

The Case for Father Custody

Daniel Amneus

*ePub | *DOC | audiobook | ebooks | Download PDF*

DOWNLOAD



READ ONLINE

#4196987 in Books Primrose Pr 2000-02Original language:EnglishPDF # 1 1.36 x 6.23 x 9.28l, #File Name: 0961086467431 pages | File size: 72.Mb

Daniel Amneus : The Case for Father Custody before purchasing it in order to gage whether or not it would be worth my time, and all praised The Case for Father Custody:

24 of 28 people found the following review helpful. I Can't Believe I Read the Whole Thing!By Martian BachelorThis is a book feminist types certainly won't get! Daniel Amneus may be the principle defender of the recently much-maligned patriarchy, which has given us all the benefits of civilization: much longer lifespans due to decent food supplies and public health, generally affluent and peaceful societies, and such accomplishments of which the I-Net is only one of many if you step back and think about it a second.In this book Amneus's central thesis is that all this is only possible if women allow men to participate equally in reproduction and have stable two-parent families, a system which benefits men, women, and children and has been breaking down over the last 30-35 years, with often catastrophic results. The way women do this is by accepting sexual law and order (monogamy and chastity generally), which gives men paternity certainty and motivates them to provide and produce all the wonderful benefits of civilization. In the presence of a liberalized female sexuality, things revert back to basic Stone Age and mammalian forms, with the males specializing in predatory and destructive behavior rather than productive and protective behavior -- the matriarchal pattern of the ghetto and the indian reservation. Because many women resist sexual control (but still want the benefits) it's necessary to bind them to males and families by making men the heads of families and doing away with the century-long tried-and-failed experiment in mother custody.Many books start out with an introduction and ease into their subject, but Amneus launches directly into the diatribe from the first page and hammers away at the same themes over and over. Almost all of these would be familiar to anyone who's read Garbage

Generation because the male role in reproduction is marginal, the social role of fatherhood has to be as central as the female role is biologically if men are to be equal to women; the feminist / sexual / divorce revolution has only succeeded in reinforcing traditional sex roles, with women even more burdened by parenting duties and men stuck in involuntary breadwinning for ex-wives (from which they receive no reciprocal benefits) and for children which they have little ability to influence the socialization of -- a modern form of enslavement made possible by mom's taking them hostage with the court's assistance, not to mention a system requiring multiple state run damage-control backup systems for functions which the family formerly performed. At times Amneus merely sounds like someone who's ticked off and grumpy for having missed the sexual revolution, but much of what he's saying makes a ton of sense. Even though we're constantly told about how patriarchal everything is, much of the reasoning in this book will be of the brain-wrenching variety. Here is a perspective on things which is both comprehensive and radically different. While the knee-jerk backlash reaction of many will no doubt be to hurl epithets (such as the all-purpose "misogynist"), Amneus probably reserves his worst criticisms for unthinking judges and politicians who think it's somehow chivalrous to force men to subsidize the destruction of their families. This is a hard book to read. Fortunately, one can get 90% of it from just reading the first several dozen pages. It's perhaps unfortunate that the tone is so strident (and redundant), since there are many valuable ideas here for correcting (at little cost) many of our seemingly insolvable social problems which trace their roots back to families and how kids are raised. Apply salt liberally to offending passages -- there's little likelihood that these ideas will catch on and be realized anytime soon, even if it's nice to dream.

1 of 1 people found the following review helpful. MUST READ for the whole world
By MarkGreat as always. This is an absolute MUST READ for everyone under the sun. A++++++
2 of 3 people found the following review helpful. Helpful Information and Unanswered Questions
By J. Steven Svoboda
Daniel Amneus has written a book which has definite merits and at the same time is virtually guaranteed to provoke some negative reactions in all but the most uncritical reader. Amneus' thesis is stated (and repeatedly restated) throughout the work: He essentially agrees with feminists that men are marginal and adds (without documentation) that patriarchy is "artificial" but essential to civilization. A woman's primary contribution to a marriage is her sexual loyalty, while a man's is his wage-earning ability. The marriage contract cements both these contributions. But social programs such as welfare which reduce the need for the husband's economic role have encouraged women to obtain divorces in epidemic proportions. Father custody must be reinstated to prevent women from leaving marriages. While his work differs dramatically in many ways from that of Warren Farrell, and while he can be hardhearted as well as hardheaded, Amneus possesses a version of Farrell's facility with the bon mot. "Mom functions best as caregiver when the children are infants. But infants become children--who need Dad more and Mom less." "The linchpin in the feminist program is mother custody following divorce. Pull that pin, held in place by men's money, and the feminist structure collapses." "Taking away a father's children and making him pay for them "is like stabbing a man in the back and accusing him of carrying a concealed weapon." "But wouldn't the switchover to father custody deprive the mother of most of her bargaining power. THAT'S THE IDEA." [italics in original] Amneus' willingness to cast a critical eye even on his allies can produce salutary results, as when he questions Stuart Miller's justification of joint custody as promoting higher child support payments by the non-custodial parent. Amneus acerbically comments, "Miller is saying joint custody makes the destruction of the family WORKABLE." [italics in original] In one devilishly effective formulation, Amneus notes that we are asked to suppose that an ex-husband's earning ability was made possible by his ex-wife's previous services to him. It would then follow, he notes, that "the withdrawal of these services must cripple him, as the providing of them formerly benefitted him," a crippling which according to Amneus demonstrates the senselessness of requiring divorce settlements. Amneus offers several exemplary summations of the inequity of continuing only the male's marital duties after divorce. "Wives suppose themselves entitled to the benefits of the patriarchal system without performing services to earn them." "Imagine an employee quitting her job and demanding to be paid for doing so." "The marriage contract no longer guarantees a man's right to have a family, only his obligation to subsidize its destruction..." "Feminists... want a social system in which the woman's offer to the man is revocable but the man's to the woman is irrevocable." "The logical corollary to no fault would be no punishment." Comparing Farrell with Amneus can be a fascinating exercise, despite their almost perfectly counterposed styles and diverging messages. Unlike Farrell, Amneus approves of putting men to work for sex. While Farrell speaks of the evolutionary nature of remaking the male role, Amneus refers to the creation of patriarchy as an evolutionary development. Sometimes Amneus' thinking coincides with Farrell's, as when he summarizes women's ability to continue to receive their side of the marriage contract after divorce without having to reciprocate: "Women are allowed to play the Motherhood Card; men are forbidden to play the Money Card." Amneus also is an original thinker, admirably unconstrained by received ideas. Fearlessly proclaiming the unjustness of ANY child support requirement, he notes the unfairness of taking something away from people and making them pay for it. Amneus protests the injustice of turning a bilateral marriage contract into a non-contract under which the ex-wife is no longer a wife but the ex-husband must still play husband to his departed spouse. Virtually revelling in his political incorrectness, he heaps ridicule on women who attempt to perform jobs such as firefighter and police officer. In one memorable line, Amneus growls, "Women should not be emancipated; they should be regulated, as men should be." As dogmatic as his worst opponent, Amneus "emphatically" and unrealistically

advocates a return to "the hated double standard" we turned away from in the 1950's. He may thereby be needlessly reducing his potential audience of supporters. Finally, while I disagree that this is the final and complete explanation, I found stimulating his discussion of how both males and females in the ghetto refuse to accept their traditional roles and how that contributes to ghetto pathology. The core ideas here are fascinating, set forth with great passion by the author, and certainly merit a careful, persuasive treatment. Unfortunately, despite his relatively well-written previous works, Amneus is not equal to this task. The author's tone resembles that of a crusty old grandfather. His rhetoric is often abrasive, his language periodically inappropriate for a non-fiction work intended to persuade the reader. Four-letter words repeatedly creep into the text. Worse, he mimics the most egregious feminist authors in repeating himself over and over, often without providing any supporting documentation at all. Most regrettably, Amneus makes a number of unforgivable factual and presentational blunders. He repeatedly quotes--without providing the contradictory evidence--Lenore Weitzman's badly discredited statistics on men's and women's financial positions after divorce. (This is not excused by the footnotes he sometimes provides essentially stating that he is justified in using these statistics by feminists' repeated use of them. To paraphrase Amneus, no, he isn't.) Similarly, he cites with apparent credulity the AAUW's fallacious claim that girls suffer a self-esteem deficit. He makes countless references to "Briffault's Law"--men must be able to offer woman something material in exchange for marriage--without providing any proof or even explanation of the principle. He uses the unfamiliar term gynocracy over and over, then finally defines it near the end of the book. Amneus unintentionally undercuts the validity of many of the statistics he does provide by steadfastly refusing to analyze or even consider the potential impact of confounding variables on data which--however much he may shout to the contrary--shows only association, not causation. While it is probably true that the father's absence from the home significantly harms children, the reader deserves at least a discussion of other possibly relevant factors, if only to demonstrate their irrelevance. Amneus asserts as fact, with zero documentation or acknowledgment of cofactors, that the rise in crime in 1980 is explained by the increase in illegitimacy and divorce two decades earlier. Most egregiously, he writes with apparent seriousness that we know marriage would be stabilized if we had father custody because such a result ensued when we last had father custody--IN THE MID-NINETEENTH CENTURY! He repeatedly emphasizes that the "signature" of third world countries, ghettos, and Indian reservations is their matrilineal system, leaving unanswered the obvious question of whether patriarchy would magically transform India and Watts into the United States and the Upper East Side. Again, surely other factors are relevant here? Regrettably, Amneus appears unaware of the inaccuracy of certain feminist shibboleths such as the myth that women earn significantly less than men for comparable work. This seems integral to Amneus' thesis, since "men's superior earning power is what stabilizes society." If he is right, would it not be relevant to the analysis whether men's claimed advantage stems from discrimination or sex differences? Amneus overlooks this issue entirely. Amneus' conservatism is a bit indiscriminate and quixotic at times, as when he ridicules "bewildered men adorning themselves with earrings and freaky haircuts" or laments the sex and drinking taking place on college campuses. And why is one frequently cited source ALWAYS referred to as "homosexual Arthur Evans"? The book does contain some valid documentation. The summary of all the ways children are statistically at greater risk in a fatherless home is valuable. I did not realize that white women are a phenomenal 16 times more likely to benefit from affirmative action than black men. And I was intrigued to read that statistically having two married parents is a far more powerful predictor of infant health than financial position. Amneus overlooks areas of inquiry which could have broadened his book's authority and appeal. There is some undeniable truth to his statement that marriage is essentially an economic transaction, and I enjoyed his statement that a loveless marriage is one a woman wants to leave. But surely there are many men and women who sincerely desire loving connections with each other. How does love fit into the equation other than as a straw horse to be periodically dismissed? Weighing it at 427 pages, the book is too long by at least half. The same unsupported arguments are repeated five, ten, fifteen times, often with the author acknowledging the redundancy. Both the index and table of contents refer to page numbers which do not correspond with the text, rendering both essentially useless. The overall feeling one is left with is of a first draft, marred by frequent polemics and many dots which are left unconnected to others. Amneus' harsh tone and refusal to document the bulk of his claims left me speculating on the purpose of this book and on its intended audience. I also asked myself what we can do about the issues Amneus raises. Numerous times the author suggests that all men need to do to initiate a return to father custody is to rise up and CLAIM father custody. Surely this is the height of naivete, barring a unified act of mass resistance. Even assuming we are in full agreement with him, Amneus offers no hint as to how we might even start down a path capable of leading us there from here. As readers, we are left with some helpful information, many unanswered questions, and a hope that Daniel Amneus can recover his form and find a talented editor to help him with his next project.'

"Amneus is the leading theoretician and articulator of the Mens Rights Movement. His book contains propositions necessary to the survival of civilized society." --R. F. Doyle, Publisher of The Liberator, Author of The Rape of the

Male, President of the Mens Defense Association.