



PO Box 2220, Bath, BA1 1AA
Tel: 07967 026163
Email: mike@j4mb.org.uk
Web: <http://j4mb.org.uk>

Rt Hon Theresa May MP
Home Secretary
Home Office
2 Marsham Street
London SW1P 4df

12 September 2014

Dear Mrs May,

‘Strengthening the Law on Domestic Abuse – A Consultation’ isn’t a consultation. It’s a cynical manipulation. A charade. We’re publicly challenging you to hold a public inquiry.

I lead the only political party in the English-speaking world campaigning for the human rights of men and boys. We naturally have a strong interest in the lack of state support available for the large number of men who are victims of domestic abuse / violence (DA/DV). Since the early 1970s radical feminists have run the organizations which operate DA/DV refuges, which explains why of over 4,000 refuge places available in the UK today, just 17 are available exclusively for male victims.¹

We know from numerous sources including newspaper reports² that Women’s Aid has been working with the Home Office on proposals concerning the strengthening of the law on DA. In January I wrote an article³ about the proposed extension of the government’s interference in intimate relationships. The influence of Women’s Aid – and possibly other women’s organizations – on the Home Office’s thinking about DA/DV is only too painfully apparent.

Before I turn to your consultation document, I should like to outline a few facts about DA/DV, and how the state engages (or fails to engage) with the problems that arise. They present a very different picture to that presented relentlessly by organizations such as Women’s Aid and Refuge (and, now, it seems, the Home Office):

1. With respect to dealing with DA/DV – as in many other areas – institutional anti-male bias is endemic within the Home Office, Ministry of Justice, EHRC and CPS, as outlined in the 72-page report *Partner Violence Against Men in England and Wales, and the Gender Bias of Public Bodies*.⁴ In the report, your personal anti-male bias as Home Secretary is described on pp 44-46.
2. Women are as physically aggressive towards intimate partners as men, or more aggressive.⁵
3. The Crime Survey of England & Wales (2012/13) reported that in the preceding year, 38% of the victims of partner abuse (PA) – of which DV is a part – were men.⁶
4. The same survey reported that, in the preceding year, among victims of PA, 54% of both male and female victims had experienced at least one incident of DV. A higher proportion of male

victims (34%) than female victims (28%) had experienced at least one incident involving *severe* force.⁶

5. The same survey reported that 21% of both male and female victims of PA had experienced three or more incidents of PA in the preceding year.⁶
6. While most DV is reciprocal, in cases where it's one-way, the perpetrator is more likely to be a woman than a man.⁷
7. Only 4% of female perpetrators of DV report self-defence as a motivation.⁷
8. When the number of DV-related suicides is added to the number of DV-related murders by intimate partners and ex-partners, more men than women die as a result of DV.⁸
9. There is no evidence to back the feminist 'male coercion theory' of DA/DV, which is the principal theory upon which Women's Aid and other women's refuge organizations have long based their thinking – as has the British government, for many years. A recent well-publicised British study not only reached the conclusion that no evidence existed to support the theory, it also reported that women are more likely than men to be 'domestic terrorists'.⁹
10. Further debunking of the male coercion theory of DA/DV is provided by the fact that the highest rates of DA/DV are reported by lesbian couples.⁶

In recent weeks we've publicly challenged a number of women over lies and/or misleading statements made by themselves and/or their organizations' spokeswomen:

- Polly Neate – CEO, Women's Aid⁶
- Sandra Horley – Chief Executive, Refuge¹⁰
- Eleri Butler – Chief Executive, Welsh Women's Aid¹¹

None of these women have, to date, responded to our challenges. Many women's organizations – including those running what amounts to the domestic violence industry – have a long inglorious tradition of lying and making misleading statements to further their organizations' objectives. For the Home Office to be apparently taking guidance only from such organizations is a travesty, and an assault on fairness as well as on male victims of DA/DV. Why would the Home Office not be working with highly-reputable organizations such as Mankind Initiative¹² and internationally renowned academic experts such as Dr Nicola Graham-Kevan (University of Central Lancashire), if only to provide a counterbalance against the feminist narratives of organizations such as Women's Aid, which espouse the male coercion theory of DA/DV, despite all the evidence showing it to be without any basis in reality?

Radical feminist thinking runs like a thread throughout the Home Office consultation document, and it betrays a pronounced zero-tolerance approach to men. That thinking – including the 'male coercion theory' of DV – is openly articulated on Women's Aid website, in a piece dated 1 August 2006:¹³

What is the cause of domestic violence?

Domestic violence against women by men is 'caused' by the misuse of power and control within a context of male privilege. Male privilege operates on an individual and societal level to maintain a situation of male dominance, where men have power over women and children. Perpetrators of domestic violence choose to behave abusively to get what they want and gain control. Their behaviour often originates from a sense of entitlement, which is often supported by sexist, racist, homophobic and other discriminatory attitudes. In this way, domestic violence by men against women can be seen as a consequence of the inequalities between men and women, rooted in patriarchal traditions that encourage men to believe they are entitled to power and control over their partners.

Nobody with any understanding of this subject could possibly be in the *slightest* doubt that Women's Aid is an ideologically feminist organization. Care has been taken in the Home Office consultation document to keep terminology gender-neutral in most instances, but it is unconscionable that the Home Office

should be allowing an organization such as Women's Aid to strongly influence the policy directions of the British government, which already woefully neglect the needs of male victims of DA/DV – 38% of all victims.⁶ The following conclusions are inevitable:

1. The consultation document is a charade, the outcome wholly predictable. You will receive *far* more submissions from female victims of DA/DV and women's organizations, than you will receive from male victims and the few organizations which support or advocate for male victims.
2. You will use those responses to justify yet more incursions by the state, and state-sponsored organisations, into the private lives of heterosexual couples, thereby further undermining the strength of families. Your proposals, clearly crafted by ideologically-driven women's groups that don't represent men, nor the vast majority of women, will set women against men, and cause the state to interfere ever more in intimate relationships.

The present criminal law has stood for centuries as the backstop of serious interpersonal offences, even in the home. That is right and proper, but your proposals will cause the state to step across the boundary of the front door, and unreasonably regulate what have sometimes been unfortunate but normal behaviours in families, since time immemorial. The law has no place in the day-to-day ups and downs of people in the privacy of their own homes. It is a time-honoured principle that what goes on behind closed doors is nobody's business but that of the people themselves. It is only in the last decade or so that this centuries-old principle has been challenged by those who have the long-term aim of interfering with the family and breaking down its barriers i.e. left-wing feminist ideologues, driven by Marxist principles. For a Conservative Home Secretary to be following this line is both controversial and deeply unConservative.

3. It is undeniable that the vast majority of people targeted by the state and state-sponsored organizations, using the legislation you propose, will be men. The effect will be to cause even more men to eschew marriage and intimate relationships, thus further breaking down the family, throwing more people into conflict, and more children into poverty and fatherlessness.

The consultation process is a charade, an exercise in manipulation. One indication of this is on page 5 of the consultation document, in the section titled 'Basic Information', where we read:

This consultation is open to the public. We will be particularly interested to hear from victims of domestic abuse, organizations representing victims, the police, criminal justice practitioners, front line workers, service providers and local authorities.

So the Home Office *isn't* 'particularly interested to hear' from respected academics, many of them with decades of research experience behind them? From this, it is clear that the overwhelming majority of submissions from organizations will support a one-sided ideological interpretation of DA/DV, one that is utterly at odds with the realities that academic experts understand well, and report year after year. No one wants to be insensitive to the victims of tragedies, but no one should afford their words the weight of expert opinion simply on account of their anguish. Suffering does not bestow expertise. Believing what victims believe does not make their testimony more likely to be right. This is a classic example of the logical error of Authority Fallacy¹⁴ and the Home Office should not be making this elementary error.

There can surely be only one explanation for the extraordinary approach being taken by the government in this area. This whole exercise is nothing less than a feminist-inspired ideologically-driven initiative designed to enable the state – following the introduction of legislation in the fullness of time – to become ever more involved in the intimate relationships between men and women, and provide ever more

employment opportunities for women working in organizations such as Women's Aid. It is a truly *evil* initiative, and strikes at the heart of personal freedom – something that you were elected, and appointed to the office of Home Secretary, to uphold. Sadly the initiative is consistent with the government's policy directions with respect to marriage and the family, as a noted commentator on gender political issues, Herbert Purdy, outlined in an article recently.¹⁵

We publicly challenge you to hold a public inquiry rather than continue with the charade that is the current consultation document and associated consultation exercise. In the meantime we'll be posting this public challenge on our website.¹⁶ We look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Mike Buchanan

PARTY LEADER

Copies sent to members of the Home Affairs Committee:

Rt Hon Keith Vaz MP, Chairman

Rt Hon Ian Austin MP

Rt Hon Nicola Blackwood MP

Rt Hon James Clappison MP

Rt Hon Michael Ellis MP

Rt Hon Paul Flynn MP

Rt Hon Lorraine Fullbrook MP

Dr Julian Huppert MP

Rt Hon Yasmin Qureshi MP

Rt Hon Mark Reckless MP

Rt Hon David Winnick MP

References

¹ <http://mankind.org.uk/factsmalevicitms.html>

² <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/crime/11043785/Bullying-husbands-face-jail-under-new-proposals-by-Theresa-May.html>

³ <http://www.avoiceformen.com/mens-rights/domestic-violence-industry/tough-new-domestic-violence-laws-proposed-for-Britain/>

⁴ <http://redpilluk.co.uk/PartnerViolenceAgainstMen.pdf>

⁵ <http://j4mb.wordpress.com/domestic-violence-women-are-as-physically-aggressive-as-or-more-aggressive-than-men-in-their-relationships-with-intimate-partners/>

⁶ <http://j4mb.wordpress.com/womens-aid-our-public-challenge-of-polly-neate-ceo/>

⁷ <http://j4mb.files.wordpress.com/2014/05/140514-mankind-conference-slough-2013-female-perpetrators-of-intimate-partner-violence.pdf>

⁸ <http://j4mb.wordpress.com/domestic-violence-more-men-than-women-die-as-a-result-of-it/>

⁹ <http://j4mb.wordpress.com/2014/07/29/a-study-on-the-male-control-theory-of-intimate-partner-violence/>

¹⁰ <http://j4mb.wordpress.com/refuge-our-public-challenge-of-sandra-horley-chief-executive/>

¹¹ <http://j4mb.wordpress.com/2014/09/07/our-public-challenge-of-elieri-butler-chief-executive-welsh-womens-aid/>

¹² <http://mankind.org.uk>

¹³ <http://www.womensaid.org.uk/domestic-violence-articles.asp?section=00010001002200410001&itemid=1275>

¹⁴ Whyte, Jamie, *Bad Thoughts: A Guide to Clear Thinking* (Corvo Books, 2003)

¹⁵ <http://herbertpurdy.com/?p=600>

¹⁶ <http://j4mb.org.uk>