BUCKS COUNTY
FACE
Fathers' & Children's Equality, Inc.

104 Berry Lane
Feasterville PA 19053
(215) FACE-464
rolfyboy@plantagenet.com

Good Morning, Chairman Gannon, members of the committee, gentlemen and ladies. As you can see by the dress I have conspicuously chosen to wear today, I am not a member of the Bar or a politician with any financial stake in the current court system or legislative process.

What I am, is Mr. Rolf Dinsmore, father of Michael and Joseph Dinsmore, ex-husband of Mrs. Leslie Ramsey, and the information and training officer of the Bucks County Chapter of Father's and Childrens' Equality, Incorporated (A non-profit self-help oprganization for non-custodial parents).

In early 1995, I asked my ex-wife to let me spend more time with our children because Michael was starting to fall behind in his schoolwork. She said no, so I told her that I would ask the honorable Montgomery Court of Common Pleas to grant my request. She immediately moved to a hidden address, and two weeks later filed charges of abuse with the police and Children and Youth Services.

After a complete investigation, the Police and Children and Youth Services determined that the allegations were unfounded. I had filed an emergency petition for custody with the Court, but had been turned down, because, I am quoting the Judge here, "Just because Mr. Dinsmore is not seeing the children doesn't make it an emergency. Now if he had non-refundable tickets to Disneyworld, *that* would be an emergency."

It is now three years later, and I am still waiting to have my protracted hearing to decide custody of Michael and Joseph. Now, I am sure the question that you are asking is; "Why is it taking so long?" That is a question that the Court must answer. But in the meantime, what is happening to the children?

I have filed many petitions and requests for the children to see me, but the Court has been unwilling to consider granting them even one day alone with me. Mrs. Ramsey was charged with truancy for keeping our son home for 90 out of 180 school days. After the school won their case, Michael was transfered to Catholic

school, where they have continually refused to disclose any information whatsoever to me.

Gentleman and Ladies, I am the result of this Commonwealth's sole custody policy. A father who loves his children, pays 100% of his ordered child support, and doesn't even know where the children are today.

I am sure that you have heard many reasons for maintaining the status quo of sole custody in pennsylvania. So I would like to provide you with **The Case For Joint Custody.**

A Georgia superior court judge named Robert Nolan always gave custody of the children to the mother. He explains: **"I ain't never seen a calf following a bull. They always follow the cow. So I always give custody to the mamas."**

Most judges think like Judge Nolan, that mother headed households are the natural order. In the Detroit ghetto, where I was born, it was common knowledge that apart from being sperm-donors, men were completely unfit to be parents. In 1965, that mind-set was confined to the mostly poor black parts of the inner cities. But now, it has spread throughout the country. It is not just the poor welfare mothers rejecting fathers anymore, it is the middle-class and well-to-do divorcees, helped by strict child support collection and welfare programs, forcing fathers out to the street corners to complain to each other about **"how they been wronged."**

Judge Nolan may try a divorce case in the morning and place the children in the mother's custody. He may try a criminal case in the afternoon and send a man to prison for robbing a liquor store. The chances are three out of four that the criminal he sends to prison grew up in a female headed household just like the one he created himself that morning when he tried the divorce case.

His thinking is that he is only doing what is right. After all, the biological link between the mother and her children is closer than between the father and his children, and therefore the mother is the natural choice for sole custodian.

In a sense, he is right. Patriarchy, or father headed households are not natural, they are artificial, shaky constructs built to separate us from judge Nolan's cattle. He thinks, as Margaret Mead does, that the female role is a biological fact, and that fatherhood is a social invention, man-made, artificial, fragile. When the

social props it requires are withdrawn society reverts to matriarchy, the pattern of cattle. And of the Detroit ghetto.

The creation of female headed households in place of joint parenting households has resulted in what Senator Moynihan said on Meet the Press in 1994:

The larger society is coming to take on the pattern of the ghettos. (Paraphased)

Female headed households are a minority of households, but they do not generate a minority of the criminal class nor just a simple majority of it. They generate over seventy percent of the criminal class. It takes eight hundred and fifteen intact homes to generate as much delinquency as is generated by one hundred (moslty female headed) broken homes.

Ardent feminists, and many of the Common Pleas Judges I have met, reply that even though delinquency is eight times more likely in fatherless homes, most fatherless children do not grow up to be delinquents, so there can be no objection to mother custody.

This is called the "Safe Drunk Driver Argument": Most drunk drivers don't get into accidents, most of them get home safely. Drunks are, however, overrepresented among those who to get in accidents, and therefore we have laws that discourage drunk driving.

Fatherless children, by the same reasoning, are overrepresented among criminals, drug addicts, mental patients, high school dropouts, and teenage pregnancies. Therefore, we should have laws which discourage fatherlessness.

The high crime areas of my hometown Detroit, my adopted city Philadelphia, and my current home in Bucks County, are the areas with the largest numbers of fatherless children. There are no exceptions. The divorce courts' exiling fathers from families in divorce cases is the current social policy, and it is a bad policy.

According to sociologist David Popenoe:

"The negative consequences of fatherlessness are all around us. They affect children, women, and men. Evidence indicating damage to children has

accumulated in near tidal-wave proportions. Fatherless children experience significantly more physical, emotional, and behavioral problems than do children growing up in intact families."

To reduce delinquency and violence, we must keep fathers fully involved with rasing their children. Here's what sociologist henry Biller says:

"Males who are father-deprived early in life are likely to engage later in rigidly overcompensatory masculine behaviors. The incidence of crimes against property and people, including child abuse and family violence, is relatively high in societies where the rearing of young children is considered to be an exclusive female endeavor."

Why do judges routinely award custody to the mother? There are three reasons:

1) Motherhood is more solidly based in biology than fatherhood.

2) Women, like children, are percieved to be more dependant, therefore need their rights more closely guarded.

3) When given only the sole custody option, Judges must choose between creating a fatherless household, or a motherless household. In their eyes, a fatherless household does not carry as large a social stigma, and is therefore better for the parents and children.

With regard to the first excuse, if biology takes care of the matrimonial bond, then our laws should seek to strengthen the weaker bond, so that the child may have a father.

With regard to the dependancy excuse, women are no longer the dependant member of the family. Mothers have the full force of law with regards to divorce, custody, support and abuse. While men have almost no legal protection, in fact, if not in law.

With regards to the third excuse, creating a joint custody arrangement would reduce the lure of divorce. If custody can no longer be used to punish the other parent, and if both parents will remain involved with the children, then there is little benefit to be gained by using the children as legal pawns.

We have been trying to rescue the fatherless with more welfare and by hounding the fathers to subsidize the mothers, which has exacerbated the destruction of the family by further emphasizing the roleness of the fathers.

What is needed is to make fathers who want to have families and who signify their commitment to family-formation by marrying... to make their fatherhood irrevocable and precious by force of law. Nothing except this will give them a secure role. Thus the father and mother will know, prior to marriage, that the father is assuming his responsibilities for the support of the children regardless of the stability of the marriage

In conclusion, never before have fathers been cast aside as they have been in Pennsylvania during the last 30-40 years. Never before has such a strong commonwealth become as threatened as we are, for this solitary reason. Regrettably, as long as we continue to hold to the relatively new idea that only mothers are capable of being parents, and ignore the essential role of fathers, our children remain at risk.

The single mother-headed household must go the way of the slum high-rise dwelling. Both are human disaster zones. Both are exalted attempts at social engineering that ignore the basic facts of human society.

What is needed? Joint custody, good fathers here on earth, and our Father in heaven- as well as a society that values them, includes them, and encourages their involvement in their families.

The Child's Bill of Rights

As adopted from Wisconsin Supreme Court decisions

I. The right of the child to be treated as an interested and affected person and not as a pawn.

II. The right to grow up in the home environment that will best guarantee an opportunity to achieve mature and responsible citizinship.

III. The right to the day-to-day love, care, discipline, and protection of the custodial parent.

IV. The right to know the noncustodial parent and to have the benefit of such parent's love and guidance through adequate visitation.

V. The right to a positive and constructive relationship with both parents, with neither parent permitted to degrade the other in the child's mind.

VI. The right to have moral and ethical values inculcated by precept and example, and to have limits set for behavior so that the child may develop self discipline early in life.

VII. The right to the most adequate level of economic support that can be provided by the efforts of both parents.

VIII. The right to the same opportunities for education that the child would normally have had if the family unit had not been broken.

IX. The right to such periodic review of custodial arrangements and child support orders as the parent's circumstances and the child's benefit require.

X. The right to the recognition of the fact that children involved in a divorce are always disadvantaged parties, and the Law must take affirmative steps to assure their welfare.

School officials say that

FAMILY BREAKDOWN

is the leading cause of school violence.

(The 2nd and 3rd causes listed by school officials result from the lack of parental role models and a need to fill the emotional gap left by the absence of a parent.)

Our children need families.

We can't stop divorce, but we can continue to give them 2 parents following separation or divorce.

For more information, contact the:

Fathers *HOTLINE* 512-472-DADS (3237)

Schools fight losing battle

By Kenneth Eskey
SCRIPPS HOWARD NEWS SERVICE

Schools have tried suspensions, expulsions, locker searches and metal detectors, but student violence is worse now than it was five years ago, a survey of 700 school districts has found.

The survey found that school officials blame family breakdown and violence in movies, television and song lyrics for the violence in their schools, with alcohol, drugs and access to guns as secondary factors.

Schools are responding to violence with a variety of prevention tactics — but nothing seems to work very well.

Thirty-nine percent of urban districts had a shooting or knifing in school last year, and 23 percent reported a drive-by shooting.

Administrators in suburban and rural areas say violence has increased in their districts as well, though not to the extent experienced in urban areas.

"School districts have tried everything from suspending students to establishing alternative programs for disruptive students to installing closed-circuit television, especially on school buses," says the report by the National School Boards Association.

Attacks by students on students and teachers reflect what is happening in the surrounding communities, says NSBA President William Soult, a school director in Longmont, Colo.

"Students typically do not buy drugs or weapons in school and they do not see violent TV programs in school," he said.

The report contends that concern over TV violence is so great that restrictions on television content are justified.

"In an era when some children spend as many hours with Beavis and Butt-head as they do with Mom and Dad, efforts to limit the amount of violence on TV seem especially appropriate," the report says.

Among the methods school systems are using to curb violence:

• Fairfax County requires parents of students with repeated suspensions to attend a three-day intervention program before the student is allowed back in class.

• A school district in Tucson, Ariz., responded to a drive-by shooting by erecting an 8-foot-high fence around each campus.

• San Diego schools removed all lockers from secondary schools to reduce the availability of contraband and weapons.

• In Spokane, Wash., a city police officer has an office in one of the schools.

• Students in Philadelphia elementary schools are trained as "peace seekers" to stop fights during recess.

• Broward County, Fla., hired a former New York City gang member to keep students from joining gangs

• A "greeters" program in St. Paul, Minn., places adults in the hallways and around the school grounds to control access by outsiders. Many other schools have similar programs.

The survey found little agreement on whether a student should serve a suspension in school or at home.

One school district argued that "allowing a kid to sleep late, watch television and spend a day unsupervised is hardly a punishment."

Another district said students "hate" home suspensions.

Still others said it doesn't matter.

"Suspensions do not work. Students don't care whether they are suspended or not," one district reported

against student mayhem

CAUSES OF SCHOOL VIOLENCE

The leading causes of school violence, as seen by school district officials responding to a National School Boards Association survey. Respondents were allowed to check more than one factor.

Family breakdown	77%
TV and other media violence	60%
Alcohol and drugs	45%
Access to guns	43%
Poverty	40%

Source: National School Boards Association

The Washington Times

IN THE
SUPERIOR COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
PHILADELPHIA DISTRICT

NUMBER
01535 PHL 97

LESLIE RAMSEY
Appellee

v.

ROLF DINSMORE
Appellant

APPLICATION FOR RECONSIDERATION

APPLICATION FROM THE ORDER OF THIS HONORABLE COURT ISSUED DECEMBER 31, 1997. APPEAL OF ORDER OF THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY DATED MARCH 13, 1997, LOWER COURT DOCKET 97-04675

FILED BY:

Rolf Dinsmore
Pro Se for Appellant
331 Jackson St.
Bristol, PA 19007
(215) 788-4712 home
(215) 355-3300 work

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

TABLE OF CITATIONS

APPLICATION FOR RECONSIDERATION

This action is a petition under the Protection From Abuse Act. 23 Pa.C.S §6102 *et seq.* (The "Act"), brought by the mother (appellee) against the father (appellant). The final order was entered on March 13, 1997 by Judge Lawrence of the Montgomery County Common Pleas Court.

By Order dated December 30 1997, a Panel of this Court affirmed the Lower Court's Order preventing contact between the children and their father without a hearing on the merits of this act. The Panel affirmed the Lower Court's usage of improper evidentiary standards, denial of continuances, preventing affirmative defenses, and the constitutionality of the Protection From Abuse Act (hereinafter referred to as 'PFA').

Pursuant to Pa.R.A.P 2541 *et seq.,* The Court is respectfully requested to reconsider the Panel's decision, or to permit oral argument (reargument) of this case on the following grounds:

I. The Panel has adopted the Lower Court opinion as its own, disregarding the Lower Courts clear misapprehension of facts and record material. In failing to address the appellant's assertions regarding the standard of evidence, this Court is stating that evidence standards are not applicable in Protection From Abuse hearings

The Panel has accepted the Lower Court's opinion that in PFA actions, a standard of proof will be used in which "...the evidence, viewed in the light most favorable to the petitioner and granting her the benefit of all reasonable inferences was sufficient to sustain the determination that abuse was shown by a preponderance of the evidence." Lower Court opinion, page 1.

The correct interpretation of the opinion used by the Lower Court comes from Miller on Behalf of Walker., 665 A.2d 1252, 445 Pa.Super. 537 (1995), "**When a claim is presented on appeal that the evidence was not sufficient to support an order of protection from abuse,** we review the evidence in the light most favorable to the petitioner and granting her the benefit of all reasonable inferences, determine whether the evidence was sufficient to sustain the trial court's conclusion by a preponderance of the evidence." (Emphasis added).

In the appeal before the panel, the mother presented only her testimony that she was being harassed over the phone. There was no evidence that she made any attempt to report threats to the police or the phone company. There was no witness who could confirm the alleged abuse. Under cross examination, the mother admitted that she had perjured herself on two of the three allegations in the original complaint.

On the Father's side, he attempted to present documentary evidence showing no outgoing phone calls from his residence (impossible without a continuance to obtain phone records!) or place of employment. His companion testified that it would have been impossible for the alleged abuse to have taken place while the father was sleeping in bed with her.

The lower court refused to hear evidence of the mother's prior attempts to falsely accuse the father, and also refused to allow an affirmative defense which would have shown the reasons for the mother's false allegations of abuse. The Lower Court did, however give significant weight to the mother's extensive fabricated history of marital abuse.

The Panel's endorsement of the Lower Court's opinion regarding the unfair standard of evidence used in PFA hearings will result in continued misuse of the PFA act by mothers to gain pre-emptive sole custody. Investigations by practicing attorneys, judges, and abuse advocates nationwide is showing that a false allegation of abuse is now the most common method of gaining custody, much as the false allegation of sexual abuse has been used to gain custody over the previous decade and a half.

II. The Panel has failed to address the appellant's second issue: "Did the Lower Court abuse its discretion by not continuing the hearing until evidence could be obtained, first, on the respondent's request, and second, on the unavailability of phone records?"

The Panel has failed to rule on this issue. Current regulations allow an organization 20 days to produce records in response to a request for records or *subpoena duces tecum*. The phone company is not able to comply with phone record requests in the short time between notification of a PFA hearing, and the actual date of the hearing.

The father requested a continuance on two separate occasions so that records could be obtained. Phone records would have settled the issue of harassment via phone instantly. The Lower Court, perhaps knowing this, decided to rule without hearing such critical evidence, and the Panel has affirmed such tactics. The Panel is apparently telling the Lower Court that crucial evidence is less important than uncorroborated testimony from the mother.

It is unlikely that the framers of the PFA act envisioned a false allegation such as the one before this Court. There are procedures in place, and published in every phone book, concerning what to do about harassing phone calls. The fact that the mother and her attorney knew these procedures and NEVER once used them, shows once again that the allegations are completely false. And, more importantly, shows that the mother knew that the PFA act could be used to circumvent the proper procedures. She knew that her allegations would be proven false is proper procedures were used.

III. The Panel has failed to address the appellant's third issue: "Did the lower court abuse its discretion and/or commit an error of law in not allowing evidence to be presented showing the respondent's prior history of false allegations, mental deficiencies, and abuse of process?"

The Panel has once again refused to offer its opinion in response to the father's claim. Any person reading the Lower Court's opinion would be shocked at the level of abuse that is said to have occurred. The mother alleges years of abuse both to her and the children. The father denies that any abuse has occurred, but has a difficult task of proving his innocence. Without witnesses to corroborate abuse, the Lower Court and the Panel has accepted the mother's testimony.

The father attempted to present an affirmative defense, the only defense possible. Why would the mother make up allegations of abuse? The mother has engaged in a consistent pattern of parental

alienation, including false allegations of sexual abuse, and false allegations of harassment and stalking. Under the scrutiny of proper law procedures and due process, these prior complaints have been dismissed.

> "To meet the special exigencies of abuse case, acceptable procedures have been fashioned which suspend, temporarily, the due process rights of the alleged abuser and providing for summary procedures for implementation of orders. But continued suspension, irrespective of motivating factors, cannot be countenanced without judicial limits, subject to substantive or procedural restraint...Such a hearing, of course, must contain all of the elements of due process, which, above all, requires sufficient evidence, which, by its preponderance, will support restriction of a member of the family to his or her rights under the law." In re. Penny R., 509 A.2d 338, 353 Pa.Super. 70 (1986)

The Panel has accepted and affirmed the Lower Court's denial of due process, in direct opposition to the above opinion.

IV. The Panel has failed to address constitutional issues raised by the appellant, ignoring Supreme court decisions which clearly state that fundamental fairness must be preserved when an individual is threatened with a "significant deprivation of liberty," or "stigma."

"85% of prisoners, 78% of high school dropouts, 82% of teenage girls who become pregnant, the majority of drug and alcohol abusers-- all come from single mother headed households... And, how has the government responded to this crisis? **By continuing to drive fathers out of the family**. It is bad enough that some fathers abandon their families, but it is **unconscionable** that our federal and state policies drive fathers away from their families." *Reuniting Fathers with their Families*, Stuart A. Miller and Rich Zubaty, Washington Times, December 19, 1995 (A19). (Emphasis added)

The Panel comforts itself with the knowledge that the children being denied their right to see their father would only occur for a short period of time. The result? The children are at an undisclosed location and have not been permitted to see their father for eight months. Prior to that, the children saw their father only sporadically (one hour per week) since 1995. Each time the father asks the Court to correct this injustice to the children, the Court responds that it is only temporary, and therefore they wash their hands of the matter. The father filed a petition for special relief after the mother was found guilty of truancy (the oldest child missed 90 days of school), and the Lower Court refused to hear the petition. The Panel is now continuing this outrage.

The Panel has refused to consider the larger implications of the PFA act. On its surface, it protects women and children from abusive relationships. The underside, that of the effect of a false allegation undermines hundreds of years of constitutional law. The nation's courts have ruled repeatedly that the parent-child relationship must be vigorously protected. Listed below is a sampling of applicable cases, which are simply too numerous to be discussed in detail. The father hopes that they will serve notice to the Court and the Panel that the method of dealing with the mother's complaint in this instance has severely overstepped the bounds of due process and equal protection.

The rights of parents to the care, custody and nurture of their children is of such character that it cannot be denied without violating those fundamental principles of liberty and justice which lie at the base of all our civil and political institutions, and such right is a fundamental right protected by this amendment (First) and Amendments 5, 9, and 14. Doe v. Irwin, 441 F.Supp. 1247; U.S. D.C. of Michigan, (1985).

Law and court procedures that are "fair on their faces" but administered" with an evil eye or a heavy hand" was discriminatory and violates the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 US 356, (1886)

Even when blood relationships are strained, parents retain vital interest in preventing irretrievable destruction of their family life; if anything, persons faced with forced dissolution of their parental rights have more critical need for procedural protections than do those resisting state intervention into ongoing family affairs. Santosky v. Kramer, 102 S.Ct. 1388; 455 US 745, (1982).

Parent's interest in custody of her children is a liberty interest which has received considerable constitutional protection; a parent who is deprived of custody of his or her child, even though temporarily, suffers thereby grievous loss and such loss deserves extensive due process protection. In the Interest of Cooper, 621 P. 2d 437; 5 Kansas App. Div. 2d 584, (1980).

The Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment requires that severance in the parent-child relationship caused by the state occur only with rigorous protections for individual liberty interests at stake. Bell v. City of Milwaukee, 746 F. 2d 1205; US Ct. App. 7th Cir. WI, (1984).

The United States Supreme Court noted that a parent's right to "the companionship, care, custody and management of his or her children" is an interest "far more precious" than any property right. May v. Anderson, 345 US 528, 533; 73 S Ct. 840, 843, (1952).

No bond is more precious and none should be more zealously protected by the law as the bond between parent and child. Carson v. Elrod, 411 F Supp. 645, 649; DC E.D, VA (1976).

Judges must maintain a high standard of judicial performance with particular emphasis upon conducting litigation with scrupulous fairness and impartiality. 28 USCA § 2411; Pfizer v. Lord, 456 F 2d 532; cert denied 92 S Ct 2411; US Ct. All. MN, (1972).

The right of a parent not to be deprived of parental rights without a showing of fitness, abandonment or substantial neglect is so fundamental and basic as to rank among the rights contained in this Amendment (Ninth) and Utah's Constitution, Article 1 § 1. In re U.P., 648 P 2d 1364; Utah, (1982).

In conclusion, the scientific research shows that access/visitation interference occurs in an alarmingly high number of cases and that the family courts have not been able to enforce compliance by civil measures.

"Between 25% - 35% of mothers denied visits." (Pg. 451, col. 2, 2, lines 11-14) *Frequency of Visitation by Divorced Fathers: Differences in Reports by Fathers and Mothers* - Sanford H Braver, Ph.D., et al., American Journal of Orthopsychiatry

"40% of mothers reported that they had interfered with the non-custodial father's visitation on at least one occasion, to punish their ex-spouse." (Pg. 449, Col. 2, 1, lines 3-6 citing Fullton, 1979) *Id.*

"Unilateral abuse of parental custodial power is more common in court ordered sole custody situations." (Pg.4, col. 1, 1, lines 17-20) *Child custody and Parental Cooperation*, Frank Williams, M.D., Dir. Psychiatry- Cedar-Sinai- presented to the American Bar Association, Family Law Section, August 1987 and January 1988.

"Mothers may prevent visits to retaliate against the fathers for problems in their marital or post marital relationship." (Pg. 1025, Col. 2, 2, lines 5-8) *Family ties after Divorce: The Relationship Between Visiting and Paying Support,* Judith Seltzer, Nora Shaeffer, Hong-wen Charing, University of Wisconsin, Journal of Marriage and Family, Vol. 51, No. 4, November 1989.

"Our research indicates that most fathers and children who are separated from each other face barriers to continued interaction." (Pg. 675, col. 1, 1, lines 2-5) *Children's Contact with Absent Parents,* Judith A. Seltzer, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and Suzanne M. Bianchi, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

"The former spouse [mother] was the greatest obstacle to having frequent contact with the children." (Pg. 281, Col. 2, 1, lines 1-4); **"The court's failure to enforce or expand visitation agreements were a frequently mentioned complaint."** (Pg. 281, Col. 2, 2, lines 14-16) *Increasing our Understanding of Fathers Who Have Infrequent Contact With Their Children*, James R. Dudley, Professor, University of North Carolina, under a grant from Temple University, Family Relations, Vol. 4, No. 3, July, 1991.

"Unfortunately, some angry women attempted to use the child's symptomatic behaviors as proof that the visits were detrimental to the child's welfare and should therefore be discontinued, distressing the unhappy child even more." (Pg. 126, 2, lines 1-5) *Surviving the Breakup*, Joan Berlin Kelly and Judith A Wallerstein, Basic Books.

"Over 85% of child sex abuse allegations in divorce and custody allegations are found false in tried court cases. In these cases, the accuser has MMPI's indicating unusual personality characteristics in 90% of cases, and the alleged perpetrator has normal MMPI's in 95% of cases." *Personality Characteristics of Falsely Accusing Parents in Custody Disputes"* Ralph Underwager and Hollida Wakefield, Sixth Annual Symposium in Forensic Psychology, 1990.

Domestic violence by women is increasing and violence by men is decreasing. *Societal change and change in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys.* Straus, M.A. and Gelles, R.J., Journal of Marriage and the Family 48, Pgs. 465-479, 1986.

Rates per year per 1000 couples of various forms of violence

	CTS Survey #1 1975 (N=2143)		CTS Survey #2 1985 (N=3520)	
	Victim		**Victim**	
	wife	husband	wife	husband
1) Threw something	28	52	28	43
2) Pushed, grabbed, or shoved	107	83	93	89
3) Slapped	51	46	29	41
4) Kicked, bit, or hit with fist	24	31	5	2
5) Hit or tried to hit with something	22	30	17	30
6) Beat up	11	6	8	4
7) Threat with gun or knife	4	6	4	6
8) Used gun or knife	3	2	2	2
Overall Violence (1-8)	121	116	113	121
Severe Violence (5-8)	38	46	30	44

The appellant, for the foregoing reasons set forth in this Application respectfully requests that the full Court should give careful review to the panel's holding.

Respectfully Submitted

_____

Rolf Dinsmore
Pro Se for Appellant

Dated: _____,1998