

To the Secretary,
Senate Committee of Inquiry on Men's Health,
P.O.B. 6100,
Parliament House, A.C.T. 2600
Canberra.

Email: menshealth.sen@aph.gov.au

02)6277.3559
Fax: 61) 2 62775775

Sir,

I respectfully submit the following considerations:

I am incensed at the morally degenerated status of men and women in Australia, that it is generally unrecognised, and at the very clear fact that there is no such a thing as "family-rights" in this country, and the fact that it is bureaucrats, not always impartially, that have the last say in decreeing what is "the best interest of the child." "For three things the earth doth tremble, -- the first is for the servant, when he reigneth." (O.T.) For the present disgraceful state of the Family, the church stands guilty of the grossest negligence and cowardice, in its utter failure to speak out against this state of affairs and in its preparedness to surrender to materialistic, secular government, one basic reason for its isolation now from even "the sheep" who may not be so stupid after all. Surely one clear reward for its institutional cowardice is to be seen recently in the ease with which feminist machinations can have an archbishop "burned" -- (I mean metaphorically, - and not like Thomas Cranmer), -- merely for acting to preserve the perceived dignity of his institution as might any C.E.O. of a large corporation.

I come from a decent, respectable loving family background. My mother divorced my father in 1950, basically because he was a spoiled brat with a bad temper, and my Mother was trained in a sense of her own dignity. He'd gone to [an old church-based boys college], as had his father and his brother. My Mother was a true hero, and as such is unsung in the general assemblies of the ordinary people. Her parents showed me all the love in the world to me and my sister, and are to me now eternal examples of familial lovingkindness. My paternal grandmother, a widow for most of the time I knew her grieved like Queen Victoria for my grandfather who died in 1936. She also showed me kindness. My sister was also an example of familial loyalty unto death.

In 1970 I initiated divorce from my wife, since re-married twice typically,

because her priority was money and self-opinion over love and righteousness. She had been trained, brainwashed, by her early "feminist" mother, to believe a "husband" was just a material convenience. She therefore, with the complete support of official or legal processes was given everything, including the four children, and I was left with just what she couldn't use, & virtually no assets at all... ruined for my righteousness. My choice was to my integrity, which means health, wholeness, of body, mind and spirit. By being true to myself, in the truest sense, I also did right by all others. Or, in Shakespeare's timeless words.. "To thine own self be true, then it must follow... thou canst not be false to any man." This is not the common understanding, nor the common ethic... which, I suggest, is "Dog eat dog." I believe I have maintained my integrity and therefore my spiritual health, which is, in the natural order, the basis for the mental and physical health of the individual and also the body-politic. Both of these areas are in a potentially disastrous state today, not coincidentally, as the national priorities themselves are morally- sick, as in terms of being materially-based. The usual approach to such profound problems are inquiries followed by temporary bandaid measures, even over the spiritual-gangrene. The basic meaning of the term "modern" is "temporary expediency" and the immediate answer of modern government to any perceived problem is, "We must modernise!" This simply means any real future is down the drain. There is always a time of reckoning. We are one right now, as many in fact realise, more or less -- "as due." Even a bank has a "reconciliation" process. But, what of the metaphysical one? Fortunately this level of mind follows its own immutable and perfect laws.

Since 2001, I have served on the cmtee. of an organisation dedicated to justice for the Family, as a researcher and liaison. I have studied the stories of many men who have reached the end of an otherwise useful life as a member of, or contributor to, the "national economy." Financial ruin has been a common thread, from which a significant number never recover, as with their mental and physical health, following the consequences of a divorce or separation from a legal wife or defacto. Effectively, the ex- wife becomes the "defacto-wife" of the State, and the children become effectively "proles" - children of the State. Her gratitude, insofar as she is capable of it, in her confusion and fear, is to the State for keeping her body and soul together, so to speak, - and for the "protection" of her children. The State pursues the former husband ruthlessly for money to maintain the former wife and children, aside from any considerations of true justice or equity, and less of sanity. The father may seek to keep in some kind of contact with his children, but he is virtually hounded by the legal processes which prejudice him all the way. There is always a limit to which human flesh and blood can withstand against persecution, especially when all that is good in human nature itself is denied and blocked. The protective instincts of the father are no less than that of the mother towards the well-being of the children. The deadly intrusions of the mechanisms of the State are as a bulldozer in the natural forest to make a clearing for a "development" which pollutes all of the living environment, and of course makes more monetary gain for those with a vested interest in such "developments." Thus is the condition of the "human environment" today. Since "The Family Law Act of 1975" enormous industries have sprung up around the plundering

and destruction of the natural and original Family institution.

I suggest this Act has ended, as in terms of the morally twisted and many times revised administration of it, to become an insane and shameful farce, affording not true justice, nor equity, not leadership, nor example nor vision,, but imposing a demoralising regime of profound psychological fear and uncertainty upon the much-vaunted "social-unit" of the natural family - the so-called "basic unit" or "building-block" of the nation, and also upon any prospective candidates for any semblance of the married state. As such, I suggest it is desperately in need of a genuine and truly-caring, renovation, or revision, if this were possible at this stage, with so much vested interest in the effective destruction of any type of family unit, by default. "Without vision, the people perish." (O.T.)

I believe these developments have come about by no intention of its original architect, Lionel Murphy. He was a legalist, but also a decent man with a true social conscience, long since over-ridden and forgotten so quickly. The original Act, at the initiative of an idealistic man, of Irish background, a member of a predominantly overly idealistic administration, has been radically revised and/or "superseded" or amended many times, in an era of gender and identity confusion globally, or at least, as common to western civilisation. It is not in the "national interest" to maintain this white-anted psychological canker, which subverts the morale of the nation more effectively than any "terrorist group." We ought to have learned by now the result of the politics of fear and divisiveness.

So much of so-called "education" is shallow, arbitrary and materialistic trivia, not to mention the ideological fads, propaganda and egoistic indoctrination. No wonder so many now have an identity and gender problem. Where arise the demons which, once embedded in the young minds, return like gun-toting chickens... all over the world? The cleric, eyes momentarily upward, sonorously intones, "We may never know why" The psychologist offers hopeless hypotheses, which are designed more to keep him in a job than to afford real answers, which some may not even want. When do the indecencies, and massacres, become so normal that any with real answers become the suspects, the mischief-makers, and the "something unusual" to beware of?

The average Australian tends to have an identity problem, both as to country and his essential human nature. This has become tinged with guilt. The guilty one tends to blame others for his misery. The immigrant may know better who he is, and because of it have no where to live. The politicians tend to be lawyers who tend to be ignorant that the law was made to serve the man. They are accountants who tend to be ignorant of the truth that money can only ever be a means.... as the ancient Greeks so called it - "chremates," and not an end of itself. They are "businessmen" who tend to be ignorant of the truth that the first matter of business is to be decently and honourably human. Even if they purportedly represent "the family" they still tend to put "money-making business" first. Governments cannot do what the people cannot do.

Our policy-makers tend to have forgotten that "A house is not a home" as New York prostitute Polly Adler knew when she wrote her book of this title. I've never been an anarchist. I believe in real leaders, but even such a one cannot lead a compost-heap, except to spread it around. Admittedly, the bureaucrats do seem to acknowledge this when re-housing, or re-distributing, the hopeless ones. I've never been a "revolutionary." By definition, these are revolting, and tend just to go around in circles because they are not educated to have any real sense of direction, only how to complain and make false accusations, which are seemingly not only so completely acceptable to the administrators, but encouraged as more grist to the "satanic mills." (W.Blake) This country today it seems is many nations and many minds and too many sore divisions and too many suppressed conflicts. "A house divided against itself cannot stand" (Matt.12:25) ... so that not even our bureaucrats will have the job guarantees they look for.

Where has any real sense of duty gone, -- aside from that, as inculcated, to spend and consume? Where has gone that sense of obligation to our Maker, that has made our earth and also the sun which keeps us alive and the stars that give us hope?

This has been a very rushed job, so please excuse me if I have breached any of your protocols, and advise accordingly.