The Cycle of Female Violence: A new Psychological Approach to the Roots of Domestic Violence!

***Abstract: at the basic level, violence is rooted in the mind and both men and women are prone, capable of it and can be violent. On top of that level, the Gynocentric society adds evolutionary as well as structural elements to the female violence. This does not mean that men are incapable or that this dynamic prevents them to be violent in relationships. It indeed, widens the wider circles of violence in the detriment of men. As such it creates a nested spheres of micro macro relationship of violence where men suffer and are the most victims of it whether this is general crime, victims of war, financial exploitation, systemic institutionalized discrimination and violence against men and many more. In gynocentric societies men are not only indoctrinated by women to violence, not only aren't they the main perpetrators, not only that vice versa they are indeed the main victims of violence but based on the clandestine nature of most of female violence and the concept of female hypo-agency women are rarely persecuted and men are victim blamed for it. Unravelling the clandestine nature of female violence and the gynocentric – feminist narrative of misandry is only the first but most crucial step in ending this situation and create a more compassionate, wise and just society towards men.***
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Before we begin with our discussion, it must be stated that on the level of personal analogy, men and women are prone violence. I want now to outline the two main frames in terms of discussion that causes or embody the roots of violence including DV and where it originates:

(1) violence arising from an individual's confusion on the personal level of human psychology and cognition!

(2) violence arising from unsatisfactory social and environmental conditions, caused by the delusion, ignorance, craving, attachment and the aversion of others!

In this essay we are going to concentrate and discuss the first type of surroundings because it is mainly those settings where female violence especially within the context of DV originates and takes its root. So, to pass now to the psychological roots of violence, another myth can be cited. The root of the process is significant here and is actually threefold in its nature namely a) ignorance (delusion); b) attachment/craving; c) aversion. Thus ignorance, attachment and aversion are the three mental prototypes that might culminate in violence which at this stage is gender neutral and applies to both men and women and are for both of them the source of many afflictive and destructive emotions that might give rise to personal as well as wider circles of violence. Next, we will go on to explore how from this stage on and in a Gynocentric society female violence is shaped and takes a distinctive form within the context of domestic as well as structural and evolutionary violence.

Here we should bear in mind that in this context and rooted in ignorance (=delusion aka. cognitive dissonance) the craving or the attachment of beings and subsequently aversion or ill will that is among others fear/rage/anger and many more afflictive emotions are the root cause of violence. As such and as standing opposed to unsatisfactory social environment, they are all also the cause or the basis of domestic violence. In contrast to feminist paradigm which mixes cause and effect or the horse with the rider, violence as a matter of fact cannot act or being originated in itself without the mind. It is the psycho cognitive base that gives rise to violence or vice versa prevents it. Believing that the root of violence is located within the mind, our paradigm has also placed now a greater urgency upon inner reflection rather than external excuses. While the latter is denial of responsibility which cannot solve the problem of violence the former means taking responsibility over the seeds or potentially of violence in our mind and thus by first acknowledging and admitting finally also eradicating in actively working on it.

In that sense, violent tendencies link, at this point, with the defilement of delusion/ignorance/cognitive dissonance. It is delusion in terms of a misunderstanding of *the impermanent as well as selfless nature of reality.* The latter states that there is no abiding, unchanging substance within the human being. Men and women are verbs rather than nouns, causal processes rather than unchanging souls. This supposition does not deny that there is a person, but it reformulates the definition of what constitutes a person to embrace continuity rather than static entity. As the sound of the lute cannot be found within the lute as it is taken apart, so the "I am" cannot be found in the human personality when it is dissected into the five *aggregates of a "person" or a "being".*

Anyway, one root through which much anger and violence arises, stem from the felt need to defend what is seen to be one's own or to grasp personal gain. It is a need which sees the gain of others as a threat to personal power and the rights of others as an attack on personal status. As is so representative for Gynocentric societies women wield the most important power within the domestic sphere in a world of finite resources namely that of informal power while they compromise the formal power for the sake of balancing relationships thus every male move that might be perceived as a threat to those personal powers, prestige, status, rights and gains of women and what is considered to be theirs own or is grasped as a personal gain within the domain of informal power is fiercely protected and countered with violence if perceived as threatening. It does not mean that men aren't prone to such kind of violence at all, they do. Only that for women based on Gynocentric dynamics it becomes structural on the very personal level which as we will see later projects itself into in the wider spheres of societal and gendered violence especially against men and children. This is one root through which female violence is arising and we are going to discuss immediately more of them.

Nonetheless and exactly as it is with men at the basic level of the cycle of violence, this structural female violence as an extension of social and cultural Gynocentrism rooted in informal power dynamics and as exhibited by women, is none other than the fault of the failure at the basic level to see the truth of *selflessness* and the interdependence of all phenomena. It is this failure which leads to the self-becoming the touchstone and measuring rule for every perception and judgment. It is the failure which at wider circles leads to the urge to be violent in defense of superficial needs and seeming rights which is the classic combination of delusion/ignorance leading to attachment and craving and accompanied by aversion. In other words, all forms of violence including physical and structural violence are the product of human mental status such as fear, anger, hate, attachment, craving and delusion and which are considered in to be the internal causes to violence and conflicts. Those are those mental motivating factors that give rise to violence and not materiality or the social construction that prompt it. Poor social conditioning or settings can indeed lead to violence yet even in this situation it is the trigger and not the cause. So, in the bottom line whether legitimate or not, violence is always rooted in the mind and takes its origin from there. It is gender neutral and representative of any gender whatsoever whether male or female.

Moreover, even when no external danger to personal security through social conflicts and warfare is in presence, struggles and violence may still ensue as a result of our two key mental attachments, first, subjective views, opinions and, second, the desire for material gains and possessions which leads us to the next main route through which violence over the psycho cognitive base and via the Gynocentric structural form of violence arises. This is the attachment to the desire which refers to the wants for material goods as well as longing for affection and belonging in human beings which once again is evolutionary projected and is tied with the tendency of mating, pair bonding and coupling including us humans. In other words, it is the evolutionary Gynocentric violence for the purpose of survival of the species which goes hand in hand with the structural violence in the Gynocentric disposition of power dynamics. The problem is that this dynamic can easily go beyond the level of necessity and become extensive and excessive greed in form of hedonism. The extensive greedy desire to have and to own drives individuals, groups, and nations into extreme rivalry for what they want, followed by conflicts and even wars which as we will see is a Gynocentric and not a patriarchal trait. In other words, structural and evolutionary violence are all a hall mark of Gynocentrism and not patriarchy (which does not exist).

In the animal kingdom we can see it in the way female monkeys rally troops through wile. A famous research conducted by Arseneau and his team of co – researchers who studied four Vervet monkey groups at a game reserve in South Africa for two years proves this beyond all doubt. They observed that after a fight with a competing group, normally over food (the desire for material gains and relationships), females would groom males that had fought hardest (social Gynocentric conditioning), while snapping at those that abstained (both indoctrination of the beta and alpha male archetypes). When the next battle came along, both those singled out for attention and those aggressively shunned would participate more vigorously in combat (=indoctrination of violence in males by females), the researchers reported in the journal *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*. "Thus, females appear to use grooming as a reward for participation and aggression as punishment for defection" (sex as the main tool of social engineering and conditioning of males by females), said Arseneau. Success in battle ensures control over territory and food sources (again, the desire for material relationship)—a key concern for females, who take care of the young. But why would males risk involvement in a potentially high-stakes battle just for a bit of female attention? It's all about sex (longing for affection and the survival of the species) the researchers believe. "Receiving punishment" for not taking part in battles "could damage the... male's social relationship(s)" with females in the group, the researchers wrote. On the other hand, being rewarded could "potentially signal to other female group members that".

So, it is crucial first of all to remember the fact that in essence women have dominated social life in human societies (gynocentrism) for as long as humanity has existed. As we have seen above, not only for humans but other primates too, males’ strategies depend on female behavior. Sociality evolved in primates and in fact in our societies too because it improved females’ access to resources (material necessities and relationships) which was necessary in evolutionary terms and for survival of the species. Consistent with general patterns of primate life, elite men and women in modern society compete to establish social rules that most effectively and heartlessly transfer resources from men to women through the legal system, political institutions as well as gender norms and many more. To achieve the goals and to satisfy those female interests as well as the evolutionary purpose there was a female need in socially creating, instilling, conditioning and indoctrinating males with violence. Therefore, adequate social structures had to be built around this cause and they affect till those very days how women prompt men to kill other men as well as how women use aggression and violence against men as a tool of social engineering in order to manipulate and form male identity and masculinity while inevitably creating a taboo around those structures and dynamics so that they can hide the tracks with the aim at making men to accept their roles as a disposable tool and utility in the pursuit of female interests.

This is also the most basic root of the denial of female violence against men as well as their key role in generating male criminality because it simply endangers the gynocentric society and the female privilege within it. That is also why gynocentrism is basically a culture that breeds and is so well- known for its violence which also and primarily affects and targets men, both by male and female group members of the community, and that rests upon another well-known gynocentric principle namely that of male disposability. In his excellent research Maurrey Strauss has documented this phenomenon and has brought to light the denial of female violence in the last three decades. As we have seen above the outstanding study on the Vervet monkeys indicated that females play a key role in generating and supporting violence against males. Here, we want maybe to add that in intergroup aggression in Vervets consists of vocalizations, charging, chasing, and biting. Both females and males participate in such aggression. Females usually take the lead in organizing and instigating intergroup conflict. Adult males, which are about 1.5 times larger than adult females, are stronger fighters. Adult females poke adult males in their group into fighting with both rewards and punishments.

Furthermore, during pauses {in intergroup aggression}, females selectively groomed males that had participated in the previous aggressive episode, but aggressed male group members that had not. In subsequent (i.e. future) episodes, males who had received either aggression or grooming participated above their personal base-line level. Therefore, female–male aggression and grooming both appear to function as social incentives that effectively promote male participation in intergroup fights. Vervets are socially sophisticated primates. Group members observe males being rewarding for fighting and punished for not fighting. Those actions plausibly have broader social implications: Grooming and tolerance (i.e. the lack of aggression) are important services exchanged in the formation and maintenance of social bonds in primates, and it is possible that punishment and rewards have a disproportionate impact on male behavior because these social interactions influence the quality of male–female social relationships. That is to say, receiving punishment could damage the target male’s social relationship(s), either with the female actor(s) directly (i.e. experience based) or with other female group members who have observed the social incentive (i.e. reputation or information based). Conversely, receiving rewards could improve bond strength and potentially signal to other female group members that the target male is a valuable social partner. Sex, reproduction, evolution and survival of the species isn’t socially constructed, but social status is.

In human society, this female violence, however, is not directly exhibited by acts or in a vivid and apparent way but more as a clandestine and covert lifeline of Gynocentrism and it is actually twofold in its nature. First, it's the taboo of female violence against men and, second, it's the financial exploitation with the aim at transferring resources from men to women (necessity which transcends to greed) alongside with the incentive of attaining material necessities in general as explained above. There are many expressions to this phenomenon or dynamic but part of the basic ones is as follow: forced parenthood, enforced cuckoldry and enforced responsibility as well as accountability which are all male attributes in a gynocentric society might not be the sole expression but part of the taboo of female violence against men. Lack of reproductive rights as well as the nonexistence of male body autonomy especially in the domain of work and labor are part of the taboo of financial male exploitation and oppression aiming at first creating the financial and social resources but then transferring them to women. As we will see immediately all of them interfere one with another, they are intrinsically intertwined as a principle of nested spheres which forms the basis for the macro micro relationship of female violence against men.

Anyway, if we return to the basic psychological level the cycle of violence it is as said above the same for both men and women. Here, we must understand that when not equally applied to both genders at this basic level, a method that is selectively founded on inequality at the level of the root causes it cannot in a structured way create a solution and bring an equal solution to the problem of violence simply because inequality is inherent in its approach. The theory of patriarchy as we have seen is mistaken first of all at the empirical level. Not only that decades of research prove that symmetry in violence between men and women does exist, not only because this symmetry exists in all societies, even the ones called patriarchal, but especially because none human gynocentric primate societies disprove this notion. Thus, the dimensions of the phenomenon of women's violence against men are the same in all societies, modern, traditional and even existent in none human societies, as well as the existence of gender equality, namely, symmetry in violence, the patriarchal concept is nothing than a myth or bogus. In addition, it is known that violence is often the refuge of the weak and therefore the physical strength of men is actually the number one factor in their ability to avoid violence. In addition, the idea of ​​patriarchy does not fit into the studies of neoteny as well as male psychology in relationships based on two central principles related to the woman's neotenic nature: the first is the need to protect the woman in from of physical protection; and the other is the desire to make her happy and provide emotional and metal protection. Therefore, once again, the cause should be sought elsewhere.

Basically, and as we have seen above, a dynamic that I want to explain and outline now in details, violence comes from three psychological elements in which we respond to every experience in the world. These three elements are ignorance (ignorance, cognitive dissonance, confusion, etc.), clinging/attachment/craving and aversion/ill will. These are the three psychological prototypes through which we respond to all of our experiences as human beings. Cognitively, our reality is actually formed of our senses or the sense base through which we experience this world and reality that is what we see, what we hear, what we taste, what we feel, what we think, and so on. The bottom line, when we experience any of these three prototypes, it is still a conditioned response to our experiences. Therefore, psychologically we will respond conditioned by one of them that can be illusion (ignorance, cognitive dissonance and so on), attachment or clinging (i.e. conditional desire) and hate/anger (at the level of aversion). When the experience is pleasant, we cling to it and crave it more. We want it to last, stay forever and never lose it. It's a conditional desire. When the experience is unpleasant, we have a distaste for the experience. We do not want it, we hate it, we are angry, we try to block and to repel the negative experience in every possible way. There are almost no endings to these three prototypes and combinations at the level of negative emotions. Fear, hatred, anger, resentment, bitterness, frustration, alienation and so on as a derivative of attachment, aversion and delusion may finally lead to violence and abuse. The other possibility is ignorance, a kind of illusion, when the experience is neither pleasant nor unpleasant - it is a kind of neutral experience. This is when we repress and deny experience - a kind of self-deception and escapism, for example. In fact, ignorance or delusion is the primary cause, the root of the problem, which subsequently leads to attachment, clinging or hatred, anger and aversion and thus potentially to violence and abuse.

This is also deeply rooted in cognitive neuroscience. Visual consciousness, arises because of eye and visible forms; the meeting of the three is sensory impingement; because of sensory impingement arises feeling*;* what one feels, one perceives*;* what one perceives, one reasons about*;* what one reasons about, one turns into mental proliferation*;* what one turns into *mental proliferation,* due to that dynamic, mental proliferation assail us in regard to visible forms cognizable by the eye belonging to the past, the future and the present. Now, let's look at the process in more detail: the conventions of language enter near the beginning of the process of sense perception, at the point where feeling gives rise to mental activity and concepts. The mind, if unchecked, will attempt to place order on its feelings through language. This language immediately introduces the duality of subject and object, subject and feeling. The "I" enters with "I feel aversion" or "I feel attraction" or "I like this" or" I don't like this." This emphasis on the "I" is predetermined by the very nature of language and reinforces the strength of the feeling and the tendency for the person to identify completely with what is felt. What seems to happen after that is that language takes on a dynamism of its own.

Moreover, following the process described above, concepts now proliferate and leave the empirical behind. This everything happens from now on under the driving psychological forces that I've mentioned above. For instance, the observation, "I feel aversion" might lead to further thoughts such as: I am right to feel aversion. Therefore, the object is inherently worthy of aversion. So, the object must threaten me and others. Therefore, the objects must be got rid because otherwise I and mines cannot survive. And if I or mines cannot survive unless the object is annihilated from my sphere of vision and feeling, violence and abuse are legitimate. Thus, it is not only in my interest, not only it is my incentive but it is my duty to either to annihilate, to put in in its place or to control it for my sake and the sake of others. Thus, the entrance of "I" leads to the urge to protect the wishes, attachments, fears and desires and it becomes a seemingly rational decision about duty. The above is a purely hypothetical progression, yet it is not an implausible one. It illustrates the way in which thought progresses further and further away from what is empirically observed. Speculation enters as the mind attempts to reason. Eventually, as the thought process develops further, what might appear to be reason cloaks obsession which, in turn, can make the person a victim of the apparent logic of language. Hence, the societal narrative in the Gynocentric society is overwhelmingly female focused and anti-male, this narrative inevitably affects not only the personal level of female proliferation but also all other forms of collective proliferation which once against explains both the typical excuse of female as well as the systemically institutionalized gynocentric and feminist misandrist violence against men but also the phenomenon of the nested sphere macro/micro relationship of all forms and level of violence against men.

Another important area is the mechanism through which the "I" notion helps to generate unwholesome states. The danger in here in the view of some schools of psychology is that there is a creative use of the concept of self. In this respect, the concept we commonly understand as proliferation and that I mentioned above, is important. Metaphorically, we can declare or see *proliferation and in wider sense the narrative* to be the root of taking up weapons, and the defeat of *proliferation and narrative* is one of the main routes to end such violence. This is itself an end to the propensity to ignorance, this is itself an end of taking a weapon, of quarreling, contending, disputing, accusation, slander, lying speech. *Proliferation and narratives,* fed and generated by *craving, delusion, attachment, fear, ignorance, hatred and anger,* whether overt or covert, as it is in Gynocentrism and feminism, is therefore central to the theme of violence in the thoughts and actions of human beings. In such environment not only that the human being can become susceptive or the victim of such obsessive actions, thoughts and inclinations but given the misandrist Gynocentric and feminist environment it is almost inevitable. It holds that the drift towards violence within one person or within society, especially if a communal or cultural obsession has arisen, may become an inevitable causal process unless the inner mechanism is discovered. Related to this is the danger and motivating force of dogmatic and speculative views as one of the roots of violence — the *false view as ignorance/delusion,* for instance, the misandrist views towards the evil nature of men, connected in the above analysis with *proliferation as well as attachment, clinging, aversion and ill will.*

Here, in that sense, we must also understand that formal power (authority aka codification, law, legislation, directives, regulations and many more) is rooted, defined, it depends and can be exercised only with the help, the consent and when approved by the informal power (societal focus, collective intelligence/understanding and narrative). And the latter is always gynocentric and especially matrifocal that obsessively concentrates on female incentives, wishes and desires. It is also important to add that conventional - collective intelligence is a form of relative wisdom but not the ultimate one. As such and on a large group scale it is susceptible to mistakes, false views and misinterpretations having thus to undergo an evaluation not through group members but by being scrutinized through empirical finding and data as to be classified as truth. In fact, metaphysically authority springs conceptually (abstractually) from wisdom, language, speech including verbal interpretation (before codification) and is overwhelming controlled by female energies and gynocentric concepts while it is important to understand that through conditioning, beginning from early stages of infancy up to adulthood both boys and girls adopt their mother's female and thus gynocentric mindset in how and through which they perceive and interpret the world and reality. In practical terms authority springs in the world of actual forms (as standing opposed to abstract and conceptual "emptiness" aka. "pregnant void" ( which can be compared to the quantum physical principles) from the narrative and through the realm as well as at the same time the means of language and speech, both heavily colored through its gynocentric and female nature, then it is codified (thus dependent on it) and is finally implemented/exercised over the masses through the support and acceptance of the informal power (women and the gynocentric principle).

Without going too much into a metaphysical discussion it is important to understand and differ between the ultimate, unborn - abstract wisdom and its emanation into other realms of knowledge and intelligence which are born, relative and not ultimately always true as even paradigm changes (and shifts) within science itself show. In that sense the ultimate wisdom, the abstract - unborn is eternal and primordial; other forms are born and emanate from it. The next one is the born wisdom and it is followed by various stages, level and realms of intelligence up to the last and lower pieces in the chain of originating wisdom, intelligence and knowledge which are bits of data and information. In this context despite the unborn wisdom there exist non dually personal as well as (conventional) collective forms of wisdom and intelligence leading to knowledge based on data and information. Not only this is the dwelling realm of the collective conventional knowledge but it is also the place where it is created. Thus, gynocentric collective - conventional knowledge and narrative is formed in the born, conditioned realm of the narrative and this is the root dimension of its origins. Despite the feminist's and the blue pill's claims, gynocentric conventional - collective wisdom is not the ultimate truth and in fact it is wrong and falsely fabricated narrative. Anyway, authority as a characteristic of male power is surrounded by female qualities, concepts and energies from every side while at the same time it is born of it, conditioned and thus at the end implementing its narrative and cause by being approved and the support of the feminine in the same way as male baby is by his mother even physically in the womb. In other words, authority, in that senses, resembles, reminds and embodies the same dynamic as masculinity itself that by default of the gynocentric nature of women and the societal expression of reality is defined by women. In other words, the origin of mundane authority is metaphysically born, conditioned, created and is emanating from born, conditioned, relative and emanating wisdom, especially the collective one as well as narrative, language and speech. It functions on a two-folded realm principle whereas the origin of authority it gives it birth and rise and then in another two folded manner it first defines it and then through language, speech and narrative interprets it. It is only in the middle stage or link that based on the female principles' men practice, codify and exercise authority. Therefore, the codification and execution always occur within this none dual phenomenon where the masculine and feminine can never be separated and function alone but the feminine is the dominant force which gives rise, defines and allows the masculine to be acted and executed in the world.

Also derived from the principle of dependent origination and the interconnected worldview as I have explained above is a holistic view of the micro/macro linkage between violence at all levels where all causes of violence are interrelated and mutually influential. In that sense, violence shows a clear link between interpersonal, collective, national, and global levels of violence. There is an increasing number of evidences which postulates a relationship between the causes of violence at the micro level and those at the macro level. It illuminates the micro-macro association between the different levels of violence in terms of relationship between direct, structural and cultural violence. In that it is clear that the domestic violence would be reflected in a nation’s social but also international level between countries. The violence against men in so-called peace time, whether perpetrated by women or the feminist state apparatus through institutionalized misandry when cultivated, culminated and replaced with compassion towards men will end war on international level when men's life would stop being disposable as Warren Farrell said. Once the economic exploitation of men stops, once the discrimination of men on all level ends, once misandry's uprooted, culturally as well as legally, and many more than it will all lead to peace, equality, national security and social harmony in a more holistic framework. This has to start within the family in general and marriage in particular and end in the larger setting of world society.

To sum it up: at the basic level, violence is rooted in the mind and both men and women are prone, capable of it and can be violent. On top of that level, the Gynocentric society adds evolutionary as well as structural elements to the female violence. This does not mean that men are incapable or that this dynamic prevents them to be violent in relationships. It indeed, widens the wider circles of violence in the detriment of men. As such it creates a nested spheres of micro macro relationship of violence where men suffer and are the most victims of it whether this is general crime, victims of war, financial exploitation, systemic institutionalized discrimination and violence against men and many more. In gynocentric societies men are not only indoctrinated by women to violence, not only aren't they the main perpetrators, not only that vice versa they are indeed the main victims of violence but based on the clandestine nature of most of female violence and the concept of female hypo-agency women are rarely persecuted and men are victim blamed for it. Unravelling the clandestine nature of female violence and the gynocentric – feminist narrative of misandry is only the first but most crucial step in ending this situation and create a more compassionate, wise and just society towards men. The obliteration of the anti-man narrative and hate speech is what we must target first and this can be done among other by unravelling the clandestine nature of gynocentric and feminist misandry.
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