

The Richard Hillman Foundation Incorporated

~ Pursuing Equality, Unity and Justice for Families ~

House of Representatives
Committee on Family and Community Affairs

Submission No: 1178

Date Received: 8-8-03

Submission:

to the Standing Committee on Family & Community Affairs

*Family and Family Groups.
Grand Parents in relation to
Joint Parenting.*

~ o o o ~


Produced by:

Mark Bourne

of

The Richard Hillman Foundation Incorporated

(Lodged on the 8th of August 2003)



Patron: Hon. PETER LEWIS., JP, AFAIM, MAIAST, RDA (Hort), MP
MEMBER for HAMOND & SPEAKER of HOUSE of ASSEMBLY

Post to: The RICHARD HILLMAN FOUNDATION INCORPORATED.
C/o The Public Officer. PO Box 8309 Station Arcade, Adelaide, South Australia 5000.

Phone: + 61 08 8285 1940 **Email:** rhfinc@airnet.com.au **URL:** www.rhfinc.org.au

QUITE SIMPLY:

**Man is an animal - a social animal.
Innately and historically, man has lived in Family and social groups.
Remove the Family Structure and members become dysfunctional.
Enough dysfunctional people creates a dysfunctional society.**

Children of separation and divorce do not have a Family Home.
Sure there are Mum's and Dad's houses, but usually with changing partners.
These are not homes!

QUESTIONS: As the senior custodians of our society it's time for Grandparents to stand up.

1. Ask not what our Grandchildren can do for us, but what we can do for them?
2. Do we have a dream that our Grandchildren can live and be judged by their wishes, not by the imposed will of a vindictive, vexatious and bitter resident parent?
3. What sort of world is our selfishness and apathy creating? Are we prepared to say 'enough is enough,' and lobby and work for the return of truth, honesty and justice for all ?
4. Should the children of divorce treat grandparents with the kindness and respect that we want, or the contempt with which we have treated them, by ignoring their cries for help ?
5. How do we make these unhappy people with unreal expectations, that we have created, happy?

OVERVIEW

LOOK AT WHAT YOU CAN DO

(1) **Introduce Joint/Shared Parenting** so that children can keep their personal and cultural history, thereby aligning Australian Children of Separation and Divorce to the spirit of The International Rights of The Child. Enshrine in the black letter of the law a child's right to love and to be loved and have a meaningful relationship with their total gene pool ie: both mother, father and extended families.

(2) **Strengthen the Backbone of Society** by refusing to pay for Families to separate and disintegrate through divorce via government sponsored Legal Aid, Welfare Payments and associated costs. If couples must separate and divorce, let them do so, but pay for it themselves ie: hit the HIP POCKET NERVE. Research tells us society will already be paying through Law and Order, Health, Education etc. in the future

(3) **The Human Misery Industry** created by The Family Court, Child Support Agency and the nonsensical, politically correct way of thinking that pervades our society, is costing us billions and devoid of common sense. If common sense prevailed, it would be working like 'The Drug Beat Program' in S.A.

Return to common sense and practical solutions. Dispense with doubtful and unnatural academic rhetoric.

We can build a future for our children by redirecting the billions of saved dollars to infrastructure, including hospitals, schools, police, roads etc. WHERE THE WHOLE OF SOCIETY CAN BENEFIT.

4. **The emerging new age Baby-Boomers-now-Grandparents** must take a leading role in the cleansing of The Divorce Revolution. Our 'Easy-Come, Easy-Go' attitude of the 50's and 60's developed this "I / Me" culture that has allowed this social disaster to breed, multiply and get out of hand.

The village elders must stand up.

5. **Modern social 'ills and misery'** have grown in proportion to separation and divorce. We must recognise and accept this statistical truth.

6. **Human misery is spreading like cancer** with second partners, particularly wives, being caught in a no-win marriage. The baggage of false allegations, disruptive contact and associated grief from the first marriage seems to grow in proportion to the newly found happiness of the second marriage. Eventually it all becomes too much and another marriage fails - and yet another group of children become victims of the poverty and unhappiness roundabout.

We must create an environment where second marriages can work.

7. **The present Sole Custody Presumption** is a curious mix of perjury, false allegations, child abuse, paedophilia, destruction of families (Marxist style), suicide, gender bias, corruption and the list goes on. Generating such societal unhappiness leads society to the verge of civil war - recent demonstrations in front of Minister Ruddock's house are a clear indication of the current groundswell.

We must reunite broken family relationships and blood lines as best we can.

8. **The present Sole Custody Presumption** encourages divisiveness and hate which is showing in society in many different ways including lack of respect, impatience eg: road rage, delinquency etc, and above all, unhappy kids.

Get the lawyers and government out of families.

9. **This hate is transferred to the child victims** and manifests itself in a 'psychotic no-one-loves-me' mentality that prohibits these children from reaching their true potential. This mental dysfunction often affects children who are least favoured, adopted or who suffer from the 'middle child syndrome.' But now it is being artificially manufactured through marriage breakdown and divorce in epidemic proportions, which is ruining our country emotionally and financially.

Re-unite Families.

RATIONALE: The Family - Mother, Father and Children.

1. Most children are born as a result of a planned pregnancy or from a reasonably stable relationship where children could be seen as a 'consummation of that relationship.' (ie. not too many children are conceived on a change over at bus and flight terminals.)

2. Most couples have a reasonably defined working relationship with both contributing to specific household roles, or at least knew what the other person was like before the pregnancy.
3. That over time each parent could develop their own support network to care for their children ie: family, friends and paid care.
4. That both Mothers and Fathers can nurture children.
5. That both parents have had different upbringings and so their nurturing skills, although different, are not necessarily right or wrong. The children have each parent's genes, and can therefore expect to have guidance from their gene pool, and know and enjoy both their extended Families.
6. That Fathers protect children and much modern research:
 - (a) Supports the importance of Fathers in the child's life.
 - (b) Clarifies the significance of Fathers in certain developmental characteristics.
 - (c) Children do not feel 'as safe and secure' in single mother homes as they do with fathers and as an intact family.
7. That children have a better chance of developing into well rounded adults when they have a loving and meaningful relationship with both their Mother and Father.
8. Most men do not become overnight physical and sexual abusers upon separation and divorce.

RATIONALE: Family Court

9. The Family Court will no longer tolerate Perjury, because a society based on lies and deceit is dangerous for everyone and eventually self destructs.
10. The Family Court will have a 'Duty of Care' to those children whose lives pass through their doors.
11. The Family Court will interpret the act as intended.

RATIONALE: Society

12. Today's young parents are being lead to believe that their lives will be much better, richer and fuller by separation and divorce. These expectations are found to be false. Instead, young mothers become poorer, lonelier and above all, embittered. This bitterness ripples outward to the children, ex-partner, extended family and society.
13. These young persons are being coached by anti- family interests, usually under the guise of Family Planning, and Shelters.

These coaches need to be identified and released from their duties.

14. Marriage Breakdown is affecting ' the happiness of the nation.'

Most people and their extended families who are encompassed in this social blight are not satisfied with their lives for many different reasons. As members of parliament and the sounding board on both sides of the argument, you are aware of the many differing grievances.

If no one is happy, that means you do not have the right structure in place.

The present structure is not fair. Everyone knows what is fair, and what isn't!!

The present structure is not based on common sense. It is unnatural to separate a child from a parent!

The present structure is not based on good Social Science Research.

The present structure is flawed in its policies and procedures.

The present structure is based on emotion and distorted lies.

The present structure has been developed to appease and quieten minority interest groups.

The present structure is a disgrace to mankind, and especially to ' you, the politicians,' the custodians of it.

SUBMISSION BASE:

1. This submission has its base on the monograph, '**Back To The Best Interests Of The Child**', by **Yuri Joakimidis**.

We thank and acknowledge **The Joint Parenting Association** for allowing us to do this.

2. The starting point for all reform should be The Family Law Amendment Joint Residency (2002), as introduced by Senator Len Harris into The Senate, and based on '**Back to the Best Interests of the Child.**'

3. We believe that the term '**Joint Parenting**' should be used in favour of '**Shared Parenting**,' for the very good reasons that Yuri Joakimidis from The Joint Parenting Association espouses; that under the existing law we already have a shared parenting presumption in the '95 Duncan speech in Parliament when amending The Family Law Act, second reading, which is ignored and not interpreted as such.

We have grave concerns that politics may be played with this implied 'shared parenting,' thereby further confusing this argument to the detriment of the children of separation and divorce.

However, should ' Shared ' be chosen instead of ' Joint ', as it may be for political reasons, rather than solid argument, the definitions are very important. Refer to '**Back to the Best Interests of the Child.**'

POINTS TO ADDRESS:

CONTACT:

Contact is for the children, and when parents agree or courts order to have uneven times of residency, the terms and conditions must be agreed to, and disruptive parents must be suitably punished, by either The Federal Family Court or its agency for Child Abuse. (ie. State institutions that are charged with enforcement.)

MOVEMENT:

The Family Home, following separation or divorce, becomes the central or pivotal base for any parental or family movement.

Parents should stay in the same Post Code Area.

New Research supports that separating parents should live close together.

Therefore, if we are really interested in 'The Best Interests of the Child,' the parent that moves is not acting in the Best Interests and Guardianship of that Child and will need to negotiate residence and contact time downward, unless a suitable Joint Parenting arrangement eg. extended holidays, term about, year about arrangements can be negotiated.

CHECKLIST OF FACTORS FOR WELL ROUNDED CHILD:

1. The opportunity to have a loving and meaningful relationship with both Parents.
2. Once this factor has been acknowledged, every other factor is secondary, and can be discussed ie: education, friends, lifestyle etc.
3. Education is often used as a reason for Sole Custody. While education is important in later years, a loving and meaningful relationship with both parents is of paramount importance to the young developing child, and so term about, year about Joint Parenting when the parents are separated by distance should be considered. The children at the appropriate time will make their wishes clear as to where they wish to live and go to school.
4. Similarly, children can cope with different environments so long as they feel secure.

STATUS QUO:

The use of the 'status quo' is the single most reprehensible tool. A Non-Custodial Parent who tries to negotiate a satisfactory outcome or a re-union with their partner, are, with their children, punished for life, as the parent who has had custody or residence while these negotiations have been taking place will tell the court that they are now settled into their new life without the ex-partner, and the presence of the other partner will only disrupt the children.

The registrar, judge or whoever evokes the 'status quo,' means the other parent, usually at best, will become the children's visitor.

So much for trying to broker a happy arrangement and settlement under The Sole Custody Presumption.

SUPPORT GROUPS :

Both Parents can establish their own support groups, including family, friends and paid care, and must be given the appropriate amount of time to establish this.

A time consideration for a 'status quo' type decision may extend to equal the age of the eldest child, or length of marriage, but in no situation less than a year, which would give all parties time to come to terms emotionally with this new situation, and time and space to work out practical and long lasting solutions.

TIME - 50 / 50 PHYSICAL RESIDENCY: SLEEPING PLACE

Where the child sleeps should not be a consideration, as this often destroys many good working family timetables.

Eg: a Parent who works during the day and comes home to care, bath, feed and bed their children, while the other goes out to pursue their job and personal activities, is a very common practice in many intact families.

This is suddenly destroyed by separation, because a requirement for Child Support is where the children sleep. So the day-time Parent, for Child Support reasons only, keeps the children full-time, not allowing the other parent their usual nightly role of feeding, bathing and caring, thereby interrupting the routine of the child, and eliminating one parent from the child's life.

This disrupts everyone, so where a child sleeps should not be a factor in 50/50 Joint Parenting Plan.

HOW TO MAKE DECISIONS WHEN JOINT PARENTING GENUINELY WON'T WORK :

This is exactly why the new recommended proposal is rebuttable. Everyone knows that each situation or case is different, and should be treated as such. However the final outcome must be a fair one.

Both parents must take on a responsibility for 50 % of child development. Unwilling parents can negotiate their share to the other partner if they wish, by paying child support, or similar.

Examples may include: when a Mother or Father works 80/90 hrs per week; or is an Incapable, Abusive and/or Neglectful etc. Parent; or if a parent or parents are deemed unsuitable by the courts, then the welfare systems can assume their role.

MEDIATION:

Hopefully, with both parents sitting down and on a level playing field, the best options for the family will be settled by mediation.

Where one parent wants the Joint Custody Presumption set aside, or the parents cannot agree, 'the burden of proof, which must be beyond reasonable doubt, ' must be on that parent who believes that sole custody would be better for the child.

ABUSE:

TYPES: Physical, Sexual, Psychological, Emotional, and Neglect.

PROOF: Must be proved beyond reasonable doubt.

ONUS OF PROOF: On the party that does not want Joint Parenting.

TARGET OF ABUSE:

(1) At PARTNER: Abuse targeted at the partner or spouse should not have any bearing on 50/50 physical shared/joint custody.

(2) At CHILD: Abuse targetted at the child is the only abuse that can be considered in rebutting Joint Parenting:

(a) If abuse is not proven beyond reasonable doubt, 50/50 Joint Parenting should start immediately.

(b) In the Family Court 'not proven' and similar statements should be replaced with 'not guilty.'

(c) The Family Court on the child's behalf should immediately investigate possible false allegations and appropriate sentences should be made on the offending party as a matter of urgency.

LEAST ANGRY PARENT:

IF PARENTAL FIGHTING/DIFFERENCES are considered to be such a problem that Joint Parenting cannot be negotiated, then residence should be given to the ' least angry parent,' as this parent is more likely to allow frequent and meaningful contact to the other parent.

DEATH OF A PARENT:

If a parent dies, does their share of time pass on to the other biological parent or the dead parent's chosen representative(s) ie: their parents (grandparents?).

Grandparents and significant others are just that. They are not the parents. They are not primary care givers.

(1) The most important relationships for children are with their parents.

(2) Children who have a good relationship with both parents are usually secure, stable members of society.

(3) Children who do not have a good relationship with a grandparent, as sad as it may be, do not exhibit the same behavioral problems as a failed relationship with a parent.

(4) Children have an inherent right to know and love their total gene pool.

(5) THE TEST FORTIME: ' Past history of the child's relationships' with grand parents OR significant persons should be the determining factors: including history of contact time, distance and willingness of the significant others to provide a safe and secure environment. It is doubtful that their time would add up to 50/50 Joint Parenting, as the remaining parent would become the only primary care giver.

RETROSPECTIVE enforcement: "Children are allowed equal treatment under law."

(1) The practices and interpretation of the present system are only being challenged because of the ' widespread unhappiness ' in the community with regard to The Sole Custody Presumption.

(2) Therefore any change that does not consider the present ' hurt' in the community will not be effective and will probably only result in more angry, deviant and violent behavior.

(3) Those parents who wish to pursue a more equitable arrangement should be able to make contact with the other parent, either directly or indirectly through a government agency eg. Social Security, The Child Support Agency etc. and register their intentions of resuming their rightful role.

(4) The government should seek a ' full and proper disclosure and cleansing' of all wrongful and hurtful tricks and acts used as levers in the Sole Custody Model,' including false allegations, perjury etc so that these false records can be removed and expunged from all court and police records, both federal and state, so victimised parents are not burdened with a police record on false pretences.

(5) The Federal Government must accept responsibility for these hurts, and for being so neglectful in reading research and tolerating perjury in their courts for so long, despite the never ending trail of dissatisfied constituents.

(6) The Federal Government should make The Family Court available to expunge those allegations that are marked 'unproven' or similar, on application by the injured party, as a high priority and then pursue any relevant state body to expunge the same.

(7) Counseling sessions should also be made available on request to inform and counsel those children who have suffered parental alienation, been sexualized and desexualised etc and to help re-establish their relationship with the alienated parent.

(8) The government should acknowledge that ' these inhumane accusations ' are a social experiment gone wrong, and give offending parties 6-12 months to clean the slate, and not only help, but encourage expungement, so that society can begin the healing process.

CHILD SUPPORT:

Given that most parents want to contribute to their child's development, but at a fair rate:

(1) Assets bought into a marriage, particularly if 'Family,' eg. a farm, should not be considered as part of marital assets for division.

(2) Assets / capital improvements accumulated during the marriage are eligible for division.

(3) FIGURES: Should be left for parents to work out by mediation, as suggesting figures leads to repeated judicial abuse as we have witnessed with the '109 days' in the present formula. It may be best done with prenuptial agreement. The final figure must be that which the payer can afford comfortably, so that they continue to contribute to both their Family and society.

Australia does not need anymore demoralised crippled dropouts!

(4) What is clear, however, is that families should not depend on, or be subjected to beaurocratic interference, as it destroys families and society.

Some points on The Child Support Agency.

(a) The Child Support Agency and Politicians are subject to criminal neglect for their failure to acknowledge the suicide and ' stress related death ' rates of the agency.

(b) The Child Support Agency is based on false research (Lenore Weitzman) that women's income status dropped by 70%.

(c) The present formula was based on the Russian Formula that was out to destroy the Nuclear Family, and has done nothing but foster a black economy and high suicide rate among non - custodial parents.

(d) It relies on antisocial, corrupt and excessive punitive enforcement.

(e) There is abuse of state powers by public servants who can deem incomes at exorbitant amounts.

(f) It provokes massive welfare dependency.

FAMILY ASSETS should be frozen for the future wellbeing of the children.

That lawyers can play games and eat up all a family's assets playing ' Chinese Whispers ' in The Family Court is criminal, and it does nothing but create a new underclass to society, as these children lose their springboard to a wealthier future.

GRANDPARENTS : The happiness of the nation !!

Separation and divorce ruin our lives.

At a time in life when we should be enjoying the fruits of our labour, we are torn in two by the human tragedy of 'dead people walking.'

To watch your son or daughter grow into a wonderful human being capable of producing and rearing the next generation, then roll over into a psychotic mess capable of much, much less, and not being able to help, is soul destroying.

Then, to see the sadness and confusion in your grandchildren's eyes, and still not being able to do anything, is gut wrenching.

Most Grandparents are so distressed that they suffer some form of stress related illness.

IMPORTANT:

Research shows that Grandparents are very important providers of often the only stable environment that children of divorce may have.

Unfortunately, far too often, vindictive son and daughter in-laws don't let this happen, particularly if you are a non-custodial parent/Grandparent.

COSTS:

Parents build up a nest egg to pass on to their children for the benefit and growth of both their children and Grandchildren. But where does this nest egg often go?

It often goes to 'The Federal Government's Human Misery Industry,' which includes lawyers, psychologists, counsellors and government departments that feed off the misery of their fellow man.

UNDERCLASS:

This process creates an underclass because two households cost more than one, and grandparents only have so much money to invest in The Human Misery Industry – designed to feed the Professionals overseas trips and college education for their children, thus creating a bigger socio-economic divide in the community.

TIME:

If the best interests of the child are paramount, upon separation or divorce, grandparents should enjoy the same time with their grandchildren as they did before the separation, as a minimum. Time may, in fact increase, if they become part of the parents support team on separation.

STRUCTURE : Why Joint Parenting ??

Does the government seek lower divorce rates ?
Does the government seek happier and more stable children ?
Does the government seek better Child Support Compliance ?
Does the government seek to lower the suicide rate ?
Does the government seek to save billions of dollars from not propping up The Human Misery Industry?
Does the government seek more money to develop infrastructure? Hospitals, Health, Police, Schools, Roads?
Does the government seek to lower the dependence on welfare ?

Joint Parenting is The Answer, and ' Back to the Best Interests of the Child, ' by Yuri Joakimidis is your template.

Considerations

WHO RUNS OUR COUNTRY:

Both ordinary folks and politicians alike are questioning why The Attorney General, Daryl Williams, and Minister for Children and Youth Affairs, Larry Anthony, are captives of their own Departments.

Is it tolerable that such important people in this argument are not held Accountable? We believe that their advisers, and the advisers that advise them should be part of this inquiry process. Furthermore, they should be subject to both argument and debate (publicly and privately) by a panel of Family Law Experts, chosen by Joint Parenting Exponents but also including:

1/Yuri Joakimidis, author of the monograph Back to the Best Interests of the Child and The Joint Parenting Bill introduced by Senator Len Harris of the One Nation Party

2/ Ray Lenton, President of The Joint Parenting Association

3/ John Stapleton, from Dads on the Air

4/ Matilda Bawden, President of the Shared Council of Australia.

THE FAMILY COURT.

Some people describe The Family Court as hard. The populus can tolerate a hard court so long as it is seen to be fair and just.

However, the Family Court is corrupt. It tolerates perjury, which causes grief to the victims and is spreading like cancer through all other courts and jurisdictions that undermine society.

THE INQUIRY : Accountability and Mutual Obligation.

There is an old saying: First time funny, second time silly, third time smacks !!

This committee is on notice, as it is (at least) the third major inquiry by the Australian Federal Government into The Family Court.

You will be seen as either sensible, basing your decisions on good Social Science Research; OR gullible being swayed by emotion.

Both The Child Support Agency and The Family Court are based on misinformation and lies. (Yuri Joakimidis)

YOU WILL BE JUDGED by the Australian voters until your dying days should you not base your findings on facts.

FIRST TIME: Lies slipped into 1992 Senate Inquiry before they could be tested.

SECOND TIME: The Labor party is, and was, captive to the Gender Feminists, despite Justice Fogarty's Inquiry.

THIRD TIME: Judgement time - What will be your excuse? The world is watching YOU (even Iraq and Korea) the so called do-gooders, of world peace.

ENFORCEMENT: Will the Children of Australia Lament?

On Tuesday, 15th of July 2003, The Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Alexander Downer, was on Adelaide's 5AA lamenting with some frustration that, while The United Nations would be the best organisation to enforce North Korea's nuclear Disarmament, they had no capacity to enforce their decisions.

THE FAMILY COURT does not enforce their decisions, nor does it have the capacity to do so.

Similarly, Mr Downer, member of the cabinet, the Australian Public who have been victims of this corrupt and unjust Family Court system have cause for **FRUSTRATION?**

HAPPINESS OF SOCIETY?

The happiness of society may well improve with a Joint Parenting Presumption. It is the first and vital step in this cleansing and healing process.

BUT THERE ARE STATE PROCESSES THAT ARE THE CANCEROUS VICTIMS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S FAMILY COURT,

and that is perjury by way of False Allegations of Domestic Violence, Restraining Orders, Apprehended Violence Orders and Sexual Abuse.

The inquiry must highlight and mention this plight and apologise to the Australian Children for creating a dishonest society, and make sure that this practice is eliminated.

Some people will argue that we should not discourage false allegations as this may inhibit those true victims from reporting their abuse.

Do you believe this?

What about the false allegations and the mortal hurt to the victims?

If yes, is it O.K. for me and all family court victims to go around calling all black people 'smelly midnights' with a big smile on our face and saying it is a joke, so that it will make their job easier when they report real prejudice?

CHECKLIST of factors

One of the factors in the checklist has to do with domestic violence and this could be the reason why there are so many restraining orders before the first court appearance.

ANIMALS

As part of the animal species, we need nurturing. Man has the longest nurturing period of all animals.

WHY JOINT PARENTING:

By introducing a rebuttable Joint Parenting bill, it will:

1. Provide or create a level playing field, where both parents have equal rights as they walk into the court room, and which can not be taken away by false allegations and innuendo, but must be substantiated by facts. (Christopher Pyne)
2. It will change the Defeatist Psyche that exists and is instilled into Fathers in particular, by groups and lawyers before they enter the court ie. 'You'll get this if you are lucky.'
3. According to research, Joint Parenting will :
 - (1) reduce divorce rates
 - (2) create happier and better adjusted children
 - (3) lower child abuse rates
 - (4) lessen litigation
 - (5) enable better child support compliance
4. Enable more Fathers see more of their children. Most people and politicians are lead to believe that most Fathers see their children as much as they wish. However this is not true.

'Back to the Best Interests' reports an American Study that found that Fathers wanted more more time with their children than had been traditionally offered. While one third

did not object to Mother Custody, one third wanted Father custody, and one third wanted Joint Physical Custody. This means that two thirds of Fathers wanted more involvement with their children.

5. Reduce failed second relationships and marriages as there would be less of them, but when they do occur, the male would be far less susceptible. He would be far more stable and far less vulnerable, as he would have good contact and relationships with his children; and the new partner could see from the outset what life with this bloke is.

Divorced Dads become so preoccupied trying to make second marriages work by bending over backwards to do the right thing that they lose their identity and become unlovable shadows of nothing!

It would also mean that the complaints that you hear in your electoral office would be greatly reduced.

WHO BENEFITS FROM THE (MATERNAL) SOLE CUSTODY PREFERENCE.

Children:

Research shows that children want to see more of their non-custodial parent. Children who grow up in Single Family Homes are worse off on all social science indicators compared to Intact Families and Joint Custody Families.

Mothers:

Feminism is about being independent, financially independent, and the ability to self-actualise. How can welfare dependent single Mothers achieve this, particularly with high risk children? Do working single mothers in high stress jobs achieve their goals?

Fathers:

Many develop a psychosis or neurosis that stunts them emotionally, physically and spiritually for the rest of their lives, putting pressure on the welfare system, until they die prematurely either by suicide, or a Family Court / Child Support broken-hearted stress-related death .

Many walk around with such a heavy heart that even talking about their problems is an insurmountable obstacle.

Society:

Society is burdened with ' love - seeking - ego - centred - single - parent - children, youths and adults who lack many of the most basic social morals and yearn for the love of their lost parent. Statistics show that they are a drain on the states resources in education, health, law and order.

SO WHO DOES BENEFIT FROM THE FAMILY LAW COURT'S SOLE CUSTODY PRESUMPTION :

If it is not the Mother, Father, Children or Society as a whole -

Is it an interest group?

Most exponents say it is Feminists, but how do women win? (see above)

If it is not Feminists, could it be teachers, police, health workers?

We need more and more resources to control the growing unruly behaviour.

Is it employment possibilities within the court system ie: lawyers, counsellors, psychologists?

Shouldn't the vast sums of money be better spent on trying to help the child victims?

We could reunite them with their Dads - if they haven't already suicided !!

And spend the billions of dollars in savings on infrastructure - hospitals, roads, schools etc.

Are the lawyers, counsellors, psychologists and court workers and anti family socialist elements that pervade our universities the only winners of sole custody?

IF NO-ONE REALLY BENEFITS FROM THE FAMILY LAW COURTS - WHAT IS THE REAL AGENDA?

WHO ELSE BENEFITS FROM UNSTABLE, VULNERABLE AND INSECURE CHILDREN?

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).