's ideal date who works and doesn't mess about the house if he knows what's good for him, that's who.

Go through this TV list and reverse the genders. What do you see now? Put any minority group — or any group — in place of the men. How does it all sound now? Would it not be a miracle if there was no violence against men? Conversely, what attitudes are making such TV fare attractive?

Go to any newstand, Look, really look, at the titles of the Women's magazines: “Show him who's boss,” “How to turn him on — and off,” “Faking Sex”[2]. Reverse the genders and imagine *Popular Mechanics* running such titles.

Not that the articles are particularly objective: in “Faking It” L. Featherstone at *Columbia Journalism Review* describes how facts are re-arranged in magazines for women to suit the prevailing ideology.[3]

It need not be arcane. In an article on sexual enjoyment, a married couple were having relations 5 times a week. The editor changed it to three times since such happy marriages where women revel (perhaps in “the inherent abusive relationship” of marriage) were “impossible.”

Not to worry — it is editorialized that such fraud in truth-telling is just: “women's magazines sometimes

seem like they feel afraid...” Of what? Male violence?
Ask a woman if she makes the tacit association.

But there’s more.

Doesn't Fit the Paperwork

It seems forgotten today that the term domestic violence was originally used in the ‘60s to describe female abuse of males. In 1972 when I started college it was not taught as a gender problem but one of counseling involving aggravating factors such as illness, mental disorders, or alcohol. A policewoman who came said both women and small men were far more violent and more of a problem for police to handle than men or large men. This attitude had changed radically as graduation approached.

Ask any police old timer what was really going on in domestics then — and today. But wait till he retires or will speak off the record: Police who say inconvenient things have little doubt they will be dismissed. Indeed, as one officer told me, female violence is rarely reported because, quite simply, it doesn’t fit the paperwork. Plus there are no promotions for what is not tracked. Consider:

- Most police departments do not track female versus male abuse. This inevitably influences both behavior and data.
- In many jurisdictions police may be reprimanded for not arresting the male
- According to several police departments that I contacted, all domestic violence training and awareness programs presume there is no abuse of men. Programs teach that if a woman denies she was abused, that is evidence of domestic violence
- Open your phone book. Tell me how many centers for violence on males that you see
- In Pennsylvania a heavyset woman raped and beat a man with a cola bottle to insensibility, screaming for sex even as several police wrestled her off. Was she tried for abuse or rape? Was she even arrested? No, she was initially summonsed for disorderly conduct as the man

was rushed to the hospital. Police told the man he was lucky police arrived and he was not charged with rape. There is no reporting box for rape or abuse of males on the police reports, it seems. The attitude is summarized by this: it got nationwide coverage in “News of the Weird” comic section.

This is not weird or funny. It is sinister reality. An Arab woman who is about to be stoned for plotting the murder of her husband with a paramour is subject to sympathetic international headlines. (No, I do not advocate government death penalties). In contrast? Violence against an American man is a comic strip.

Tell me, were you among the millions of American males who righteously denounced OJ so there would not be any suspicion you — shudder — sympathized with woman-beaters? Even as you admitted to friends you thought the evidence was a little screwy?

Ask yourself, is one reason we are seeing this epidemic of accusation is the subconscious guilt over abortion? (Sure there’s a right to abortion. But when you have hundreds of thousands of abortions, the problem isn’t abortion, it’s a symptom.)

Could it be that people in academia and government now devalue their own instrumentalities, such as the military, as a remnant of independence — in favor of the nebulous all-problem solver, the abstraction “government”?

The only reason the Federal government even reports female abuse of men is that a few libertarians, led by me, conducted a 10 year letter writing campaign until they did. As the statistics show, under the most charitable interpretation, wives and girlfriends are murdering and beating men with abandon. And why not? The practical legal consequences are less, police will readily arrest a man on mere accusation, but only a woman in many places (by formal or informal policy) if they see it with their own eyes. If anything males vastly under-report attacks compared to assumptions of female under-reports. Why? Women are psychologically supported, relatively; men endure ridicule.

Janet Reno Is Just a Klepto

Now realize the shocking figures do not reflect that police — and police I have spoken to estimate that over 95 percent of violence is female initiated — often cannot or are discouraged from reporting female violence. These are figures that got through the filtering system. And then realize that the worst violence of all, false accusations, is not tracked by the government.

Worse, Federal procedure when I last checked in 1998 was that even if a crime was found to have been a hoax, the FBI still reported it as a crime.

Indeed, we often enable a female criminal class in all respects, not just one crime type. Increasingly, the language itself seems to be making female crime invisible:

- A woman who steals expensive clothes is not a thief, but a kleptomaniac in need of counseling. A man who takes a slice of pizza as a joke gets life under the three strikes law.
- A woman who murders her child is distraught. A man who shoots a deer to feed his family is a violent gun nut.
- A woman who conducted an audacious embezzlement scheme for millions gets probation as “having a difficult past.” The boyfriend who reported the crime to police the next day gets 1 year for not reporting it soon enough.
- A woman against a male who makes a false accusation for profit is rarely prosecuted. Her victim finds even if he wins the case that no crime is reported

One day I went to court to observe a domestic violence trial. The couple had been married several years. The man claimed the woman tried to poison him, beat him as he slept, and then called the police and cried rape when he recovered. He was arrested. She immediately raided the bank accounts, her children’s trust funds, and tried to seize the house though she had just sold her own. She had a history of allergic mental instability. She had a court appointed free attorney (with whom she admitted she was having an affair) as the money she was spending from her husband was still legally his. He had no attorney as the money she had, still technically his, disqualified him from legal aid. As he struggled to tell his story and presented evidence such as her tampering

with his insurance policies in the last few months, the judge kept saying it was not important or interrupted. When the woman on cross examination was caught in palpable lies the judge said it didn't matter — she was “upset.” The man left with a three month sentence, forbidden to see his children and \$400 child support on an \$800 salary if he could get it. From his jail cell the next day he could hear a parade of women chanting against domestic violence.

Eventually his wife got off the allergy, snapped back to normal and disavowed the whole thing. Last I knew they were still trying to pick up the pieces.

Where was the violence here? Who were the perpetrators? Where was it reported so academics can study it?

Increasingly, thanks to the Internet, a variety of eccentric but informative sites have emerged as men begin to talk to one another and realize that if the Nation had been invaded by psychopathic infiltrators from Mars who had jimmed the entire legal system and brainwashed their very families, things could scarcely be worse.[4] In the last year a startling array of men and women from all parties, religious beliefs, and secular persons are focusing on this as a major item among humanity's woes. Amazingly, these sites regularly collect hard-to-find government statistics, collate similar stories from many sources and countries, and act as an intellectual underground for academics who go to them to track down contrarian information that has disappeared from State University research libraries — and, as I found recently, which sites are censored so they cannot be accessed from some Public Libraries.

A Victimless Crimewave

Government academics tell us that men dominate the US Prison population and order studies to find out what is wrong with the men, as they design ever more Byzantine prison and sentencing proposals. What is wrong with the men is they put these academic twits in power in the first place.

Such Academia doesn't want to hear any of it, particularly now that this is becoming an industry. When an occasional academic does a study that challenges the

status quo, or as happens revisits studies to find that the raw data proves the reverse, they are picketed, attacked by colleagues, reviled on TV, denounced as “enabling abuse” — as happened to researchers in 1994 in western Pennsylvania, as reported in a series in the Pittsburgh papers.[4] As a commentator, J. Lester, noted, a piece describing the “path breaking” and “controversial” research was entitled “Girlfriends Strike Back.”

Forget draconian or outdated laws on smoking funny cigarettes or reading Playboy as the most common victimless crime. St. Petersburg, Florida police tell me they now spend over 65 percent of their time on domestics — and with lawyers in the act, many of these are obvious set-ups, with police joking women have their divorce attorney’s name right there.

But the police nonetheless arrest the man.

And under the Nuremburg-style domestic violence court system, she immediately gets half of the income, the house, seizes the bank accounts, and moves on to the next victim.

Academics piously report this as an income loss to the female. What bilge.

So for some time I have been expecting the military would be the next target in the culture of substituting scandalous accusation for thought. Why? Because people I know in the military have been complaining of an epidemic of violence and false accusations against men . The honest career Officers feel powerless to act, except by dragging their feet, or meet the problem by resigning before they as well are accused of something. And why not? An accusation earns:

- Sympathy
- A cushy divorce or settlement
- Blackmail to drop the charges for a payment
- They even get his gun — men lose the right to own a gun if accused

In Korea, they had classes at USO’s for prospective military brides. An officer who monitored them one day

was shocked to discover the material was about how women had the right to refuse sex, divorce anytime, make unsupported sexual accusations, and seize marital assets in wonderful America. “But isn’t that a sort of slavery of men? Isn’t that a sort of prostitution of marriage?” said one bride to be. Others passed around cards of domestic violence and divorce lawyers in the US.

“If you kill your husband while he is trying to have sex, even kiss you, against your will, in the right circumstances it isn’t murder,” said the facilitator brightly.

The officer canceled the wedding.

I also learned of stories like the pilot who came home literally from a mission in Europe, was told by his wife to take out the garbage, said he wanted a glass of water first — so she stabbed him. “We tell soldiers if they’re real men they’ll take it. Unofficially. Stuff like that happens everyday,” said my informant, “So I suspect sooner or later the men will be blamed.”

Indeed. The government has announced a zero-tolerance policy for domestic violence of soldiers — male soldiers.

I thought this seminar in Korea must be some Naderesque church-ladies’ program gone wild until a year later I tuned in PBS and saw a presentation on Korean military brides. There was the program, or one much like it, and running commentary on how marrying an American Soldier was exploitation of these women. So no wonder they murder their wives — they’re already exploiters.

Other officers and soldiers over the years have told me of similar discoveries of these seminars — including near US military bases.

Were there any near the bases in question? What, exactly, is going on?

If soldiers are murdering their wives, this is terrible. But is it a social problem? Is it worse than anywhere else? What happened behind closed doors? Is imprisoning somebody or orders of protection really an insulting

incitement to violence that does far more harm than good? Can any of this even be discussed honestly while the government universities and controlled media churn out questionable data inlaid with hard-luck tearjerkers? What, really are we looking at behind the headlines? Does the military track women murdering husbands (I know the answer on that but will leave to you the pleasure of making a few enlightening phone calls to find out) and how does it compare?

No. This is murder, not some domestic violence or anything else, and should be coldly analyzed as such — or for factors such as upbringing, alcohol or other favorite government causes that have quietly become has-beens paving the way for the new social crusade. That other things going on are studiously ignored tells a different tale of managed social hysteria. It is like the Soviet Union or Nazi Germany, when the mundane offense became a “social crime” and suddenly almost everything, bad or good, was also — so real mass crimes in plain sight became invisible.

I often discuss at Libertarian events that part of the task is defusing social hysterias. The first step is identification, recognition, naming the unnamable. Such hysterias do not take hold without tacit co-operation of go-along “scientists” and scholars with a variety of motives, none noble. Thus people with legitimate problems best handled by counselors have seen their suffering politicized by things like the marital rape laws and “no means no” (except for the bottle wielding female rapist, apparently) violence standards championed by people like then Governor Ridge, which, in the debates in Pennsylvania, happy legislators described as “full employment acts.” Are academics paid by taxes from the families they destroy, as we may well have in the article cited[1], who grab a headline while irresponsibly using government statistics they know, or should know, are misleading — instead of getting out there and doing real academic research that can benefit the public — the worst abusers, and enablers, of them all?

America, face it: By using numbskull government self-righteousness, you have created a nightmare in plain sight of encouraged and sanctioned female violence — on boyfriends, husbands, children that make the most hair-raising feminist allegations against men pale. And other countries, beware: America is exporting this

nonsense to you. Ask yourselves: What is “domestic abuse” where academics who dissent are terrorized as “abusers” while police look the other way?

And yet — violence, schmiolence. What we are seeing as a growing number of women, and their male cohorts, use this as a racket. It is really and simply a pandemic of self-righteously legalized theft, mass looting and extortion rarely seen in history.

And many people today may subconsciously recognize this — but are afraid to investigate, or uncertain how to admit it — as they flip the channel to watch the next man being slapped by a woman and told he is an abuser.

References

- [1] <http://www.rense.com/general32/epi.htm>
- [2] [Here](#).
- [3] <http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=12543>
- [4] <http://www.vix.com/men/battery/battery.html>

Michael Gilson De Lemos ("MG") is on the National Committee of the US Libertarian Party, and also coordinates the [Libertarian International Organization](#). Retired as a Fortune 100 management consultant, he is working on books on management and libertarian philosophy. His email address is gilsondelemos@msn.com.

-30-

from *[The Laissez Faire Electronic Times](#)*, Vol 1, No 45, December 23, 2002

Editor: [Emile Zola](#) Publisher: [Digital Monetary Trust](#)