

The other day a male posed the following question to myself. Why is it these females say they are single and interested in men yet when a man approaches them they don't seem interested? They say they've been abused and want a good man but then back away when a good man comes along.

Okay, he did elaborate after that and triggered some red flags. Red Flags, for those who don't know are warning signs. Like someone sends you a friends request, you have a couple of mutual friends so think you might know them and accept. Then they message you directly with Hi, you respond the same and suddenly they're calling you via messenger. I'm not saying that everyone who does this is a potential threat because you might know them and they want to chat. However, most people would continue a conversation or check if you're busy before calling.

Some of you reading this will be thinking that I'm seeing issues and problems where there aren't any. Some of you will completely understand the fears. I've tried writing things like this before. On reading them back through I've felt like I come across as a complete nutcase. The issue is that we all view life from our own unique viewpoint. Everything we experience in life shapes the way we see the world and as such those who have not experienced trauma do not understand what it is like for those who have.

The point of this document is to try to explain what life is like for those of us who have experienced trauma. Even then, my viewpoint could differ significantly from other trauma survivors. There's no guidebook to cover every experience and men are just as likely to experience trauma as females. I have spoken to male survivors and have found that some residual effects are the same. Feelings of being unworthy of love or blaming themselves are just two examples that crossover.

But first let's examine the original questions. Why is it these females say they are single and interested in men yet when a man approaches them they don't seem interested? This question could easily be posed by a female to a male so I will try to answer this from a mutual standpoint.

Just because someone says they are single or sets their status on any social network platform as single and interested in the opposite sex does not mean they are desperately looking for a relationship. It doesn't mean they want to be bombarded with messages from potential partners and does not mean they have to be interested in you. Someone stating they are single, divorced, widowed etc. is just that, they are stating a fact about themselves. This is not a direct invitation for admirers. If they were posting this on a dating site or app then they would be stating an invitation for admirers because that's the whole point of a dating site or app. Social media sites and apps are not the same as dating sites. Social media is about being social, more so during a pandemic when people can't go out like they used to.

Why do people not always reciprocate your advances. Well, sometimes it's because they don't know you well enough, sometimes it's because they see you as just a friend. Maybe, you are not the kind of person they are looking for or maybe even though they are available to date they are not ready to date. There is no term for someone who is free to start dating but isn't ready or actively looking to date. It's the same for people who know how to drive but decide not to. Just because you can do something doesn't mean you have to.

Anyone who tries to pressure you into a relationship with them when you are not ready to date or just don't want to date them would be a good example of a red flag. If they can pressure you into an unrequited relationship what would that relationship end up like? No matter what kind of relationship you have with someone, friends, family, co-worker or partner you should always respect the other persons boundaries. Respect is a major part

of any form of relationship and aids with trust. These combined help to build a bond and bonds can become stronger over time or be broken. Native Americans have a story about two wolves living inside everyone's hearts. It is their way of explaining yin, yang. Good Vs evil. According to the story the stronger wolf is the one you feed. This is an area we will come back to later, the duality of a person.

Moving on to the next question, or rather statement. They say they've been abused and want a good man but then back away when a good man comes along.

I'm going to struggle with this one because it immediately raised a red flag for me after the first question. (By the way I had only been talking to this guy for about 10 minutes) However, if I take this comment as a stand alone comment, which again could apply to either male or female I will do my best to formulate an answer.

In my experience there are three reasons someone will immediately tell someone else that they have been abused.

1. They are being extremely open and believe that telling someone they are interested in straight away avoids the possibility of being let down later or told they've deceived the other person. These are the people who have decided on the answer to the questions that baffle most survivors. A. When is the right time to tell someone you want a relationship with that you've previously been in an abusive relationship (as an adult or a child) and B. when is the right time to tell someone you want a relationship with that you suffer from mental health issues. Some believe in stating the issues directly before a relationship has started whilst others want the other person to get to know them for who they are before broaching the subject and then there's the ones who will never tell.
2. They use their truth to get out of pushy conversations or situations. In these cases it's a defence mechanism. Someone is coming on too strong or trying to get them to do something they'd rather not do. They've probably tried other solutions first and failed. Maybe a mutual acquaintance has already told the other person and they're confirming it. This is when they'd rather not say but feel they have no choice. Or they're trying to make sure the other person is as they seem.
3. The ones who either lie or use their truth to gain sympathy or use it as a form of manipulation. The liars lie because it makes them seem less of a threat and as a way to gain the other persons vulnerability levels, to get out of trouble or as a way to get something else they want. The sympathy users have been conditioned by the system or have learnt that they can use it to get out of trouble, gain an advantage etc. The liars are just that, liars who use bullshit abuse stories or trauma stories to control others, get things they would not be able to get easily otherwise (misuse refuges, end contracts early without penalties, qualify for higher rate benefits) and are in general abusers themselves. The sympathy users have probably heard others say things like, what do you expect he/she was abused. Look at the difficulties they've had to contend with. They didn't have a great start in life. More commonly found in child abuse survivors than domestic abuse survivors it does not detract from the trauma these individuals have been through and is generally, as previously stated, a conditioned response or statement. This is also the same kind of conditioning response that you find in people who have been led to believe all their lives that they can breeze through life because of their looks, money etc. Whereas the liars have full understanding about what they are doing, why they are doing it etc the sympathy users may or may not have full understanding of their actions.

Now we've covered the reason behind this latest attempt to write this document, lets move on to some life laws and myths. These have been specifically chosen to impart knowledge and understanding to help those who have been traumatised heal and those who have not been traumatised understand the viewpoint of those who have as well as dispel some very ignorant myths.

1. People will only do what they are going to do.

This seems to be a very simple statement, yet there are some who seem to think that the victims of abuse can somehow control the abuser and make it stop. If someone is going to do something they're going to do it. It doesn't matter if this is about driving under the influence of drugs or drink. It doesn't matter if it is about speeding, theft, attacking someone in the street, rape, racism, sexism, child abuse, domestic abuse or murder. If someone decides they want to cause pain towards others no amount of negotiations, changing what you wear, where you go, driving carefully or any other normal behaviour will stop them from doing it. The same can be said about nice things in life as well like throwing a surprise party, buying expensive gifts, being kind etc. Once someone decides on a course of action unless they change their minds that course of action is set.

Due to the ignorant belief system that somehow the victim can stop things before they happen victims of all kinds of trauma start to blame themselves for what they have been through. If this belief was accurate explain why it is that even when people have fitted expensive alarm systems in their homes or cars they are still victims of home invasion and car theft. Explain why victims of mindless violence in public areas are still attacked.

Explain why racism or bullying happen.

Victim blaming has nothing to do with the victim, it is an excuse used to minimise the actions of the perpetrator and somehow make the rest of society sleep better or feel safer in life. That somehow if we modify our behaviour we are less likely to become victims. This actually empowers the perpetrators because they are basically being told that their behaviour is somehow not their fault.

Once society accepts that the victim is not to blame and starts taking the perpetrators to task, making them accept full responsibility maybe, just maybe this mindset will change and there will be less crime. At the same time social workers and other experts need to understand that when they use victim blaming they are actually committing and compounding emotional and mental harm to the victim.

2. Everyone lives in their own unique version of the world.

This is not as easy for a lot of people to understand but can be easily explained. The foundation of this statement comes from the fact that everything we see, touch, smell, hear and experience helps to shape and form our viewpoint about the world around us. Those who have happy lives find it difficult to understand those who are unhappy. People who have never experienced mental health issues do not understand the actions of those who suffer or why they suffer. This is why the police and other authorities have problems interpreting witness statements. Each statement is told or written from the perspective of the individual witness.

This however, does not mean that because someone was abused as a child that they are more likely to abuse others. Ted Bundy, Jeff Dahmer and Dennis Rader are just 3 examples of serial killers who had a good or normal upbringing. These three are also very

good examples of point 1 above.

3. The meaning of a communication is the response it elicits, the intention behind a communication is not its meaning.

This can cause a lot of miscommunication between people and links with point 2 above. It's a little like saying that even when speaking the same language errors of understanding happen. Words carry weight and without understanding the context and intention behind those words they can be taken the wrong way. It is also not easy to explain how this happens so I've worked out a couple of examples.

Scenario 1: summertime. Mother is washing the kitchen floor by hand and to avoid any accidents she closes the backdoor as the children are happily playing. As she washes each section of the floor on her hands and knees, she dries each section with a towel starting at the far side of the kitchen, working towards the backdoor. There's a knock on the front door so the mother gets up leaving everything where it is and answers the door. It's a social worker turning up unannounced. Mother shows the Social worker into the kitchen, moves the bowl of water from the floor and proceeds to offer the social worker a drink before engaging in conversation regarding the visit. The children are still playing happily outside. Just before the social worker leaves one of the children call out to see if it is okay to come in. Mother opens the backdoor to let the child in.

conclusion: To the mother and the children there is nothing wrong with this situation as the mother sees this as keeping the children safe from slip hazards. To the children this is mum cleaning and they understand that mum has asked them to knock or call out before running inside so they don't fall over.

To the social worker this situation is written up as mother locks the children in the garden when they are in the garden.

When this is brought up in a meeting the mother tries to explain her logic and safeguarding reasons for the door being closed. She is told a shut door is basically the same as a locked door and the social workers report stands.

Both parties in this scenario are using their knowledge of the world to safeguard the children. The mother is using fear based logic. If the children run indoors and slip they're going to fall and hurt themselves, possibly badly so she explains to her children about not being in the kitchen when the floor is being washed and allows the children the freedom of the garden to run around and play with the door closed so she can wash the floor without accidents or stopping the children having fun. To the social worker, who physically saw the mother open the backdoor without using a key she sees children, who in her mind have to ask permission and wait to be let indoors. She has probably read about or seen incidents of children being locked in rooms or outside and her mind makes the connection of closed doors equals locked doors.

In this situation the communication was both visual and verbal and yet miscommunication still occurred and yes this is a real life historical scenario. The only difference is I have tried to understand the viewpoint of the social worker.

Scenario 2: winter, snow and ice conditions. Mother takes 4 children out to the shop. Two of the children are in a double buggy, the other two are on wrist straps as mother has no way to physically hold their hands. The younger of the two walking children is using a fixed length wrist strap, the older child is using a curly rubber/plastic coil type wrist strap that allows them more freedom of movement and range away from the buggy/mother. At the

end of the alley they have to walk through is a road and no path. Mother and children stop so mother can check it is clear to cross the road. The older of the walking children has been happily collecting snow to throw snowballs in front of their path. Normal excited child behaviour in the snow. Mother is listening for traffic as the road can not be clearly seen from her position, she is used to this as they've walked this way on multiple occasions. She hears what sounds like a heavy vehicle approach so she waits. For no apparent reason the older of the walking children suddenly darts forward towards the road. Mother uses her closest hand to grab the back of her child's coat to pull them back from the road and pulls them back just as a big van drives past. She holds her child and explains how dangerous their actions were. When she stands back up she sees an old couple on the other side of the road who let her know the road is clear to cross. She crosses the road with her children and thanks the old couple, who saw what just happened and thinks the mother's reactions were faster than they'd expected and are just happy everyone is safe. They then talk about how dangerous the road is and how the council should do something about there not being any way to see the road and traffic when using the alley. A few days past the mother is at home, incident basically forgotten when social worker arrives with police because they've received an anonymous referral. Mother lets them in and lets them see the children. The child she saved has a small scratch on the back of his neck. The reason behind the mark is explained to the social worker and police. The police say it was lucky the child didn't get knocked down by the van and agree the mother acted quickly (they know the area) the social worker says none of that matters because there is a mark on the child from the mother's nails and as such it is physical abuse. It is then written up as mother being guilty of physical abuse because her nail was obviously too long as it scratched the child's neck. The rest of the situation over how this happened was not included in the report, although the fact the mother had taken a dangerous route to the shops was.

Conclusion: The mother acted to her mind in the best way she could and the resulting scratch was not only unintentional but wasn't anything to worry about because if she hadn't grabbed her child they would have been in hospital or possibly dead. She had never viewed the length of her nails a problem as she generally kept them very short. The old couple who witnessed the incident saw the mother as having quick reactions because she averted a potentially serious incident. The police officer understood the potential of a serious incident being avoided and did not have an issue with the mothers actions. The social worker focused on the scratch instead of the entire incident and wrote the mother up for physical abuse. Again, this is a true depiction of actual historical events.

I would like you to take a moment to work out how you would view both of these scenarios. They both include visual and verbal communication. Then I'd like you to think about three times you can recall yourself of when a conversation or communication didn't go the way you expected it to.

In both of these situations the mother tried to have the wording of the reports changed to accurately represent the situations and both times the social workers viewpoint was upheld with the mother being told she was trying to underplay the seriousness of the incidents and lower/negate her responsibility for her actions. Depending on your own viewpoint you will either side with the actions of the mother or the social services because even in written form I am communicating with you and no matter what form of communication you use it is open to interpretation.

4. Normality is dependant on the situation.

This brings up the question of what is normal? I love this quote and I tend to use it a lot when discussing different things.

To someone from a war torn country conflict and fear becomes normal and they find it difficult to adjust to peace and freedom because that is abnormal to them.

For someone who has lived a peaceful life a trauma, no matter how slight is viewed as a an enormous entity because it is not normal for them. This also links in nicely with the previous points so far. How often have you heard someone discussing an issue that you think is trivial and yet the other person seems fixated on it? How often have you thought someone downplays the seriousness of a situation because they treat it like its nothing when you think it is terrible?

It is normal for a fire fighter to rush headlong into a fire, yet, for the rest of us the idea of running into a burning building fills us with dread.

No matter what the situation we need to question our belief of normality. Once we start to question what is normal, we open our minds to new possibilities and start to change our viewpoint of the world around us. It also helps us rethink our judgement towards others.

When you are in a therapy group of any kind you are surrounded by people who have similar experiences to yourself for example grief counselling, trauma therapy, drug or alcohol support groups etc. Whilst you are in that group setting normality changes to whatever you are there for. Those around you have a better understanding of your struggles and can connect to you based on that shared by different experience. Once you leave that group setting and you re-enter society as a whole suddenly your experiences are abnormal to those around you because the majority of people do not understand your struggle or at least you perceive that they will not understand your struggle.

5. People always make the best choices available at the time using their model of the world and the situation.

How many times have we all questioned why someone did something that we would have done differently. Here's your answer. When faced with a situation we calculate what we should do using our life experiences to that point and how we view the situation. In short there are no how to guides for every situation that work for everyone. Our actions can escalate or de-escalate a situation. Our brains are the most complex computers available and sometimes we have a split second choice to make. Our brains run through a series of possible outcomes in microseconds and then we act. Just like a computer the results are based on the information we have inputted. Our behaviour, our thoughts, our belief systems start being formed from the moment we are born. I love horror films because to me real life has been scarier and I can acknowledge that horror films are made for entertainment purposes. To me they're like a guide as what to do or not do when faced with different situations. I watch natural disaster and apocalyptic films for exactly the same reason. Yet, I can't stand feel good Christmas, romance or comedy films because they seem so implausible. Maybe, I should watch some to work out how to handle non-life threatening situations who knows.

The issue here is that when we hear, read or watch an incident we use hindsight and our own knowledge of the world to judge someone else's actions. Our minds run through a series of scenarios as to what we would have done in the same situation without adding the other persons experiences into our formula. We don't know what they were feeling at the time or how their previous experiences shaped their conclusions and actions. If we use one of the previous scenarios as an example where the mother grabbed the back of her son's coat which saved his life but resulted in a scratch to the back of his neck it is easy

with hindsight to say the mother should have grabbed his arm to pull him back. This would also have saved his life but then there wouldn't have been a scratch to the back of his neck. This is the viewpoint of the social worker, the mother should have grabbed a different part of his body or not gone down that alley. However, what if the mother had moved to grab his arm and missed. What if the mother had grabbed his arm but the force of her pulling backwards had unintentionally dislocated his arm. What if grabbing his arm had resulted in him falling and hitting his head on the wall that blocked her view. What if she had used a longer but safer route to the shop and hadn't been as vigilant and the accident had happened in a different way. What if she chose this route to avoid someone who scared her and to avoid a possible conflict. Did any of these ideas run through your head when you read that scenario?

I've previously spoken about social conditioning in this document. Social conditioning affects our thought process and ultimately how we deal with different situations. We have preconceived ideas about the world around us. Not all of these preconceived ideas are based on personal knowledge and experiences but on what we believe to be true. If you have had no involvement with the police but have been told they are here to protect you then you believe they will protect you no matter what the situation even though you've no personal experience of this. If you've been constantly told that the police will accuse you of misdoings when you are innocent, that they will plant evidence to get you in trouble and that they can't be trusted you will fear the police even though you've had no personal interaction with them. This is an example of social conditioning.

Unfortunately, social conditioning is teaching people that victims are somehow responsible for what happens to them. The preconceived idea that somehow these victims allowed this to happen to them has been reinforced time and time again through all forms of media.

In case you think I've gone off topic and social conditioning has nothing to do with the split second choices people make I haven't. Social conditioning and media portrayal of situations makes up part of the formula we use when making split second choices.

6. Why didn't they leave the abusive relationship sooner. Why do they allow themselves to be abused.

People who make these statements or ask these questions are acknowledging that they have no idea of what it is like to be in an abusive relationship. It is also an unintentional form of victim blaming. Again this kind of thinking is social conditioning.

When people ask why do they allow themselves to be abused they are detracting from the actions of the abuser and putting the emphasis on the victim. Do you seriously think that people decide to be abused. That they just allow it to happen as if they deliberately put themselves at risk? Like they wake up one day and say to themselves, today I'm going to find someone who will abuse me. The, why did they allow themselves to be abused generally goes hand in hand with the why didn't they leave earlier and the these people say they've been abused but when a good person comes along they back away bullshit. Yes, it is bullshit and I'm calling it as such.

Let me explain something to you. When we become involved in these types of relationships we have no idea they're going to turn out that way. We meet someone who seems nice, we are told by other people that they are a good person, kind, loving, considerate etc. we have NO idea that they're going to change and try to control every part of our lives or that they are going to abuse us. How many times have you heard people on the news regarding murders etc say that they were a quiet person, they were always helpful to neighbours etc etc. No one suspected them of being capable of such an act. Yet, society immediately blames an abuse victim for being a victim, like we're supposed to

be able to predict the future and should have known something was wrong. My response to this is shut the f**k up, like you've never fallen in love with someone only to have your heart broken because they turned out to not be the person you thought they were.

These abusers are very good at convincing the world that they are good people. Talk to the victims and I can almost guarantee that friends, family and co-workers were shocked when the truth came out. They've learnt how to adapt to society and appear the perfect partner. The abuse starts off so subtle its easy to miss the warning signs until it is too late and you're in a situation you feel you can't escape. You've been gaslighted so much and convinced no one will believe you because they make out to people that you are the problem. Maybe you have children and you've been repeatedly told that if you tell anyone what is happening you'll never get to see your children again, that social services will take your children off you, that they'll ensure they keep hold of the children etc etc. Maybe you've already tried telling people what is happening only to be told you're imagining it because there's no way he/she is doing that.

Why do we stay? Because we feel we have no choice. We have been conditioned to believe we are the problem, we've brought this on ourselves, that we are making it up, that we need to change our behaviour to stop it from happening, that our children will suffer if we say anything. In many cases the victim has been isolated from friends and family so they have no support. They've been conditioned to keep quiet and if child social services have been involved or get involved they've learnt to be extra cautious of what they say. By the time we work things out we are probably suffering from Stockholm syndrome.

Stockholm syndrome, psychological response wherein a captive begins to identify closely with his or her captors, as well as with their agenda and demands.

The name of the syndrome is derived from a botched bank robbery in [Stockholm, Sweden](#).

In [August](#) 1973 four employees of Sveriges Kreditbank were held hostage in the bank's vault for six days. During the standoff, a seemingly [incongruous](#) bond developed between captive and captor. One hostage, during a telephone call with Swedish Prime Minister [Olof Palme](#), stated that she fully trusted her captors but feared that she would die in a police assault on the building.

<https://www.britannica.com/science/Stockholm-syndrome>

After reading the exert from Britannica above which explains the results of six days just imagine what it is like for the victim of domestic abuse when they've endured years of coercion, verbal, mental, physical or sexual abuse. Yet, do any of the authorities take this into account when they are dealing with the victim? The answer is no they don't. Do social services treat the victim as a victim, no they don't. Have any psychological studies been done to verify if domestic abuse victims end up with Stockholm syndrome, probably not. Why? Because it is a hell of a lot easier to victim blame the victim and continue the abuse they've already suffered rather than accept that these are victims that need care and support. Let's be honest here, if victims were treated as victims by child social services they wouldn't be able to remove as many children.

Instead of victim blaming, society should be holding the abusers to account. As for why these victims then back away when a potentially good partner comes along it is probably because they need extra time to adjust to the situation and trust the other person. They will

question their choices and in many ways when social services and professionals have stated that these people will end up in another abusive relationship they wonder when the abuse is going to start.

7. Social services are there to help families.

This is what everyone believes before they've had dealings with children social services. That social services only get involved when something serious is going on. The problem here is that anyone can make a referral to child social services and the family are not told who the person is or what the actual accusation is. This means that people can be targeted for no real reason.

Social workers go into any situation with a belief that there are problems and as such they look for problems. There are no hard and fast rules over the definition of any form of abuse. There is no solid checklist. I know people will disagree with me on this but let's get real for a moment, under the current guidelines social services could enter any house in the UK and find a reason to get involved and once you've had social services involvement even when proven innocent they use it as an easy in to get involved again. They then look for more reasons. It should also be pointed out here that the guidelines for being a parent are also constantly evolving so you can change parenting style to pass a parenting assessment one year only for the rules to change the following year or the following month.

As shown by the two scenarios earlier in this document even when you believe you are doing the right thing you can be told you are doing it wrong. I can cite multiple examples of social services changing the rules, wording or situation to make their own case stronger. If you argue against this then you are not taking the seriousness of the situation into account. However, if you admit that looking at their evaluation that changes need to happen then you are basically admitting you are an abusive parent. The rules as they stand are set up to make a no win situation for parents. Then when you add to this that social workers and other experts can and are allowed to lie and use hearsay in family court parents have no chance. The burden of proof is almost non-existent in family court. Parents are automatically on the defensive and you are guilty until you can prove yourself innocent. The system is set up that you use all your energy in defending yourself and you can not represent the inaccuracies in social services paperwork without being accused of not accepting the seriousness of the situation.

It is a no win situation. Trying to resolve historical inaccuracies is not allowed. Complaining to the local council in charge of social services gets you nowhere. Bringing up these issues with MP's get you nowhere. They seem to be allowed to walk all over your human rights because they say that children's rights trump human rights.

Once your children are removed you are left with absolutely no support but you are left with stigma associated with not having your children with you. Once again social conditioning comes into play.

What is worse is that you never actually get child social services out of your life and they can reuse historical accusations against you, your children and grandchildren even if you've been found innocent of that accusation within family court.

The fact you were found innocent is pushed to one side and these allegations are presented as facts. Try to fight against it and you'll be gaslighted. Plus, if you were the victim of domestic abuse, they will word things so you are guilty by association even if you've cut all ties with your abuser and changed your life. Undergoing multiple assessments does not change how they think about or treat you. You are guilty in their eyes and subhuman. They continue the emotional and mental abuse for years.

As for the poor children who were taken into the care system, they are often separated from their siblings. If they raise complaints they are not listened to or gaslighted. Then they

are let out into a world they have not been prepared for and their childhood trauma is used against them when they have children.

You don't have to take my word for it. There is plenty of documented proof of this. I am stating things as they have historically and currently stand. These are not just my imaginings or thoughts on the situation.

The following information has been taken from women's aid organisation. I have added my own thoughts to the myths supplied below. www.womensaid.org.uk/information-support/what-is-domestic-abuse/myths/

Myth #1: Alcohol and drugs make men more violent.

Reality: Alcohol and drugs can make existing abuse worse, or be a catalyst for an attack, but they do not cause domestic abuse. Many people use alcohol or drugs and do not abuse their partner, so it should never be used to excuse violent or controlling behaviour. The perpetrator alone is responsible for his actions.

This would clarify what I have been saying about the need to stop victim blaming. It doesn't matter if the victim is male or female the abuser should be held accountable for their actions.

Myth #2: If it was that bad, she'd leave.

Reality: Women stay in abusive relationships for many different reasons, and it can be very difficult for a woman to leave an abusive partner – even if she wants to. Like any other relationship, one that ends in abuse began with falling in love and being in love. Abuse rarely starts at the beginning of a relationship, but when it is established and often harder to leave.

A woman may still be in love with her partner and believe him when he says he is sorry and it won't happen again; she may be frightened for her life or for the safety of her children if she leaves; she may have nowhere to go; she may have no financial independence. Abusers often isolate their partners from family and friends in order to control them, making it even more difficult for an abused woman to exit the relationship.

Women in abusive relationships need support and understanding – not judgement.

Again this clarifies what I have been saying throughout this document. Victim blaming is wrong. Why is it that child social services seem to believe they can treat the victim as a perpetrator? Continue the abuse they've already been subjected to and not be held accountable for their actions.

Myth #3: Domestic abuse always involves physical violence.

Reality: Domestic abuse does not always include physical violence. Women's Aid defines domestic abuse as an incident or pattern of incidents of controlling, coercive, threatening, degrading and violent behaviour, including sexual violence, by a partner or ex-partner. These incidents can include **coercive**

control; psychological and/or emotional abuse; physical abuse; sexual abuse; financial abuse; harassment; stalking; and/or **online or digital abuse**.

From my own understanding and experience the emotional and mental abuse are worse and leave a longer impact on the victims lives. Again I will state that child social services seem to get away with coercive, mental and emotional abuse towards parents. They get away with gas lighting, misrepresenting the situation to make it sound worse and then continue that abuse for years after the victim has left the original abuser.

Myth #4: He can be a good father even if he abuses his partner – the parents’ relationship doesn’t have to affect the children.

Reality: An estimated 90% of children whose mothers are abused witness the abuse. The effects are traumatic and long-lasting. When a child witnesses domestic abuse, **this is child abuse**. Between 40% and 70% of these children are also direct victims of the abuse which is happening at home.

I will point out this should not be levied just against fathers.

Myth #5: She provoked him.

Reality: This myth is widespread and deep-rooted. It is often based on the belief that the man is the head of the family, and that his role is to punish his partner or children if they act in a way he doesn’t approve of.

The myth is dangerous because any reference to ‘provocation’ means that we are blaming the woman and relieving the abuser of responsibility for his actions.

Abuse or violence of any kind is never the victim’s fault. Responsibility always lies with the perpetrator, and with him alone.

Again proof that society victim blames the victims.

Myth #6: Domestic abuse is a private family matter, and not a social issue.

Reality: Violence and abuse against women and children incurs high costs for society: hospital treatment, medication, court proceedings, lawyers’ fees, imprisonment – not to mention the psychological and physical impact on those who experience it.

All too often, when women disclose their abuse, no one listens to them, and no one asks them what they would like to happen next. That’s why Women’s Aid have launched a new approach for domestic abuse survivors and their children: **Change that Lasts**. It places the survivor at the heart and builds responses around her needs and the strengths and resources available to her. Domestic abuse happens every single day all over the world, and affects women of all ages, classes and backgrounds. It is a serious, widespread crime. Despite this, Women’s Aid and other organisations like us are still campaigning to ensure that survivors’ voices are heard. When we describe domestic abuse as a ‘private family matter’, we minimise, condone and permit it.

More proof of social conditioning and that things need to change so that the perpetrators are held to account. There's many historical and current cases that prove things need to change.

Myth #7: Pornography is not linked to violence against women.

Reality: Most consumers of pornography are male, and pornographic material is becoming increasingly explicit, violent, and focused on male pleasure. It's also freely available to anyone online, and studies indicate it is how many young people find out about sex.

Pornography contributes to a culture of misogyny, in which women and girls are abused by men for male pleasure. Women are harmed by pornography in two ways: directly, when they are used for the production of pornographic material; and indirectly, through the effects of mainstream availability and consumption of violent pornography.

Not much needs to be added to this.

Myth #8: Women are just as abusive as men.

Reality: In the vast majority of cases, domestic abuse is experienced by women and perpetrated by men. A woman is killed by her male partner or former partner every four days in the UK England and Wales. In the year ending March 2019, the majority of defendants in domestic abuse-related prosecutions were men (92%), and the majority of victims were female (75%) (in 10% of cases the sex of the victim was not recorded) (ONS, 2019). It is a gendered crime which is deeply rooted in the societal inequality between women and men.

Women are more likely than men to experience multiple incidents of abuse, different types of domestic abuse, and sexual violence particularly.

Domestic abuse exists as part of the wider spectrum of violence against women and girls, which also includes different forms of family violence such as forced marriage, female genital mutilation and so-called "honour crimes" that are perpetrated primarily by family members.

I am going to disagree slightly with this one because I believe that men find it more difficult to come forward in regards to this issue. I'm not saying that the ratio between female and male victims is the same but we need to realise the statistics being used above are in relation to court cases.

Myth #9: Women often lie about abuse.

Reality: False allegations about domestic abuse are extremely rare. The Crown Prosecution Service released the **first ever study** of this in 2013, and concluded that false allegations are even more infrequent than previously thought. In the 17 month period that the study examined, there were 111,891 prosecutions for domestic violence, and only six prosecutions for making false allegations.

This myth is extremely damaging, because the fear of being called a liar can and does deter women from reporting the abuse they have experienced.

People in general do not lie about abuse because of the stigma attached. However, I did cover this at the start of this document and will allow people to decide for themselves.

Myth #10: Men who abuse women are mentally unwell.

Reality: There is no research that supports this myth. Abuse and violence are a choice, and there is no excuse for them. Domestic abuse happens throughout every level of society, regardless of health, wealth or status.

I wonder if there's any research to dismiss this myth.

Myth #11: Women are attracted to abusive men.

Reality: Domestic abuse is prevalent throughout society, and it is not uncommon for a woman to experience abuse in more than one relationship. To suggest that some women are particularly attracted to abusive men is victim-blaming. A perpetrator of domestic abuse can be charming and charismatic when he first meets a new partner, and often no one, let alone the woman he has just met, would suspect he would ever be abusive in a relationship.

This was also covered above. Yet victims both male and female are conditioned to believe that they attract abusers, which is to my understanding a form of emotional and mental abuse as well as victim blaming.

Myth #12: Men who abuse their partners saw their fathers abuse their mothers.

Reality: Domestic abuse is prevalent throughout society, and because of this many people have grown up witnessing domestic abuse. Most of these people will never perpetrate domestic abuse in their own relationships, so it is never an excuse – and some of our most passionate supporters are child survivors of domestic abuse.

Child social services use the you were abused so you are more likely to abuse crap all the time, even though there is evidence that this is not the case.

Myth #13: Domestic abuse isn't that common.

Reality: We know through our work over the last 42 years with survivors and local services that domestic abuse is very common. On average a woman is killed by her male partner or former partner every four days in the UK England and Wales. Domestic abuse has a higher rate of repeat victimisation than any other crime, and on average, the police receive over 100 emergency calls relating to domestic abuse every hour.

There are no reliable prevalence data on domestic abuse but the Crime Survey of England and Wales (CSEW) offers the best data available. According to these data, an estimated 7.5% (1.6 million) of women experienced some form of domestic abuse in the year ending March 2019. An estimated 28.4%

of women aged 16 to 59 years have experienced some form of domestic abuse since the age of 16 years (ONS, 2019).

How about adding courses in schools as part of the national curriculum to teach the difference between a good and bad relationship within secondary school. This could lower the number of domestic abuse situations before they occur.

Myth #14: Domestic abuse is a 'crime of passion', a momentary loss of control.

Reality: Domestic abuse is rarely about losing control, but taking control. Abusive men rarely act spontaneously when angry. They consciously choose when to abuse their partner: when they are alone, and when there are no witnesses (if there is a witness, then usually they are a child). He has control over whom he abuses.

A lot of different crimes are about control. I suggest that victim blaming is not only a form of abuse but also a form of control.

Myth #15: All couples argue – it's not domestic abuse, it's just a normal relationship.

Reality: Abuse and disagreement are not the same things. Different opinions are normal and completely acceptable in healthy relationships. Abuse is not a disagreement – it is the use of physical, sexual, emotional or psychological violence or threats in order to govern and control another person's thinking, opinions, emotions and behaviour.

When abuse is involved, there is no discussion between equals. There is fear of saying or doing the 'wrong' thing.

This is one of those things a victim gets told by the abuser. It's not abuse it is an argument. An argument they have to win and will use any methods to win.

Myth #16: Women are more likely to be attacked by strangers than by those who claim to love them.

Reality: In fact, the opposite is true. Women are far more likely to be assaulted, raped and murdered by men known to them than by strangers.

According to Rape Crisis, only around **10% of rapes are committed by men unknown to the victim**. Women are far likelier to be attacked by a man they know and trust.

A woman is killed by her male partner or former partner every four days in the UK England and Wales.

Again this is a form of victim blaming because they allowed it to happen. I would say that the myths busted above apply just as equally to men as they do women. Yes, females undergo more abuse than males, that is a fact of life. However, we should never detract

from the fact that men can also be victims of abuse.

I hope that this document gives you a better understanding of the situation and will help you challenge what you believed previously. I could have used any number of different websites for myth busting information.

What I still find difficult to understand is why with so much information readily available in regards to victim blaming etc. children social services continue to victim blame rather than support the victims. Why when the victims try to speak out about the continuance of the emotional and mantel abuse perpetrated by child social services they are then threatened with gagging orders or removal of contact rights.

This document could include so much more information, evidence, scenarios etc to prove the points raised.

I stated at the start of this document that I have tried writing this on a number of different occasions and when I have read it back through I've deleted them because I felt as if I sounded like a crazy person. Who would believe that this information is readily available and yet the very people in charge of protection do not act on that information. I could with the right support write pages upon pages of statistics in regards to how many of these abuse cases go to court vs how many are thrown out by the CPS.

I could cover every aspect of trauma, victimisation etc to show the extent that this happens.

I could take it further to give examples of how whistleblowers are then subjected to persecution by different governmental bodies and have their lives destroyed because they've stood up against the atrocities within these governmental bodies. This is not conspiracy theory, this is not parents trying to downplay their actions or reasons for having children removed. These unfortunately are facts of life that people turn a blind eye to because they've been conditioned to believe that there is justice in this world.

I am also aware that I am setting myself up for further persecution, threats etc. from these governmental bodies by writing and publishing this document on the website. Now, that sounds crazy doesn't it? I've already set myself up by writing the statistical analysis report I finalised and published as well as sending to every MP and newspaper I could find. Hell in for a penny in for a pound.

Truth is I can not sit back and watch this continue without speaking out. Yes, I am scared of what might happen by doing this but I'm still doing it. If more people stand up against this oppression, violation of human rights, injustice and abuse perpetrated by governmental bodies then maybe we can get the long overdue changes to avoid its continuance.