



EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor

Miles Groth, PhD, Professor of Psychology, Department of Psychology, Wagner College, Staten Island, New York, United States

Executive Board

John Ashfield, PhD, Director, Education and Clinical Practice, Australian Institute of Male Health and Studies, South Australia, Australia

Dennis Gouws, PhD, Associate Professor of English, School of Arts, Sciences and Professional Studies, Springfield College, Springfield, Massachusetts, USA; Lecturer, English Department, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut, United States

Miles Groth, PhD, Professor of Psychology, Department of Psychology, Wagner College, Staten Island, New York, United States

Robert Kenedy, PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, Faculty of Liberal Arts & Professional Studies, York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Advisory Board

Gerhard Amendt, PhD, Professor of Gender and Generation Research (Emeritus), founder and Director of the Institute for Gender and Generation Research at the University of Bremen, Bremen, Germany

John Archer, PhD, Professor and Research Coordinator, School of Psychology, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, Lancashire, United Kingdom

Timothy M Baghurst, PhD, Assistant Professor of Kinesiology, Henderson State University, Arkadelphia, Arkansas, United States

Roy F. Baumeister, PhD, Professor, Department of Psychology, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, United States

David Benatar, PhD, Professor of Philosophy and Head of the Philosophy Department at the University of Cape Town, University of Cape Town, South Africa

Pelle Billing, MD, author, commentator, Malmö, Sweden

Jon G. Bradley, PhD, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Dean Carson, PhD, Director of Research and Professor of Rural and Remote Research, Flinders University Rural Clinical School and Poche Centre for Indigenous Health, Australia

Don Dutton, PhD, Professor, Department of Psychology, University of British Columbia Vancouver, B.C., Canada; Adjunct Professor, Department of Psychology, Simon Fraser University

Warren Farrell, PhD, Independent Researcher, Mill Valley, CA, United States

Craig Garfield, MD, MAPP, Departments of Pediatrics and Medical Social Science, Feinberg School of Medicine, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL, United States

Herb Goldberg, PhD, Professor Emeritus of Psychology, California State University, Los Angeles, United States

Dennis Gosse, PhD, Co-Director Northern Canadian Centre for Research in Education & the Arts (NORCCREA); Associate Professor, Schulich School of Education, Nipissing University, North Bay, Ontario, Canada

Stephen Koch, author of *The Modern Library Writer's Workshop: A Guide to the Craft of Fiction*, two novels, *Night Watch* and *The Bachelor's Bride*, *Stargazer: The Life, World and Films of Andy Warhol* and *Double Lives*. He is curator of the work of photographer Peter Hujar, United States

Celia Lashlie, BA, Independent Researcher, Auckland, New Zealand

Rafael Locke, PhD, Professor, Department of Perceptual Studies, School of Psychiatry, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, United States

John Macdonald, PhD, Professor of Primary Health Care, School of Biomedical and Health Sciences, University of Western Sydney; Director Men's Health Information & Resource Centre UWS; Visiting Professor of Community and



Public Health, Birzeit University, Palestine

Marty McKay, PhD, Clinical Psychologist, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Gary Misan, PhD, Associate Research Professor, University of South Australia, Centre for Rural Health and Community Development; and Adjunct Associate Professor (Research), Spencer Gulf Rural Health School (SGRHS), University of South Australia at Whyalla, South Australia, Australia

Steve Moxon, Independent Researcher and Author, Sheffield, United Kingdom

Paul Nathanson, PhD, Researcher, Department of Religious Studies, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Andrew Smiler, PhD, author, visiting Assistant Professor, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC. Past President of the Society for the Psychological Study of Men and Masculinity (SPSMM; APA Division 51)

Jeanne Stolzer, PhD, Professor of Child and Adolescent Development at the University of Nebraska- Kearney; Advisory board member for the International Center for the Study of Psychiatry and Psychology. Commissioner for the International Citizens Commission on Human Rights

Lionel Tiger, PhD, Charles Darwin Professor of Anthropology (Emeritus), Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, United States

Katherine Young, PhD, Professor of Religious Studies (Emeritus), McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Luigi Zoja, PhD, Independent scholar and author, Milan, Italy, member of the Centro Italiano di Psicologia Analitica

Communities Advisory Board

Greg Andresen, Editor of the Men's Health Australia website and Senior Researcher for the One in Three Campaign supporting male victims of family violence, Australia

Rick Belden, poet and author exploring men's issues, masculine psychology, and recovery from abuse, Austin, TX, United States

Dan Bloom, psychotherapist, fellow and past-president New York Institute for Gestalt Therapy, New York, United States

Mike Buchanan, BSc, Independent Researcher and Author, Bedford, United Kingdom

Joseph Campo, Director, St. Francis House, Brooklyn, New York; Executive Producer, Grassroots Films Inc., New York, United States

Brian Jenkins, M. Math, Director, International Institute for Family Research, Toronto, ON, Canada

Assistant to the Editor

K.C. Glover, BA, Social Worker, Brooklyn, New York, United States



NEWMALE STUDIES JOURNAL

Volume 2 Issue 2 2013

BRIEF CONTRIBUTION

Sexism: The New Prudery?

Gerhard Amendt

5

ARTICLES

The Systemic Correlation Between Psychiatric Medications and Unprovoked Mass Murder in America

Jeanne Stolzer

9

Human Pair-Bonding as a Service to the Female

Steve Moxon

24

The Influence of Non-Legal Research on Legal Approaches to Ex Parte Domestic Violence Protection Orders in New Zealand

Peter Zohrab

39



PANEL ON MALE-POSITIVE PEDAGOGY (NORTHEAST MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION)

- The Learning Style of Males and How to Involve College Men in the Curriculum**
Miles Groth 55
- Males, Melville, and *Moby-Dick*: A New Male Studies Approach to Teaching Literature to College Men**
K.C. Glover 62
- A Male-Positive Introduction to the Victorian Manhood Question**
Dennis Gouws 68

MEMOIR

- Living With Crazy: My Experiences of an Abusive Wife**
Michael Farris and Timothy Baghurst 75

BOOK REVIEWS

- John Guy, *Thomas Becket: Warrior, Priest, Rebel: A Nine-Hundred-Year-Old Story Retold* - -**
Reviewed by: Dennis Gouws 89

- Andrew Smiler, *Challenging Casanova: Beyond the Stereotype of the Promiscuous Young Male* -** Reviewed by: Tony Rafetto 92

NEW MALE STUDIES: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL (NMS) IS AN OPEN ACCESS ONLINE INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION OF ISSUES FACING BOYS AND MEN WORLDWIDE. THIS JOURNAL USES OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEMS 2.3.4.0, WHICH IS OPEN SOURCE JOURNAL MANAGEMENT AND PUBLISHING SOFTWARE DEVELOPED, SUPPORTED, AND FREELY DISTRIBUTED BY THE PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE PROJECT UNDER THE GNU GENERAL PUBLIC LICENSE.

THIS ARTICLE HAS BEEN DOWNLOADED FROM [HTTP://NEWMALESTUDIES.COM](http://newmalestudies.com).



Sexism. The New Prudery?

GERHARD AMENDT



The delusion of sexism not only denies that eroticism creates and maintains relationships. It also attempts to unmask eroticism as an instrument of male domination and to replace it with the belief that men are perpetrators and women their victims, and that the sexes are bonded together solely by male dominance rather than arrangements. The ideology of sexism is intended to anchor guilt feelings in every man over his potential status as perpetrator. As a result, sexism can only be experienced by women. This ideological belief system disparages the importance of everything personal. It is therefore argued, that the ultimate goal is to defend eroticism as the most highly developed form of civilized boundary crossing in intimate relationships against condemnatory feminism.

Key Words: erotic, eroticism, sexism, male gender, condemnatory feminism

The lament over sexism stems from the plundered arsenal of feminism. It is a battle cry that draws life from political indoctrination, not enlightened conviction. Ultimately, its intention is to describe the world of men and women in terms of irreconcilable opposition and to create the appearance that their relations to one another are shaped not by eroticism but rather annoyance, anger, and violence. Sexism fights eroticism because the latter focuses on what men and women have in common rather than what separates them. The intention is to significantly weaken eroticism, a pulsating occurrence between the sexes that has always made it possible to transition from stranger to acquaintance and finally to sexual intimacy. For as long as the cultivation of eroticism is maintained, the ideology that divides society into perpetrators and victims has no chance of survival. Especially since erotic relationships refute the belief that women are controlled by male animosity alone. It is above all women whom this message of salvation has not yet reached, who are meant to become acquainted with it through official government channels. As they establish themselves and become pervasive, feminist-influenced bureaucracies see themselves as the chosen ones bearing the glad tidings of polarization!

Yet the delusion of sexism not only denies that eroticism creates and maintains relationships. It also attempts to unmask eroticism as an instrument of male domination and to replace it with the belief that men are perpetrators and women their victims, that the sexes are bonded together solely by male dominance rather than arrangements they enter into with one another, and are driven either by habit, intent, carelessness, or unconscious motives. The allegation of sexism is therefore intended to transmute eroticism into male autocracy, if not sheer violence, so that women are left with no sphere of domination of their own, and convincingly embody a call for constant help. Although this view is extremely out of touch with everyday life, things cannot be otherwise because this is the only way to cast women as a collective of victims, and because their advocates' own passionate infatuation with victimization would not make sense to those on the outside.

Since eroticism attempts to near the vulnerable intimate sphere of the other, it not only entails risk but can lead to misjudgments, grave breaches of decency, misunderstandings, a sense of personal offense, and consequently violence. And that holds true for both sides, women as well as men. There are innumerable examples of abuse happening all the time. The abuses are committed by men and women in every stage of their lives, in every conceivable situation, every imaginable place and manner. But because feminist circles can only imagine this as unilaterally male behavior, the intention is to replace erotic spontaneity as a male characteristic with a body of formalized approach regulations. The object is to rein men in, regulating their conquest behavior step by step—right up to the sexual act itself—bringing their alleged violence under control, and thereby protecting women. At many American universities and businesses this already defines daily life. For a man who is alone, not riding in the same elevator with a woman is part of it, as are student events with headings such as “She’s afraid of you!” Meanwhile, feminism fantasizes that all women are passive and helpless and therefore require no such body of rules.

Bill Clinton was already abiding by these protective regulations in exemplary fashion when, in 1999, he asked intern Monica Lewinsky in the White House Oval Office whether he could touch her. Her answer was yes, and all the rest is history. Even though incrementally granted permissions have rendered eroticism toothless, in the end every individual still has the final say as to yes or no. Everything becomes very simple-minded and bureaucratic, however; during the process of garnering consent, passion is lost.

When eroticism arises between two individuals, it is something extremely intimate. As a result, the media have in the meantime fastened on sexism as a means of increasing advertising rev-

enue. Eroticism has been proclaimed an everyday risk for women. Their bodies have been declared totally off-limits and cloaked under a chador of approach rules. Beyond the vagina, the buttocks, and breasts, this defines the rest of the female body as sexual as well. Thus, while the chador in Islam shrouds the object completely from sight, democracy would wrap the rather naked female body in protective legislation. The chador as a visual mantle is replaced by a secular taboo against touching and thereby clashes with female self-presentation which by design is a progressive removal of clothing. In this manner, feminist clichés gradually blossom into prudery in practice. And when erotic risk is no longer linked to two individuals, a boundless space abruptly opens, where all male activity can be explained as violent encroachment. At the same time, this vein of thought once more casts women in their traditional role as custodians of passivity.

Desire, as communicated either verbally or mimetically, not to mention the speechlessness of passion—*silently, they draw unspeakingly near*—goes down the drain. Some men have already begun to fear that they, too, could harbor a molester; that in the end they could be a rapist simply because they, too, have on occasion looked at a woman's behind before looking into her eyes. A man who entertains such fears has already infected himself with sexism's allocation of guilt. He no longer lives the life of an individual who can lustfully desire women, but instead numbers himself among the imaginary throng of perpetrators. And this is precisely what the politically driven polarization of the sexes strives to achieve; it is an attempt to ossify a conflict-laden world in an insuperable antagonism between good women and bad men. The ideology of sexism is intended to anchor guilt feelings in every man over his potential status as a perpetrator.

This probably already characterizes the internal world of many men in the German Social Democratic Party who have mutely submitted to the misanthropic image of masculinity espoused by their party constitution—because according to this document human society can only be realized if masculinity has been eliminated beforehand. In their manifesto against machismo of 2010, the men of the Green Party in North Rhine-Westphalia submitted to accusations of sexism no less permanently and with no lesser degree of self castration.

At the same time, however, a growing number of men would like to escape the misandrist denigration that is washing across the country. They rummage through their life histories searching for far-flung pieces of evidence that women are no less sexist. Yet the you're-no-better-than-we-are misses sexism's core accusation. In sexism there is no symmetrical distribution as we know it from violence in relationships. There can be no such thing as sexism in women, although there are just as many forms of emotional and sexual offensiveness as among men, be it in the personal or the public sphere. One who tries to pin sexism on women as a means of relieving unpleasant feelings has failed to understand that "sexism" is merely an application of condemnatory feminism, according to which men alone can be perpetrators and therefore evil and violent. And, above all, it is a failure to realize that the idea is to spur the polarization of society ahead and into the very pores of the intimate sphere. That is the reason why only men can commit sexual abuse, for only those who rule come into question as perpetrators, and not the ruled themselves.

As a result, sexism can only be experienced by women. Anybody who accuses women of sexism fundamentally misunderstands the totalitarian polarization of society that feminism seeks to advance. Although normality always entails conflicts of many kinds, according to feminist ideology it can be explained through male destructivity alone. Hence, this ideological belief system disparages the importance of everything personal while passing off sexism as a structural principle, according to which intimate relations are dominated by male violence from the outset. A differentiation is no longer made between a gentle touch that is premature, a look that is too direct and can be annoying,

invasive bottom grabbing, the lack of women in corporate board rooms, the physically violent male in the home, Oscar Pistorius pulling the trigger, and a homicidal rape in an Indian bus. That is intentional. That is why it is generally claimed that women should have the right to define violence according to their own criteria. There must be no law stipulating the criteria or setting any limitations. Women are granted the right of self-determining harm. Instead of defending the female erotic space, feminists are inculcating women with a world view that paints any approach by a man as a threat. For Julian Assange, this right to self-determine harm resulted in rape proceedings; the case of Joerg Kachelmann was similar. Instead of clarifying what women want or do not want of men, the articles of this faith would permit women to pass judgment on a man's advances autocratically.

In the current heated debate, the ultimate goal is to defend eroticism as the most highly developed form of civilized boundary crossing in intimate relationships. Crossing boundaries in a cultured manner generally protects us from incursions that injure others or harm them. As a rule, however, it creates the intimacy desired because, in principle, eroticism attempts to explore whether something can be shared, the existence of separation notwithstanding. For without crossing the boundaries of daily life, without overstepping (or even exploding) day-to-day routines with another person—consensually and yet simultaneously embracing risk—personal relationships simply cannot come about. The person who is incapable of transcending routines will ultimately remain isolated and lonely.

The differences between men and women, despite their many commonalities, lie in the way they overcome the aloofness of everyday life. For the most part, men choose and reach out with their eyes, sometimes in the form of pleasant flirtation and captivating charm, sometimes aggressively, obtrusively brash, or disinterested and dismissive, sometimes overshooting the mark with their “skirt chasing.” Men are the active ones—not always, but probably more often than not. Women, on the other hand, tend to be more selective, allowing themselves to be courted in order to create a sense of having been shown preference—not always, but probably quite often. For many women, being drawn out of their careful reserve is already perceived as a sign of esteem. Although many traditional customs have become more fluid in the younger generation, believers in sexism categorically insist that men are the only ones who boorishly violate boundaries. They speak of sexism because they generalize individual cases out of resentment against all things male. But in reality they are waging war against eroticism and reverting to puritan prudery! While opposing the chador in other countries, feminist adherents of sexism actually champion an invisible chador here. The media have taken up the conservative trend, thereby resurrecting the female passivity of bygone days in neo-conservative guise.



Gerhard Amendt is professor emeritus of sociology, Institute for Gender and Generation Research University of Bremen, Germany. He may be reached at amendt@uni-bremen.de. Translated by Philip Schmitz.

NEW MALE STUDIES: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL (NMS) IS AN OPEN ACCESS ONLINE INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION OF ISSUES FACING BOYS AND MEN WORLDWIDE. THIS JOURNAL USES OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEMS 2.3.4.0, WHICH IS OPEN SOURCE JOURNAL MANAGEMENT AND PUBLISHING SOFTWARE DEVELOPED, SUPPORTED, AND FREELY DISTRIBUTED BY THE PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE PROJECT UNDER THE GNU GENERAL PUBLIC LICENSE.

THIS ARTICLE HAS BEEN DOWNLOADED FROM [HTTP://NEWMALESTUDIES.COM](http://newmalestudies.com).



The Systemic Correlation Between Psychiatric Medications and Unprovoked Mass Murder in America

JEANNE M. STOLZER



Since the beginning of the human race, violence has permeated every civilization in recorded history. However, over the last 10-15 years, violence of an unprecedented nature has become common place across America. Young male killers are opening fire in movie theatres, shopping malls, and schools with no apparent motivation. Innocent six- and seven-year-old American children are shot to death as they sit in their first grade classrooms. We as a nation are stunned, despondent, and angry. How could this happen? Why is this happening? How can we prevent such tragedy from occurring in the future? On December 17, 2012, President Barack Obama addressed the nation at a memorial service for the 20 first grade children and the six school employees who were shot to death at a public school

in Newtown, Connecticut. The president of the United States consoled the American public and made it absolutely clear that change was needed in order to stop the senseless carnage that is occurring in America. A significant number of American citizens are convinced that stricter gun laws are the answer to decreasing mass murder in America. Others are suggesting that bullying, coupled with the rise in violent video games are at the root of our problem. Still others are insisting that more mental health screening and involuntary commitment to psychiatric hospitals is the answer. One thing is certain, and that is that we as a nation can no longer tolerate the senseless brutality that has become a part of our national landscape. Interestingly, despite the multitude of international drug regulatory warnings on all classifications of psychiatric medications citing adverse reactions such as suicidal ideation, homicidal ideation, violence, and psychosis, not one local, state, or federal commission has investigated the correlation between the mass shootings in America and the use of psychiatric medications. Drawing on the scientific literature, this paper will explore in depth the hazards associated with exposure to psychiatric drugs and will offer a scientifically validated explanation as to how these classifications of drugs are intrinsically related to the escalation of mass killings across America.

Key Words: Psychiatric drugs, mass shootings and psychiatric drugs, connection between psychiatric medications and violence, drug-induced violence, violence and psychotropic drugs

Correlates Linked to Mass Shootings in America

Beginning with the unprovoked slaughter at Columbine High School on April 20, 1999, specific correlates have been linked to mass murder in America. Immediately following the Columbine shootings, bullying was put forth as a possible cause for the senseless school shooting. While it is certain that being bullied is an unpleasant experience, the fact of the matter is that bullying exists across all cultures, across all mammalian species, and across recorded human history. Never before in the recorded historical literature has bullying caused two adolescent males to enter their high school and begin the indiscriminate shooting of their classmates and teachers. If indeed bullying is the cause of the increasing frequency of unprovoked violence in America, these specific types of mass murders would have been taking place since the inception of the public school system in the United States, and this clearly is not the case. Furthermore, if bullying (i.e., being ostracized, teased, rejected, etc. . .) is the impetus for the mass shootings, we would see these types of shootings frequently across the globe from Canada to Switzerland, from Peru to South Africa, and every nation in between, as bullying does not only occur within the confines of America, but exists in every corner of the globe. If the hypothesis that bullying is the sole cause of mass murder were accurate, then we would be able to document similar rates of mass murder across cultures and across historical time. Fortunately, there exists no data to support this hypothesis as the majority of unprovoked mass murder that is occurring in movie theatres, shopping malls, and elementary schools is largely an American phenomenon.

Another correlate that has been linked to mass murder in America is the availability of violent video games, violent television programs, and violent movies. While it is certain that the frequency and intensity of media violence has increased dramatically over the last three decades, the proliferation of violence in the media can be seen not only in America, but across Europe, Australia, South America and in much of Asia. Japan, the United Kingdom, and Canada are all highly industrialized countries that are on the cutting edge of technological advancement. Violent video games, as well as a plethora of other violent media outlets abound in these countries, yet there has been very little mass murder committed in these countries, and certainly, there has been no quantifiable increase in unprovoked mass murder in schools, shopping malls, or movie theatres. Clearly, if exposure to

violence via video games and movies is causing the increase in mass murder, there would be a significant increase in unprovoked mass killings throughout much of the industrialized world. However, at present time, there is no empirical evidence to support the hypothesis that links media violence to mass murder.

As a direct result of the mass shootings in America, many citizens' groups and politicians are calling for a widespread gun control bill. Proponents of gun control cite easy accessibility to firearms and the lack of comprehensive background checks as the causal factors in the escalating gun violence in America. The second amendment of the United States Constitution allows for citizens to keep and bear arms; however, the increasing rates of senseless mass shootings have made many Americans rethink their stance on the interpretation of the second amendment. While to many, stricter gun control laws seem to be a justifiable response to the violence in America, many Americans argue that guns have been readily available throughout American history, and it is just recently that senseless gun violence has accelerated.

Historical archives indicate that firearms have been widely available throughout America since the 1600s. It has been, and continues to be, a rite of passage for many fathers and grandfathers to introduce their young sons and grandsons to guns at a very early age. In many parts of the country, BB guns are given as birthday or Christmas presents to 11-12 year old boys. As these boys enter their teens, they are introduced to rifles, shotguns, and other types of firearms. Many Americans attended public schools where it was commonplace in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s for shotguns to be in the gun racks of numerous pick-ups parked in the high school parking lot. Before the automobile was invented, many young males carried firearms with them as they went about their daily lives. To many that were raised in metropolitan cities, this scenario sounds unbelievable, but for those millions of Americans who live in rural communities across the central, western, and southern parts of the United States, guns were, and continue to be, a fundamental component of daily life. Perhaps the time has come to enact stricter gun laws in America. However, the fact remains that guns have always been available to young American males, but it is only in the last 10-15 years that guns have been used to indiscriminately kill innocent, defenseless strangers in mass killings in schools, shopping malls, and movie theatres with no apparent motivation for the killings.

Lastly, many Americans are convinced that an increase in mental health screening will significantly reduce the unmitigated violence that Americans are experiencing. However, if we look at the demographic data collected over the last 30 years in America, we will find documentation that shows that as psychiatric diagnoses increase, so does the number of mass shootings. Prior to the 1950s in America, psychiatric diagnoses in American men, women, and children were extremely rare. Fast forward to 21st century America and one in five Americans have been diagnosed with a plethora of mental illnesses including ADHD, depression, anxiety, bi-polar, Aspergers, personality disorders, etc. . . , and for the first time in human history, the standard method of treatment is daily doses of dangerous and addictive psychiatric medications (Breggin, 2011).

Politicians, teachers, researchers, parents, physicians, pharmaceutical companies, and concerned citizens are calling for legislation that will make compulsory mental health assessment mandatory for all Americans (including American infants and children). The underlying assumption is that if we can identify those who are mentally ill and get them the proper medication, we as a nation will see a significant decrease in mass violence across America. While the intention of these concerned citizens must be applauded, we must also acknowledge that an unprecedented number of Americans (more per capita than any other country) have already been diagnosed as mentally ill and are prescribed a wide range of psychiatric medications that can, and often do, cause irrational

and senseless violence, including homicide and suicide (Breggin & Cohen, 1999).

More mental health screening and more psychiatric drugging? We as a nation conduct more mental health screening than any other nation on earth and have the highest rates of gun violence on the globe. Over the last 15-20 years we have become engulfed in a paradigm that pathologizes the human experience and insists that behaviors that were once considered normal are now indicators of a psychiatric illness that require daily doses of dangerous and addictive psychiatric drugs. Never before have so many citizens (including children) been scrutinized by so many who are on the lookout for mental illness. Take the average American child, for example. Beginning in infancy, he is assessed for signs of psychiatric illness by parents, physicians, and daycare workers. If he is enrolled in the federally funded Head Start program, it is mandatory that he undergo a comprehensive mental health evaluation and this evaluation is conducted by staff who have no training whatsoever in the behavioral assessment of children. As the child enters school, teachers, principals, counselors, and other staff personnel are continually evaluating him for behavior that is indicative of a mental illness. As the child grows, this scrutiny escalates as coaches, babysitters, piano teachers, after-school daycare providers, and family friends and relatives all join in the lookout for signs of psychiatric illness. As a direct result of this unprecedented scrutinization, millions of American children and adolescents (the majority are males) have been formally diagnosed as “mentally ill” and are forced to take psychiatric medications for an illness that, according to the Surgeon General of the United States, cannot be definitively diagnosed as there exists no medical tests or abnormality within the brain that would indicate the existence of a psychiatric illness (Baughman, 2006).

The Hidden Correlate: Psychiatric Drugs

Since the Columbine massacre, there have been 31 documented mass shootings in the United States of America. Each mass shooting was unprovoked and countless numbers of men, women, and children died or were injured as a result of the senseless violence that has become a regular feature of American society. Following Columbine, it appeared that there was a pattern developing as each of the shooters was young, male, Caucasian, came from a two-parent family, was middle-to-upper income, and was prescribed psychiatric medications. As time passed, and more shootings occurred, the demographic information concerning the shooters began to change. Not all were Caucasian, not all were from two-parent families, and not all were from middle-to-upper income classes. The two constant variables that remained were that the vast majority of shooters had been formally diagnosed with a mental illness and were prescribed psychiatric medications. In some instances, such as the massacre at Virginia Tech, medical records concerning the shooter were sealed. However, the mother of the shooter was interviewed by a local news organization and stated publically that she believed her son was “doing better now as he was taking his medicine for his mental problems.” In addition, the *New York Times* also reported that the Virginia Tech shooter had been prescribed psychiatric medications.

Across the world, there has always existed senseless killing and individual acts of violence that defied logic. In America, one can go through the historical archives of local newspapers and find accounts of gruesome and horrific murder. What has changed dramatically over the last 10-15 years is 1. the frequency of these mass murders and 2. the senseless nature of the murders (i.e. these murders are not the result of organized crime, revenge, or crimes of passion). One does not have to look far for the answer as to why this type of senseless violence is increasing. According to the pharmaceutical industry, *The Physician's Desk Reference Manual*, and numerous researchers, all classifications of psychiatric medications can cause a wide range of pathological behavior including, but not limited to, suicidal ideation, homicidal ideation, violence, mania, and psychosis (Breggin &

Cohen, 1999; Breggin, 2004; Novartis, 2012; *Physician's Desk Reference Manual* (PDR), 2009). Should we as a country really be so incredulous that this type of psychotic violence is occurring? The manufacturers of psychiatric medications clearly and unequivocally state that use of their product can cause all of the behaviors that these shooters have displayed, including unprovoked violence, murder, suicide, and violent psychosis (Novartis, 2012).

The question really is this: How did we convince a whole generation of Americans that feelings such as sadness, worry, anxiety, or behavior such as overactivity, disobedience, and defiance were indicators of a neurochemical abnormality in the brain? These feelings and/or behaviors have existed in every culture throughout the world and in every historical time period. For the majority of human history, these feelings and/or behaviors were not collectively defined as indicators of mental illness, but were instead thought to be an integral part of human nature.

Beginning with the amendment to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in 1990, all types of psychiatric diagnoses have skyrocketed across America (Baughman, 2006). This federal amendment states that psychiatric disorders such as ADHD, depression, Aspergers, anxiety, conduct disorder, and oppositional defiance are legitimate disorders and that individual schools must receive additional federal monies for each child diagnosed with a psychiatric disorder. As a direct result of this federal legislation, millions of American children have been diagnosed as "mentally ill," and use of psychiatric medications in child and adolescent populations is at an all-time high (Baughman, 2006; Stolzer, 2007). According to published research, approximately 98% of all referrals for psychiatric diagnosis in pediatric populations come directly from the United States public school system (Baughman, 2006). This should come as no surprise as there clearly exists an economic incentive (as outlined in the 1991 ADA Amendment) to label children with a myriad of psychiatric disorders. Over the last 20 years, teachers, principals, and school counselors have become brokers for the pharmaceutical industry as referrals for psychiatric diagnoses are now reaching epidemic proportions in America. Let us remember that teachers are not now, nor have they ever been, trained as neurologists, psychiatrists, or psychologists. Their training is in curriculum and instruction, as they are paid by the American tax payer to educate children- not to serve as unpaid brokers for the pharmaceutical industry (Stolzer, 2009). Interestingly, according to the United States Department of Education (2009), 85-90% of students who have been formally diagnosed as "psychiatrically disordered" are male.

The pharmaceutical industry has also played a pivotal role in the mental illness epidemic in America. This industry funds the majority of research focused on mental illness and its treatment, and is responsible for billion dollar advertising campaigns that have been quite successful at convincing Americans that they (and their children) are mentally ill. As a direct result of this successful marketing campaign, Americans consume 80-90% of the psychiatric drugs produced worldwide (Breggin & Cohen, 1999; Stolzer, 2009). With regard to the ADHD epidemic in America (which clearly is a "boy disorder," as young males are significantly more likely than their female cohorts to be diagnosed and drugged for this disorder), prescriptions for Ritalin (i.e. methylphenidate) increased 700% from 1990-1998 (Root, 2009).

Unquestionably, the pharmaceutical industry has a vested economic interest in promoting the sale and distribution of various types of psychiatric drugs that are known to cause a wide range of psychiatric abnormalities ranging from homicide to suicide, to unprovoked violence, to mania and psychosis (Breggin, 2006). Physicians' offices, hospitals, parenting magazines, television commercials, and medical journals routinely advertise a wide range of psychiatric medications, while at the same time promoting the neurobiological explanation for mental illness without a shred of sci-

entific data to back up their claims (Baughman, 2006; Breggin, 2011; Stolzer, 2011).

According to published scientific data, one of the major reasons for the epidemic of psychiatric drug use in America can be found in the economic alliance which exists between the pharmaceutical industry and the American medical community (Baughman, 2006; Stolzer, 2011). Backed by the pharmaceutical industry, physicians routinely give free samples of psychiatric medication, and often times receive financial incentives for prescribing particular psychiatric drugs. In addition, the pharmaceutical industry in tandem with the medical community strongly endorse the hypothesis that behaviors defined as “psychiatric illness” are the result of a “chemical imbalance” of the brain, despite no evidence to support this claim (Breggin, 2011).

From the 1600s until the 1960s, psychiatric illness was extremely rare in America. Furthermore, throughout most of American history, medicating pediatric populations with a plethora of psychiatric drug cocktails was unheard of. It is only in the last 10-15 years that Americans have collectively accepted the widespread use of psychiatric medications to treat behaviors that were once considered normative. In spite of the Surgeon General’s statement that the diagnosis of mental illness is questionable as there exists no metabolic, cognitive, or any other type of marker that can confirm the existence of mental illness, we as a country continue drugging millions of Americans each year, and many of these citizens are young males. To add credence to the Surgeon General’s statement on mental illness, the World Health Organization has stated emphatically that the diagnosis of psychiatric illness in child and adolescent populations is especially problematic as distinguishing between “normal” and “abnormal” behaviors is extremely difficult (Baughman, 2006).

Risks Associate with Psychiatric Medications

According to published data, psychiatric drugs “work” by impairing the chemical composition of the brain by overstimulating particular neurotransmitters, or by preventing the brain from producing specific neurotransmitters such as dopamine, norepinephrine, and serotonin (Breggin & Cohen, 1999). Every classification of psychiatric drug causes brain dysfunction and has been found to impair emotional responsivity, self-awareness, and overall cognitive functioning (Breggin, 2006). Following is a summation of the effects associated with specific classifications of psychiatric drugs.

Stimulants

This category of psychiatric drugs includes Ritalin, Adderall, and Dexedrine, as well as other stimulant drugs. These drugs are commonly presented to treat symptoms of ADHD which include fidgeting, impulsivity, jumping, climbing, and inability to pay attention. The vast majority of stimulant medications are prescribed to American males ranging from ages 2-24 (Breggin & Cohen, 1999). Stimulants are highly addictive drugs and have been known to cause insomnia, seizures, agitation, irritability, nervousness, confusion, visual disturbances, aggression, disorientation, personality changes, apathy, social isolation, depression and suicidal feelings (Breggin & Cohen, 1999; Novartis, 2012; Stolzer, 2011). The most common characteristic of the stimulant classification of drugs is that they cause a wide range of psychoses, including mania, paranoia, and violent feelings towards others. In addition, stimulant drugs have been found to cause a lack of empathy towards others, lack of impulse control, heightened reaction to stressful situations, uncontrollable mania, acute anxiety, abnormal thoughts, feelings, and behavior, and acute psychosis (Breggin & Cohen, 1999; Novartis, 2012; *Physician’s Desk Reference Manual* (PDR), 2009). The literature indicates that all classifications of stimulant drugs impair growth- including brain growth. These drugs also affect particular hormone production, which has been shown to be particularly dangerous, especially in prepubescent and pu-

bescent males due to the influx of testosterone and androgen that is typically associated with puberty in the developing male (Breggin & Cohen, 1999).

Antidepressants

Some of the most commonly prescribed antidepressants in America include Prozac, Zoloft, Cymbalta, Paxil, and Luvox. These drugs are typically prescribed for individuals who have been diagnosed with depression. Symptoms of depression include loss of interest in social activities, sadness, crying, sleep disturbances, and lack of energy. Despite the lack of efficacy of these drugs, Americans continue to be prescribed antidepressants at an alarming rate, and that rate is significantly higher than any other nation on the globe (Barber, Barrett, Gallop, Rynn, and Rickels, 2011; Breggin, 2011).

According to Breggin and Cohen (1999), antidepressants often times produce effects similar to amphetamines and methamphetamine including but not limited to synthetically induced euphoria, anxiety, agitation, and the inability to sleep. In addition, antidepressants have been found to cause manic psychoses, violence, loss of impulse control, akathisia (e.g. a sensation of being tortured from within and often times causes self-directed or other-directed violence), obsessive suicidal thoughts, flat affect, loss of empathy, delirium, and brain abnormalities (Breggin & Cohen, 1999; PDR, 2009).

In addition, the PDR (2009) lists the following side effects associated with antidepressants. (Note that none of these side effects are listed as “rare” by the PDR; rather, they are listed as either “frequent” or “infrequent”). Side effects listed include: manic reaction, hypomania (which includes impulsive actions and poor judgment), abnormal thoughts, hallucinations, personality disorder, agitation, psychosis, emotional instability, hostility, paranoia, confusion, and delusions. The PDR (2009) also states that adverse effects are most likely to occur when starting or discontinuing a psychiatric medication, increasing or lowering the dosage, switching to a new classification of antidepressant, or when adding additional psychiatric medications.

According to the literature, antidepressants can also cause sudden onset of compulsive aggression directed at the self or others, accelerated agitation, extreme and/or bizarre thoughts or actions, obsessive thoughts concerning violence, and ego-dystonic feelings (i.e. thoughts and/or actions that seemed “unreal” to the person taking antidepressants) (Breggin, 2004, Gualtieri, 1991; Healy, 2003; Preda, MacLean, Mazure, & Bowers, 2001).

Benzodiazepines/Non-Benzodiazepines

Benzodiazepines are typically prescribed for anxiety, panic attacks, and insomnia. This category of drugs includes Ativan, Klonopin, Serax, and Xanax. Side effects associated with benzodiazepines include acute anxiety, cognitive impairment, poor judgment, feelings of disassociation with the self or others, and amnesia (Breggin & Cohen, 1999; PDR, 2009). Benzodiazepines often times cause serious withdrawal reactions between therapeutic doses, and the vast majority of individuals prescribed these drugs experience extreme difficulty when discontinuing these medications. These classifications of drugs suppress neuro activity which in turn affects thinking and memory. As with all psychiatric drugs, use of benzodiazepines can cause irreversible brain damage (Breggin & Cohen, 1999). Other effects of benzodiazepines include: confusion, paranoia, mania, agitation, rage, unprovoked aggression, uncontrollable violence, depression, suicide, impulsivity, and acute depersonalization (Breggin & Cohen, 1999; Rouve, Bagheri, Telmon, Pathak, Franchitto, & Schmitt, 2011).

Non-benzodiazepines include Ambien, Atarax, BuSpar, and Trancopel. These drugs are often times prescribed to treat insomnia and acute anxiety. Side effects of these drugs include manic-depressive episodes, confusion, amnesia, hallucinations, nightmares, night terrors, sensory disturbances, disinhibition, bizarre and/or dangerous behaviors, anxiety, delirium, psychotic mania, and violent psychosis (PDR, 2009).

Antipsychotics

The antipsychotic classification of drugs includes Haldol, Risperidone, Abilify, Seroquel, and Zyprexa. In spite of the published international data that has concluded that antipsychotic medications have low efficacy rates, and can cause irreversible atrophy of the brain, Americans (including infants and children) continue to be prescribed these classifications of drugs at an alarming rate (Breggin, 2011; Krystal, 2011). Many antipsychotics are being mass marketed in America as “miracle drugs” that supposedly help individuals who in the past were unable to get relief from conventional antidepressant drugs. However, there is no data to support these spurious claims made by physicians and the pharmaceutical industry (Breggin, 2011; Krystal, 2011).

Side effects associated with antipsychotic drugs include neurological impairment, sedation, agitation, bizarre behaviors, apathy, emotional flatness, and severe withdrawal symptoms as these drugs directly impact the frontal lobes and basal ganglia which are associated with the highest functions of the human brain (Breggin & Cohen, 1999; PDR, 2009).

Mood Stabilizers

This category of drugs includes Klonopin, Depakene, Depakote, Dilantin, and Lyrica. The side effects associated with this classification of drugs includes apathy, indifference, cognitive dysfunction, behavioral abnormalities, confusion, delirium, chronic mental impairment, nightmares, anxiety, depression, and hallucinations (Breggin & Cohen, 1999; PDR, 2009). Other side effects include neurological intoxication, double vision, visual disturbances, suicide, homicidal ideation and homicidal actions (Canadian Adverse Reaction Newsletter, 2010; Moore, Glenmullen, & Furbert, 2010).

According to Breggin (2006), all classifications of psychiatric drugs alter the chemical composition of the human brain, and interestingly none of these drugs have been shown to improve brain function in any way. In addition, all psychiatric drugs affect *all* people- not just individuals diagnosed with a specific psychiatric illness. These drugs “work” by interfering with normal brain functioning and by disabling specific neurotransmission (Breggin, 2011; Breggin, 2006). According to the scientific literature, all classifications of psychiatric drugs cause a wide range of psychiatric impairment, including but not limited to mania, paranoia, bizarre thoughts and/or behavior, agitation, depression, irritability, confusion, visual disturbances, personality changes, acute anxiety, violent ideation toward others, loss of impulse control, akathisia, delirium, brain abnormalities, delusions, emotional instability, hostility, aggression, cognitive impairment, amnesia, suicidal ideation, suicide, hallucinations, homicidal ideation, homicide, drug-induced violent psychosis and homicide (Moore, et al, 2010; PDR, 2009).

Discussion

For over 50 years, scientific data has demonstrated that psychiatric drugs neuropharmacologically induce bizarre and violent behavior patterns (Breggin, 2006; Klein & Fink, 1962). In addition, over

the last 15 years, there have been over 20 international drug regulatory warnings issued that state unequivocally that psychiatric medications cause violence, mania, hostility, unprovoked aggression, hallucinations, violent psychosis, homicide, and suicide (Citizen's Commission on Human Rights International (CCHR), 2012; Moore, et al, 2010).

While Americans collectively shake their heads in the wake of another senseless tragedy, this scientific literature has, and continues to, document that the majority of mass killings that have occurred over the last 10-15 years in schools, shopping malls, and movie theatres in America involved a young male shooter who had been prescribed psychiatric medications (CCHR, 2012). It is a distinct possibility that every one of the shooters was, or had been, prescribed psychiatric drugs, but at present time, it is impossible to factually confirm this as many of the shooter's medical records have been sealed (i.e., withheld from the American public). What is clearly needed at this time is a full scale, compendious, federal investigation into the linkages between psychiatric medications and the senseless mass murder that has occurred in America beginning in the mid-to-late 1990s. Indeed, if each of the shooters had been found to be users of illegal drugs such as heroin or methamphetamine, no one would have any doubt as to the cause of these senseless shootings. The time has come to demand answers, to demand transparency with regard to medical records, and to demand that pharmaceutical companies and physicians be held accountable for the role they have played in the meteoric rise in psychiatric drug prescriptions over the last 15 years.

It is an undisputed, scientific fact that psychiatric drugs cause a wide range of violent and unexplainable behaviors directed toward the self and others (Mosholder & Pamer, 2006; PDR, 2009). In some cases, psychiatric drugs have caused toxic psychosis which symptoms are drug-induced brain impairment, loss of touch with reality, and violent behavior which culminates in homicide and/or suicide (Breggin & Cohen, 1999; Coupland, Ohiman, Morriss, Arthur, Barton, & Hippisley-Cox, 2011). Numerous researchers have documented the homicidal and suicidal effects associated with psychiatric drugs, yet the majority of Americans are unaware of these effects, which according to the PDR (2009) are "frequent" or "infrequent" side effects (Burrai, Bocchetta, & Zompa, 1995; CCHR, 2012; Peyre, Verdous, & Bourgeois, 1992).

It is clearly stated in various psychiatric drug inserts that use of psychiatric medications can cause violent psychosis, hallucinations, delirium, mania, suicidal ideation, and homicidal ideation (Canadian Adverse Reaction Newsletter, 2010; Novartis, 2012; Moore, et al, 2010). Published scientific data indicates that while there are numerous adverse effects associated with psychiatric drugs in adult populations, children, adolescents, and young adults are significantly more susceptible to the deleterious effects of psychiatric drugs as serious side effects occur more frequently in pediatric populations and in young adults (Breggin, 2004; Sim, 2000). In spite of the scientific evidence that demonstrates that psychiatric drugs are especially harmful in child and adolescent populations, the United States public school system continues to refer children for psychiatric diagnoses in record numbers, while physicians and pharmaceutical companies enjoy immense economic profit as a direct result of the sale and distribution of psychiatric drugs to pediatric patients (Jain, Birmaher, Garcia, Al-Shabbout, & Ryan, 1992; Koizumi, 1991; Stolzer, 2011).

According to the scientific literature, psychiatric drug-induced violence toward the self and/or others typically results from 1. a rapid, drug-induced escalation of compulsive aggression, 2. the initial exposure to psychiatric drugs, 3. a recent change in the dosage of the psychiatric drug(s), 4. a recent addition or removal of a psychiatric drug, 5. extremely violent and bizarre thoughts, 6. an obsessive focus on violent and bizarre behaviors, 7. an out-of-character quality for the individual's past history, and 8. an alien or ego-dystonic quality as determined by the individual's subjective

report (Breggin, 2004, p. 36-37). It is a distinct possibility that young males are particularly sensitive to the violence-inducing effects of psychiatric drugs due to the surging influx of the hormones testosterone, androgen, and vasopressin- hormones which are known to significantly increase territoriality, combativeness, aggression, and the fight or flight response (Brizendine, 2010).

Proponents of psychiatric drugs insist that these drugs are both safe and effective; however, decades of published scientific data clearly refute this supposition. First of all, controlled trials of psychiatric drugs typically last less than 6 weeks, and are conducted on adults. In addition, researchers are not required to report any side effects that occur in less than 10% of the population studied (Breggin & Cohen, 1999). Secondly, numerous researchers have documented that psychiatric drugs are no more effective than placebos in controlling psychiatric symptoms (Breggin, 2011; Healy, 2003). Thirdly, every new psychiatric drug that is approved by the FDA claims to be “safe” and “effective” in spite of the fact that there exists no double blind, longitudinal data to back up these claims. Lastly, even when there is scientific data indicating that psychiatric drugs lack efficacy, or worse, induce violent and bizarre behavior, pharmaceutical companies and physicians continue to push these drugs on record numbers of Americans- including infants, children, adolescents, and young adults (Breggin & Cohen, 1999; Moore, et al, 2010; Stolzer, 2011).

With regard to the stimulant classification of drugs typically prescribed to treat the symptoms of ADHD, there exists no scientific data indicating that these drugs are effective (Breggin, 2002). Numerous studies have reported that there are no benefits associated with stimulant therapy, yet physicians continue prescribing stimulant drugs to millions of American children, and in many instances, physicians advise that the drug(s) be continued throughout the life course (Baughman, 2006). Data has clearly demonstrated that stimulant drugs suppress brain growth and cause neurological atrophy, yet these drugs are some of the most commonly prescribed psychiatric drugs in America, and alarmingly, the majority of Americans who are prescribed these dangerous and addictive drugs are male children and adolescents (Breggin, 2002).

According to the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM IV, 2000), there are no laboratory tests, neurological assessments, or any other type of confirmatory evidence that can definitively establish the existence of any psychiatric disorder. Furthermore, the pharmaceutical industry has clearly stated that the mode of therapeutic action in all classifications of psychiatric drugs is unknown at this time. In addition, the pharmaceutical industry states unequivocally that the specific etiology (i.e., cause) of psychiatric illness is unknown, and that there are no diagnostic tests which can definitively confirm the existence of any psychiatric illness. Lastly, they openly report that the effectiveness of psychiatric drugs for long term use (i.e., longer than 2 weeks) has not been established in controlled trials, nor has the safety of long term use of psychiatric drugs been determined (Eli Lilly, 2012; Moore, et al, 2010; Novartis, 2012).

Conclusion

In the shadow of the senseless mass murder that has spread across America over the last 10-15 years, Americans are asking questions, seeking answers, and demanding that the violence stop. We can, if we so choose, continue blaming the ever increasing horrific violence on bullying, violent video games, and/or easy accessibility to firearms. However, the fact of the matter is that bullying exists across all cultures, and has existed throughout historical time, and yet, has never produced the type of violence we have witnessed in America beginning with the Columbine Massacre in April, 1999. Violent video games exist in much of the industrialized world, yet it is in America where the majority of senseless gun violence is occurring. Perhaps stricter gun laws would decrease the violence,

but logically speaking, easy accessibility to firearms cannot be the cause of the rampant violence, or this type of violence would have been the norm since the first Europeans set foot on American shores. Clearly, there is another factor that must be analyzed, and that factor is the widespread, meteoric rise in the use of psychiatric drugs. Never before in the history of the human race have so many human beings had their brains pharmacologically altered. Never before in the history of the human race have we allowed, and indeed encouraged, millions of children to be labeled as “mentally ill” and to be prescribed daily doses of psychiatric drugs that are known to cause homicidal ideation, suicidal ideation, mania, hallucinations, violent psychosis, suicide, and homicide (Baughman, 2006; Breggin, 2004; Moore, et al, 2010; Stolzer, 2007). According to Baughman (2006), every classification of psychiatric drug causes varying degrees of toxicity, which can, and often does, neuropharmacologically induce violent and bizarre behavior patterns. We as Americans ask ourselves, “Why is this senseless violence occurring?” The answer can be found in any one of the psychiatric drug inserts that are available at the corner drug store. READ THE INSERTS! There you will find the answer as to why the senseless mass murder is increasing, as the inserts clearly and plainly state that the use of psychiatric drugs can cause of a wide range of pathological symptoms, including hallucinations, psychosis, suicide, and homicide.

As the American Psychiatric Association (APA) continues to enlarge the DSM by voting into existence more mental illnesses, the psychiatric drugging of Americans will continue to increase exponentially. We are now witnessing the wholesale medicalization of normative, human developmental processes, and it seems that very few Americans are willing to take a stand and collectively shout “enough!” The DSM IV (2000), as well as the pharmaceutical industry have decreed that there exists no evidence to confirm that mental illness exists. There is not one neurologic, metabolic, or cognitive marker to indicate the existence of pathology, and according to the pharmaceutical industry, the safety and efficacy of psychiatric drugs cannot be determined at this time. Safety and efficacy of drugs prescribed to treat an illness that cannot be confirmed? This is absurdity at its height.

Do we really want to decrease the senseless mass murder? Then perhaps our very first step in eradicating this senseless violence is to stop the cycle of the psychiatric drug-induced lunacy that is permeating America. Surely we can see- because the DSM and the pharmaceutical industry have pointed it out- that if there is no confirmatory evidence that a psychiatric illness exists, then clearly, there is no need for psychiatric drugs that cause mania, psychosis, homicide, and suicide. It is evident that we have been fooled into accepting the greatest hoax in history. Enough of voted-into-existence diseases. Enough of fabricated illnesses. Enough of drugging human beings with brain-crippling medications. Enough of ignoring 22 international drug regulatory warnings. Enough of innocent men, women, and children being slaughtered.

The time has come to shake ourselves out of our collective complacency. We as Americans can no longer afford to ignore the deadly effects of psychiatric drugs. What is needed at this time is a swift and compendious response. Following is a call to action:

- Demand a full scale, federal investigation into the linkages between psychiatric drugs and unprovoked mass murder in America.
- Demand that all members of the federal investigative team have absolutely no financial ties to the pharmaceutical industry, the medical community, or any other entity that profits economically from the sale and/or distribution of psychiatric drugs.
- Demand full disclosure of all psychiatric medical records of the shooters, including the specific

types of psychiatric medications they were currently prescribed, or had been prescribed in the past.

- Demand that Americans be made aware of the serious side effects associated with the use of psychiatric drugs, including, but not limited to, public service announcements, black box warnings, national anti-psychiatric drug campaigns (modeled after anti-smoking campaigns), television and radio advertisements, and the use of the internet to inform consumers of the multifarious risks associated with psychiatric drugs.
- Require comprehensive psychiatric drug education during physician residency training.
- Require continuing education for physicians regarding the serious side effects associated with psychiatric drugs.
- Require that physicians be trained in non-pharmacological treatment of the human condition (i.e., alternative ways to treat worry, sadness, heightened activity level, anger, etc.).
- Demand that physicians adhere to the doctrine of informed consent by requiring patients to read and sign a full disclosure of *all* of the side effects associated with psychiatric drugs (including the side effects suicide, homicide, and unintended death).
- Require physicians to inform their patients in writing that there is no way to confirm the existence of any mental illness.
- Require physicians to inform their patients in writing that there is no data demonstrating the safety or efficacy of psychiatric drugs.
- Demand that the economic alliance that exists between the pharmaceutical industry and the medical community be severed. This includes refusal to give free samples of psychiatric drugs, and refusing to provide free advertising for psychiatric drugs in clinics and/or hospitals.
- Demand that explicit and factual warnings appear on all psychiatric prescription bottles.
- Enact federal legislation that bans the advertising of psychiatric drugs (including advertisements on television, in magazines, in medical journals, and on the internet).
- Challenge the medical model's "chemical imbalance" hypothesis (i.e., demand empirical evidence to validate a psychiatric diagnosis).
- Demand that the pharmaceutical industry be banned from funding psychiatric illness research and conferences that focus on psychiatric illness.
- Demand that physicians do not profit in any way from the sale and/or distribution of psychiatric drugs.
- Prohibit the practice of pharmaceutical sales representatives educating physicians regarding the safety and efficacy of psychiatric drugs.
- Demand that physicians inform their patients in writing of the numerous, potentially life-

threatening side effects associated with withdrawal from psychiatric drugs.

- Demand that researchers are required by federal law to inform consumers of all of the side effects associated with psychiatric drugs.
- Require insurance companies to pay for extensive and long term talk therapy (as opposed to the current practice of paying only for long term use of psychiatric drugs).
- Demand that the pharmaceutical industry be held liable for injuries and deaths that occur as a direct result of the manufacture of psychiatric drugs.
- Demand that physicians be held liable for the injuries and deaths that occur as a direct result of the distribution of psychiatric drugs.
- Ban federal policies that allow schools to profit economically from the psychiatric labeling of children and adolescents.
- Federally ban all public school employees from “practicing medicine without a license by pushing psychiatric diagnoses and psychiatric drugs they are not qualified to discuss” (Baughman, 2006, p. 221).
- Discontinue the practice of police officers requiring juvenile offenders to undergo psychiatric evaluations (i.e., return to the criminal justice model).
- Understand and respect that the normative, developmental processes associated with boyhood are not indicators of a psychiatric illness.
- Understand and respect that emotional suffering is an inevitable part of life. Sadness, worry, shame, anger, loneliness, and emotional numbness are normative parts of life’s journey. Pharmacologically blunting these human emotions will do nothing to encourage authentic healing (Breggin & Cohen, 1999).
- Ban federal policies that require that low-income children who are enrolled in the Head Start program be evaluated for psychiatric illness.
- Ban federal policies that allow the Head Start program to profit economically from the psychiatric labeling of preschool children.
- Understand that “psychiatric drugs are not ‘medications’- they are foreign compounds- poisons, each with its greater or lesser potential to harm or kill” (Baughman, 2006, p. 221).
- Expose the fact that 80% of school shootings occur in the United States of America and that 80-90% of the methylphenidate produced worldwide is prescribed to American children and adolescents- and the majority of these children are male.
- Inform the American consumer that “normalcy” is never achieved through the use of brain-impairing drugs (Breggin, 2002).

The time has come to demand action. We can, if we so choose, enact policies that limit media violence, enact stricter gun control policies, ban bullying, and have armed guards stationed at every shopping mall, movie theatre, and school in America. However, if we are serious in our collective endeavor to significantly reduce the senseless violence, we must courageously and factually expose the risks associated with the use of psychiatric drugs, and hold those who recommend, manufacture, and distribute these drugs accountable for their actions. We as a country have experienced horrible and senseless violence for much too long. The time has come to demand an end to the violence, and to expose psychiatric drugs for what they are- brain-crippling chemicals that extinguish empathy and induce a wide range of pathological behaviors, including the massacre of innocents. A long and arduous task lies before us. Let us begin our work now.

References

- American Psychiatric Association (2000) *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (4th ed.) Washington, D.C.
- Annual Report to Congress (2009) The Implementation of Individuals with Disabilities Act. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education
- Barber, J., Barrett, M., Gallop, R., Rynn, M., & Rickels, K. (2011) Short term dynamic psychotherapy versus pharmacotherapy for major depressive disorder: A randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 2 (1), 55-64
- Baughman, F. (2006) *The ADHD Fraud: How Psychiatry Makes Patients of Normal Children*. Oxford, England: Trafford
- Breggin, P. & Cohen, D. (1999) *Your Drug May Be Your Problem: How and Why to Stop Taking Psychiatric Medications*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing
- Breggin, P. (2002) *The Ritalin Fact Book*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing
- Breggin, P. (2004) Suicidality, violence, and mania caused by selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs): A review and analysis. *International Journal of Risk and Safety in Medicine*, 16, 31-49
- Breggin, P. (2006) Intoxication anosognosia: The spellbinding effect of psychiatric drugs. *Ethical Human Psychology and Psychiatry*, 8 (3), 201-210
- Breggin, P. (2011) Psychiatric drug-induced chronic brain impairment (CBI): Implications for long-term treatment with psychiatric medication. *International Journal of Risk & Safety in Medicine*, 23, 193-200
- Brizendine, L. (2010) *The Male Brain*. New York, New York: Three Rivers Press
- Burrai, C. Bocchetta, A. & Zompo, M. (1995) Mania and fluvoxamine. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 148, 1263-1260
- Canadian Adverse Reaction Newsletter (2010) *Pregabalin (Lyrica): Suicidal ideation and attempt*. 20 (3), 13-18
- Citizen's Commission on Human Rights International (2012) Psychiatric drugs- Regulatory Warnings on Violence, Mania, Psychosis, and Homocide. Retrieved December 20, 2012. http://www.cchrint.org/psychiatric-drugs/drug_warnings_on_violence
- Coupland, C. Dhiman, P., Morriss, R. Arthur, A., Barton, G., & Hippisley-Cox, J. (2011) Antidepressant use and the risk of adverse outcomes in older people: Population based cohort study. *British Medical Journal*, 343, (2), 51-55
- Eli Lilly and Company (2012) *Prozac* (Package Insert), Indianapolis, Indiana, 46285
- Gualtieri, C. (1991) Paradoxical effects of fluoxetine. *Journal of Clinical Psychopharmacology*, (11), 393-396
- Healy, D. (2003) Lines of evidence on the risks of suicide with selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 72, 71-80
- Jain, J., Birmaher, M., Garcia, M., Al-Shabbout, M. & Ryan, N. (1992) Fluoxetine in children and ado-

- lescents with mood disorders: A chart review of efficacy and adverse reactions. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychopharmacology*, 2, 259-263
- Klein, D. & Fink, M. (1962) Psychiatric reaction patterns to Imipramine. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 119, 432-438
- Koizumi, J. (1991) Fluoxetine and suicidal ideation. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 30, 695-698
- Krystal, J. (2011) Adjunctive Risperidone treatment for antidepressant resistant symptoms of chronic military service related PTSD. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 306 (5), 125-133
- Moore, T., Glenmullen, C. & Furbert, C. (2010) Prescription drugs associated with reports of violence towards others. *Public Library of Science*, ONE, 5 (12), 39-45
- Mosholder, A. & Pamer, C. (2006) Postmarketing surveillance of suicidal adverse events with pediatric use of antidepressants. *Journal of Adolescent Psychopharmacology*, 16, 33-38
- Novartis Pharmaceutical Company (2012) *Ritalin LA* (Package Insert), East Hanover, NJ: Elan Holdings
- Peyre, R., Verdous, H., & Bourgeois, M. (1992) Fluvoxamine: Study of treatment effect on a group of 189 hospitalized patients with depression. *Encephale*, 18 (1), 73-75 (In French)
- Physician's Desk Reference Manual* (2009) 63 Edition, Montvale, NJ: Physician's Desk Reference Incorporated
- Preda, A., MacLean, C., Mazure, C., & Bowers, M. (2001) Antidepressant-associated mania and psychosis resulting in psychiatric admission. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 62, 30-41
- Root, E. (2009) *Kids Caught up in the Psychiatric Maelstrom: How Pathological Labels and Therapeutic Drugs Hurt Children and Families*. Oxford, England: Praeger
- Rouve, N., Baheri, H., Telman, N., Patnak, A., Franchitto, N. & Schmitt, L. (2011) Prescribed drugs and violence, *European Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*, 3, 45-51
- Sim, F. (2000) A single dose of fluvoxamine associated with an acute psychotic reaction. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 45, 762-770
- Stolzer, J.M. (2007) The ADHD epidemic in America. *Ethical Human Psychology and Psychiatry*, 6 (2), 37-50
- Stolzer, J.M. (2009) Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder: Valid medical condition or culturally constructed myth? *Ethical Human Psychology and Psychiatry*, 11, 5-20
- Stolzer, J.M. (2011) The medicalization of boyhood. *The Journal of Critical Psychology, Counseling, and Psychotherapy*, 10, (4), 22-30



J.M. Stolzer is Associate Professor of Child and Adolescent Development at the University of Nebraska-Kearney in Nebraska. She can be reached at stolzerjm@unk.edu.

NEW MALE STUDIES: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL (NMS) IS AN OPEN ACCESS ONLINE INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION OF ISSUES FACING BOYS AND MEN WORLDWIDE. THIS JOURNAL USES OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEMS 2.3.4.0, WHICH IS OPEN SOURCE JOURNAL MANAGEMENT AND PUBLISHING SOFTWARE DEVELOPED, SUPPORTED, AND FREELY DISTRIBUTED BY THE PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE PROJECT UNDER THE GNU GENERAL PUBLIC LICENSE.

THIS ARTICLE HAS BEEN DOWNLOADED FROM [HTTP://NEWMALESTUDIES.COM](http://newmalestudies.com).

Human Pair-Bonding as a Service to the Female

STEVE MOXON



Though human pair-bonding generally is considered to be male proprietorial control and provisioning, the evidence does not support either of these assumptions. Not only is provisioning relatively lacking and of little impact, but in any case is antecedent to the evolution of human pair-bonding; and the male (in pair-bonding species generically) does not prevent the female partner from engaging in chosen extra-pair sex. In thus contradicting the standard biological model of male mate-guarding as preventing partner defection, its function instead appears to be to displace social/sexual access to the female by lower (but not by higher) mate-value males; thereby indirectly facilitating the female partner's extra-pair sex with males of her choice or acceptance (males of higher mate-value than the pair-bond partner). Furthermore, by producing successive offspring with the same male, the pair-bond in effect allows the female to project forwards in time her early peak in fertility (her own mate-value). [Reproducing instead through promiscuous sex would entail progressively lower fitness of offspring

as the female's mate-value declines with age; and correspondingly the mate-value of each subsequent father.] Pair-bonding is, therefore, a service provided by the male to the female. The male's interests are served in that the offer of the service enables a degree of trade-off against deficiency in the male's own mate-value, to secure for regular sex a more fertile female than would be acquired otherwise. With pair-bonding primarily of benefit to the female, the requirement to mate-guard as hitherto understood, to prevent partner defection, is not performed by the male but by the female. This explains the findings of predominantly female 'control' within intimate-partnerships, and indirect measures showing women value and invest in the pair-bond more than do men.

Key Words: pair-bonding, mate-guarding, female 'control', mate-value

The facility to pair-bond is accepted as a human universal, with even its cultural manifestation in marriage ascribed a long evolutionary history [Walker et al 2011]. The sole recent challenge is a psychology / cultural-anthropology anti-biology polemic, *Sex at Dawn* [Ryan & Jetha 2010]; which was comprehensively refuted by evolutionary biology arguments in the riposte, *Sex at Dusk* [Saxon 2012], and the sole formal academic review [Ellsworth 2011]. Ryan & Jetha draw their conclusion that ancestrally humans were entirely promiscuous through defining the pair-bond as exclusive of any other sexual behaviour, obligatory, and of lifelong duration; when none of these criteria are reasonable. Pair-bonding can be polygynous or serially monogamous, and can persist despite extra-pair sex in various forms. There is no contradiction between a universal motivation to pair-bond and the failure of some or many individuals ever to do so — all too obviously, pair-bonding can be thwarted in so many ways that lifetime failure to form (or to sustain beyond the initial stages) a pair-bond is commonplace. And it would be difficult to make an adaptive case for an unconditional open-ended affiliation. The popularly held notion that the pair-bond is naturally of very long duration is through conflating pair-bonding with other forms of affiliation that may augment and/or replace pair-bonding to change the nature of the relationship — a usual development to which the parties to long-enduring marriages often readily attest. Ryan & Jetha do not acknowledge (even when repeatedly requested) [personal communications 2009, 2010] Fisher's cross-societal finding [Fisher 1989, 1994] that the facility to pair-bond indeed is universal, though with a short average duration of four years (based on the median age of separation after marriage). A short duration hardly calls into question the existence of pair-bonding, but it does inform the debate as to the basis of its being adaptive.

Theorising as to the basis of pair-bonding is summed up by Quinlan [Quinlan 2008] as two apparently conflicting theories of male mating competition and male provisioning of the female (henceforth 'male provisioning'), between which it is not possible to decide, with human pair-bonding appearing to have an ecologically varied complexity. The conflicting theories are two inter-related major assumptions usually made about the function of the pair-bond (generically across species, humans included): that it is male proprietorial control of the female's fertility, so as to provide paternity confidence; and that this serves to facilitate the resourcing of offspring. The latter would appear to entail the former, in that proprietorial control ensures the male's investment of provisioning is to his own genetic offspring and not to those of another male. Given the impasse Quinlan identifies, it would be instructive to examine the assumptions of male proprietorial control and provisioning to see if they are warranted. I will take them in turn.

The assumption of proprietorial control is contradicted by data from many ostensibly 'monogamous' species showing a high incidence of extra-pair paternity [eg Colombelli-Négrel et al 2009, Ležalová-Piálková 2010]. Humans are no exception: there is a substantial (albeit variably estimated) incidence of human extra-pair paternity, and most tellingly this applies even where it might

least be expected, in a 'traditional', 'primitive' community [Scelza 2011]. Manson [Manson 1997] reviewed the literature on pair-bonding across species and found that the courtship element of pair-bonding is predictive of reproductive outcome, but that this is not true of the element of mate-guarding. A review of avian mating systems found little relationship between the strength of mate-guarding and paternity [Johnson & Burley 1998]. Kokko & Morrell [Kokko & Morrell 2005] ask the pertinent question: "if females regularly escape mate-guarding attempts, we face an enigma: why does mate guarding evolve if it is so inefficient?"

The most likely answer to this question is that the 'inefficiency' is apparent rather than real, owing to the actual nature of mate-guarding not being understood. A female appears to have little problem having sex with males *of her choosing*. It is with respect to female choice that mate-guarding seems 'inefficient'. Her choice will be from the pool of those males with a higher mate-value than that possessed by her pair-bonded partner, as is shown by women behaving in the very opposite way to men in *raising* their 'standards' re opposite-sex mate-value when looking for 'casual' sex [Szepeswol, Mikulincer & Birnbaum 2013]. Female extra-pair choice for 'good genes' – that is, 'better' genes than those of the pair-bonded partner – appears indeed to be the basis of extra-pair sex [eg Cochas et al 2006, Kempnaers et al 1992]. With the consequences of sex for the female, there would be no value in extra-pair sex with any male of a lower mate-value than that of the pair-bonded partner.

If a male were to try to oppose the female partner's chosen extra-pair sex, then the cuckolding male, in being comparatively higher in mate-value, is likely to be the physically more powerful and/or more belligerent of the two, and/or to be a member of a stronger male coalition. Therefore, if the confrontation resolved to simple contest, most likely the male attempting to defend against cuckoldry would be defeated. The physiology and psychology concerning dominance hierarchy provide evolved mechanisms to avoid initiating or escalating conflict with higher- (but not lower-) ranking males, thus likely avoiding from the outset the possibility of an escalation. Yet given that the threat to paternity confidence is from higher, and not from lower mate-value males, then this would obviate the function of male mate-guarding as the basis of pair-bonding.

It would seem, therefore, that male mate-guarding – as understood to be proprietorial control to prevent the female from either initiating or accepting extra-pair sex with any other male – is something of a misnomer, as Kokko & Morrell realised; and presumably it must have a different function to that hitherto supposed. The only apparent – or at least the most obvious – alternative is that it serves not the interests of the male to avoid being cuckolded, but instead is a service to the female in preventing attempts at sexual access by males of *lower* mate-value (lower than that of her pair-bonded partner). This previously has been suggested [Norscia & Borgognini-Tarli 2008] as the basis of primate pair-bonding. Deterrence of unwanted suitors has been recognised [Lumpkin 1983], but assumed to be a development of male mate-guarding as usually understood, through its exploitation by females.

Lower mate-value males, in being sexually selected against by females and liable to face reproductive oblivion, are obliged to employ a riskier, long-odds approach to try to initiate courtship and obtain sex. Consequently, males in numbers are likely to try to gain access to females with relative mate-values too high for them to have an interest in mating. The problem this poses for females may be less the risk of unwanted, fitness-lowering sex (in the human case, given social prohibitions it's not likely that females require 'bodyguards' to prevent coerced mating; though it may be that some females could be cajoled into mating against their interests) than continual, persistent attention that would displace interest from the high mate-value males to whom the females are potentially sexually receptive, and effectively hinder the females' own initiatives to associate with such males.

In requiring a male to provide a mate-guarding service to deal with this problem, males of intermediate mate-value are in a position to exploit this need in conditionally offering the service only to those females whose mate-value (fertility) is higher than that of those females who would be willing to engage in sex promiscuously. Pair-bonding thus would emerge as an evolved mutual trade-off. The female obtains assistance to optimise sexual access to her (by not the ‘wrong’ and only the ‘right’ sort of males, as it were), thereby increasing her total fertility; whilst the male acquires for regular sex a more fertile female than he could otherwise procure ‘casually’.

Turning to the other major assumption about the function of the pair-bond — that it facilitates male provisioning of offspring: this is the supposed basis of the need for paternity confidence. The male needs to be sure the offspring indeed are genetically his own, given that the male invests in offspring. This assumption is also contradicted by the evidence. There is comprehensive data that father-presence has little if any impact on child survival (because female relatives provide any child-care the mother could not provide herself, so there is no need to rely on the father); this being recently extensively reviewed [Sear & Mace 2008]. Studies in respect of child growth and morbidity show at best a weak, cross-culturally inconsistent impact of father-presence [Winking 2007]. As for the key material contribution of meat, the evidence is mixed. The well-known evidence from extant hunter-gatherer communities is that males share hunting proceeds to a large extent equitably across the group [eg Kaplan & Gurven 2005]. [Hunting usually yields nothing, but on occasion an abundance of very quickly perishable food, and consequently inasmuch as there is, in what is a cooperative venture, in any particular instance a successful individual hunter, this same individual is unlikely to be the successful one next time; so sharing incurs little cost whilst ensuring future cooperation.] Qualifying this are findings that men do in fact keep back meat for their own family [eg Hawkes et al 2001]. Most importantly, there is clear data showing that women in forager societies benefit nutritionally from a pair-bond partner during lactation, when their own ability to forage is most compromised, with men making up for this by contributing foods such as honey [Marlowe 2003]; this being shown to be the case across the various forms of ‘traditional’ society [Quinlan & Quinlan 2008].

That male provisioning during lactation is not apparent as any impact of father-presence is explained by male-provisioning post-dating the evolution of pair-bonding – across species generically [Brotherton & Komers 2003], and specifically regarding humans [Chapais 2008]. Chapais’ is the most comprehensive recent exposition on the origins of human pair-bonding; the conclusion of which is that male mate-guarding is key (though Chapais’ understanding is in male-proprietary terms). Still more recently affirming this position [Chapais 2011], Chapais concludes that human pair-bonding originated as “a *pre-adaptation* for the evolution of parental cooperation in the provisioning of progressively altricial (helpless) children”. Similarly outlining a primate phylogeny of pair-bonding, Geary & Bailey conclude that the emergence of a specifically human mating pattern coincided with increasing male provisioning evolving out of a (polygynous) pair-bonding base [Geary & Bailey 2011].

In the light of male provisioning being itself facilitated by pair-bonding rather than the basis of it, a new interpretation is required of the important finding that although there is no correlation between male provisioning and child mortality, there *is* between male provisioning and average female total fertility [Marlowe 2001]. The relation here being only a correlation, it does not show the causal link as supposed. With pair-bonding being antecedent to male provisioning, then the increased female total fertility presumably is the result of the other contribution that males make of mate-guarding — as Chapais concludes. That increasing female total fertility is the function of pair-bonding is the conclusion in what is, other than Chapais’, the most important recent review of the

basis of pair-bonding, by Winking [Winking 2007]. The male's contribution – through (prior to Chappais' analysis), provisioning in Winking's view – allows the female to transfer effort from parenting to mating; though what form this takes is not discussed.

The female's increased mating effort could be either within or extra to the pair-bond, or both. It would seem to be both. From the consideration of mate-guarding above, then clearly the female has utility in the service provided by the male to displace social and sexual access by males of lower mate-value, and thereby in effect to facilitate her extra-pair sex with males of higher mate-value. But additionally, if when very young (at or near the peak of fertility shortly after puberty), through the fertility indicators of youth and beauty that at that time she possesses, a female can assortatively acquire a male partner of corresponding mate-value and secure him over a lengthy period; then she can have successive children with the same complement of 'good genes' at each successive conception. She can, in effect, *project forwards* in time her peak of fertility. Otherwise, the female would reproduce simply through promiscuous sex, and her offspring likely would have a progressively poorer male genetic complement as the mate-value of the men she is able to acquire falls with her advancing years (and the effects on her body of childbirth). Though over the course of the duration of the pair-bond, the female partner experiences a decline in mate-value with age, there is no corresponding fall in the mate-value of the male partner, because being in terms of 'good genes' as manifest in status (male dominance rank), male status if anything increases over time with cumulative outcomes of male intra-sexual competition. [Some males do of course 'flat-line' or actually fall in status, but this propensity usually will be evident beforehand in the mate-value criteria females scrutinise, leaving them of little interest to females.] The pair-bond thus can be considered in the light of the intersection of very different life-history trajectories in terms of mate-value according to sex. There is sex-differential – sex-dichotomous – mate-value trajectory. This major divergence over time of attractiveness according to sex (with the male an appreciating asset and the female a depreciating one), in itself provides a basis for pair-bonding in the female interest.

In the male solving the female's problems of both unwanted engagement by lower mate-value males and her quickly falling fertility, the trade-off he succeeds in making against his own relative lack of mate-value results in the female not assortatively mating according to a full corresponding opposite-sex mate-value – that is, in terms purely of 'good genes'. Instead, the female has made a compromise to accept a male with a mate-value made up of 'good genes' plus the ability to provide a mate-guarding service plus durability as a pair-bond partner. To have sex with males possessing a mate-value truly corresponding to that of her own – that is, purely in terms of male 'good genes' to correspond to fertility – the female would need to eschew her pair-bond partner to seek extra-pair sex. And this is not difficult given the actual nature of the male pair-bond partner's mate-guarding – to not include keeping at bay males of higher mate-value than his own. Female physiology drives women to seek extra-pair sex at the very point in their cycle when sex is most likely to lead to pregnancy [eg Gangestad & Thornhill 2007]. The female has the pair-bond partner's genetic complement to fall back on if the tactic of extra-pair sex does not bear fruit.

If the pair-bond indeed is an adaptation functioning to achieve at least one successive conception with the same male, then the pair-bond would have to be of a certain (minimum) duration to encompass the several stages from the commencement of courtship to the second birth. The length of these stages can be assessed (in populations as near as possible to the ancestral), added together; and the total compared to Fisher's conclusion of the pair-bond lasting four-years on average. Fisher's estimate would appear to require an adjustment, however, in that there is no account taken of the period of courtship before marriage; and therefore this duration should be added. Unfortunately, quantifying cross-culturally is extremely difficult given the enormous variation, both individually

and according to society, and often wildly contrasting measures by different researchers studying the same population, as with China [Zang 2004]. There seems to be little if any reliable and comparable data. All that can be said is that the average length of contemporary courtship is years rather than months: two years or more in the USA [Whyte 1990]. Another problem is that pair-bonding cannot be taken to be from the very beginning of courtship, given that it would require some elapse of time to form; but there seems to be no data on this, despite courtship having been broken down into twelve stages [Morris 1972]. It would appear that the time taken from first meeting to the establishment of a pair-bond is completely elastic. Taking all into account, in augmenting Fisher's average pair-bond length, an appropriately cautious stretching would be to five or six years from four.

To compare with this, data is needed on the sequence of courtship, sex, conception, gestation, birth, lactation and resumed cycling and sex, ending with a second conception; this in populations living in conditions as near as possible to those that pertained ancestrally. The major contributor here is the duration of lactation: the age of weaning. This is too variable for a cross-cultural average to be meaningful, but at two-and-a-half years it is surprisingly long, with the natural duration before 'self-weaning' being still longer at three to four years [Dettwyler 1995]. The significant duration for the present calculation is that portion of the lactation period before cycling is resumed, which depends on the frequency of suckling – short bouts of frequent suckling trigger a complete suppression of reproduction [Konnon & Worthman 1980]. This is assured in 'hunter-gatherer' societies because the mother has the child with her all of the time, enabling the child to suckle at will. However, as the child gets older and less dependent, then feeding frequency presumably declines, thus triggering renewed cycling and the mother becomes fertile again.

To avoid these indeterminacies regarding lactation (and to reduce the number of other stages to take into account between the first and subsequent birth, which have their own uncertainties); instead, use can be made of the data on the actual inter-birth intervals of extant hunter-gatherer societies. There are reports for several of these: all being three to four years [Kaplan et al 2000]. [This reveals that lactation must be shorter and less reproductively-suppressive than might be expected.] From this data, to arrive at the overall length of time between the start of pair-bonding and the second birth, there would need to be added the nine-month duration of gestation, the 'fecundability' period – the time taken for regular sex to lead to conception; and any elapse of time between the beginning of courtship and the commencement of penile-vaginal sex. 'Fecundability' is, in modern societies at least, four to six months on average [Hutchins 2011]; so I will factor into the calculation five months in respect of this. As for courtship, based on evidence from extant hunter-gatherer societies, a reconstruction of ancestral marriage practice shows unregulated courtship rather than arranged marriage to be ancestral [Walker et al 2011]; and without the various factors contributing to protracted courtship in agricultural and 'developed' societies, ancestrally courtship presumably would be very much shorter; months rather than years. There is no readily accessible data, however, save for a mention that for the Hadza courtship is 'brief' [Marlow 2004]. In the absence of data it can only be assumed that the Hadza are representative. 'Brief' suggests just a few months, and a guesstimate of four months would seem reasonable. Also difficult to assess is the point during courtship when penile-vaginal sex commences and the 'fecundability' period thereby begins to apply, creating an overlap, which needs to be taken into account; but inasmuch as marriage does not coincide with the onset of fertility, in at least some hunter-gatherer societies any sex before marriage is proscribed and absent; eg the Hamza [Unrau 1971]. Consequently, it is reasonable not to factor this into the calculation (that is, for it to be ascribed a value of zero).

Even simplifying through using the inter-birth interval leaves major uncertainties, then, in

the durations of other stages that have to be taken into account; but to add them up is to arrive at a very rough but not entirely uninformative overall duration with which to compare the augmented measure of pair-bond length based on Fisher's findings. The total based on the above conservative guesstimates is four-and-a-half to five-and-a-half years, which is close to corresponding to the five to six years for the pair-bond that is Fisher's four-years together with the omitted courtship period. Using less conservative guesstimates that go beyond averages to be in line with better guaranteeing that most or the great majority of couples reproduce twice, would increase the calculated 'first sex to second conception' duration to equal or surpass the pair-bond duration based on Fisher's findings. In this regard, most notably the 'fecundability' period required to ensure not merely half but 90% of couples conceive, would double to ten months the five months factored into the calculation. This alone would bring the estimated ancestral 'first sex to second conception' duration to match the Fisher-based findings.

So the data regarding the duration of pair-bonding and a quantitative estimate based on a rationale as to its basis are not in discord. They are together consistent with ensuring the conception of a second child with the same father, and therefore not inconsistent with a female fertility model of pair-bonding. [If female fertility indeed is the adaptive explanation, it would not be expected that the evolutionary process would still further extend the duration of pair-bonding to ensure three or more offspring by the same male. The very many competing selection pressures would entail diminishing returns for any specific adaptation within the context of the suite of all others. In any case, other forms of affiliation can 'piggy-back' pair-bonding, in effect extending it by augmentation or replacement.] The length of the pair-bond thus both assessed and estimated is about the same as, or rather longer than what would be required to ensure male provisioning during lactation (which is Fisher's own explanation of her findings) [Fisher 1989]; but (to reiterate) provisioning has been excluded from being a candidate in its being antecedent to the evolution of pair-bonding.

The understanding of male mate-guarding turned on its head so that in humans what had been taken to be proprietorial control by the male instead is *by the female*, is evident in the literature. That there is mate-guarding by women as well as by men and that they are very different in nature has been recognised [Archer et al 2001, and personal communication 2005]. There is female mate-guarding in other primate species in the form of high-level unilateral aggression; eg the mongoose lemur [Anzenberger 1993]. That the human female rather than the male is the 'controlling' partner is the case in 90% of couples [Coleman & Straus 1986], and even in terms of what are perceived to be male sex-typical forms of 'control', women at least match men [Graham-Kevan & Archer 2009] — so if there were also factored in any distinctively female forms of 'control', then presumably women would be revealed as the more 'controlling' partners. Other research reveals that men are obliged simply to give in and agree in the face of women taking overall charge of the relationship in a 'domineering' manner [Vogel & Murphy 2007].

The need for 'control' within the pair-bond self-evidently can precipitate as intimate-partner violence, and with 'control' being overwhelmingly by the woman, then it would be expected correspondingly that intimate-partner violence is predominantly female-perpetrated. This indeed is what is revealed by several converging lines of evidence and a sum total of evidence [Moxon 2011]. Physical violence is women's preferred mode of aggression in domestic situations (in complete contrast to men, who back away from engaging in physical aggression in any situation where a female would be the target) [Cross, Tee & Campbell 2011]. This explains why, despite huge sex-differentials in both upper-body strength (conferring far greater hitting power to men) and body-frame weakness (rendering a profound susceptibility to injury to women), there is almost no sex-differential in intimate-partner injury rates – slightly higher for women [Archer 2000, Mirrlees-Black et al 1998,] or a

difference that is not significant [Capaldi & Owen 2001], or nil [George 2003]. Yet *even if rates of male and female perpetration of intimate-partner violence were similar*, the sex-differential in injury rates would be expected to be double an order-of-magnitude ($\times 20$); that is, 95% of injuries would be sustained by females [Dixon 2012]. This indirectly reveals a very large preponderance of female perpetration of intimate-partner violence. Furthermore, at levels of violence where serious injury occurs, victims are much more likely to be male [Felson & Cares 2005]. The data for intimate-partner violence is well understood to suffer from a highly sex-differential reporting bias, with men compared to women having less willingness to report to police by a factor of ten [Stets & Straus 1990], because women but not men self-perceive victimhood. Consequently, couching surveys in terms of crime or personal safety evokes a victim response in women but the very opposite in men; but even after removing such demand characteristics men still under-report compared to women [Archer 1999]. Given the proportion of male victims of intimate-partner violence as formally recorded by police is consistently 40% [eg Thompson 2010], then if the very large sex-differential in the propensity to report were factored into the crime data, there would be shown an overwhelming preponderance of male victims of intimate-partner violence.

The greater importance of the pair-bond to women compared to men is belatedly showing up in research, that in being of indirect measures of the emotional investment in pair-bonding detect implicit genuine attitudes. The results may appear counter-intuitive, but this is because of the popular context of *direct* measures of *explicit* attitudes, which in failing to exclude (and instead creating) demand characteristics are worthless. Simple surveys of attitudes to marriage inevitably strongly evoke perennial prejudices couched in contemporary political fashion. Also uninformative are divorce statistics regarding the sex of the initiator, because formal separation proceedings are likely the response to de facto separation initiated by the other partner, or to the other partner's indifferent inertia – and to very strong financial and child-custody incentives. The key new research on *indirect* measures is by Dunbar and associates: in analysing patterns of mobile phone use, it was found that not only do women invest far more heavily than men in a pair-bond, but also persist with it as their principal focus fully twice as long as do men – fifteen years as opposed to seven [Palchykov et al 2012]. Another window is provided by a major cross-cultural study in which wives were shown to be more worried about their spouse's infidelity than were husbands [Shattuck et al 2012], notwithstanding the clear major male concern of cuckoldry – the importation of a genetic complement from outside the pair-bond – which is an objective male fear without a parallel for women. The authors ascribe their results to a greater likelihood of male extra-pair sex, but questions as to the reality of a sex difference in propensity to obtain extra-pair sex aside – and note that the male can seek excessively and not obtain; whereas the female can obtain very easily with little if any seeking required – the profound sex differences in the evocation of jealousy surely would be expected to be evident here; *males* rather than females being sensitive specifically to sexual rather than emotional betrayal [eg Sagarin et al 2012]. With females having less fear of the very sort of infidelity in which males usually indulge, then Shattuck et al's findings would seem to be rooted in men's lack of concern for the integrity of the pair-bond. The research by Sagarin et al is the culmination of an extensive literature on sex-differential aspects of jealousy, which has been in part a debate as to whether there is indeed a real sex difference rather than some artefact of study. Their meta-analytic review of both real-life studies and hypothetical scenarios confirms a real sex difference. Not that this was ever in doubt with one of the most common conversational staples being of the woman 'standing by her man' despite his infidelities whilst the man may well desert at the first sign of the female partner's infidelity.

This 'deal-breaker' nature for the male of female extra-pair sex is easily explained. Notwithstanding the lack of male investment in offspring, the female partner's extra-pair sex completely negates the male's investment of sexual effort over time in this one particular pair-bond. Instead,

the male could have been in a different pair-bond, with a faithful partner, and/or simply mated promiscuously (which for men ancestrally would be highly reproductively profitable). To not quit the pair-bond upon discovery of infidelity would be to compound this opportunity cost by a likely further loss of the same kind, as the female may well then enter a long period of non-fertile gestating and lactating another male's offspring before resuming cycling. Furthermore, it is not just that the male cuts his losses and avoids further opportunity costs; but he is likely to gain an opportunity windfall, as it were, in acquiring a *more fertile* new pair-bond partner. With the typical male mate-value trajectory being upwards in line with rising status with age (as his 'good genes' over time manifest more in status), then in a new bout of assortative mating the male may well be able to find a replacement partner of a correspondingly higher mate-value – higher fertility – than was the former partner even at the beginning of that pair-bond; let alone at the time of the dissolution of the pair-bond, by which time the former partner's mate-value would have declined in proportion to the pair-bond's duration. So it is that the discovery of a partner's extra-pair sex is a clear 'deal-breaker' for the man, though not for the woman because of what she would lose in dissolving the partnership. By contrast with the male ex-partner, the new pair-bond partner the female ex-partner likely would acquire would be of a lower mate-value than her previous partner, given that she had acquired her former partner when younger and nearer the peak of her fertility. The consequence would be a significantly lower fitness for all of her subsequent offspring. The upshot is that whereas the male readily quits a pair-bond on discovery of his partner's infidelity, the female is likely to attempt to keep the pair-bond intact, even with repeat infidelity by her partner.

Pair-bonding as male mate-guarding to thwart lower mate-value males would complement concealed ovulation/oestrus, in that this can serve the very same function, rather than that usually assumed either of ensuring male investment or counteracting infanticide by males. [For a full review of the competing hypotheses re concealed ovulation/oestrus, see Thornhill & Gangestad 2008.] Neither of these putative explanations would seem to apply in the human case, given the absence of any evidence of male-perpetrated infanticide of offspring of a still-lactating female to force a resumption of cycling (presumably because no such phenomenon exists), and with the advent of male provisioning being in the wake of the evolution of the pair-bond rather than the basis of it. It may be that pair-bonding and concealed ovulation/oestrus evolved in tandem. In rendering males unable to detect the short monthly window of fertility when it is potentially fruitful to gain social and sexual access to the female, lower mate-value males would have to expend effort continually; and this time, effort and risk – for what anyway for such males is a very long-shot bid to obtain sex – would be problematic if not prohibitive. That for humans this may well be the function is indicated by what seems to be the obverse of keeping at bay lower mate-value males, in the body of research revealing that human ovulation/oestrus actually is not entirely hidden but subtly evident [eg Tarin & Gomez-Piquer 2002]. With the female being most receptive to extra-pair sex with high mate-value males at the most fertile point in the menstrual cycle [eg Gangestad & Thornhill 2007], then if ovulation/oestrus were to be detectable only by preferred males – perhaps through the female being proceptive and allowing a male she favours to get particularly close – then the mechanism can be discriminating in both discouraging low mate-value males and encouraging high mate-value males.

There would seem to be an instructive long evolutionary history to these adaptations in homologous behaviours in the orangutan. This is the sole ape species other than the human to display concealed ovulation/oestrus, and it also has a form of (proto-)pair-bonding. Not only do orangutans have sexually exclusive consortships that can be of comparatively long length (up to seven months) [Utami et al 2002], but the same individuals pair up between child-rearing, and adolescents establish long-term affiliations prior to future consortships [Grehan 2006]. These similarities might be thought merely homoplasious were it not for the new finding that the orangutan is the extant higher primate

species closest to the extinct common ancestor of all apes, owing to its having evolved very slowly (in comparison to all other ape species) since that split [Locke et al 2011], and therefore this species is highly indicative of human ancestry. Specifically regarding mating systems, that of the human is now shown likely to have evolved not from a chimpanzee-like ancestor but from one much more like the gorilla or orangutan [Nakahashi & Horiuchi 2012, Geary & Bailey 2011]. [The gorilla is polygynous, the orangutan short-term polygynous.] This is in accord with a substantially greater overall behavioural and morphological similarity, revealing that humans are evolutionarily closer to the orangutan than to the chimpanzee/ bonobo [Grehan & Schwartz 2009]; albeit that this contradicts what had been taken to be irrefutable molecular evidence, and controversy has ensued; but generally, constructing phylogenies based solely on genetics (and sampling very small fractions only of coding regions of the genome) entails assumptions and methodologies now criticised [eg Carvalho & Craig 2011]. There is also recent further important evidence against human-chimpanzee genetic closeness in the almost complete non-similarity of the human and chimpanzee Y-chromosome [Hughes et al 2010]. Even so, it is not necessary to accept greater human-orangutan than human-chimpanzee genetic proximity in order to accept human-orangutan homology of mating systems. The balance of evidence is that concealed ovulation/oestrus and pair-bonding in orangutans and humans are likely homologous rather than homoplasious.

The problem both mechanisms would appear to address for female orangutans is that of 'forced' copulation by 'unflanged' (low status) males [Knott et al 2010]. These rarely result in conception, but this would appear to be because of these very counter-measures. When most fertile, females can form a consortship or ingratiate themselves with 'flanged' (high status) males, whose ferocity to other males deters low mate-value males from approaching attendant females; the effort in any case being rendered much less worthwhile by concealed ovulation/oestrus. The above-mentioned usual hypotheses re concealed ovulation/oestrus are even less potentially applicable to the orangutan than to the human; there being no investment at all by orangutan males in their offspring, and an extremely long – seven-year – inter-birth interval, which is several years longer than the three-year lactation period, rendering infanticide ineffective to bring the female back into sexual receptivity (thus explaining why infanticide has never been observed in the wild) [Beaudrot, Kahlenberg & Marshall 2009]. It would seem, then, that concealed ovulation/oestrus and pair-bonding may well be related mechanisms that evolved far back in the phylogeny – to the beginning of the ape radiation, if not beforehand – to deal with the problem for females of social and sexual attention from lower mate-value males.

This review reveals that a major correction would seem to be required to the understanding of the nature of mate-guarding and the human pair-bond. That hitherto what (at least in retrospect) is an obvious different understanding of male mate-guarding has not been appreciated, suggests compromise by political considerations completely out of place in science. The all-pervasive 'politically-correct' totalitarian mindset in its extreme-feminist core insists on an ideological model of 'patriarchal' [sic] 'power' to the exclusion of a scientific understanding from the underlying biology. This prevents any coherent analysis of social structure and dynamics; especially in respect of how the sexes inter-relate, as in mate-guarding and pair-bonding. Indeed, it leads to accepting complete falsehoods. It is ironic that this has eclipsed the key role of female choice, which determines both the pair-bonded and extra-pair sex partners of the female. Female choice is revealed to be central in recent modelling of the evolution of pair-bonding [Gavrilets 2012]. The model's assumptions are the same as the findings or assumptions in this review: female choice, female fidelity but with extra-pair sex, male heterogeneity, assortative mating, and a key male contribution. Though in the model's case this is provisioning, the model should work just as well if the element of male contribution instead was mate-guarding (in terms of preventing access to the female by lower mate-value males).

References

- Anzenberger G (1993) Social conflict in two monogamous New World primates: Pairs and rivals. In *Primate Social Conflict* Mason WA & Mendoza SP (ed).
- Archer J (1999) Assessment of the reliability of the conflict tactics scales: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 14 1263-1289
- Archer J (2000) Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin* 126 651-680
- Archer J (2001) Partner aggression: Is mate-guarding too narrow a perspective? London Conference presentation, Human Behavior & Evolution Society
- Beaudrot LH, Kahlenberg SM & Marshall AJ (2009) Why male orangutans do not kill infants. *Behavioral Ecology & Sociobiology* 63(11) 1549-1562
- Brotherton P & Komers P (2003) Monogamy: Mating Strategies and Partnerships. In *Birds, Humans and Other Mammals* (eds Reichard U & Boesch C) Cambridge University Press. 42-58
- Capaldi DM & Owen LD (2001) Physical aggression in a community sample of at-risk young couples: Gender comparisons for high frequency, injury, and fear. *Journal of Family Psychology* 15 425-440.
- de Carvalho MR & Craig MT (eds) (2011) Morphological and molecular approaches to the phylogeny of fishes: integration or conflict? *Zootaxa* 2946 1-142
- Chapais B (2011) The Evolutionary History of Pair-bonding and Parental Collaboration. Chapter 3 in *The Oxford Handbook of Evolutionary Family Psychology* (ed Salmon C & Shackelford TK) Oxford University Press
- Chapais B (2008) *Primeval Kinship: How Pair Bonding Gave Birth to Human Society*. Harvard University Press
- Cochas A, Yoccoz NG, Da Silva A, Goossens B & Allainé D (2006) Extra-pair paternity in the monogamous alpine marmot (*Marmota marmota*): the roles of social setting and female mate choice *Behavioral Ecology & Sociobiology* 59 597-605
- Colombelli-Négrel D, Schlotfeldt BE & Kleindorfer S (2009) High levels of extra-pair paternity in Superb Fairy-wrens in South Australia despite low frequency of auxiliary males *Emu — Austral Ornithology* 109(4) 300-304
- Cross CP, Tee W & Campbell A (2011) Gender symmetry in intimate aggression: an effect of intimacy or target sex? *Aggressive Behavior* 37(3) 268-277
- Dettwyler KA (1995) A time to wean: The hominid blueprint for the natural age of weaning in modern human populations. In Stuart-Macadam P & Dettwyler KA (Eds) *Breastfeeding: Biocultural Perspectives* 39-73. Aline. New YorkNew York: Aldine

- Dixon L (2012) Personal email: "What is remarkable is the high proportion of men injured by their partners: the figures are 38% from a meta-analysis of 20 studies (Archer, 2000) and 35% from a more recent analysis of 14 studies (Straus, 2011). From the same perspective it is also remarkable that such a high percentage of men are killed by their partners (23% according to the Home Office figures cited by the Respect authors). Based on size and strength differences, a figure of around 95% would be expected in both cases."
- Ellsworth R (2011) Book Review: *The Human That Never Evolved*. A review of Christopher Ryan R & Jethá C (2010) *Sex at Dawn: How We Mate, Why We Stray, and What It Means for Modern Relationships*. Harper Perennial New York. *Evolutionary Psychology* www.epjournal.net 9(3) 325-335
- Felson RB & Cares A C (2005) Gender and the seriousness of assaults on intimate partners and other victims. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67(5) 1182-1195
- Fisher HE (1989) Evolution of human serial pair-bonding. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 78(3) 331-354
- Fisher HE (1994) *Anatomy of Love: The Natural history of mating, marriage and why we stray*. Ballantine Books
- Gangestad SW & Thornhill R (2007) Human Oestrus. *Proceedings of the Royal Society (Biological Sciences)* 275(1638) 991-1000
- Gavrilets S (2012) Human origins and the transition from promiscuity to pair-bonding. *PNAS* 109(25) 9923-9928
- Geary DC & Bailey DH (2011) Reflections on the Human Family Chapter 21 in *The Oxford Handbook of Evolutionary Family Psychology* (ed Salmon C & Shackelford TK) Oxford University Press
- George MJ (2003) Invisible touch. *Aggression & Violent Behavior* 8(1) 22-60
- Graham-Kevan N & Archer J (2009) Control tactics and partner violence in heterosexual relationships. *Evolution & Human Behavior* 30 445-452
- Grehan JR (2006) Mona Lisa Smile: The Morphological Enigma of Human and Great Ape Evolution. *The Anatomical Record (Part B: The New Anatomist)* 289B 139-157
- Grehan JR & Schwartz JH (2009) Evolution of the second orangutan: phylogeny and biogeography of hominid origins *Journal of Biogeography* 36 1823-1844
- Hawkes K, O'Connell JF & Blurton Jones NG (2001) Hunting and nuclear families: Some lessons from the Hadza about men's work. *Current Anthropology* 42 681-709
- Hutchins AI (2011) *The Infertility Handbook: The Complete Resource For Couples Longing to have a Baby*. Exisle Publishing
- Hughes JF, Skaletsky H, Pyntikova T, Graves TA, van Daalen SKM, Minx PJ, Fulton RS, McGrath SD,

- Locke DP, Friedman C, Trask BJ, Mardis ER, Warren WC, Repping S, Rozen S, Wilson RK & Page DC (2010) Chimpanzee and human Y chromosomes are remarkably divergent in structure and gene content. *Nature* 46, 536-539
- Johnson K & Burley NT (1998) Mating tactics and mating systems of birds. *Ornithological Monographs* 49. *Avian Reproductive Tactics: Female and Male Perspectives*. University of California Press. 21-60
- Kaplan H, Hill K, Lancaster J & Hurtado AM (2000) A theory of human life history evolution: Diet, intelligence, and longevity. *Evolutionary Anthropology* 9 156-185
- Kaplan H & Gurven M (2005) The Natural History of Human Food Sharing and Cooperation: A Review and a New Multi-Individual Approach to the Negotiation of Norms. In *Moral sentiments and material interests: the foundations of cooperation in economic life*. (Gintis H) MIT Press. Cambridge Mass 75-114
- Kempnaers Bm Verheyen GR, Broeck MV, Burke T, Broeckhoven CV & Dhonth AA (1992) Extra-pair paternity results from female preference for high-quality males in the blue tit *Nature* 357, 494-496
- Knott CD, Emery Thompson M, Stumpf RM & McIntyre MH (2010) Female reproductive strategies in orangutans, evidence for female choice and counter-strategies to infanticide in a species with frequent sexual coercion. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, Biological Sciences* 277(1678) 105-113
- Kokko H & Morrell LJ (2005) Mate guarding, male attractiveness, and paternity under social monogamy *Behavioral Ecology* 16 724-731
- Konnon M & Worthman C (1980) Nursing frequency, gonadal function, and birth spacing among !Kung hunter-gatherers. *Science* 207 788-91
- Ležalová-Piálková R (2010) Molecular evidence for extra-pair paternity and intraspecific brood parasitism in the black-headed gull *Journal of Ornithology* 152, 2 (2010) 291-295
- Locke DP et al (50+ collaborators) (2011) Comparative and demographic analysis of orang-utan genomes. *Nature* 469 (7331) 529
- Lumpkin S (1983) Female manipulation of of male avoidance of cuckoldry behavior in the ring dove. In *Social Behavior* (Ed Wasser SK) 91-112 Academic Press. New York
- Manson JH (1997) Primate Consortships: A Critical Review. *Current Anthropology* 38(3), 353-374
- Marlow FW (2004) Mate preferences among Hadza hunter-gatherers. *Human Nature* 15(4)
- Mirrlees-Black C, Budd T, Partridge S & Mayhew P (1998) The 1998 British crime survey. Government Statistical Service, Home Office. London
- Marlowe F (2001) Male contribution to diet and female reproductive success among foragers. *Current Anthropology* 42 755-760

- Marlowe FW (2003) A critical period for provisioning by Hadza men. Implications for pair bonding. *Evolution and Human Behavior* 24 217-229
- Morris D (1972) *Intimate Behaviour*. Random House
- Moxon SP (2011) Beyond staged retreat behind virtual 'gender paradigm' barricades: The rise and fall of the misrepresentation of partner-violence and its eclipse by an understanding of mate-guarding. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict & Peace Research* 3(1) 45-54
- Nakahashi W & Horiuchi S (2012) Evolution of ape and human mating systems. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 296 56-64
- Norscia I & Borgognini-Tarli SM (2008) Ranging behavior and possible correlates of pair-living in South-eastern Avahis (Madagascar) *International Journal of Primatology* 29(1) 153-171
- Palchykov V, Kaski K, Kertesz J, Barabasi A-L & Dunbar RIM (2012) Sex differences in intimate relationships *Scientific Reports* 2 (370)
- Quinlan RJ (2008) Human Pair-Bonds: Evolutionary Functions, Ecological Variation and Adaptive Development. *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News and Reviews* 17(5) 227-238
- Quinlan RJ & Quinlan MB (2008) Human Lactation, Pair-bonds, and Alloparents. A Cross-Cultural Analysis. *Human Nature* 19 87-102
- Ryan C & Jetha C (2010) *Sex at Dawn: How We Mate, Why We Stray, and What it Means for Modern Relationships*. Harper Perennial. New York
- Sagarin BJ, Martin AL, Coutinho SA, Edlund JE, Patel L, Zengel B & Skowronski JJ (2012) Sex differences in jealousy: a meta-analytic examination. *Evolution & Human Behavior* 33(6) 595-614
- Saxon L (2012) *Sex at Dusk: Lifting the Shiny Wrapper on Sex at Dawn*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform
- Scelza BA (2011) Female choice and extra-pair paternity in a traditional human population *Biology Letters* 23 7(6) 889-891
- Sear R & Mace R (2008) Who keeps children alive? A review of the effects of kin on child survival. *Evolution and Human Behavior* 29(1) 1-18
- Shattuck K, Dillon L, Nowak N, Weisfeld G, Weisfeld C, Imamoğlu O, Butovskaya M & J Shen (2012) When the cat's away, the spouse will play: A cross-cultural examination of mate-guarding in married couples. ISHE XXI biennial international conference on human ethology, Vienna
- Stets JE & Straus MA (1990) Gender differences in reporting of marital violence and its medical and psychological consequences. In Straus & Gelles (eds) *Physical violence in American families* Transaction Publishers 151-166
- Szepeswol O, Mikulincer M & Birnbaum GE (2013) Misguided attraction: The contribution of nor-

mative and individual-differences components of the sexual system to mating preferences. *Journal of Research in Personality* 47(3) 196-200

Tarin JJ & Gomez-Piquer V (2002) Do women have a hidden heat period? *Human Reproduction* (2002) 17(9) 2243-2248

Thompson G (2010) Domestic violence statistics. House of Commons Library SN/SG/950. Available online www.parliament.uk/briefing-papers/SN00950.pdf

Thornhill R & Gangestad SW (2008) *The Evolutionary Biology of Human Female Sexuality*. Oxford University Press

Unrau WE (1071) *The Kansa Indians; a History of the Wind People, 1673-1873*. Norman. University of Oklahoma

Utami SS, Goossens B, Bruford MW, de Ruiter JR & van Hooff JARAM (2002) Male bimaturism and reproductive success in Sumatran orangutans. *Behavioral Ecology* 13(5) 643-652

Vogel DL, Murphy MJ, Werner-Wilson RJ, Cutrona CE & Seeman J (2007) Sex differences in the use of demand and withdraw behavior in marriage. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 54(2) 165-177

Walker RS, Hill KR, Flinn MV & Ellsworth RM (2011) Evolutionary History of Hunter-Gatherer Marriage Practices. *PLoS ONE* 6(4) e19066

Whyte, Martin King. (1990). *Dating, Mating, and Marriage*. New York: Random House

Winking G (2007) Are men really that bad as fathers? The role of men's investments. *Biodemography and Social Biology* 53 (1-2) 100-115

Zang X (2004) Ethnic differences in marriage and household structure in a Chinese city. *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies* 6(1) 64-82



Steve Moxon is an independent researcher based out of Sheffield in the United Kingdom. He is a cross-disciplinary researcher in the biological roots of human sociality, with a special interest in the sexes. He can be reached at stevemoxon3@talktalk.net.

NEW MALE STUDIES: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL (NMS) IS AN OPEN ACCESS ONLINE INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION OF ISSUES FACING BOYS AND MEN WORLDWIDE. THIS JOURNAL USES OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEMS 2.3.4.0, WHICH IS OPEN SOURCE JOURNAL MANAGEMENT AND PUBLISHING SOFTWARE DEVELOPED, SUPPORTED, AND FREELY DISTRIBUTED BY THE PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE PROJECT UNDER THE GNU GENERAL PUBLIC LICENSE.

THIS ARTICLE HAS BEEN DOWNLOADED FROM [HTTP://NEWMALESTUDIES.COM](http://newmalestudies.com).

THE NEW ZEALAND BILL OF RIGHTS

FAMILY LAW POLICY IN NEW ZEALAND

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The Influence of Non-Legal Research on Legal Approaches to Ex Parte Domestic Violence Protection Orders in New Zealand

PETER ZOHRAB



Ex Parte Domestic Violence Protection Orders arguably breach numerous provisions of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 (BORA) — ss. 13, 17, 18, 19(1), 27, and possibly also s. 25(a)-(f) — unless BORA s. 6 can be used to interpret the Domestic Violence Act 1995 (DVA) in a BORA-consistent way. Their most egregious breach, however, is their breach of s. 22 — the protection against arbitrary arrest or detention. Although Parliament is the most obvious place to seek a solution, recourse could be had to the Human Rights Committee, which, operating as it does under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights 1966, is not bound by BORA s. 4, which allows other statutes to trump BORA.

Key Words: Law, Human rights, Domestic Violence, Feminism, New Zealand.

Introduction

Section 13 of the Domestic Violence Act 1995 (DVA) allows a Court to grant temporary protection orders to an applicant without notice to the respondent prior to the hearing. The Latin term *Ex Parte* is, of course, commonly used for without-notice procedures. As Edward Clark¹ points out, such orders often have severe consequences for the respondent, despite having the apparently laudable objective of preventing Domestic Violence.

Just as Courts rely on expert witnesses to provide part of the basis upon which findings of fact can be made, so the Legal profession as a whole — including academics and students — depends on research carried out by researchers in non-legal fields. There is necessarily a degree of trust involved here: the Legal profession needs to be able to trust that the research has been carried out and reported objectively and honestly. However, in politically sensitive areas such as Domestic Violence, this trust has been abused, and this abuse of trust has consequences for how the New Zealand legal profession should approach the issues such as the extent to which Ex Parte Domestic Violence Protection Orders (EPDVPOs) comply with the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 (BORA), for example.

The Bill of Rights Act and Ex Parte Protection Orders

As Clark² points out, the Family Court is frequently in the public eye, targeted by men's groups clamouring about a judicial bias in favour of women and politicians out to score points (though I myself would see the politicians involved as being more sincere than Clark implies). Perhaps surprisingly, he states, there is a paucity of cases involving the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 (NZBORA), and a lack of consideration of its impact either in the public sphere or judicial discourse.

Clark's article discusses to what extent the practice of granting ex parte protection orders under the Domestic Violence Act 1995 (DVA) is consistent with the right to natural justice guaranteed by s 27(1) of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 (which I will usually refer to as "BORA"). He concludes that Ex Parte Protection Orders are generally consistent with BORA, except for the frequent long delays that occur between the imposition of such an order and the actual hearing, at which the respondent has his first chance to respond to the charges. He writes:³

The system deferring the respondent's right to be heard, as set out in the DVA, accommodates a reasonable construction of natural justice in the circumstances. The availability of protection orders without notice is an essential tool in preventing violence, but this interest must be balanced against the respondent's right to be heard. The system mandated by the DVA does this adequately by requiring a high standard of proof and by including a statutory direction that the respondent must be heard as soon as practicable and within 42 days. This regime, though, is rarely followed in practice. It usually takes weeks longer than the required 42 days for the

Family Court to hear a respondent, meaning that their right to be heard is deferred for an unacceptable period of time, breaching their right to natural justice under s 27 of the NZBORA.

In his discussion of the policy behind the Domestic Violence Act, Clark states:⁴

*The ability for an applicant to quickly get protection orders when they are needed is an essential (sic) in protecting vulnerable people from domestic violence. This point is **not really in doubt**. (my emphasis)*

This statement (including its underlying assumptions as to the nature and scale of the problem) is based on the non-legal research on Domestic Violence that Clark takes into account, and it is the reason why Clark limits his criticism of the extent of DVPOs' BORA-compliance to the issue of delays. However, this sort of research can properly be subjected to severe criticism.

How Policy has been Distorted by Politicised Research

In his article *Research and advocacy: Can one wear two hats?*,⁵ Richard Gelles laments the absence of objectivity on the part of Feminist critics of research demonstrating female-perpetrated domestic violence. It is tempting to read into his article a reaction to his own experience of co-authoring (with Claire Cornell) the book *Intimate Violence in Families*.⁶ This book is at the end of a referential chain of Feminist surveys of the Domestic Violence research. The chain (for present purposes) starts at Clark's article.

In the course of discussing the rationale for ex parte protection orders, Clark states:⁷

One of the motivating forces behind the DVA was the Domestic Violence and the Justice System report commissioned by the Victims Task Force.

Clark states that the only published version of the report is the abridged version: *Protection from Family Violence: A Study of Protection Orders under the Domestic Protection Act 1982*.⁸ This report is clearly a Feminist political tract which concentrates on the theme of women as victims. There is just one passage which mentions men as victims of domestic violence:

*Studies of domestic violence tend to focus on women, because abuse of men is rarely reported to social agencies. Research on physical assaults in the family has suggested that it is common for men to be hit by their partners. However, physical attacks on men by women are likely to be less damaging, **are more likely to occur in self-defence** (my emphasis) and are less likely to occur in an atmosphere of fear and coercion. Although men may sometimes be on the receiving end of physical assaults, they are seldom victimised by continual abuse.*

The source given for the above claims was Hilary Lapsley.⁹ The above passage misquotes Lapsley (on page 35) by missing out the words "or in exchange" after the words "likely to occur in self-defence" (above), which distorts the meaning of the sentence in a way that disadvantages men. In view of published exposes of alleged Feminist intellectual dishonesty,¹⁰ I wonder if this is just one further

example of that phenomenon (see below for another, more extreme example). The relevant sentence from the passage in Lapsley (1993) reads:

*When women hit men they are less likely to do so with such damaging consequences, it is more likely to be in self-defence **or in exchange** (my emphasis), and they are less likely to create an atmosphere of fear and coercion.*

Lapsley, in turn, appears to be quoting Gelles and Cornell,¹¹ although this is not entirely clear from the text. What is clear from the text, however, is that, if she meant to cite any authority for her statement, it could only have been Gelles and Cornell.

In fact, Gelles and Cornell¹² is itself just a survey or popularisation, so what we have is a chain of three reviews/summaries, including no primary sources (so far). Gelles and Cornell is shaky authority for Lapsley’s sentence (quoted above). It contains fewer than two pages on violence against men, in a so-called “Note on Husbands as Victims.” So anyone who uses this book as an authority on female domestic violence against men is not making a serious attempt to come to grips with the topic.

However, Gelles and Cornell does contain actual research data. See their Table 4.1 (below).

Table 4.1 Frequency of Marital Violence: Comparison of Husband and Wife Violence Rates (in percentages)

	Incidence Rate	Frequency				
		Mean		Median		
<i>Violent Behavior</i>	<i>Husband</i>	<i>Wife</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>W</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>W</i>
1 Threw something at spouse	2.9	4.6	3.7	2.7	1.5	1.0
2 Pushed, grabbed, or shoved spouse	9.6	9.1	2.9	3.1	2.0	2.0
3 Slapped spouse	3.1	4.4	2.8	2.7	1.0	1.0
4 Kicked, bit, or hit with fist	1.5	2.5	3.9	2.9	1.5	1.0
5 Hit or tried (sic) to hit spouse with something	1.9	3.1	3.6	3.3	1.2	1.1
6 Beat up spouse	.8	.5	4.2	5.7	2.0	2.0
7 Choked spouse	.7	.4	1.9	2.9	1.0	1.0
8 Threatened spouse with knife or gun	.4	.6	4.3	2.0	1.8	1.1
9 Used a knife or gun	.2	.2	18.6	12.9	1.5	4.0
Overall violence (1-9)	21.3	12.4	5.4	6.1	1.5	2.5
Wife-beating/husband-beating (4-9)	3.4	4.8	5.2	5.4	1.5	1.5

SOURCE: Second National Family Violence Survey (Richard J. Gelles and Murray A. Straus, 1988).

This table says nothing about injuries, but it does show that the more serious violence (what it calls “wife-beating/husband-beating”) was carried out more by wives (4.8%) than by husbands (3.4%).

When we look at the entries for “Overall Violence”, however, we find that, like the Victims Task Force report, Gelles and Cornell (1990) is inaccurate in its reporting of research. The entries, which claim to be the sum of rows 1-9, show husbands (21.3%) with a much higher percentage than women (12.4%). However, if one actually does one’s own addition, one finds that the true figures are 21.1% for husbands and 25.4% for wives! As mentioned above, I think that political motivation cannot be excluded as a factor in this discrepancy.

Gelles and Cornell (1990) state, as the conclusion to their note on female violence:

It is quite clear that men are struck by their wives. It is also clear that because men are typically larger than their wives and usually have more social resources at their command, that they do not have as much physical or social damage inflicted on them as is inflicted on women. Data from studies of households where the police intervened in domestic violence clearly indicate that men are rarely the victims of “battery”.... Thus, although the data in Table 4,1 show similar rates of hitting, when injury is considered, marital violence is primarily a problem of victimised women.

This passage, then, must be what Lapsley relied on in the passage quoted above. Gelles and Cornell do cite a study in support of their claim that greater injury is inflicted on wives than on husbands — a claim that is supported by more recent and reliable data which I cite below. However, the study they cite is based on police interventions and so is biased against male victims, since it is clear that massive publicity has encouraged women to report domestic violence to the police, whereas there is never any official encouragement for men to report violence by females — indeed, this phenomenon is officially treated as if it hardly exists.

However, it is discriminatory to conclude, as Gelles and Cornell do, that “when injury is considered, marital violence is primarily a problem of victimised women.” It is unfair to expect a man simply to put up with female violence, on the grounds that, if he retaliated, he would probably inflict more damage on her than she has inflicted on him (so far)! The studies I summarise in the table below are unanimous in finding that women initiate violence more often than men do. *Prima facie*, surely, guilt and liability must lie with the initiator of physical violence, though any preceding psychological violence should also, ideally, be taken into account.

It is hard to know by what process Gelles and Cornell arrive at the conclusion that men “usually have more social resources at their command.” In New Zealand, the combined forces of Ex Parte Protection Orders (which are usually granted to women), women’s refuges which take in women and children and bar entry to their fathers, and a Police Force that has to a greater or lesser extent adopted a Feminist approach to Domestic Violence are all aligned with women against men. It is hard to see what “social resources” men have which could compete with that!

In 2003, the Hutt News published a supplement,¹³ in which the Police printed a clearly anti-male advertisement on the topic of Domestic Violence. It is convincing evidence — together with my ex-

perience of being harassed by Police Headquarters staff while working on another floor of their building, and other anecdotal evidence— that the New Zealand Police, like their colleagues in other Western countries, cannot be confidently expected to take seriously claims of domestic violence made by men against women.

To be fair to Gelles and Cornell (1990), they do manage, in the meagre space they allocate to violence against men, to mention Suzanne Steinmetz’s article *The Battered Husband Syndrome*.¹⁴ They also bemoan the lack of research into female domestic violence — a lack that has since been remedied (see below).

In order to put into perspective the claims made in the various Feminist passages quoted above, I reproduce (below) a more up-to-date and compendious survey of domestic violence research. This is my own summary of the major findings that are evident from the annotated bibliography on Domestic Violence research that was drawn up by Martin Fiebert and incorporated in *Family Violence: A report from: Family Resources & Research*.¹⁵

Finding	Number of Studies reporting that Finding
Women are more physically abusive than men.	35
Women and men are equally physically abusive.	23
Men are more physically abusive than women.	2
Women initiated violence more often than men did.	6
Men initiated violence more often than women did.	0
Women’s violence has been decreasing.*	0
Men’s violence has been decreasing.*	2
Women suffered more injuries than men did.**	2
Men suffered more injuries than women did.**	1
More female than male partners were	2

killed.**	
More male than female partners were killed.**	o

N.B. A few individual studies are about violence in cartoons, about specific ethnic groups, or about the reasons why women are abusive, etc., and were ignored for the purposes of this overview.

* One study has been ignored (for the purposes of this table) because it compared the same group of people over time, and said that the decrease in both men’s and women’s violence that it found was caused by that group of people getting older.

** A possible reason for more women than men being injured and killed is (as evidenced by the data on decreases in violence) that Domestic Violence information and enforcement has been targeted mostly at male domestic violence. Since men have little encouragement or incentive to report female violence, because it will probably not be taken seriously, men probably mostly just try to put up with female violence and then explode when it gets too much to bear — resulting in injury or death.

It is relevant to mention, in this context, the classic Feminist work on Domestic Violence: *The Battered Woman*.¹⁶ As Robert Sheaffer says in his Review:¹⁷

The Battered Woman is unsatisfactory as a serious work, and completely unacceptable as a foundation for family law. First, it is profoundly unscholarly. Without objective verification of the incidents herein described, they are nothing more than hearsay. Second, the book does not even pretend to be objective: the woman’s side, and only the woman’s side, is presented, when it is undeniable that in a large percentage of cases, the woman initiates violence against the man. Third, Prof. Walker’s expanded definition of “battering” that includes verbal abuse does not even address the issue of female verbal abuse of men. Fourth, there is no reason whatsoever to believe that Prof. Walker’s sample of “battered women” is in any way a representative sample, and even if it were, she presents no statistics to support her conclusions. In fact, most of her conclusions are utterly unsupported by any kind of data, and are simply pronounced ex cathedra.

This book was the main inspiration for the Feminist focus on the issue of Domestic Violence which culminated in the formulation of the Duluth (Power and Control) model. This is a frankly anti-male model that sees Domestic Violence simply as the result of men’s attempts to enforce their control over women. The notion that women could initiate Domestic Violence for unattractive motives of their own has no place within this model. However, as we have seen, the actual statistics are *prima facie* incompatible with this model — whatever might be the motivations of the aggressors — since most of the violence is actually initiated by women.

Revisiting the BORA-Consistency of Ex Parte Protection Orders

With the benefit of a more objective overview of the nature of Domestic Violence, we are now in a position to revisit the issue raised by Clark. Are EPDVPOs consistent with the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 ? It will be recalled that Clark’s criticism is directed at the implementation of the

current regime, rather than at the regime itself. I quoted him (above) as follows:

The system deferring the respondent's right to be heard, as set out in the DVA, accommodates a reasonable construction of natural justice in the circumstances. The availability of protection orders without notice is an essential tool in preventing violence, but this interest must be balanced against the respondent's right to be heard. The system mandated by the DVA does this adequately by requiring a high standard of proof and by including a statutory direction that the respondent must be heard as soon as practicable and within 42 days.

Clark limits his BORA-consistency inquiry to s. 27 (the right to justice), because of the strict word-limit he was subject to at the time.¹⁸ I will discuss that BORA section, as well, but I will also raise other BORA sections in connection with EPDVPOs. I will also discuss the power of the Court to force respondents to attend "programmes", which appear to be courses for males, run by Male Feminists, and which aim to teach men that they are by nature violent and that they need to stop needing to control women, because this is what causes Domestic Violence. In other words, these programmes inculcate the Power and Control model.

I will discuss the following issues:

Do EPDVPOs breach BORA ss 13, 17, 18 and 25?

Do EPDVPOs breach BORA s 19(1) (on sex discrimination)?

Do EPDVPOs breach BORA s 27(the right to justice)?

Do EPDVPOs breach BORA s 22(the right not to be arbitrarily arrested or detained)?

Are EPDVPOs "essential"?

Do EPDVPOs breach BORA ss 13, 17, 18 and 25?

I assume that the reason Clark did not mention s. 25 (on minimum standards of criminal procedure) is that it states:

*Everyone who is **charged with an offence** (my emphasis) has, in relation to the determination of the charge, the following minimum rights:....*

Technically, at least, EPDVPOs do not result from someone being charged with an "offence", as such, so this might seem to rule out applying s. 25 to EPDVPOs. However, constitutional enactments such as BORA are typically interpreted purposively and generously.¹⁹ For example, in interpreting the word "interpreter" in BORA s. 24(g), the High Court in *Alwen Industries Ltd. v Collector of Customs*²⁰ held that "to restrict interpretative assistance to the spoken word would rob the right of its true force."

It is true that in *Drew v Attorney General*,²¹ the majority did not find it necessary to decide whether to take a broad or narrow approach to the meaning of the word "offence" in BORA ss. 24 & 25, but in *Darmalingum v The State*,²² the Privy Council held that a purposive and generous interpretation of the word "charged" in s.10(1) of the Mauritian Bill of Rights was required.

Moreover, apart from restricting the respondent's freedom of movement (BORA s. 18) and freedom of association (BORA s.17) by limiting their ability to approach or contact the applicant, EPDVPOs can often result in other restrictions on their freedom, by limiting their rights in relation to firearms (DVA s. 21), by directing them to attend a demeaning Feminist programme of anti-male indoctrination, based on the power and control model (DVA s. 32 — interfering with their BORA s. 13 right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion), and by causing them to pay a fine or to be imprisoned if they breach the EPDVPO (DVA s. 49). Breaching an EPDVPO is explicitly called an "offence" in s. 49, and this strengthens the case for considering the behaviour that the respondent was initially accused of by the applicant to be the equivalent of an offence.

If that behaviour crosses the threshold to be considered an "offence", it is apparent that there is a *prima facie* breach of BORA s. 25 subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f). They read as follows:

Minimum standards of criminal procedure —

Everyone who is charged with an offence has, in relation to the determination of the charge, the following minimum rights:

(a) The right to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial court:

(b) The right to be tried without undue delay:

(c) The right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law:

(d) The right not to be compelled to be a witness or to confess guilt:

(e) The right to be present at the trial and to present a defence:

(f) The right to examine the witnesses for the prosecution and to obtain the attendance and examination of witnesses for the defence under the same conditions as the prosecution:....

As is well known, Family Court sessions are not public, and whether they are fair — as well as the related issue of whether the court is impartial — is a matter of heated political controversy. A delay of 42 days is arguably undue, seeing that it involves a restriction on one parent's right to associate freely with his children. This often occurs at a crucial juncture, when the other parent may be trying to alienate their affections from him, and when Family Court proceedings might result in a *de jure* confirmation of the other parent's *de facto* sole custody, on the grounds that it would unsettle the children to change their custodial arrangements.

By no stretch of the imagination does the EPDVPO process involve the respondent being proved guilty — yet a penalty can be imposed on him, which presumes that he is guilty. This is an issue I will return to in connection with the right to justice (BORA s. 27). Being compelled to attend a non-violence programme is tantamount to being compelled to confess guilt. By definition, an *Ex Parte* hearing — except in the Pickwick variation (which allows the other party to be present, but at extremely short notice) — involves the absence of the respondent. Because he is absent and is not represented at an EPDVPO hearing, the respondent cannot call or examine witnesses. Of course, the

applicant does not call or examine witnesses either, but it is arguable that the seriousness of the jeopardy requires at least the ability of the respondent to file a statement of defence and affidavits from at least one witness (e.g. himself).

The freedom of movement (BORA s. 18) that is impacted upon by an EPDVPO is typically the freedom to go to one's own home, which is one of the most severe forms of restriction on one's freedom of movement that could possibly be imposed. Similarly, the freedom of association (BORA s.17) that is impacted upon by an EPDVPO is typically the freedom to associate with members of one's own immediate family, which, again, is possibly the most severe form of restriction on one's freedom of association that could possibly be imposed. The interference with one's BORA s. 13 right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion that is involved in being compelled to attend a Power-and Control-model-inspired non-violence course (when one might have been less violent than one's partner, or even not been violent at all) affects the core value of the Bill of Rights: the inherent dignity of the individual.. It is one thing for Feminists to invent and propagate in universities, etc. — at taxpayer expense — a model of Domestic Violence that treats men as guilty by virtue of their sex, but it is quite another thing entirely to force men to accept this as the truth by judicial fiat, when it could be contrary to their knowledge of the facts and/or to their personal religious or ethical beliefs.

The case is overwhelming, in my opinion, that EPDVPOs involve a *prima facie* breach of BORA ss. 13, 17, and 18. Moreover, provided that being a respondent to an EPDVPO crosses the threshold to being considered “charged with an offence”, the case is also overwhelming that EPDVPOs involve a *prima facie* breach of BORA ss. 25(a), 25(b), 25(c), 25(d), 25(e), and 25(f).

Do EPDVPOs breach BORA s 19(1) (on sex discrimination)?

It is clear that most respondents are male. Table 3 of the Ministry of Justice's Domestic Violence Act 1995 Process Evaluation (http://www.justice.govt.nz/pubs/reports/2000/domestic_eval/method.html#Table%203), for example, lists 42 male respondents and only two female respondents. The report states:

Few male applicants, and in particular gay men, are yet using the Act. In the experience of lawyers who have prepared applications for men, as well as court staff who have processed applications and judges who have decided on them, male applicants are not disadvantaged when applying under the Act, but rather they are reluctant to apply. Social taboos, stigma, shame and embarrassment can make it difficult for men to apply for an order. Some men believe that the court system is biased towards women, and that their experiences will not be taken seriously.

The comments about social taboos, stigma, shame and embarrassment may well be correct. However, it is undeniable that the Family Courts are in fact biased against men, given such statements as the following, by Family Court Judge K G MacCormick:²³

*That more women seek (protection orders) is **no doubt** (my emphasis) because men are generally physically stronger and more inclined to try to resolve disputes by the use of physical*

force.

The above statement was made without reference to any supporting evidence whatsoever.

In addition, the programmes that male respondents are told by the Court to attend inculcate the Power and Control model, which is a sexist and discriminatory model.

So EPDVPOs, as implemented in practice, involve *prima facie* breaches of s. 19(1). This cannot be rectified by amending the DVA, of course, but it is a real issue nonetheless. The amount of discrimination involved could be lessened, however, by making sure that the Power and Control model is not used as the basis for any of the programmes.

Do EPDVPOs breach BORA s 27 (the right to justice)?

BORA s. 5 states:

Justified limitations — *Subject to section 4 of this Bill of Rights, the rights and freedoms contained in this Bill of Rights may be subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society.*

As Clark points out, the right to justice is a flexible concept. Rishworth et al.²⁴ state:

The decision as to the requirements of natural justice in particular circumstances both defines and limits the right without recourse to s.5. Although in theory a failure to meet the minimum requirements of natural justice might be justified pursuant to s. 5, in practice this is unlikely to occur.... Where its principles apply there is no room and no need for the operation of s. 5.

As stated above, Clark's finding of a breach by EPDVPOs of BORA s. 27 is limited to the following ground:

It usually takes weeks longer than the required 42 days for the Family Court to hear a respondent, meaning that their right to be heard is deferred for an unacceptable period of time, breaching their right to natural justice under s 27 of the NZBORA. (op.cit. p. 8)

I commend Clark for raising this issue and for coming to this well-argued and (in my opinion) justified conclusion. However, Rishworth et al.²⁵ mention that there is considerable overlap between s 27 and ss. 23-25. Accordingly, I would submit that the issues I raised in connection with s. 25 (above) would also be grounds for considering EPDVPOs to be a *prima facie* breach of BORA s 27.

In addition, the considerations I will raise (below) in connection with BORA s. 22 could also arguably be raised in connection with s. 27.

Do EPDVPOs breach BORA s 22 (the right not to be arbitrarily arrested or detained)?

BORA s. 22 reads as follows:

***Liberty of the person** — Everyone has the right not to be arbitrarily arrested or detained.*

Clearly, the initial effect of an EPDVPO is not to arrest or detain the respondent. However, DVA s. 49 provides for “imprisonment for a term not exceeding 6 months or to a fine not exceeding \$5,000” (or imprisonment for up to 2 years for certain categories of repeat offenders) for failing to comply with the terms of an EPDVPO or of a direction to attend a programme. So, if, in a given case, an EPDVPO can be said to have been imposed arbitrarily, and the respondent subsequently receives a prison term under DVA s. 49, I submit that he has been arbitrarily arrested and detained in terms of BORA s. 22.

The next question, then, is whether there is scope for the **arbitrary** imposition of an EPDVPO under the DVA. This is the point at which words almost fail me, because of the sheer scale of the breach that is involved, and because of the fact that it appears to have attracted no public criticism.

I refer to DVA s. 13 (2), which reads:

***Application without notice for protection order** — (1)
(2) Without limiting the matters to which the Court may have regard when determining whether to grant a protection order on an application without notice, the Court must have regard to —
(a) The perception of the applicant or a child of the applicant’s family, or both, of the nature and seriousness of the respondent’s behaviour; and
(b) The effect of that behaviour on the applicant or a child of the applicant’s family, or both.*

I do not claim an encyclopedic knowledge of the Law in all its historical and geographical forms and variations, but this subsection seems to me to be unprecedented in what we are pleased to call “civilised” communities. Courts routinely have to determine what the objective facts of a case are. In criminal cases, they also routinely have to determine what was going on in the mind of the alleged perpetrator at the time of the alleged crime, in relation to the *mens rea* elements of the crime, as described in the statute. All that is reasonable, since a person has control over his acts (with certain exceptions), and can reasonably be held to account for his own intentions, negligence, or recklessness, etc.

But to be subject to a court sanction — which may be converted into a fine or imprisonment if one does not comply with its terms — because of what goes on in the mind of **another** person is such an unreasonable assault on the inherent dignity of the individual, I submit, that even the Third Reich, that icon of crimes against humanity, did not go so far in its inhumanity to man. This modern, Feminist, New Zealand provision is certainly arbitrary, in my opinion.

Are EPDVPOs “essential”?

This is an issue that relates principally to BORA s.5. If EPDVPOs are held to be essential, then that may be considered to be a reasonable limit prescribed by law that can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society.

It is clear that the judgement of Parliament and of commentators such as Clark that EPDVPOs are essential has been based on research that is politically motivated, one-sided and cavalier with the truth. The input from pressure-groups at Select Committee hearings was also undoubtedly one-sided, as far as the politics of Domestic Violence are concerned. As a member of the Men’s Movement myself, I am certain that there would have been virtually no Men’s Movement input at the time that would have contradicted the Feminists as to the nature of Domestic Violence.

The motivation for enacting EPDVPOs, therefore, must be seen as the understandable emotional reaction by Parliament and the public to the Feminist-inspired image of a poor helpless woman being repeatedly bashed — possibly to death — by an evil, power-mad man.

Her Honour Judge Jan Doogue, in her paper *Domestic Violence: Reviewing the Needs of Children*,²⁶ states:

The Domestic Violence Act 1995 and s. 16B of the Guardianship Act 1968 were based on the classification of violence within the power and control model. In my experience and that of other Judges this model does not fit the profile of many cases coming before the Family Court in New Zealand.

There is reasonable doubt that Parliament, when faced with the evidence outlined above, would maintain the position that the EPDVPOs are essential for the prevention of Domestic Violence.

However, there seems to me to be an overwhelming logical argument against the need for EPDVPOs: Search warrants and Ex Parte Interlocutory Injunctions (EPIIs), such as Mareva injunctions and Anton Piller Orders, are directed at the property of the respondent, and are granted *ex parte* because their effect would probably be nugatory if the respondent was given notice. However, EPDVPOs are directed at the respondent, and do not come into effect until served on the respondent, so there is almost no logical reason why a summons to appear at a defended interlocutory hearing should not be served on the respondent instead. The Domestic Violence Act 1995 does not allow for that, but such a provision, if enacted as an amendment, could protect the applicant by imposing a temporary Protection Order for the period leading up to the hearing, and by automatically imposing a 42-day Protection Order if the respondent or his counsel failed to appear at the hearing.

In that context, the real reason for EPDVPOs seems to be to prevent the respondent (who is usually male) from presenting his side of the story. This is consistent with the common Feminist approach to research and policy-making, which is systematically to exclude pro-male points of view. For example, we have seen (above) how a book that was based purely on women’s accounts of Domestic Violence (*The Battered Woman*) has become the foundation stone of the Feminist campaign on that issue.

My conclusion would therefore be that EPDVPOs are not at all essential, since the nature and extent of the problem they are intended to solve has been distorted and exaggerated beyond all recognition. It follows, if I am correct, that the many and diverse breaches of BORA that they involve may not be considered to be a reasonable limit prescribed by law that can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society.

Should EPDVPOs be mutual?

Swayed by the Duluth model, Parliament has simply assumed, in the Domestic Violence Act, that Domestic Violence is one-sided, and that the relevant parties consist of one perpetrator and one victim, with no significant cross-over between the roles. Thus, there is no explicit provision for mutual Protection Orders. However, there is nothing in the Act to exclude mutual protection orders.

Paragraph 7.614 of Butterworths Family Law Service states that mutual orders (under DVA s. 18) are not actually banned, but they are cautioned against. If counsel became aware of the issues I have raised above, however, it should be easier for them to convince the Court that mutual orders were appropriate in many instances.

In fact, I would argue for mutual Protection Orders in most cases. One reason is that fairness dictates that, if both parties, on the facts, share the blame for the violence, both parties, rather than just one, should be barred from carrying out such acts on the other party. Another reason is that it is unfair to allow one party to play on the other party's emotions by phoning him, writing to him, etc., and provoking him to respond, or frustrating him through his inability to respond without putting himself in jeopardy. The third reason is that one-sided Protection Orders allow the applicant to manipulate and entrap the respondent, by inviting him to come and see her, and then (on some pretext) claiming a breach of the Protection Order, which results in the respondent acquiring a jail term and a criminal record. I know of one case where that happened, though I cannot make a judgement as to whether the breach was sincerely or maliciously alleged by the applicant.

Conclusion

I submit that EPDVPOs breach numerous provisions of BORA — ss. 13, 17, 18, 19(1), 27, and possibly also s. 25(a)-(f) — unless BORA s. 6 can be used to interpret the DVA in a BORA-consistent way. Their most egregious breach, however, is their breach of s. 22 — the protection against arbitrary arrest or detention. This situation needs to be rectified, and, although Parliament is the most obvious place to seek a solution, one should not necessarily write off the ability of the Courts to provide one in the meantime. The EPDVPOs' breaches of BORA — especially their breach of s. 22 — amount to *Wednesbury* unreasonableness,²⁷ I submit. However, BORA s. 4 prevents the Courts from trumping Parliament outright, although Justice Thomas looks forward to the time when the Common Law will empower them to do just that.²⁸ Recourse could be had to the Human Rights Committee, which, operating as it does under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights 1966, is not bound by BORA s. 4, which allows other statutes to trump BORA.

Footnotes

¹Edward Clark: *Ex parte orders in the Family Court and the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990*, But-
terworths Family Law Journal Vol. 4, December 2003, Part 8.

²*Op cit*, 1.

³*Op cit*, 8.

⁴*Op cit*, 4.

⁵Richard Gelles, *Research and advocacy: Can one wear two hats?*, 1994, *Family Process*, 33, 93-5.

⁶Richard Gelles and Claire Cornell, *Intimate Violence in Families*, 1990, second edition, London:
Sage Publications.

⁷*Op cit*, 2.

⁸*Victims Task Force, Protection from Family Violence: A Study of Protection Orders under the Do-
mestic Protection Act 1982 (Abridged)*, Wellington: Victims Task Force 1992.

⁹Hilary Lapsley, *The Measurement of Family Violence: A Critical Review of the Literature*, 1993, Wel-
lington: Social Policy Agency.

¹⁰Christina Hoff Sommers, *Who Stole Feminism ? How Women Have Betrayed Women*, 1994, New
York: Simon and Schuster, and *Figuring Out Feminism*. 1994, National Review magazine, June 27 –
also: Peter Zohrab, *Sex, Lies & Feminism*, 2002, Fourth, NZEEF Edition
<http://nzmera.orcon.net.nz/contents.html> .

¹¹*Op cit*.

¹²*Op cit*.

¹³*Life in Wainuiomata, Eastbourne, Petone, Moera, Alicetown & Western Hills* – see: [http://nzmera.or-
conhosting.net.nz/pubenemy.html](http://nzmera.or-
conhosting.net.nz/pubenemy.html) .

¹⁴Suzanne Steinmetz, *The Battered Husband Syndrome*, 1977-78, *Victimology: An International Jour-
nal*, 2, 499-509.

¹⁵Formerly at <http://www.landwave.com/family/> .

¹⁶Lenore E. Walker, *The Battered Woman*, N.Y.: Harper Colophon Books, 1979.

¹⁷<http://nzmera.orcon.net.nz/batwmrev.html> .

¹⁸Personal communication.

¹⁹*Minister of Home Affairs v Fisher* [1980] A.C. 319, 328-329 per Lord Wilberforce, echoed in New
Zealand, for example, by Cooke P in *Ministry of Transport v Noort* [1992] 3 NZLR 260 (CA), 268.

²⁰*Alwen Industries Ltd. v Collector of Customs* (1996) 3 HRNZ 29, 31.

²¹*Drew v Attorney General* [2002] 1 NZLR 58.

²²*Darmalingum v The State* [2000] 1 WLR 2003.

²³*A v R* [2003] NZFLR 1105, 1107.

²⁴*The New Zealand Bill of Rights*, 2003, Melbourne, Australia: OUP, 761.

²⁵*Op. cit.*, 753.

²⁶Judge Jan Doogue, *Domestic Violence: Reviewing the Needs of Children*, paper delivered at the 3rd
Annual Child & Youth Law Conference 2004, 1-2 April.

²⁷*Associated Provincial Picture Houses Ltd v Wednesbury Corporation* [1948] 1 KB 223.

²⁸Justice E W Thomas, *The Relationship of Parliament and the Courts: a Tentative Thought or Two
for the New Millenium*, paper delivered as the Victoria University of Wellington Law Faculty's
Centennial Lecture on 30 June 1999.

References

- Edward Clark: *Ex parte orders in the Family Court and the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990*, Butterworths Family Law Journal Vol. 4, December 2003, Part 8.
- Judge Jan Doogue, *Domestic Violence: Reviewing the Needs of Children*, paper delivered at the 3rd Annual Child & Youth Law Conference 2004, 1-2 April.
- Richard Gelles, *Research and advocacy: Can one wear two hats?*, 1994, *Family Process*, 33, 93-5.
- Richard Gelles and Claire Cornell, *Intimate Violence in Families*, 1990, second edition, London: Sage Publications.
- Hilary Lapsley, *The Measurement of Family Violence: A Critical Review of the Literature*, 1993, Wellington: Social Policy Agency.
- Paul Rishworth, Grant Huscroft, Scott Optican and Richard Mahoney, *The New Zealand Bill of Rights*, 2003, Melbourne, Australia: OUP
- Christina Hoff Sommers, *Who Stole Feminism ? How Women Have Betrayed Women*, 1994, New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Christina Hoff Sommers, *Figuring Out Feminism*. 1994, National Review magazine, June 27
- Suzanne Steinmetz, *The Battered Husband Syndrome, 1977-78*, *Victimology: An International Journal*, 2, 499-509.
- Justice E W Thomas, *The Relationship of Parliament and the Courts: a Tentative Thought or Two for the New Millenium*, paper delivered as the Victoria University of Wellington Law Faculty's Centennial Lecture on 30 June 1999.
- Victims Task Force, *Protection from Family Violence: A Study of Protection Orders under the Domestic Protection Act 1982 (Abridged)*, Wellington: Victims Task Force 1992.
- Peter Zohrab, *Sex, Lies & Feminism*, 2002, Fourth, NZEEF Edition <http://nzmera.orcon.net.nz/contents.html>



Peter Zohrab is a New Zealand graduate in Law and Humanities. He may be reached at peter@zohrab.name

NEW MALE STUDIES: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL (NMS) IS AN OPEN ACCESS ONLINE INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION OF ISSUES FACING BOYS AND MEN WORLDWIDE. THIS JOURNAL USES OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEMS 2.3.4.0, WHICH IS OPEN SOURCE JOURNAL MANAGEMENT AND PUBLISHING SOFTWARE DEVELOPED, SUPPORTED, AND FREELY DISTRIBUTED BY THE PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE PROJECT UNDER THE GNU GENERAL PUBLIC LICENSE.

THIS ARTICLE HAS BEEN DOWNLOADED FROM [HTTP://NEWMALESTUDIES.COM](http://NEWMALESTUDIES.COM).



The Learning Style of Males and How to Involve College Men in the Curriculum

MILES GROTH



Now the minority (35%) of those attending college and university, young often arrive on campuses that are unwelcoming. Until fairly recently an atmosphere unlike that at the elementary level, where for many decades boys have been treated as defective girls, the undergraduate classroom today is typically a place where young men sit quietly. Male-positive pedagogic approaches to engaging college-age men are identified that depend not on the sex of the instructors but on their attitudes toward males. The undercurrent of misandry in academe is addressed.

Key Words: misandry, tertiary education, college classroom, males, young males, male-positive ped-

agogy

Introductory Note: Affiliated with the Modern Language Association of America, the Northeast Modern Language Association (NeMLA) hosts an annual conference primarily for scholars working in the northeastern United States and Canada. Papers are presented on topics concerning various languages, their literatures, and their pedagogies. In addition, NeMLA supports special-interest caucuses that both investigate certain challenges faced by those working in academe and organize conference panels that address these challenges. Among these groups is the Women's and Gender Studies Caucus that, according to its web page, "welcomes members interested in feminist scholarship, women's and gender studies, and the status of women in the profession at all stages of their careers." NeMLA does not currently maintain a men's caucus.

Following is one of three papers presented by members of the staff of New Male Studies at the 44th annual NeMLA convention held in Boston, Massachusetts, on March 22, 2013, hosted by Tufts University. The other two papers are included in this issue. Each paper offers practical examples of male-friendly strategies that enhance critical inquiry and teaching methods. They comprised a panel, "The New Male Studies in Praxis: Male-Positive Criticism and Classroom Practice," that was initially proposed by one of the presenters (Dennis Gouws) as either a pedagogy or a women's and gender-studies panel and was accepted as one among nineteen pedagogy panels. Twenty-eight women's and gender studies panels were accepted.

During the last two decades the experience of most males in the college classroom has changed remarkably. The number of males attending college has declined to a nationwide 37% of the total college population. Recently, relevant evidence has been accumulating that suggests the college classroom setting and even campus life in general are no longer welcoming to young males. As a result, many of those males who do attend college have fallen silent in the classroom and have disengaged from campus life with the exception of participation in athletics. While it is not yet clear why this has occurred, the need for immediate concern and concerted efforts to make tertiary level education male-affirmative and male-positive once again especially in the humanities is inarguable. Just as at the primary and secondary levels, the learning style of boys (much like their styles of play and social interaction) varies in identifiable and important ways from that of girls, and the ways young males interact with their teachers, each other, and female students at the college level are also distinctive.

Drawing on forty years' experience teaching undergraduates, I will describe their learning style and propose ways to facilitate involving college males in the curriculum, including especially taking part in classroom discussions. I will recount ways of interacting with young males that draw them into the life of the mind as it plays out in the undergraduate classroom. I will suggest that it is not so much a matter of the gender of the teacher but rather his or her assumptions about male experience and the teacher's understanding of male behavior that determine whether the instructional ethos is male-positive.

To provide some context for my comments and suggestions, let me begin by revealing a few

facts of my personal life as a student that are germane to this discussion. In the postwar years from 1951 to 1957, I was a primary school student in an eight-room brick schoolhouse in a semirural county seat city in western Pennsylvania. I had only women as teachers from kindergarten through the sixth grade. Ann Rummell (I still remember her name quite clearly), the principal of my district ward school, was an imposing, serious woman whose presence was felt from the moment I arrived for my first half-day of kindergarten until the final days of my sixth-grade year during which she had been my teacher. Every day, she greeted every student who arrived at the schoolhouse door. During that same period, the most important early influence in my life was Mildred Gardner, a woman who taught me piano and composition privately in her father's studio in Greensburg, Pennsylvania, and later at Carlow University in Pittsburgh. Even though she was 46 years older than I was when I became her student while in third grade, after ten years of instruction and my sojourn away from home at college we became close friends. Our endless discussions over tea in her dining room were formative for me through my early 30s.

It was not until I moved on to junior high school that I encountered my first male teachers, who were in short supply as you may know following the Second World War. My Latin teacher in junior high school was a woman. Our senior high principal was a woman, Helen Barron, another powerful, commanding figure who presided over the group of several hundred girls and boys from our predominantly middle- and lower-class town and the surrounding dairy-farming countryside. These were all women who understood the differences between boys and girls and demanded respect on the authority of their interest in us, their personalities, and their unspoken but unambiguous message that they valued us as children—some male, some female—and in the first place as individual boys and girls. We were not gendered beings but essentially different groups of a common youthful humanity. Yet while clearly recognizing that boys and girls are essentially different in important respects, they never said “boys will be boys” or “girls are that way.”

When I entered my last year of senior high school in 1963 the word ‘gender’ was introduced into the language in its current usage in a little-known book by the British sociologist Alec Comfort, *Sex in Society* (second edition), first published in 1950 but without the word ‘gender’ appearing anywhere in that text. Sometime between 1950 and 1963, however, the modern notion of gender—a euphemism for ‘sex’—was given its name. The concept has since created no little excitement among those interested in understanding men and women, boys and girls. Up to that time, only my Latin teacher used the word ‘gender’, which applied to nouns, not people.

On my parents’ authority (they were paying the bills), the following year I went off to Franklin and Marshall College which was then all male, as it had been for 177 years and remained until 1969, the year after I graduated, when it admitted the first woman. In only eleven years (by 1980), parity in male and female university enrollments had been reached nationally. Now, in 2013 at my alma mater and elsewhere, for every male attending there are on average two young females.

At college, I attended classes, plied my skills as a pianist accompanying the glee club, wrote music reviews for the school newspaper, performed three leading roles in the Green Room Theatre, and took part in the ‘60s counter culture, which we were sure would change the world. Sorry...

Today, at Wagner College in New York City where I have taught for nearly 20 years after some

years at Saint Vincent College, and after training and working as a psychoanalyst in New York from the mid-1980s on, the climate has changed for boys. In a book I co-edited in 2010, *Engaging College Men: Discovering What Works and Why*, you may read about the efforts that have been under way for nearly a decade at a dozen or so schools to call attention to the disengagement of college males from campus intellectual and cultural life. Today, I will focus on only one aspect of the problem and that is the way in which young males, based on observations of their behavior, seem to experience campus classroom life.

The point of the autobiographical frame was to justify my suggestion that essential and basic things are no different now than they were in 1963, when we the first generation became gendered. Girls think, speak and write differently than boys. My feminist colleagues have repeatedly stated this and they are correct. What are some of the differences? Since no one knows for sure how or what anyone else thinks, we must limit ourselves in this kind of analysis to the differences in the speaking and writing styles of males and females, and given time constraints, I will focus on speaking. (On the matter of writing I will only say that generally boys are not on the track to being a Kierkegaard or Isaac Asimov.)

By the elementary school years boys say less than girls. Most will not go on to make a living talking, as I do. It is as though they had been born in Lakonia, the area around Sparta in ancient Greece whose residents were known for the brevity of their utterances. Like the neighbors of Spartan Greeks, boys are laconic. To exploit the sense of the title of J.L. Austin's book, boys tend *to do things with words*. Early on, their brevity is often confused with reticence. That was understood and accepted by Mrs. Rummel, but in recent years many boys have been located somewhere along the autism spectrum of disorders. Far from being a sign of mental illness, however, I think that boys' terseness is more intelligibly understood in relation to their tendency to move quickly over short distances. They say only what needs to be said, sometimes abruptly and loudly, usually without commentary. They say something to be done with it. In contemporary elementary school classrooms, their laconian tendency has been intensified and being inhibited to say their little bit in classrooms has rendered many boys mute.

Before turning to this tendency among males in undergraduate classrooms and my proposed remedy to the situation that males say less and less in them, let me add a few additional features to my account of boys' (and most men's) speech style. One is drawn from boyhood. Given the wish to show her gratitude to a mother, a girl is likely to say: "Oh, Mommy, thank you, Mommy! I love you so much. You're the best Mommy in the world!" By middle childhood a boy is more likely to find or make something to give to Mommy in return and slip it to her without a word, and without an explanation. My other example is from older men. In my research for today's presentation, I spoke to some male staff on campus (most of them in their mid-30s to late 50s) as they worked on repairing my office door and asked them why they had barely said a word to each other for the half-hour it took them to complete the job. One replied: "I don't have to explain to him how to fix this door; I just show him and he does it." The other one didn't say anything. Is this related to males having hunted together in pairs or groups? In that case, not speaking would have given them the advantage of more likely getting close enough to their prey to kill it. Had they been talking, the animal would have heard them and fled. Take that explanation provided by my anthropologist colleagues for what you will. I prefer another one and that is that boys are socialized to express less of their experience

in particular their emotional life. But since from early in life most of what one wants to report to others about one's experience is about what one feels, not thoughts about climate change or changes in tax law, socialization that limits self-expression of this kind or marks it as potentially embarrassing is ultimately handicapping to boys and men.

But let me now, like the hunter I am said to be at heart, cut to the chase. Given college classrooms with greater numbers of women, what might be the expected response of young men when called on to speak, knowing that the girls who are there with them are not only listening to the content but are judging them as males, that is, as prospective dates or boyfriends or even sexual partners? (This was the case for women were they were the minority in college classrooms.) The high school and college years are critical times for young males in this respect but ours is a culture that still considers articulate self-expression by males—most males—to be unmanly. Moreover, given boys' basic tendency to be terse, the additional effect on boys of being in settings where they may be impressed by how little what little they might have to say will be valued is suffocating.

For a variety of reasons, males now also have a bad reputation that precedes them before matriculating. Sadly, in too many classrooms negative, stereotypic generalizations about males are voiced by faculty and echoed perhaps reluctantly by some female students. Here I invoke what is today called misandry, a generalized contempt for men that has been documented in a series of three heavy volumes (so far) published by McGill-Queens University Press for Paul Nathanson and Katherine Young. In her book, *The War Against Boys*, the philosopher Christina Hoff Sommers has spoken out on a related view of boys, who are now regularly depicted as defective girls, echoing the complementary psychoanalytic disparagement that for a century saw girls as defective boys, based on Freud's view of femininity that in turn echoed a history of viewing females as inferior to males and minimizing their strengths. Happily, we have gotten past all that, but something comparable is now being experienced by boys and young men that girls and young women had to endure for an unconscionably long time.

Given their predisposition to be brief, their sensitivity to the assessment of young women, the negative reputation that precedes them, the onus placed on young males who are as verbal as most girls, and the experience of being less valued and sometimes disparaged in the classroom, boys have gone silent in great numbers. One statistical prediction (for what it is worth) suggests that the last bachelor's degree awarded to a male will be handed over to him in 2025. (That is certainly not going to happen, but the projection indicates the steepness of the trend of lessening enrollments.) What should we do as their professors? What do I do? First, some general recommendations that will provide the background for a review of some of my own practices.

Like my wonderful grade-school teachers, we must recognize the differences between young males and young females in their ways of experiencing the world and expressing what they can of that experience. Second, we must vigorously refuse to sanction or commit acts of stereotyping boys just as we refused to do that regarding girls beginning in the 1970s. Third, we must take seriously the idea that, given some common tendencies, each boy is different. That will account for the fact that *some* boys are very talkative in class. (I was.) Fourth, we must counteract the felt experience of most boys that I have inferred based on their behavior, namely, that many now feel not especially welcome and perhaps even intruders on campus, in the lecture hall, or seminar room. We must openly note

their withdrawal (which has become patent), question it, and encourage boys to speak, not to the disadvantage of any girl's offering a contribution to the discussion but as a corrective to the by now relative quiet of these seemingly autistic boys.

How do I implement these recommendations? I must stress that being a male is relevant to these practices (both for the boys and for the girls, for different reasons and with different effects), but as in the example of my own teachers as a young boy, the fact that they were women was not relevant. Nor should it be in today's college classrooms. (Where I teach, our 100 full-time faculty are exactly 50 men and 50 women.) Only that my teachers as a boy were a certain kind of person who happened to be a woman was relevant. Similarly, a certain kind of male or female undergraduate professor is to be desired now, a person who is as unashamedly male-positive as he or she is female-positive.

I now do for the boys in my classes what I did with the girls in my classes in the 1970s and 1980s when they were entering the disquisitional fray of college life in greater numbers and were often shy, not yet sure if they were welcome. I often now favor the boys as I often favored the girls then. Just as I did not assume that the "co-eds" (as we called them) were less apt and articulate than the boys, I do not now assume that the boys are inept and can't put together a sentence, although that is what, sadly, we have been told in recent years and what their behavior often intimates.

In short, I am male-positive at a time when boys are undervalued as I was female-positive when girls were not yet valued enough on campus. At the same time I remind myself that most boys tend to say less and am content with a brief communication from them. I often have to press them to speak, maybe urge them to say a bit more, and see what I can salvage of what the average sophomore conjures up. I occasionally convey to a class that intelligence is not gendered while hinting that ways of expressing oneself as a male or as a female are gendered, both by disposition and as a result of socialization. I may then do a head count and point to the fewer number of boys in the class. A cursory indication of what is obvious is adequate, unless it has bearing on the topic we are considering (for example, in a psychology class where we might be talking about the play styles of male and female children or the "nature/nurture" debate). These topics may not often turn up in a literature class, but others that are occasions for fostering male-positive attitudes do, as Professor Gouws will describe shortly (see Dennis Gouws, "A Male Positive Introduction to the Victorian Manhood Question," pp. 68-74, present issue).

As you heard in the introduction, I teach psychology and philosophy. So what am I doing at a NeMLA meeting? My second undergraduate major (after philosophy) was English literature and I earned a certificate to teach secondary English in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I used it for five years while a graduate student to teach middle school English. On that authority, I will hazard in conclusion an example of pro-male pedagogic practice from an imaginary undergraduate "Language and Rhetoric" class. (I think it will work just as well in a seminar on "Chaucer" or "Twentieth-century Women Poets.")

Often enough, the Western canon is condemned as being bereft of contributions by women and therefore has been increasingly discarded even at liberal arts colleges. Everything from the pre-Platonics and early Greek dramatists to literature up to 1960 (when gender was invented) was an-

drocentric. So goes the claim. I might respond when hearing this from a bright undergraduate by reminding my class that while the canon was authored mostly by males, these men did not write about *most men's experience* but only about the behavior of that small group of males who were politically powerful as a result of lording it over women, children and *most other men and boys*, and, of course, writing the books about the munificence and magnificence of their own behavior. With few exceptions—found in the work of the poets—the experience of these men (again, I stress, *most men*) has not been explored. Male *experience* (including that of the chief honchos by the way) remains an unwritten text. There is everything to read about their behavior, but scarcely anything about their experience. Philosophy, music and poetry somehow just appear. But as for the experience of the blokes, it remains mostly a mystery. As noted, there are a few exceptions; for example, the work of Herman Melville which Mr. Glover will discuss (see K.C. Glover, “Males, Melville, and *Moby-Dick*: A New Male Studies Approach to Teaching Literature to College Men,” pp. 62-67, present issue). As you will hear, in Melville’s work we find some of the earliest insights into (forgive me) the male soul where experience arises.

I would then say to my class: “Most of you boys in this class will, like me, not gain any power over anyone, especially now when power is allocated more and more without regard to gender. Moreover, you should remember that the power enjoyed by heroes, kings and presidents, bureaucrats and senators did not necessarily imply power over their own lives. But that sort of power is the only real power, isn’t it? If you died in the line of duty as a hero, you were not a man with real power, were you?. Real power—power over one’s own life—has been denied to *most men*, as soldiers, as (until quite recently) the principal wage earners in a household, and as men who gave up much to the benefit of their partners, spouses and children. And, in view of this (to modify a title, the title of a novel by James Agee): Let us now praise most men—not famous men, but most men.” I think this might make the boys in that class feel more positive about themselves and make them more real to the girls who sit beside them and for the most part like them, after all is said and done. And I would say it to all of you here, too.



Miles Groth is a professor of psychology at Wagner College on Staten Island, New York. He can be reached at mgroth@wagner.edu.

NEW MALE STUDIES: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL (NMS) IS AN OPEN ACCESS ONLINE INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION OF ISSUES FACING BOYS AND MEN WORLDWIDE. THIS JOURNAL USES OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEMS 2.3.4.0, WHICH IS OPEN SOURCE JOURNAL MANAGEMENT AND PUBLISHING SOFTWARE DEVELOPED, SUPPORTED, AND FREELY DISTRIBUTED BY THE PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE PROJECT UNDER THE GNU GENERAL PUBLIC LICENSE.

THIS ARTICLE HAS BEEN DOWNLOADED FROM [HTTP://NEWMALESTUDIES.COM](http://newmalestudies.com).



Males, Melville, and *Moby-Dick*: A New Male Studies Approach to Teaching Literature to College Men

K.C. GLOVER



The experience of males has rarely been conveyed, even in the great works of literature of the “dead white men.” Tales of heroic exploits are many, but few touch upon the depth of the male soul. With the decrease in male enrollment on college campuses, many sodden with gender studies ideology in the classroom and the campus, it is of growing importance to understand the best ways to teach young men. It is posited here that the work of Herman Melville, explicitly here his novel Moby-Dick, offers

insight into the “male experience” in a way that is lacking in much of literature. Melville gave voice to the Erotic and numinous in the life of the everyday man. Here it is offered as an antidote to the sex-obsessed and misandric views of the contemporary humanities.

Keywords: New Male Studies, male experience, Herman Melville, *Moby-Dick*

Introductory Note: Affiliated with the Modern Language Association of America, the Northeast Modern Language Association (NeMLA) hosts an annual conference primarily for scholars working in the northeastern United States and Canada. Papers are presented on topics concerning various languages, their literatures, and their pedagogies. In addition, NeMLA supports special-interest caucuses that both investigate certain challenges faced by those working in academe and organize conference panels that address these challenges. Among these groups is the Women’s and Gender Studies Caucus that, according to its web page, “welcomes members interested in feminist scholarship, women’s and gender studies, and the status of women in the profession at all stages of their careers.” NeMLA does not currently maintain a men’s caucus.

Following is one of three papers presented by members of the staff of New Male Studies at the 44th annual NeMLA convention held in Boston, Massachusetts, on March 22, 2013, hosted by Tufts University. The other two papers are included in this issue. Each paper offers practical examples of male-friendly strategies that enhance critical inquiry and teaching methods. They comprised a panel, “The New Male Studies in Praxis: Male-Positive Criticism and Classroom Practice,” that was initially proposed by one of the presenters (Dennis Gouws) as either a pedagogy or a women’s and gender-studies panel and was accepted as one among nineteen pedagogy panels. Twenty-eight women’s and gender studies panels were accepted.

The development of a New Male Studies graduate program is currently being undertaken internationally with the development of a curriculum designed around male positive ways of pedagogy. This may come as curious, as I assume that most hold the belief that most things in society privilege males. However, as Professor Groth (see “The Learning Style of Males and How to Involve College Men in the Curriculum,” current issue) has hinted at and others are increasingly writing about, our colleges and universities are losing male enrollment and it cannot be spun as merely a feel good story of increased female college enrollment. My purpose here is not to call out the various issues leading to the decline in male enrollment, but to offer a male-positive approach to teaching. My method of teaching in the New Male Studies way would be to resurrect the humanities from their ideological graves and to offer a safe place to look at the great literature and poetry of history. That Herman Melville was both arguably the greatest American novelist, especially with his leviathan tale, *Moby-Dick*, as well as unabashedly a lover of men, leads me to believe that a class based around his works would be intellectually stimulating while maintaining a male-positive approach. A close reading of his work, especially diving into the poetic world of *Moby-Dick*, would enrich students as well as provide valuable insight into a homosocial, male world. A brief history of Melville scholarship would also provide context for what has happened in the American university.

Herman Melville died unrecognized and poor in 1891, and is buried in an unremarkable grave

next to his wife in the Bronx. He never received the acclaim he thought he deserved, until the posthumous publication in 1924 of his novel *Billy Budd*, when there was a revival of interest in his work. Around this time Newton Arvin published his famous biography of Melville and D.H. Lawrence dedicated a chapter of his *Studies in Classic American Literature* to his work. The revival came to fruition after World War II with the creation of a Herman Melville society dedicated to preserving his work. These initial scholars focused on his literary quality and the grand scope of his novels, stories, and poems.

Starting at the dawn of the sixties the most pressing topic relating to his life became Melville's sexuality. The most notable contribution to this line of scholarship came from Leslie Fiedler with his *Love and Death in the American Novel*. His psychoanalytic look into Melville's work looked to find overt, covert, and latent homosexuality throughout. In our time the emphasis is still on Melville's sexuality, most notably his supposed homosexuality. Any questioning of this has led some to say, like Rictor Norton, that any attempt to dissuade others of Melville's homosexuality is homophobia and that Melville himself was "confused" and "closeted."

The starting point for a new understanding of the male in literature is a focus on experience. The point is to be radical, a to return to the roots. The soil in which these roots are planted is experience. Experience is a difficult term to discuss, as I do not merely mean "an experience" such as an IMAX movie. To badly paraphrase Aristotle: as sight is the soul of the eye, experience is the soul of the body. The New Male Studies approach would not reduce the male to biology or culture, but seek to understand his experience of both. It looks beyond behavior to the underlying experience. This is exponentially more difficult than the vogue methods of sociology, a discipline dedicated to quantitatively and qualitatively trying to identify patterns of human behavior. Behavior is deceptive and an inadequate way to understand one another; that sociology is so popular may be the result of our laziness in attempting to understand our fellow humans. Experience is something untasteful, un-touchable, unsmellable, inaudible, and poorly conveyed by words to others. *Moby Dick* itself is that "white rush" of experience, leaving us like Leda, uncomprehending and bruised.

R.D. Laing, the psychologist and showman, once wrote, "The study of the experience of others is based on inferences I make, from my experience of you experiencing me, about how you are experiencing me experiencing you experiencing me..." Experience must be understood as relational and out-in-the-world. A male human is a unique creature in how he experiences the world through his body in relation to others. To understand the male experience is to draw inferences from the experience of that unique male as he tries to communicate it to us. Poets and novelists such as Melville have offered us glimpses into the male experience, capturing the microscopic moments lost amid the study of the male in history and sociology. This is Melville's great merit.

Moby-Dick is replete with insights into the male experience of the world. Simultaneously straddling the sacred and mundane, or shattering the line all together, Melville struck deep into the heart of existence through the eyes of whalers. Reflecting on existence he echoes Bob Dylan's *All Along the Watchtower* when he delivered the darkly existential claim, "There are certain queer times and occasions in this strange mixed affair we call life when a man takes this whole universe for a vast practical joke, though the wit thereof he but dimly discerns, and more than suspects that the joke is at nobody's expense but his own." The relationships between men in Melville's novel are respite from

this joke. What small revelation would be offered to those young men struggling through shallow friendships or “bro-ships” to learn of Ishmael and Queequeg sharing their “marriage bed?” What understanding could we gain from taking an earnest look at the demonic Ahab, not as patriarch or oppressor, but as a man who would scorn the Sun and God in order to fulfill his fiery ambition? “Tell not to me of blasphemy, man; I’d strike the sun if it insulted me.” The complexities of Ahab’s character are a truer vision of the male experience than textbooks a foot thick can offer us.

So let us look closely at two specific instances of the male experience, as attempted to be conveyed to us by Herman Melville in *Moby-Dick*.

(1) The relationship between Queequeg and Ishmael has long been discussed and dissected. A cursory look at their intimacy may lead us to quickly label them as homosexual. Usually using Melville’s alleged homosexuality as a guide, some have envisioned his works as confessions or “winks” to readers from a time when homosexuality could only be written about in pornographic texts. I think that this has become the dominant narrative, no doubt a product of our times that focus so intensely on sexuality and sexual identity. Identity studies influenced scholars have also ideologically driven this climate of opinion. A more studious approach to Melville and his characters would reveal a different kind of intimacy between men that I think Queequeg and Ishmael embody as part of their characters. Queequeg is an embodiment of Melville’s encounter with Polynesian culture, one in which bodily expression of all kinds were more permissive. Before Ishmael encounters Queequeg, much like before Melville encountered the Marquesas Islands, he experienced restlessness and a “damp, drizzly November in my soul.” Both Ishmael and Melville experienced Polynesian culture as a kind of revelation, a liberation from the false courtesy of Christian nicety and bourgeois values. As Ishmael sits contemplating his pagan friend he experiences a great change, an ego orgasm as elucidated by the psychoanalysts D.W. Winnicott and Masud Khan. “I began to be sensible of strange feelings. I felt a melting in me. No more my splintered heart and maddened hand were turned against the wolfish world. This soothing savage had redeemed it.” Ishmael and Queequeg’s joining is homoerotic and most expressly an enlivening of Ishmael’s leaden, Victorian soul.

The homoerotic nature of Ishmael and Queequeg’s relationship should be stressed beyond the merely sexual. By erotic, I refer to Eros, rather than erotica. That Ishmael and Queequeg “marry” and share a “marriage bed” is a higher kind of marriage as seen in Plato’s *Symposium*, rather than in romance novels. It is no coincidence that after this ego orgasm that Ishmael experiences with Queequeg, Ishmael becomes more than another character in an adventure novel, taking to the high seas and bedding women. Instead he becomes a philosopher, contemplating the immensity of existence as it bombards him on the untamed seas in quest of the White Whale. That *Moby-Dick* is dedicated to Nathaniel Hawthorne, who I think Melville experienced ego orgasm with in his own life, sets a nice parallel between the creation of the book and Ishmael’s philosophical adventure in the story.

(2) If Ishmael is the Orphic character of *Moby-Dick*, Ahab is the Promethean man, one of the more complex characters in literature. It might be easy to pass him off as a ruthless patriarch, uncompromising and brutally leading his whale ship on a doomed venture to conquer nature, but this caricature of Ahab and men is worthless for understanding them. Ahab’s very body has been deformed in his quest for absolute knowledge and will to power, conquering the White Whale. He has lost his leg, a brutal castration that has left him mad, but imbued with a sort of divine or demonic

vision. He is both king and seer, a Rasputin of the high seas.

Ahab's relationship to his body is something that has not been stressed enough, for it is a level of experience sorely lacking in expression among males. Like a knight's suit of armor or our modern day body builders, Ahab made it known how he would see it fit for the male body to be made. "Imprimis, fifty feet high in his socks; then, chest modeled after the Thames Tunnels; then, legs with roots to 'em, to stay in one place; then arms three feet through the wrist; no heart at all, brass forehead, and about a quarter of an acre of fine brains; and let me see – shall I order eyes to see outwards? No, put a sky-light on top of his head to illuminate inwards." This great Golem of a man, wearing armor against all foes (and friends), is the character armor of the maniacally driven and blind ambition of the male soul gashed by outrageous fortune. No heart to be stopped by trifling emotions, no eyes to look upon the world, but a purely ascetic suit of armor to take on the world.

Though much of the novel sees Ahab fiercely goading on his crew to pursue the White Whale, many scenes of Ahab addressing his crew invoke imagery similar to footage of Hitler addressing the Third Reich, towards the climactic chase of *Moby Dick* we see Ahab become more contemplative. One of the last chapters before the fated chase calls to mind stories of samurai finding enlightenment on the battlefield faster than Zen monks who dedicate their life to it in monasteries. Amid the symphony of the quiet seas, Ahab's armor lowers for a time and experiences a bonding with the natural world around him. Ahab then peers into the eyes of his first mate, Starbuck, and experiences a revelation. "Close! stand close to me, Starbuck; let me look into a human eye; it is better than to gaze into sea or sky; better than to gaze upon God. By the green land; by the bright hearthstone! this is the magic glass, man; I see my wife and my child in thine eye." Ahab is able to experience a validation of his tortured humanity in the gaze of his companion Starbuck and is able to see the faces of all his loved ones there. For a time Ahab is able to rest from his fate, nearly freed by this brief universal vision, but then turns away from it, driven by his demons.

Man's place in nature comprises a large part of the text, whether contemplatively through Ishmael or menacingly through Ahab. Most importantly is Melville's attempt to ground man back in nature. Many passages that would commonly be filled with feminine nature imagery are substituted with the masculine. Our culture since Descartes has created a firm dichotomy with male/mind and female/body, which has been a disservice to both sexes. Seeing it as a disservice to only females is part of the soporific narrative of postmodern academe and requires deeper insight. Unlike others, who see Melville's attempt to masculinize nature as a product of his sexual anxieties and ambivalence, I see Melville as trying to give man a place back in nature, to see nature not just as a Mother Goddess, but more like Shiva, both male and female at the same time. Melville turned to Hinduism and it's paradoxes instead of Christianity and it's rigid categories. *Moby Dick* the whale is a hermaphrodite, supreme symbol of Melville's conception of nature. With his grasp of Eros, poetic Melville is able to grasp paradox more than scholars who emphasize sex. Melville's revival of the polymorphous perverse human body from it's puritanical shackling involves man understanding his place in nature, the great matrix from which he springs and falls.

Lastly, I think it is important to touch on those characters that aren't large players in the books greater drama. Melville is able to capture a legion of smaller characters in moments of glory, giving time to the normally unheralded men of the whaling ship. They are much like the unheralded

men of any society, those who do the dirty work that keeps the infrastructure of society running. The whale men, risking their lives to bring back the valuable whale oil to their homes, are the everymen of their day, not spoken of, but necessary for the very comfortable lives that we academics are leading while we sit in a conference about literature! Hence Melville shines a poetic light on the workers. "But this august dignity I treat of, is not the dignity of kings and robes, but that abounding dignity that has no robed investiture. Thou shalt see it in the arm that wields a pick or drives a spike; that democratic dignity which, on all hands, radiates without end from God; Himself!" The very fabric of democracy is in the loom of the common man.

This might be hard for us to swallow here, that the everyday man, that vile patriarch who upsets the fancies of academia this day, is shown in a noble light by Melville, a writer and poet, who himself traveled the seas as a whaler:

If then to meanest mariners, and renegades and castaways, I shall hereafter ascribe high qualities, though dark weave round them tragic graces; if even the most mournful, perchance the most abased, among them all, shall at times lift himself to the exalted mounts; if I shall touch that workman's arm with some ethereal light; if I shall spread a rainbow over his disastrous set of sun; then against all mortal critics bear me out in it, thou just Spirit of Equality, which has spread out one royal mantle of humanity over all my kind!

Even in the late 1800's Melville felt the need to defend the everyman from the disgust of those who could not see the importance of their work. For the sins of those few men who have enough power to rightfully be called patriarchs, these men have suffered the consequences; have faced the resentment of the ill informed. However, these are the men that we need to be heard now so that the young men who will one day take their place feel welcome in this world. Writers like Melville, in Orphic contemplation, are the ones who can attempt to make their experiences understood to us.



K.C. Glover is the Assistant Editor of *New Male Studies: An International Journal*. He is also a social worker located in Brooklyn, New York. He can be reached at kglover@aimhs.com.au.

NEW MALE STUDIES: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL (NMS) IS AN OPEN ACCESS ONLINE INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION OF ISSUES FACING BOYS AND MEN WORLDWIDE. THIS JOURNAL USES OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEMS 2.3.4.0, WHICH IS OPEN SOURCE JOURNAL MANAGEMENT AND PUBLISHING SOFTWARE DEVELOPED, SUPPORTED, AND FREELY DISTRIBUTED BY THE PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE PROJECT UNDER THE GNU GENERAL PUBLIC LICENSE.

THIS ARTICLE HAS BEEN DOWNLOADED FROM [HTTP://NEWMALESTUDIES.COM](http://newmalestudies.com).



A Male-Positive Introduction to the Victorian Manhood Question

DENNIS GOUWS



The new male studies offer an affirmative alternative to traditional gender scholarship on boys and men. Unlike pervasive men's-studies research, male studies inquiries are essentially male positive: their methodologies not only celebrate men who embody different masculinities, but also critique—and suggest strategies for overcoming—systemic inhibitors of masculine affirmation. Misandric constructions of masculine identities in gynocentric educational environments have resulted in males experiencing serious education deficits. This paper reports on a qualitative study undertaken in a British-Literature course on Victorian Manhood that offered students a male-positive approach to understanding the texts and their contexts and that solicited their written feedback on what they had learned from this experience.

Key Words: Victorian literature, manhood, male-positive pedagogy

Introductory Note: Affiliated with the Modern Language Association of America, the Northeast Modern Language Association (NeMLA) hosts an annual conference primarily for scholars working in the northeastern United States and Canada. Papers are presented on topics concerning various languages, their literatures, and their pedagogies. In addition, NeMLA supports special-interest caucuses that both investigate certain challenges faced by those working in academe and organize conference panels that address these challenges. Among these groups is the Women's and Gender Studies Caucus that, according to its web page, "welcomes members interested in feminist scholarship, women's and gender studies, and the status of women in the profession at all stages of their careers." NeMLA does not currently maintain a men's caucus.

Following is one of three papers presented by members of the staff of New Male Studies at the 44th annual NeMLA convention held in Boston, Massachusetts, on March 22, 2013, hosted by Tufts University. The other two papers are included in this issue. Each paper offers practical examples of male-friendly strategies that enhance critical inquiry and teaching methods. They comprised a panel, "The New Male Studies in Praxis: Male-Positive Criticism and Classroom Practice," that was initially proposed by one of the presenters (Dennis Gouws) as either a pedagogy or a women's and gender-studies panel and was accepted as one among nineteen pedagogy panels. Twenty-eight women's and gender studies panels were accepted.

The New Male Studies and a Male-Positive Approach to Reading Literature

The new male studies offer an affirmative alternative to traditional gender scholarship on boys and men. Unlike pervasive men's-studies research, which is fundamentally informed by feminisms, male studies inquiries are essentially male positive: their methodologies not only celebrate men who embody different masculinities, but also critique—and suggests strategies for overcoming—systemic inhibitors of masculine affirmation. Moreover, the precepts informing male-positive methodologies also differ from customary patriarchal assumptions: rather than concerning themselves with what men want for women and for other subordinated men, male studies explore what men want for themselves. The practice of male studies involves acutely attending to how masculinities are inscribed in texts, textual criticism, and pedagogy. In much Western culture, misandric and gynocentric value judgments have profoundly hindered boys' and men's wellbeing; for example, reductive chivalric and patriarchal stereotypes; which regard males as little more than pleasers, placaters, providers, protectors, and progenitors; have designated the male body primarily as an instrument of service rather than lauding it as the dignified embodiment of a sentient boy or a man.¹ Similar misandric constructions of masculine identities in gynocentric educational environments—particularly those that imagine maleness is in crisis or in need of a cure—have resulted in males experiencing serious education deficits.²

Men are increasingly underrepresented in higher education: Peg Tyre reports that, "[in] 2005, ... 57.2 percent of the undergraduates enrolled in American colleges and universities were women," that "women are [now] better educated" than men, and that "[at] present, 33 percent of women between twenty-five and twenty-nine years of age hold a four-year degree compared to 26 percent of men" (Trouble 32). Data from a 2010 report published by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) updates these percentages to thirty-five percent of women and twenty-seven percent of men (Aud et al. 214).⁴ A 2008 American Association of University Women report on girls' performance in education notes that women have earned more bachelor degrees than men since 1982, and that women earned approximately fifty-eight percent of all the bachelor degrees conferred in 2005-2006

(Corbett et al. 55, 62). In 2007-2008, women earned sixty-two percent of associate's degrees, fifty-seven percent of bachelor's degrees, sixty-one percent of master's degrees, and fifty-one percent of doctoral degrees (Aud et al. 216). At recent conferences and in the recently launched *New Male Studies: An International Journal*, scholars have begun to challenge misandric stereotypes and to remedy gynocentric educational biases by applying male-positive methods to textual analysis and teaching practice. I recently designed and taught a course on the Victorian Manhood Question that adopted celebratory and critical male-positive teaching strategies; most students demonstrated that they had understood how misandry and gynocentrism adversely influence not only representations of men and manhood, but also males' lives; in addition, some even resolved to resist these negative representations whenever they encountered them in literature and in their lives.

The Victorian Manhood Question

Since the fourteenth century, men's identities and conduct had been conceived of as a question of *manhood*; manhood had elucidated men's difference from women and boys, men's sexuality, men's duty to society, and men's courage. Manhood, moreover, had traditionally been contingent, a reputation that a man had to attain and maintain. In newly industrial nineteenth-century Britain, the manhood question considered traditional and new ways a man might grow into and sustain a meaningful, productive, and commendable type of manhood.³ My Victorian manhood question course examined these traditional and new ways of attaining and sustaining manhood within four topics: first, contending manhood identities in George Eliot's *Adam Bede*, (a novel set in the early nineteenth century when proto-industrial manhood began to contend with gentlemanliness as the measure of a man); second, industrial manhood (which examined debates by Thomas Carlyle, Thomas Babington Macaulay, and Karl Engels the consequences for men of submitting themselves to be labor as manufacturing tools); third, artistic manhood (which examined works by John Ruskin, Matthew Arnold, D. G. Rossetti, Walter Pater, and Oscar Wilde that explored art's role as moral edifier, social unifier, or antagonist to industrialization), and finally, imperial manhood (including W.E. Henley's "Invictus" and Kipling's "If—" which encouraged male stoicism in the name of empire building). Throughout the course students were encouraged to consider the extent to which the question of manhood had changed or stayed the same for men in the twenty-first century.

What Students Claim to Have Learned from the Course

I offered an end-of-the semester summative assessment that asked the twenty-two participating students to write about their most important lesson, concept, or experience gained from the course, and I used their papers as the basis for a qualitative study of what they had learned from this male-positive educational experience. To encourage the students to express themselves freely, I graded this assignment only on whether the work had been satisfactorily completed, not on what was reported: students who adequately completed the assignment were given full credit for it. For the study I grouped their papers into three categories: first, those safe, stock responses that merely reiterated either points made in class or traditional gender-studies commonplaces (five students chose to write those); second, those papers that demonstrated their authors' ability to undertake a male-positive approach to understanding manhood in both the texts we read and broader socio-historical contexts (thirteen students wrote such papers); and finally, those works that bore witness to their authors' decision to embrace aspects of a male-positive philosophy, one that celebrates masculinities, critiques their construction, and potentially resists pervasive gynocentric and misandric representations of men (four students' work provided such evidence). I will only discuss those student responses from the latter two categories because they offer clear evidence that this course successfully enabled more than three-quarters of the students to understand and apply the salient concepts of the course to the literature, its respective contexts, and their lives.

Among the respondents who successfully applied a male-positive approach to the texts and their broader contexts, both women and men commented on the normative gynocentrism they experienced in literature classes. Janey, for example, marvelled that the course enabled her, “to look at gender roles in a different way.” Moreover, she noted that “literature ... isn’t all about women,” that after “analyzing women’s roles in literature for the majority of the time [she] has been studying English, it was refreshing to focus on something new.” Mickey similarly noted that “it is refreshing to have the male gender” studied “in a positive light,” that “the texts ...read throughout the course... were a refreshing change from the norm.” Both genders also commented on how misandric assumptions pervade our society: Elsie remarked that the course successfully “allowed [her] to see that men shouldn’t always be seen in a negative way as today’s society tells us we should” and Roger noted that Kipling’s advocating for stoicism in the face of adversity in “The White Man’s Burden” “stands for the greater burden of all men [commonly and regularly] portrayed in the media.” Women and men, however, differed in their reactions to this misandry: the former were surprised at the profundity of the social pressures and the responsibilities inherent in the manhood question and the latter felt vindicated that their experience was being afforded dignified recognition. Ella appreciated learning about the “the duties and pressures different cultures and time periods put on men”; moreover, she came to appreciate that “men have always displayed tremendous effort to help others besides themselves.” Christine acknowledged the inadequacy of her “stereotypical view of men” to account for the complexity inherent in male-positive criticism: she concluded that as a result of examining “the manhood question, and defining manhood,” she now understood that “a man is very multidimensional.”

Among the male students, Theo remarked on the “enormous pressure on men to live up to [society’s moral] standards”; in addition he appreciated that “respecting these pressures and treating men with dignity” was inherent “in a male-positive approach” to literature. Sam also noted, that “very few people take the time or effort to consider how the men in society are perceived and the pressures that are placed on them”; he was grateful that the course afforded him “a deeper and more cultured understanding of [manhood and masculinity]—something he “thought” he had “figured out.” Sam concluded with satisfaction, “that is all you can really ask for from a class.” These male students clearly felt pleased that the course had respectfully addressed their educational needs.

Unique to the men’s responses to the course was an appreciation of both the male-appropriate content of the course—evident in those readings that sought better to understand men’s experiences—and the interest that the course stimulated. After remarking that “there is a lot of pressure put on a man to fit [socially determined, changing roles], Kelvin, for example, discovered that “it’s through literature that we can understand the thoughts and feelings [a] man has [when] he undergoes scrutiny which truly defines [his] manhood and masculinity,” and Adrian concurred that the central issues of the Victorian Manhood Question, “are qualities we [men] still hold onto [and] try and mold ourselves accordingly...because of all of the success” that accompanies them. These men certainly understood that the course encouraged a greater understanding of men’s experience of the social pressures inherent in the manhood question in both the Victorian era and the twenty-first century. Three students praised the male-oriented literature and male-positive approach to it for effectively generating interest in the course topics: Charles remarked that the course “was more interesting to [him] than most literature courses” because it “focused on ... masculinity and literature” and this “allowed [him] to learn more because [it] avoided the drollness of most literature course” and “allowed [him] to think more open-mindedly about literature than most courses offered” at the college. Roger concurred, praising the course for offering “something more relatable [to him], mak[ing] things much more interesting and keep[ing him] engaged.”

Among the three men who valued the course for being interesting was one who saw similar-

ities between the male-positive aspects of this approach to manhood and his personal struggle with his work ethic and self-confidence. Collin noted that the topic of Victorian manhood “gave the course an interesting twist that made it enjoyable.” He candidly acknowledged: “I have struggled with self-confidence in all areas of my life,” and in the process of working hard to improve [his] self-confidence, he came to “agree with the Victorian concept that hard work and confidence prove a person’s manhood.” Collin clearly saw the benefits of a male-positive approach to understanding his own experience and was one of four to adopt aspects of its philosophy as his own.

Like Collin these students understood that there are similarities between the laudable struggles of Victorian men to attain and sustain manhood and their own twenty-first-century struggles. Nat, for example, noted how lessons learned in the class—and particularly the strong male character in Henley’s “Invictus”—will “allow [him] to be a better man” and “attain manhood.” Two students, however, took their male-positive involvement further: choosing to commit themselves both to adopting a male-positive philosophy in their work and their lives and to critiquing and resisting the misogyny they encountered. Ted recognized how the gynocentric nature of his education had caused him to internalize misogynistic ways of thinking about men. He remarked that misogyny, “is similar to the mindset...present in previous courses [he had taken]”; moreover, he felt, “finally to take a class that focused on the elimination of [misogyny] was [both a relief] and enlightening.” Ted shared the following reflection: “I was very interested to see how my thoughts about men had been tinted/shaded from past classes, and I was eager to try and eliminate this type of thought process. This aspect of the course educated me on how to look at men and comment on their actions without coloring my thoughts with a bitter tone.”

Alex similarly adopted a male-positive attitude to his educational experience and his extracurricular life, striving for a persistent healthy resistance to the gynocentrism he had encountered in class and at home. “Throughout my life I had never really thought about a male positive approach to anything” Alex remarked; “this class has really taught me to look at stories through multiple lenses because I will always read and analyze stories with a slight male-negative view out of habit, but now I know to stop and look at the same story from a male-positive view in classes and in life.” In sum, Alex committed himself to becoming what he succinctly expressed as “a better me based on what I want and not on what others project onto me.” Collin, Nat, Ted, and Alex demonstrated through their thoughtful work that carefully accommodating male students in literature courses can have profoundly positive impacts on their lives.

Conclusions

From this teaching experience I offer two interesting observations: first, men of varying levels of academic preparation and commitment to studying literature (reflected in their final course grades) benefitted from a male-positive approach to Victorian literature. The students who either successfully undertook male-positive readings of the texts and their context or chose to adopt a male-positive philosophy represented various levels of academic achievement (their course grades ranged from A through D+). Indeed, those male students who had found the concepts taught in this course sufficiently useful to adopt a male-positive philosophy were men who experienced different levels of academic success in the course. Second, only male students were in the latter category of male-positive adopters. No women in the class demonstrated a commitment to future allied behavior. This qualitative study suggests that a male-positive approach to teaching literature—and other courses—could beneficially engage men in exploring their identities through literature and in all aspects of their lives; this approach could also help them build the confidence to demand environments that would succeed academically. Doing that would require them to challenge the gynocentric bias they encounter in academic environments. Moreover, adopting a male-positive approach would not disad-

vantage women students; they performed as well as the men on the assessments in this Victorian Manhood course. Although none committed herself to male-positive allied behavior, the women in the class gained a better understanding of men's identities and an appreciation of the costs and benefits inherent in males' negotiations of the manhood question.

Footnotes

¹Nathanson and Young's examinations of assumptions about men in western culture persuasively demonstrate how misandry and gynocentrism collude to disadvantage men in popular culture, legal discourse, and contemporary spiritualism. Although written more than a decade ago, the first work in the series, *Spreading Misandry*, effectively models an acute critical attentiveness to negative inscriptions of masculinities in popular culture. In spite of differing on the importance of literary texts to the development of chivalry, Nigel Saul and Maurice Keen acknowledge the influence of gynocentric values on Chivalry. Keen observes "The conception that chivalry forged of a link between the winning of approbation by honorable acts and the winning of the heart of a beloved woman also proved to be both powerful and enduring; western culture has never since quite shaken itself free of it" (249-50); Warren Farrell explores the contemporary remnants of this conception in his discussion of The Chivalry Factor. The chivalry debate in recent popular essays by Emily Esfahani Smith, Mark Trueblood, and Peter Wright offers vivid testimony of its topicality in the twenty-first century.

²In addition to Peg Tyre's work discussed below, see Christina Hoff Summers, chapter seven, "Why Johnny Can't, Like Read." The updated and revised edition of this book; due to be published in August, 2013; pays more attention to the male-hostile educational environment and offers some suggestions to make the educational experience more boy friendly.

³Herbert Sussman and John Tosh have produced thoughtful, but not necessarily male-positive, scholarship on nineteenth-century British manhood. This field offers many productive opportunities for new male studies research.

References

- Aud, Susan, Hussar, William, Planty, Michael, Snyder, Thomas, Bianco, Kevin, Fox, Mary Ann, Frohlich, Lauren, Kemp, Jana, Drake, Lauren. *The Condition of Education 2010* (NCES 2010-028). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC, 2010. Print.
- Corbett, Christianne, Catherine Hall, and Andresse St. Rose. *Where the Girls Are: The Facts about Gender Equity in Education* Washington D.C.: AAUW Education Foundation, May 2008. Print.
- Esfahani Smith, Emily. "Let's Give Chivalry Another Chance." *The Atlantic*. 10 December 2012. Web. 24 March 2013.
- Farrell, Warren. *The Myth of Male Power: Why Men Are the Disposable Sex*. New York: Berkley Books, 1994. Print.

- Hoff Sommers, Christina. *The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism Is Harming Our Young Men*. New York: Touchstone Books, 2000. Print.
- Keen, Maurice. *Chivalry*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1984. Print.
- Nathanson, Paul and Katherine K. Young. *Spreading Misandry: The Teaching of Contempt for Men in Popular Culture*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001. 2006. Print.
- Saul, Nigel. *Chivalry in Medieval England*. Cambridge, MA, 2011. Print.
- Springfield College *Victorian Manhood Essays*. Spring, 2011. Print.
- Sussman, Herbert. *Victorian Masculinities: Manhood and Masculine Poetics in Early Victorian Literature and Art*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995. 2008. Print.
- Tosh, John. *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999. Print.
- Trueblood, Mark. "Do you want chivalry or equality? Yes?" *A Voice for Men*. 10 January 2013. Web. 24 March 2013.
- Tyre, Peg. *The Trouble with Boys: A Surprising Report Card on Our Sons, Their Problems at School, and What Parents and Educators Must Do*. New York: Crown Publishers, 2008. Print.
- Wright, Peter. "The Rise of Chivalric Love: The Power of Shame." *A Voice for Men*. 30 March 2013. Web. 4 April 2013.



Dennis Gouws is Professor of English at Springfield College and Director of Arts and Education at the Australian Institute of Male Health and Studies. His recent publications include "Orientalism and David Hockney's Cavafy Etchings: Exploring a Male-Positive Imaginative Geography" in *The International Journal of the Arts in Society* (Vol. 6.6, 2012); and "Boys and Men Reading Shakespeare's 1 Henry 4: Using Service-Learning Strategies to Accommodate Male Learners and to Disseminate Male-Positive Literacy" in *Academic Service-Learning across Disciplines: Models, Outcomes, and Assessment* (2012).

The photograph heading the article is "Boy Studying in Candlelight" by Jan H. Andersen. His wonderful work can be seen at <http://www.jhandersen.com>.

NEW MALE STUDIES: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL (NMS) IS AN OPEN ACCESS ONLINE INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION OF ISSUES FACING BOYS AND MEN WORLDWIDE. THIS JOURNAL USES OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEMS 2.3.4.0, WHICH IS OPEN SOURCE JOURNAL MANAGEMENT AND PUBLISHING SOFTWARE DEVELOPED, SUPPORTED, AND FREELY DISTRIBUTED BY THE PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE PROJECT UNDER THE GNU GENERAL PUBLIC LICENSE.

THIS ARTICLE HAS BEEN DOWNLOADED FROM [HTTP://NEWMALESTUDIES.COM](http://newmalestudies.com).



Living With Crazy: My Experiences of an Abusive Wife

MICHAEL FARRIS
TIMOTHY BAGHURST



Women are as physically aggressive as men in domestic relationships (Archer, 2000). However, this is not necessarily recognized, and men may be distrusted when claiming domestic abuse. Thus, as part of a series of articles, our purpose is to highlight the experiences of one male who experienced such abuse, detailing the historical underpinnings, the warning signs, the physical and psychological effect of the abuse, and the challenges and stereotypes faced by a male who makes such allegations. In this first article, warning signs prior to marriage are presented in addition to an explanation of how they may be ignored.

Key Words: domestic abuse, violence, battery, spouse, male victim

Part 1: The Honeymoon and Before

I could start by telling you about the two times she tried to kill me, or how she would occasionally assault me, her little fists or feet pounding away to little effect. There were times when she would hurt herself, convulsively slamming her head, knee, elbow, against the wall.

“Is this what you want? You want to drive me crazy?” she would scream at me.

Instead I’ll start with this very simple, very real fact; women are as physically aggressive as men in domestic relationships (Archer, 2000). For those who have researched domestic violence against men, this won’t be a surprise. For the rest of you, it may seem counterintuitive, and perhaps quite surprising. It is important that you understand this fact, because what comes next is only believable if you accept that women can be as psychologically and physically violent as men. Violence is commonly about control and emotional outbursts (Bair-Merritt, Shea, Thompson, Sibinga, Trent, & Campbell, 2010). In some situations, it can be used as the final means to resolving an untenable situation; the way a cornered dog might attack a bear with reckless abandon to the consequences, for example. However, in general domestic violence is used either as a means to control a spouse or by using the spouse as a means to control another area of powerlessness (Bair-Merritt et al., 2010). This is the way it was with Alex, my ex-wife. Yes, I changed the name, but some may appreciate the reference to *Fatal Attraction*.

The violence began over my sexual activity prior to marriage, and it began on our honeymoon. Alex was a virgin while I was not; however, she knew this going into the marriage. This simple fact brought forth more bile and venom than I’ve ever seen come out of someone, and I’ve seen *Jersey Shore*. During the second day of our honeymoon, she started to ask me questions about my sexual history. Now I was raised in a fairly conservative home in which, a) we didn’t talk about sex, and b) premarital sex was a slap to God’s face. I was ashamed of my past sexual “infidelities” (and this is what they are if you believe that God had intended only one person for you), and they were not something I wanted to discuss but forget about.

When I told her I didn’t want to discuss them, she insisted on the specific details, as if they were some sort of amulet to ward off the paralyzing fears in her head. She wanted to know what was done, with whom, and how.

I was savvy enough to know that more details only would make things worse. I knew that more details meant more things she could ruminate over, more things she could compare herself with, more ways to find herself lacking. So I held out, and she became enraged. “You brought all these women into our bed and you won’t keep this from me!” she screamed.

Trapped in a hotel room in a foreign country, during what was supposed to be one of the happiest times of my life, I was emotionally eviscerated. “How could this be happening?” I asked myself. When I didn’t tell her what she wanted to hear, she came at me. Liked a caged animal who breaks out to exact revenge against its captor; like the tiger Montecore mauling Roy, she came at me with arms swinging and legs kicking.

At first it didn’t register with me that I was being attacked, and for perspective it’s important to describe the scene. I am a former high school lineman and weigh over 250lbs. She was petite and there may have been 100lbs on her 5’4” frame. From an outside perspective it may have seemed almost comical to see such a small woman leaping on top of a big guy and trying to beat him down. Her punches and kicks were not well aimed, and even with her on top of me she was not able to actually make an impact. Although research on partner violence suggests that some males find female partner violence to be comedic (Holtzworth-Munroe, 2005), to me, it wasn’t so funny. It finally dawned on me that I was being assaulted when she started spitting.

For those of you who have never been spat upon, there is a visceral feeling of being degraded when someone spits on you. It’s doubly so if they spit in your face, and when your attacker is on top of you, there’s only one place where that spittle is going. The first time it hit my cheek, the total gravity of the situation pushed me through the bed, down through the hotel floor, the concrete, the bedrock, and down to the molten core of the earth burning like her rage. I knew then that I was in way over my head.

After she spat, I can remember rolling us both over so that I was on top, and holding her arms at her sides, and turning my head to the side (evasive maneuvers to avoid the spit-to-eye contact) until her rage gave way to tearful sobbing.

Through her tears she moaned, “Why don’t you love me?”
“I do...Alex what’s going on?”

I couldn’t understand what was happening and she couldn’t explain it to me. It made no sense to me. Alex’s back was never against the wall; there was never a gun to her head, but she attacked me because she didn’t know how to relieve her pain in any other way.

She would recover, her insecurities would subside, and we attempted to honeymoon. But, at least once a day, her insecurities would emerge in some way. Sometimes she would ask these questions during times when she wasn’t distracted. However, there were also times when we would be in a passionate moment and she would become lost to her nightmares. “Is this how you did it with her?”, or “She was better than me, wasn’t she?” were questions asked more than once while we were making love.

Alex’s insecurities were not always displayed through physical violence, but she would become overwhelmed. Sometimes out of nowhere she would start up about my past, and other times a scantily clad female on TV would jumpstart her insecurities. In those moments no amount of my reassurance would make a difference. I tried it all. The truth through phrases like “You’re the only woman I want.” and “You’re the sexiest woman in the world.” could not usurp the hold her fears had

over her. She was obsessed with her insecurities, and the depth to which she could feel them extended to the marrow.

The question this preamble begs is, “Didn’t I see this coming?” After all, this amount of crazy, or its violent manifestations, should have shown themselves a priori, right? Just like the research suggests (Lang, 2012) they did; however, I immured myself to them for “love’s sake”. Let me back up a little and explain.

Alex came to the US on a tourist visa so that she could serve as an intern at my church. At that time I was leading a college-aged group within the church. The first time I saw her was at a party to celebrate her arrival. I was at the party to seek advice from our pastor about a member of my group who was in significant legal trouble.

It was an Arkansas January, everything cold and soggy from long weeks of drizzle. I don’t remember much of Alex other than she looked exhausted from her trip from Brazil. She was a little dark-haired girl with dark circles around her eyes. It was not love at first sight. We didn’t have much contact at first, as she wasn’t a member of the group that I led. She was opinionated and quickly developed a cold war with another female member of my group, thus alienating her from my group. We were really only acquaintances until we took a 22-hour bus trip to Colorado as part of a church-organized skiing trip. It’s funny to think about, but I don’t imagine many romantic stories start on a bus anymore.

There were no open seats on the bus so we were forced to sit beside each other. We talked the entire way there, and I was surprised to find that we had many things in common. We both liked folk-rock musicians like Damien Rice. We were both interested in medicine. At that time she wanted to become a nurse in the US and go back to Brazil in order to raise the reputation of nurses in Brazil. I found this to be admirable. She was effervescent and easy to talk to. She seemed mature for her age and certain of herself. Of course, I would later find that neither of these things were true, but during our week in Colorado, we fell in love.

Alex came to the US somewhat coincidentally. In 2005, she took a trip to California and met a man from my church on their airplane. During the flight, he related that he knew a young man named Saul, and asked Alex if she would pray for him, as he was a soldier in Iraq. They met again at a seminary in Brazil a year later where she was invited to do her internship at my church. Think about those odds; really think about them. There are approximately 300 million people in the USA and 200 million in Brazil. There are millions of things you could discuss with a stranger on an airplane. That two Christians (from different countries) would meet on their way to California, that she would be asked to pray for me, and then they would meet coincidentally a year later seems impossible. It seemed meant to be. Looking back, this is one of my failings. I’m a romantic. Where other people would see chance or coincidence, I see providence.

Events like Alex praying for me or our sharing a row on a bus held a special meaning for me and would later hold me in my marriage. I viewed events like these as harbingers of our life together. I held them close to my heart and they defended me against my intuition telling me something was wrong. I thought I was where God wanted me to be, and if I just prayed enough and waited, every-

thing would work out. I told myself that the winds of time would sweep through, the smoke would clear, and the marriage I expected would be revealed. The smoke did finally clear only to reveal an inferno threatening to consume both of our lives.

The danger in romantic thinking is that it clouds the judgment. It gives us an excuse to ignore the obvious wrongs in our lives. In psychiatry, they would call it a delusion. A delusion is described as a false belief that is based on incorrect inference about external reality that persist despite the evidence to the contrary (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). It sets you on a path where every coincidence, every instance of *déjà vu*, has some deep, connected, cosmic meaning. It sets you up for failure, as you miss the more obvious signs that would normally save you heartache.

The fact that Alex couldn't get along with the other girl in my group should have been a red flag. Alex felt like the other girl should pray more during group meetings. I know that sounds like such an inconsequential thing (and it is), but because she didn't/wouldn't change, Alex stopped talking to her. Alex had many conflicts with people like this. She would find some slight, either real or imagined, and become fixated on it. As a consequence, these people would be dead to her.

There were other warning signs which I chose to ignore. The first family she stayed with while she interned in the US opened their home to her. They bent over backwards to help her. They let her live with them for free, but they did ask to know where she would be. This isn't an unrealistic request given that they felt responsible for a young female in a foreign country. However, she felt like they were controlling. Once she left their home she never looked back, and forever held a grudge against them.

There were times when she would become enraged and have a complete breakdown because something didn't go her way. A flat tire was a sign that God didn't love her and she would be ruined for days.

At one point she went through my Facebook postings. Now these weren't just the recent posts, but posts months and years old. Somewhere in them she found a sarcastic, irreverent comment I had made to an old girlfriend. It enraged her. What was feeding that search? Her all-consuming relationship insecurity. At the time my phone was off because I was in class. When I turned the phone on after class I had missed 33 calls, multiple text messages and several voicemail messages accusing me of cheating. Had I been a more self-aware person, I would have ended it there. But, I thought, she was "The One", like some kind of asshole in a *Highlander* movie. Thus, I apologized and spent hours combing through Facebook and email accounts making sure that I scrubbed them free of any hints of girlfriends past.

There were other instances like this, but it's my nature to give people the benefit of the doubt. She also had an indefatigable desire to control who my friends were and how much time I spent with them. If Alex felt that I talked to a buddy of mine too much, she might imply that we were gay or just complain until I caved in and stopped talking to him.

When Alex would go crazy I always tried to convince myself that her statements or actions could be attributed to a specific situation or were a reasonable, albeit extreme, response to some

slight from another person. She would often become angry with people and say terrible things about them. For example, there was a time when we were in church, and as churches do, they were highlighting an area of ministry; in this case it was adoption. They were showing a video of people in our church who had adopted, and were encouraging us to consider adoption. Alex became incensed. She started to mutter about a couple that had helped us in our marriage and told me they should stop being lazy and adopt. She went on to say that they weren't "real" Christians because they hadn't adopted. At first I thought she was joking, but she kept it up through the service and even afterwards. It was as if she felt put upon by the pro-adoption video, and was transferring this sense of guilt onto a couple who had invested a lot of time and energy into our marriage. To this day I don't know why she felt that way, and she never recanted or apologized.

After dating for six months, a major crisis in Alex's life developed. She had come to the US on a tourist visa to complete an internship for her seminary degree in Brazil. During the course of this visit she had been given an opportunity to stay and go to college in the US. Unfortunately, she had been given some bad immigration advice and as a consequence, was forced to leave the country. When this outcome was finally determined, she turned her focus into marrying me as an "end around" immigration.

I didn't have much objectivity, but I knew that neither of us was ready for marriage. I knew that making a major life decision out of fear is almost always a bad decision. Until the moment she boarded her airplane to Brazil, Alex held out hope that God would change my mind. He didn't. However, while she was "waiting" on God, she laid into me with criticism and guilt. "You're indecisive. You're not a real man." she would say, or, "God thinks you're doing the wrong thing." Let's not forget the classic line from every asshole who has pressured his girlfriend into sexual favors, "If you loved me, you would do this for me."

The worst manipulation was when she would quote people I respected saying that they were disappointed with my decision to not marry her. I knew that she was hurt and that that was why she felt justified in saying these awful things to me. But, the idea that other people thought I was wrong and were disappointed in me filled me with self-loathing and doubt. Alex said these things, knowing full well that she could do so with impunity. She knew that out of shame, I wouldn't check her story. If she had been quoting people I was close to, or at least people I was closer to than she was, I might have followed up. She knew better, and I didn't think to question it. In essence, I had a part to play in all of this and in some ways contributed to our dysfunction (National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence, n.d.). There is a common empathic reaction to someone who has had some kind of trauma perpetrated upon them. We attempt to make it "better" or "less worse" for that person. "It's not your fault." we say. "You didn't make X do Y to you." In the short term maybe it's okay to say that. Perhaps the objective is to prevent someone from feeling blame or shame for what happened; to allow them to heal from their wounds. But, from my experience, owning up and taking responsibility was what is sometimes needed instead of the "head in the sand" attitude. Taking responsibility allowed me to take control and become a better person out of this mire.

My main contribution to our problems was passivity. In my life I was taught by both example and by religion that the "right" thing was never taking what you wanted. To openly pursue what you wanted was greedy and selfish. I understood that to take what you wanted was a sin. To be honest, I

saw it as a virtue to choose last and to always put others before myself. Coupled with deep desire to understand and empathize with people, I was set up to fail.

Alex took root in this. Really, her brand of intimidation (threats and violence) only survives in a relationship with someone like me. A person who is assertive will either flee wrath like Alex's or their craziness will break upon the rocks of sanity. I too, like Alex, had questionable self-esteem. Mine played out in not getting help for us sooner. When Alex would crank up the crazy, I would tell her that we needed help. Her response was to, very easily, manipulate my insecurities, predisposition to passivity, and primary imperative to "do the right thing". If I would say that we needed help, she would say that she would call the police and tell them that I was abusing her. If she acted out in public, she would blame it on me and say that I had caused her to become upset.

If you were raised in the Judeo-Christian tradition, like I have been, then you may think that what I'm calling a vice (self-sacrifice) is a virtue. In my interpretation, self-sacrifice was deceptive. Not asserting myself was being deceitful and, moreover, it allowed me to hide behind the veil of moral superiority. I didn't take what I wanted therefore I'm not being greedy. I'm being selfless and by sacrificing myself, I was being a "good" man. Worthy of its own discourse, it's a blatant falsehood. While my part of our dysfunction was not as overtly wrong as Alex's, it nonetheless carries the same weight. Alex burned down our relationship with gasoline and dynamite, while I sat back and let it rot away.

Part II: Marriage and Misery

Deportation

One of the greatest tragedies of this story is the death of a dream: two partners weaving the tapestry of a life together. I don't miss Alex, but I grieve the loss of that dream. It may be I that put marriage upon a pedestal, the heights to which it should never be placed upon. I think the elevation of marriage in my mind began with my parents. They both came from divorced homes and knew the heartache and loss it caused. They wanted something different for their children and they have always held a reverence for marriage, even if their own wasn't perfect. And, then there was New Testament Christianity. Modern evangelical Christianity spends a disproportionate amount of time instructing on sex and marriage. They recognize the stabilizing effect that long-term marriages have on their church bodies and society at large. The church's view on an almost irrevocable marriage contract is reinforced with the rich symbolism of Jesus as the groom and the church as his bride. I was taught from the beginning that it was God's best to postpone sex until marriage. Furthermore, it was hammered home that divorce was only acceptable in the most grievous of circumstances; that is unrepentant adultery. Marriage was not to be taken, or dissolved, lightly.

In the 5 months we had dated, prior to Alex's deportation, we had discussed marriage. This

discussion was based on the understanding that there were things we wanted to accomplish first; college/nursing school for her and medical school for me. Marriage was a distant event, something that we would do once we had completed our education.

However, when Alex learned that she was to be deported, marriage suddenly became not just a discussion, but a necessity. She had learned that if we married, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services would permit her to stay in the US. And, if we didn't, she could be barred for up to 5 years from reentering the US. I went to see her every night during the weeks leading up to her exit. One night, a few days before she left for Brazil, I visited her at a friend's home that she was temporarily living in. When I entered the house, the lights had been dimmed and Alex called to me from the living room. I found her there, dwarfed in an oversized La-Z-y boy recliner, sitting on her legs. The ambience and her position reminded me of one of those movie scenes where the killer is lurking in the dark, like Chili Palmer from *Get Shorty*, for example.

"I've been praying and I know that you're going to marry me." she said in an even voice. In a slow, measured motion she turned her head towards me. "I've been praying and God gave me this peace."

In that moment, she had the calm of a serial killer and the fanatical certainty of an underwear bomber. In the four years that I knew Alex she was never that calm or certain again. She *knew* that I would propose to her that night.

She was wrong. I simply couldn't do it. There was something so completely, absolutely wrong about her push for us to marry. The impetus wasn't inseparable love or God's plan. It was to circumvent a legal system that Alex had accidentally crossed. When it came to marital discussion, there were never plans to elope to Vegas or the Friar's cell. I don't remember our conversation that night, but, I know I didn't relent. I didn't lie about my intentions either; I was direct and told her that we wouldn't be wed then.

My refusal to marry drove a wedge in Alex's well-planned agenda. Unfortunately for her, there were only a few days left before she was to be deported. Thus, she used whatever and whomever she could to guilt me into marriage. She told me that other people thought I should marry her now, and that I was being indecisive and not a man. She told me that people thought I was a liar and that I wasn't a Christian. Of course, most of these quotes were complete fabrications. Had Alex taken a different route and professed her undying love, declaring that no matter if we got married then or later she would make it work, I believe I would have married her then.

The subtleties of human interactions demonstrate the deepest parts of who we are and the respect we share for one another. They are the hidden glue of civilization, providing a framework for taking care of one another. For example, saying something as simple as "I'm sorry" can have a profound effect on someone's reaction to a tragedy. In many states, "Benevolent gesture" or "Apology laws" had to be passed so that doctors and motorist could express empathy without accepting legal liability (Caspar & Stallworth, 2012; Robbennolt, 2003; Zimmerman, 2004). With these laws in place, people were "allowed" to respond in the caring way they wanted to, and subsequently wronged people's anger was assuaged and the number of lawsuits and the amount of awards dropped. These sim-

ple social constructs, the simplest words, can ease anger and smooth over offense. With her thinly veiled manipulations, Alex violated them and something subconsciously told me to dig in and not marry.

I vaguely remember Alex leaving for Brazil a few days later. I saw her off at the airport and it was what you would expect from separation and an uncertain future; tearful goodbye and promises to call. She rode the escalator up and away, and my heart was broken.

There's a normal, healthy amount of guilt I should have, and did feel, when I let Alex go. I believed that she was the monolithic "one", my Juliet, my Maude. This idea carries with it a certain poetic gravitas... certain expectations; chiefly, that you will move heaven and earth to be with that person. I know this sounds like the romantic rhetoric echoed in every awful tween vampire book or homogenized pop song, but in reality it's one of the oldest archetypes (Bulfinch, n.d.). Since I was a little boy I can remember feeling a pull to find the one woman, that right woman, I was supposed to be with. This naive, deeply held belief would play a part in my undoing.

The Continental Divide

The following three and a half months, before we wed, were awful. I had to deal with my own sense of loss and doubt, which Alex compounded with her grief and constant derision of my decision not to marry her. "Everyone is disappointed in you." "No one believes that you love me." "They don't think you're a man." "When are you going to marry me? You said we would, but it's never going to happen."

I held out for a few weeks. I believed that what I had done was right. I knew that if we were meant to be then it would work out somehow. But, under the pressure of her manipulation, in my own weakness and romantic naiveté I caved. There was no proposal. There was only my, "I will marry you" and a date set. Although I should have been excited, I felt defeated in that moment, gravely resigned to follow through on a course I would not have freely chosen. It had never dawned on me that my "on bended knee" moment would come with a thud and not an echoing cry of celebration. I had dreamed up these elaborate scenarios of proposing. This moment was none of them. To Alex's credit, I don't think it was the way she wanted it either, and later during one of our arguments she would let me know that with a scream. But, she wanted so badly to be back in the US (or married to me), she wasn't willing to stifle her want long enough to get a proper proposal.

The months leading up to the ceremony were tumultuous. Alex stopped eating and became anemic. She didn't go outside much because she couldn't face people who questioned the existence of her American fiancé. She thought that her mother and grandmother were hijacking her wedding preparations and fought with them constantly. Marrying a foreigner in Brazil was a hassle that involved lots of paper/footwork on Alex's end. And finally, Alex was robbed at gun point. In Brazil it's custom to hand deliver wedding invitations. One day while doing this, she got out of her car and a "street kid" saddled up beside her on his bike. He pulled out a "shiny" revolver and relieved Alex of her purse. Alex not only lost her purse, but also control of her bladder. It was a horrible experience. This was the debris that littered the landscape of our imminent wedlock.

The week between when I landed in Brazil and the wedding was uneventful. Alex was dis-

tracted with last minute details and the focus was on her; which is why I think things didn't go off the rails until the honeymoon.

There were two wedding ceremonies; one legal and one religious. The legal wedding, a necessity due to my status as a foreigner, was held at the local federal building two days before the religious ceremony. The religious ceremony was a formal sit-down dinner wedding. The wedding hall was beautiful. It was painted white and there were bouquets of roses and candles suspended from the ceiling in such a way to appear as though they were levitating. There was an interpreter and two preachers. One did the ceremony and the other gave a sermon on marriage. A three-stringed instrument band played in the background. Alex was beautiful and happy. After the ceremony, as everyone ate, Alex and I went table to table thanking people for attending and auctioning off parts of my tie for honeymoon money.

From the wedding, her father and grandmother drove us to a hotel where we would spend the night before flying out to our honeymoon destination the following day. I remember Alex being fiercely angry that her father was driving us and not her grandmother's driver. There wasn't an explanation for her anger; not one that I could imagine nor one she could supply. She was angry, at the exhausting end of what had been up to that point a happy day.

Solitary Imprisonment

"You want to fuck her, don't you!" she half mumbled, huddled against me. I didn't think it was a question.

"What?" I said through a marmalade haze of too much TV.

"You want to fuck her!" The volume of her voice picked up as her body pulled away from mine.

"Who are you talking about?"

"That slut on the TV!"

She was referring to the Carnival drum queen on TV. The woman in question was nude from the waist up and be sequined with body paint and plumes of ostrich feathers radiating from the back of her keister and neck. Nudity and beautiful women are a common part of Carnival in Brazil. In fact, it's not uncommon to see advertisements with topless women during Carnival season. The samba school parades during live broadcasts are littered with dancers in various stages of dress.

I hadn't commented on the woman, and in reality it didn't fully register with me that I was watching a naked woman. We had returned to her parents apartment after the honeymoon and I was in that haze that can only come from watching TV and being completely unproductive.

"No I don't want to have sex with her." I said flatly.

"Then why were you lusting after her?!?" she yelled incredulously.

"I wasn't lusting after her. She came on TV and I was watching TV."

"You could've changed the channel."

"You have the remote control!" I yelled back.

"I don't care. From now on I'm going to cover your eyes whenever there are naked girls or sex

on TV!” she said with authority.

“Yeah, that’s not going to happen,” I said, as she began to become angry.

“See, you do want to fuck those girls. You do want to cheat on me,” she moaned in half-feigned sadness.

“No I don’t, but you’re not going to control me.”

“If you don’t want to cheat then you’ll let me cover your eyes,” she retorted.

“No, this is crazy. This isn’t how marriages work. You have no reason not to trust me,” I reasoned.

“You don’t call me crazy!” she screamed at me.

That’s when she started hitting me. Her little fists came at me but were easily deflected. When she realized that they weren’t connecting, she stood up on the couch and started kicking me. Her escalation required me to escalate. I wrapped my right arm behind her knees and bringing them towards me pushed back on her chest with my left hand. This had the effect of dropping her on to the couch beneath me. I held her arms because she was trying to hit and scratch me.

“Stop it! Stop fighting!” I said.

“Why don’t you love me and why are you cheating on me?” she railed.

She started spitting on me causing me to recoil. Then, she launched off of the couch and began storming around the living room.

“This is nuts. We need help, Alex!” I demanded.

“No you’re not going to talk to anyone” she screamed as she turned her head and started hitting it on the concrete wall.

She only did this twice before transitioning to slamming her knee into the wall, I think because the pain was greater than her desire to manipulate me.

“Is this what you want? You want to drive me crazy?” she screamed as she continued to beat her knee against the wall.

This was madness! I’d never had a very good analogy for the word madness, but this is what madness is; your new wife is barbarically hurting herself while violently declaring you responsible for her actions. And, how did I respond? I laughed. It wasn’t normal laughter but something more akin to the manic laughter of a man facing something that is both wholly beyond his reason yet comically absurd. She was hurting herself, and she was doing it to control me, that is for “interpersonal influence” (Allen, 1995; Brown, Comtois, & Linehan, 2002).

The effect my laughter had on Alex was to make her take the crazy up another notch. She stomped a meter and a half into the kitchen where I heard a drawer open and the reckless jostling of silverware. When she emerged from the kitchen she was holding up her shirt and pressing the business end of a large butcher’s knife into her stomach. She lacked the strength of her convictions to go perform seppuku. I should reinforce that these were half-hearted attempts at hurting herself. The goal wasn’t to hurt herself but more insidious. It was to control me. She was counting on my empathy and love, counting on them so that she could use them against me, to form the shackles of

my capitulation. When I saw the knife I sprung off of the couch and headed towards her. Subconsciously, I believed she didn't intend to really harm herself, but I also knew that the margin of error was thinner with a knife than it was when battering her knee against a wall. As I moved, she began to draw the knife's edge against her stomach like a bow against a violin string.

"This is crazy! You need help!" I yelled at her as I walked toward her. I intended to wrestle the knife away from her. "I'm going to have to tell your mom or grandmother, because you need help."

This triggered something inside her. I think the fear of being publicly shamed was greater than her desire to control me, because once I had said that she turned the knife towards me and began moving, ominously, in my direction. Her face contorted with rage as she threatened me.

"You're not going to tell anyone anything. I won't let you!"

The apartment we were living in, had only two exits and both of them were behind Alex. From the menacing look on her face I knew that she was no longer interested in hurting herself, and she was advancing on me knife in hand. I backpedaled to the only place I could, the balcony. We were on the eighth floor, and the balcony opened to an apartment building-lined street that led down to the ocean 50 meters away. I got out to the balcony and pulled the sliding glass door shut. She tried to open it, but I held it in place pressing the glass against its frame. She was cursing in a blend of Portuguese and English, as she locked the glass door from the inside and threw closed the drapes. I found myself alone save the company of the roaring waves pounding against the beach. It was raining, it was night, and the streets were empty.

I was locked out for two hours before I heard the latch click back. The door didn't open for me so I went in cautiously. We didn't talk. I don't know what you say after an episode like that. Even if I could have formed the words in my mind, exhaustion would have stolen them from my lips. This episode was never discussed until two years later during a "Peacemakers" counseling meeting in which Alex would deny that it happened, or rather deny that she made any threats to kill me.

Was she trying to kill me? It's a clear question with a difficult to resolve answer. However, given that this episode happened three weeks into a three and a half year marriage, it's obvious that I had to resolve it in my mind to stay in the marriage. What was Alex's intent? Intent is a mercurial thing and resolves only on personal disclosure and belief in the revealer. We can draw on context clues, but to truly know someone's intent we have to first trust that person and then have them tell us "why" they did it. And, since Alex never talked about this episode, I can only speculate at her intent. Was she trying to hurt me with the knife clenched in her hand, or was she just angry and happened to have a knife in her hand? Instead of injuring me, did she instead intend to manipulate me into apologizing, as is sometimes the case (Mechem, Shofer, Reinhard, Hornig, & Datner, 1999; McLeod, 1984)?

Alex had a history of manipulating me, even if I didn't always consciously recognize it. I think I know what intent to harm looks like. I've been in fights before and the desire to push my fists through someone's face was so visceral I could taste it. It's such an unbridled feeling, yet Alex's motions were controlled. I feel like she lacked the depth of feeling, the courage, to carry it through. It was all so contrived, like so many other things with her. The many times when she would try to harm

herself were always half-hearted. The pain of running the knife along her stomach would make her recoil before the skin was broken. Slamming her knee against the concrete wall would force her to the ground before she broke anything. I could of course just be explaining away her behavior and giving her a pass; displaying my own inability to recognize the truth, to see the capacity for violence in her soul. The truth is that women can be just as violent as men (Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980).

There is the truth and then there is the way we perceive the truth. This is one of the reasons that eye witnesses are not always considered to be credible (Wells & Bradfield, 1998). I chose to believe that she didn't really mean the violent things she did or the hateful words she said. Whether or not I was right, it's the truth I saw in that situation. And so, I stayed. I had a friend once ask me why I stayed when he thought most people would be done. Would they be done? If you have this certainty that you're supposed to be with this person, that they are the "one" that God has chosen for you, would you so quickly give up on your destiny? Other issues also mitigated my response to her reactions. I felt guilty about my previous sexual history due to my Christian beliefs. I also agreed with her that gratuitous nudity shouldn't be on basic television. Of course, the way she reacted with all of this was wrong. But, I rationalized that with time her reactions could be changed or, at least, muted.

At the time, I had an unbreakable sense that marriage was forever even though 40% - 60% of new marriages end in divorce (Williams, Sawyer, & Wahlstrom, 2005). This belief is the strongest of all chains, one forged over years in the heat of dogmatic Christianity, and reinforced by parents who suffered the anguish of divorce as children. At that time divorce simply was not a possible option. You're suffering an affliction that has no conceivable cure, almost like the way medieval people suffered the plague and could not have dreamed of penicillin. Divorce was just as unimaginable to me.

Four weeks after our wedding, having been physically attacked, spat upon, verbally and emotionally abused, I returned to the US to resolve her immigration issues while Alex remained in Brazil. I boarded the plane having been put through an emotional meat grinder. Some might see this as an opportunity to have escaped, and perhaps it was. However, I didn't. And things got worse.

References

- Allen, C. (1995). Helping with deliberate self-harm: Some practical guidelines. *Journal Of Mental Health, 4*(3), 243-250. doi:10.1080/09638239550037523
- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*(5), 651-680. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.126.5.651
- Bair-Merritt, M. H., Shea Crowne, S., Thompson, D. A., Sibinga, E., Trent, M., & Campbell, J. (2010). Why do women use intimate partner violence? A systematic review of women's motivations. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 11*(4), 178-189. doi:10.1177/1524838010379003
- Brown, M. Z., Comtois, K., & Linehan, M. M. (2002). Reasons for suicide attempts and nonsuicidal self-injury in women with borderline personality disorder. *Journal Of Abnormal Psychology, 111*(1), 198-202. doi:10.1037/0021-843X.111.1.198

- Bulfinch, T. Pyramus and Thisbe Retrieved 1/18, 2013, from <http://ancienthistory.about.com/od/myths/a/101810-Pyramus-And-Thisbe-By-Thomas-Bulfinch.htm>
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (2005). Female perpetration of physical aggression against an intimate partner: A controversial new topic of study. *Violence and Victims, 20*, 253–261.
- Kaspar, D. J., Stallworth, L. E. (2012). The impact of a grievant's offer of apology and the decision-making process of labor arbitrators: A case analysis. *Harvard Negotiation Law Review, 17*(1), 1-59.
- Lang, S. C. (2012). The earliest warning signs of intimate partner violence. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 72*.
- McLeod, M. (1984). Women against men: An examination of domestic violence based on an analysis of official data and national victimization data. *Justice Quarterly, 23*, 171-193.
- Mechem, C. C., Shofer, F. S., Reinhard, S. S., Hornig, S. H., & Datner, E. (2008). History of domestic violence among male patients presenting to an urban emergency department. *Academic Emergency Medicine, 6*(8), 786-791.
- National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence (n.d.). Power and control wheel. Retrieved from http://www.ncdsv.org/images/Power_and_Control_wheel_NCDSV.pdf.
- Robbennolt, J. K. (2003). Apologies and Legal Settlement: An Empirical Examination. *Michigan Law Review, 102*(3), 460-516. doi: 10.2307/3595367
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Press.
- Wells, G. L., & Bradfield, A. L. (1998). "Good, you identified the suspect:" Feedback to eyewitnesses distorts their reports of the witnessing experience. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(3), 360-376.
- Williams, B. K., Sawyer, S. C., & Wahlstrom, C. M. (2005). *Marriages, families, and intimate relationships: A practical introduction*. New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Zimmerman, R. (2004). Doctors' new tool to fight lawsuits: saying 'I'm sorry.' *Malpractice insurers find owning up to errors soothes patient anger. 'The risks are extraordinary'.* *The Journal of the Oklahoma State Medical Association, 97*(6), 245-247.



Michael Farris is a resident intern at Oregon Health Sciences University. He is a veteran of Operation Iraqi Freedom III and an Eagle Scout.



Timothy Baghurst is Assistant Professor of Kinesiology at Henderson State University in Arkadelphia, Arkansas. His main research interests are in male body image (muscle dysmorphia) and the perceptions of educators based on their physiques. He can be reached at tbaghurst@live.com.

NEW MALE STUDIES: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL (NMS) IS AN OPEN ACCESS ONLINE INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION OF ISSUES FACING BOYS AND MEN WORLDWIDE. THIS JOURNAL USES OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEMS 2.3.4.0, WHICH IS OPEN SOURCE JOURNAL MANAGEMENT AND PUBLISHING SOFTWARE DEVELOPED, SUPPORTED, AND FREELY DISTRIBUTED BY THE PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE PROJECT UNDER THE GNU GENERAL PUBLIC LICENSE.

THIS ARTICLE HAS BEEN DOWNLOADED FROM [HTTP://NEWMALESTUDIES.COM](http://newmalestudies.com).

Book Reviews



John Guy, *Thomas Becket: Warrior, Priest, Rebel: A Nine-Hundred-Year-Old Story Retold*, New York: Random House, 2012.

John Guy's careful examination of Thomas Becket's life questions hagiographical commonplaces about the Archbishop, about Henry the Second, his king, and about their friendship. Becket is described as stubborn and self-righteous: Guy observes that "he assumed that everyone shared his values and had the same ardor in pursuing them" (343). Henry is similarly stubborn: Guy notes, moreover, that he was also "utterly self-assured" and "did what he wanted when he wanted, night or day, rather than pleasing others for the sake of it or working to a plan" (81). Both men are presented as impulsive yet cleverly strategic: Becket's breathtaking betrayal of his fellow clerics at the Council of Clarendon is matched by Henry's sacrilegious oath breaking that undermined his nobles and clergy, and both men's actions suggest their brinkmanship rather than their malice. Both are not only intelligent—having "highly retentive" memories—but also impressively athletic: Thomas is described as "unusually tall," "good-looking," and an "accomplished horseman" who as a boy participated in "martial exercises [that] were integral to Anglo-Norman male bonding"—most notably the "mock tournaments ... held at Smithfield every Sunday in lent" (83, 14,17); Henry is "well above average height" although shorter than Beckett, his "complexion ruddy," and "dressed for much of the time in riding gear, his legs were bruised constantly from kicking his horses" (81). Their common interests and temperaments seem to have enabled a sound manly, chivalric camaraderie.

The historical basis of their legendary friendship, Guy argues, is, however, unconvincing:

Henry “found Becket useful, amusing, and companionable, indulging him and treating him as a favorite, but knowing that such privileges could always be withdrawn”; Thomas, according to Guy, was “n ive and experienced enough to believe it was something unique, even a relationship of near equals, whereas in reality it was a partnership of convenience” (121). This corrective argument is augmented by the author’s skillful collation of documentary evidence gleaned from contemporary authors such as Becket’s friend, John of Salisbury (who notes Becket’s constantly having to “contend ...against the king himself” [345]) and his critic, Peter of Celle (whose dry rejoinder to Becket’s request for his friendship—“what common ground is there between the Abbot of Celle and the chancellor of the English king?”—baldly lays bare Beckett’s real relationship with Henry [173]). Indeed, Guy’s strength lies in his judicious use of such evidence, augmented by concise lessons in English and Norman dynastic politics and history (most skillfully integrated into chapters four, six, seven, and eleven). His typical thoroughness is evident in his examination of the circumstances occasioning Henry’s apocryphal outburst, “Who will rid me of this turbulent priest?” (310): Guy provides three separate documented accounts of it before concluding that “it was undoubtedly ‘for’ him, if not ‘by him, that Thomas was murdered” by Reginald Fitz-Urse, William de Tracy, Richard Brito, and Hugh de Morville (311).

This disciplined use of documentary material often satisfies the reader’s curiosity about what motivated Thomas the Archbishop and Henry the King; however, its inevitable inability to provide satisfying accounts of Thomas and Henry as fully embodied men (rather than contending minds), because of a scarcity of reliable information, is most apparent in the treatment of their desire. Guy more convincingly describes Henry’s limbic-brained sex life as “tainted by bouts of debauchery (83),” but his diffident examination of Thomas’s sexuality seems obfuscatory.

Becket’s body features prominently in his biography as the source of his painful colitis, of his physical pleasure in sports, and of his mortification. When Guy deals with Becket’s sexuality, he acknowledges what John of Salisbury delicately termed Becket’s “indulgence in the rakish pursuits of youth” including “uttering the words of lovers” (127) as well as his mature celibacy; however, what was arguably Becket’s most formative relationship as a young man, that with Richer de l’Aigle, is interpreted as merely homosocial. Characterized as one of “fast friends and fine fellows” (21) by Robert of Cricklade, this relationship was sufficiently intense—with Richter, “the world offered him her sweetness somewhat more freely than before” according to Prior Robert’s illusive account”(22)—to necessitate their separation and result in Becket continuing his education in France. Guy’s training as a historian lead him to argue that had evidence of Becket’s homosexuality been apparent, it would surely have been used by King Edward the Second in his persecution of the clergyman once they began to quarrel. An alternative reading of Becket’s sexuality might find a suitable theoretical framework in James Eli Adams’s research that interprets Walter Pater’s discreet celibacy as “the reclamation of the body from the antagonisms of an orthodox Ascetic morality” (“Pater’s Muscular Aestheticism” in *Muscular Christianity: Embodying the Victorian Age* 215). Such a reading might meaningfully contrast Becket’s youthful somatic celebration with his later physical mortification, as the result of a process enabled by a gradual surrender of a discreet homoerotic celibacy (that accommodates physical enjoyment) into an ascetic morality whose culmination was his martyrdom. The Archbishop offered up his strategic mind and muscular body to secure the autonomy of the Church from what he thought was royal tyranny. In spite of its diffidence to acknowledge an embodied homosexual Thomas, John Guy’s life of Becket insists that “not just a legend, Thomas Becket was also a man,

however repressed his sexuality, however ambiguous his relationship with Henry” (131). Becket’s mission was embodied intellectual and spiritual service. In the best possible meaning of the phrase, John Guy’s Becket was a crafty muscular Christian.

Dennis Gouws is Professor of English at Springfield College in Massachusetts

NEW MALE STUDIES: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL (NMS) IS AN OPEN ACCESS ONLINE INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION OF ISSUES FACING BOYS AND MEN WORLDWIDE. THIS JOURNAL USES OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEMS 2.3.4.0, WHICH IS OPEN SOURCE JOURNAL MANAGEMENT AND PUBLISHING SOFTWARE DEVELOPED, SUPPORTED, AND FREELY DISTRIBUTED BY THE PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE PROJECT UNDER THE GNU GENERAL PUBLIC LICENSE.

THIS ARTICLE HAS BEEN DOWNLOADED FROM [HTTP://NEWMALESTUDIES.COM](http://newmalestudies.com).

Book Reviews



Andrew Smiler, *Challenging Casanova: Beyond the Stereotype of the Promiscuous Young Male*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2012.

I liked *Challenging Casanova*, even if Smiler's arguments did not satisfy my curiosity. I appreciate his keen eye in noticing how we leave men and their sexuality to their own devices, and his steadfastness in collecting numbers and opinions about men. His discussion for parents was helpful, and his awareness and concern for the harm we cause young men by reinforcing male stereotypes comes through clearly. I also appreciate his dividing men into different groups (Casanovas, emos, romantics, etc.) to sort male behavior into a few different temperaments, and I could not help but listen to his statistics with interest and compare myself to them. At the end, I was left encouraged that, according to Smiler's statistics, there are many men who wanted to love someone and settle down.

Sometimes, however, the book read like a collection of random statistics, with the story of the argument left to squeeze in whenever the chance was appropriate. Smiler's primary method of "challenging" the famous seducer was to ask young men what they wanted, as well as compile an impressive array of data to show that most young men do not want to be like Casanova. Unfortunately, surveys are not always the best ways of finding out what somebody wants, certainly not their deepest desires. That comes from watching how people act, given the opportunity. One of Smiler's questions, for instance, asked men how many partners they would like to have in the next month. While their answer was relatively low, it misses the point, which the author hints at from the first pages of the introduction to his book. While most men do not try to sleep with countless women, they wish they

could. While men may only want one or two partners for the immediate future, is that because they prefer only one or two partners, or because the work and desirability required to attract more women just are not worth it or even attainable for most men? This is why men like Tiger Woods (whom Smiler frequently mentions) engage their desires with multiple women. Meanwhile, if Tiger were asked about what he would like in a partner, he would probably give somewhat similar answers to the rest of the men surveyed.

This is, I think, one of the fundamental problems of Smiler's argument: he does not pay much attention to what makes the "Casanovas" different. Sure, he mentions statistics about them (like their higher likeliness of being sexist or having sex when they are younger), but he does not seem to challenge the assumption that "rock stars" (whom he only briefly mentions) and other celebrities who do sleep with countless women are no different than other men in their sexual desires. They just have better access to women and are able to live out their desires. It does not even necessarily mean they do not want a woman to marry or settle down with. Even the famous womanizer, Russell Brand, got married young.

While Smiler notes the love the media and culture pay to these Casanovas, he does not seem interested in answering why the media are this way. If being a Casanova is as undesirable as the author suggests (he argues it is undesirable primarily because of increased risk of health risks and possible pregnancy), why do the media value it to such an great extent? Why have the biceps of GI Joe increased over the years since its release? Why does our music talk more about sex than it used to? These fascinating psychological questions are pretty much ignored by the author, despite his awareness of the statistics that support these facts.

While he mentions the popularity of Casanovas like Barney in the television show "How I Met Your Mother," he ignores the fact that Barney ends up marrying one woman and living happily with her. Shows like "Californication" address the Casanova dilemma as well: no matter how many women the smarmy Hank Moody sleeps with, he is not able to stop loving the mother of his daughter. Chuck Bass in "Gossip Girl" is the same. Even Vincent Chase of HBO's "Entourage" ends an 8-season show full of sex and drugs by settling down with one woman. The theme often seems to stem from the idea of woman as a tamer of man, that when these Lotharios find the woman for them they can finally settle down and raise a family, if their personal demons do not prevent it from happening. This evidence all supports Smiler's argument that men ultimately want to settle down, but he seems more concerned with observing how culture disagrees with him to notice that, ultimately, the idea of some sort of "soul mate" is pervasive in American and Western culture. I would love to know how he views this idea in relation to his research.

This is the distinction I am trying to make: celebrities and other famous womanizers have women lining up for them in spades. Average Joe does not have that temptation nearly as much, and he knows that to sleep around with such attractive women is effectively out of his reach. Does that mean that most men do not highly desire sex with many women? Not at all. I think, more likely, a man capable of getting lots of sex easily will be much more tempted to do just that and likely succumb to the temptation. Casanova seriously considered settling down with one woman as he grew older and thought he could not attract women anymore. It becomes a battle of incentives: to marry or not to marry. As the incentives for men to marry decline, the temptation to sleep around becomes more

prominent. This manifests itself as an increase in Casanova-like behavior, and the subtle mainstream message that a man just needs to find the right woman remains. Unfortunately, Smiler's data do not tell us anything about the desirability of a man to women, which means we have no way of knowing if his Casanovas embody traits that women just find more attractive in general.

This brings up another gap in Smiler's data. While he makes brief mention of the popularity of romance novels and the stereotypical nature of their stories, he does not go on further to tell us about what women are like or what they desire in men. This misses a huge part of the topic of men's proclivities, which are logically driven by women as much as women's proclivities are driven by men. As he mentions in chapter 11, if men and women are at war, then why are they sleeping together? This particularly frustrated me towards the end of the book, where he mentions the difference in views towards women who sleep around (sluts) from men who sleep around (players). He gives it only a page or two, mentioning the double standard but pretending it has nothing to do with the relative difficulty for men to obtain sex relative to women. He ignores another very simple explanation for this: women criticize other women for "looseness" as much if not more than men do, because it makes it harder for other women to draw out commitment from men. I was chatting with a couple of 20-something girls recently when a Taylor Swift song came on the radio. "She's a slut!" they responded when I asked their opinion of her. Apparently she sees too many guys. But I had been referring to her music, not her personality. Why does it matter? I wish Smiler had taken more time to explore this.

Tony Rafetto is currently completing his master's degree in quantitative methods in the social sciences at Columbia University, where he is writing his thesis on the effects of hypergamy/hypogamy on divorce rates and marital satisfaction.

NEW MALE STUDIES: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL (NMS) IS AN OPEN ACCESS ONLINE INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION OF ISSUES FACING BOYS AND MEN WORLDWIDE. THIS JOURNAL USES OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEMS 2.3.4.0, WHICH IS OPEN SOURCE JOURNAL MANAGEMENT AND PUBLISHING SOFTWARE DEVELOPED, SUPPORTED, AND FREELY DISTRIBUTED BY THE PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE PROJECT UNDER THE GNU GENERAL PUBLIC LICENSE.

THIS ARTICLE HAS BEEN DOWNLOADED FROM [HTTP://NEWMALESTUDIES.COM](http://newmalestudies.com).