

## TCW 12:17, 30.4.22, article by Gail MacDonald

**Mike Buchanan** - a few seconds ago  
Ⓞ Hold on, this is waiting to be approved by TCW.

I'm well used to reading deeply misandrous articles on the subject of Interpersonal Violence - IPV - by women, but this one takes the biscuit for a number of reasons. The first is that the writer is a psychologist - to my mind, she brings her profession into disrepute. God help any man in an IPV case if she's brought in to give her 'evidence'.

(90% of psychology graduates are female, but it's not seen as a 'problem to be fixed'. The same cannot of course be said of the 90%+ of engineering graduates who are male. As far back as 2015 we were reporting that more than £30m of taxpayers' money - about 75% of income tax receipts are from men - had been wasted on initiatives to increase the proportion of engineering students who are female. Needless to say, not a penny has been spent on trying to increase the proportion of psychology students who are male.)

Back to the article, which is an object lesson about writing after looking through an emotional 'lens', not a rational one. Ms MacDonald doesn't like Depp, which is her prerogative, but what has that to do with Depp's guilt or innocence? Absolutely nothing. It would have been just as easy to write an article titled, 'An acting mistressclass from Amber Heard'.

Has Ms MacDonald even been following the current court case? She says nothing about what psychologist Dr Shannon Curry said about Amber Heard's personality disorders in the case, a link here <https://cafp.uk/2022/04/26/...> The evidence couldn't be clearer. Amber Heard has a history of violent behaviour - her PA reported that Heard spat in her face after flying into a blind rage when she asked for a pay rise - and of course we have the infamous recording of Heard telling Depp nobody would believe him to be a victim of IPV.

So, what is known about the gendered nature of IPV? 50 years ago Erin Pizzet was reporting that a sizeable majority of the women who entered her shelter were at least as violent as their (male) partners. (Women are more at risk of IPV from a female partner than a male partner - quite how the patriarchy makes lesbians attack one another is an abiding mystery, even to feminists. Just one of the many reasons we must laugh at feminists <https://cafp.uk/laughing-at-...>

We cover IPV over pp.43-5 of our new 94-page manifesto <https://cafp.uk/manifesto/>. The largest ever review of IPV research literature was the Partner Abuse State of Knowledge Project (2013). The headline finding was that:

"Men and women perpetrate physical and non-physical forms of abuse at comparable levels, most domestic violence is mutual, women are as controlling as men, domestic violence by men and women is correlated with essentially the same risk factors, and male and female perpetrators are motivated for similar reasons."

A key numerical finding from the PASK review was that:

"Among large population samples, 57.9% of inter-partner violence (IPV) reported was bi-directional, 42.1% uni-directional; 13.8% of the uni-directional violence was male to female, 28.3% female to male."