

Sanctioned by the State

Globally, the brutal impact of the current forty year old International Family and Child Protection Laws, has now caused one in four of the civilian population to lose 'protective contact' with their family, while annually soaking up more taxpayer dollars than we spend on the whole of our annual defence budgets. In the English speaking world alone, the populations of the USA, UK, Canada and Australia, account for an estimated **112 million** men, women and children being involuntarily removed from their families by these laws. They have also become a leading cause of fractured societal cohesion, as well as premature mortality and morbidity outcomes.

In other words we spend more on waging war against ourselves, than we spend on defence against external threats.

Government statistics indicate, we have allowed the forced removal of millions of 'protective' family members from their biological children, and replaced them with civil servants and a collective of profiteering enabling cohorts, who now decide what is best for a nation's children. There are many reasons why this has been tolerated for so long, but primarily it happens due to the financial gains that family breakdown present, and because not one of the many contributing factors operates in isolation. They are all interconnected and feed off each other, creating the biggest, costliest, least effective and most damaging child protection network, the world has ever witnessed. The enormity of the costs (both social and economic) and the sheer magnitude of the number of people harmfully impacted, causing many to take their own life, has the potential to lead to a dangerous erosion of confidence in our political leadership.

Apart from those with a vested self-interest, who exactly encourages, supports or defends a Legal system that can only manage a 20% success rate for those it's supposed to protect? Conversely, who are the main beneficiaries of a Legal system that presides over a combined 80% failure rate for the children it claims to protect?

As a result of oppressive secrecy provisions, there remains a lack of transparency, which silences critics, and allows everything relating to Family Breakdown and Child Protection to be filtered through a prism of ambiguous data. All too often the blind acceptance of such dubious information, leads to it being upheld as fact by the dominant legal elite, enabling institutions, our elected representatives, and unfortunately by much of the mainstream media.

This is not what the civilian population either demands or expects, so why have successive governments supported such chaotic and harmful outcomes for our children and their families, with such cavalier indifference for 40 years?

The following small glimpse into Government supported bigotry and gender prejudiced attitudes, is worth noting:

During his 16 year reign as Chief Protector of Australian children, the former Chief Justice of the Family Court, Alastair Nicholson, presided over the involuntary removal of an estimated 736,000 children from 'protective contact' with their families. His gender prejudice became particularly evident in 1998, when he referred to any desperate fathers who tried in vain to remain in 'protective contact' with their children, as "Sinister Men" who wanted to change the law to disadvantage women. He accused them of exhibiting a complete absence of concern for their children, other than as objects of their rights and entitlements. Many people say such bigotry is alive and well and claim that the 'Sinister Men using children as objects of rights and entitlements' mentality which Nicholson speaks of, is more psychological projection than fact, since it is misdirected. They point out how the phrase "women and their children", which has now become part of the discredited child removal process, better clarifies who is using children as objects.

Sixteen years later, on July 4 - 2014, in 'The Age' Newspaper, the same Alastair Nicholson, who by then had been able to position himself as the chairman of 'Children's Rights International', proclaims that he is ashamed of being an Australian. Ironically, and perhaps a sign of things to come, the vast majority of people now consider the bigoted attitude and actions of one of his predecessors, the 'Chief Protector of Aboriginals' as a historical embarrassment.