

FORMAL RESPONSE
TO
B31-2022 NATIONAL COUNCIL ON GENDER-BASED
VIOLENCE AND FEMICIDE
BY
THE
OFFICIAL FATHERS 4 JUSTICE SOUTH AFRICA
DUE
19TH OF MAY 2023



Contents

STATEMENT OF FACT	4
THE CONSTITUTION OF SOUTH AFRICA	6
SCIENTIFIC STUDIES.....	10
STATISTICS WITH REGARD TO GROWING UP WITHOUT A FATHER.....	27
FURTHER	33
SUMMATION.....	36
SOLUTION.....	37
CONCLUSION.....	37

STATEMENT OF FACT

The Official Fathers 4 Justice South Africa (F4J) rejects all forms of violence and abuse out of hand, perpetrated by anybody against anybody. There is no justification no matter the circumstances for anyone to abuse or violate someone mentally, psychologically, emotionally, sexually, or physically.

We believe as a matter of principle that anyone violating another human being MUST be punished to the fullest extent of the law and should indeed be extracted from society with extreme prejudice for the longest time permissible within the confines of the law.

HOWEVER

It is F4J's considered opinion that with 22 years of direct experience that the current dispensation has absolutely no intention of addressing the socioeconomic and educational issues that are so desperately needed to address and resolve the myriad of issues plaguing our beloved country, including but not limited to violence, abuse and crime perpetrated against ALL peoples living in South Africa.

In fact, the current dispensation not only exacerbates the violence and failed economy in this country it actively encourages it, through failed economic Socialist Marxist, communist fascist, Maoist policies that have never worked any were in the world.

In the last 130 years, these economic policies have not only failed ALL the people of South Africa but more than 160 countries across the planet with a conservative estimate of 60 million dead to as many as 200 million dead not to mention the massive increase in poverty as a direct of this failed experiment.

As a direct result of the South African government following the socialist, and communist ideologies – it has also implemented Marxist communist ideologies.

In a communist society, there would be no need for a private family unit as there would be no private property.

communism is based on the premise that property, family instincts, and private interests would distract man's attention from his obligations to the community. He strongly opined that family and property are always impediments not only to philosopher king but also to a commoner in his discharge of duties.

<https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/History/Faculty/Weikart/Marx-Engels-and-the-Abolition-of-the-Family.pdf>

Secondly, the South African government has aligned itself with the woke radical feminist who was identified and infiltrated by the Marxist socialist communist movement and aligned with this woke radical leftist feminist movement that seeks to have all women turned into victims, seeks out that children are abused, that the family unit is destroyed, that society collapses and oh yes men must be violently removed from society.

Linda Gordon said, "The nuclear family must be destroyed... Whatever its ultimate meaning, the break-up of families now is an objectively revolutionary process."

*it could be argued that **if feminism actually cared about helping all women**, it would advocate for father involvement, so no daughter would grow up disadvantaged and every son would be a*

*strong and capable partner to those daughters. Yet, while feminism purports itself to be the movement for equality, **it is at best silent when it comes to father's rights.***

Like many isms before it (Communism, religions, cults), feminism seeks to dismantle the traditional family unit for its own gain. Why? To the ism, old loyalties are like bad habits interfering with an individual's ability to pledge unwavering allegiance. Isms want control, but families tend to put family members and their needs before the demands of the ism, reducing the ism's power and influence and therefore undermining its control.

<https://nikitaccoulombe.medium.com/why-feminism-wants-to-dismantle-the-family-long-4695d45bcf88>

The current dispensation has left us with a minority group of predatory elite politicians who only seek to serve themselves, a failed economy, corrupt dysfunctional state entities, a collapsed education and health system, and an ineffectual justice system to name a few, that is pertinent to this conversation.

THE CONSTITUTION OF SOUTH AFRICA

The South African Constitution Bill of Rights Chapter 2, Section 7-39

TO THAT END WE ADDRESS THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE AND FEMICIDE

The implementation of the NATIONAL COUNCIL ON GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE AND FEMICIDE is nothing more than another hate group against men.

It is also in direct contravention and goes against the constitution of South Africa

Equality

9. (1) Everyone is equal before the law and has the right to equal protection and benefit of the law.

Fathers are specifically targeted by the government with direct complicit assistance of the child-abusing divorce industry which comprises lawyers, advocates, psychologists, and social workers.

1. Fathers in South Africa specifically have their
 - a. Constitutional
 - b. Legal
 - c. Psychological
 - d. Emotional
 - e. Mental
 - f. Physical
 - g. Financial

Rights unilaterally removed from them irrespective of whether they were formally married to the mother or not where no just cause exists in the first place.

2. Women are not only equal before the law in South Africa as they enjoy the same rights as men. These include but are not limited to
 - a. Women can not be prohibited from
 - i. Any school
 - ii. College
 - iii. University
 - iv. Career
 - v. Or work opportunities based solely on their gender or sex
 - b. Women can enter into all aspects of business in so far as
 - i. Opening a business
 - ii. Applying for finance
 - iii. Making and signing contracts
 - iv. Meeting all contractual obligations
 - v. Applying for government and private financial and related assistance
 - vi. Signing for all regulatory and or statutory requirements based solely on their gender or sex
 - c. Women can apply for the same work or career that men do and
 - i. They can not be discriminated on their sex
 - ii. They must receive the same remuneration or compensation as that of a man who has similar
 1. Skill

2. Degree or diploma
 3. Length of service
 4. Experience
- d. Women can not be prohibited from traveling, relocating, or moving anywhere in South Africa or internationally.
3. Should women have any violation on any level perpetrated against them they have immediate free access to
 - a. Police
 - b. Social services
 - c. Commission for Conciliation, Mediation, and Arbitration
 - d. Labour court
 - e. Family Advocates Office
 - f. Family court
 - g. Magistrates court
 - h. Regional court
 - i. The high court through to the constitutional court
 - j. Equality court
 - k. Commission for Gender Quality
 - l. South African Human rights commission
 4. Not with standing this the criminal procedures act more specifically the domestic violence act seeks to deliberately destroy men
 - a. Constitutional
 - b. Financially
 - c. Legally
 5. Additionally to this woman have superior rights than that of men in South Africa in so far as having children a woman can choose to either abort the child or have the child
 - a. When she chooses to abort the child she
 - i. Does not have to inform the biological father
 - ii. Does not have to get his consent
 - iii. Offer him the opportunity to raise the child by himself
 - b. Where she chooses to have the child irrespective of whether the father wants to have the child or not he is automatically
 - i. Legally and
 - ii. Financially liable for the child
 6. Women have more constitutional, legal, and financial rights than that of men
 7. Men are consistently blamed rightly or wrongly for the violence perpetrated in South Africa
 - a. In Research done by the British Psychological Fraternity circa 2013, they found that
 - i. 83% of all domestic violence is started by the woman
 - ii. In well over 340 research papers since the 1980's it has been consistently found that
 1. Approximately 70% of all violence perpetrated is men on men
 2. Approximately all domestic or physical violence is on a 50/ 50 basis men against women and women against men
 3. Domestic violence or physical violence has NOTHING to do with gender and everything to do with alcohol abuse
 - a. The higher the rate of alcohol abuse the higher the rate of abuse

4. 52% of all protection orders issued in South Africa are based on false, fake, or non-existent evidence
 - a. Justice insiders tell us this figure could be as high as 90%
 5. A magistrate must issue a protection order with a 3% probability of an event taking place.
- b. Once a father has been falsely accused of wrongdoing
- i. He can spend from 18 months to 2 years proving his innocence
 - ii. Spend 10s of if not 100s of thousands of rands proving his innocence
 - iii. When he is indeed found not guilty of the offence or offences
 1. The presiding refuses to issue Nolle prosequi
 2. The presiding officer refuse to bring any form of sanction against the mother and her legal representatives
 3. Refer the case to the public prosecutor to formally prosecute the mother and her legal representatives with perjury.
 - iv. Further
 1. The mother's lawyer will find a pet-friendly psychologist who will falsely accuse the father of not making an effort to maintain contact with his child
 2. The psychologist will make further recommendations on the hearsay of the mother let alone have bothered to contact him and offer him a right to reply
 3. The father will then be forced at his sole cost to
 - a. Pay for supervised visits
 - b. That is fazed in
 - c. Pay 10s of if not 100s of thousands of rands for reunification

Men and more specifically fathers are simply NOT the problem anymore in actual fact fathers not just in South Africa but globally are the single most prejudiced group in society today!

(2) Equality includes the full and equal enjoyment of all rights and freedoms. To promote the achievement of equality, legislative and other measures designed to protect or advance persons, or categories of persons, disadvantaged by unfair discrimination may be taken.

1. Fathers are singularly the most discriminated group not just in South Africa but on a global basis

(3) The state may not unfairly discriminate directly or indirectly against anyone on one or more grounds, including race, gender, sex, pregnancy, marital status, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, conscience, belief, culture, language, and birth.

1. Notwithstanding that men and more specifically fathers are discriminated against based on race, gender, sex, marital status, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, conscience, belief, culture,
2. Our black fathers are specifically singled out under section 21 d of the Children's act

- a. by having to meet additional legal and financial requirements or pay damages under customary law
- b. This is blatantly racist – UNCONSTITUTIONAL
- c. They are subject to additional and separate legal requirements that fathers of other races do NOT have to meet – UNCONSTITUTIONAL
- d. They are subject to additional and separate financial requirements that fathers of other races do NOT have to meet – UNCONSTITUTIONAL
- e. The damages payment has nothing to do with the maintenance of the child as it goes to the maternal grandfather – Financial abuse of the child
- f. Black mothers are referred to as damaged – this is mentally and psychologically abusive as well as highly degrading to our black mothers.
- g. It also implies that black mothers are inferior and not deserving of any form of respect that mothers of other races enjoy merely because they have had a child out of wedlock.
- h. Black fathers escape being called damaged as if they had no part in making the mother pregnant.

(4) No person may unfairly discriminate directly or indirectly against anyone on one or more grounds in terms of subsection (3). National legislation must be enacted to prevent or prohibit unfair discrimination.

- 1. Fathers in South Africa are discriminated against
 - a. Constitutionally
 - b. Legally
 - c. Financially
 - d. Psychologically
 - e. Mentally
 - f. Physically
 - g. Tradition
 - h. Gender
 - i. Culture
 - j. Dignity
 - k. Religion
 - l. Race
 - m. Marital or single status

(5) Discrimination on one or more of the grounds listed in subsection (3) is unfair unless it is established that the discrimination is fair.

We have already well established that South African Fathers are discriminated against on multiple levels detailed above.

Human dignity

10. Everyone has inherent dignity and the right to have their dignity respected and protected.

We have already well established that South African Fathers have had their dignity removed with extreme prejudice on multiple levels detailed above.

SCIENTIFIC STUDIES

AN EXTENSIVE LIST OF SCIENTIFIC STUDIES UP TO THE YEAR 2000 CONFIRMS THAT WOMEN ARE MORE OFTEN PERPETRATORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE THAN MEN.



"Aizenman, M., & Kelley, G. (1988). The incidence of violence and acquaintance rape in dating relationships among college men and women. *Journal of College Student Development*, 29, 305-311. (A sample of actively dating college students <204 women and 140 men> responded to a survey examining courtship violence. Authors report that there were no significant differences between the sexes in self reported perpetration of physical abuse.)

Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 651-680.

(Meta-analyses of sex differences in physical aggression indicate that women were more likely than men to ³use one or more acts of physical aggression and to use such acts more frequently.² In terms of injuries, women were somewhat more likely to be injured, and analyses reveal that 62% of those injured were women.)

Archer, J., & Ray, N. (1989). Dating violence in the United Kingdom: a preliminary study. *Aggressive Behavior*, 15, 337-343. (Twenty three dating couples completed the Conflict Tactics scale. Results indicate that women were significantly more likely than their male partners to express physical violence. Authors also report that, "measures of partner agreement were high" and that the correlation between past and present violence was low.)

Arias, I., Samios, M., & O'Leary, K. D. (1987). Prevalence and correlates of physical aggression during courtship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 2, 82-90. (Used Conflict Tactics Scale with a sample of 270 undergraduates <95 men, 175 women> and found 30% of men and 49% of women reported using some form of aggression in their dating histories with a greater percentage of women engaging in severe physical aggression.)

Arias, I., & Johnson, P. (1989). Evaluations of physical aggression among intimate dyads. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 4, 298-307. (Used Conflict Tactics Scale-CTS- with a sample of 103 male and 99 female undergraduates. Both men and women had similar experience with dating violence, 19% of women and 18% of men admitted being physically aggressive.

A significantly greater percentage of women thought self-defense was a legitimate reason for men to be aggressive, while a greater percentage of men thought slapping was a legitimate response for a man or woman if their partner was sexually unfaithful.)

Bernard, M. L., & Bernard, J. L. (1983). Violent intimacy: The family as a model for love relationships. *Family Relations*, 32, 283-286. (Surveyed 461 college students, 168 men, 293 women, with regard to dating violence. Found that 15% of the men admitted to physically abusing their partners, while 21% of women admitted to physically abusing their partners.)

Billingham, R. E., & Sack, A. R. (1986). Courtship violence and the interactive status of the relationship. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 1, 315-325. (Using CTS with 526 university students <167 men, 359 women> found similar rates of mutual violence but with women reporting higher rates of violence initiation when partner had not--9% vs 3%.)

Bland, R., & Orne, H. (1986). Family violence and psychiatric disorder. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 31, 129-137. (In interviews with 1,200 randomly selected Canadians <489 men, 711 women> found that women both engaged in and initiated violence at higher rates than their male partners.)

Bohannon, J. R., Dosser Jr., D. A., & Lindley, S. E. (1995). Using couple data to determine domestic violence rates: An attempt to replicate previous work. *Violence and Victims*, 10, 133-41. (Authors report that in a sample of 94 military couples 11% of wives and 7% of husbands were physically aggressive, as reported by the wives.)

Bookwala, J. (2002). The role of own and perceived partner attachment in relationship aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17, 84-100. (In a sample of 161 undergraduates, 34.3% of women <n=35> reported being victims

of partner aggression compared to 55.9% <n=33> of men.)

Bookwala, J., Frieze, I. H., Smith, C., & Ryan, K. (1992). Predictors of dating violence: A multi variate analysis. *Violence and Victims*, 7, 297-311. (Used CTS with 305 college students <227 women, 78 men> and found that 133 women and 43 men experienced violence in a current or recent dating relationship. Authors reports that "women reported the expression of as

much or more violence in their relationships as men." While most violence in relationships appears to be mutual--36% reported by women, 38% by men— women report initiating violence with non violent partners more frequently than men <22% vs 17%>).

Brinkerhoff, M., & Lupri, E. (1988). Interspousal violence. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 13, 407-434. (Examined Interspousal violence in a representative sample of 562 couples in Calgary, Canada. Used

Conflict Tactics Scale and found twice as much wife-to-husband as husband-to-wife severe violence <10.7% vs 4.8%>. The overall violence rate for husbands was 10.3% while the overall violence rate for wives was 13.2%. Violence was significantly higher in younger and childless couples. Results suggest that male violence decreased with higher educational attainment, while female violence increased.)

Brush, L. D. (1990). Violent Acts and injurious outcomes in married couples: Methodological issues in the National Survey of Families and Households. *Gender & Society*, 4, 56-67. (Used the Conflict Tactics scale in a large national survey, n=5,474, and found that women engage in same amount of spousal violence as men.)

Brutz, J., & Ingoldsby, B. B. (1984). Conflict resolution in Quaker families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 46, 21-26. (Used Conflict Tactics Scale with a sample of 288 Quakers <130 men, 158 women> and found a slightly higher rate of female to male violence <15.2%> than male to female violence <14.6%>.)

Burke, P. J., Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1988). Gender identity, self-esteem, and physical and sexual abuse in dating

relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 51, 272-285. (A sample of 505 college students <298 women, 207 men> completed the CTS. Authors reports that they found "no significant difference between men and women in reporting inflicting or sustaining physical abuse." Specifically, within a one year period they found that 14% of the men and 18% of the women reported inflicting physical abuse, while 10% of the men and 14% of the women reported sustaining physical abuse.)

Carlson, B. E. (1987). Dating violence: a research review and omparison with spouse abuse. *Social Casework*, 68, 16-23. (Reviews research on dating violence and finds that men and women are equally likely to aggress against their partners and that "the frequency of aggressive acts is inversely related to the likelihood of their causing physical injury.")

Carrado, M., George, M. J., Loxam, E., Jones, L., & Templar, D. (1996). Aggression in British heterosexual relationships: a descriptive analysis. *Aggressive Behavior*, 22, 401-415. (In a representative sample of British men <n=894> and women <n=971> it was found, using a modified version of the CTS, that 18% of the men and 13% of the women reported being victims of physical violence at some point in their heterosexual relationships. With regard to current relationships, 11% of men and 5% of women reported being victims of partner aggression.)

Cascardi, M., Langhinrichsen, J., & Vivian, D. (1992). Marital aggression: Impact, injury, and health correlates for husbands and wives. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 152, 1178-1184. (Examined 93 couples seeking marital therapy. Found using the CTS and other information that 71% reported at least one incident of physical aggression in past year. While men and women were equally likely to perpetrate violence, women reported more severe injuries. Half of the wives and two thirds of the husbands reported no injuries as a result of all aggression, but wives sustained more injuries as a result of mild aggression.)

Caulfield, M. B., & Riggs, D. S. (1992). The assessment of dating aggression: Empirical evaluation of the Conflict Tactics Scale. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 4, 549-558. (Used CTS with a sample of 667 unmarried college students <268 men and 399 women> and found on a number of items significantly higher responses of physical violence on part of women. For example, 19% of women slapped their male partner while 7% of men slapped their partners, 13% of women kicked, bit, or hit their partners with a fist while only 3.1% of men engaged in this activity.)

Claxton-Oldfield, S. & Arsenault, J. (1999). The initiation of physically aggressive behaviour by female university students toward their male partners: Prevalence and the reasons offered for such behaviors. Unpublished manuscript. (In a sample of 168 actively dating female undergraduates at a Canadian university, 26% indicated that they initiated physical aggression toward their male partners. Most common reason for such behavior was because partner was not listening to them.)

Coney, N. S., & Mackey, W. C. (1999). The feminization of domestic violence in America: The woosle effect goes beyond rhetoric. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 8, (1) 45-58. (Authors review the domestic violence literature and report that while society in general as well as the media portray women as recipients of domestic violence...epidemiological surveys on the distribution of violent behavior between adult partners suggest gender parity.²)

Corry, C. E., & Fiebert, M. S. (2001, Sept.). Controlling domestic violence against men. Sixth International Conference on Family Violence, San Diego, CA. (A critical examination of men as victims of partner abuse.)

Deal, J. E., & Wampler, K. S. (1986). Dating violence: The primacy of previous experience. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 3, 457-471. (Of 410 university students <295 women, 115 men> responding to CTS and other instruments, it was revealed that 47% experienced some violence in dating relationships. The majority of experiences were reciprocal. When not reciprocal men were three times more likely than women to report being victims. Violent experiences in previous relationships was the best predictor of violence in current relationships.)

DeMaris, A. (1992). Male versus female initiation of aggression: The case of courtship violence. In E. C. Viano (Ed.), *Intimate violence: interdisciplinary perspectives*. (pp. 111-120). Bristol, PA: Taylor & Francis. (Examined a sample of 865 white and black college students with regard to the initiation of violence in their dating experience. Found that 218 subjects, 80 men and 118 women, had experienced or expressed violence in current or recent dating relationships. Results indicate that "when one

partner could be said to be the usual initiator of violence, that partner was most often the women. This finding was the same for both black and white respondents.")

Ernst, A. A., Nick, T. G., Weiss, S. J., Houry, D., & Mills, T. (1997). Domestic violence in an inner-city ED. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, 30, 190-197. (Assessed 516 patients <233 men, 283 women> in a New Orleans inner-city emergency Department with the Index of Spousal Abuse, a scale to

measure domestic violence. Found that 28% of the men and 33% of the women <a nonsignificant difference>, were victims of past physical violence while 20% of the men and 19% of the women reported being current victims of physical violence. In terms of ethnicity, 82% of subjects were African-American. Authors report that there was a significant difference in the number of women vs. men who reported past abuse to the police ,19% of women, 6% of men.>)

Farrell, W. (1999). *Women can't hear what men don't say*. New York: Tarcher/Putnam. See Chapter 6. (Pp. 123-162; 323-329.) An excellent social and political analysis of couple violence.)

Feather, N. T. (1996). Domestic violence, gender and perceptions of justice. *Sex Roles*, 35, 507-519. (Subjects <109 men, 111 women> from Adelaide, South Australia, were presented a hypothetical scenario in which either a husband or wife perpetrated domestic violence. Participants were significantly more negative in their evaluation of the husband than the wife, were more sympathetic to the wife and believed that the husband deserved a harsher penalty for his behavior.)

Fiebert, M. S., & Gonzalez, D. M. (1997). Women who initiate assaults: The reasons offered for such behavior. *Psychological Reports*, 80, 583-590. (A sample of 968 women, drawn primarily from college courses in the Southern California area, were surveyed regarding their initiation of physical assaults on their male partners. 29% of the women, n=285, revealed that they initiated assaults during the past five years. Women in their 20's were more likely to aggress than women aged 30 and above. In terms of reasons, women appear to aggress because they did not believe that their male victims would be injured or would retaliate. Women also claimed that they assaulted their male partners because they wished to engage their attention, particularly emotionally.)

Fiebert, M. S. (1996). College students' perception of men as victims of women's assaultive behavior. *Perceptual & Motor Skills*, 82, 49-50. (Three hundred seventy one college students <91 men, 280 women> were surveyed regarding their knowledge and acceptance of the research finding regarding female assaultive behavior. The majority of subjects (63%) were unaware of the finding that women assault men as frequently as men assault women; a slightly higher percentage of women than men (39% vs 32%) indicated an awareness of this finding. With regard to accepting the validity of these findings a majority of subjects (65%) endorsed such a result with a slightly higher percentage of men (70% vs 64%) indicating their acceptance

of this finding.)

Flynn, C. P. (1990). Relationship violence by women: issues and implications. *Family Relations*, 36, 295-299. (A review/analysis article that states, "researchers consistently have found that men and women in relationships, both marital and premarital engage in comparable amounts of violence." Author also writes, "Violence by women in intimate relationships has received little attention from policy makers, the public, and until recently, researchers...battered men and abusive women have receive 'selective inattention' by both the media and researchers.")

Follingstad, D. R., Wright, S., & Sebastian, J. A. (1991). Sex differences in motivations and effects in dating violence. *Family Relations*, 40, 51-57. (A sample of 495 college students <207 men, 288 women> completed the CTS and other instruments including a "justification of relationship violence measure." The study found that women were twice as likely to report perpetrating dating violence as men. Female victims attributed male violence to a desire to gain control over them or to retaliate for being hit first, while men believed that female aggression was based on their female partner's wish to "show how angry they were and to retaliate for feeling emotionally hurt or mistreated.")

Foshee, V. A. (1996). Gender differences in adolescent dating abuse prevalence, types and injuries. *Health Education Research*, 11, (3) 275-286. (Data collected from 1965 adolescents in eighth and ninth grade in 14 schools in rural North Carolina. Results reveal that 36.5% of dating females and 39.4% of dating males report being victims of physical dating violence. In terms of perpetrating violence 27.8% of females while only 15.0% of males report perpetrating violence.)

Gelles, R. J. (1994). Research and advocacy: Can one wear two hats?

Family Process, 33, 93-95. (Laments the absence of objectivity on the part of "feminist" critics of research demonstrating female perpetrated domestic violence.)

George, M. J. (1994). Riding the donkey backwards: Men as the unacceptable victims of marital violence. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 3, 137-159. (A thorough review of the literature which examines findings and issues related to men as equal victims of partner abuse.)

George, M. J. (1999). A victimization survey of female perpetrated assaults in the United Kingdom. *Aggressive Behavior*, 25, 67-79. (A representative sample of 718 men and 737 women completed the

CTS and reported their experience as victims of physical assaults by women during a five year period. Men reported greater victimization and more severe assaults than did women. Specifically, 14% of men compared to 7% of women reported being assaulted by women. Highest risk group were single men. The majority (55%) of assaults on men were perpetrated by spouses, partners, or former partners.)

George, M. J. (2002). Skimmington Revisited. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 10, No. 2, 111-127. (Examines historical sources and finds that men who were victims of spousal aggression were subject to punishment and humiliation. Inferences to contemporary trivialization of male victims of partner aggression is discussed.)

Goldberg, W. G., & Tomlanovich, M. C. (1984). Domestic violence victims in the emergency department. *JAMA*, 251, 3259-3264. (A sample of 492 patients <275 women, 217 men> who sought treatment in an emergency department in a Detroit hospital were surveyed regarding their experience with domestic violence. Respondents were mostly African-American (78%), city dwellers (90%), and unemployed (60%). Victims of domestic violence numbered 107 (22%). While results indicate that 38% of victims were men and 62% were women this gender difference did not reach statistical significance.

Gonzalez, D. M. (1997). Why females initiate violence: A study

examining the reasons behind assaults on men. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Long Beach. (225 college women participated in a survey which examined their past history and their rationales for initiating aggression with male partners. Subjects also responded to 8 conflict scenarios which provided information regarding possible reasons for

the initiation of aggression. Results indicate that 55% of the subjects admitted to initiating physical aggression toward their male partners at some point in their lives. The most common reason was that aggression was a spontaneous reaction to frustration).

Goodyear-Smith, F. A. & Laidlaw, T. M. (1999). Aggressive acts and assaults in intimate relationships: Towards an understanding of the literature. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 17, 285-304. (An up to date scholarly analysis of couple violence. Authors report that, ³...studies clearly demonstrate that within the general population, women initiate and use violent behaviors against their partners at least as often as men.²

Hampton, R. L., Gelles, R. J., & Harrop, J. W. (1989). Is violence in families increasing? A comparison of 1975 and 1985 National Survey rates. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 51, 969-980. (Compared a sample of 147 African Americans from the 1975 National Survey with 576 African Americans from the 1985 National Survey with regard to spousal violence. Using the CTS found that the rate of overall violence (169/1000) of husbands to wives remained the same from 1975 to 1985, while the rate of overall violence for wives to husbands increased 33% (153 to 204/1000) from 1975 to 1985. The rate of severe violence of husbands to wives decreased 43% (113 to 64/1000) from 1975 to 1985, while the rate of severe violence of wives to husbands increased 42% (76 to 108/1000) from 1975 to 1985. In 1985 the rate of abusive violence by black women was nearly 3 times greater than the rate of white women.)

Harders, R. J., Struckman-Johnson, C., Struckman-Johnson, D. & Caraway, S. J. (1998). Verbal and physical abuse in dating relationships. Paper presented at the meeting of American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA. (Surveyed 289 college students <97 men, 186 women> using a

revised form of the Conflict Tactics Scale. Found that women were significantly more physically aggressive than men, particularly in the areas of: pushing, slapping and punching.)

Headey, B., Scott, D., & de Vaus, D. (1999). Domestic violence in Australia: Are women and men equally violent? Data from the International Social Science Survey/ Australia 1996/97 was examined. A sample of 1643 subjects (804 men, 839 women) responded to questions about their experience with domestic violence in the past 12 months. Results reveal that 5.7% of men and 3.7% of women reported being victims of domestic assaults. With regard to injuries results reveal that women inflict serious injuries at least as frequently as men. For example 1.8% of men and 1.2% of women reported that their injuries required first aid, while 1.5% of men and 1.1% of women reported that their injuries needed treatment by a doctor or nurse.

Henton, J., Cate, R., Koval, J., Lloyd, S., & Christopher, S. (1983). Romance and violence in dating relationships. *Journal of Family Issues*, 4, 467-482. (Surveyed 644 high school students <351 men, 293 women> and found that abuse occurred at a rate of 121 per 1000 and appeared to be reciprocal with both partners initiating violence at similar rates.)

Hoff, B. H. (1999). The risk of serious physical injury from assault by a woman intimate. A re-examination of National Violence against women survey data on type of assault by an intimate.

WWW.vix.com/menmag/nvawrisk.htm. (A re-examination of the data from the most recent National violence against women survey (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998) shows that "assaulted men are more likely than assaulted women to experience serious attacks by being hit with an object, beat up, threatened with a knife or being knifed.")

Jackson, S. M., Cram, F. & Seymour, F. W. (2000). Violence and sexual coercion in high school students' dating relationships. *Journal of Family Violence*, 15, 23-36. (In a New Zealand sample of senior high school students <200 women, 173 men> 21% of women and 19% of men reported having been physically hurt by their heterosexual dating partner.)

Jouriles, E. N., & O'leary, K. D. (1985). Interpersonal reliability of reports of marital violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53, 419-421. (Used the Conflict Tactics Scale with a sample of 65 couples in marriage therapy and 37 couples from the community. Found moderate levels of agreement of abuse between partners and similar rates of reported violence between partners.)

Kalmuss, D. (1984). The intergenerational transmission of marital aggression. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 46, 11-19. (In a representative sample of 2,143 adults found that the rate of husband to wife severe aggression is 3.8% while the rate of wife to husband severe aggression is 4.6%.)

Kim, K., & Cho, Y. (1992). Epidemiological survey of spousal abuse in Korea. In E. C. Viano (Ed.) *Intimate Violence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. (pp. 277-282). Bristol, PA: Taylor and Francis. (Utilized the Conflict Tactics scale in interviews with a random sample of 1,316 married Koreans <707 women, 609 men>. Compared to findings with American couples, results indicate that Korean men were victimized by their wives

twice as much as American men, while Korean women were victimized by their spouses three times as much as American women.)

Lane, K., & Gwartney-Gibbs, P.A. (1985). Violence in the context of dating and sex. *Journal of Family Issues*, 6, 45-49. (Surveyed 325 students <165 men, 160 women> regarding courtship violence. Used Conflict Tactics Scale and found equal rates of violence for men and women.)

Laner, M. R., & Thompson, J. (1982). Abuse and aggression in courting couples. *Deviant Behavior*, 3, 229-244. (Used Conflict Tactics Scales with a sample of 371 single individuals <129 men, 242 women> and found similar rates of male and female violence in dating relationships.)

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Vivian, D. (1994). The correlates of spouses' incongruent reports of marital aggression. *Journal of Family Violence*, 9, 265-283. (In a clinic sample of 97 couples seeking marital therapy, authors found, using a modified version of the CTS, that 61% of the husbands and 64% of the wives were classified as aggressive, 25% of the husbands and 11% of the wives were identified as mildly aggressive and 36%

of husbands and 53% of wives were classified as severely aggressive. Sixty-eight percent of couples were in agreement with regard to husband's overall level of aggression and 69% of couples were in agreement on wife's overall level of aggression. Aggression levels were identified as "nonviolent, mildly violent, or severely violent." Where there was disagreement, 65% of husbands <n=20> were under-reporting aggression and 35%

of husbands <n=11> were over-reporting aggression; while 57% of wives <n=17> were under-reporting aggression and 43% of wives <n=13> were over-reporting aggression.)

Lewis, A. & Sarantakos, S. (2001). Domestic Violence and the male victim. *Nuance*, #3. (Based on interviews with 48 men in Australia and New Zealand, authors present findings that domestic violence by women toward men exists, that the refusal to examine the prevalence of this abuse is a "disempowerment" of men and that official policy should be changed to provide help for abused men.)

Lillja, C. M. (1995). Why women abuse: A study examining the function of abused men. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Long Beach. (A review of the literature examining the issue of men as victims of female assaults. Includes an original questionnaire to test assumption that women who lack social support to combat stress are likely to commit domestic violence.)

Lo, W. A., & Sporkowski, M. J. (1989). The continuation of violent dating relationships among college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 30, 432-439. (A sample of 422 college students completed the Conflict Tactics Scale. Found that, "women were more likely than men to claim themselves as abusers and were less likely to claim themselves as victims.")

Lottes, I. L., & Weinberg, M. S. (1996). Sexual coercion among university students: a comparison of the United States and Sweden. *Journal of Sex Research*, 34, 67-76. (A sample of 507 Swedish students <211 men, 359 women> and 407 U.S. students <129 men, 278 women> responded to items on the CTS. Results reveal that 31% of U.S. men compared to 18% of Swedish men reported being victims of physical violence by female partners during the previous 12 months. While 31% of U.S. women compared to 19% of Swedish women reported being victims of physical violence by male partners during the previous 12 months.)

Macchietto, J. (1992). Aspects of male victimization and female aggression: Implications for counseling men. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 14, 375-392. (Article reviews literature on male victimization and female aggression.)

Magdol, L., Moffitt, T. E., Fagan, J., Newman, D. L., & Silva, P. A. (1997). Gender differences in partner violence in a birth cohort of 21 year Olds: bridging the gap between clinical and epidemiological approaches. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 65, 68-78. (Used CTS with a sample of 861 21 year Olds <436 men, 425 women> in New Zealand. Physical violence perpetration

was reported during the previous 12 months by 37.2% of women and 21.8% of men, with severe violence perpetration by women at 18.6% and men at 5.7%.)

Makepeace, J. M. (1986). Gender differences in courtship violence victimization. *Family Relations*, 35, 383-388. (A sample of 2,338 students <1,059 men, 1,279 women> from seven colleges were surveyed regarding their experience of dating violence. Courtship violence was experienced by 16.7 % of respondents. Authors report that "rates of commission of acts and initiation of violence were similar across gender." In term of injury, both men (98%) and women (92%) reported "none or mild" effects of violence.)

Malone, J., Tyree, A., & O'Leary, K. D. (1989). Generalization and containment: Different effects of past aggression for wives and husbands. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 51, 687-697. (In a sample of 328 couples it was found that men and women engaged in similar amounts of physical aggression within their families of origin and against their spouses. However, results indicate that women were more aggressive to their partners than men. Aggression was more predictable for women, i.e., if women observed parental aggression or hit siblings they were more likely to be violent with their spouses.)

Margolin, G. (1987). The multiple forms of aggressiveness between marital partners: how do we identify them? *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 13, 77-84. (A paid volunteer sample of 103 couples completed the Conflict Tactics Scale. It was found that husbands and wives perpetrated similar amounts of violence. Specifically, the incidence of violence, as reported by either spouse was: husband to wife =39; wife to husband =41.)

Marshall, L. L., & Rose, P. (1987). Gender, stress and violence in the adult relationships of a sample of college students. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 4, 299-316. (A survey of 308 undergraduates <152 men, 156 women> revealed that 52% expressed and 62% received violence at some point in their adult relationships. Overall, women report expressing more physical violence than men. Childhood abuse emerged as a predictor of violence in adult relationships.)

Marshall, L. L., & Rose, P. (1990). Premarital violence: The impact of family of origin violence, stress and reciprocity. *Violence and Victims*, 5, 51-64. (454 premarital undergraduates <249 women, 205 men> completed the CTS and other scales. Overall, women reported expressing more violence than men, while men reported receiving more violence than women. Female violence was also associated with having been abused as children.)

Mason, A., & Blankenship, V. (1987). Power and affiliation motivation, stress and abuse in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 203-210. (Investigated 156 college students <48 men, 107 women> with the Thematic Apperception Test <TAT>, Life Experiences Survey and the CTS. Found that there were no significant gender differences in terms of the infliction of physical abuse. Men with high power needs were more likely to be physically abusive while highly stressed women with high needs for affiliation and low activity inhibition were the most likely to be physically abusive. Results indicate that physical abuse occurred most often among committed couples.)

Matthews, W. J. (1984). Violence in college couples. *College Student Journal*, 18, 150-158. (A survey of 351 college students <123 men and 228 women> revealed that 79 <22.8 %> reported at least one incident of dating violence. Both men and women ascribed joint responsibility for violent behavior and both sexes, as either recipients or expressors of aggression, interpreted violence as a form of "love.")

Maxfield, M. G. (1989). Circumstances in supplementary homicide reports: Variety and validity. *Criminology*, 27, 671-695. (Examines FBI homicide data from 1976 through 1985. Reports that 9,822 wives & common law wives <57%> were killed compared to 7,433 husbands and common law husbands <43%>).

McCarthy, A. (2001.) Gender differences in the incidences of, motives for, and consequences of, dating violence among college students. Unpublished Master's thesis, California State University, Long Beach. (In a sample of 1145 students <359 men, 786 women> found that 36% of men and 28% of women responding to the CTS2 reported that they were victims of physical aggression during the previous year. There were no differences in reported motives for aggression between men and women.)

McKinney, K. (1986). Measures of verbal, physical and sexual dating violence by gender. *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology*, 14, 55-60. (Surveyed 163 college students, 78 men, 85 women, with a questionnaire designed to assess involvement in dating abuse. Found that 38% of women and 47% of men indicated that they were victims of physical abuse in dating relationships. Also found that 26% of women and 21% of men acknowledged that they physically assaulted their dating partners.)

McLeod, M. (1984). Women against men: An examination of domestic violence based on an analysis of official data and national victimization data. *Justice Quarterly*, 1, 171-193. (From a data set of 6,200 cases of spousal abuse in the Detroit area in 1978-79 found that men used weapons 25% of the time while female assailants used weapons 86% of the time, 74% of men sustained injury and of these 84% required medical care. Concludes that male victims are injured more often and more seriously than female victims.)

McNeely, R. L., Cook, P. W. & Torres, J. B. (2001). Is domestic violence a gender issue or a human issue? *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 4, No. 4, 227-251. (Argues that domestic violence is a human issue and not a gender issue. Presents and discusses empirical findings and case studies to support this view. Expresses concerns about men's "legal and social defenselessness.")

McNeely, R. L., & Mann, C. R. (1990). Domestic violence is a human issue. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5, 129-132. (A review article which discusses the findings that women are more prone than men to engage in severely violent acts and that "classifying spousal violence as a women's issue rather than a human issue is erroneous.")

McNeely, R. L., & Robinson-Simpson, G. (1987). The truth about domestic violence: A falsely framed issue. *Social Work*, 32, 485-490. (A review article which concludes that women are as violent as men in domestic relationships.)

Mercy, J. A., & Saltzman, L. E. (1989). Fatal violence among spouses in the United States, 1975-85. *American Journal of Public Health*, 79, 595-599. (Examined FBI figures regarding spousal homicides. During the 10 year period from 1975 to 1985 found higher murder rates of wives than husbands <43.4% vs 56.6%>. Black husbands were at the greatest risk of victimization. Spousal homicide among blacks was 8.4 times higher than that of whites. Spouse homicide rates were 7.7 times higher in interracial marriages and the risk of victimization for both whites and blacks increased as age differences between spouses increased. Wives and husbands were equally likely to be killed by firearms <approximately 72% of the time>

while husbands were more likely to be stabbed and wives more likely to bludgeoned to death. Arguments apparently escalated to murder in 67% of spouse homicides.)

Meredith, W. H., Abbot, D. A., & Adams, S. L. (1986). Family violence in relation to marital and parental satisfaction and family strengths. *Journal of Family Violence*, 1, 299-305. (Authors report that 6% of men and 5% of women in Nebraska indicated that they used severe violence at least once in the previous year.)

Mihalic, S. W., & Elliot, D. (1997). A social learning theory model of marital violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 12, 21-46. (Based on data from the National Youth Survey <see Morse, 1995> a social learning model of marital violence for men and women was tested. For men ethnicity, prior victimization, stress and marital satisfaction predicted both perpetration and experience of minor violence. With regard to serious violence ethnicity, prior victimization, marital satisfaction predicted men's

experience of marital violence, while ethnicity, class and sex role

attitudes predicted the perpetration of male marital violence. For women the most important predictor of the experience of both minor and serious marital violence was marital satisfaction, class was also a predictor. With regard to female perpetrators of marital violence the witnessing of parental violence was an important predictor along with class and marital satisfaction. The social learning model worked better for women than men.)

Milardo, R. M. (1998). Gender asymmetry in common couple violence. *Personal Relationships*, 5, 423-438. (A sample of 180 college students <88 men, 72 women> were asked whether they would be likely to hit their partner in a number of situations common to a dating relationship. Results reveal that 83% of the women, compared to 53% of the men, indicated that they would be somewhat likely to hit their partner.)

Morse, B. J. (1995). Beyond the Conflict Tactics Scale: Assessing gender differences in partner violence. *Violence and Victims*, 10 (4) 251-272. (Data was analyzed from the National Youth Survey, a longitudinal study begun in 1976 with 1,725 subjects who were drawn from a probability sample of households in the United States and who, in 1976, were between the ages of 11-17. This study focused on violence as assessed by the CTS between male and female married or cohabiting respondents during survey years 1983 <n=1,496>, 1986 <n=1,384>, 1989 <n=1,436>, and 1992 <n=1,340>.

For each survey year the prevalence rates of any violence and severe violence were significantly higher for female to male than for male to female. For example, in 1983 the rate of any violence male to female was 36.7, while the rate of any violence female to male was 48; in 1986, the rate of severe violence male to female was 9.5, while the rate of severe violence female to male was 22.8. In 1992, the rate of any violence male to female was 20.2, with a severe violence rate male to female of 5.7; while the rate of any violence female to male was 27.9, with a severe violence rate female to male of 13.8. Author notes that the decline in violence over time is attributed to the increase in age of the subjects. Results reveal <p. 163> that over twice as many women as men reported assaulting a partner who had not assaulted them during the study year." In 1986 about 20% of both men and women reported that assaults resulted in physical injuries. In other years women were more likely to self report personal injuries.)

Murphy, J. E. (1988). Date abuse and forced intercourse among college students. In G. P. Hotaling, D. Finkelhor, J. T. Kirkpatrick, & M. A. Straus (Eds.) *Family Abuse and its Consequences: New Directions in Research* (pp. 285-296). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. (A sample of 485 single collegestudents <230 men, 255 women> completed the CTS. Overall men reported greater victimization than women. For example, 20.7% of men compared to 12.8% of women reported being kicked, bit or hit with a fist

and 6% of men compared to 3.6% of women reported being beaten up by their heterosexual partner.)

Mwamwenda, T. S. (1997). Husband Battery among the Xhosa speaking people of Transkei, South Africa. Unpublished manuscript, University of Transkei, S. A. (Surveyed a sample of 138 female and 81 male college students in Transkei, South Africa, regarding their witnessing husbanding battery. Responses reveal that 2% of subjects saw their mother beat their father, 18% saw or heard female relatives beating their husbands, and 26% saw or heard female neighbors beating their husbands.)

Nisonoff, L., & Bitman, I. (1979). Spouse abuse: Incidence and relationship to selected demographic variables. *Victimology*, 4, 131-140. (In a sample of 297 telephone survey respondents <112 men, 185 women> found that 15.5% of men and 11.3% of women report having hit their spouse, while 18.6% of men and 12.7% of women report having been hit by their spouse.)

O'Keeffe, N. K., Brockopp, K., & Chew, E. (1986). Teen dating violence. *Social Work*, 31, 465-468. (Surveyed 256 high school students from Sacramento, CA., 135 girls, 121 boys, with the CTS. Ninety percent of students were juniors or seniors, the majority came from middle class homes, 94% were average or better students, and 65% were white and 35% were black, Hispanic or Asian. Found that 11.9% of girls compared to 7.4% of boys admitted to being sole perpetrators of physical violence. 17.8% of girls and 11.6% of boys admitted that they were both "victims and perpetrators" of physical violence.)

O'Leary, K. D., Barling, J., Arias, I., Rosenbaum, A., Malone, J., & Tyree, A. (1989). Prevalence and stability of physical aggression between spouses: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 57, 263-268. (272 couples were assessed regarding physical aggression. More women reported physically aggressing against their partners at premarriage <44% vs 31%> and 18 months of marriage <36% vs 27%>. At 30 months there was a nonsignificant but higher rate for women <32% vs 25%>.)

Pedersen, P. & Thomas, C. D. (1992). Prevalence and correlates of dating violence in a Canadian University sample. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 24, 490-501. (A sample of 166 undergraduates <116 women, 50 men> responded to the CTS; 45.8% of subjects reported experiencing physical violence in their current or most recent dating relationship. Of this total, 44.8% of women and 48% of men reported being physically aggressed upon by their partners. It was also found that only 22% of men and 40.5% of women reported using physical aggression against a dating partner.)

Plass, M. S., & Gessner, J. C. (1983). Violence in courtship relations: a southern sample. *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology*, 11, 198-202. (In an opportunity sample of 195 high school and college students from a large southern city, researchers used the Conflict Tactics scale to examine courtship violence. Overall, results reveal that women were significantly more likely than men to be aggressors. Specifically, in committed relationships, women were three times as likely as men to slap their partners, and to kick, bit or hit with the fist seven times as often as men. In casual relationships, while the gender differences weren't as pronounced, women were more aggressive than men. Other findings reveal that high school students were more abusive than college students, and that a "higher proportion of black respondents were involved as aggressors.")

Riggs, D. S., O'Leary, K. D., & Breslin, F. C. (1990). Multiple correlates of physical aggression in dating couples. *Journal of*

Interpersonal Violence, 5, 61-73. (Used CTS and studied 408 college students <125 men and 283 women>. Found that significantly more women <39%> than men <23%> reported engaging in physical aggression against their current partners.)

Rollins, B. C., & Oheneba-Sakyi, Y. (1990). Physical violence in Utah households. *Journal of Family Violence*, 5, 301-309. (In a random sample of 1,471 Utah households, using the Conflict Tactics Scale, it was found that women's rate of severe violence was 5.3% compared to a male rate of 3.4%.)

Rouse, L. P. (1988). Abuse in dating relationships: A comparison of Blacks, Whites, and Hispanics. *Journal of College Student Development*, 29, 312-319. (The use of physical force and its consequences were examined in a diverse sample of college students. Subjects consisted of 130 whites <58 men, 72 women>, 64 Blacks <32 men, 32 women>, and 34 Hispanics <24 men, 10 women>. Men were significantly more likely than women to report that their partners used moderate physical force and caused a greater number of injuries requiring medical attention. This gender difference was present for Whites and Blacks but not for Hispanics.)

Rosenfeld, R. (1997). Changing relationships between men and women. A note on the decline in intimate partner violence. *Homicide Studies*, 1, 72-83. (Author reports on homicide rates in ST. Louis from 1968-1992. Findings indicate that while men and women were equally likely to be victims of partner violence in 1970, in subsequent years men, primarily black men, were more likely to be murdered by their intimate partners.)

Rouse, L. P., Breen, R., & Howell, M. (1988). Abuse in intimate relationships. A Comparison of married and dating college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 3, 414-429. (A sample of 130 married (48 men, 82 women) college students and 130 college students in dating relationships (58 men, 72 women) reported their experience of physical abuse in intimate relationships. Men were more likely to report being physically abused than women in both dating and marital relationships.)

Russell, R. J. H., & Hulson, B. (1992). Physical and psychological abuse of heterosexual partners. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13, 457-473. (In a pilot study in Great Britain 46 couples responded to the Conflict Tactics Scale. Results reveal that husband to wife violence was: Overall violence= 25% and severe violence= 5.8%; while wife to husband violence was: Overall violence= 25% and severe violence=11.3%.)

Ryan, K. A. (1998). The relationship between courtship violence and sexual aggression in college students. *Journal of Family Violence*, 13, 377-394. (A sample of 656 college students <245 men, 411 women> completed the CTS. Thirty four percent of the women and 40% of the men reported being victims of their partner's physical aggression.)

Sack, A. R., Keller, J. F., & Howard, R. D. (1982). Conflict tactics and violence in dating situations. *International Journal of Sociology of the Family*, 12, 89-100. (Used the CTS with a sample of 211 college students, 92 men, 119 women. Results indicate that there were no differences between men and women with regard to the expression of physical violence.)

Saenger, G. (1963). Male and female relations in the American comic strip. In D. M. White & R. H. Abel (Eds.), *The funnies, an American idiom* (pp. 219-231). Glencoe, NY: The Free Press. (Twenty consecutive editions of all comic strips in nine New York City newspapers in October, 1950 were examined. Results reveal that husbands were victims of aggression in 63% of conflict situations while wives were victims in 39% of situations. In addition, wives were more aggressive in 73% of domestic situations, in 10% of situations, husbands and wives were equally aggressive and in only 17% of situations were husbands more violent than wives.)

Schafer, J., Caetano, R., & Clark, C. L. (1998). Rates of intimate partner violence in the United States. *American journal of Public Health, 88*, 1702-1704. (Used modified CTS and examined reports of partner violence in a representative sample of 1635 married and cohabiting couples. Both partners reports were used to estimate the following lower and upper bound rates: 5.21% and 13.61% for male to female violence, and 6.22% and 18.21 % for female to male violence.)

Shook, N. J., Gerrity, D. A., Jurich, J. & Segrist, A. E. (2000).

Journal of Family Violence, 15, 1-22. (A modified Conflict Tactics Scale was administered to 572 college students <395 women; 177 men>. Results reveal that significantly more women than men, 23.5% vs 13.0%, admitted using physical force against a dating partner.)

Sigelman, C. K., Berry, C. J., & Wiles, K. A. (1984). Violence in college students' dating relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 5*, 530-548. (Surveyed 504 college students <116 men, 388 women> with the Conflict Tactics Scale and found that men and women were similar in the overall amount of violence they expressed but that men reported experiencing significantly more violence than women.)

Simonelli, C. J. & Ingram, K. M. (1998). Psychological distress among men experiencing physical and emotional abuse in heterosexual dating relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 13*, 667-681. (Responses from 70 male undergraduates to the CTS and a Psychological Maltreatment Inventory revealed that 40% reported being the target of some form of physical aggression from their female dating partners while only 23% reported expressing physical aggression to their partners. Men who were victims of emotional and physical abuse also reported greater levels of distress and depression.)

Simonelli, C. J., Mullis, T., Elliot, A. N., & Pierce, T. W. (2002). Abuse by siblings and subsequent experiences of violence within the dating relationship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*, 103-121. (A sample of 120 undergraduates <61 men, 59 women> completed the CTS. Ten percent of men and 33% of women reported that they perpetrated at least one type of physical aggressive behavior against their dating partner and 18% of men and 15% of women reported receiving physical aggression from their dating partner.)

Sommer, R. (1994). Male and female partner abuse: Testing a diathesis-stress model. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada. (The study was in two waves: the first was from 1989-1990 and included a random sample of 452 married or cohabiting women and 447 married or cohabiting men from Winnipeg, Canada; the second was from 1991-1992 and included 368 women and 369 men all of whom participated in the first wave. Subjects completed the CTS & other assessment instruments. 39.1% of women reported being physically aggressive (16.2% reporting having perpetrated severe violence) at some point in their relationship with their male partner. While 26.3% of men reported being physically aggressive (with 7.6% reporting perpetrating severe violence) at some point in their relationship with their female partner. Among the perpetrators of partner abuse, 34.8% of men and 40.1% of women reported observing their mothers hitting their fathers. Results indicate that 21% of "males' and 13% of females' partners required medical attention as a result of a partner abuse incident." Results also indicate that "10% of women and 15% of men perpetrated partner abuse in self defense.")

Sommer, R., Barnes, G. E. & Murray, R. P. (1992). Alcohol consumption, alcohol abuse, personality and female perpetrated spouse abuse. *Journal of Personality and Individual Differences, 13*, 1315-1323. (The responses from a subsample of 452 women drawn from a sample of 1,257 Winnipeg

residents were analyzed. Using the CTS, it was found that 39% of women physically aggressed against their male partners at some point in their relationship. Younger women with high scores on Eysenck's P scale were most likely to perpetrate violence. Note: The sample of subjects is the same as the one cited in Sommer's 1994 dissertation.)

Sorenson, S. B., & Telles, C. A. (1991). Self reports of spousal violence in a Mexican-American and non-Hispanic white population. *Violence and Victims*, 6, 3-15. (Surveyed 1,243 Mexican-Americans and 1,149 non-Hispanic whites and found that women compared to men reported higher rates of hitting, throwing objects, initiating violence, and striking first more than once. Gender difference was significant only for non-Hispanic whites.)

Spencer, G. A., & Bryant, S. A. (2000). Dating violence: A comparison of rural, suburban and urban teens. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 25 (5) 302-305. (A sample of 2094 high school students in upper New York State indicated their experience of physical dating violence. There were a similar number of boys and girls surveyed, with more subjects from urban areas than rural or suburban areas. The majority of subjects were white non-Hispanic. Males in each region were more likely to report being victims of physical dating violence than females in each region. Specifically, 30% of rural boys and 20% of urban and 20% of suburban boys reported being

victims of partner physical aggression while 25% of rural girls and 16% of suburban and 13% of urban girls reported victimization.)

Steinmetz, S. K. (1977-78). The battered husband syndrome.

Victimology: An International Journal, 2, 499-509. (A pioneering article suggesting that the incidence of husband beating was similar to the incidence of wife beating.)

Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). Women and violence: victims and perpetrators. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 34, 334-350. (Examines the apparent contradiction in women's role as victim and perpetrator in domestic violence.)

Steinmetz, S. K. (1981). A cross cultural comparison of marital

abuse. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 8, 404-414. (Using a modified version of the CTS, examined marital violence in small samples from six societies: Finland, United States, Canada, Puerto Rico, Belize, and Israel <total n=630>. Found that "in each society the percentage of husbands who used violence was similar to the percentage of violent wives."

The major exception was Puerto Rico where men were more violent. Author also reports that, "Wives who used violence... tended to use greater amounts.")

Stets, J. E. & Henderson, D. A. (1991). Contextual factors surrounding conflict resolution while dating: results from a national study. *Family Relations*, 40, 29-40. (Drawn from a random national telephone survey, daters <n=277; men=149, women=128> between the ages of 18 and 30, who were single, never married and in a relationship during the past year which lasted at least two months with at least six dates were examined with the Conflict Tactics Scale. Findings reveal that over 30% of subjects used physical aggression in their relationships, with 22% of the men and 40% of the women reported using some form of physical aggression. Women were "6 times more likely than men to use severe aggression <19.2% vs. 3.4%>...Men were twice as likely as women to report receiving severe aggression <15.7% vs. 8%>." Also found that younger subjects and those of lower socioeconomic status <SES> were more likely to use physical aggression.)

Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1987). Violence in dating

relationships, *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50, 237-246. (Examined a college sample of 505 white students. Found that men and women were similar in both their use and reception of violence. Jealousy was a factor in explaining dating violence for women.)

Stets, J. E. & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1989). Patterns of physical and sexual abuse for men and women in dating relationships: A descriptive analysis, *Journal of Family Violence*, 4, 63-76. (Examined a sample of 287 college students <118 men and 169 women> and found similar rates for men and women of low level physical abuse in dating relationships. More women than men were pushed or shoved <24% vs 10%> while more men than women were slapped <12% vs 8%>. In term of unwanted sexual contact 22% of men and 36% of women reported such behavior. The most frequent category for both men <18%> and women <19%> was the item, "against my will my partner initiated necking".)

Stets, J. E., & Straus, M. A. (1990). Gender differences in reporting marital violence and its medical and psychological consequences. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families* (pp. 151-166). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction. (Reports information regarding the initiation of violence. In a sample of 297 men and 428 women, men said they struck the first blow in 43.7% of cases, and their partner hit first in 44.1% of cases and could not disentangle who hit first in remaining 12.2%. Women report hitting first in 52.7% of cases, their partners in 42.6% and could not disentangle who hit first in remaining 4.7%. Authors conclude that violence by women is not primarily defensive.)

Straus, M. (1980). Victims and aggressors in marital violence.

American Behavioral Scientist, 23, 681-704. (Reviews data from the 1975 National Survey. Examined a subsample of 325 violent couples and found that in 49.5% of cases both husbands and wives committed at least one violent act, while husbands alone were violent in 27.7% of the cases and wives alone were violent in 22.7% of the cases. Found that 148 violent husbands had an average number of 7.1 aggressive acts per year while the 177 violent wives averaged 6.8 aggressive acts per year.)

Straus, M. A. (1993). Physical assaults by wives: A major social problem. In R. J. Gelles & D. R. Loseke (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence* pp. 67-87. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. (Reviews literature and concludes that women initiate physical assaults on their partners as often as men do.)

Straus, M. A. (1995). Trends in cultural norms and rates of partner violence: An update to 1992. In S. M. Stich & M. A. Straus (Eds.) *Understanding partner violence: Prevalence, causes, consequences, and solutions* (pp. 30-33). Minneapolis, MN: National Council on Family Relations. (Reports finding that while the approval of a husband slapping his wife declined dramatically from 1968 to 1994 <21% to 10%> the approval of a wife slapping her husband did not decline but remained at 22% during the same period. The most frequently mentioned reason for slapping for both partners was sexual unfaithfulness. Also reports that severe physical assaults by men declined by 48% from 1975 to 1992--38/1000 to 19/1000 while severe assaults by women did not change from 1975 to 1992 and remained above 40/1000. Suggests that public service announcements should be directed at female perpetrated violence and that school based programs "explicitly recognize and condemn violence by girls as well as boys.")

Straus, M. A. (1998). The controversy over domestic violence by women: A methodological, theoretical, and sociology of science analysis. Paper presented at Claremont Symposium on Applied Social Psychology, Claremont, CA. (Examines issue of differential rates of assaults between crime studies)

and couple conflict studies. Provides a sociological explanation to account for assaults by women within the family.)

Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1986). Societal change and change in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 465-479. (Reviewed data from two large sample national violence surveys of married couples and report that men and women assaulted each other at approximately equally rates, with women engaging in minor acts of violence at a higher rate than men. Sample size in 1975 survey=2,143; sample size in 1985 survey=6,002.)

Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1981). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*, Garden City, NJ: Anchor. (Reports findings from National Family Violence survey conducted in 1975. In terms of religion, found that Jewish men had the lowest rates of abusive spousal violence (1%), while Jewish women had a rate of abusive spousal violence which was more than double the rate for Protestant women <7%>, pp. 128-133. Abusive violence was defined as an "act which has a high potential for injuring the person being hit," pp.21-2.)

Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2). Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues*, 17, 283-316. (The revised CTS has clearer differentiation between minor and severe violence and new scales to measure sexual coercion and physical injury. Used the CTS2 with a sample of 317 college students <114 men, 203 women> and found that: 49% of men and 31% of women reported being a victim of physical assault by their partner; 38% of men and 30% of women reported being a victim of sexual coercion by their partner; and 16% of men and 14% of women

reported being seriously injured by their partners.)

Straus, M. A., & Kaufman Kantor, G. (1994, July). Change in spouse assault rates from 1975-1992: A comparison of three national surveys in the United States. Paper presented at the Thirteenth World Congress of Sociology, Bielefeld, Germany. (Reports that the trend of decreasing severe assaults by husbands found in the National Survey from 1975 to 1985 has continued in the 1992 survey while wives maintained higher rates of assault.)

Straus, M. A., Kaufman Kantor, G., & Moore, D. W. (1994, August). Change in cultural norms approving marital violence from 1968 to 1994. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association, Los Angeles, CA. (Compared surveys conducted in 1968 <n=1,176>, 1985 <n=6,002>, 1992 <n=1,970>, and 1994 <n=524>, with regard to the approval of facial slapping by a spouse. Approval of slapping by husbands decreased from 21% in 1968 to 13% in 1985, to 12% in 1992, to 10% in 1994. The approval of slapping by wives was 22% in 1968 and has not declined over the years.)

Source:

http://familieslink.co.uk/pages/research_fiebert.htm

STATISTICS WITH REGARD TO GROWING UP WITHOUT A FATHER.

Underlines once again why it's so important for the elite to push fatherless homes so hard: it destroys children.

63% of youth suicides are from fatherless homes (U.S. Dept. Of Health/Census) – 5 times the average.

90% of all homeless and runaway children are from fatherless homes – 32 times the average.

85% of all children who show behavior disorders come from fatherless homes – 20 times the average. (Center for Disease Control)

80% of rapists with anger problems come from fatherless homes –14 times the average. (Justice & Behavior, Vol. 14, p. 403-26)

71% of all high school dropouts come from fatherless homes – 9 times the average. (National Principals Association Report)

Father Factor in Education – Fatherless children are twice as likely to drop out of school.

Children with Fathers who are involved are 40% less likely to repeat a grade in school.

Children with Fathers who are involved are 70% less likely to drop out of school.

Children with Fathers who are involved are more likely to get A's in school.

Children with Fathers who are involved are more likely to enjoy school and engage in extracurricular activities.

75% of all adolescent patients in chemical abuse centers come from fatherless homes – 10 times the average.

”

Father Factor in Drug and Alcohol Abuse – Researchers at Columbia University found that children living in a two-parent household with a poor relationship with their father are 68% more likely to smoke, drink, or use drugs compared to all teens in two-parent households. Teens in single mother households are at a 30% higher risk than those in two-parent households.

70% of youths in state-operated institutions come from fatherless homes – 9 times the average. (U.S. Dept. of Justice, Sept. 1988)

85% of all youths in prison come from fatherless homes – 20 times the average. (Fulton Co. Georgia, Texas Dept. of Correction)

Father Factor in Incarceration – Even after controlling for income, youths in father-absent households still had significantly higher odds of incarceration than those in mother-father families. Youths who never had a father in the household experienced the highest odds. A 2002 Department of Justice survey of 7,000 inmates revealed that 39% of jail inmates lived in mother-only households. Approximately 46% of jail inmates in 2002 had a previously incarcerated family member. One-fifth experienced a father in prison or jail.

Father Factor in Crime – A study of 109 juvenile offenders indicated that family structure significantly predicts delinquency. Adolescents, particularly boys, in single-parent families were at higher risk of status, property and person delinquencies. Moreover, students attending schools with a high proportion of children of single parents are also at risk. A study of 13,986 women in prison showed that more than half grew up without their father. 42% grew up in a single-mother household and 16% lived with neither parent.

Father Factor in Child Abuse – Compared to living with both parents, living in a single-parent home doubles the risk that a child will suffer physical, emotional, or educational neglect. The overall rate of child abuse and neglect in single-parent households is 27.3 children for every 1,000, whereas the rate of overall maltreatment in two-parent households is 15.5 for every 1,000.

Daughters of single parents without a Father involved are 53% more likely to marry as teenagers, 711% more likely to have children as teenagers, 164% more likely to have a pre-marital birth and 92% more likely to get divorced themselves.

Adolescent girls raised in a 2 parent home with involved Fathers are significantly less likely to be sexually active than girls raised without involved Fathers.

43% of U.S. children live without their father [U.S. Department of Census]

90% of homeless and runaway children are from fatherless homes. [U.S. D.H.H.S., Bureau of the Census]

80% of rapists motivated with displaced anger come from fatherless homes. [Criminal Justice & Behavior, Vol. 14, pp. 403-26, 1978]

71% of pregnant teenagers lack a father. [U.S. Department of Health and Human Services press release, Friday, March 26, 1999]

63% of youth suicides are from fatherless homes. [U.S. D.H.H.S., Bureau of the Census]

85% of children who exhibit behavioral disorders come from fatherless homes. [Center for Disease Control]

90% of adolescent repeat arsonists live with only their mother. [Wray Herbert, "Dousing the Kindlers," Psychology Today, January, 1985, p. 28]

71% of high school dropouts come from fatherless homes. [National Principals Association Report on the State of High Schools]

75% of adolescent patients in chemical abuse centers come from fatherless homes. [Rainbows for all God's Children]

70% of juveniles in state operated institutions have no father. [U.S. Department of Justice, Special Report, Sept. 1988]

85% of youths in prisons grew up in a fatherless home. [Fulton County Georgia jail populations, Texas Department of Corrections, 1992]

Fatherless boys and girls are: twice as likely to drop out of high school; twice as likely to end up in jail; four times more likely to need help for emotional or behavioral problems. [U.S. D.H.H.S. news release, March 26, 1999] Interesting stats with regard to growing up without a father. Underlines once again why it's so important for the elite to push fatherless homes so hard: it destroys children.

63% of youth suicides are from fatherless homes (U.S. Dept. Of Health/Census) – 5 times the average.

90% of all homeless and runaway children are from fatherless homes – 32 times the average.

85% of all children who show behavior disorders come from fatherless homes – 20 times the average. (Center for Disease Control)

80% of rapists with anger problems come from fatherless homes –14 times the average. (Justice & Behavior, Vol. 14, p. 403-26)

71% of all high school dropouts come from fatherless homes – 9 times the average. (National Principals Association Report)

Father Factor in Education – Fatherless children are twice as likely to drop out of school.

Children with Fathers who are involved are 40% less likely to repeat a grade in school.

Children with Fathers who are involved are 70% less likely to drop out of school.

Children with Fathers who are involved are more likely to get A's in school.

Children with Fathers who are involved are more likely to enjoy school and engage in extracurricular activities.

75% of all adolescent patients in chemical abuse centers come from fatherless homes – 10 times the average.

Father Factor in Drug and Alcohol Abuse – Researchers at Columbia University found that children living in a two-parent household with a poor relationship with their father are 68% more likely to smoke, drink, or use drugs compared to all teens in two-parent households. Teens in single-mother households are at a 30% higher risk than those in two-parent households.

70% of youths in state-operated institutions come from fatherless homes – 9 times the average. (U.S. Dept. of Justice, Sept. 1988)

85% of all youths in prison come from fatherless homes – 20 times the average. (Fulton Co. Georgia, Texas Dept. of Correction)

Father Factor in Incarceration – Even after controlling for income, youths in father-absent households still had significantly higher odds of incarceration than those in mother-father families. Youths who never had a father in the household experienced the highest odds. A 2002 Department of Justice survey of 7,000 inmates revealed that 39% of jail inmates lived in mother-only households. Approximately 46% of jail inmates in 2002 had a previously incarcerated family member. One-fifth experienced a father in prison or jail.

Father Factor in Crime – A study of 109 juvenile offenders indicated that family structure significantly predicts delinquency. Adolescents, particularly boys, in single-parent families were at higher risk of status, property and person delinquencies. Moreover, students attending schools with a high proportion of children of single parents are also at risk. A study of 13,986 women in prison showed that more than half grew up without their father. 42% grew up in a single-mother household and 16% lived with neither parent.

Father Factor in Child Abuse – Compared to living with both parents, living in a single-parent home doubles the risk that a child will suffer physical, emotional, or educational neglect. The overall rate of child abuse and neglect in single-parent households is 27.3 children for every 1,000, whereas the rate of overall maltreatment in two-parent households is 15.5 for every 1,000.

Daughters of single parents without a Father involved are 53% more likely to marry as teenagers, 711% more likely to have children as teenagers, 164% more likely to have a pre-marital birth and 92% more likely to get divorced themselves.

Adolescent girls raised in a 2 parent home with involved Fathers are significantly less likely to be sexually active than girls raised without involved Fathers.

43% of U.S. children live without their father [U.S. Department of Census]

90% of homeless and runaway children are from fatherless homes. [U.S. D.H.H.S., Bureau of the Census]

80% of rapists motivated with displaced anger come from fatherless homes. [Criminal Justice & Behavior, Vol. 14, pp. 403-26, 1978]

71% of pregnant teenagers lack a father. [U.S. Department of Health and Human Services press release, Friday, March 26, 1999]

63% of youth suicides are from fatherless homes. [U.S. D.H.H.S., Bureau of the Census]

85% of children who exhibit behavioral disorders come from fatherless homes. [Center for Disease Control]

90% of adolescent repeat arsonists live with only their mother. [Wray Herbert, "Dousing the Kindlers," Psychology Today, January, 1985, p. 28]

71% of high school dropouts come from fatherless homes. [National Principals Association Report on the State of High Schools]

75% of adolescent patients in chemical abuse centers come from fatherless homes. [Rainbows for all God's Children]

70% of juveniles in state operated institutions have no father. [U.S. Department of Justice, Special Report, Sept. 1988]

85% of youths in prisons grew up in a fatherless home. [Fulton County Georgia jail populations, Texas Department of Corrections, 1992]

Fatherless boys and girls are: twice as likely to drop out of high school; twice as likely to end up in jail; four times more likely to need help for emotional or behavioral problems. [U.S. D.H.H.S. news release, March 26, 1999]

FURTHER

What has the department done about and what does it intend to do about the following?

1. Children's access to electricity and clean water

We have clearly demonstrated that the South African government has deliberately followed a policy that has killed millions and left those countries in a wasteland and increased the poverty of the vast majority of the population which has directly affected the children of this country.

It is a well-established fact as to how the government has destroyed the electricity supply in this country that has

- a. Destroyed the economy
- b. Increased unemployment to unacceptable levels
- c. Left parents struggling to care for their children
- d. Forces children to learn in the dark

What is the department doing to force the government to sort out the electricity supply in this country for the dignity of our children?

2. Access to water

Notwithstanding that, there are large swaths of rural towns and peri-urban communities suffering from intermittent and no water supply. As a direct of the collapse of Eskom.

- a. Water supply is intermittent
- b. As a direct result of the failure to maintain water pumps
 - i. Children will be severely restricted or not have access to water
 - ii. Food will not be able to be cooked properly
 - iii. Being able to clean children and maintain their human dignity

What is the department doing about making sure that mothers that are giving birth and their children have access to continuous water for drinking, cooking and cleaning themselves in order to maintain their dignity?

Please see the Star report attached regarding how water is the next major issue that has been directly and indirectly caused by the current incompetent government dated the 17th May 2023.

3. Education

One can only hang its head in shame as to the state of education in our country.

Outcomes-based education has never worked anywhere in the world.

The DOE wants to close in excess of 3000 schools and force them into hostels where the parents will be only able to visit their children once a month.

Bearing in mind that people who generally come from rural areas are generally poor so will they indeed be able to visit their children monthly?

These so-called hostel schools are very poorly disguised reeducation centres in line with Pol Pots Cambodia and Communist Chinas reeducation centres for Uyghur Muslims – we are not deceived.

Further, the Department of Education (DOE) wants to close down schools with 130 or fewer students. Keeping in mind that the vast majority of these schools have opened in direct response to

the abysmal failed education system in South Africa. The DOE wants to close in excess of 1000 schools in Kwa Zulu Natal alone.

We are fully apprised that the Department of Education is introducing a woke agenda in line with the feminist requirement to overtly sexualise and groom children and to promote that child embark on a process of physical, chemical and medical mutilation of themselves.

The funds directed to NATIONAL COUNCIL ON GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE AND FEMICIDE could be better spent on

4. Promoting a direct focus in schools
 - a. STEM Subjects
 - b. Business and entrepreneurial skills
 - c. Teachers are hired only if they
 - i. Have a 95% pass rate for their chosen field/subject of education
 - ii. That they must also be skilled in educational development and childhood development and psychology and
 - d. That child must have a 70% pass rate at a higher grade level in all subjects.
 - i. A pass rate of 25% for maths does not bode well for our future accountants and engineers
 - ii. Does nothing to assuring our children's opportunity for employment
 - iii. And to their current and future dignity.

4. Health

Once again the collapse of the Department of Health is well established.

However, what is of growing concern in direct collaboration with the Department Of Education is the promotion of the radical, physical, medical and chemical mutilation of children through the unscientific transgender medical abuse and mutilation on a scale last seen in Nazi concentration camps.

1. 80% of children that suffer from body dysmorphia as young teenagers
2. There has been an in excess of 4000% increase in transgender mutilation surgery amongst children in northern America and Europe
3. 60% of these mutilation surgeries are performed on girls who by default more susceptible to the latest fad
4. The United Kingdom is already seeing a massive increase in litigation against the government, doctors, hospitals and pharماسuticle companies by children that were mutilated as they simply did not have the ability to give informed consent.
 - i. America is already seeing an increase in these litigation suites <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6O3MzPeomqs&t=597s>
 - ii. In excess of 80% of children that were illegally forced into these barbaric chemical and medical mutilation surgeries are facing lifelong mild to severe pain.
 - iii. They will be sterile for the rest of their lives
 - iv. The suicide rate of pre and post-transgender mutilation surgeries remains the same

- v. The suicide rate of transgender mutilation surgeries is the second highest per capita. The Highest suicide rate of any given population group is Jews in the holocaust.

What is the department going to do to immediately ban all forms of the chemical and medical transgender mutilation of our children?

5. Department of Social Welfare / Social welfare workers

The Official Fathers 4 Justice notes with EXTREME ALARM that THE PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT CHILDREN'S AMENDMENT BILL [B18 -2020] S76 is proposing under the foster care portion of the children's act mothers can have their children removed from them. That, the courts, social welfare, Department of Justice, and Department of Social Development have absolutely no obligation to locate the biological father, let alone inform him of what is happening to and with his children.

1. The government has a moral responsibility to maintain the family unit – irrespective of whether the parents are together or not. Please see section 7.1 .k of the Children's Act
2. Irrespective of whether the father is good, bad, or indifferent the state has a moral and legal responsibility to allow for the child to be cared for by its family Please see section 7.1 .k of the Children's Act
3. The state is NOT the place where every child should be going to be cared for
4. That there will be a dramatic rise of mothers being denied the right to raise their children simply because they have fallen on hard times
5. Mothers will be denied contact and care of their children equal to the 70% of the fatherless nation where no just cause existed in the first instance
6. South Africa will become the largest orphanage in the world.
7. The issue of child trafficking, child sex trafficking, and paedophilia will skyrocket to pandemic proportions
8. The state is usurping and inserting itself in a role where it neither has the capacity, moral responsibility, or emotional, physical, or psychological ability to provide and care for the children that their parents married or single are far better suited to maintain the child.
9. The state under the current dispensation has displayed beyond a shadow of a doubt that it hates fathers 10. The state has successfully removed 70% of fathers from their children's lives.
11. It is now going to target mothers with the same impunity – once it has achieved a 70% motherlessness rate it is no stretch of the imagination it WILL BEGIN to target married couples.
12. The state is NOT in the business of raising children that's what parents, both MOTHER, and father, and families are for.

SUMMATION

We as the official Fathers 4 Justice South Africa once again reiterate that any form of violence perpetrated by anyone against anyone is fundamentally unacceptable.

Further, we advocate any person found guilty of any form of violence against another human being no matter the circumstances should automatically and mercilessly be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law without fear or favour.

However, through direct experience, we as F4J can prove by hundreds of thousands of individual court cases (i.e. demonstrable information in the public domain) the South African government could be less than bothered to address the root causes of violence in South Africa.

Further, the fake femanazi narrative around the patriarchy and toxic masculinity has been specifically employed to divert everyone from failed government policies and a collapsed South African government.

We have demonstrably proven that the South African official government narrative around the fake woke, socialist, Marxist, femanazi, post-modernist narrative of Gender-based violence, is nothing more than a smoke screen of the government wanting to be seen (doing nothing) and the NATIONAL COUNCIL ON GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE AND FEMICIDE is nothing more than a vanity project that is merely tilting at windmills, and ensuring the continuation of cadre deployment and eating at the trough of public funds.

It is clear that there is a hate movement against Men and boys for the last 60-plus years. While we are the first to admit that men have not always conducted themselves with honour, the same can be said for women.

This is not about a he-said-she-said argument – this is about removing the woke Leninist mob from the kitchen and allow for the adults to take back the conversation.

The time for hysterical woke socialist Marxist femanazies screaming at every slight is over!

If the true feminist movement had actually worked by removing men from the family unit, and society you should have seen an exponential drop in violence and abuse. The opposite is true we have seen an exponential increase in violence.

Our society needs powerful masculine men to take back the space that the insane femanazi movement has controlled for far too long at the direct negative impact of our amazing women and our precious children.

Our Women and children have paid a too higher price for the woke communist femanazi stupidity for too long. Oh and yes men are done with the ignorant narrative. Men are simply no longer the problem.

ENOUGH! THE STUPIDITY STOPS TODAY!

SOLUTION

That the Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities and the National Council On Gender-Based Violence And Femicide must be immediately disbanded.

That a DEPARTMENT FOR THE SUCCESSFUL ADVANCEMENT OF SOUTH AFRICAN SOCIETY is immediately formed.

This department.

1. Must be made up of members of South African society.
2. It may have no political appointees or person directly or indirectly associated with any political party
3. Absolutely no Cadre deployment.
4. That this is a ministerial / cabinet department and position
5. That failed ideologies and agendas may not form any part of the constitution and running of this department whatsoever
6. That this department adheres strictly to the constitution of South Africa, the Constitution of South Africa must be our principal guiding document.
7. That this department promotes the sound advancement of economic, justice, education, and health of every individual in South Africa.

CONCLUSION

Please note that men not just in South Africa but globally are done with being blamed for every single problem that society currently faces.

Men are done being the scapegoat for every single issue that failed governments, economic, social and stupid ideologies being advanced at the direct detriment of our WOMEN AND CHILDREN, the family unit, our communities and society as a whole.

Men are done being your convenient fool.

We are Done!

Enough!

This commission would be well advised and well cautioned to take heed of what has been stated above.

We not only expect but demand proper consultation with this commission.

MEN ARE SIMPLY NOT THE PROBLEM ANY MORE!

Sincerely

Gary Da Silva

Chairperson

The Official Fathers 4 Justice South Africa

Contact 066 331 8972

Email info@f4j.co.za

Twitter https://twitter.com/fathers4J_SA

Linkedin <https://www.linkedin.com/company/fathers-4-justice-south-africa/?viewAsMember=true>

Facebook <https://www.facebook.com/fathers4justicesouthafrica/>

<https://www.f4j.co.za/home>