The background of the entire page is a dark grey color with several orange, broken heart shapes scattered across it. The hearts are of various sizes and orientations, some appearing as simple outlines and others as solid shapes with jagged cracks.

The Reunion and Family Law

MARY W MAXWELL, LLB

ISBN:

Copyright Mary Maxwell 2019

Permission is hereby granted for anyone to copy this book for personal use.

Key words

The Reunion, child abuse, Protective parent, Family Law Act 1975, The Family Court Survey, *Rilak v Tsocas*, Fixated Persons Investigation Unit, Truth Commission, parental alienation syndrome, Don Rufty, Senator Nancy Schaefer, Russell Pridgeon, law maxims, Adelaide Fringe, Dunblane massacre, Tim Minogue, Andrew McIntyre, NSW Parent Responsibility Contract, Beaumont children, forced adoptions

Author's websites: ProsecutionForTreason.com, and
MaxwellforSenate.com

Author's email address: MaryWMaxwellLLB@gmail.com

Cover design:

Broken heart overlain on the text of Prime Minister Morrison's 2018 apology to Australia's abused children

For Lily and Landon

Peter Lewis (1940-2015), Speaker of the House in the South Australian Parliament:

I [was] bringing some of the people who had made the allegations to the point where they might pluck up enough courage and confidence and swear the truth of those allegations, enabling them to be more carefully investigated.

But they were being ‘bumped off’– that is, murdered and viciously assaulted – quicker than I could get them to write down their allegations.

The most outrageous thing of all [is] the related and organised activities of those pedophiles in high public office – that is, the judiciary, the senior ranks of human services portfolios, some police and MPs, across the nation....

Canada’s Prime Minister Stephen Harper, June 11, 2008:

We realize that by separating children from parents, we undermined [that child’s] ability to parent, and sowed the seeds for generations to follow and we apologize for having done this.

PREFACE

Is there any point writing a book about the family court?
Does anyone care that the thing is corrupt beyond belief?

This book is mostly about *Australia's* Family Court – at least that's what brought me most of my material. But I have seen that the situation is almost identical in the US, the UK, and Canada. Almost certainly it's a global racket.

The way I came into this odd story was through a beautiful member of the McIntyre family of Adelaide, Rachel Vaughan. Her father, Max McIntyre, died in 2017 at age 89. He was quite a terrible human being. He was employed by a powerful pedophile ring and did any murders they ordered.

This book isn't about those murders, nor is it about child sexual abuse. Granted, it's set against a background of an existing pedo-and-trafficking system (which is global and therefore our judges are probably under foreign instruction!) but the nitty-gritty of that racket won't appear here.

My concentration is on the law. We need our law. Our law is fabulous (when it is not being perverted.) This book has two parts. The first part says 'Legal kidnap' is *illegal*. There are plenty of odd and frightening things happening in the courts. Judges can take your kids away without so much as a by-your-leave. They can even order the removal of a baby from the hospital on the day it's born.

"Unjust!" you cry." "Outrageous! I'll fix that guy's wagon."
No, you won't because there is a tight system to lock you out of the *civil* courts and to prevent you from exposing your plight to media. It really outdoes Kafka.

The second part of the book is about solutions. Once you have become aware that “legal kidnapping” by the courts is taking place, and you realize it is criminal, you can take steps. Prosecuting the miscreants and suing them to within an inch of their wallet is possible. But so is setting up a citizen-run Truth Commission.

Here is an idea I found at a website of sensible people in Douglas County, Kansas, USA, douglascountyks.org. It’s a Citizen Review Board to overcome the problems of bad decisions by judges or child protection services. Quote:

“There are currently five Citizen Review Boards – CRBs -- which meet monthly. Potential volunteers must submit a written application and go through a screening procedure.

“All must complete training requirements set forth by the Kansas Supreme Court before they can be sworn in by the Chief Judge to review cases. CRB volunteers are assigned to review *child in need of care* cases and to report in writing to the presiding judge. Volunteers meet as a group once a month and interview *families and service providers* and then deliberate in private before sharing their recommendations orally with the people in attendance. These are then shared in writing with the presiding judge. The presiding judge can use the CRB recommendations to make his/her own court orders.”
Simple but brilliant!

Why not get your Australian state to endorse such a thing? Even without ‘permission’ of government you can make recommendations. Are you worried this would be subversive? Stop worrying. Society owns the law. I believe a tiny minority think they own it (and are happy to break all kinds of laws to enforce their ownership) but their day is over. It seems essential at this stage that citizens get on top of the problem by reclaiming ownership of the law.

Supervised Visits

Perhaps some readers picking up this book do not know of the disrespect with which many a parent has been treated by courts and related child-protection units. I will briefly state it now.

To my amazement I have heard from mothers that they are allowed only supervised visits with their darling children – usually once a week or a fortnight, located at a governmental place where the interaction of kids and parents is watched through a two-way mirror.

There, I said it. Did you faint on the floor? Good. Many parents have been broken by this persecution. I am not talking about a parent who has choked her child – we would all approve of supervised visits. I am talking about a parent who, say, let dirty dishes pile up at home. Is that the state's business? They claim it is. (Faint again.)

I can tell you more. The parent may be instructed not to hug the kid, or say "I love you," or even give him a gift. We know this is wrong. It's wrong on the face of it. Also, she, the mum, will be asked to prove over and over that she's not a mental case. (Remember, this is for "dishes.")

I'm not a mother – I'm a furious citizen. For reasons of my slightly odd academic background, I know a lot about the efforts to change our culture that have been undertaken for decades, clandestinely. So the supervised visit nonsense makes sense to me. But *I'm not having it.*

What is needed here is a complete reunion of children with the parents from whom they have been kidnapped, even if the separation dates back a few long years. Some mothers don't even get supervised visits – the court orders the Dad to

bring the child to the visitation place; he fails to do so and the court looks the other way.

Don't believe me? Whew, I am glad you are still plain enough to think the world works according to our values.

But did you hear the ABC show with Dr Chris Rikard-Bell? He diagnosed 2,000 cases of child abuse. He claims abuse is caused by an "anxious" mother. See what we're up against? Words can be twisted and if it's a cop knocking at your door, even the most twisted words will sound authoritative to you, poor Mum.

It's time to terminate the whole gig. The judiciary is mainly accountable. It should be a cakewalk once we get started. Let's just stop honoring the kidnappers, huh?

A reunion is the only reasonable goal. Punishing the bad guys has its place, but only a secondary place.

I seem to write a lot of books about how to punish bad officials. This is not the career I want! I'd like to kick aside my PhD in Politics and study the lilies of the field.

All right. Time to jump onto the case. Please join me!

Note: This book incorporates articles that I published from June 2018 through March 2019 at GumshoeNews .com, which is based in Melbourne. So when I say "in this country" I mean Australia, but I was born in US.

My law degree is from University of Adelaide, South Australia, but note: this book is layperson to layperson. Or should I say, law owner to law owner.

Mary W Maxwell, LLB

February 28, 2017

CONTENTS

Preface	6
<i>Dramatis Personae</i>	12
Part One: “Legal” Kidnap Is Illegal	
1. A Reunion Year and a Truth Commission	17
2. Introduction to the Family Law Act	21
3. Australia’s Royal Commission and The Apology	26
4. The Child’s Best Interest and Parental Alienation	30
5. Two Good Guys Get Arrested	35
6. A Sample Protective Mum and The Family Court Survey	39
7. Contempt of Court and Freedom of Speech	44
8. Why Do Child-Protection Workers Lie, Worldwide?	49
9. The Matrix of Congress Exposed at a Hearing	57
10. The Fixated Persons Unit and Forced Adoptions	66
11. Medical or Educational Neglect? Lose Your Child	71
12. Beaumonts, Andrew McIntyre, and Media Silence	79
13. Ms Rilak Seeks Recusal and Tries for Mandamus	91
14. “I Was Strip-searched for Loving My Family”	95
15. Another Sad Tale and a Proposed Reunion for All	101
Part Two: Operation Clean-up	
16. Confessions, Amnesties, and Negotiating	109
17. A Law To Investigate Holsworthy Army Base	115
18. The Age-old Maxims	121

19. Proposing a Citizens' Covenant of Rights	126
20. Accessories Before and After the Fact	128
21. How To Remove a Judge	133
22. Whom Would You Like To Sue for Damages?	140
23. Gentleman McClellan Reprimands the ODPP	147
24. An Open Letter to Susan and Bill	154
25. Our Oppressors Can Indeed "Do Time"	161
26. We Can Learn a Lot from Dunblane	168
27. The Adelaide Fringe: Dee Quizzes Dr Day	177
28. Fiona Barnett: Let Them Dob Each Other In	182
29 Really, Who's in Charge Here?	187
30. Conclusion	195

Appendices

A. "End the Family Court," Says a Change.org Petition	202
B. Questions for Dame Marie Bashir	208
C. Don Rufty, Protective Dad and Newspaper Owner	210
D. Affidavit by Imprisoned FBI Man, Richard Taus	212
E. El Presidente Sees the Light	213
F. Letter to Vickie Chapman, Attorney-General of SA	214
G. Ms Rilak Tells Judge of the PAS and Corruption	215
H. The Family Court Survey	221

Acknowledgments	236
-----------------	-----

Index	237
-------	-----

Dramatis Personae

Organizations

In this book, various official groups will be named. I will use South Australia (SA) as the base. Here are some:

The police – both state (SAPOL) and federal (AFP) and CrimeStoppers SA

The Department of Child Protection, the DCP

Families SA (until 2017, then transferred to DCP)

ACIS – Assessment and Crisis Intervention Service

The Family Court (federal, except for Western Australia)

The Youth Court (Family Division)

Some Relevant Laws and Policies

The Family Law Act 1975 *Cth* (Commonwealth)

SA's Criminal Law Consolidation Act of 1935

Children's Protection Act, 1993

Children and Young People (Safety) Act

The Australian Constitution, effective 1901

Policy: Children and Young People (Oversight Bodies)

In US: The Adoption and Safe Families Act, ASFA, 1997

Miscellaneous Helpers

Legal Aid

CARL – Child Abuse Report Line 13 14 78

OPI -- Office of Public Integrity (*sans dents*)

The Ombudsman

Legal Services Commission of South Australia

Australian Law Reform Commission

Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner, Adelaide

University of Adelaide Law School's Legal Clinic

Various grassroots groups

A Note on Pronouns and the word "Parent"

In this book, the masculine pronoun *he* may be used randomly to mean any person, to avoid the awkwardness of saying he/she. Thus "Each child did his homework" means boys and girls did their homework. I may refer to a girl or boy as a "child" or a "kid."

Reference will often be made to "the Protective parent" – meaning the one who does not harm the child. The word *parent* here indicates either mother or father. Statistically, more mums than dads are the Protectors in the kind of court case discussed in this book. But I state here and now that a father can be as protective (against the abuser) as a mother.

PART ONE
“LEGAL” KIDNAP IS ILLEGAL

1. A Reunion Year and a Truth Commission



All those years without my boy! Photo: Telegraph.co.uk

The Year 2018 was the 65th anniversary of the end of the Korean War. To celebrate, the North Koreans allowed their people to visit family members in the South from whom they had been separated since 1953.

A family reunion is a wonderful thing. Indeed family is the basis of much affection and support throughout life. It is ridiculous that the Korean people had to suffer like this, and it is mind-boggling that families are ruthlessly broken up today by Western governments.

I nominate 2020 as the Reunion Year for any child who was unjustly removed from one or both parents. Whatever it takes we should make this happen. And it will be easy. There is only one stumbling block. There is a group of nut-cakes who sell children and also kill them.

We've put up with this for decades as we did not really know what was going on. I, for one, know it now. It is intolerable to me and I'm not even personally involved.

You can count on me to make sure there is a reunion. And I'll count on you to not accept any lesser goal.

Plan of This Book

Part One describes “legal kidnap.” Just jump over it if you are an “experienced bereaved parent” – it’s OK to read Part Two first. That is the *let’s get ’em* part, and you could come back later to pick up some details in Part One. Nothing needs to go in order, and you can shop the Appendices randomly too. Appendix A is pretty funny.

This book should help Protective parents, but not by showing them how to slog through the system. I disfavor slogging. It is torture. The need is to get citizens to notice that what judges are doing is absolutely forbidden. I’ve not yet got any kids to come home. But we are going to make sure they do come home. Not to do so is absurd.

A Truth Commission

In South Africa, prior to 1990, there was an equally intolerable situation known as apartheid. It was eventually overcome, and one of the methods for pursuing justice was the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC).

We must have a truth commission – not one run by government – to overcome the issue of child-stealing. If you are reading this book it is probably because you are already familiar – brutally familiar – with the issue.

If you are *not* familiar, you must be wondering why there wouldn’t have been a normal, standard response to the disappearance of children, namely the police would track them down and bring them home.


(Granted, there are times when police do perform that service, nobly. Let me know of cases you have seen. I am sure also that many judges want this mess cleared up.)

The trafficking racket involves kidnapping a kid in order to use him as a child prostitute or a star of porn movies, perhaps even for organ parts. This book does not describe the details of any of those strange fates of children. Please take it as given that such things do exist.

In Adelaide, Australia I happened by chance to learn of it. Adelaide is a beautiful, happy city. How can it be that a child is ripped from its mother's arms yet locals like me do not even hear of it? Well, for one thing the media won't discuss it. Isn't that *amazing*?

For another thing, hardly any politician will divulge it. No judge will pronounce on it publically. No altruistic social workers are heard yelling. All have shut their eyes to it.

Setting Up the Truth Commission



Anglican Archbishop Tutu of Capetown

By the time the South African Truth Commission was in process, the decision had already been made by society, via a vote, to end apartheid. The job of the TRC, of which Archbishop Desmond Tutu was a prominent member, had to do with restorative justice. I do not think we should endeavor to restore justice any further than restoring the children to the Protective parent. To do that much would be to call attention to many problems that would then naturally get sorted out, I think.

You may be wondering what I have in mind for the structure of a TC. As little structure as possible, please! Humans love structure and rules and even fine detail. But this idea of a Truth Commission is only fledgling and will smake mistakes. I think we should be modest and flexible about its size and shape. Just cook up what you can.

Note: infiltrators will show up in droves as they always do. Please try to ignore them, as there's no hope of dissuading them. I assume they are mind-controlled or something.

The usefulness of a Truth Commission on our subject is:

1. It will console and encourage the Protective parent just to know that such a thing exists – it validates them.
2. It will be a gathering place for information.
3. Just by its announcement of its existence, it puts weight on the side of decency.
4. It will intimidate the bad guys. (Note: At the same time, it will put them into aggression mode, and they have a well-known bag of tricks for hurting people. Australia's great whistle blower Fiona Barnett says she is harassed and threatened all the time, even today, and several of her pets have been killed.)
5. It will help revive the court and prompt good people to fill the many vacancies that will occur on the bench. Yay!

The South African TRC offered amnesty from criminal and civil punishment to perpetrators who confessed. I can't foresee what we should do about that in Australia. But a perp should be able to deduce logically that his/her coming forward voluntarily is likely to be rewarded.

2. Introduction to Australia's Family Law Act



Oz mainland. Tasmania is south. Illustration: Mark Rubens

It is generally accepted as a natural value that families should have privacy and freedom to raise their children as they wish. However, there are times when someone in a family needs help from the law.

Australia's Family Law Act came into force in 1975. The main item it deals with is divorce. As the 1970s were a time of "liberation," this new law changed the rule accordingly. Previously, the member of the couple that wanted to leave the marriage had to "sue for divorce." In the new law, divorce was granted on a no-fault basis.

Some parts of the Family Law Act deal with distribution of property upon divorce and with child custody. The law typically goes about 'awarding' custody to the parents on a shared basis of time, with joint responsibility for major decisions. If the child is old enough, he will have a say.

In a normal custody dispute the court often makes orders for the following three categories:

-- where the child will live (if mostly with one parent, then the other parent's access rights, telephone rights, etc)

- who will have responsibility for major decisions such as the child's religion, major medical treatment, and financial support
- possible other person (e.g. grandparent)'s right to access

In this book, we don't address "normal" custody cases. We are only looking at a dispute in which one parent, most often the mother, accuses the other parent of abusing the child. In fact this book narrows the issue down to *sexual abuse*, not physical abuse or neglect.

And thereby hangs the tale. If we did not have various corrupt persons in charge, the logical thing would happen. The child would stay with the non-abusing parent (called "Protective" parent) and the abuser would be kept at arms length and also may be charged with crime for having hurt the boy or girl. But wait till you hear what really happens.

This book records the travails of the Protective parents. They want the kid at home but the court has other plans. The court wants the kid to live with the abuser, for reasons one can only speculate.

Or the child may be placed with a guardian. After a time in guardianship, the state may make the decision that the child can be adopted out. Yes the adoption can take place against a parent's wishes. All this while the Protective parent is longing for the child – naturally, naturally -- and is worried about the bad future the child will have.

A pretty kettle of fish, no?

Here are short excerpts from three controversial areas of Family Law Act: secrecy, evidence, and "the vexatious litigant." Plus section 70NAE, which for many Protectors is the key to keeping their child, as a matter of safety.

FAMILY LAW ACT 1975 - SECT 121

Restriction on publication of court proceedings

(1) A person who publishes in a newspaper or periodical publication, by radio broadcast or television or by other electronic means, or otherwise disseminates to the public or to a section of the public by any means, any account of any proceedings, or of any part of any proceedings, under this Act that identifies: (a) a party to the proceedings; (b) a person who is related to, or associated with, a party to the proceedings or is, or is alleged to be, in any other way concerned in the matter to which the proceedings relate; or (c) a witness in the proceedings; commits an offence punishable, upon conviction by imprisonment for a period not exceeding one year.... [Note: Powers to make Rules of Court are also contained in sections 26B, 37A, 109A and 123.]

.....

FAMILY LAW ACT 1975 - SECT 69ZT

Rules of evidence not to apply unless court decides

(1) These provisions of the Evidence Act 1995 do not apply to child-related proceedings: (a) Divisions 3, 4 and 5 of Part 2.1 (which deal with general rules about giving evidence, examination in chief, re-examination and cross-examination), other than sections 26, 30, 36 and 41... Note: Section 26 is about the court's control over questioning of witnesses. Section 30 is about interpreters. Section 36 relates to examination of a person without subpoena or other process. Section 41 is about improper questions....]

(2) The court may give such weight (if any) as it thinks fit to evidence admitted as a consequence of a provision of the Evidence Act 1995 not applying because of subsection (1). [Note: Family Law Act has frequently been amended.]

Making vexatious proceedings orders [all bolding added]

(1) This section applies if a court exercising jurisdiction in proceedings under this Act is satisfied:

(a) a person has **frequently instituted** or conducted vexatious proceedings in Australian courts or tribunals; or

(b) a person, acting in concert with another person who is subject to a vexatious proceedings order ... has instituted or conducted vexatious proceedings in an Australian court or tribunal.

(2) The court may make any or all of the following orders:

(a) an order **staying or dismissing** all or part of any proceedings in the court already instituted by the person;

(b) an order **prohibiting the person** from instituting proceedings, or proceedings of a particular type, under this Act in a court having jurisdiction under this Act;

(c) **any other order** the court considers appropriate in relation to the person. [Note: that is fantastically wide open.]

Examples of an order under paragraph (c) are an order directing that the person may only file documents by mail, an order to give security for costs and an order for costs.

(3) The court may make a vexatious proceedings order on its own initiative or on application of any of the following:

(a) the Attorney-General of the Commonwealth or of a State or Territory; (b) the appropriate court official;

(c) a person against whom another person has instituted or conducted vexatious proceedings;

(d) a person who has a sufficient interest in the matter.

(4) The court must not make a vexatious proceedings order in relation to a person **without hearing the person** or giving [him] an opportunity of being heard. [Emphasis added]

Family Law Act: 70NAE Meaning of reasonable ex-cuse for contravening an order. [Always see the original]

(1) The circumstances in which a person may be taken to have had, for the purposes of this Division, **a reasonable excuse for contravening an order** [include]:

(2) if: (a) the respondent contravened the order because, or substantially because, he or she did not, at the time of the contravention, understand the obligations ...

(4) A person (the respondent) is taken to have had a reasonable excuse for contravening a parenting order to the extent to which it deals **with whom a child** is to live with in a way that resulted in the child not living with a person in whose favour the order was made if: (a) the respondent believed on reasonable grounds that the actions

constituting the contravention were necessary to protect the health or safety of a person (including the respondent or the child); and (b) the period during which, because of the contravention, the child did not live with the person in whose favour the order was made was not longer than was necessary to protect the health or safety of the person referred to in paragraph (a).


(5) A person (the respondent) is taken to have had a reasonable excuse for contravening a parenting order to the extent to which it deals with **whom a child is to spend time with in a way** that resulted in a person and a child not spending time together as provided for in the order if:

(a) the respondent believed on reasonable grounds that **not allowing the child and the person to spend time together** was necessary to protect the health or safety of a person (including the respondent or the child); and

(b) the period during which, because of the contravention, the child and the person did not spend time together was not longer than was necessary to protect the health or safety of the person referred to in paragraph (a).

[Emphasis added]

3. Australia's Royal Commission and the Apology



The fact that pedophilia is rampant in Australia is not open to dispute. From 2013 through 2017, under Letters Patent from the Queen, the federal government conducted a massive inquiry known as the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. The commissioner was a NSW judge, Justice Peter McClellan.

The public was invited to make submissions about their experiences and could choose to have their identity protected. More than 17,000 people came forward. Depending on which institution had been the locus of their abuse, that institution was then called in to give an accounting, usually at public hearings.

Officers of institutions such as The Catholic Church, Geelong Grammar School, the Watchtower (Jehovah's Witnesses) the Boy Scouts, and the Australian Navy were made to answer questions under oath. The Royal Commission (sometimes referred to as the RC) then published its findings and recommended financial compensation to victims. My book *Deliverance: A Royal Commission and Pizzagate Reveal Society's*

Hidden Controllers was published in 2017 and updated in 2019. It reports some of the hearings in detail.

On October 22, 2018, Australia's new prime minister, Scott Morrison, gave a formal apology in Parliament. The opposition leader, Bill Shorten, made a similar statement.

“Silenced voices; muffled cries in the darkness; unacknowledged tears; the tyranny of invisible suffering; the never heard pleas of tortured souls bewildered by an indifference to the unthinkable theft of their innocence—today Australia confronts a trauma, an abomination, hiding in plain sight for far too long.

“Why has it taken so long to act? Why were others things more important than this, the care of innocent children? Why didn't we believe?...We must be so humble to fall before those who were forsaken and beg to them our apology—a sorry that dare not ask for forgiveness; a sorry that dare not try and make sense of the incomprehensible or think it could; a sorry that does not insult with an incredible promise; a sorry that speaks only of profound grief and loss; a sorry from a nation that seeks to reach out in compassion into the darkness where you have lived for so long.

“Nothing we can do now will right the wrongs inflicted on our nation's children. So today we gather in this chamber in humility, not just as representatives of the people of this country but as fathers, as mothers, as siblings, friends, workmates and, in some cases, indeed, as victims and survivors. In Ngunawal, ‘Canberra’ means ‘meeting place’. And on this day of apology, we meet together. We honour every survivor in this country. We love you, we hear you and we honour you.”

The prime minister even specifically mentioned the forbidden subject of SRA – satanic ritual abuse, that is, abuse performed in occult ceremonies and which often involves the murder of a baby.

Could the RC Have Helped Protective Parents?

As mentioned, this book picks on only Family court matters where child sex-abuse occurs. Although I will hardly refer to pedo-rings, I am sure they are behind much of the court corruption. As Speaker of the House Peter Lewis said, woe betide any whistle blowers on his “sensitive” subject. Note that it has been claimed by some that child trafficking is the very *raison d’etre* of the Orwellian-named Department of Child Protection, DCP.

I myself lived in Adelaide for 38 years (minus a few forays to other countries) without having the slightest inkling that government was run by secret bosses. Actually it had been noted in regard to some murders (for which Bevan von Einem is in prison) that a pedo-ring in South Australia has a huge hold on the judiciary.

You may think that the expensive and very thorough Royal Commission (RC) would have brought this to light, but I’m afraid we see again here the amazing reach of the traffickers. They were able to persuade the RC to hold back on any investigation of the judiciary.

Worse, the RC firmly refused to investigate “current cases” of abuse. Many mothers, begging for help, **were turned away**. The public is unaware of this. I believe there is no legal excuse for this to have happened. The RC told the mothers it was outside the RC’s Terms of Reference, but that is false, as you can see in the 2013 Letters Patent from Australia’s monarch [bolding added]:

**ELIZABETH THE SECOND, by the Grace of God
Queen of Australia and Her other Realms and Territories,
Head of the Commonwealth....**

WHEREAS all children deserve a safe and happy childhood.
AND all forms of child sexual abuse are a gross violation of a
child's right to this protection and a crime under Australian
law AND it is important that claims of systemic failures
... be fully explored....

AND noting that, without diminishing its criminality or
seriousness, your inquiry will not specifically examine the
issue of child sexual abuse, but that any recommendations
you make are likely to improve the response to all forms of
child sexual abuse in all contexts.

NOW THEREFORE We do, by these Our Letters Patent ...
require and authorise you, to inquire into institutional
responses to allegations and incidents of child sexual abuse
and related matters, and in particular....

**c. what should be done to eliminate or reduce
impediments that currently exist for responding
appropriately to child sexual abuse**

AND We direct you to make any recommendations ...that
you consider appropriate, including about any policy,
legislative, administrative or structural reforms....

AND We direct you, for the purposes of your inquiry and
recommendations, to have regard to the following matters: e.
the experience of people directly or indirectly affected by
child sexual abuse f. the need to focus your inquiry and
recommendations on **systemic issues**, recognising
nevertheless that you will be informed by individual cases and
may need to make referrals to appropriate authorities in
individual cases; the need to establish mechanisms ... for the
purpose of enabling the **timely investigation and
prosecution of offences....**

4. The Child's Best Interest and Parental Alienation



australiansportscapms.com.au

In 1990, Australia ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. At least one High Court case established that Australia must consider “the best interest of the child” to be *paramount*. In 1995 a man named Teoh was the caretaker of his nieces and nephews. Teoh was convicted of drug dealing and was ordered to be deported. He argued that his departure from Australia would mean the children would have little money and no guardian.

His deportation order was overturned on the strength of the principle of “the best interest of the child.” The High Court said although the treaty had not been turned into domestic legislation, the ratification *gave rise to a legitimate expectation* that government decision-makers would make decisions consistently with Australia’s obligations.

Well, that’s nice. But the subject of the best interest of the child tends to not even get a mention when a judge is fixated on keeping the Protective parent away from his or her beloved offspring. This is a good clue to what Family Court is all about. “Things aren’t as they seem.”

PAS – Parental Alienation Syndrome

Why do judges do wrong? An excuse given is “Parental Alienation, syndrome” where mum is said to make false allegations against the dad. The judge must then help the Dad by sending the kid into his care – never mind that it may take two cops to bundle the terrified kid into the car.

I believe this explanation is fake, and that the judge is determined for *other* reasons to do harm. I say some bad Family Court judges have two missions: to feed the sex-trafficking, and to break the good parent and the children.

There are specialists in Parliament who assist with the wording of proposed legislation. I speculate they take great care to be sure that nothing gets into the law unless it suits the powerful. Putting the phrase “child’s best interest” on paper was no issue –it’s a fluff word. Please show me an instance in which your judge appears to have considered, in a normal way, any real interest of the child.

As for parental alienation syndrome, promoted by psychiatrist Richard Gardner, it gave bad judges what they need – a **chance to accuse the mum of something** as justification for kidnap-by-Court. Significantly, Gardner also promoted False Memory Syndrome, invented by the CIA in the 1990s, to hush up the revelations by children who had been tortured in the MK-Ultra program.

Psychology Today said PAS involves the “programming” of a child by one *parent* to denigrate the other, to undermine and interfere with the child’s relationship with that *parent*, and is often a sign of a *parent’s* inability to separate from the couple conflict. -- To which I say Horse feathers! And Our Royal Commission has refuted forever the claim that a child’s report of sex abuse is likely to be deceitful. Richard Gardner, MD,

suicided in 2003. His ideas came to Australia via Kenneth Byrne. Unbelievably, Gardner recommended **children be cited for contempt** of court if they refuse to visit the alienated parent. He said: “Once found to be in contempt, the youngster **can be placed in a juvenile detention center for a few days to reconsider** his (her) decision.”... [Or] the youngster might be offered a visit or tour of the facility in advance while he or she is considering refusal.



Richard Gardner, author of a harmful book

“Another consideration, **especially for younger children, would be temporary placement in a foster home or a shelter for abused children. This is obviously punitive and could help such children rethink their decision not to visit.** [Emphasis added]

“Such placement could also serve as a transition site for visits with the victimized parent. There is much too much coddling, indulging, and “empowering” PAS children. [This] would provide sorely needed disempowerment.”

Folks, he really said that. And the Court endorses his PAS. Now see an admiring comment by an American legal firm:

Swiftlylegal.com.au (regarding the case of *Rilak v Tsocas*)

In relation to the second ground, the Full Court held that the trial judge’s **finding** that the mother had not physically assaulted the child prior to the trial **carried little weight**. This is because the trial judge had found that, at the time of the trial, **the child**

would be at a grave risk of harm if she were to remain in the mother's care. The risk **related to the mother's unfounded belief that the father had sexually assaulted the child**, and her extraordinary attempts to marshal supporting evidence. [How is that a "risk"?]

For instance, the mother had **embarked on a campaign of interrogating** the child. [I'm guessing: "Darling, were you all right when you were with Daddy?"] The purpose of these interrogations was to elicit information from the child to the effect that the father had abused her.

This led to father's concerns about the **child developing false memories** and sustaining serious psychological harm more generally. [Martin Orne, eat your heart out.]

The trial judge had also expressed similar concerns. This conduct was compounded by the mother's improprieties related to her attempts to gather evidence [including]..., **drug tests**, psychological therapy and even a vaginal swab. [That is what a doctor normally does.] The mother engaged in this conduct despite recommendations from various authorities and professionals concerning the deleterious effects they would have on the child.

This book "Reunion and Family Law" is not about people making rational decisions or having understandable fights over who loves whom. By contrast, Adelaide's *Advertiser* often covers exciting stories about father's rights or about divorcing couples who may wish to kill each other. Such incidents, which may be true, distract from the amazing fact that judges – who should be persons of outstanding intellect and moral character – make cruel rulings.

To take the heat off Australia for a moment, I should note that judges are doing identical things in other countries, too. Please ask: what is the cause of such similarities?

Judge Younger Transferred After Violating Parent's Rights,
Brian Hickey, *Philly Voice* July 2, 2018, Pennsylvania

Lyris Younger, a judge for the Philadelphia County Court is transferred [after **Judicial Conduct Board** investigated] from the family court after several parents and lawyers issued complaints against her involving due process violations and **“creating judicial parental alienation.”** Critics say Judge Younger ruled by intimidation, not the law. Parents claimed their children were wrongly taken, and rights violated, when Judge Younger **refused to allow them to address the court** or present evidence.

A petition was also created by concerned parents to remove Judge Younger from the bench. The petition reads, in part, “Within her short time on the bench, Younger has amassed more appeals than any other judge in the Philadelphia [area] resulting in 9 ruling overturns by the Superior Court.

Hundreds of families have been affected due to younger's unsupported decisions. Younger is supposed to preserve the family unit, and ONLY place children who are in danger. Lyris Younger has made it her goal to separate families, terminate parental rights, and adopt their children out. **How can we have faith in our judiciary system when the superior court acknowledges, Lyris Younger's goal is to deteriorate the bond between parents and children...** [Emphasis added]

See? There are spouses in a non-divorce situation who want the kid at home, yet the judge grabs the child. Please agree with me that Judge Lyris Younger's behavior cannot be explained by her lack of knowledge of the law. She knows the law well – she sees how it can be perverted with a terrible result for families. That is her goal -- as in Oz and it is time we stopped covering it up. Lyris works for a boss who has instructed her to weaponize the law.

5. Two Good Guys Get Arrested



(L) Russell Pridgeon (R)Patrick O'Dea Photo: gofundme.com

Whistle Blowers are often punished, directly or indirectly. Patrick O'Dea and Russell Pridgeon, MD, are two whistle blower types who got arrested on the charge of kidnap or aiding a kidnap. They were protecting kids who would otherwise be with pedo's and whom police had refused to help. The name of the crackdown was Operation Noetic.

O'Dea and Pridgeon are not whistle blowers in the strict sense. We need a new name for a category of persons that go to police, in the ordinary, proper way, to report crime and are turned away. (That includes me.)

Dr Russell Pridgeon had his medical license taken away. My late husband was a pediatrician and he was aware that all doctors dread being "struck off the register." Well, OK, you should be struck off if you do bad doctoring, or embezzle funds, or whatever. But not for helping kids in danger. Believe me I can say for sure that there are doctors who care greatly about their patients, as George Maxwell was one of them.

Here is Pridgeons's letter to medical doctors [bolding added]

Dear Colleague

You have known me as a general practitioner working at Duke St Medical Centre these many years. You may also have been aware that I have been involved in Child Protection for some time.

Amidst the prurient media coverage of my arrest you may be aware that I assisted a mother to protect her children from sexual abuse. What I have done is not a secret from the authorities; they have known about it for nearly 6 months and have not approached me on this matter until I was arrested last week.

On 30 May 2018 I wrote to the Minister of Child Safety in Queensland advising her that:

“I am one of many people who sheltered and protected them, in the four years that they were free of ongoing abuse. At various times I drove vast distances to transport them between places of safety, and when I was able find safe accommodation for them I sheltered them in a safe house in my locality from about Easter 2014 for more than a year.

This was one of the greatest privileges of my life to be able to help these children escape the horrific abuse inflicted upon them by fiends, and **enabled by Rogue Judges, lawyers and Policemen who actively hid the truth, ignored evidence, and facilitated child rape, effectively trafficking these children to paedophiles.**”

This email was cc'd to The Minister of Police in Queensland, and to Hon Christian Porter, the Federal Attorney General.

I became involved in this after the late Prof Freda Briggs AO, Australia's pre-eminent authority of child sexual abuse, asked me as a doctor, to support the mother, using my experience in trying to save other children to help them. The children had been taken from the mother and given to the father, despite multiple disclosures of abuse, so their sexual abuse continued for years.

I used to phone the mother and listen to her horrific recounting of her children's abuse. **Nearly 40 years of medicine have not provided me with greater grief and horror.** When I heard through the media that she had snatched the children and fled, and when she phoned me for help, there was nothing else to do: I had to help her, I couldn't let her children be returned for abuse.

I was acutely aware that I was breaking the law, yet I knew that the law had failed these children utterly, it was a terrible position to be in. I reflect now that these children had 4 years of their childhood free from terrible abuse, I must now pay the price for that.

At no time was I in the presence of the children, without their mother being in the immediate vicinity. My endeavours to protect abused children have resulted in the near complete destruction of my life. These were not my children, yet I could not as a moral man, or as a doctor turn my back on them, and leave them to be abused.

I would have been ashamed to do less. I knew I was breaking the law, I also knew that if I did not help them they would be returned for ongoing rape. I also knew that it is impossible to evade the law indefinitely, and that these children would eventually be found, and when that happened I would be jailed, as I have been.

May I bring to your attention that despite numerous disclosures by the abused children, to the child protection authorities, the perpetrators of child abuse remain at large, untroubled by the law. Contrast this to the vast AFP operation to apprehend those who risked everything to protect these children.

The Medical Council of NSW have suspended my medical registration indefinitely. **I believe that my actions were those of a moral man, following the best and the highest traditions of the medical profession.** I write to apprise you as my medical colleague of the true nature of the circumstances surrounding my prosecution. Please feel free to pass this letter on to any other medical practitioners you may know.

Sincerely, Dr Russell Pridgeon, Duke St Medical Centre, Grafton NSW 2460

Debbie Platz, Assistant Commissioner of the Australian Federal Police (AFP), said, in justifying the arrests:

“This [behavior of Pridgeon and O’Dea] has demonstrated a complete **disregard for the rule of law in this country and the decision of the courts...**The actions of these people **is not to protect children;** what it does is potentially **endanger** the safety and wellbeing of these children.” [Bolding added]

Comment: Here we see the bad faith of the authorities. Platz says the two men disregarded “rule of law.” No, Debbie, they are saying, as they should say, and as we must all say, that a bad law is not valid. How dare you use Tavistockian language to make the public think the men endangered the children. *You* endangered them and you will have a lot to answer for. And we will see that you do answer for it. *We have rule of law.*

6. A Sample Mum and The Family Court Survey



The Palm House in Adelaide's Botanic Garden Photo by pepitus

Protective parents started to hear heard about our Gumshoe articles and phoned the Editor Dee McLachlan, with their stories. Thus we got involved – reluctantly; it is not our job! The cases are exhausting and heartbreaking.

Dee decided to conduct an online survey in hopes of obtaining a statistical view of what was happening. She hired a professional survey company to administer it; the responses were made to that company, anonymously. The first screen said:

This is a survey is about the FAILURES of the Family Court in AUSTRALIA to protect children. It is for Protective Parents regarding their experiences.... It is broken up into these categories:

- a) Disclosure [to whom did the kid reveal the abuse?]
- b) Believing the child [who believed and who didn't believe]
- c) Family Court and Finances
- d) Disregarding and DESTROYING Evidence
- e) Coaching, Record Falsification and Punishment
- f) General questions, and Threats
- g) Damage, and Outcomes

You can find the whole survey in Appendix H. Item 9 and 10 replies are especially damning to judges. For now, for the benefit of readers who have no experience of the legal-kidnap routine, I offer a sketch of what happens.

A Sample Protective Parent with a Typical Story

Here is a case of a protective mother. (I call her 'PM1' to comply with Sec 121 prohibition of identifying parties.)

It sometimes happens that a couple marries, the woman gets pregnant, and they get along well until after the baby's birth. By the second birthday or so, the husband does a runner (Australian slang for abandoning). Thus the wife, as in this case of PM1, raises the child alone.

When the kid is, say, six, the dad comes back into the home, then leaves again after a while and, oddly enough, approaches the Family Court to ask for full custody!

So now PM1 is forced to be involved in court and the first thing she must do is spend money on a lawyer. If her case lasts a few years – sometimes they last ten years – this is bound to impoverish her. Many such mothers sell their house to pay for lawyers and may have to file bankruptcy.

How will the husband have any claim that will impress the judge? Will be asked to show that he is the better parent? No. The case will revolve around the *mum's* unsuitability. The options are for him to show that she is a mental case, or that she has committed the biggest sin: coaching. She is accused of coaching the child to hate the dad.

And why does the court care about this? After all, a million things go on in families that are no business of society.

Anyway the mother, PM1, continues to attend hearings and to carry out the court's request that she show up at a clinic to be mentally "assessed". This, too, costs her money; a forensic psychiatrist's fee is close to \$3,000.

(And is burdensome in other ways. If it were me, I'd probably start to change a lot of my normal behaviors for fear of being quizzed about them by the psychologist. I would also start to believe I am mental, as one always starts to believe of oneself what is being said about oneself. I would become wary of friends and neighbors.)

After a while, it is decided by the court, based ostensibly on the recommendation of a psychiatrist or the hoary words of the Department of Child Protection (DCP), that the child should temporarily go live with a guardia.

Guardianship status carries the responsibilities that should be in the hands of the biological parents. If the parent wants "no vaccination" it does not matter; only a guardian has "authority" to decide. A guardian can also move the kid to a new school, away from the comfort of friends.

Let's say the child whispers to mum that dad "accessed" her at the Guardian's home and gave her a black eye. Mum takes daughter to police and you will be surprised to hear how the police deal with the injury, which is a crime.

They say "*Your case is before the Court, so we can't get involved.*"

Furthermore, after a length of time in guardianship the child may be adopted without any any relative's permission! An excuse here is that the child needs stability. But perfect stability was available from the mother. The kid is now a kid from a broken home and will suffer in all the familiar ways later in life. Whose right is it to do such a thing to a child? Society needs to wake up and help.

The Survey

I want to emphasize that the Family Court Survey, which was open from October 8 to December 14, 2018, is not of scientific standing. The ideal method of taking a survey involves aiming the questionnaire at people who are not already known to think alike. McLachlan acknowledges that her survey was aimed at aggrieved Protective parents.

The survey said “Please be scrupulously accurate.” We have no way of knowing the responders’ honesty. Is it possible they cheated? Sure. But there’s a wide range of answers, some surprising. To me, that gives it credibility.

79 persons responded. I show a few replies here; more will appear later, in Appendix H of this book:

2. How old was your child when you realised that SEXUAL ABUSE (or a serious injury) occurred? Number of responses: [79 responded to this question]

- Less than 2 years: 11x chosen (13.92%)
- 2 – 4 years: 33x chosen (41.77%)
- 5 – 8 years: 27x chosen (34.18%)
- 9 – 12 years: 7x chosen (8.86%)
- Older than 12 years: 1x chosen (1.27%)

4. Who did you contact once you realised there had been abuse? Number of responses: [77, These were multiple choice questions, and the responder was invited to tick *more* than one box, e.g., MC [multiple choice]

- Family (40)
- The police (41)
- My doctor, the hospital (34)
- Child Protection Services (48)
- Other (27)

32. Who do you believe CHANGED, or FALSIFIED REPORTS — or COMMITTED PEJURY? [53]

Members of my family (7) Doctor, medical personnel (5)
The police (17) Your psychologist / psychiatrist(9)
Social workers, supervised visit personnel (12)
Child Protective Services (26)
ICL, Independent child lawyer (28)
Court reporters, pre-court services (25)
Court appointed psychiatrist (16)
Court appointed experts (15)
The judge (the court) (21) Other (19)

5. When you confronted the perpetrator about the abuse, did they do any of the following? [77, MC]

- Deny the allegations (60)
- Threaten with violence (24)
- Advance proceedings into Family Court (34)
- Call me delusional, resulting in me having to undergo mental health assessments (37)
- Other (17)

Re “advance proceedings into Family Court” the 34% figure is very significant. I believe the “other party” – i.e., the abuser, has already been instructed (if I am correct about his/her being a cog in the wheel of child sex trafficking) to approach the Court. Isn’t that intriguing? Instead of fearing the judicial system because he is a wrongdoer, he feels his ‘advancing’ will be greeted nicely.

And that is so. In the twinkling of an eye, the court – having been advised by Department of Child Protection -- will turn the spotlight on the mother. All interest in his abuse will dissipate and she will start to be accused of abuse, even if only to the extent of abusing by coaching or abusing by parental alienation. The deck is stacked! Amen.

7. Contempt of Court and Freedom of Speech



(L) *St Paul orders pagan manuscripts burned at Ephesus, painting by Lucio Massari* (R) *Shane Dowling of kangarocourt website*

The judge – who is also known as “the Court” – owns the shop. She and she alone determines how far you can go in language and in behavior inside the shop. And sometimes outside the shop. She can write orders which, if it were a king or president, might be called tyrannical.

Protective parents will tell you they live in fear. Besides the fear that things might be going badly for their dear offspring there is a worry of jail for contempt of court. It seems the biggest concern is Section 121 of the Family Law Act that tries to keep the court proceedings secret. If the mum blurts out her troubles in public she goes to jail.

Needless to say, where there is wrongdoing there will be lies and secrecy. In the 1990s, South Australia held a Mullighan Inquiry into the abuse of 800 children in state care. The 1980s NSW Wood Royal Commission named pedo’s in government. In both cases, much is redacted and part is sealed. I do not know the legal basis of that.

The concept of contempt of court has been around since the 12th century. It’s beneficial, as we do not want the courtroom

to be a rowdy place. Dignity surrounding authority is essential to our feeling of respect for law. The Parliament can make some adjustments on contempt but can't cancel it – this power is inherent in the judiciary.

There are two types of contempt of court -- civil and criminal. Within civil, contempt can be direct or indirect; indirect is when you do something *outside* the courtroom. For the direct kind, you talk back to the judge or similar.

On August 22, 2018, Shane Dowling, webhost of kangarooCourtofAustralia.com was sentenced to 18 months in jail by NSW Judge Helen Wilson (not a Family Court judge.) He had previously served 4 months for blogging about an adult sex affair. The cause this time? He says:

“[I had] repeated in court on the 3rd of February 2017 part of an article [I] had published and also for publishing an article about the contempt proceedings in breach of suppression orders. Chief Justice [X] was named as a known paedophile and 17 other judicial officers were named as known paedophiles or suspected paedophiles and allegations of judicial bribery were also raised.”

In 2009, Dr Fredrick Toben of Adelaide was imprisoned for 3 months for *civil* contempt for not taking down a website after a judge had ordered him to (regarding Holocaust revisionism). Is there a right to free speech? In the 1997 case of *Lange v Australian Broadcasting Corporation*, the High Court said it is implied in the Constitution as being needed for representative government.

A courtroom is not the right venue to criticize a judge. Still, a judge can trap you into having to say what's going on and what's going on may be his unfair use of the law.

Sherman Skolnick v. State of Indiana, Court of Appeals. 1979

“MR. SKOLNICK: Judge, look, it is no secret that I’m investigating your corruption. ...

“THE COURT: Mr. Skolnick, answer the question.

“MR. SKOLNICK: I shouldn’t be in this Court. You’re trying to get me on something. You’re trying to question me on irrelevant matters. If I had an attorney, he would object to this.

“THE COURT: Mr. Skolnick _____

“MR. SKOLNICK: It is no secret I’ve made public statements about you, I shouldn’t be in this court and I shouldn’t be here with you sitting on what I say and what I don’t say.

“THE COURT: All right. Mr. Skolnick are you sitting here in this Court and calling me corrupt? Is that what you’re doing?

“MR. SKOLNICK: I am of that opinion as the head of a citizens group. I’ve said it publicly ...and about violation of judicial ethics and I believe that I, the member of the public, could make such comment outside of Court which I have.

“THE COURT: Do you realize enough about the law to know that you have just charged me with a very serious charge?

“MR. SKOLNICK: I have not charged you, I’ve said it as of my opinion _____

“THE COURT: Are you telling me that I have set up this situation to have a lawyer come in here and set you up because of my corruption? [Skolnick was then incarcerated but only for one day.]

(Later: Skolnick says: “See what I mean? When you are in court and have the brains to be able to reason something out, a judge can prevent your doing so.”)

Contempt of Family Court

FAMILY LAW ACT 1975 – SECT 112AP Contempt

(1) ... this section applies to a contempt of a court that:

(a) **does not** constitute a contravention of an order under this Act; or b) constitutes a contravention of an order under this Act and involves a **flagrant challenge** to the authority of the court.

(1A) This section does not apply to a contempt that constitutes a **contravention of a maintenance order** if the order has been complied with before the matter of the contravention comes before the court.

(2) **In spite of any other law, a court having jurisdiction under this Act [Family Law Act] may punish a person for contempt of that court....**

(4) Where a natural person [i.e., not a corporation] is in contempt, the **court may punish the contempt by committal to prison or fine** or both.

(5) Where a corporation is in contempt, the court may punish the contempt by sequestration or fine or both.

(6) The court may make an order for:

(a) punishment on terms;

(b) suspension of punishment; or

(c) the giving of security for good behaviour.

(7) Where a person is committed to prison for a term for contempt, the court may order the person's discharge before the expiry of that term. [Emphasis added]

In ordinary court, sins for which you can be arrested for *criminal* contempt are: 1. Refusal to testify as a witness 2. Failure, as an attorney to show up in court (unless there is a good excuse) 3. Behavior, as an attorney, that is insulting to the other attorney, or of course, to the judge 4. Behavior as a litigant or person in the gallery of the court who disrupts the proceedings 5. Use of vulgar language in documents submitted.

Note: Violation of dress code isn't contempt unless the person has been warned. (The 1971 US Supreme Court precedent for that is known as the Fuck the Draft case.)

It is entirely proper that a judge maintain the sanctity of the court, by using contempt-of-court penalties, but a judge can't "try" a litigant, sort of off-the-cuff, for an infraction of other laws. It may now be that bad judges, in a scramble to protect themselves from exposure as criminals, will resort to threatening critics with jail.

It remains to be seen how lawless the government is these days. Queensland Police and NSW Police have both established "Fixated Persons Investigation Units." Their quarry would be a person like me who is "fixated" on getting justice, or who writes often to ministers, etc. But there is no legislation allowing police to run such a unit.

Commissioner, Mark Fuller, speaks of the FPIU as based on predictive crime. "You *may* be a danger to society, so we should prevent your doing anything (like terrorism)."

If you get arrested, just ask "*Quo warranto?*" By what law?

Are we to tolerate police carrying out arrests just to make a show of force? In 2014, Muslim homes were raided in the wee hours, in the Lakemba area of Sydney. I believe there is no possible excuse for such a thing, frightening whole families. Proper protocol has been on the books for yonks. Don't let the police lose sight of the law.

8. Why Do Child Protection Workers Lie, Worldwide?



Protestors in Prague, Czech Republic, against Norway's behavior

Holy smoke! The modus operandi of the child stealers is out in the open. Below I will print a United States out-break of anger over the lying behavior of social workers. But first let's see what Norway's getting up to. Per BBC:

“The case of a young couple in Norway whose five children were taken away by the state has fuelled mounting concern within the country and abroad over its child protection practices. Protesters around the world - and leading Norwegian professionals - say social workers are often too quick to separate children from their families, with too little justification, particularly when parents are immigrants.

“Ruth and Marius's life was torn apart without warning one Monday afternoon last November when two black cars approached the farm where they live in a remote Norwegian valley. ... Ruth was waiting as usual for the school bus that would bring back their two daughters, aged eight and ten. But that Monday, it never came. Instead, Ruth saw the two unknown cars... and a woman from the local child protection service knocked at the door.”

And this from *Forbes* magazine of all people:

“Norway has a reputation of being a world leader when it comes to providing social services and respecting human rights. However, allegations of ‘child-kidnapping’ perpetrated by a powerful and well-funded government agency called Barnevernet have recently sparked angry protests around the globe. International news teams flocked to the country to investigate while the Norwegian government was quick to assure the international community that it was complying with international law.

Claims that Barnevernet is excessively interventionist in the way it handles child protection cases have mired the agency for years, especially in relation to foreign parents. In 1996, the Court found Norway to have violated the right to respect for family life in the case of *Johansen v. Norway*, where Barnevernet had deprived a mother access to her daughter. ...Barnevernet had cited cultural practices, such as feeding the children with their hands and sleeping in the same bed as them, as evidence that the parents were unfit to look after their children.

And this is from reddit.com:

I know it is a sensitive topic for Norwegians, who take the wave of international criticism towards the barnevernet personally, but i will still give it a go. barnevernet makes mistakes. horrible ones. removes the children not only in cases of immediate danger to the child wellbeing, but also in any kind of situation, which suits the social workers. ...

There was a woman from Canada, who had her child taken away from her, just because they wanted to homeschool him, as the child was bullied. Barnevernet decided that it is bad for the child socialization, and took him. The video of their cruelty and animalistic behavior was seen almost a million times, and due to the pressure, the child was removed. There are many cases like this....



The late Senator Nancy Schaefer of Georgia

In the past, Protective parents had no idea they were in a large racket. Today organizations such as Exiled Parents and forced-adoption.org hold rallies and send emails. The leading light in this movement was Senator Nancy Schaefer (1936-2010). Her constituents had told her about the problem. She held a meeting in a library, attended by fifty Protective parents, with more queued up outside.

Speaking at a Family Issues conference in Amsterdam, indicating that these issues are global, Nancy Schaefer mentioned that persons who lose their kids are “dazed and glazed”; they have no idea what to do. As a legislator, she proposed that **if there is a threat of having one’s child removed, a jury must make that decision.**

Senator Nancy Schaefer is no longer alive. The story is that her husband, Bruce Schaefer, supposedly shot his wife in the head and then shot himself in the chest, in a suicide pact. I say that is nonsense. Both of them must have been murdered. A woman on a mission does not choose to quit this world. A man who loves his wife does not put a bullet through her skull.

In a Youtube video, Schaefer wisely concluded her speech by quoting the Old Testament: Proverbs: 31:8 – “Speak up for those who cannot speak up for themselves.”

A Youtuber uploaded a video, in which a US lawyer asks the judge's permission for Child Protection Service to lie.

I grabbed the top bunch of the 1800 comments. – they aren't cherry-picked! It is a valuable collection of people who have not met each other, all saying the same thing. Note: this Youtuber's handle is John919. Probably he took his name from the Gospel of John, chapter 9 verse 19: "And they asked them, saying, Is this your son, who ye say was born blind? How then doth he now see?"

In his introduction, John919 says 400,000 children go missing in the USA every year (more than a thousand per day) and 70% are from CPS and Foster Care....

Here are the comments. Enjoy some solidarity! (I've omitted the senders' names and added some bolding):

Lady should be locked up for even suggesting it's OK to lie in a court room.

CPS is all about the money. **They don't care about anything else.**

This has been going on for a long time to low-income families.

WOW A judge with ethics and knowledge of the law....Thaaaaat's something you don't see everyday! My hats off to you YOUR HONOR!! Getting in this system will drain you of not only your funds but YOUR SANITY...thanks for bringing this up in the video!

How would you like it if a government institution lied in Court to take your children away, put them in foster care and gave them drugs and **let them live with strangers?**

Leave those kids alone!!! HELP the parents, if need be. Not sell the kids. It's called "child trafficking". Big business. Thanks to Bill Clinton.

Should call CPS on her and take her children from her, it's just a little lie after all, right?

Ridiculous! **All CPS should be shut down.** They're doing more harm than good and they're the abusers. They need to serve prison time.

They shouldn't even be given a chance to speak! They should just be thrown in jail -- because it is basically illegal to steal someone's kids from their homes and lie about it.

I live in Spokane and **CPS here lies and lies!** They seem to be able to harass parents and they get away with it! The middle Judge hit it on the nose that it is low-income people who CPS lies and takes their kids!!

If only **every judge was as good as this guy**, other cases the judge is on the same side as CPS and that's just a mess.

Shocking!!!!!! CPS and Social Workers LIE under oath!!!!

Child trafficking, and low-income families cause of **social engineering.**

It's probably so rampant they can't cover it up anymore. So they thought they would get Permission from the court. **Good for these judges** calling out CPS here and calling it what it is.

CPS are all about destroying families and getting paid to do it and that's the bottom line to it all.

That old white judge is my spirit animal.

CPS always lie and twist things to steal children off innocent family's! **They get paid to take kids off families** and money is involved so you know it's going to be corrupt to the core.

I knew someone years ago who hated CPS so much that he went to their offices at night after a few beers and pissed all over their 'Kidnap Cars,' taking extra care to cover their driver's door handle.

Yes... CPS does falsify documents...it's called "**Security Protocol.**" This representative is lying through her teeth...In court!

Man, our founding fathers are rollin' in their graves!! I don't even recognize this U.S. of A.

These satanic Monsters will pay one day for their crimes against the children.

OMG is that really what they are arguing? OMG.

Never let DCF in your home unless warranted. By letting them in you give them an opportunity to say that your home is a mess, untidy, they saw alcohol, and medications visible and within reach of child, **no child locks on cabinets, open windows** where a child could fall out....

If your home is neat and tidy and you are an excellent Mom, many DCF investigators and **social workers will simply fabricate evidence** to use against you in court.

If you are low income, jobless, on disability, or live in low-income housing, **DCF will prey on you** upon the first complaint they receive. Once DCF has custody of your child,

it is highly possible that your child will suffer irreparable emotional and **psychological harm of which no amount of intensive trauma therapy can fix.**

DCF obtains custody, **they will attempt to alienate you from your child**, and say nasty things about you to your child. My investigation of DCF employees in Worcester, Mass. office indicates that some of these workers had suffered traumatic childhoods including rape and incest...

In the words of Jesus, it would be better if that person would hang a millstone around their own neck and be tossed into the ocean than for that person to hurt a child. Please pray for the conversion of all D.C.F. workers. **They lie all the time.**

They are not just going after low-income people anymore because they've gotten most of their kid it seems but after living in a large city for the past 20 years **I now know that a teacher with no criminal record not even a speeding ticket can have her kids taken away for nothing.**

Each time I went to court to get a new list of hoops to jump through until the next court date (and this went on for five years because I refused to give up). I told the absolute truth while CPS lied with every other word.

What made things worse... my children were split into two foster homes. My son and daughter went a year and a half without seeing each other and only then because I was able to schedule their visitations on the same day and at the same place.

It's happening in Tennessee, too. It's heartbreaking. D.A.'s and attorneys and sheriffs' detective who are all involved in their own criminal actions and them whom

covered for them of doing their own crimes of the fake family court.

I LOVE this guy!! I got a li'l boost in hope for humanity.

Go after that president for human trafficking and CPS kidnaping human trafficking.

Parents no longer have “clearly established” or constitutional rights in regards to their children. That’s frightening -- an anonymous phone call can start an investigation.

(Note: That last commenter’s statement is incorrect. Americans have clearly established parental rights.)

What about Australians – do they have parental rights? I find the question outlandish. OF COURSE PARENTS HAVE RIGHTS. More to the point they have duties.

Everybody knows a child belongs to his mother and father.

In the next chapter, I try to find an angle to the story that does not involve pedo-rings but, instead, money. Bounty is paid quite officially and openly for child-snatching.

I’ll bet the real goal includes other things as well -- such as to train cops into meanness and to break up families in order to make every individual weaker. There is an entity in London called Tavistock that has been slaving away since 1920 to find ways to cause social chaos. Everyone should be motivated to crank those idiots to a halt.

9. The Matrix of Congress Exposed at a Hearing



US Congress photo: Brookings Institution

So is 'legal kidnap' driven by money? In 1997, Congress passed, the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA). It allowed many American children to pass out of the foster-care system and into adoptive homes. (The legislation refers to "loving homes" but does not list criteria for judging the lovingness of the home.)

In 2003, Congress reviewed ASFA. It takes a lot of money from the Social Security Trust Fund. Example: the feds pay the state \$4,000 for each child adopted out, or \$6,000 if the child is categorized as special needs. (The term "special needs" is not limited to disabilities – it has no particular definition.) Thus in 2003 we find the House Ways and Means Committee holding a review of the law. This will be eavesdropped on, below.

Matrix. This chapter is about the matrix in US Congress; possibly it is the same in Australian Parliament. I am not referring to the woo-woo kind of matrix, or the movie by that name. The *Merriam Webster Dictionary* defines the noun matrix (plural: matrices) as "something within or from which something else originates, develops, or takes form."

The matrix I am identifying is **an atmosphere of acceptance that the government should place your kid in a home that is not your home.** Whilst reading the transcript of the 2003 congressional hearing I was struck by the uniformity of thought. You may imagine that when a legislature reviews a program that came about from its law there will be a sort of re-evaluating of the original matter. But the chatter that I will display below is nothing like that.

Federalism and States Rights

Australia's six states are allowed the Constitution's Section 51, to "refer" their powers to the Commonwealth Parliament, i.e., "Canberra." In the US there is not only no provision for referring, it is highly forbidden by the balance-of-powers mandate. When the Framers of the Constitution got together in 1787 they wanted to give, to a national – federal -- authority only those areas of legislating that could not practically be done by states.

Thus Article I, section 8 gives the federal legislature its mission: it can address 18 topics all of which have to do with a nation, not a state. For example, Congress can raise an army and can regulate immigration.

The idea of the federal legislature enacting laws that had to do with the family did not even get a mention; it was so anathema to the theme of the Republic that I believe no one thought to argue against it. The "matrix" of the day precluded it. Really, folks' brains at that time were as unaware of governmental fiddling with personal matters as they were of motorcars.

There is not the tiniest justification in the US Constitution for an "Adoption and Safe Families Act." It should be thrown out by the US Supreme Court (whose job it is to guard the

Constitution). It could also be thrown out by any or all of the 50 states.

So why do the states suffer this encroachment on their power? I think it is because the 50 governors are under control. They do not get elected on talent or on an urge to protect their people. They are adjuncts to the national power group (which probably helps them get elected.)

The real drive of the Child Protection System is probably “federal funding.” The Congress wrongly offers bribes to states to give up sovereignty. “Do what we want and your state will receive funds.” The governor can then explain to critics at home that he can’t refuse those funds as the state is desperate for them.

As an aside I might mention that, among the citizenry, it should be members of the Republican Party who would stick up eagerly for states’ rights and state sovereignty, but the parties, too, have become controlled at a national level.

Socialism, Bismarck, etc.

The first leader to organize a welfare state, with government paying money for the upkeep of needy citizens, was Otto von Bismarck in Germany in 1880. Russia came up with the Marxist program of Communism in 1917, and the US, under the tutelage of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, brought in the Social Security Act of 1933 and the New Deal.

FDR’s plans, like that of the Bolsheviks and probably of Bismarck, were not “local.” They were part of a grand plan to reduce the status of the individual to a sort of atom. Such a statement can’t be argued be me here — please accept it tentatively. It’s the premise from which I claim to explain the absolutely odd fact that we now have nationwide socialism in

the US. The government knows your every move, your every medication, and now the mother-baby interaction.

Who Spoke?

You may expect that at a congressional hearing, persons who are well placed to offer advice will be invited as witnesses, or will themselves ask permission to give testimony. In 2003, Congress announced that only invited experts would speak at the hearing on adoption.

And who might these be? They were the members of the Department of Health and Human Services, the DHHS, the very ones who administer the funding.

So let us begin with a premise that Congress, for some reason, wants the ASFA program to continue, and DHHS wants to continue administering it. So all that would have to be communicated at the hearing is a lot of cheerleading for the program, no criticism of it, and no “outside voice,” such as that of the citizenry. *What am I saying!*

Granted, the CPS – Child Protection Service is not quite the same as the adoption program, but you will see here how the whole thing works. It works by having a lock on its own reality, no matter how greatly this reality may deviate from the social norm. Of course in time it may *become* the social norm, with everyone obediently using the new language. Let’s call it a matrix.

I will now present an extremely abridged version of the transcript from the April 8, 2003 hearing in which the House Ways and Means Committee “re-thought” its law, the Adoption and Safe Families Act (1997). Please note that although the following text is an abridgement, all the pieces that ended up on the cutting room floor are virtually identical

to what you see here. The persons on both side of the table kept saying exactly the same thing.

In a nutshell they said “This program is a smashing success.”

In line with my foregoing flap about states rights, let me call your attention to something about DHHS. Namely, no such entity as a “Department of Health and Human Services” should exist in the US government. (Nor should a Department of Education and a few others.) It is outrageously unconstitutional. See Article I, sec 8.

[Warning: you will be bored to death. Bolding added to help revive you]:

Opening Statement of The Honorable Benjamin Cardin, a Representative in Congress from Maryland

The 1997 Act was designed to ensure the safety of children who come into contact with the child welfare system and to **expedite permanency** for children living in foster care. The legislation amended the **existing Federal child welfare law to require that a child’s health and safety be of “paramount” concern in any efforts made by the State to preserve or reunify the child’s family.**

The legislation also included a provision to ensure that necessary legal procedures occur expeditiously, so that children who cannot return home may be placed for adoption or another arrangement quickly. Finally, the 1997 legislation also created **Adoption Incentives** program that rewards to States that increase their numbers of adoptions from foster care...

The 1997 Act was followed up two years later with the **Foster Care Independence Act**, another bipartisan product from this Committee. The legislation increased funding for services for youths who were “aging out” of foster care and **expanded State**

flexibility to design programs to improve the transition of older foster children from State custody to independent living....

Mr. CAMP. If I might, just for a second, this legislation, which former Member Barbara Kennelly and I worked very hard on—I agree with much of what the Chairman and Mr. Cardin have said, that it was really brought about **when we saw that the way the Social Security Act was being implemented did not really protect children and families.** So, we came up with this legislation to do that. I am looking forward to your testimony, Dr. Horn, about the recommendations that you might have to enhance the Act....

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE WADE F. HORN,
PH.D., ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CHILDREN AND
FAMILIES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN
SERVICES

Dr. HORN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to appear before you and this Committee to discuss the implementation of ASFA. As many of you **know, I'm a clinical child psychologist, and I have devoted my professional career to improving the wellbeing of children. I have a longstanding interest in child welfare policy and practice, and like all of you, I am committed to improving the delivery of child welfare services throughout the country.**

The passage of ASFA represented a landmark in child welfare reform, and while there is evidence of positive change resulting from ASFA, there also are clear indications that the goals of ASFA **remain elusive** for far too many children and families. Therefore, it is important that we continue to work together to seek improvements in Federal child welfare programs.

The ASFA was significant for several reasons. The Act clearly stated that the goals of the child welfare system were safety, permanency, and well-being, and it removed any ambiguity that **safety of children is the paramount concern that must guide**

all child welfare services. Advancing these goals, ASFA provided numerous tools to States and the Federal Government to bring about systemic reforms regarding safety, permanency, adoption promotion, improved services, and accountability.

Since the passage of ASFA, **the Administration for Children and Families has worked diligently to fully implement** these reforms. We have worked **with the States to bring their laws and policies into compliance with ASFA....**

One of the strengths of this legislation is its emphasis on **tracking results** for children and families. As required by ASFA, HHS consulted with State officials, advocates, researchers, and other experts, and developed a set of national child **welfare outcome** measures to track State performance.

We also have continued to work with States to improve information systems and **increase the quantity and quality of data that States collect** and report. We have, for example, made **significant investments in the Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information Systems (SACWIS)** resulting in 29 States with comprehensive operational systems. [It] shows some positive trends and results, most notably in the area of adoption. **The number of children adopted from foster care grew from 31,000 in 1997 to 50,000 in 2001.**

Finally, our new system for monitoring child welfare services, the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR), is the cornerstone of our efforts to review State performance and **ensure compliance** with key provisions of the law.... It also is our means to partner with the States in identifying areas that need improvement....

Finally, I would like to briefly mention another proposal we have put forward to strengthen the child welfare system, a new State child welfare program option that would give **States the opportunity to receive their Title IV–E foster care funds as a flexible, fixed allotment that can be used to support a range**

of child welfare services. We believe that this option will ... relieve States of unnecessary administrative burdens.

STATEMENT OF CORNELIA M. ASHBY, DIRECTOR FOR EDUCATION, WORKFORCE, AND INCOME SECURITY ISSUES, U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Ms. ASHBY. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for inviting me ... My testimony will address four issues: changes in outcomes and characteristics of children in foster care from ASFA's enactment through fiscal year 2000; States' implementation of ASFA's fast track and 15 of 22 provisions; States' use of ASFA's adoption-related funds; and practices States use to address barriers to achieving permanency for children in foster care.... [Emphasis added]

Tidbits

Dear Reader, there is no point in continuing to print this repetitive stuff. Here a tidbits from the remainder:

“For children who have been in foster care for 15 of the previous 22 months, **the law required States to initiate proceedings to terminate parental rights**, except in specified circumstances...”

“States we visited have implemented several of these practices to overcome barriers to inter-jurisdictional adoptions. In Oregon, the state child welfare agency works with neighboring states in the Northwest Adoption Exchange to recruit adoptive parents for children with special needs. **In Texas, the state contracts with private agencies to place foster care children with out-of-state adoptive families.** In Illinois, the state works with a private agency in Mississippi to conduct home studies because families in Mississippi adopt many Illinois children.” (Why is that?) – end of quotes

How the Matrix Is Formed

At GumshoeNews we have fallen into the habit of saying “There are so many pedophiles out there, and criminal rackets, that this must be what causes the prevalence of governmental child-stealing. It’s human nature.”

Yet we know that it’s also human nature for people to look out for kids – surely that is a well-known instinct – and we know that reasonableness is also a human urge. But **the chatter at the hearings is not reasonable**. It’s not what the citizen thinks would occur there.

All 435 Representatives must by now have received pleas from constituents as to the horrible things that are done by CPS. Yet no word of it is spoken on Capitol Hill. Lip service is paid, such as in frequent mention of “good outcomes” but this excludes any emotion.

I hypothesize that there is a ruling matrix. Mr Cardin, Mr Camp, Mr Wade, and Ms Ashby are the four persons we heard from. Somehow their brains have gotten into an entrainment – I can’t think of the exact word for it. When asked to comment on the law, the ASFA, they automatically talk in that formulaic manner.

In the next chapter the question will be posed (in relation to a recent law in New South Wales that allows adoption without parental consent): “How can we tell when a law is not acceptable and invalid?”

10. The Fixated Persons Unit and Forced Adoption



NSW Police, carried M4 rifles on New Year's Eve. Theguardian.com

A protective grandmother sent the following letter to GumshoeNews. It is published with her permission:

Dear Editor, This is my story. I am scared. I am one of 50 people out of 24.6 million Australians currently being monitored and investigated by the new “Fixated Persons Investigation Unit” – the FPIU. They took more than two hours to download the contents of my phone onto a disk for the Justice’s pleasure, thereby enabling police and the judge to closely monitor me.

I now have a sticker in my passport SECURITY DO NOT REMOVE 15/11/18.

They miss the point — if courts were primarily committed to upholding The Rule of Law, there would be no need for the Vexatious Litigant provision.

Apparently I am a person who harbours unusually intense fixations on public figures – such as the judge who wrote into judgment that I am the perpetrator of “incest” rather than the real offender, who is the father.

Supposedly I constantly harass politicians and other public figures ... who always slam the door on my face, “because,” like my daughter, I must be a seriously mentally ill individual in need of “care.”

A new unit of the Police Force has been created which ostensibly aims at me as a “lone wolf-terrorist.” They will be closely monitoring me forever, until I die, which probably won’t be much longer, because I am slowly dying of a broken heart.

They can even access my medical records. They can hold me in jail for up to 14 days. The unit is about *neutralising* fixated people like me, before my issues *escalate into violence*.

And then halfway through the November police search of me, they want to know if “I plan on kidnapping my grandchild?” who was kidnapped by the Judge 18 months beforehand, to be ordered into the Child Exploitation Industry, for the benefit of the real child abuser.

Per the *Sunday Courier Mail* of 3 February, 2019, the government and the opposition are beefing up lucrative bounties for people *to encourage them to blow the whistle* and divulge white-collar crimes. [Opposition Leader] Bill Shorten said “corporate fraud is stealing.” I am saying “fraud upon the family court is child stealing.”

Shorten also said “Don’t let these crooks get away with it. It is time these corporate criminals are stopped from being above the law.” However, officers of the court don’t seem to fit this criminal category, because they are apparently so above the law they are ‘untouchable.’

The Royal Commission [into Banks] has seen corporate criminals resigning in droves. But if I continue to whistle

blow about fraud upon the family court, including all officers of the court and the judge, then I would “bring disruption to the family court organisation in which I seek my vision of justice.”

My “vision of justice” is to have my grandchild taken back from her outrageously-arranged illegal guardianship and rescued and returned to her mother and her entire maternal family who are being wickedly eradicated from her life. But my vision is untenable, hence my grandchild is ordered to stay in the child exploitation industry, for the next 12 years until she is eighteen.

But I don’t know how to do that. And yes, I am more scared for my little grandchild and my daughter than I am for me: the thought of living with an abomination of justice for the next 12 years is just too much to bear.

Comment by Mary W Maxwell

Such a law **could not be valid** within our English law tradition, as it punishes based on anticipated crime.

Try to envision the Powerful, or the minions of the Powerful, sitting around a table. The first one says: “People in free countries are a pain. They mean to thwart our takeover. Their rights are protected by law.” The second one says “No worries, change the law.”

The first one says ‘Difficult, some of their legislators won’t permit.’ The second one says “Get rid of those legislators.” The first ones says “We do that all the time, maybe we should step it up. However, even if they pass a bad law there’s another stumbling block. The High Court can throw it out.” The second one says “Don’t you know how to corrupt the judges?” — Etc.

The grandmother is now physically restrained by police and courts from seeking proper law enforcement – including that of taking the youngster out of his dangerous situation! Perhaps cops will escort Grandma to “Broadmoor.” (Do you recall how the Soviet Union used psychiatry to imprison protestors?)

So the entity that needs to help her is Society. Every Australian should feel personally, selfishly, interested — as living in a police state is not going to be any fun. “The power of one” doesn’t cut the mustard when you have legislators living in a trance, and when **good judges won’t speak out about the bad judges**. Has anyone yet heard a good judge, or a law professor, speak out?

In 2018, NSW legalized adoption even where parents object. Two thousand individuals and 80 organizations had advised Parliament not to do this.



Minister Pru Goward said “We will permit the judge to dismiss an application from the parents if it is vexatious.”

Even Blind Freddy can see that “vexatiousness” is but a way for NSW to do something bad and get away with it.

Let's talk about how to know when a law is NOT valid.

Retired NSW barrister Terry Shulze has said: **“The substance of law is reason, [thus] a law without a reason lacks the substance of law. [And] something without substance is called a VOID.**

In a Gumshoe article, “Review of Australian Law and Its Decline,” dated June 19, 2018, Shulze explained:

In English law, extrinsic aids to interpretation of a law relied primarily on the concept of searching for the “mischief which the statute was designed to remedy.” (That was the thrust of Heydon’s Case in 1584.) That ancient language is the ‘rational basis’ or ‘rationale for the legislation’ or the ‘raison d’etre’.

In American law there is a term “substantive due process”. The term was developed from the concept that a person cannot be seen to be receiving due process of the law, when the law itself lacks the substance of law. No matter how proper the procedures may be, **a person does not receive the benefits of due process when the law itself is corrupt.** My submission [is] that if there was no reason for the legislation, the legislation was a denial of substantive due process.

Please everybody, pay attention! Let legislatures who make bad law await us “invalidating” that law. I believe the part of Family Law that keeps us from knowing about the crimes being committed by judges is **invalid**. In fact, to conceal a crime is itself a crime (see Chapter 25 below).

Did you see in the Preface that a Kansas **Citizen** Review Board has placed itself in authority over the Family Court? That is as it should be. **We own the law**. It is the sign of great immaturity to obey a scary but false authority.

11. Medical or Educational Neglect? Lose Your Child



University of Adelaide

Natasha Cranmore phoned to tell me about the PRC, and I don't mean the People's Republic of China. The initials stand for yet another terrible thing. Are you ready to hear about more chicanery? Ms Cranmore thinks this feature is mainly for the stealing of *disabled* children, but as you will see it is potentially usable with regard to any children.

I am referring to the Parent Responsibility Contract. As usual it sounds harmless – think of all the talk about “the best interest of the child.” Here, harm lies in the way it's used. A parent of a disabled child may voluntarily go to get help or may be discovered to be in need of services.

So far, so good. Any mother of a disabled child is giving twice the effort of an average mother just to get through, so it is proper for society to provide extra helps. I don't mean by arranging for her to have respite. I mean the kid himself may require service from, say, a speech therapist.

When the mother signs up for it she is asked to sign a Parent Responsibility contract – I emphasize *contract*.

Parent Responsibility Contract: Information for Parents
(retrieved February 15, 2019 from Facs.nsw.gov.au)

A Parent Responsibility Contract (PRC) is a **voluntary support agreement** between you and Family and Community Services (FACS). You are being **offered** a PRC because FACS has assessed that there are **concerns for your child's safety and wellbeing**. A PRC aims to support you **to make changes** and improve your parenting skills so your child is safe and continues to remain living with you.

PRCs are to be developed between you and your FACS caseworker in a respectful, collaborative manner. The PRC will include the following information: ...

The actions that will explain what you need to do in order for your child to either remain safely in your care or be safely restored to you.

Once you have spoken to an independent person to get legal advice, **your caseworker** will organise a case plan meeting with all the relevant parties to discuss, negotiate and develop a PRC that suits your family's needs. If you have spoken with your caseworker and still disagree with the PRC, **you do not have to sign the contract, as PRCs are a voluntary agreement....**

How long does a PRC last? for a period up to 12 months.

What does a PRC do? A PRC is **not a court order**. A PRC is an **agreement** that is signed by you and FACS, registered **at the Children's Court**.

What happens while a parent responsibility contract is in place?

While a PRC is in place, the caseworker and support services work with you to reduce parenting concerns identified and create change that keeps your child safe.

[Emphasis added]

First let's note the mention of 'parenting skills.' "A PRC aims to support you to make changes and improve your parenting skills so your child is safe and continues to remain living with you."

Child is safe? How does that come into it? It sounds nice.

And this: "PRCs are to be developed between you and your FACS caseworker in a respectful, collaborative manner." I can't say the caseworker *won't* be respectful or collaborative but judging by other complaints about social workers, I would take that phrase with a grain of salt.

Remember, it's a contract. People go to court when either party to a contract does not live up to the agreement. In this case, the plaintiff will almost surely be the FACS and it has to be done at the Children's Court. Many business contracts have built into them a statement of which court can be used. This seems to me to mean that a parent could not use civil court to get her broader rights looked at in the matter.

Then the PRC goes on to say: "**If you breach a term** of the PRC or if you don't do the tasks within the timeframes outlined in your PRC, **further casework may be appropriate** and an amended PRC may be part of that. If the agreement is broken **a decision may be made to file a contract breach notice**. The contract breach notice will be filed along with a care application."

What a gentle sound here: "If the agreement is broken a decision may be made to file a contract breach notice." A decision will indeed be made, according to Ms Cranmore. But in reading the above a parent might not pick it up. How about being honest in the wording of the contract, Folks?

Medical Kidna

In 2017 I ran for US Senate in Alabama. Another candi-date sought my opinion on a book called *Medical Kidnap*. I told him I hadn't read it but that Bill Windsor's superb series on Youtube entitled *Lawless America* interviewed mothers whose kids were medically kidnapped.

Now I see Dr Joseph Mercola, host of a vey popular website in America, reporting the story of Alyssa:

“Alyssa’s mother, Amber, clashed with some of the care providers, including a social worker and head physician; the situation escalated to the point that the hospital banned Amber from seeing her daughter and increasingly sought to isolate Alyssa from the rest of her family, ultimately trying to gain guardianship. Ultimately, after months in what felt like prison, the family broke Alyssa free, only to be chased across the state by police.”

[Mercola add]s: “Hospitals aren’t prisons, and patients have a right to seek care elsewhere or leave the hospital against medical advice. In more cases than you might expect, patients end up feeling intimidated, or mistreated by hospital staff. In extreme cases, like that of Alyssa Gilderhus, the case escalates to the point of “medical kidnapping,” in which the patient is held at the hospital against their will and increasingly isolated from family.”

Alyssa was 18 year’s old, not a child. She had suffered a a brain aneurysm, which landed her in the Mayo Clinic. The trouble started later at the Rehab facility where her mother disagreed with the care plan. The story got a lot of coverage on CNN (Fox News had hyped up a similar case: Justina Pelletier, 15, at Boston Children’s Hospital. I suspect the TV coverage was intended to “condition” us.)

Now to return to the Australian situation. Ms Cranmore told me that the focus is on the mother as a bad parent. The way to get named as a bad parent is to fail to neglect the medical or educational needs of your disabled child. The educational neglect could consist of doing something as simple as taking her on a holiday on a school day.

No rational human being would interpret such an act as “neglect.” Thus, it can be presumed that the desired goal is to take the kid away. In Chapter 9, regarding Congress’s law of adoption, I tried to show how the money factor comes into the handing over of kids to adopters. It has to do with the feds paying the state for every adopted child.

There is also a financial incentive related to the Parent Responsibility Contract. The more services your kid can be recorded as needing, the more money gets paid. Natasha told me, said, with sorrow: “A bedridden baby is a million dollar baby.” It all has to do with Commonwealth funding for the bureaucrats, the doctors, the pharmacies, the guardians, etc. How is that for weird? How could it not be better for the Commonwealth to have mums looking after their beloved offspring?

The School As Guardian

Along the lies of tricks for removing children, please consider the cases in which the school is named as guardian. Most people might not realize the huge legal implication of that. In Canada, Rev Kevin Annett made the important discovery that when indigenous children went to Residential Schools, the school automatically became the legal guardian. This meant, for all practical purposes that even if the child had a competent, loving parent near the school, he or she had *no say* as to the child’s fate.

The same occurred to the Stolen Generation of Aboriginal children in Oz. I first doubted that there was really a stolen generation. The Reconciliation group put out a big pamphlet decrying state “policies” but nowhere could I find any parliament saying the parent’s rights were lost.

After Annett’s work, I checked and found that kids (Aboriginal or not) in a certain “industrial school” – from memory, in NSW, around 1926 – were guardian’d by the school. Gotcha!

Australian States’ Legislative Fluidity

On the subject of, say, health, Commonwealth Parliament can make law for the two territories, NT and ACT, but not for states. However, a state can voluntarily *refer* (read: abdicate) its power on a given topic, to Canberra. So says Section 51 of the Australian Constitution.

Also, the Commonwealth – or any state -- can invent a “model” law, and others can mimic it. A state that wants to use it must *enact* it. They are welcome to copy cat it. I had not learned in law school (University of Adelaide) that one state can use another state’s laws, but it is so.

There is an “applied law scheme” that even a practicing attorney might be unaware of. It allows a state to apply the law of another state. This was controversial in the area of regulatory stuff, until states signed the Commonwealth Corporation Act, via referred powers. I do not know if applied law is being used regarding children legislation.

As far as I know the PRC is used only on New South Wales and grew out of a law called The Child Welfare Act. When I went to look for that Act, I happened upon a website run by Canberra: findandconnect.gov.au.

It is to help you find your lost family members. I quote from it:

The Child Welfare Act 1939 repealed the Child Welfare Act 1923. Its full title was 'An Act to consolidate and amend the law relating to children and young persons; ... to amend the Interstate Destitute Persons Relief Act, 1919, and certain other Acts; to validate certain matters.' It contained many of the provisions of the previous child welfare legislation, but was much stronger and increased the powers of the Child Welfare Department.

After the Aborigines Protection (Amendment) Act 1940, Aboriginal children were removed from their families under the Child Welfare Act 1939. This Act was amended many times, and Adoption was separated from it by the Adoption Act 1965. The Child Welfare Act 1939 was repealed in 1987 and replaced by the Children (Care and Protection) Act 1987.

At *The Conversation* at ABC.net.au, Katherine McFarlane of Charles Stuart University wrote, on November 19, 2016:

The Wood Royal Commission into police corruption in the late 1990s exposed evidence that police and the child welfare sector were ignoring cases of paedophiles abusing children in out-of-home care. As a result, the NSW Government introduced new standards that child welfare agencies were supposed to meet to prove they could properly care for children. This was known as “accreditation”.

The huge disaster here is that the biggest player in the sector - - the NSW Government's own department in charge of child welfare, Family and Community Services -- has never itself received accreditation.

More children are going to end up in “care” as a result of another new program, announced by NSW Health Dep’t:

“*Got It!* is a specialised mental health early intervention program for children in Kindergarten to Year 2 (K-2) aged 5-8 years who display emerging conduct problems such as defiant, aggressive and disruptive behaviours. The targeted clinical program is delivered in the school setting in conjunction with universal *Got It!* interventions at a point in children’s development when intervention is likely to be effective. Locating the program in the school setting supports engagement with children and families.”

Kinda makes ya wunda how we ever got by without it! Note: In the US some schools are allowed to diagnose and treat – with medication – such conditions, without any input from the parents. That is totally, plainly *wrong*.


Reunion: Let’s Get This Tragedy Over Right Now

I am touting a reunion of separated parents and children as a way of pointing to the road we *should* be on. Clearly we shouldn’t be on a road that leads to totalitarianism. This business of government “intervention” into family life is outrageous. All the practitioners who have been given jobs in the child industry must be guided elsewhere.

The inventor of 20th-century strategies for controlling whole populations is Tavistock in the UK. That group has been flourishing since 1920. One hundred years is enough – the plan was never composed out of good will. It is malicious. Don’t be tricked into supporting it.

Anyway, we owe it to the children to return them to their Protector. That’s a fairly uncontroversial statement, right?

12. Beaumonts, Andrew McIntyre, and Media Silence



Children of Jim and Nancy Beaumont -- deprived of their future. In 1966: Jane 9, Artna 7, Grant 4

Some men are shy. Some men are weak. Some men are strong. Some men are fearless. Meet South Australian Andrew McIntyre — fearless.

As we will see, Andrew, who is now 64, has tried exhaustively to tell anyone who would listen that he knows who killed the Beaumont children. Namely, his father, Max. The jig is now up. His story can be denied no more.

A Terrible Day in Adelaide's History

The Beaumont kids went to Glenelg Beach on Australia Day, January 26, 1966 and “disappeared.” Allegedly no one saw them after that afternoon, but that’s not true.

Media say there are many theories to explain what happened. But no “theories” were ever needed! SAPOL (police of SA) always knew. Please feel free to be a bit suspicious of anyone

who pushed any explanation of the case, as they may be been part of a cover-up.

The fact is that POLICE KNEW ALL ALONG what had happened. Although Andrew McIntyre had solved the case of the murder of the Beaumont children *many* years ago, SAPOL had sufficient prestige with the population of SA – including *moi* – to be able to belittle all his evidence.

The Deep State

I assume there is a layer of “rulership” in the human race that is higher than the various national governments. We can easily trace this “cabal” back to 1913 and it may have been in place well before that. Secrecy is their mainstay. Today the label ‘Deep State’ is gaining popularity.

The point that’s relevant to the Beaumont story is that it must be **that group that lent sufficient authority to the SA police and the SA media** to turn the law upside down. They can do this almost effortlessly because they’ve already got their puppets appointed to all the key positions in society. Those ones “know their duty.”

Here is my interview with Andrew McIntyre, conducted by phone on September 13, 2018.

Mary: Thanks for trusting GumshoeNews with your information

Andrew: It’s nice to be listened to.

Mary: We published an interview with your sister Rachel Vaughan, and then I listened to her testimony at the International Tribunal for Natural Justice. I haven’t found even the slightest point on which to doubt her.

Andrew: Maybe there will be some small points that we get wrong, but we know we lived with a terrible man.

Mary: As your family is a bit complicated, let me go over this. Max had three wives: your mother Margaret who is also the mother of Ruth and the late Clare, and then a wife named Suzanne who is Mum to Rachel and her two siblings who don't wish to speak, and then a third wife who is a lecturer at Deakin University. Is that right?

Andrew: Yes, my mother died in 1967 when I was 13. My father accused me of murdering her in hospital. Although it's an absurd accusation it is hard to bear.

Mary: So young, she was only 34. Did the coroner of South Australia hold an inquest?

Andrew: I don't think so. Probably Max was the murderer. By the way, in addition to his story that I did it, he has said that two male nurses in hospital murdered her.

Mary: I look for connections around Australia regarding the MK-Ultra program. I got involved in that research in 2005 in America, my "hometown," but not till 2016 did I learn of the Australian connection.

Andrew: I don't know much about it, but when we were children Max used to control us by beating us and giving us minimal food. He drugged us and kept telling me that I was retarded and that I would never amount to anything.

Mary: The starvation bit is textbook MK-Ultra, but maybe Max was a born psychopath.

Andrew: Possibly, but it is more likely he was trained into it. By losing all human empathy and moral conscience he

became valuable to those he worked for. He fulfilled quite a heavy schedule of body-disposal for the murders they committed.

Mary: How did he claim to make a living openly?

Andrew: he was a wire tapper, employed by Telecom. And he said he was a police informant. In those days, they had people tapping into telephone conversations.

Mary: Do you have any idea who his targets were?

Andrew: I know that he wire-tapped SP bookies. They were bookies who take bets on horses and so forth. Some people who were SP bookies were Robert Symonds (Mother Goose), my maternal grandfather Hurtle Horan, and Jim Beaumont the father of the Beaumont children.

Mary: I understand that last November, 2017, you were prevented from attending the funeral of your father.

Andrew: Because of the malicious statements that Max had spread throughout the family about my sisters Ruth and Rachel and me, I felt that people at the funeral would have turned on us. So I viewed it from a distance. I bear so much hatred towards my father for the things that he did. His associates in crime were there, however.

Mary: You believe the three Beaumont children are buried at your father's old property in Stansbury?

Andrew: Yes. They were thrown into a sinkhole and it was later covered over.

Mary: I am trying to establish some context here. A wonderful woman in Victoria, Diane DeVere, told me that

Geelong and Ballarat were havens for MK-Ultra in the Fifties. Townsville was too. She said the real boss is the Tavistock psychiatrists. I think the cult run by Anne Hamilton-Byrne in Victoria is in some way connected.

Andrew: I have heard of Anne Hamilton-Byrne.

Mary: She is over 96 years old in a nursing home, I believe. One of her adopted children, Sarah Moore, MD, now deceased, wrote a book "*Unseen, Unheard, Unknown.*" There was a police raid on the property that allowed the kids to escape. Her group, like the SA group, is called "The Family." That's the name of a fine movie about her.

Andrew: I have not heard of that movie. I have cousins who have adopted the name Hamilton. Marty Hamilton-Smith is one. He's a recently-retired Liberal Party leader.

Mary: There's also a Byrne, Kenneth Byrne, who brought Richard Gardner's parent alienation abomination to Oz.

POLICE INVOLVEMENT, AND THE TORRENS

Mary: If you prove your story I can assure you that will have a beneficial impact on the people of Adelaide. It will teach them that the South Australian Police has known all long, yet we have been insulted for 52 years by being told of the "mystery" of the Beaumont kids' disappearance.

Andrew: It is not a mystery.

Mary: In Victoria there is an 83-year-old former police detective, Denis Ryan, who wrote a book, *Unholy Trinity*, about the way he was not believed or was told to shut up when he reported on pedophile priests. The recent Royal Commission helped him get a payment of compensation.

Andrew: They should pay Mick O'Shea. He was an Adelaide cop and he doxed other cops in. You can see his 2009 interview with Graham Archer on the subject of police corruption.

Mary: I know Mick O'Shea's name because he whistle-blew the murder of law lecturer George Duncan.

Andrew: Yes, Mick said the cops all went for a few beers that night, then they threw some guys into the Torrens. ...

Mary: I read at *Wikipedia* that two Vice-squad cops were put on trial for manslaughter but were not convicted — Francis Cawley and Michael Clayton. I believe George Duncan's death wouldn't have been investigated at all but for my dear law teacher, Professor Horst Leucke insisting.

Andrew: Mick O'Shea said that the cops knew, before they started, that the night was going to end badly. They knew George Duncan couldn't swim and that he had only one lung. You can ask Mick — if he is still alive. He had to go into hiding as he had ratted on the Brothers.

Mary: Thank God whistle blowers pop up everywhere. Some people have a drive for truth.

Andrew: My sisters and I have been acting on our truth drive for many years.

Mary: My last Fringe play was about "false memory syndrome." My MK-Ultra friends all claim that the FMS attack on them in the 1990s was worse than the suffering they had early in life — and that's saying something.

Andrew: Being rebuffed by SAPOL is no joke either.

Mary: How do you think your father became a bad man?

Andrew: I don't know. He had only a Grade 7 education but he was very smart. He was an all-rounder for talent.

Second Interview, September 25, 2018

Mary: I'd like to ask you about the Beaumont children and about your dear sister Clare. I noticed that Rachel said Ruth was taken as a witness by your father to see some of his crimes as they happened. Can you explain why?

Andrew: Ruth told me that she would be taken along to witness things. Max would use his children as witnesses to the dismantling, disposal, burial of bodies. No one else was murdering children at the time, it was our father doing it, along with (Tony) Munro, who is now in prison.

Mary: What about the supposed sightings of the Beaumont children after they went missing?

Andrew: I believe they died immediately. If any children were found at the Castalloy site, they'd be the 3 wards of the state. Max took 3 kids from Goodwood Orphanage who resembled the Beaumonts. He dressed them and cut their hair to look like them, then paraded them around Adelaide so people would report sightings of them.

Mary: You mean he was so powerful that he could snatch children from a public institution and not get questioned?

Andrew: Max then murdered those orphans. Amazingly my sister Ruth was later taken to a police station and told to make an admission that it was she who pushed them off a cliff. But she refused to say that. She knew about kids being used as "substitutes."

By the way, as I told the *Sunrise* journalist, there were approximately 600 children that went missing. That was reported in the 2008 Mullighan Inquiry.

Mary: I am so sorry that you lost your sister Clare and so sorry for her that she lost her life. Was there an inquest?

Andrew: I don't know. I was asked to file a written report, which I did. I say she was murdered and as usual I think it was Max who did it. She was found in the back garden with a broken neck. It was called a suicide.

Mary: And your mother's death, too, was ruled a suicide.

Andrew: My mother had admitted herself to hospital early on New Years Eve in 1966. Max had given my sister Ruth a letter to hand to my mother telling her he was kicking us all out and selling the family home.

He suggested that we could all live with our grandfather. This is why my mother admitted herself to hospital as she was so distressed and had become very anxious.

Mary: How old was Clare when the Beaumont's died?

Andrew: Clare was 15. The dates of birth for the first three kids of Max (real name Allan McIntyre born 1929) are: Clare, 1951; Andrew, 1953; Ruth born 1957. When my father left, my mother, Margaret, had to continue to work her full-time job to pay the mortgage.

Mary: Did you report to the recent Royal Commission?

Andrew: It was statements made to the RC by myself and another victim that led to the 2017 prosecution of Munro, as he had been a Scout leader. He was convicted of rape.

The Relevance of the Beaumont Story

I am grateful to Andrew for his willingness to talk even though it puts him in constant danger. By the way he has now given testimony to the International Tribunal of Natural Justice, which you can see on Youtube. Rachel also gave the ITNJ a video'd interview.



Rachel and Andrew

So what is the McIntyre story doing in this book? It's not about Family Court as such. I bring it in for three reasons.

First: the life of Max McIntyre was one of slavery to the hidden rulers of Adelaide. I believe many business people and governmental people are similarly in thrall to those rulers. The higher-ups must know who is calling the shots but the majority, say of lawyers and doctors, need only imitate the culture of their profession. Quiet slavery! The Family Court judges may well be very un-free persons.

Second: it shows that when police or Parliament say they have "investigated," you should never believe them. This is true of the FBI in the US. They create false evidence.

Third: The abduction of the Beaumont kids and of Louise Bell were suited to media coverage but all we got was lies. What gall the TV and press have to mock of the public, pretending those cases to be fascinating mysteries!

Media Tactics of Telling Partial News

Please walk with me through a mild example of trickery of the press. While I was writing two crime books, about the Port Arthur massacre and the Boston Marathon bombing, I had to wade through the distraction tactics that are used.

Whole stories or TV shows can be made without enlightening you, in fact they en-darken you. In this case it is Tammy Mills of the online *The Sydney Morning Herald*. Her article is called: **“Boy’s diary puts paedophile near beach when Beaumont children disappeared.”**

She’s referring to the fact that Andrew submitted to Bryan Littlely a journalist, a diary that Tony Munro had used for recording their diving experiences in the 1960s. Andrew had made a few contributions to that diary, thus he could authenticate its date and author and so forth. Watch how Journo Mills lets every attempt by police to override Andrew version shine forth as a reasonable response.

“A child’s diary that puts a convicted paedophile on Glenelg beach in the days surrounding the Beaumont children’s disappearance has been handed to detectives. It [is about] adventures diving off the Adelaide coast. The dives regularly involved Allan ‘Max’ McIntyre, and family friend Anthony Munro, who will be sentenced in August for abusing boys in 1965. [Hmm. 1965 is close to 1966...]

“Mr McIntyre says the diary is evidence that his father and Munro were frequenting Glenelg beach in the days before Jane, Arna and Grant Beaumont went missing there in one of the country’s most infamous mysteries....

“In his statement to police as part of the investigation into Munro’s abuse, Mr McIntyre alleged his father, now in his late

80s, and Munro, now 72, were involved in the Beau-monts' disappearance. Max McIntyre, a former Telecom worker, was investigated [not really, you know] over the disappearance after one of his daughters, Ruth Collins, made the allegations back in 2007.

“Police found no evidence he was involved. [Oh, I see. By the way, how do you “*find* no evidence.”]

“Munro, who lived in Glenelg in 1966, was interviewed about the Beaumonts after he was arrested for the abuse of boys last year. Again, police found no evidence. “In an interview with Littlely in 2015, [Max] denied his own involvement and pointed the finger at Munro. [Wow! Tony Munro got blamed by an eyewitness. Hello? Any developments there in the legal proceedings?]

“Munro’s lawyer, Stephen Ey, dismissed the allegations.

[In case any citizen out there reading this doesn’t know, it’s not for a defendant’s lawyer to “dismiss” allegations, A judge who has heard both sides can *dismiss* it. Attorney Stephen Ey is entitled to “scoff at it,” “call it a parcel of horse manure” or whatever. Wait, I see ‘dismiss’ was Tammy’s word. I guess she wants us to think the matter is dismiss-worthy. Why does she want that?]

“The police who interviewed Munro were satisfied he had nothing to do with it.” I’m sure studies have shown that the word “satisfied” has the effect of closing your mind.

It’s the fanciful ravings of Ruth Collins,’ Mr Ey said on Wednesday.

[Being accused of fanciful ravings is pretty bad when you know that your fanciful ravings are plain ordinary facts.]

“Mr McIntyre claims there was sand and blood in Munro’s car. His sister [Ruth] goes even further. She says her father came home wearing a bloodied shirt and, extraordinarily, she claims she saw the children’s bodies in the back of the car.

[*Excusez moi*, Tammy Mills, are you trying to indicate that the witnessing of dead bodies is “**extraordinary**” (yes, sure, it is, or are you having a crack at the wild-raver Ruth)]

“The siblings have demanded that a filled-in well on their father’s property outside of Adelaide be dug up, though the well remains undisturbed...“Mr Max McIntyre was unable to be reached for comment. ...The officer in charge of South Australia Police’s major crime unit, Detective Superintendent Des Bray, said dozens of people had been named as persons of interest.

[Poor Superintendent Des being deprived of solving Oz’s most famous murder case, and no doubt getting a medal for it, and going down in history as a great Aussie.]

The Great Rachel Effort

Rachel Vaughan showed me a 28-page list of attempts she has made to tell officials that Max was *currently* killing children. Here are a few that she contacted unavailingly:

David Ridgeway, MP, Dennis Hood, (Denzel Clarke, Task Force Argus) Doug Barr, Det. Insp. Major Crime
Paul Holloway, MP, Michael O’Connor, Victims of Crime Officer, Ted Mulligan, QC, Mulligan Inquiry, Australian Federal Police, Kris Hannah, MP, Jane Lomax-Smith, MP
Michael Atkinson, MP, Jay Weatherill, MP, Carmel Zollo, MP, Nick Xenophon, MP, Detective. Supt. Phillip Hoff (SAPOL), Attorney-General Robert McClelland, MP.

13. Ms Rilak Seeks Recusal and Tries for Mandamus



A famous mother-child bond: Diana and the princes

This is a case in Family Court, Sydney, which has been running for many years. You can find all of it on the website austlii.edu.au, hosted by the Australian Legal Information Institute. The case is *Rilak v Tsocas*.

First I will show the part where the mother, Ms Rilak, asked for a recusal of the judge – Justice Ann Ainslie-Wallace, from her case. This transcript begins by saying “The application [for Ainslie-Wallace J to recuse herself] is dismissed.”). Where I abridge text, I use three dots (...).

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT

On 23 March 2018, on the Court’s own motion, two appeals instituted by Ms Rilak (“the appellant”) were listed before the Full Court to determine whether they should be dismissed. On the day before the hearing of that motion, the appellant, by Application in an Appeal sought that I recuse myself from hearing the matter.

In the affidavit in support of the application, the appellant contended that I had been involved in six appeals instituted by her and that I had “rejected all of her applications” (Affidavit filed 22 March 2018, paragraph 12).

In oral submissions, the appellant said that she does not have faith in me and that **she feels I am impermissibly prejudiced against her and will not afford her justice in the hearing of her matters....**

In July 2015 the appellant sought expedition of an appeal instituted by her against interim parenting orders made on 5 June 2015 during the final parenting proceedings (“the interim parenting orders appeal”). The appellant had earlier sought and been granted expedition of the recusal appeal. ...

[Note: Ms Rilak has not see her child, born 2010, in over 3 years despite the court ordered regular weekly contact.]

On 12 July 2017 I dismissed the appellant’s application for extension of time in which to bring appeals from an order of Justice Stevenson made on 7 July 2016 and an order of Justice Rees made on 22 July 2016. In both cases the time for filing an appeal had long passed by nearly 12 months

Finally on 13 October 2017, on the application of the respondent, **I ordered the appellant to provide security for costs in relation to an appeal** instituted by her against a costs order made by Rees J resulting from **the appellant’s unsuccessful application that the respondent be dealt with for contravention of the parenting orders.**

[The father is on utter breach of orders to allow visits.]

The law in relation to disqualification on account of apprehended bias is well settled. In *Johnson v Johnson* (2000) 201 CLR 488, the plurality of the High Court (Gleeson CJ, Gaudron, McHugh, Gummow and Hayne JJ) held at 492-493: “... It has been established by a series of decisions of this Court that the test to be applied in Australia in determining whether a judge is disqualified by reason of the appearance of bias (which, in the present case, was said to take the form of prejudgment) **is**

whether a fair-minded lay observer might reasonably apprehend that the judge might not bring an impartial and unprejudiced mind to the resolution of the question...[Our way] is based upon the need for public confidence in the administration of justice.”

.... I observe that in one of the matters which the appellant said had given rise to her concern, **I was but one member of a bench of three** who came to a unanimous decision on the application.

I am comfortably satisfied that the fair minded reasonable observer understanding the context of the applications decided by me and the Full Court would not apprehend that I would fail to bring an impartial mind to the issue to be determined in the present appeal.

Thus I refused the application that I disqualify myself from further hearing the appeal.

*****Comment: There is a list of maxims (overarching principle of law) later in this book. One of the maxims says “No man can be judge in his own case.” It is expressed in Latin, the language used in British courts for centuries, as: *Nemo iudex in causa sua debet esse.*

Are you ready for more of Ms Rilak’s case? She tried several approaches that are the only hope a citizen can have. She tried to get:

declaratory relief,
mandamus, via Section 75(v) of Australia’s Constitution,
and an injunction to restrain the judge.

But she was blocked on each one, and was told that **she was committing abuse of process**. Please see her amazing case in Appendix G. Also, here is a snippet from one of her other many trips to court.

Rilak v Tsocas. As to the main proceedings, the plaintiff seeks (i) declarations that she was denied procedural fairness, declarations that reports were not prepared according to law and oral evidence was not received according to law and a declaration that the trial judge should have recused himself from the main proceedings and

(ii) a writ of prohibition or injunction against the second defendant, the Chief Justice of the Family Court, restraining him from relying upon various evidence and findings in the main proceedings and, a writ of mandamus compelling him to “do his duty according to law” in relation to written complaints made by the plaintiff on 30 July 2015 and 7 September 2015.

To the extent that the application relates to the main proceedings, it is an abuse of process. ...As Nettle J noted in *Construction Forestry Mining and Energy Union v Director of Fair Work Building Industry Inspectorate* [2016] HCA 41; (2016) 91 ALJR 1 at 8 [22]:

The high constitutional purpose of s 75(v) of the Constitution is to make it constitutionally certain that there is a jurisdiction capable of restraining officers of the Commonwealth from exceeding Commonwealth power. It is not to provide an alternative means of remedying judgments of superior courts from which there are adequate rights of appeal.

In the same way a litigant must generally exhaust statutory rights of appeal before this Court will contemplate an application for a constitutional writ ...An attempt to leapfrog that process via the original jurisdiction of this Court is, for the reasons just given, also an abuse of process in this case....

The Court will adjourn until 10.15 am on 13 June 2018.

14. “I Was Strip-Searched for Loving My Family”



shackle photo

Milanyersweeky.com

Cuffie’s Story. I am a 75-year-old grandmother recently imprisoned for six months (with three to serve) for ‘contempt of court’ by Family Court Judge [name redacted], because I did not advise the Court the whereabouts of my daughter and grandchildren despite a court order to do so.

I did not give them up because my daughter had three years earlier gone into hiding with her two children, then 5 and 6, because of a death threat and ongoing domestic abuse by the children’s father. I did not want the children to go back since I had witnessed their trauma when the time came for them to go the Court-ordered time with their father and their distressed and unexplained behaviour on their return to my home where they had lived for more than half their lives.

The Judge determined that I did not give them up because I was afraid of going to jail – this thought did not even enter my head. The Judge also threw out the report by a recognised psychiatrist that explained my position after seeing the treatment of my family by the children’s father, the supposedly supporting services, Family Court and Judge [name redacted] since early in 2013.

There was no trial as our lawyers agreed we had shown ‘contempt of court’ although we now understand we could have relied upon Sec 79 NAE(2) and also that my daughter should not have been given a sentence for longer than twelve months if contempt had been proven.

On sentencing (I received the greatest shock of my life that I was being imprisoned, as this had not been suspected by my legal team) I was immediately sent to the Watchhouse where everything I had with me, clothes and jewellery were taken away and I was issued with a tracksuit (no knickers) a towel and a blanket. In the Watchhouse on that first night, I suffered from extreme cold that exacerbated a severe headache all night, I had none of my medications for blood pressure; I am also under treatment for cancer. The stress and shock of the situation contributed to the stroke that I suffered within a couple of weeks of being imprisoned.

On the following morning after sentencing, the nurse determined that I should be sent to hospital – I was fitted with shackles (I could not believe my eyes when these were being fitted *and* handcuffs) and taken to the hospital in an ambulance. The symptoms of severe headaches, swollen veins on each side of my face, the best offer of medical assistance I was given was pain relief and chemotherapy!!!! I was then put into a bed in a general ward in full view of other patients with two police officers at my bed-end 24/7.

I stayed there for three days with no comb or hairbrush, (was given hospital issue toothbrush and toothpaste) and able to have a shower on day 3, still no undies and back in the same clothes issued four days earlier. Late on Monday evening, I was sent to the Women's prison where I was strip-searched and given an issue of clothing to be worn at all times – at least there were knickers and a camisole type bra in the kit! I was also given some bed linen and a doona – so useless as it had no filling in it (just the outer fabric). On the first night, I was in the Secure Area of the prison complex in a room on my own and absolutely froze.

On the third night, my daughter, who had also been sentenced for contempt of court, was allowed to share my cell. She tried desperately to assist with the headaches (by using sanitary pads

to cover over some of the holes through which the air conditioning blew at an extremely low temperature). She sat by me and held me through the night to try to keep me warm and ease the pain in my head.

From the very beginning, the prison lost funds that had been sent to me to pay for personal items and phone calls and it was five weeks before they were found and I was able to buy a hairbrush and other personal items. A generous fellow prisoner had given me hair shampoo, conditioner, soap, deodorant and a razor. The hair brush – what a luxury! Prison is meant to take away one's freedom, but it also takes away one's self assurance, self confidence, self esteem and general feelings of wellbeing. A prisoner's mind and body are controlled by officers whose best saying is 'Do the crime, serve the time' no matter why the person has been incarcerated.

After two weeks and while still experiencing the excruciating headaches each night, I experienced an incident where I lost the sight in my right eye (blind for a time of more than an hour sometimes and then the sight gradually returned). This went on for a number of weeks. The medical team checked my blood pressure, suggested I stop the work in the sewing room each day and continued to provide pain relief (when available). The results of one blood test had the medical attendant decide to send me to the hospital again in an ambulance -- in shackles and handcuffs again and during the time I was there under observation with two officers on hand every minute, I required a visit to the toilet.

The handcuffs were not removed 'as a prisoner had attacked a nurse a few weeks' earlier. Imagine the pain of trying to remove my track pants and my knickers and then the effort of getting them back into place 'with hand cuffs still in place'. The pain to my tiny wrists was excruciating!

Another experience and huge shock to me was that every time I was moved from the prison to hospital and when I received a

visit from a relative, I had to sustain a full body search – that is, all clothes above waist removed and then replaced, and then all clothes below waist removed and then replaced. To someone, whose privacy is paramount, this is such a debasing exposure that it took me weeks to get over the shock. This was so humiliating to me that I decided I did not want or accept visitors.

Being there, made me angry that my daughter and I had been given less than 24 hours from the time of the advice of our sentencing until we were to be in Court – although we had been waiting for 9 weeks after being told we'd have to wait 5 days for a decision.

Then we both ended up in prison -- both of us for simply loving and accepting our maternal responsibility of taking care of our children and grandchildren! From the day of the children's discovery, we had both been denied any contact with these children since they had been found 7 months earlier. That denial continues to this day, February, 2019 – now nearly 15 months' later.

I am concerned for their health and safety every day and it makes me feel so extremely unhappy and guilty. It was because of our desire to keep them safe – which the Judge has failed to allow us to do.

My daughter and I admitted we had gone against the orders of the Court, but believed we both had reasonable explanations and medical evidence to support our case. Also, I was 74 years old at the time, took full care of my 91-year-old aunt and was continuing treatment for bowel and lung cancer. I received no treatment for my cancer condition while in prison as I could not get access to the natural alternative treatment that I was taking.

Life after prison is unbelievably different and far more difficult from what one would expect. It also brings surprises – my sight

deteriorated within the first couple of weeks of release and my eye specialist was able to confirm that I had suffered a stroke in the prison within those first few weeks and another condition called Ausmorosis (stuttering blindness). I have lost 25% of the sight in my right eye and it is still undetermined whether any of this will be recovered. The impact of my prison experience has been extreme even to the extent that on release, I could not remember how to turn on my computer. Prison turns your brain to mush.

Even to go to the shops and face people is daunting and for myself, who was still working as a professional [redacted] before prison, have had some of my credentials taken away. I had been a member for over 35 years of a highly respected professional international body – membership terminated – not considered a ‘fit and proper’ person to be a member any more. Again, for protecting one’s family?? Even my ability to continue in my profession is still under consideration and confirmation awaited.

So prison has taken a huge toll upon my professional life and my personal life – now without my daughter for another year and and with concern for grandkids’ health and safety – for who knows how long! Again, for protecting one’s family??

The general public and the government needs to know that the cost (for myself over \$400,000) of trying to negotiate the Family Court process is ridiculously high and should be capped; that the parties should be made to mediate; and that the lies in affidavits that can be proven should be taken into account and the perpetrators, including lawyers who lie themselves and encourage the litigants to do so, should be punished/imprisoned for the perjury.

And perhaps even more importantly, Judges should be made responsible for the damage they cause to people’s lives....

-- end of Cuffie’s story

Comment on Cuffie's Case

I named this lady "Cuffie" and omitted her occupation, so as to be in compliance with Section 121 -- the part of the Family Law Act that has all the Protective parents terrified. While I think a child's privacy is a very important value, Sec 121 does get called on to conceal crime.

It's a worry that the sadness of what happened to Cuffie will make folks give in, all the more. Don't do that! Naturally she was shocked. We ought to stay shocked until we fix this up.

Recall when the social status of any grandmother was high and the mother-child bond was protected by everyone? And it was normal for nurses to show caring, even with prisoners. We admired people who stood up for the weak.

Reunion time at the zoo



Baby orangutan reunited with its mother after having been kidnapped

Various forces want to destroy our affectionate relationships -
- I blame the invention of that absurd idea on Tavistock. The media subsequently spread it around by loading us with messages about our new cultural "reality." Balderdash! There is no reason on earth for us to diminish our loving habits.

Note: See Appendix J for a Change.org petition with valuable criticism of the Contempt provisions of the Family Court.

15. Another Sad Tale -- and a Proposed Reunion for All



The story below about Ben (fake name but a real boy, now a teenager) was sent to me by a mother in one of the eastern states. She currently has custody of her younger son but not of Ben. I don't know if she realizes how typical, almost "textbook" is her story as regards the behavior of police, judges, and DCP workers. There was also an "ICL."

An Independent Children's Lawyer, ICL, is appointed by the court. In the US, a somewhat similar person is called a Guardian ad Litem, GAL but a GAL may have no qualifications at all. In Australia the ICL is an attorney. I note from Dee McLachlan's Family Court Survey that when dealing with a dispute, the ICL does not appear to side with the child, for example dismisses the child's disclosures.

This chapter contains the mum's tale and ends with a sketch of the parent/child Reunion that I proposed in Chapter 1.

Lena's Story. At 25, I had just been dumped by my boyfriend and was glad to be introduced, by a mutual friend, to the charming Francois, complete with French accent. The dating relationship lasted six years off and on. We never married or even lived together. Francois started to perform what I am now told is "gas-lighting" to lower my self-esteem (which was low anyway).

After I fell pregnant, he said such things as “I never touched you.” I am grateful to nurses at hospital for advising me not to put his name on the birth certificate; it was left open. The bottom line of my story is that the baby, Ben, was given to Francois at age 5, eight years ago and I still try to get him back.

One of my biggest sadnesses is that people look at me funny and whisper “There must be more to it.” But there isn’t.

Francois used violence and threats. I fled with baby Ben to my cousin’s house. Later I made the mistake of re-contacting Francois, thinking he should share the joy of having a child. He already had an older daughter, Marie, and I treated her as my step-child, naturally. She still calls me Mumma.

At first, Francois behaved OK, but later he kidnapped Ben (when Ben was still on boobies!) I went to police and luckily they found him. They told me if the dad’s name had been on the birth certificate they would not have been able to bring the kid back to me for 6 months, breastfeeding be damned.

At age 6 my son Ben start to complain about visiting Dad. He refused to speak to him and started to tell me of plans to injure or even kill Francois using crude kitchen weapons. By now I was in a relationship with a new boyfriend and was about to give birth to my son Shane. Francois broke into my house and said “I’m going to destroy you and your family in court and see to it you never see Ben again.”

I was required to go to Mandatory Mediation and was told I might go to jail (!!!). Francois had written to my employer, my friends and neighbors with lies about my mental health and my ability to raise kids. The police and the wrongly named “Department of Child *Safety*” began to investigate on his behalf, searching for something to cause the removal of Ben. They went to Ben’s Daycare Center and recorded him, asking him if Mum goes out and leaves him alone. Of course he said No.

Police and Francois colluded to take Ben when I would be at hospital giving birth. Yes. They had been unable to find a reason to get a safety order or recovery order. My sister was in the house with me to mind Ben while I was in hospital.

At this point I was made out to be the baddy. Francois had learned how to involve such government departments as commissioners, Parliamentarians, child protection people, with the story that Ben should be removed from me immediately and permanently.

The Court Experience

The next five years were shockers for me. Threats of jail, allegations of coaching, enmeshment, parentification, brain-washing, extremism – made me think Francois’s prediction would eventuate. Two persons connected to the court – an ICL and a Report Writer acted against me 100%.

One Independent Children’s Lawyer yelled, swore, and threatened **to have Ben sent to foster care** if I didn’t sign the orders he was pushing. A Family Court report writer clearly supported Francois and didn’t believe any of my reports of domestic violence by him. But, to me, it was the judge who was the most shocking. After a trial that lasted 6 days he ordered me not to see – and not to even speak to -- my child again.

I assure you I presented with a clean bill of mental health, perpetrated no domestic violence, did not neglect or harm the child in any way mentally, physically, or emotionally.

So what was the reason for such an order, I am often asked. When Ben was 5 years old, he finally broke down and told me why he so desperately didn’t want to go back to see his dad or ever live with him again. Ben confessed that his father had been sexually abusing him ever since he could remember. Ben had been threatened and told to kill both me and the little brother.

While accused of coaching, I got “permission” to visit my child years later in a “supervised setting.” This occurs at a contact centre where the environment is totally unnatural and tends to damage the bond between mother and child. And the child thinks the separation has been *his* fault! (By the way, Ben loves his brother Shane of course and misses him – and vice versa.)

After 18 months Ben had become trusting of the staff at the contact centre and one day while I’m in the loo, he began to open up about what his dad does to his “privates.” So I took Ben to the nearest police station, as I guess anyone would do. There I found out that Ben had disclosed details to a child protection officer who now lies to cover up the fact.

The police officer attempted to coach Ben to say that his dad was **only washing him**, despite the abuse reportedly occurring on the couch in the living room without soap, water or towels, and that it included the dad threatening him with his fist held up to Ben’s face to not to tell anyone. Shortly after this, Ben is handed back to Francois. Can you believe such an outcome?

At a trial, I was yelled at and accused. (Am I really in Australia?) I was not allowed witnesses and was denied a chance to show the 93A interview with Ben and police (it went missing). Medical evidence of Ben’s damaged genitals was not allowed, nor affidavits by my relatives swearing on oath that they’d been threatened by the child protection police to not assist me.

I am grateful that I still have my younger boy. I’ve taken a polygraph to prove my “innocence.” But the word goes around that I am delusional, as the court took Ben. Do you believe me?

-- end of Lena’s story. I have met Lena; I believe her. People whisper “There must be more to it” -- they haven’t experienced the untrammled (illegal) power of a court. Yes there’s a lot more to it! On next page is a similar case in the US, from Bill Windsor’s not-to-be-missed video series Lawless America.

Mona Gudbranson, interviewed by Bill Windsor, 2012:

“My family was completely destroyed. I will never be whole again. All it took was one false call to an 800 number, which rings to a place which calls itself Child Protective Services -- and they are anything but. It was the beginning of the end for my daughter Ingrid May Bates and her children. I supported my daughter throughout this witch-hunt; all the endless appointments, meetings, court appearances, doctors, counsellings, on and on, that the court ordered of her.

Whatever was demanded, Ingrid complied, as the clock continued to tick. I encouraged Ingrid to stay strong, everything would work out, she would get her children back, this is America, they will see. The truth will prevail. But in the end it all proved futile. When the system is set in place that is not a just system, and has no accountability, unlimited power, unconstitutional laws, total immunity, it is a very dangerous system. The worst abuse that we had experienced was at the hands of our government. The late beloved two-time State Georgia senator Nancy Shaver, and her husband Bruce, were silenced for their attempts to expose this.

After five very long and difficult years it took its toll on my daughter they did everything in their power to physically destroy her. We had little or no money to hire a counsel, so we were at the mercy of their attorney pool. Judge William Aims from Courtland, New York’s gavel rang out time and time again, case adjourned, case adjourned, case closed.

Sitting in that courtroom, shocked by what we were witnessing, goes way beyond comprehension. Attorney threw her hands way above her head as if she scored the winning touchdown in the super bowl. I was shocked. I said to her, as we were ordered to leave the courtroom, “This is not a laughing matter, this is our family, this is our lives.”

[After 7 years Ingrid committed suicide. Mona said “The day my daughter died, I died. Mona is still not allowed to see her grandchildren until they are 18. Can you imagine.]

Dear Reader, here is the “news” that I printed rather fancifully on the back cover of this book:

THE REUNION

After a while, people began to see that “child protection schemes” were criminal. They said Enough!

Some issues had been seen by individuals caught in the system. For example, Parental Alienation Syndrome (invented by a disturbed doctor) had been recognized as a ploy for judicial kidnap. Impoverishment via legal costs was seen as a way to weaken the already harassed parent.

In Australia, a law that could stop anyone from revealing what goes on in the courtroom was really a gag order to conceal crime (hence is invalid). Police were told to refuse help to any injured child “if the matter is before a court.”

Parents of disabled children ran into a different trap by signing a “parent responsibility contract” that resulted in the state taking the baby away on a flimsy pretext – for money!

One day Protective parents stopped tolerating judicial kidnap. They arranged to have a Reunion with offspring as soon as humanly possible. (For many that could be within weeks.) They gathered in cities and issued ‘chits’ to parents who could demonstrate basic criteria for getting their child back.

Chit holders could go to the clerk of the *civil* court and obtain an injunction for the return of the child. A coterie of parents would supervise each handover. State authorities would be given a list of officials to arrest if necessary.

The pass-code for imbuing good citizens with the right to issue chits was “God is not mocked.”

Anyone can see that such a Reunion is the only way to go. In Part Two I'll strut some legal stuff about actions a Protective parent can take, but really Part One has provided the basis for any citizen to get up in arms about this travesty. You will need to use whatever means you can creatively come up with.

Please be prepared to meet a brick wall. Even your neighbors will give you, the citizen, a look of "You're exaggerating." It's natural – they think a court is good and a "child safety officer" must be an angel. Ah, language is a problem to be overcome!

Here's a hint: Don't be put off by Fathers' Rights groups. Join them! Tell everyone that propaganda along the lines of a female-male division is irrelevant or worse. Help *all* Protective parents.

I need to disclaim that I'm giving legal advice. My advice is civic. In the Preface I mentioned owning the law. We all own the law. Society is the authority (I'll hold forth on that biologically in Chapter 29 entitled Really, Who Is in Charge Here?). As Terry Shulze pointed out in the Chapter 7, it is possible to tell a valid law from one that is void. Valid laws have to be reasonable.


Part I dug up much unreasonableness. What's this about social workers berating a mum for "coaching"? You will need to ask your state to cite the authority for the actions of, or even the existence of, its child protection agency. Is it a statutory body? That is, did the state legislature set it up with instructions? Some agencies have become "privatized." That should not happen. We need accountability from any entity that tries to govern us.

Please hand around copies of the Reunion page (opposite). Personally I don't encourage marches or rallies; they never have an effect, except maybe the effect of rubbing in one's victim status. Why not start small? I wrote a comic act for Adelaide Fringe: "Help! A Judge-o's Got My Baby." You can write a song. Doing a small thing gives you a taste for more. Nothing succeeds like success. Goodonya for trying, Mate!

Part Two

The Clean-Up Operation

16. Confessions, Amnesties, and Negotiating



The confessional photo: HealthyCatholics.com

Part Two is supposed to be the antidote to Part One. Part One argues that the Australian government condones the snatching of children from their parents. I blame judges, Parliament, and anyone who participates, or even knows about it and fails to speak up.

In Chapter 1, I ‘proclaimed’ 2020 as a Reunion Year. I also said we will have a Truth Commission. (You may be wondering “Who is she to be proclaiming a Reunion and starting a Truth Commission?” Hmm, I’m wondering that too. This is not exactly the unpaid job of one’s dreams.)

Look, comes a time you just can’t abide nonsense anymore. Comes a time when you see unacknowledged evil happening in your society and suddenly it all sticks out like canine appurtenances.

So do something. At the top of this page is an illustration of forgiveness. The Truth Commission (‘TC’) I envision doesn’t have any particular religious theme of forgiveness. It is a practical matter. We need to get the kids back and how best to do it? If forgiveness has a role to play in that, fine.

I don't think it should be called a "Truth and *Reconciliation* Commission." It is more like a clearinghouse of facts about what has been done to this or that child by CPS or judges. It will be a blame game – that's unavoidable. This TC is meant to show up the lawlessness of the law.

Bill Windsor. About 6 years ago, Bill Windsor started to drive all around the 48 contiguous states asking people about their court experiences. He intended to incorporate their interviews into a movie. But the state has twice jailed him (Texas and Montana) on a false pretext – as usual.

His interviews are still on Youtube. I'm afraid they show malfeasance in *all courts not just Family court* -- but he did do a lot of family court work. Windsor found kids being taken from hospital right after birth, on the amazing grounds that the parent(s) did not have enough money to support them.

So let's spend a moment emphasizing the tricks of language. Sure, one can put together a logical sentence "We need to help this child, as its parents can't feed it." But now put it against the context of ordinary human life. Is it normal to take a kid away for that reason? Certainly not. Everyone knows there's a fantastic tie between mother and newborn.

Windsor also noted "medical kidnap." The state takes the kid on the grounds of medical neglect. Recall Natasha saying in Chapter 11 that parents of disabled kids get accused of breaching Parent Responsibility contracts. Quel trick -- right up there with PAS, Parental Alienation Syndrome. It is often a method for feeding the Pedophile rings. And Chapter 9 on Congress' matrix showed how tricks are used to draw "federal funding." Enough already!

Note: Another Bill Windsor-type is doing good work on Youtube. His name is

Two Separate Purposes

A Truth Commission and a Reunion Year are separate.

The point of naming a year as the Reunion Year is to put a deadline on this thing. 2020 is a nice round number. Really it's a statement that we are united and we are not willing to waste more years chasing after complicated hearings and motions filed in court – at vast expense. Hand the kid over to the Protective parent. That includes million dollar babies and porn-star pre-teens.

The purpose of the TC is to let the perpetrators know they are committing crimes and that their free ride is ending. In Australia it is well known that the purpose of a royal commission is to do a whitewash. As far as I know, no one has been punished based on any information that came up at the sex-abuse RC. (I may be wrong.)

The emphasis has been on compensating the victims by money and by the fulsome apology. The same thing happened after exposés of the CIA torture of children. A few managed to win a lawsuit and some others got paid as “victims of crime.” But no one was charged with crimes.

Again, we need a name for this. The closest explanation I can think of is that an underlying human instinct directs us to give special honoring to CIA-type persons as they claim to be doing something wonderful and “necessary.” Hogwash! (And you know what hog washes in.) Plus secrecy gives an aura.

Our TC, being non-governmental, won't be a whitewash. It will concentrate on the crimes committed, not on the need for victims to be compensated. It will aim to jail the miscreants. Society absolutely needs to find out what has been going on – whilst the media was all hush-hush.

Confessions and Amnesties

The South African TRC reached out to the wrongdoers and offered them amnesty in exchange for confession and remorse. The government authorized the issuance of amnesties – basically immunity from prosecution.

Recall that the “R” in their TRC reflected South Africa’s need to reconcile the white population with the much more numerous black population, after apartheid ended. I suppose this was a good way to do it, but of course many were disappointed that their torturers got off scot-free.

Never mind South Africa. We won’t be imitating anyone, as our situation is unique. The real baddies here are the judges. I believe, and Don Rufty agrees, that it’s *not* important to go after the small fry such as police or social workers. But getting them interested in a ‘new’ way of life might help.

It is the persons at the top, the decision makers, who are puppets of the hidden rulers. They feel protected – God knows they *are* protected – yet I am sure they’re nervous.

Negotiation, Anyone?

It is essential that Protective parents develop a thick hide and a sharp tongue. Since most of them are female they have a built-in disadvantage: *we gals are polite*. We give in as a matter of courtesy, and instinctively we support males. Plus, as Senator Nancy Schaefer said, when the child is shockingly removed, the mother is “dazed and glazed.”

All I can offer is the idea of negotiating. Not that the negotiator on our side has to be a Protective parent -- better if it’s a neutral party. Note: Synonyms for *negotiate* are: to arrange, work out, hammer out, broker, reach terms.

Here is an abridged excerpt from the book *Getting Past No: Negotiating in Difficult Situations* by William Ury (2007).

On the five steps of breakthrough negotiation:

1. First step is not to control the other person's behavior. It is to control your own. When the other person says no or launches an attack, you may be stunned into giving in or counterattacking. Buy yourself time to think.... Throughout the negotiation, keep your eyes on the prize. Don't react.

2. Before you can negotiate, you need to create a favorable climate. They expect you to attack or to resist. [Don't.] Listen to them, acknowledge their points, and agree with them wherever you can. Acknowledge their competence.

3. Reframe. Direct their attention to the challenge of meeting each side's interests. Take whatever they say and reframe it as an attempt to deal with the problem. Ask problem-solving questions, such as "Why is it that you want that?" or "What would you do if you were in my shoes?"

4. Build them a Golden Bridge. Draw them in the direction you would like them to go. Think of yourself as a mediator whose job is to make it easy for them to say yes. Involve them in the process, incorporating their ideas. Try to identify and satisfy their unmet interests. Help them save face and make the outcome appear as a victory for them.

5. If the other side still resists and thinks they can win without negotiating, you need to educate them to the contrary. You need to make it hard for them to say no. You could use threats and force, but if you push them into a corner, they will likely lash out, throwing even more resources into the fight against you. Instead, educate them about the costs of not agreeing. Ask reality-testing questions, ... Minimize their resistance by exercising restraint. Reassure them that your goal is mutual satisfaction, not victory.

The Issue Is Not Pedophilia

Australia has already had its big Royal Commission on pedophilia. The subject matter for our Truth Commission is the judiciary and child-stealing. It won't try to explain child molestation. Nor are we trying to go after the few judges who are themselves pedo's. For our TC, any judge is a wrongdoer if he/she *makes orders to kidnap a child*.

Factors driving the child-stealing racket are often noted:

Blackmail. We also know that people get led into child sex so they will be blackmailable. This contributes to the controlling of legislators, judges, mayors, etc.. Jim Rothstein of NYPD told Fiona Barnett that the CIA is the trafficker.

Satan. It is also claimed, probably correctly, that child-sex business is related to rituals of Satan-worship. Some of this is emanates from – excuse me -- the Vatican.

Money. Another angle: cash. Porn movies sell at a high price. Trafficking children as prostitutes is lucrative. And we also hear of using children for their blood, as kiddy blood helps longevity. Organs may be stolen too.

Social Engineering. I think the effort to reduce the mums and dads to broken wrecks is part of the same plan by which harassment and confusion is forced on the public at large: to eliminate *anyone* who is strong, intelligent, and moral.

No matter, the children deserve to be restored to the Protective parents and we must help them. If the abuser wants to be a good parent, no doubt it can be looked into. Everything is on the table. But the task sketched for our TC is simple and direct; it does not require expertise in pedophilia. **What we need is enforcement of law.**

17. A Law To Investigate Holsworthy Army Base



Fiona Barnett on October 2015; Senator Bill Heffernan (retired)

True to its name, the chapters of Part Two constitute a clean-up operation. Many things that are above-board and absolutely proper can be done to help our situation. One is to offer Parliament draft legislation for new laws.

On July 18, 2018, Fiona Barnett, a survivor of MK-Ultra, read an hour's worth of stunning testimony to the International Tribunal for Natural Justice. It has been shown to the world, on video. In my opinion, human history changed the minute she spoke.

Fiona has more to contribute than just a claim; she has insider knowledge. She personally watched some of the big-name psychopaths doing their thing, as she was scheduled to become a leader in the group herself.

Australia has a prime minister, a Governor-General to represent royalty, and a premier in each of its six states: VIC, SA, WA, NSW, QLD, TAS. (Its population of 24 million is a mere 8% that of US, with similar land mass.) Barnett's testimony names names of politicians both high and low. She mentions a premier of New South Wales, also noting that he

started out as a journalist for the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, and later became Australia's Foreign Minister. (It causes me to wonder if all foreign ministers, all premiers, and all ABC personnel are required to be "in the system.")

Fiona says child protective services, which are state bureaucracies, are riddled with child-traffickers. And she came down hard on universities, identifying many scholars who she thinks are members of a Luciferian cult.

Most shockingly, in the basement of Holsworthy Army Base, she says, you may find children who were "bred" for various uses, and who have never seen the light of day. She believes the late heart surgeon Dr Victor Chang was a sadist at that location and she hints at "organ harvesting."

I bet Ms Barnett is not making this up. Once you start to look upon human beings as a commodity it's a natural progression to such things as slave auctions and cannibalism, isn't it? Society used to promote a philosophy of the sanctity of life and ought to do so again. Why ever not?

Of course the criminal law in every state prohibits the things Fiona Barnett discusses – child abuse, rape, torture, and lying about these things, misleading the court, etc. *No new law is needed to criminalize any of that.* But how about an innovative law to demand a raid on Holsworthy?

I will now show the draft of a text for Parliament to consider. I'm naming it "the Heffernan bill," in honor of the sole Canberra senator who spoke up for Fiona Barnett when she was both alone and in great danger.

(And by the way, she is still in great danger.) Here is my recommendation:

An Act to Facilitate Indictments of Powerful Persons and for the Investigation of Holsworthy Army Base

*Recognizing that there is a powerful criminal contingent in Australia today,

*Acknowledging that bringing suspects to justice has been hampered by secrecy and fear,

*Realizing that the citizenry was shocked by the findings of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Abuse,

we enact this statute to facilitate the indictment of powerful persons and to investigate Holsworthy Army Base in regard to crimes against children.

Registering and the Questionnaire

All persons employed in the traditional professions in Australia will be required to register with Parliament for the purpose of answering a questionnaire. They have until 90 days after the enactment of this bill to register.

Within 30 days of receiving the questionnaire, the person must answer it under oath, divulging the extent to which they were aware of sexual abuse of children or any unauthorized experimentation on children at any time.

Children here means: persons under the age of 18.

Traditional professions here means: doctors, lawyers, judges, parliamentarians, directors of media corporations, clergy, teachers, professors, dentists, pharmacists, nurses, psychiatrists, counselors, accountants, social workers, military officers and national security agents.

Refusal to register or to answer the questionnaire is an offense. The penalty is a fine of \$500,000.00 and a maximum of 5 years in prison.

No one who admits on the questionnaire that they failed to report crime will be charged with having failed to report crime.

The Panel

Parliament will establish a panel (hereinafter “The Panel”) that will be accountable to the Attorney General. Panel members will be vetted to eliminate conflicts of interest.

The first job of The Panel will be to examine the replies to the questionnaire, and to choose some repliers to be called in for questioning. After such questioning, The Panel, in consultation with Parliament, will draw up any relevant indictments.

A Second Panel re Holsworthy Army Base, and ASIO

Because public allegations have been made that Holsworthy Army Base has engaged in unthinkable crimes, Parliament will appoint a Second Panel to conduct a thorough inquiry into these allegations.

The state Attorneys-General will liaise with the Commonwealth Minister of Defence concerning the military. The state Attorneys-General will liaise with the Commonwealth Minister of Home Affairs about any involvement of ASIO. The Prime Minister will brief any foreign government if needed.

This law comes into effect 14 days after it receives the royal assent.

[That’s the end of my draft of “the Heffernan bill.”]

I can see one problem with this bill straightaway. Namely, indictments for prosecution are to be issued by a Panel that answers to the Attorney-General. Under present state law, indictments are the prerogative of a “Director of Public Prosecutions,” a DPP.

Therefore, prior to (or concurrent with) submitting the Heffernan bill, someone in each state Parliament and in Canberra should draft a simple bill called “The Abolition of the Office of Public Prosecutions Act.” That abolition should take place on its own merits. There should never have been creation of an office that is accountable to no one. It is a very bad joke as I have argued elsewhere.

If the military or ASIO refuses to cooperate regarding the questionnaire, additional legislation will be required to confirm that all military and security offices are under the control of Parliament. If this means that any Official Secrets Acts need to be modified, Parliament can deal with that. Of course.

Proceeding to Crack Down

The time has come. We can’t just gossip about it. In 2015 Fiona Barnett produced a very graphic video (“Candy Girl”) on Youtube — but it never led to anyone’s arrest. I think that’s because all of us have become resigned to the *ridiculous premise* that the prestigious and “the powerful” are untouchable. Trust me, trust me, they are touchable.

Two Catholic bishops were arrested in Australia in 2017, so the cloak of prestige seems to have disappeared, but there is still an almost worshipful deference to the powerful. “If they’re high up, we can’t get them.” That deference was seen in Belgium, for example, in the Dutroux case, and in California in the McMartin Pre-school trial. In both instances

the public was very steamed up, and judicial wheels did appear to turn, but it fell apart.

Mainstream media are wondrously helpful in causing any such case to peter out. And admittedly the public largely handles distressing things like this by losing interest.

I note that politicians, having been paralyzed for a long time, seem reluctant to act. But maybe that's inaccurate! – many polities might gladly jump on the bandwagon if someone will start it going. I offered the above parliamentary bill, and you could hand it in to your MP.

Once there is a bill in parliament, interested members can call for a division – thus the ayes and the nays get identified. (They stand on opposite sides of the room – it's rarely done, but it's legally provided for.) Every MP would find himself or herself asking “Am I for or against bringing child-stealers and child-murderers to justice?”

Parliament must take into consideration that many of “the guilty” in Australia were directed by persons outside the country — and that those powerful persons have weapons and a lack of scruple about using them, on anyone.

Citizens today need to have it drummed into them that *society* is in charge of society. Citizens need to hear specifically that all persons are accountable. Were you shocked when I said Holsworthy will be investigated? I was shocked myself!

Let's go around shocking everybody with the news that top brass in the armed forces (and police forces, and ASIO) are not above the law. And remind everyone that cover-up of crime is a felony. The particulars of that are put forward in Chapters 20 and 25 below. Yipee!

18. The Age-old Maxims of Law



Picture of a law school lecture, manuscript in St John's College

A Mum called to ask me if she can refuse to give back the child to the pedo father at the end of her current two-week visit. I am not a practicing attorney, but I am not an idiot. I know that 2 and 2 make four, that the sun rises in the east, and that the capital of Florida is Tallahassee. And naturally I know that a parent does not have to hand a child over to a person who is almost certain to harm that child.

Is there anyone, anywhere, who does *not* know that?

Of course this mother wants to hear more than my common-sense prattle. She wants to hear law. I think Section 70NAW of the Family Law Act can be useful to her, but the first thing that popped into my head to tell her was the law maxim: *Necessitas non habet legem*. Necessity has no law.

If the rule at your local swimming pool is that everyone has to be out of the pool by 5pm, and one of the swimmers is busy drowning at 4.59pm you can't very well apply the rule to him. It would be absurd to say he is breaking the law. Necessity has no law.

I've gathered together some maxims that are on point for the mother in question. She may ask *if they supersede what the Court has to say*. I believe they do. Maxims are high legal principles.

Given that she is living in a state of fear, I expect her next emailed question will be "Can you please show me the proof that they supersede it?" Yes I can, Mrs X, but first let me power you up with 12 maxims that say, basically, "**A parent's gotta do what a parent's gotta do.**"

Here are the maxims *du jour*: I won't clutter it with the Latin.

1. No one is bound to do what is impossible.
2. No one is bound to arm his adversary. [Wow]
3. To a judge who exceeds his office or jurisdiction no obedience is due.
4. When laws imposed by the state fail, we must act by the law of nature.
5. The law regards the order of nature.
6. Necessity makes that lawful which otherwise is unlawful.
7. Let justice be done, though the heavens should fall.
8. Nothing is more just than what is necessary.
9. Nothing against reason is lawful.
10. What is prohibited in the nature of things, cannot be confirmed by law.
11. What necessity forces, it justifies.
12. We must have recourse to what is extraordinary, when what is ordinary fails.

I think it may help to give the Latin just for Number 3 above, so Mrs X can be extra-assertive vis-à-vis the Court. It's: *Judici officium suum excedenti non paretur*.

And maybe number 11: *Quod necessitas cogit, defendit*.

In regard to Protective parent's typical circumstances, the following 12 maxims may come in handy:

13. An act of a judge that does not relate to his office, is of no force.
14. It is a fraud to conceal a fraud.
15. The law does not require that to be proved, which is apparent to the court.
16. Mayhem is incipient homicide. *Mabemium est homicidium inchoatum*
17. Paternal power should consist in affection, not in atrocity.
18. Offences against nature are the heaviest. *Peccata contra naturumsunt gravissima.*
19. What has been admitted against the spirit of the law, ought not to be heard.
20. What is proved by the record, ought not to be denied.
21. The safety of the people is the supreme law.
22. It is safer to err on the side of mercy.
23. Where there is a right, there is a remedy.
24. Force is inimical to the laws.

(Number 13 is pretty relevant to the theme of this book.)
You can send the following dozen maxims directly to the attention to the judge:

25. Twisting of language is unworthy of a judge. *Angupia verforum sunt iudice indigna.*
26. Violence may also put on the mask of law.
27. One out of the pale of the law (an outlaw) is civilly dead.
28. The laws themselves require that they should be governed by right.
29. A multitude of ignorant practitioners destroys a court.
30. The law always intends what is agreeable to reason.

31. A greater inheritance comes to every one of us from right and the laws.
32. An evil custom is to be abolished. *Malus usus est abolendus.*
33. What is done contrary to the custom of our ancestors neither pleases nor appears right.
34. Power should follow justice, not precede it.
35. Truth fears nothing but concealment.
36. Where there is culpability, there punishment ought to be. *Ubi culpa est ibi paena subesse debet.*

Waiting it out may seem to the Protective parent to be the best option. But the law does not favor that and actually sees holding back as **condoning** the status quo:

37. Time runs against the slothful and those who neglect their rights.
38. An error not resisted is approved.
39. The law always abhors delay. *Lex dilationes semper exhorre.*
40. The laws serve the vigilant, not those who sleep upon their rights.
41. He who does not prevent what he can, seems to commit the thing.
42. He who spares the guilty, punishes the innocent.
43. **One absurdity being allowed, an infinity follow.**
44. He who consents cannot receive an injury.
45. Consent removes or obviates a mistake.
46. Evil deeds ought not to remain unpunished, for impunity affords continual excitement to the delinquent. *Note: all these numberings are arbitrary, added by me.*

Finally, I said I would pronounce on **the authority of the maxims themselves**. In a recent Gumshoe article I opined that such things as proof, blame, and evidence occur in

ordinary social interactions. As customs develop over time, we enshrine some of them in law.

So it's not as though law exists on its own and we have to scurry to discover it. **We made the law.** Many thinkers worked on it, with an eye to actual lives. And many thinkers are still working on it, and always will be!

It helps us to be able to cite authority. Indeed one of the maxims of law is: "The two brightest lights in the world are reason and authority." Holy wow.

There are **meta-maxims**, too, such as this:

"A maxim is so called because its dignity is chiefest, and its authority most certain, and because universally approved by all." Translated:

Maxime ita dicta quia maxima ejus dignitas et certissima auctoritas, atque quod maxime omnibus probetur.

The law that developed in England has as its premise that the Court was there to help individuals get a fair settlement of their plaint, but that the welfare of the community was even more essential. England was not a nation of Thatcherites with everyone watching out only for himself.

Thus we saw, as Number 31 above: "A greater inheritance comes to every one of us from right and the laws."

Aside from maxims, don't forget helpful statutes. Family Law Act, Section 70 NAE, reprinted in Chapter 2 above, says contravention of court order may be made where **necessary to protect the health or safety** of a person. That means you can contravene it. We do speak English, don't we?

19. A Covenant of Rights for Australia



A child born in Australia in 2018 may yet have the best future

Australia is one of the few Western countries that hasn't got a Bill of Rights. This may dissuade a court from adjudicating a case based on widely held principles, if they're not set out in the Constitution or specifically provided for by statute.

Today, if a draft Bill of Rights were to be circulated, with Referendum the mode of ratification, I fear the proposed text would fall into the usual hands of media, parliamentary "leaders," and interest groups. It would wind up looking "political."

I suggest instead a voluntary *Covenant* of Rights. It skips the middleman – government. Each Australian who wishes to join this covenant may do so, and can then expect both to benefit from it directly and to participate in protecting other covenanters. Sort of like a food co-op. It is heavily laden with duty.

Here is a first draft. Please add, subtract, or argue. No point aiming for pie-in-sky stuff. It is better to keep it modest in hopes that people would get the idea they can enforce it themselves.

A Covenant of Rights for Australia

We the covenanters agree that we have the following rights and will support others in obtaining them:

1. the right to survive and to find food
2. the right to live with unpolluted Nature
3. the right to bodily integrity and to be left alone
4. the right to a home and to privacy
5. the right to freedom of thought and speech
6. the right to make enforceable agreements
7. the right to be helped in an emergency
8. the right to be appreciated for our work
9. the right to have possessions
10. the right to determine who will govern us
11. the right to defend against violators
12. the right to be different

Covenanting is a standard feature of human nature. It's a good method for extracting altruism from one's neighbor! Throughout history, humans have increased their ability to do great things by working cooperatively. Today it will take a repairing of the mistrust of one's fellow man that has been fed to us by media. It will also take a repairing of "learned helplessness." The fact is you are *not* helpless.

20. Accessories Before and After the Fact



If there's a kangaroo and emu on the badge, it must be federal court

Let's scan the horizon to see what kinds of persons could be indicted. Let's consider the principal crime to be the act of removing a child from a parent against that parent's wishes (excepting where it is clearly warranted). I claim it is the judge who makes the kidnap happen and so I consider him/her to be the principal offender. It does not matter that the judge was not physically present at the crime scene. You can commit a crime by ordering it.

The Lesser Criminals: Accomplices and Accessories

So the question is: **How many other persons** have participated criminally in state kidnap? Who qualifies as an accomplice or an accessory, or as an aider and abettor?

When a man robs a bank, the person driving the getaway car may be named as an accessory. But if that driver also helped plan the robbery, he'll be charged as an *accomplice*.

In the New South Wales Criminal Trial Courts Bench Book, at Judcom.nsw.gov.au we see directions for the judge to use at trial. I have abridged it and added bolding:

A person is guilty of being an **accessory before the fact** where at some time before the crime is actually carried out, he or she intentionally **encourages or assists the principal offender** to commit that crime. Therefore, there must be some act committed by the accessory that was intended to bring about the crime... it can be **assisting in the preparations** for the commission of the crime....

The Crown alleges, and must prove beyond reasonable doubt, that [*the accused*] [*specify the act of assisting in the preparations relied upon by the Crown*] intending that [*the principal offender*] would commit the crime of [*specified offence*] later. The Crown must prove that by these acts [*the accused*] intentionally [*encouraged and/or assisted*] [*the principal offender*] to commit the crime of [*specified offence*].

Before a person can be convicted of being an accessory before the fact, the Crown must prove beyond reasonable doubt that, at the time of the ... assistance, the accused **knew all the essential facts or circumstances which would make what was later done a crime**. This includes the state of mind of the principal offender when those acts are carried out. **The accused need not actually know that what he or she encourages and/or assists the principal offender to do is in law a crime**. The accused does not need to have the legal knowledge that the conduct to be committed by the principal offender actually amounts to a criminal offence. ...

It is my claim that in, say, Adelaide, the infamously murderous pedophile ring is connected to (though not perhaps majorly dependent on) the way in which kids can be captured by means of a court order that takes the kid from its Protective parent and hands it over to an abuser.

(The Family Law Act does allow a judge to “place” a child.)

Which Occupations Are Involved?

I hypothesize that there are many helpers. Examples could be: cops, lawyers, ICL's, psychologists, and social workers.

They may think the judge is doing good by, say, taking a child from a mum who alienated that child against the father. Or they may think it is a good thing to save a child from living with a mother who has psychiatric issues such as anxiety or delusion.

The NSW Bench Book, above, said that an accessory is one who “intentionally **encourages or assists the principal offender** to commit that crime.” And that “The accused **does not need to have the legal knowledge** that the conduct to be committed by the principal offender actually **amounts to** a criminal offence.”

In a typical case, of a Protective parent losing his/her kid, the various occupational groups come into the story:

- **cops** may go to the home of the parent and actually take the child by force
- **lawyers** may advise their clients not to mention “sexual abuse of the child” in court
- **psychologists** may write up a report of interview with the pedophile that makes him (or her) sound nice, and may, in reporting the mental problems of the Protective parent, tell lies or exaggerate the facts
- **social workers** may interfere in the procedure by which a Protective parent comes to the Department of Child Protection for a weekly “supervised visit” with the child, or may make a false report downplaying child abuse.

Above, we were talking about accessories *before* the fact but now let's look at **accessories after the fact**.

I'll abridge and bold the next quote, as is my wont. But this time, I'll also alter the wording. Instead of using the generic terms "principal offender", I will specify **the judge** and instead of "the accused" I'll specify **the journalist**. Instead of the pronoun he/she I will say **he** for a journalist and **she** for the judge. And forsake the square brackets.

Why did I select the occupation of journalist"? Because the media is well known for committing the crime of cover-up. Police and politicians do it too. The Bench Book says:

As to accessory after the fact, see s 347 *Crimes Act* which makes provision for how the accessory may be tried. Sections 348–350 contain provisions relating to punishment, depending upon the nature of the principal offence. **The offence of being an accessory after the fact can be committed by rendering assistance either to the principal offender or to a person who aids and abets the principal. ...**

The Crown does not allege that the journalist was involved in the commission of the crime carried out by the judge. The charge brought against the journalist is that he assisted the judge after she committed the crime of kidnap, and **gave that assistance with knowledge that the judge had committed that crime.**

... A charge that a person is an accessory after the fact to a crime committed by another is an allegation that the person giving that assistance has himself or herself committed a crime.

It is a separate and distinct offence from that committed by the principal offender but it is dependent upon the fact that the principal offender committed a specific crime.

Here, the Crown must prove beyond reasonable doubt both the commission of the crime of kidnap by the judge and that the journalist assisted the judge knowing that the crime had been committed. A person is an accessory after the fact ...[by, for example] disposing of the proceeds of the crime, or by doing an act **intending to hinder the arrest, trial or punishment of the principal offender.**

... The Crown says this was done with the purpose of [*specify the alleged reason for the assistance rendered by the accused (Mary inserts "cover-up")*]. To be guilty of being an accessory after the fact, the Crown must also prove beyond reasonable doubt that the journalist knew that the judge acted in a way and with a particular state of mind that gives rise to a criminal offence. The journalist **does not need to have the legal knowledge that those facts amount to a crime....**

... It will often be the case in a charge of accessory after the fact that the accused is said to have known of the commission of a crime simply on the basis of what he or she is told by the principal offender or some other person **The accused [Mary says "the journalist"] may come to know that a crime has been committed by the principal offender [judge] from inferences that the accused has drawn from facts which he or she believes have occurred.** [Emphasis added]

An aside: In the case of The Marathon bombing, in which I nominate the FBI as principal offender, i.e., I say the FBI did the bombing, journalists who are accessories after the fact, such the editors of the *Boston Globe*, would have been able to make inferences that they drew from facts. You can see this in the way they avoid asking questions of witnesses. And recall from Chapters 12 and 14 how News Channel 7 avoids Rachel Vaughan and Andrew McIntyre like the plague.

21. How To Remove a Judge



The Australian Constitution of 1901 says in its Chapter III, section 72:

“The Justices of the High Court and of the other courts created by the Parliament:

1. shall be appointed by the Governor-General in Council;
2. shall not be removed except by the Governor-General in Council, on an address from both Houses of the Parliament in the same session, praying for such removal on the ground of proved misbehaviour or incapacity....”

And there you have it. Out they go.

The phrase “other courts created by Parliament” means Commonwealth parliament; this is not for *state* judges. It is, however for Family Court judges, as that court was created by Parliament. Note that the “address from both Houses of Parliament” mentioned in Australia’s Constitution only “prays” to the Governor-General; it doesn’t tell the G-G he must act.

By contrast, a majority of members of the US House of Representatives can impeach a federal judge, and send it to the Senate for conviction. If a majority of senators vote to convict, the person is removed from office instantly without the need for a presidential signature.

In Colonial Times

Before the Australian Constitution came into effect in 1901, making us a nation, each of the colonies had judges who were appointed by the Crown. To tip them out, for bad behavior, the colony could appeal to Britain to “amove” the bad judge.

Ten judges – from various colonies – were so “amoved.” High Court Justice Michael Kirby listed some in his 1983 Boyer lecture.

Tasmanian judge (technically, Van Diemen’s Land judge) Algernon Montagu (1802-1880) was amoved by the Lieutenant Governor over “questionable financial transactions.’

John Walpole Willis of Melbourne had previously been removed as a judge in Canada. His sins were “cantankerousness and foibles.” In 1842 he got the flick.

In South Australia, John Jeffcott (1800-1855) was the very first judge of the colony’s Supreme Court. He had been removed as judge of Sierra Leone for having killed a man in a duel. In SA however he was not amoved. He died by drowning in the River Murray.

Note that what these three judges had done was of a personal nature. This is almost always the case in US. The most recent judge impeached by Congress was tipped out for not paying child support. Another was impeached for hitting his wife.

No Australian judge in colonial times was punished for making a court ruling in a criminal fashion. And none since 1901 either.

Ah, aren't judges immune in regard to any rulings they make from the bench? Well, yes, of course they have to be protected from civil actions for their judgments – or they might make lenient rulings in fear of being sued. But I am not talking about *immunity from civil suit*. I am talking about immunity from criminal charges.

As I have yelped many times at GumshoeNews, there is only one person in Australia who is immune from criminal liability. “The king can do no wrong.” (I note that Sir Walter Scott challenged this, in regard to the throne in England, but that is off-topic here.)

We are talking about judges. *They are never immune*. If they commit a crime they get punished like anyone else. And that crime could be something they do on the bench. Of course. That is where they can inflict a lot more harm than beating a wife or failing to pay child support.

Something Less Than the Full Judge-Overboard Punishment

Both in the US and Australia there are “boards” you can go to with a complaint about a judge. These boards are made up of judges. Will they actually discipline their colleague? They might, but one would not want to count on it.

In the US there is a so-called Judicial Conference; it meets annually in Lexington, Kentucky. It handles ethics business but other matters, too, such as upgrading court technology or problems of jurisdiction.

The American Bar Association (please, God don't let me say what I want to say about the ABA) has concocted a model Code of Ethics for judicial Conduct. For example:

CANON 1
A judge shall uphold and promote the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, and shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety.

CANON 2
A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially, competently, and diligently.

CANON 3
A judge shall conduct the judge's personal and extrajudicial activities to minimize the risk of conflict with the obligations of judicial office.

Surely you'd think anyone who is a judge does not need to be told those mundane rules. But it may help a complaining citizen to be able to point to a specific breach.

In Australia, New South Wales is the only state with a set-up for making complaints against judges. If that board finds the matter serious enough it may get moved to the floor of Parliament.

Crimes Committed by Judges in Office

There is material in the Crimes Act, Commonwealth, of 1914. (That is a model criminal code for any state wishing to adopt it.) Its Part III is devoted to Crimes in the administration of justice. Section 32 says that a judicial officer who

(b) corruptly gives, confers, or procures, or promises or offers to give, convert, procure, or attempt to procure to,

upon, or for, any such judge, magistrate, or Commonwealth officer, any property or benefit of any kind, on account of any such act or omission on the part of the judge, magistrate, or officer; shall be guilty of an indictable offence. Penalty: Imprisonment for 10 years.

On Beyond “Corruption”

It is disappointing that attention is always focused on the judge’s selfish interest, such as swinging a case a certain way in exchange for *money* – as if this were the only type of corruption going on.

How about a provision for judges who do the wrong thing because someone is leaning on them, maybe has even threatened his/her life? It would be good to make that an indictable offense similar to taking a bribe. Once a provision is on the books, at least people can talk about it.

Is the reader thinking that judge should be let off the hook due to the threat he/she received? The person first needs to be charged with the crime. Then he or she can plead that there was coercion.

The idea of “diminished responsibility” is another matter.

What about the fact that many judges are placed in office to carry out the agenda of a sinister secret society? If he/she then obeys these instructions while in office, the essential crime is treason. But people find it hard to ken the law against traitors. (See my 2015 book *Fraud Upon the Court*.)

I think a specific law about judges doing these things needs to be enacted. At the very least, every nominee to the bench should be asked to state is he/she is a member of a secret society.

Justice Angelo Vasta

As I said, since federation (1901) no federal judge has been removed from office in Australia. Only one *state* Supreme Court judge, Angelo Vasta of Queensland, was removed after a Commission of Inquiry reported to state parliament that he should be removed. Interestingly, a former Australian Chief Justice, Harry Gibbs, chaired that commission. The matter on which Vasta was removed from the bench was his personal tax situation. Federal MP Bob Katter sought in 2018 to have the 77-year-old judge exonerated and reinstated as a judge, saying he was unfairly treated.

One of the charges against Vasta had been *perjury*. We need to see more discussion of that crime, and in the interstices of that case there was a matter of four policemen having perjured. Note: Appendix A at the end of this book contains a Change.org petition that offers a perspective on Vasta.

Prosecuting a Judge

Many judges in the US have been convicted of crime. If you type “the judge was prosecuted” into a Google search (as I just did), you may get this headline from Oklahoma: **Ex-judge Donald Thompson, busted for using penis pump during trials, has pension cut off.** One remark in that article that I don’t understand is that Thompson’s exposing himself was said to violate his oath of office. I am unaware of the violation of an oath – such — being a crime. Anyway he went to prison.

In Australia the only High Court judge to have been *prosecuted* was Lionel Murphy. But it was a state court that did the prosecuting (with regard to his previous behaviour as a state judge). He continued to sit on the High Court as he went through appeals of his conviction.

His case is complicated. He died at age 64 of cancer. I reckon “they” gave him cancer in order that the threatened federal prosecution would never occur. Much dirt would have come out. By the way, his mugshot appears on Fiona Barnett’s famous gallery of pedophiles but none of them has ever been hauled before a court and I do not pretend to know that Fiona is correct as to each “candidate.”

In 1986, the material in the Lionel Murphy case was put under seal for 30 years. Hence it did emerge into daylight in 2016. One item caught my eye. In regard to his desire to see a certain mafia company get a construction contract, Lionel had asked someone to find out if particular AFP police were “approachable.” The answer came back: “No, those two are straight.” Two handy vocabulary words for us, Folks, in regard to Federal Police: “straight” and “*approachable*.”

Family Court

Humans have an instinct for worshipping those high up. All judges should be respected, almost as God. High standards should apply. But that does not mean they can be unaccountable.

I have recently heard of judges doing horrible things in the Family Court in South Australia, New South Wales, and Queensland. You can indict them. You can citizen-arrest them. (See my books *Prosecution for Treason* and *The Soul of Boston*.) You can also tip them over. As stated, in Australia, the Constitution’s sec 72, gives *Parliament* the power to judge a judge.

Why have a Constitution if you don’t use it?

22. Whom Would You Like To Sue for Damages?



Everyone has the right to bring a dispute to court. The law maxim relevant here is *Ubi jus, ibi remedium* — Where there is a right, there is a remedy.

At Gumshoe, the focus of my writing in regard to child-stealing has been mainly on the criminal activity of various parties. But this chapter says nothing about prosecuting, only about suing. The place to sue is not Family Court; it is civil court or possibly the Court of Equity.

The parent's goal is to get the kid back. Granted, the lawsuits I am about to mention are not aimed at that. Still, they could lead indirectly to that in two ways.

First, the act of suing causes your opponent (your oppressor) to get the label “defendant” — that will make you feel you are no longer on the defensive. It puts you in the driver's seat. You feel less inclined to collapse under the weight of what the Family Court is doing to you if there be a prospect of getting justice elsewhere.

Second, the improprieties of the Family Court show up more vividly when seen in the light of *normal* civil court procedure.

What Remedies Are Available in Common Law?

Please note that I am a layperson. Although I have a law degree, I am not in practice. So the following inventory of remedies is probably very incomplete.

I've seen people go to civil court for three things:

-- to claim damages

-- to seek an injunction – forbidding someone to continue a certain practice, or demanding that someone be “enjoined” to do such-and-such

-- to get a declaratory judgment (Actually I've never seen that happen, but it's on the books!)

Damages, Torts

You might ask for damages if someone has broken a contract – the court would apply the law of contract.

If the matter does not involve contract, you will probably be suing someone under the law of tort. The WEX Legal Dictionary gives this definition of *tort*:

“A tort is an act or omission that gives rise to injury or harm to another and amounts to a civil wrong for which courts impose liability.

In the context of torts, “injury” describes the invasion of any legal right, whereas “harm” describes a loss or detriment in fact that an individual suffers.”

Thus, you can *injure* me by depriving me of a right, not just by throwing a brick at me.

If you did throw a brick at me, I could both file a criminal complaint *and* sue you in civil court for that injury. The judge may award “damages” – usually money.

The Restatement of the Law

In the US it’s hard to keep track of changes to the common law, as there are so many jurisdictions – those of 50 states plus the federal court system. The American Law Institute puts out, every generation or so, a “restatement” of the law. It offers a wrap-up and analysis of the laws.

Naturally the publication by a private group, the American Law Institute, is not authoritative but it helps and may be consulted by Australians as we also have common law. We can look into its section on torts to see what injury or loss the protective parent or the child could sue for.

If the child is currently under guardianship by a third party, that is a real problem: the parent may have lost the chance to sue on the child’s behalf. But let’s assume here that a parent *is* the guardian.

Child As Plaintiff

The first step is for the plaintiff (the child) to identify an injury (invasion of rights) or harm (loss or detriment), caused by the defendant (fairly often the father).

Say the father has raped her. He has also assaulted her by threatening her as to future harms. He has disrupted her relationship with her Mum and aunts. He has invaded her privacy by making films of her in sexual acts. (Recall: we are not talking about the criminality of that here, just of the injuries that can be sued for in torts.)

In the US, every citizen has the constitutional right to demand a jury trial for civil suits as long as “the value in controversy exceeds twenty dollars.” Australia has reportedly lost the use of jury trials in civil suits – was it brushed under the carpet? So a suit brought by the child may be adjudicated by a judge or a magistrate. (Magistrates handle small amounts.)

I think the child might also be able to sue agencies such as the Department of Child Protective but for simplicity I’ll list those sorts of complaints as suits by the mother.

The Mother As Plaintiff

The mum needs remedies from the law, first as against her ex-husband partner, the perpetrator, and also against many people who caused her an injury (invaded her legal rights), or caused her harm, such as loss to her health or wealth.

Thumbing through the aforementioned Restatement of Law (dated 1977), I see that a mother in the US could claim invasion of her parental rights. I say there has never been an abrogation of parental rights in Australia as that would be an absurdity. Refer back to Terry Shulze’s ideas in Chapter 10.

In US she can sue for *infliction of emotional distress*. Which entities can she sue? Reminder: the items below may also constitute crime, so maybe she can try to get prosecutions going but prosecution is *not* being looked at in this chapter.

Can Governmental Entities Be Sued?

It is generally hard to attack the wrongdoer when the wrongdoer is part of the government. But it can be done. On Youtube there is a video of a mother in US who was awarded \$3 million for being accused by Child Protection of harming her child when she had not harmed it.

Possible defendants are:

– Teachers, nurses, and others who are subject to mandatory reporting of child abuse but who did not report it for the child to question even when they saw injuries on the child's body or the child disclosed to them.

— Police who refused to listen to urgent reports of crime or imminent danger to the child

— Social workers who wrongly wrote a notification that the protective mother has mental health issues.

In America it is not uncommon for the Mum to be diagnosed with Munchausen-by-Proxy syndrome. They say she keeps taking her child to the doctor because she herself is a hypochondriac or wants attention. (Can you imagine?)

I believe that these government workers can be sued “in their individual capacity.” Granted, when they're at work they have some immunity, but if the thing they have done is “not in their job description” – e.g., it is not in a policeperson's job to conceal evidence – then why should they be immune?

To grant them immunity would suggest that anything any government employee does under color of law – no matter how wicked – is acceptable. The law has never made any such declaration. It has declared the exact opposite.

Declaratory Judgment

What is a court? It is a place where disputes are settled. It is a place where the might of the law is able to coerce any individual or organization. It is a place where society's thinking about fairness over the centuries ends up in a magnificent body of jurisprudence.

It may be very helpful to a person to get a court to say whether such-and-such is a breach of the law, even if no damages are sought and no criminal complaint is made.

When someone knows a wrong has occurred, he or she wants at least to tell friends and have friends say “Yes you are right, that was a terrible injury.”

The recent formal apology by the Prime Minister to abused children was a great reliever of stress to many victims. In my own life someone wronged me in a business deal. Many years later I ran into the businessman and the first thing he said was “I apologize.” I was flabbergasted. It also surprised me to find how a big burden was lifted off me just by those words. It was almost dizzying.

Anyway, the courts are able to give *declaratory judgments*. Lawyers seldom pursue this perhaps because there would be no payouts in which the lawyer could share. I recommend that protective parents seek declaratory relief.

The Court of Equity

Above I quoted the maxim “Where there is a right, there is a remedy. Here is another one: “When a common remedy ceases to be of service, recourse must be had to an extraordinary one. *Ubi cessat remedium ordinarium ibi decurritur ad extraordinarium.*”

Under English law there was a court of chancery and a court of equity. They used to be separate, until British Parliament passed the Judicature Act in 1873, combining them. Even after 1873, however, a person could still use the coordinated court to ask for a judgment according to the *principles* of equity.

In Australia, nearly a century later, the state of New South Wales got around to combining the courts, via its Law Reform Act (Justice and Equity) in 1972. Other states had already done so. Note: Australia's High Court recognizes the principles of equity as still extant.

(I should point out that Courts of Equity do not deal in criminal matters.)

Can our model child ask for Equity? I say why not? Equity allows a judge to go outside the strict law and make a "constructive remedy." It is especially used when the law as such would result in an obviously unjust outcome. EQUITY CAN BE USED FOR REUNION.

Since the twelfth century in England, the Court of Equity has included a provision for the "disgorgement of ill-gotten gains." As everyone knows, child trafficking is a lucrative business. Surely everyone knows that the lucre involved is ill-gotten. Let the disgorgement begin!

And Now for the Bad News

I mentioned a mother who got a payout of \$3 million. She had been accused of Munchausen by Proxy syndrome as her kid looked like he was starving. He had an illness that prevented growth. So she sued and got that huge compo.

The bad news is that she has not yet got her son back. She is allowed a two-hour monitored visit with him once a week. Incredible! I think this tells you all you need to know about the amount of bad faith in the system.

23. Gentleman McClellan Reprimands the ODPP



Photo of prosecutors from website odpp.nsw.gov.au

Two Australian women, Fiona Barnett and Rachel Vaughan, have provided their testimony to a private group, the International Tribunal for Natural Justice, the ITNJ. Both told of their direct experience of extreme abuse as children, and their witnessing of murders.

Their main complaint is that no matter how many times they reported these things to the police, they were rebuffed. It was shocking to them, and it will be to you also if you hadn't realized it, that the government prosecutors will not prosecute, or even charge, any of the numerous criminals in government. "No way, José."

They are happy to charge your local drug dealer and your local car thief. They will even charge a pedophile as long as it is an isolated one, not in the protected group. Such behavior by prosecutors is itself plainly criminal.

This chapter quotes a complaint by a good judge, Justice Peter McClellan of New South Wales Supreme Court, who was head of the Royal Commission into Institutional Response to Child Sexual Abuse, which lasted from 2013 to 2017. He took the ODPP to task over prosecutorial discretion, a nice name for "protecting the baddies."

Australia does not have a Department of Justice like that of the US. It has the ODPP, Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions. This was copied from the UK. Its excuse for existence is the “independence” of those who will enforce the law. How nice – he or she “will be non-political and fearless.” But this is crazy on the face of it.

The DPP does not answer to Parliament. He/she does not answer to anyone. Just ask: what person can stand up alone to the mafia? It is a recipe for rule by the mafia.

I have written a book, co-authored by Dee McLachlan, called *Port Arthur: Enough Is Enough*. It shows how the alleged killer, Martin Bryant, was definitely not the man who massacred 35 people in 1996. His case was handled with outrageous injustice by Tasmania’s DPP, Damien Bugg, who subsequently became the Commonwealth DPP.

Here is a lengthy excerpt from McClellan’s speech. It’s very somber and restrained. I’ve added some bolding.

“Seeking justice for victims,” by Justice Peter McClellan, April 13, 2017

The establishment of independent prosecuting offices has been described as ‘one of the more significant improvements to the criminal justice system in this country in the 20th century.’[20]

In *Price v Ferris*, then President Kirby described the object of having a Director of Public Prosecutions as ‘to ensure a high degree of independence in the vital task of making prosecution decisions...’

The position of Director of Public Prosecutions was first established in Australia, in Victoria in 1982.

The move in Victoria followed the establishment of a Crown Advocate under the Tasmanian Crown Advocate Act 1973, in Tasmania. The Tasmanian Act, however, **did not provide guidance on the relationship between the Crown Advocate, the Attorney-General and the Solicitor-General**. This was seen as a significant flaw.

[In Victoria] the second reading speech to the relevant bill stated: “A major aim of the Bill is to remove any suggestion that prosecutions in this State or, indeed **the failure to launch prosecutions** can be the subject of political pressure. [Right. It’s now the subject of criminal pressure.]

The Australian Law Reform Commission [had] described the process of prosecution in Australia ... as ‘probably the most secretive, least understood and poorly documented aspect of the administration of criminal justice.’ [But] the degree of transparency, and the capacity for scrutiny, of the prosecution process has increased. [e.g., by] the promulgation and publication of Director’s Guidelines.

Director’s guidelines are, probably, the primary mechanism in this country for the control of prosecutorial discretion. However, they are only part of the picture. A report by the Australian Institute of Criminology almost a quarter of a century after the creation of independent prosecuting agencies, stated the following:

“... The considerable discretionary powers vested in prosecutors employed by the state and territory Offices of the Director of Public Prosecutions are exercised in accordance with prosecution policies and guidelines, but the decision making process is rarely subject to external scrutiny.” This lack of external scrutiny or oversight has emerged as an issue for the Royal Commission [of which I am the head]...

...the Commission has been required to examine the issue of DPP complaints and oversight mechanisms.

For those of you who may not be aware in Case Study 15 the Commissioners found inadequacies in the processes of the ODPP of New South Wales. The Commissioners further found that the **Queensland DPP failed to comply with its own guidelines, including in relation to consulting with complainants.**

Concerns in relation to DPP processes emerged again in Case Study 17 in relation to the Northern Territory.... The Commissioners again found noncompliance with the Northern Territory DPP guidelines **in relation to a decision to discontinue a prosecution.**

These case studies confirm that the mere existence of the Director's guidelines is not sufficient to ensure the level of accountability and transparency the community might reasonably expect. This is not surprising. [Too right, mate]

The [RC] Commissioners are conscious that there is a tension between ensuring DPP accountability and maintaining DPP independence. Given that independence was essentially the *raison d'être* of ODPPs, concern in relation to how greater accountability might be achieved is understandable. However as former Victorian DPP, and later Justice, John Coldrey observed:

“Whilst it is argued that prosecutorial independence is an essential element in the proper administration of criminal justice it must be equally recognised that **inherent** in an independence without accountability is **the potential for making arbitrary, capricious and unjust decisions.**

[Hooray for Justice Coldrey!]

Currently **there is no formal mechanism through which a complainant can challenge, or seek review of, the exercise of prosecutorial discretion** including in circumstances where the decision making process has not been in accordance with the relevant Director's guidelines.

Further, **the general community has no body or mechanism it can rely on to be satisfied that the DPPs and staff are adhering** to their guidelines. [Would it matter? *Would they be saints* where all others are sinners?]

In the Report of Case Study 15 the Commissioners stated:

“Any body that is given statutory independence and that cannot be subject to any external reviews is at risk of failure in its decision-making processes. **When the decisions being made are critical to the lives of the individuals involved,** ...it is relevant to ask whether the current structure, where there is **absolute immunity from review of any decision** is appropriate. ...”

Requirements in the guidelines to consult **before decisions are made to discontinue** [i.e., let the guy off the hook] recognise the importance of these decisions to complainants. Insufficient consultation before deciding to discontinue a prosecution or accept a negotiated plea is likely **to cause victims to experience distress**. [like a sunshiny day is likely to cause happiness]

The ACT Victims of Crime Commissioner told [us] that “it is **the procedural justice issue** for many victims of crime that **stays with them** as much as the crime itself.”

[Note: AS far as I am aware, Justice McClellan has not been in a car accident since giving that speech.]

“The point at which the prosecutorial discretion to commence or continue a prosecution is exercised is one of the key points of attrition in the criminal justice system.[30] As the ALRC has stated ‘prosecutors play a key role as gatekeepers determining which victims of crime have access to justice’.[31]

In 2013 the Victims Right of Review Scheme [the VRR] commenced in England and Wales. **That scheme gives victims the right to request a review of certain decisions of the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS).**

Decisions to which a right of review applies are: decisions by the CPS to not bring proceedings; to discontinue proceedings or withdraw all charges involving the victim; **to offer no evidence** in all proceedings relating to the victim; or, to leave all charges in the proceeding **to ‘lie on the file’ such that they cannot be proceeded with** without leave of the court or the Court of Appeal.

Decisions to accept **pleas to lesser charges** or decisions to only prosecute some counts **are not reviewable**. [The Crown says] review is afforded where otherwise a victim would have no remedy at all. The creation of the VRR scheme followed the decision of the Court of Appeal of England and Wales in *R v Christopher Killick*. In *Killick* the Court [said] the right to review a CPS decision should be made the subject of a clearer procedure....

The **case is approached afresh by the reviewer**. They may ask police to obtain further evidence. [biggie, biggie] If the original decision was to discontinue proceedings it may be possible reinstitute proceedings if the reviewer found the original decision to be incorrect. [Truly wow]

The victim is then notified of the outcome and provided with a full explanation of the decision, initially in writing.

[My] Commissioners consider that all Australian DPPs should be able to implement a number of minimum requirements. Those requirements are:

-- The adoption of comprehensive written policies for decision-making and consultation with victims and police.

-- Ensuring that all policies are publically available and published online.

-- Provision of a right for complainants to seek written **reasons** for key decisions. [Rachel Vaughan will be pleased to find out why the murderers she reported did not get prosecuted.]

In relation to a complaints mechanism the Commissioners recognise that the CPS [not *the* CPS] is significantly larger than the offices of all Australian DPPs combined.

We also recognise that ... decision-making in Australian ODPPs already occurs at a more senior level than in the CPS. Accordingly there is a capacity for some degree of informal review [OMG] before a decision is made.

...there is merit in the provision of a formal internal complaints mechanism which would allow **victims to seek merits review** of key decisions...that result in a prosecution not being brought or being discontinued. There is a further option – an **audit** of compliance with DPPs guidelines and policies. If the results of any audit were **published** this would advance the transparency and accountability of DPPs and their offices, and might negate the need for an external audit process. [*Merci beaucoup* to the author, Justice McClellan]

24. An Open Letter to Susan and Bill



(L) Susan Kiefel, Chief Justice of Australia
(R) William Alstergren, Chief Justice of the Family Court

Dear Susan and Bill,

Believe me I know better than to address a judge in a casual manner. The Court is sacred (well, it's sacred to me anyway), and a show of respect is always needed. I am keen to uphold the Court.

However, I need to talk to today you in your personal capacity. Besides being judges, Susan and Bill, you are also citizens of Australia. In that area we are equals.

Maybe if you would put on your “personal glasses” to read this letter it will all go smoothly. Just leave to one side the thoughts that you'd normally come to in your job as high-level judges. Just be yourselves, please.

The Reality Today

The reality today is that both Australia, and my other country the United States, are essentially run by forces that are not mentioned in any Constitution. These are free-wheeling power holders and are usually secretive.

In some cases these entities are recognized in law. For example, some of the biggest power holders are corporations; a corporation is an *entity whose existence is based in law*. There are also some foundations; the privileged behavior of every foundation *is a result of law*.

Thus a court can to some extent control the Boeing Corporation or Telstra or the Rockefeller Foundation.

But what we need to talk about are forces, sometimes called The Deep State, that are hidden and typically are illegal. In effect they are mafia's. The members feel good about breaking the law or contravening it. They don't worry about getting caught; they don't even expect that their enterprise will get reined in.

My first inclination is to say that they are "beyond" the law. But really *they are easy prey for the law* if only the courts or Parliament wanted to go after them.

Getting Them

Various ways to control them come to mind. The first way is to capture them – just by ordinary arrest – and treat them individually as criminals. (I favor this myself. Law is the great equalizer.)

Another way would be to track down what they do and block their enterprise. I have read that President Trump of the United States ordered the arrest of thousands of viewers of child porn on the Internet. This would block the porn film industry by depriving them of customers.

Still another way to deal with the powerful forces is to bump them off outside the law. There is a rumor that Trump has authorized this lately (via "military tribunals.") I don't know if

he has. I don't approve of doing it secretly. There's also the public law of outlawry, and the unquestionable law of plain old self-defense.

Our ancestors recognized that life threatening emergency displaces the workings of law. Hence the maxim *Necessitas non habet legem*. Necessity has no law.

The Pattern

The problem that has caused me to write to you today is a powerful force in South Australia, Queensland, New South Wales and probably the other states and territories, having to do with child-stealing. The online magazine that I write articles for, GumshoeNews.com, has spent the last 8 months trying to find out what is going on.

Allow me to tell you a pattern we uncovered. We did not go looking for it; it was thrown at us. I will simplify it:

1. A couple produces a baby. The Dad may do a runner, but when the child is around 2 to 4 years, he comes back asking for custody. There is no reason for the mother to lose custody.
2. Then it becomes apparent that the child is being sexually abused. (Both genders can become abusers.) This is certainly doing damage to the child's natural development. Of course.
3. The protective Mum does not want to hand the kid over. Oh but she must! The government of Oz will force her to do it. Practically guaranteed! And no effort, no amount of having the law on her side will give her a way out of the nightmare.
4. How so? First, the mother's right to the child will be called into question "medically." She will be labeled a danger, as *she* is deemed mentally unwell.

5. Plus, her efforts to get her child back will be used against her. Officials will note her reluctance to send the child to the Dad (never mind if the kid is screaming “Mummy, please don’t make me go!”). The mother’s reluctance will then be called emotional abuse of the kid. I am not joking.
6. She may also be “diagnosed” with Parental Alienation Syndrome (or the latest equivalent) – she is trying to turn the child against its father. They will claim, and write it in the case notes, that she “coaches” the child.
7. Because of the coaching problem, the child may be sent to live with a “neutral” guardian -- a group home, a relative’s home, or a non-kin foster parent. If more than one child is involved, the siblings may be sent to separate foster homes.
8. Legislation provides that it’s bad for a child to linger in guardianship more than six months, so The Law will speed up the disposition of the case. The guardian may become a permanent guardian and will then have authority to adopt the child out.
9. The adopting parent may legally have the child’s name changed and the Mum will thus lose hope of even being able to locate her beloved child.
10. Dr Amanda Gearing reckons that some men import a wife, possibly to “breed” a victim child!

We have heard from many mothers that the following parts of government each do their part in carrying out the pattern: police, child protection workers, child’s independent lawyers (so-called), the guardianship board, the staff of Family Court and – wait for it – the judges.

Also, in regard to getting the mother “certified,” a psychology assessment organization called ACIS steps in to help. Acute Something-or-Other Intervention Service.

Ignorance and Secrecy about This

Allow me tell you how ignorant I was of the whole thing. I never knew the Pattern till I got to 2018. And yet I was well-up on related things: I am a virtual expert on the CIA's Mk-Ultra program in the US.

I was a member of a Truth and Reconciliation Coalition for that in 2010, and I studied the recent Royal Commission on pedophiles, writing a book about it entitled *Deliverance! A Royal Commission and Pizzagate Reveal Society's Hidden Controllers*.

It must be down to the secretiveness of the criminals that I never had a glimmer of what the mothers go through. So whence cometh the secretiveness? I suggest:

-- The Protective parent is dazed and glazed (so said Senator Nancy Schaefer in Georgia, USA before she was bumped off). The parent, focused on the child's needs, is worn out by the whole thing and, for extra effect, is financially smitten by the cost of lawyers, psychologist assessments, etc.

-- The media – who must surely be in on the deal –not only won't inform the public about this baby-snatching, but will publish stories about cases where coaching *is* actually done, or where a child truly *does* need to be grabbed from a drug-addicted mother. This keeps the public off the scent.

-- Perhaps the biggest block to publicity is the “gag order” in Section 121 of the Family Law Act. It tells the suffering Protective parent not to have loose lips. He or she is thus scared of mentioning the problem, and frustrated beyond belief.

Moreover, lawyers routinely tell their clients not to even broach the subject of child sex abuse in court.

The Presence of a Racket

Dear Susan and Bill, did you know of all this? Would you agree, as ordinary observers, that there must be someone running this racket (statewide at least, maybe nationally) as how else could such a standard pattern emerge?

Fiona Barnett was the first to come forward – in a loud way – and tell the public about torture of children by a pedophile group in Australia. She says it's CIA-run.

Diane DeVere has revealed to us at Gumshoe that in the 1940s her grandmother was part of the Tavistock group, along with Dr Eric Dax, that was seeded into Australia.

I don't claim there's a racket is involved in the handling of *every* child in custody battle. But a certain percent of cases fits the Pattern. The kids get fed to cruel pedophiles. The amount of suffering by the children is immense and for parents to miss their child is similar to death.

As citizens, dear Susan and Bill, you can hardly be other than alarmed by my news. I wish every Aussie were alarmed by it, but as I mentioned they have never been told, such as by the MSM. (I almost wish I hadn't been told, as it burdens me with a new responsibility that is getting in the way of important things I was doing!)

At present, even on the outside chance that you, too, had been in the dark, you can be in the dark no more.

Picturing myself in your shoes now – but as justices not citizens, I think the thing you would most want is help. If it be true that there's a huge bunch of racketeers out there, so unscrupulous (so inhuman, really) as to harm little children, you'd naturally have to be scared.

You may think that the problem is so intractable that you should just remain cool, calm, and collected. Heck, Your Honors, don't do that. It only gives them leeway.

All your weapons are needed on deck. And who has more weapons than you? Nobody. You can instruct the ranks of judges to tell the Protective parent to grab the kid. Here's what the High Court held in 1987 in *Zecevic v DPP*:

“The question to be asked in the end is quite simple. It is whether the accused believed upon reasonable grounds that it was necessary in self-defence to do what he did. If he had that belief and there were reasonable grounds for it, or if the jury is left in reasonable doubt about the matter, then he is entitled to an acquittal. Stated in this form, the question is one of general application and is *not limited* to cases of homicide.” [So sensible, so simple!]

And the law of self-defense is not limited to the person who is being attacked. One can practice “self” defense when it is a loved one is about to be killed or harmed.

So I take back my licentious use of first names and appeal to you now in your official capacity, Chief Justice of Australia and Chief Justice of the Family Court.

Do the right thing and go to glory! Endorse the Reunion of parents and children. In many cases reunion can be done by a flick of the judicial pen. Let me ask if -- and I realize it's a big *if* -- if what I say in this book is accurate and many children have been separated from their most Protective parent by a wrongful act of a judge would you want this to be turned around?

I'm absolutely sure you would, so let's do it, a.s.a.p.

25. Our Oppressors Can Indeed “Do Time”



An unusually clean-looking prison Photo: Brookings.edu

My motive in writing this book is not so much to help the families as it is to get bad judges off the bench. Bad judges kill our law instead of preserving it. It is dangerous for all.

Chapter 21, How To Remove a Judge, was about getting him off the bench politically. Chapter 20, Accessories, showed that he and his helpers can be charged with crime. For this chapter, it'll be useful to think of two categories: direct crime (such as assault, torture, or theft) and crimes against justice. I call the latter *Blackstonian crimes* after Sir William Blackstone, who catalogued them in 1769.

Depriving a Protective parent of his child, as described, involves **offenses against justice**. The Blackstonian crimes listed below are very bad, as they *prevent courts* from “doing justice.” If you have stolen from me or assaulted me, I should be able to get satisfaction in a courtroom.

There are many rules -- “due process of law” – to assure I get satisfaction. All of this was put together over eight centuries in English law. Luckily, jurists had an eye for the way a baddy will endeavor to clog up the workings of law:

From Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, vol 4

EMBEZZLING or **vacating records, or falsifying certain other proceedings in a court of judicature**, is a felonious offense against public justice.

A **THIRD** offense against public justice is **obstructing the execution of lawful process**. This is at all times an offense of a very high and presumptuous nature; And ...the party opposing such arrest [of a criminal] becomes a **principal in high treason**. [since the law is sacred.]

Subornation of **PERJURY** is the offense of procuring another to take such a false oath.... The punishment has been various. It was anciently death; afterwards banishment, or **cutting out the tongue**, then forfeiture of goods; and now fine and imprisonment, and **never more to be capable of bearing testimony**. The statute 5 Eliz. c.9. inflicts the penalty of perpetual infamy, and to **stand with both ears nailed** to the pillory.

BRIBERY is the next species of offense against public justice; which is **when a judge, or other person concerned in the administration of justice, takes any undue reward to influence his behavior in his office**. ... In England this offense of taking bribes is punished, in inferior officers, with fine and imprisonment. But in judges, especially the superior ones, it has been always looked upon as so heinous an offense, that the chief **justice Thorpe was hanged for it** in the reign of Edward III.

ANOTHER offense of the same species is the negligence of public officers, entrusted with the administration of justice, as **sheriffs, coroners, constables**, and the like. **THERE** is yet another offense against public justice, which is a crime of **deep malignity**; and the power and wealth of the offenders may often deter the injured from a legal prosecution. **This is the oppression and tyrannical partiality of judges....**

Today, nuances that protect justice include: making sure the material evidence has a known chain of custody; making sure each witness has demonstrated her credibility; making sure the accused speaks English or has an interpreter, making sure the jurors have not been bribed.

Breaches of those provisions do not just mean the wrongdoer is being a bit unethical; they are *felonies*. A felony, (unlike a misdemeanor) gets a prison sentence or big fine. The point is to safeguard the sanctity of the Law.

Crimes of the Helpers

Chapter 20, Accessories, merely stated that a helper may *share* some of the punishment of the principal. But now let's see how the social workers, psychologists, and police may commit Blackstonian crimes *of their own*.

Undoubtedly something is causing the social workers to aim for the goal of placing the child with the perpetrator. You know that I am prejudiced toward the idea that the child-stealing racket is run by higher-ups. But whatever the reason be, the social worker is not looking at the case and saying "What does this kid really need?" Rather, *she is finagling* to cause the Protective parent to lose the child.

The classic way to do this seems to be to paint the perpetrator as "not a serious problem" (even if he is heavy with red flags and blatant breaches of court orders) and paint the Protector as unworthy of, or incapable of, parenting.

A first line of attack is to try to make her out as a mental case. If she really were mentally unfit for motherhood, it would have been brought to someone's attention before. But no, it is standardly a feature that appears right after she (or he) has accused an ex-partner of child sex abuse.

Division 1A— 5E (1) 14. I am listing this here as a crime of the person who falsely diagnoses the mother. Until act-iveists started to see the commonness of this ploy we may have believed the mother was really ill or incompetent.

Three “syndromes” seem tailor made: Munchausen-by proxy syndrome (she projects illness onto her kid), parent-al alienation syndrome (she obsessively alienates the kid against the father), and vexatiousness (she is determined to get satisfaction in court). I think anyone who makes such diagnoses on mothers who reports sexual abuse of the child should be investigated. IMMEDIATELY.

As for police who declare such a Mum fixated, ditto.

Dishonesty with the Case Files

Is there any honesty at all in these child abductions? The whole thing is a sham, so you would hardly expect that the court would behave in the correct way as to the files. For SA there is the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935:

Fabricating, altering or concealing evidence. Sec 243— A person who— (a) fabricates evidence or alters, conceals or destroys anything that may be required in evidence at judicial proceedings; or (b) uses any evidence knowing it to have been ... altered, with the intention of ... (d) influencing the outcome of judicial proceedings... is guilty of an offence. [Max. Imprisonment for 7 years.]

Recall *Contra spoliatorem, omnia praesumuntur*. If he is despoils evidence, you should presume that he is the guilty party. If innocent why is he despoiling? See Appendix H, McLachlan’s **Survey**, where Protective parents state which parties have despoiled evidence. One item shows judges disbelieving the child even where the doctor believes her.

Some crimes are committed against Protective parents:

Unlawful threats. Sec 19— (1) (b) intends to arouse a fear that the threat will be, or is likely to be, carried out, or is recklessly indifferent as to whether such a fear is aroused, is guilty of an offence. [Maximum penalty: (a) for a basic offence—imprisonment for 10 years...

(3) This section applies to a threat directly or indirectly communicated by words (written or spoken) or by conduct, or partially by words and partially by conduct.

And direct harm to the child such as this:

Kidnapping. Division 9, sec 39 (1) A person who takes or detains another person, without the other person's consent— (a) with the intention of holding the other person to ransom or as a hostage; or (b) with the intention of committing an indictable offence against [him] or a third person, is guilty of an offence. [Maximum penalty: (a) for a basic offence—imprisonment for 20 years]

Subornation [recruitment] of perjury. Division 3—242

(2) A person who counsels, procures, induces, aids or abets another to make a false statement under oath is guilty of subornation of perjury. Maximum penalty: Imprisonment for 7 years. [No ears nailed, though. Darn.]

Again from the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 SA:

Criminal Neglect. Division 1A— 5E (1) 14 (1) A person (the defendant) is guilty of the offence of criminal neglect if— (a) a child... suffers harm as a result of an act; and (b) the defendant had, at the time of the act, a duty of care to the victim; ...and (d) the defendant failed to take steps that he or she could reasonably be expected to have taken ... Maximum penalty: (a) where the victim dies—imprisonment for life; or (b) imprisonment for 15 years.

Good News from FamilyLawWeek.co.uk:

Justice Pauffley, has deprecated the widespread practice in the family proceedings court by which parties, usually the local authority, **draft the ‘Facts and Reasons’ which are then adopted by the Justices.** (re the 2014 case of NL)

[[They] drafted the entire ‘Facts and Reasons’ document in regard to an interim care order. The draft had been sent to the court, by email, prior to the hearing. It was **made available to the parties’ legal representatives, in hard copy, outside court on the morning of the hearing.** [It] included **reference to an expert’s report obtained on the previous day.** In her judgment... Pauffley J said:

“...I am profoundly alarmed by the existence [of this practice which] significantly interfered with the most basic requirements for openness and transparency. There was, apparently, an established but **largely clandestine arrangement between the local authority and the court** which, to my mind, has considerable repercussions for justice.... It is fundamental that nothing is sent to the judge by one party unless it is copied simultaneously to every other party.

“Just because there may be tacit acceptance on the part of many professionals within the family justice system that the practice exists, that does not mean it is right. **It is patently wrong, must stop at once and never happen again....**

“It simply cannot be right, fair or reasonable to commission an expert to provide what may turn out to be the pivotal evidence justifying separation of **a neonate** from his mother in the way that happened here. It surprises me that Dr van Rooyen was asked ... to provide a report on the basis of papers supplemented by a telephone conversation with a professional who had **never met** the mother. I struggle to understand how Dr van Rooyen’s apparently firm opinions, adverse to the mother, could have been formed.”

There are laws against racketeering also, but they are outside my pay grade. In the US, I understand RICO, but even there, if you can scare the helpers into abandoning their helpship, by indicting them with, say, spoliation of documents, that would put the racketeers out of business.

Treason. In general we need to revitalize the concept of treason. Here is the current law in the Criminal Code, Part 5.1 Division 80.1 (amended in 2002 re anti-terrorism)

(1) A person commits ...treason, if the person: (a) causes the death of the Sovereign... (d) levies war, or does any act preparatory to levying war, against the Commonwealth; or (e) engages in conduct that assists by any means whatever, with intent to assist, an enemy....

(2) A person commits an offence if (b) knowing that another person intends to commit treason, does not inform a constable of it within a reasonable time or [try] to prevent the commission Penalty: Imprisonment for life.

The *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* definition of *traitor* is: 1 one who betrays another's trust or is false to an obligation or duty 2. one who commits treason. Synonyms for traitor: apostate, backstabber, betrayer, double-crosser, double-dealer, Judas, quisling, recreant, serpent, snake, turncoat.

Diminished Responsibility. The claim "I was only following orders" does not win mercy under law, but there is mercy for acting under coercion. I suspect the social workers who have laughed at a suffering parent (a common complaint!) are actually mind-controlled in some way. It is too much to believe any human would do that voluntarily.

As a negotiating strategy we need to make **leniency** a possibility. And we need to dangle the word '*pardon.*' In any case, punishment is less essential than freeing the children.

26. We Can Learn a Lot from Dunblane



Lord Cullen

Lord Robertson, later head of NATO

It is never comfortable to talk about something terrible that is happening in one's own country but usually easy to discuss overseas events. In 1996, we awoke to the news that 16 first-graders had been killed in Scotland. (That was 6 weeks before the Port Arthur massacre in Tassie.)

After reading Sandra Uttley's book *Dunblane Unburied*, I felt sure she was correct -- that the authorities knew more about it than they admitted and that information about the killer, Thomas Hamilton, were being hidden.

For purposes of this book on Australia's child stealing I will come straight to my conjecture. I say the lords "did" Dunblane. And while I am being, frank I speculate that the toffs of Australia are the protectors of the pedo-rings.

I am determined to evade any woo-woo topics (such as satanic rituals, cannibalism, or spirit cooking) in this book as the focus should be on the newly-recognized judicial kidnap. Lord Burton, a Mason, said that the Masons are responsible for the massacre. Masons are a powerful force in the legal profession and the judicial system in the US.

Except for Lord Burton's accusation against his own mates (divulged by him to the newspaper Scotsman), I have no way to pin it on the Masons but I can pin it on the toffs – a British slang word for the upper class.

The etymology of *toff* has something to do with eating toffee that sticks to the teeth and makes a person talk funny. The Aussie vocabulary has a fairly close equivalent – plummy (you talk like you have a plum in your mouth).

In brief, the official story is that Thomas Hamilton was an unpleasant loner who had run camps for boys. No explanation was provided for his sudden criminality much less his suicide. In early years after 1996, complaints surfaced that the police had complaints in file that should have led to his not being allowed to re-register a gun and not be given the use of public grounds for his camps.

Sandra Uttley found other issues. Highway surveillance showed Hamilton that morning going off a ramp that did not lead to the school. An off-duty cop who was in the gym where the shooting took place was not called as a witness. Parents complained that bullet holes in the gym wall didn't match the story -- so the gym got razed.

For my money, another significant point is that the folks of the town were told it should not be discussed for a whole year due to trauma – plainly this is suppression. A bigger clue is Lord Cullen's *sealing the records for 100 years!*

Tim Minogue's Research

There is an article by Tim Minogue entitled "Savile isn't the only obnoxious paedophile being covered up by the system." (Referring, of course, to Jimmy Savile, born 1926, died 2011). Find it at dunblaneexposed.info.

Minogue learned a lot from Glenn Harrison who had been housemaster from 1989 to 1991 at The Queen Victoria School, the QVS, also in Dunblane. Harrison saw bullying and suspected sexual abuse, especially as the boys were sometimes taken away for weekends. Eventually he tried every which way to use the proper system – police, parliament, judiciary, royalty – to get help for the kids, but he kept hitting a brick wall. *What does that tell you?*

Recall how Denis ‘Dinny’ Ryan, a police detective from Mildura, told our Royal Commission that he couldn’t get his fellow cops to deal with the matter of sexual abuse of kids by a priest. So cops must have been in on it. Glenn Harrison (I will call him Glenn) contacted many officials of the Queen Victoria School, *and above*, and – in my opinion – proved that “they are *all* in it.” Toffs, that is.

Supposedly the lone gunman, Hamilton, had “turned the gun on himself,” and laid his corpse down there on the gymnasium floor for all to see. When Hamilton, was identified on TV, Glenn recognized him immediately.

Not only had Hamilton come wandering around the dormitories at QVS, he had been reported on, by this Housemaster, in an effort to get him kicked out. This was around 1990. You would think a housemaster making such a complaint would be listened to, right? But all his letters went unanswered or were handled dismissively.

In June, 1991, Glenn decided to resign. His contract required that he give one term’s notice, so he would depart in January. On December 11, he wrote to the parents of his 57 boys and warn them of the danger of bullying and abuse at the school. This responsible behavior on the part of the Housemaster led to someone throwing a stone at his window. Frightened, he went to the police. Well, that was a mistake. While he was not

home, another batch of police broke down his door at QVS with a sledgehammer and stole some of his papers.

I feel as though I shouldn't say "stole." After all, the police have a duty to enter a premises and check on something don't they? Maybe we should say they "seized the goods for inspection," or something like that.

Nah, let's call a spade a spade. The point of using a sledgehammer was surely to scare him, and the point of taking his papers, which they never gave back, was to deprive him of the evidence that was in those papers – such as copies of letters to Ministers.

Once he was situated in a new job, at Baltasound, Glenn wrote more letters, this time to the Secretary of State of Scotland and to the Duke of Edinburgh in his role of patron of the Queen Victoria School. Nothing came of it. (I got all of the Glenn story from stickybeak Tim Miogue.)

A key complaint was the fact that people using the name "Friends of the QVS" would take the boys away for weekends. Glenn and his wife lived near the front gate so they could see flashy cars driving up on Friday night to get the boys. He says the boys would return looking stressed but with a lot of money.

Australian *Deja Vu*

Many of the "friends" were recognizable to Glenn as they were famous people – a veritable Who's Who of Society. By the way, Fiona Barnett said that when she witnessed a baby-murder of that kind in the Great Hall of the University of Sydney, the audience consisted of Sydney's "high society."

In Mildura, VIC, Detective Ryan had discovered that one of his colleague-cops worked for ASIO (Australia's intelligence agency). I ask: do ASIO members realize whom they actually work for? I think the Dunblane story, especially the cover-up, shows that many police and covert agents are **working directly for the toffs**.

For whom did the CIA perform the unbelievable sins of MK-Ultra? CIA, director Allen Dulles, had previously been in the OSS. The letters O-S-S are supposed to stand for Office of Strategic Services, but its nickname was "Oh So Social". In other words, members of America's upper class were all supporting OSS (headed by Bill Donovan).

British journalist Tim Minogue had, *prior* to the Dunblane mass murder, attempted to get legislation requiring members of the Freemasons to declare their membership if they were a parliamentarian or a judge. This seems to me a good idea. I recommended similar in my 2011 book, *Prosecution for Treason*. When President George W Bush was asked about his fraternity, Skull and Bones, he said he was not allowed to discuss it. That's OK, thanks to First Amendment rights. A Bonesman, like any other US citizen, can be as silent as he wishes. But if he won't discuss his conflicting loyalties, a law should prevent him being elected. No talkie, no White Housie.

I want to make a point here about the way in which Minogue was treated, for his efforts. He is a journalist who went about his inquiries politely and "by the book." But he found that the police had started an investigation on *him*. When he asked why this was happening he was told that it was because Lord Robertson (one of the persons he wrote to) was a public figure and therefore deserving of police protection. Makes me think it was like a pioneer of the "fixated persons investigations unit."

Moogue says: “[I wrote] to those legally responsible for the safety and wellbeing of the pupils in a private boarding school, the board of governors, which in this case of Queen Victoria School were Her Majesty’s Commissioners. The head commissioner is an ex-officio post held by the Secretary of State for Scotland.

“I wrote to my MP, the late Rachel Squire and asked her to ask the then Secretary of State, Mrs Helen Liddell (Baroness Liddell of Coatdyke), if she was aware of any group such as the ‘Friends of QVS.’ ... My MP would not take on my concerns and suggested I contact the Secretary of State directly. I replied to my MP stressing the seriousness of the allegations and copied the letter to the then Secretary of State, Mrs Helen Liddell. By a return e-mail I was told by Mrs Liddell that ... the matters I had raised “are devolved to the Scottish Parliament” and my letter had been forwarded to my MSP Scott Barrie!

“I responded to the Secretary of State’s ‘palming-off’ of my enquiry to my Member of Scottish Parliament by pointing out that she could not shirk her responsibilities as a Chief of Her Majesty’s Commissioners, which were invested in her by Royal Warrant...

“Minogue was then told that he should write to the Chief Executive/Headmaster of QVS.” What nonsense.

Minogue did not get any satisfaction, and found those officials to be unaware that Hansard (i.e., official record of Parliament’s business) had contained information about the Housemaster’s complaints. So Minogue widened his search, this time writing to the headmaster of the school for the years 1989-1991 and all the then commissioners. He also wrote to Lord Cullen (ahem) and Lord Robertson (ahem, ahem) who had been **visitors to the school**.

Minogue then used the Internet to search the Dunblane Inquiry and found that three persons had said under oath that they knew of a Hamilton connection to the school:

Grace Jones Ogilvie, a neighbour of Hamilton, said she knew of him taking his boys' clubs camping at Loch Lomond and at the QVS. Ian Steven Boal said that his friend Hamilton had got him a job at a QVS summer camp. Robert Mark Ure who lived across the street from Hamilton said his estranged wife had been at the firing range at QVS with her friend Hamilton.

Did Minogue get anywhere with the Ombudsman? No because the police are one of the exclusions from the list of offices that ombudsmen can investigate. Minogue did find in 1993 Hansard that the Chief Inspector of Schools had carried out an inspection, and that it was discussed in Scottish newspapers in 1992 – only the matter of bullying, not abuse, and nothing about the letter Glenn had sent to parents.

Lord Burton

Most interestingly, Minogue was contacted by Burton:

“Lord Burton knew of my contact with The Housemaster and we had an exchange of views. I found him to be a pleasant, and I believe a decent man, but he was over-keen to protect his organisation and **blamed the Speculative Society clique in the judiciary**, and the police for a cover up ‘at the highest level’ of the Dunblane tragedy. He told me that a Scots Tory Law Lord and member of the Speculative Society had pounded his fist on his desk in the House of Lords to emphasise that he [Burton] should let the matter [of the Dunblane massacre] drop.” [Emphasis added]

Getting the downlow about the QVS from Minogue's article has been quite a shock. My late adored husband George grew

up near Dunblane and graduated Edinburgh. All the folks I've met through him are morally solid. I thought Scots had cornered the market on decency – and that, like Bobbie Burns, they scoffed at toffs.

Tim Minogue has now published a list of the Speculative Society's members. Whew! Many judges. What do they think they are doing? All guilty of *obstruction of justice* regarding a serious crime. William Scott, a concerned citizen of Dunblane, found that that there was **no statute authorizing Lord Cullen's 100 sealing of records**.

Wait a minute. *Why* did Lord Cullen and his mates cover up the massacre? In order to keep pedophilia hush hush? Well yes, but it's much worse than that. I speculate (pardon the pun) that the massacre was group-planned. Some people somehow thought it good to send sixteen darling children to their graves.

Note: Cullen "made his name" by running the Lockerbie case. He also ran a 5-year investigation of the North Sea oil spill known as Piper Alpha. I'll bet both were frauds. I see that Lord Robertson has sued *The Sunday Herald* over the fact that a commenter indicated Robertson was responsible for the Dunblane massacre. The newspaper [insider?] paid an out of court settlement of 25K pounds.

The Guardian wrote: "The case in 2004 forced internet publishers to re-double their efforts to ensure internet users posting on their message boards do not libel people." Nonsense. Citizens must look around for murderers and they need to debate it. By the way, Robertson was a Labor MP. In 1999, having been UK Defense Secretary for 2 years, was made a peer. Then he became NATO secretary general from 1999 to 2001. On retiring, he went to work for a defense contractor.

Toffs Did It

I believe that Thomas Hamilton was not the killer. He had no reason to cause his own death like that. Someone else did everything and threw Hamilton's body onto the gym floor. You can see the trickiness of the case at various websites, and in Sandra Uttley's book.

I say the persons who do the cover-up are the guilty parties. As stated in a law maxim: *contra spoliatorem, omnia praesumuntur*. "Against the one who destroys evidence, all things can be presumed."

In fact, denying that there is such a group as "friends of the QVS" is a clear sign of guilt that the friends do bad things. If they are doing good, wouldn't they want to boast about it? Or at least take a modest bow?

It's Clinic Time

Can we please stop saying that various patsy-terrorists are nuts and use basic diagnostic skills to see who is really sick? How sick is the mass murder of children?

I don't have much hope of getting upper-class child-killers into Broadmoor (or in America, Bellevue, or in Adelaide, Glenside). But they *can* be forcibly sent to a clinic. This is called "sectioning," after a section of the law that allows the freedom of the mentally ill to be curtailed, legally.

I propose a new clinic. Toff's Clinic. This is not a joke. Either they should be in prison as murderers, or, if they qualify for diminished responsibility, then in hospital.

27. Adelaide Fringe: Dee Quizzes Dr Richard Day



Every February and March Adelaide hosts Fringe performances

Note: This is fiction from Mary W Maxwell's 20019 Fringe play entitled "Crikey! Adelaide Conspiracy Theories," March 17, 2019:

Dee: Dr Day, it's good of you to be interviewed for Gumshoe News. I want to go over some of your famous work from 1969. You see at this moment in Australia, exactly fifty years later, we are having quite the *family* problem. You had predicted a break-up of the family as being a *good thing* for society.

Dr Day: [very stiff] I said it would restrain population growth.

Dee: But now it has come to an extreme. It's almost as though the people who were told to make it happen, which I understand were Rockefeller's people, went way too far. There is now a scheme of child-stealing, not by your basic weirdo's or criminals but by *judges*.

Dr Day: I think I know what you are going to say. These people turn the tables and accuse the *mother* instead. The next thing you know the kid is sent to a foster home.

Dee: Right. So ---- the planning must have been *prior to* 1969.

Dr Day: Yes, we did arrange it.

Dee: I noticed that Dr Lawrence Dunegan, the guy who publicized your speech after mulling it over for 19 years, was already your critic before he even left the medical dinner where you gave your speech that night. He disap-proved of your prediction that men would be sent to jobs far away, and this would lead to an increase in divorce. Dunegan used the word *diabolical* for that.

Dr Day: It wasn't diabolical. It was being business-like.

Dee: That's why I am here. How far can "*businesslike*" go when it comes to the entire set of human relations. My beef is about the judges. You said a child would be sent to foster care. It's the *judge* that signs the order for that. But, once you have so corrupted a judge to get him to do *that*, you have no prospect of the judiciary being decent in *any* matter. Justice is going down the gurgler.

Dr Day: Are you saying this is too high a price to pay for *population* control?

Dee: I'm thinking Bible. What does it profit a man if he gain everything he sets out to gain – in your case "planned parenthood," so-called – but loseth his soul. I mean the soul of society in general, what we used to call *humanity*. No decent judge, no justice. No justice, law of the jungle. Who can survive in that setting?

Dr Day: Hopefully the *strong* can survive.

Dee: How could you be so foolish? The strong cannot survive. No one could endure the law of the jungle today. In some past era, we lived in a real jungle. Each adult could scrounge for their own food. Fruits in the tree, fish in the

river. But in a big city, food arrives in supermarkets from far away. There will be no food *at all*. And we're all dependent on public works, such as the water supply. It is necessary that we have a government, one that enforces justice.

Dr Day: I'm willing to entertain the idea that we "overdid" our planning.

Dee: Thank you. It's a relief to hear you say that. In fact many people like the bit in your 1969 speech where you said "People don't ask the right questions...."

Dr Day: If I recall correctly – but it was 50 years ago – the thing I was referring to was people's willingness to accept wrong information even when it's *illogical* on the *face* of it.

Dee: A funny thing, those medical students in your audience prove that point. *They* took what you said as acceptable – just because *you* said it. Even when you told them that the cure for cancer was under lock and key at the Rockefeller Institute, nobody threw a shoe at you. Did anyone even clear their throat?

Dr Day: We had put a little something in their wine. [pause] Still, it was an experiment, and we took a chance.

Dee: But in the long run, your speech *did* reach us. People are using it to over-come "Rockefeller-ism." You see, Dr Day, the race is not always to the swift.

Dr Day: Nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet *riches* to men of understanding, nor yet favour to men of skill -- *but time* and *chance* happeneth to them all.

Dee: Good heavens. I see you didn't spend a lot of time at punishment parade.

Dr Day: What is punishment parade?

Dee: I was in the South African army and on Sunday mornings those who chose to skip church services had to spend the time marching. Oh and that reminds me, Dr Lawrence Dunegan was taken aback by your remark that night, that not only was the Church going to *collapse* but the clergy would *help* make this happen.

Dr Day: It's obvious now that they did so.

Dee: The way it worked – and I imagine you did not specifically foresee this, is that large numbers of Catholic priests got outed for molesting children.

Dr Day: I *did* know about that.

Dee [suddenly angry, bangs on desk]: *How dare you!* How dare you, fifty years ago, on some kind of putrid mission for your employer, decide that it was OK to wreck the life of a child before he or she had a chance to grow up?

Dr Day: [closes his eyes and sighs] I suppose I was brainwashed.

Dee: Well, then, you'd better *un*-brainwash yourself. [yelling] You'd better figure out which of your mission-accomplished colleagues are as un-happy as you are and *do something* to turn this around.

Dr Day: [shyly] What do you recommend?

Dee: [yelling] What do *I* recommend. What do *you* recommend.

Dr Day: My son and grandson are not too thrilled with me. I will ask them what *they* recommend.

Dee: [calms down] Just asking could heal a rift in the family.

Dr Day: Rift in the family isn't the *word* for it. I'm an *ass*. They know it. I couldn't see it. How many people have I hurt. [looks distressed] Seven or eight at least. Maybe more.

Dee: Try a *million*, maybe a hundred million?

Dr Day: This is horrible. I feel sick. I am going to throw up. I should never have done it.

What craziness this *all is*. How could it have happened? How could anyone get it so *wrong*. [whispering] What ever happened to my conscience.

[he gets up and starts to pace around] My stupid conscience. [Pause] If I could live my life *over* again. [Pause] It's unbelievable what we did.

How can we make up for destroying the ocean. Was it even possible to destroy an ocean? Yes we did it *deliberately*. [screaming] We did all kinds of stuff secretly. You know why? Because we could get away with it.

We thought it was funny. [Pause, starting to cry]

It's our fault. It's my fault. Mea culpa. Mea [expletive] culpa. Mea [expletive *expletive*] culpa.

28. Fiona Barnett: Let Them Dob Each Other In



Bathurst Courthouse, near Bathurst City Hall

Fiona Barnett's website, Pedophilesdownunder.com, is the most amazing document that has ever appeared in Australia. Fiona Barnett has indeed explained (to my satisfaction anyway) why the life of this country has seemed *hampere*d for many years. She claims that politics, law, medicine, science, government, police, and academia have been run by a coterie of Luciferians.

Seize the Moment

I want to show how we can seize the moment. At times in the past, a red-hot confession, or a red-hot catching someone in flagrante delicto, has raised hopes that someone – police? courts? media? — will rush in and “justice will prevail.”

But many past revelations that seemed hot soon faded away. The bad guys, not justice, prevailed. I'm sure that this time the enormous wrongs aired by Fiona Barnett can never fade entirely, but on the other hand, if action does not start soon the fabulous momentum will be lost.

Fiona, and others, have told of child-murders that were watched by upper-level persons AS A FORM OF ENTERTAINMENT. You can't really beat that as a crime, can you?

I now suggest a way to seize the moment. We won't be depending on any government office or famous helper organizations, and anyway they may be infiltrated to such an extent that they are effectively immobilized.

Rather, this innovative way calls on the criminals, both big and small, to do each other in. Probably the best way for them to seek clemency is to tell us what they know.

I offer a double formula – a questionnaire and a kind of prosecution that I call a “flypaper prosecution.”

The Questionnaire

I envision a voluntary reporting system, via a questionnaire. Naturally there will be an implication that volunteering one's report is safer than waiting to be listed as a person who would not volunteer. The non-co-operators will automatically appear suspicious.

Start with doctors. Every doctor in Australia either does know, or doesn't know, that crimes are being committed against children by members of pedophile rings.

It does not matter here if the doctor has encountered an actual case of child sexual abuse in his practice. The question is: Is he aware of such goings on, and if so, to what extent.

For doctors there would also have to be a question: Do you know that some Australian hospitals carried out the CIA's MK-Ultra subprojects, which entailed messing up children's

minds? And, do you know that children who get wounded by pedophiles go to particular doctors who would not dream of reporting the child's injury to police?

Since Ms Barnett says the ranks to worry about are: cops, military brass, academics, psychologists, physicians, and child protection workers, the questionnaire will go to them. For my prejudices, I will add: lawyers, judges, and media personnel.

As stated earlier, we hope people will answer the questionnaire voluntarily. This uniformity will also make it easier to code the answers. They may submit it without the formality of a sworn signature. Anyone wanting to show extra goodwill can have the whole form rendered as a Statutory Declaration.

The form contains names and events supplied by Fiona Barnett. They will be listed down the left column. Then in the middle section the person can tick one of three boxes, indicating that he was unaware of it, or was slightly aware, or was very aware.

Pretend for a moment that this is England. You are asked to say if you have heard of any allegations against Jimmy Savile. You are not being asked to trot out your personal knowledge of wrongdoing by him (at least not thus far on the questionnaire).

The form will then say "If you ticked 'slightly aware' or 'very aware,' please provide the **date** of your knowledge and the **source**. You only need to say *MSM* if mainstream media is your source, or *Net* if Internet. If it's a personal knowledge source, please describe."

The Names

Fiona's August 2, 2018 statement includes names of person she accuses of having participated in crimes against herself or other children. As many are deceased I can safely name them here. For living persons, there is a matter of being sued for libel. We will get to that later.

The questionnaire could ask if the person knew of any of these criminal allegations before they were sprung by Fiona Barnett in recent years.

The deceased persons are:

Kim **Beazley**, Sr, Education Minister, Gough **Whitlam**, a Prime Minister, Lionel **Murphy**, an attorney-general,

John **Kerr**, a Governor-General, Richard **Nixon**, a US president, Billy **Graham**, an evangelist, Leon **Petrauskas**, a doctor, Patricia Ann **Conlon**, a scholar, Antony **Kidman**, a psychologist, Neville **Wran**, a NSW premier,

John **Avery**, a police commissioner Richie **Benaud**, a cricket captain, Victor **Chang**, a heart surgeon, Harry **Bailey**, a doctor, John **Gittinger**, a psychologist.

Barnett also lists Michael Aquino, a US Army colonel, but everybody and his cousin knows about that accusation, since Aquino was talked about during the McMartin Pre-school scandal in the US in the 1990s. (The media referred to that scandal as a case of "satanic panic," in order to cover it up.)

It will be interesting to see how many voluntary respondents to the questionnaire admit to knowing of the (alleged) sexual exploits of children by famous "leaders."

The Events

Just to name four events that Fiona has mentioned, that could be listed on the questionnaire for people to say whether they have knowledge of it:

1. The satanic exercise, and orgy, that occurred in 1985 at Bathurst City Hall, with beheadings.
2. The participation of persons in Delta training for Special Operations (Fiona was such a participant), involving the use of remote viewing.
3. The applying of cattle prods to children in the basement of Holsworthy Army Base.
4. The Luciferian ceremony in the Great Hall of Sydney University.

Let's say no one bothers to reply to the questionnaire. Is there a way to force people to tell what they know? Yes, definitely, you can be subpoena'd as a witness in a criminal trial or in a civil lawsuit. In either, if you are subpoena'd you must answer questions asked (or you may be cited for contempt of court and jailed until you sing).

During the 2013-17 Royal Commissions Child Abuse, and a 1995 state RC in New South Wales, The Wood Royal Commission, there was ample opportunity for the commissioners to subpoena persons who were thought to be running pedophile rings. Yet this did not happen. That opportunity having been squandered, we could get a court case going. To be quite correct **there is such a thing as private prosecution** also, but they are rare.

Is Fiona lying about the beheadings? Let a jury decide!

29. Really, Who's in Charge Here?



QEII at coronation, 1953 *Mary, Tuscaloosa, July 4th 2017*

Let's say Mary had won the Senate seat she was campaign-ing for in the above photo. Call me "Senator Maxwell." I ask: Which of the two gals above has more authority, and why? Go on, please figure it out. I'll tell you my opinion on this later, but please cast your vote now.

[Long pause.....]

Morality Type Thing

There is a difference between right and wrong. How does a human being know when something is right or wrong? He just knows, that's how. Elementary, my dear Watson.

This penultimate chapter attempts to show how you can identify the moral high ground. I will also drag socio-biology into the discussion, seeking to discover what's in the DNA – and what is *therefore* in culture.

This has been a sad book, has it not? The grief of the children and the mums and dads is one thing. The destabilization of the whole population by the presence of lawlessness in government is another. We need to get a grip.

First I'll make the case that morality is in charge, and then the case that selfishness wins out in an emergency.

Consider a wolf pack. The wolves are "moral," if by that we mean they exercise restraint of their selfish desires. It's often in their selfish interest to be unselfish. By hunting in a pack, they can better trap large prey and get a good dinner, compared to foraging for rodents or whatever.

Normally an individual can't calculate his "enlightened self-interest" on the spot, so it is better to behave on all occasions with discipline. Wolves don't even have to do that calculation, as they are wired to act cooperatively.

And thus you may say wolves aren't really moral. Same with honeybees that labor for the good of the hive. A bee couldn't go rogue even if she wanted to (as far as I know).

Humans are 'moral' insofar as they can *choose* to be more selfish or less selfish. They also *feel* moral as the decision to do good for someone has emotional accompaniments.

Society Is the Boss

A newborn human gets to be moral by a combination of what he was born with -- the proverbial DNA -- and what he picks up from culture. DNA's contribution to morality is partly based on the innate trait of **altruism** (we love to help out), and partly based on the innate trait of **obedience**. We want rules. We crave rules. Obeying, or conforming, is much easier than trying to beat a new path.

Moreover, we are wired to enforce the rules on others. Not only do you get distressed if someone wrongs you, you get distressed if you see a person being wronged. You may lower the boom on that wrongdoer. And you worry about a boom being lowered on you if you deviate from “protocol.”

The content of protocols is very flexible. What is expected of you may differ according to your relationship to the ones you are dealing with. Even in simple societies you must respect the elders and be helpful to the young. Helping the young has a clear biological mandate, a cat helps her own kittens; a lioness helps hers and others’.

I can’t account for the motivation of respect for elders. It seems to be universal; maybe it is based on the bond to one’s parents. Could culture change that by saying “From now on you should shift Ma and Pa out of the house”? Hmm. I think someone is trying to do that now.

If it succeeds, it shows the payoff between our moral instinct and our instinct to obey the cultural norm. Both are strong pulls. Which will win?

Now let’s account for our deference to Her Majesty. I believe it is the same as deference to God. (But I believe deference to God comes from the instinct to be deferential to the group, to society. I assume the worship of anyone much higher up than oneself is an innate trait.)

At her coronation ceremony, the present queen of Great Britain was given the same insignias of office as her ancestors were given, in conjunction with justifying the legitimacy of her headship. The Archbishop of Canterbury (per Henry VIII’s church/state relationship) handed her a scepter, a sword, a rod with a dove, and the orb.

Hear our prayers, O Lord, we beseech thee, and so direct and support thy servant Queen ELIZABETH, that she may not bear the Sword in vain; but may use it as the minister of God **for the terror and punishment of evildoers**, and for the protection and encouragement of those that do well....

The ... Archbishop shall deliver the Sceptre with the Cross into the Queen's right hand, saying: Receive the Royal Sceptre, the ensign of kingly power and justice.

And then he shall deliver the Rod with the Dove into the Queen's left hand, and say: Receive the Rod of equity and mercy. Be so merciful that you be not too remiss, so execute justice that you forget not mercy. Punish the wicked, **protect and cherish the just, and lead your people in the way wherein they should go.**

The Dean of Westminster shall bring the Crown, and the Archbishop shall solemnly bless her: The Lord bless you and keep you. The Lord give you **faithful Parliaments** and quiet Realms; ... wise counsellors and upright magistrates; leaders of integrity in learning and labour; a devout, learned and useful clergy; honest peaceable and dutiful citizens. *Amen.*
[Emphasis added]

When the queen-to-be had entered the abbey, before being crowned, she had first to be accepted by the people. Walking to each of the four corners, the people who were present acclaimed their recognition. Moreover, Elizabeth had to hold the Bible and promise to be faithful to it.

I'm not trying to give a history of the monarchy, but a history of us. We are willing to obey someone who has a credible likeness to a head of family. I think the human innately knows that the head of his family is trustworthy, as that person's motives would be to care for the group. In the case of a whole realm, the queen promises (she actually uses the word *promise* in the ceremony) to stand for the agreed upon values, as symbolized by the Bible.

The Queen and the Senator

How did you go, on deciding if Mary or Liz has more authority? I believe the queen has vast authority, in that she has the authority of God, which, I say again, is the authority of Society. Of course that means we gave her that authority.

Although the coronation ceremony is all about Her being God's man on the spot, there is our species gene pool underlying that. Per human DNA, we feel good with our group. Also we are delighted to honor the chief honcho – the person who will protect us.

The prayers and hymns give us a feel of being near the Divinity, but for atheists it feels just as good, because it's the same emotion either way.

Homo sapiens has to have a boss. We did not evolve to live in populations greater than perhaps a few hundred souls. So adjustments have had to be made. Still, the core of our social instincts has not changed.

When you look at animal societies (most mammals and some bird species are social), you see that they do the same thing generation after generation. In primates each species differs. The male baboon lives with a harem of female and dominates them. Chimpanzees live in mothers-with-offspring groups; the males float around.

Human social structure stays the same, too. It involves pair-bonding of a male and female and clan-building. Two forces that modify the social structure are availability of food in the environment and huge increases in group size. Before the Year 1900 there were fewer than 2 billion humans. Now the number is higher than 7 billion.

At a low technological level, the man who emerges as chief of the group will usually work for the good of all --there aren't any rewards to lure him into "corruption." Maybe an ego trip here and there but so what.

Once the plow was invented, and agriculture brought about specialization of labor, it was no longer the case that every member of the group had mutual interests. At that point, some individuals may have sought power over a number of others in order to get what was gettable.

When the group is very large, it is inevitable that folks won't care too much about the welfare of all. Their selfish drive makes everyone do what is best for themselves.

I have claimed above that the innate trait, in the DNA, is for us to accept a boss and to revere him as the one who works for us all. Thus if the leaders are no longer working for us we still react deferentially toward them! We shouldn't but we do. Old habits die hard.

Who's Really in Charge Here?

The question being pursued in the chapter is "Who's really in charge here?" Earlier chapters have laid out some terrible things. Just imagine the malice that had to go into the planning of the deliberate breaking up of the family. The ridiculousness of it is becoming apparent.

My point in showing the photo of Her Majesty has nothing to do with the monarch's constitutional role in Australia. I was using the example of a leader or boss whom people naturally revere. We also revere judges and that is part of the problem at the moment – it is hard to swallow that they may be acting maliciously or even simply for selfish pursuits.

I, who managed to get a PhD in Politics, have a hard time figuring out who is in charge. I guess no one is in charge.

Don Rufty, a journalist, said he was able to get the judicial child-stealing racket stopped in North Carolina merely by popular pressure. He says “the court of public opinion is the highest court in the land.” (Please read Rufty in Appendix C.)

I think that is important and I imagine a coordinated pressure in Australia would be able to succeed.

Generally, we almost completely lack ways to “join up” in regard to any issue if there is a powerful group wanting something different. Consider the widespread disapproval of GMO foods (from genetically modified seeds). Nobody welcomes it, yet here it comes.

Remember the picture of me in the Fourth of July costume? If I had made it into the Senate, I’d have been only one voice among 100. If you’ve had personal experience with calling your MP, you will be aware that politicians seem to be almost in a trance today. “Nobody home” is what you get, just like when you phone a bank.

Maybe the baddies described in this book – the ones who harm Protective parents, are like that too. Cops, social workers, psychologists, and my nemesis, the judges, are just not behaving like normal, warm human beings.

I have come to believe the public is NOT “in denial,” as is claimed. They may *seem* to be in denial or are “dissociating from reality.” But this is their real reality. People *do* accept the power structure! They accept that the media is screwing us all the time and that hidden rulers will prevail even if their plans go blatantly against our values. Maybe this acceptance is because good people can’t *coalesce*.

Let's seize the moment. The Protective parent affair is crystal clear. The mother-child bond is the most basic one in any mammal species for the simple reason that mother mammals all give milk. It is almost hilarious that the bad guys think they can get away with what they're doing.

(I pause to say that the bad guys are mostly female. Many judges are male but a fair number are female. Most of the offending social workers and psychologists are female. So are the cops! Talk about strange!)

I say *don't give up*. Dee McLachlan and I have found at Gumshoe News that the bad guys work hard at intimidating us. Mostly it's pathetic to see the shenanigans they go through. While it's true that they have killed some whistle blowers, their threats are mainly bluff. They need to be stared down.

They hope to get you to quit out of discouragement. They play at your nerves every which way. There is probably an operator's manual somewhere with all the instructions.

Trust me, they are not going to prevail. Many of them have already figured this out. Life was a breeze for them whilst we were separated from one another. But we are now sharing all the data.

For my taste the most important data to share is about the strength of society -- as enshrined in law. Our ancestors knew what they were doing. The criminal law makes sense.

It would be smart to use it.

30. Conclusion



Exodus 2:3 But when she could no longer hide him, she got him a papyrus basket and coated it with tar and pitch. Then she placed the child in the basket and set it among the reeds along the bank of the Nile.

So here we are in 21st century Australia with hundreds of Protective parents needing to “do a Moses.” But the banks of the River Murray will not suffice to hide a child. The surveillance systems will track it down. Police or social workers will go after the Protector – and take custody of the youngster!

Recap of Part One: “Legal” Kidnap Is Illegal

The 15 chapters of Part One presented “the situation.” I’m not one for florid prose, so I fear I understated what the government is really doing to people. Initially the intended audience for this book was aggrieved parents -- they don’t need to have the situation described.

Let me cite again the two instances of arrest. One was the grandmother who came back to Australia from overseas and was grabbed by the Fixated Persons Investigation Unit, the all-new FPIU. Her crime was being concerned about her daughter, whose abusive husband has custody of the kid.

They had to pin a false crime on her, the Grandma, in order to rough her up at the airport. It's so disgusting.

The other arrest involves Dr Pridgeon along with other adults who perform safe-haven services. Operation Noetic was given plenty of media coverage. I thus assume it's all part of a foreign-based plan to change our cops into thugs to create a military-like atmosphere in Australia.

Both episodes -- Grandma's and Dr Russell's -- send a message to persons who are kicking up a fuss about injustice. I am one such fuss-kicker-upper and I'm now wondering what my punishment is going to be.

Why is Andrew McIntyre interviewed in this book? He is not directly related to the Protective parent problem. But he holds a key, or two, to the very powerful pedo-ring in Adelaide. His father was massively shielded from arrest despite his (Max's) having killed the Beaumont children.

Now why do you think the police remained unwilling to arrest Max, and why did all politicians shy away from replying to the letters sent by Andrew's sister Rachel? Allow me to state again my hunch about pedophile rings. I don't think they arise out of a band of adults who want to have sex with children. Frankly I do not even think "sex" is the focus of such groups. My guess, and it can only be a guess, is that they are one of the many groups employed by ... um ... I'll say "world rulers."

There isn't room in this book for me to persuade anyone about those rulers. I think their hidden hand is not so hidden when you put two and two together with regard to judicial kidnap. Clearly they reign above our justices, including High Court Justices. While we have been looking only at one court,

the Family Court, it could be true of all courts: they are bossed, thus are corrupt.

Many people use the word “corrupt” to refer to bribe-taking or feathering one’s nest. I don’t mean that. I mean a court can’t carry out the Law if it is taking directions from an entity outside the law. Surely there is interference happening. Our recent Royal Commission was the best ever but the hidden hand could be detected.

Justice Peter McClellan seems a genuinely honest man, but he shied away from the topic of pedo rings during his four years as head of the RC. It was very much in his bailiwick to deal with it, yet when Protective parents told their awful stories to the RC they were turned away!

That has got to mean that someone twisted his arm. It is odd those women were turned away. The first day I showed up at an RC hearing (just as a stickybeak), a nice staffer offered to sit with me for support. That’s how they treated visitors (who may have been bashful victims). One visitor *was* a victim and he had to have *two* staffers, one sitting on each side of him. I later heard they figured he might be planning to whack the abuser in the witness box.

Now to the short chapter about Ms Rilak. She has done a brilliant job – you must read the rest of her transcript in Appendix G. (It appears that the judges are shameless, despite it all being recorded!) Always with an eye on the main chance – getting her child back – she ransacks legal principles and procedures, even mandamus and recusal.

The Family Court Survey conducted by Dee McLachlan is a high point in the campaign to stop this tragedy. So far this book discussed only a few items from the survey but the rest awaits you in Appendix H. My favorite item in the Survey is

the statistic of who believed the child. Doctors believed but “Independent Children’s Lawyers” did not. You may think “They’re specially trained – they can read the kid’s body language.” Sorry, they don’t even meet the child!

Back now to the chestnuts: parental alienation, coaching, and the Parent Responsibility Contract. Unpleasant surprises await any disabled child’s parent who signs it. I think it’s highly likely that the PAS and the Parent Responsibility contract were *devised* for the purpose of state kidnap of children.

We looked at the claim that *money is a driving force*, such as regarding the million-dollar babies. The money may have to do with the “sale value” of a child, but it can also be an internal dynamic within the child-protection industry. The million dollars turns into income for *the doctors, the lawyers, the social workers, administrators, and the courts*.

I should point out that if sex-trafficking really is going on, and **if there are good people in the aforementioned professions** who see it and oppose it, their big barrier to opposing it is fear of losing their livelihood. Recall the walk-through of a Congressional hearing. I found the tone of voice so weird, as if the participants were in a trance. Most were from the bureaucracies that need federal funding to exist.

I rest my case. I say there is a real criminal gang in Oz and they have put their minions into all the relevant positions. And that includes the all-important position known as the Bench. The judges who are participating, whether out of fear, or bribery, or a need to kowtow, are killing the law. They are removing that great thing we all need – justice.

Why would they abjure their birthright? Why are they killing the nation that they themselves need to live in? I honestly wonder if they are mesmerized. I feel sad for them.

Recap of Part Two: Operation Clean-up

Part Two started off with a chapter on confessions by the perps, potential amnesties for those who confess, and negotiation. I next tried to inventory things that the now-desperate Protective parents can do. From my back-ground as author of *Prosecution for Treason* (2011) it was easy to make a list: legislate, prosecute, sue, and impeach.

In Australia the term *impeachment* is not used so I entitled the relevant chapter “How To Remove a judge.” Granted, that chapter had a photo of a paddy wagon with an open door, hinting that a judge might be arrested rather than impeached. And of course it is true that any judge who commits a crime is just as arrestable as a car thief, but it’s also good to know where we stand constitutionally.

Parliament can ask the Governor-General to “amove.” Today that would be ex-Army General Peter Cosgrove. I imagine (but I did not check) that each state constitution also provides for the removal of a bad judge.

As to suggestions on how to legislate, Chapter17 offered a bill to assure that Holsworthy Army Base is investigated in respect of Fiona Barnett’s claims. Granted it was a bit fanciful with two “panels” having to operate but so what. I also recommended that Parliament repeal the ludicrous Act that created the Office – Director of Prosecutions. It would be easy to do. It could be done in one afternoon.

Suggestions for suing consisted mainly of bringing the civil action known as torts, to get an award of damages. My selfish interest here is not to help Protective parents win compo, but to let them access the court’s service of subpoena so we all find out who is behind this wretched stuff. (Injunctions may help, too, and mandamus, but I neglected that area of law.)

The age-old maxims were taken out for an aring. I confessed to my lack of knowledge of the court of Equity, but hope it gets revived. It may be just the ticket.

Prosecutions? It was lovely to hear Justice McClellan reprimand the ODPP. I believe the state attorneys general are also at fault for not elbowing in. At least in South Australia the law says that *the AG has final control* over the DPP – though we know it isn't done that way.

The chapter on accessory before and after the fact, plus the chapter on punishable crimes of the judge's helpers, should give pause to a few misguided cops, psychologists, lawyers, social workers and journalists. They should not have to wait till they meet St Peter to get their deserts.

Dunblane was discussed with an eye to blaming the toffs. Then, a scene from my 2019 Adelaide Fringe show opened a can of worms – Dr Richard Day's 50-year-old predictions.

Wistfully perhaps, Chapter 28 said that when the Bathurst prosecutions begin, or even before that, there will be some frenzied dobbing. Chapter 29 compared "Senator Maxwell" to the monarch, unfavorably. Chapter 19 made up a citizens' covenant of rights, saying that you need to do deals with compatriots, however you may.

Which brings us back to the idea of a Truth Commission. Please think of ways to invite the guilty to confess. Every human knows that it's good to unburden oneself of guilt.

Thank you for reading this. Please be strong. Please honor only those officials who deserve it. Please side with the Protective parents resolutely.

Don't let the children down. You were once a child.

WELCOME TO THE APPENDICES

A. Petition at Change.org to Terminate the Family Court	202
B. Questions for Dame Marie Bashir	208



*(L) Chancellor Dame Marie Bashir,
with (R) Governor-General Quentin Bryce*

C. Don Rufty, Protective Dad and Newspaper Owner	210
D. Affidavit by Imprisoned FBI Agent Richard Taus	212




Taus in Viet Nam

E. El Presidente Sees the Light	213
F. Letter to SA Attorney-General Vickie Chapman	214



Vickie at Glenside

G. Ms Rilak Tells Judge about the PAS and Corruption	215
H. Dee McLachlan's Family Court Survey	221



Dee in interview with Justice Michael Kirby

Appendix A. Petition To Terminate the Family Court

35,000 people have signed this at Change.org, as of February 2019, entitled “Australia’s Family Court Judges Create a Smoke-screen to Conceal Horrific Facts From Public.” It asks for a new Royal Commission and an end to Family Court. The author is apparently “Jack and Jill Sanders” (I slightly abridged it -- MM)
.....

Family Court Judges of Australia are protected by “No Judicial Oversight” coupled with a heinous Section 121 (Gag Law) that prohibits any reporting of Family Court Cases by victims or the media. To this, add their total protection against prosecution. When you consider:

-- that the only criteria for these judges to be appointed by the Attorney General of Australia is for them to have been a Family Court Lawyer/Barrister and...

-- that no one knows who these people are and -- that there are no personal or character tests that they must pass and -- that their appointment process, like the Family Courts, is SECRET...

It should send shivers up your spine. And shivers it does send up victims of Family Courts’ spines but no one else ever finds out. They are a “Protected Species.” They are sitting pretty! The most powerful individuals with NO OVERSIGHT and a “Law” that gags their victims, a law unto themselves. There is no one in Australia that enjoys such dangerous protection against prosecution and scrutiny.

Even a mild suggestion of their impropriety, will end up destroying you. How? Well! They say the only way to question a Family Court judge is thru the “Appeal” process.

And one can only question the Orders made by the Judge and not his conduct.... This Appeal must be before one other Family Court Judge or three other Family Court Judges (Full

Court). If you are lucky to get through to the gruesome Appeal process, and have demonstrated impropriety of a Family Court Judge, you would be waiting more than two years for your Appeal to be heard.

The Orders that you are Appealing must go before the same judge in order for him or her to put a “Stay” on them while you are waiting for the Appeal. If the Judge finds out that your Appeal will be successful and he or she ...then the Judge will not put a “Stay” on his or her Orders!

The Judge will tell you: “If you don’t like it... you can Appeal my Non-Stay Orders.” While you are chasing your own tail trying to Appeal the non-stay Orders, the Orders are in place and you still have to wait 2 years

While waiting for Hearings your life will unravel before your eyes and the Judges KNOW this. They all know this and they protect themselves and assist with the torture until either you give up and kill yourself and your children or you go crazy. THIS is BY DESIGN. Unless these Courts are investigated before a Public Court their crimes against innocent parents and children will not be exposed.

Because they are sitting pretty, the entire machinery of these unconstitutional entities called Family Courts, come to the rescue of ... not the victims ... but the Family Court Judges demonstrated to have committed judicial crime. What are the chances that an individual can fight this most heinous, corrupt, tyrannical system? _Zilch! _Zero! _None!

After decades of abuse of power and injustice, enough evidence had reached the politicians, (in particular Turnbull, Brandis, Porter, Scomo) of entities calling [for] a Royal Commission.

They knew that this will cost (in compensation to victims of an abusive and tyrannical organisation) the government billions of

dollars and so many judges must be prosecuted and disrobed, lawyers must be jailed, Report Writers must be prosecuted and put in jail for knowingly engaging in criminal conduct against vulnerable innocent people.

Not to mention all politicians that over decades concealed and covered up these crimes and allowed the injustices to continue while THEY ALL KNEW.... Vast majority of politicians are lawyers. They all knew and know that Family Courts ... must be shut down. First year law students know Family Courts are unconstitutional.

So the politicians went into “drag it as long as possible,” “do f..k all and pretend you are doing something,” “call for Enquiries,” “Wait for Reports of Enquiries” [etc]. Finally, every judge and lawyer was saying THIS MESS needs a Royal Commission...

So Attorney General, Mr Porter came up with the disingenuous suggestion of amalgamating Family Courts with another Court!! When he first said this, the Judges of other Courts said they will fight this as it will put their courts in disrepute to be associated with Family Courts. They said they will not risk putting their courts' good reputation at risk. But Mr Porter went ahead. WHY?

Because when the MESS is so overwhelmingly BAD, a lawyer would think by watering it down he can fix it. Mr Porter thought that by injecting a different group of people into Family Courts, he can reduce the stench.

The Family Court Judges Union retaliated. They didn't want other judges in their comfortable cushioned chambers. What if one or some of these judges SPOKE OUT? They cannot be gagged like the victims of Family Court. What if there was one decent judge who said wait a minute! You let people lie and you let cases drag for years, and you don't report pedophiles to

the police, you let [al] go unnoticed as long as the crims pay the lawyers you know??

And this began to happen! The Attorney General put different Judges to Hear the Appeals! And the Family Court Judges hit the roof! They said these judges DONT know the Complicated Family Law Act and should not Hear Family Court matters! Complicated? People with no legal training can read the few pages of Family Law Act and understand it.

Plus as Judge Judy said in her interview with Norm Macdonald, “Family Court Judges are Morons and Political Hacks.” They are not the brightest of lawyers in fact if not for Family Courts they will not be able to practice long enough before being caught for their incompetence.

On 18 February 2019, there was a surprising report on a Family Court Judgement in the Australian media that is always gagged.

But not this time!

Who from the Family Court Judiciary leaked to the media and said it is OK to report on this case?

It sounded amazing!! The Full Court of Appeal was throwing dirt on a Judge?? Oh wait! This judge (Judge Vasta) is not a Family Court Judge !! He is a Federal Circuit Court Judge.

The Federal Circuit Court is the Court Mr Porter wants to amalgamate to reduce the Family Court’s stench, should he be forced to call a Royal Commission now or if at a later stage he will be liable for negligence for not doing anything about this cancer of justice, the Family Courts of Australia.

[Note: Vasta was mentioned in Chapter 21 as the only judge that got removed. Can it be that it was for whistle-blowing?]

“Judge blasted for jailing father for 12 months in family law dispute” by Michaela Whitbourn, *Sydney Morning Herald* smh.com.au, February 19, 2019

A *Federal Circuit Court* judge who jailed a father of two for a maximum of 12 months for contempt of court in family law proceedings has been blasted *by the Family Court* for committing a “gross miscarriage of justice”.

Brisbane Judge Vasta, a former prosecutor, imprison[ed] the man on December 6 for a maximum of 12 months for contempt of court [over failure to supply financial records].

The man, who has two children aged five and nine, spent six days in a maximum-security prison on suicide watch before he was released pending the outcome of an appeal

In a scathing judgment on Friday, **the Full Court of the Family Court said Judge Vasta had no legal power to make the orders and it would be an “affront to justice” to leave them in place.**

Justices Steven Strickland, Peter Murphy and Michael Kent said they were “comfortably satisfied” that “what occurred here ... constituted a gross miscarriage of justice”.

There was “no factual foundation” for the order and the **judge had no legal power to make it**, the judges said. [???

The court said Judge Vasta proceeded on the basis that a fellow Federal Circuit Court judge had already found the man was in contempt of the court’s orders, although it was “patently obvious” this was not the case.

Even in cases of proven contempt – which was not the case here – imprisonment was “a sanction of last resort”, the judges said. [??? [Emphasis added]

What is the issue? Judge Vasta sends a father to jail in contempt of court! Now! Judge Vasta did not know Family Courts have NO JURISDICTION! These courts cannot prosecute any crime, including Contempt! Pedophilia is a crime, Family Courts should not and cannot prosecute pedophiles. But now ... the Genie was out of the bottle!

For the first time they came out and said it! Victims of family Courts have always said that people can lie in Family Courts with no consequence. All Lawyers know this and encourage and coach their clients to file false affidavits. [!]

Ask victims of Family Courts of their experiences of Family judges and they tell you what Judge Salvatore Vasta did is NOTHING compared to the devastation Family court judges have caused for the most part of the past 4 decades. The Family Court stench is putrid. Nothing but a shutting down and criminal investigation will get rid of this darkest of criminal organisations. Nothing!

Comment by Mary W Maxwell

This Change.org item was forwarded to me on February 21, 2019 exactly as this book was going to press. I have not had time to research its claims about Family Court's bailiwick.

"Jack and Jill Sanders" say the court cannot make orders for contempt, but Cuffie, in Chapter 15, says she has just come out of prison for contempt, in connection with her daughters' hiding of the grandchildren. She [the daughter] is still in prison.

Per Family Law Act, Vasta seems to have acted correctly. I shall write to the Queensland Law Society to explain the contempt provision and post their reply at GumshoeNews. Disclaimer: I am not in legal practice. My qualification for writing this book is that I know right from wrong. I love the law and can sense that Family Court has all the wrong feel to it -- I recommend not an RC but a folks' Truth Commission.

Appendix B. Dame Marie Bashir, ex-Governor, NSW

Dr Marie Bashir, born 1930 is a psychiatrist, specializing in the problems of adolescents, and the Patron of the NSW police.

Australian Mother of the Year (1971)

Director of the Rivendell Child, Adolescent and Family Service

Chair of the University of New South Wales Third World Health Group (1995–2000)

Consultative role of senior psychiatrist to the Aboriginal Medical Service (1991–1999)

Consultative psychiatrist Juvenile Justice Facilities (1993–2000)

Appointed Governor of NSW on the recommendation of Premier Bob Carr, 2001

Companion of the Order of Australia

Patron of the Australia-Vietnam Medical Trust (2002)

Patron of Opera Australia, the Sydney Symphony Orchestra
[Bashir is a violinist]

Australian Living Treasure

Grand Officer of the National Order of the Cedar by President of Lebanon

Chancellor of the University of Sydney (Appointed 2007)

Honorary Member UN Development Fund for Women (2004)

Chevalier of the Ordre National de la Légion d'Honneur by President Sarkozy (2009)

Fifteen Questions for an Interview with Dame Marie:

Do you believe the things Fiona Barnett is saying at her web-site PedophilesDownUnder.com?

What do you think is the extent of pedophilia in NSW?

Did it surprise you that the NSW Police asked you to be their patron after you left office as Governor?

When you worked with troubled adolescents, did you see any signs of mind-control or dissociation?

Did any of your patients show evidence of being tortured?

What did you think of the cult run by Anne Hamilton-Byrne?

Have you ever filed a mandatory report of child sexual abuse?

Do you agree that NSW's Wood Royal Commission white-washed police corruption?

How serious do you think the problem of police corruption is today in NSW?

Do you believe Fiona Barnett's claim that a "thug" harassed her after she reported a pedophile?

If that proves true, what do you recommend we do about it?

Do you think NSW has any cops who might be eligible for compensation like that given to Detective Denis Ryan of VIC who was blocked in his efforts to deal with pedophile priests?

Had you heard of ritual sacrifice in the Great Hall at Sydney University while you were Chancellor?

Did you know the late Anne Conlon of St Sophia College?

Appendix C. Don Rufty, Protective Dad and Newsman

Newspaperman Don Rufty, claims to have cleaned up the Family Law judges in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina. He says in the rest of NC the judges are crooked but in that county he forced the judges to make a 180-degree turn, and now they are “paragons of virtue.”

He accomplished it by persistent public pressure. I will quote here from Rufty’s speech “Enforce the Law and Prosecute Crooked Judges.” It can be found on Youtube. The numbers indicate the minute at which he says each item:

1.06 We have a responsibility to people who do not know these things. Educate the public and inform them, which will give rise to scrutiny, and pressure to put the crooked judges in jail....

1.51 **Every time their orders violate the rights of a citizen the judges are committing a felony.**

3.25 I am going to read the law to you. USC code title 18 section 242 — deprivation of rights under color of law. To willfully deprive a person of rights protected by the constitution can receive punishment up to the death penalty. It includes actions done outside the official duties. 5.33 These judges violate the law with the regularity of breathing. **The myth that judges have immunity is as phony as the three-dollar bill.** This needs a movement by the American people to indict and **incarcerate the judges in the Family Court and their accomplices** for those crimes.

6.19 We should be collectively demanding that. There is no reason why not to enforce the law. The **consequences for millions of Americans have been absolutely horrendous.** Social carnage. Victims have concerned themselves with peripheral issues such as what a cop said or how bad the social worker is. No. It is the court orders that caused all this. 7.48 **The crooked judges enable all of the abomination such as**

CPS. If your neighbor sicked his pit bull dog on you, do you think it's the fault of the dog? 9.20 Even some activists say that the judge has absolute discretion. **They think that filing motions and appeals will make things right for them.**

They think if they try one more time and dot a few more I's and cross a few more T's they will receive justice. That 9.50 is an **incorrect idea based on the idea that the judges involved are good honorable people.** 10.40 It's a false and very costly mistake. 10.12 **The judges are habitual criminals engaged in a continuous crime.** It is a very lucrative racket. Millions of dollars came from the Social Security Trust Fund **to fund their child-trafficking racket.**

11.00 So who is going to bring criminal charges against the criminal judges? We know that judges protect the crooked judges. Those judges are guilty of obstruction of justice, 11.28 malfeasance and misfeasance. **So it can be seen that the judiciary is extremely rotten and corrupt.**

In 1995 I released an unrelenting barrage of editorials. Took two years. I put a lot of heat on. I listed the crimes they were committing and what **length of prison** they deserved.

15.15 Judge Fitzmertzler kicked me out of my house and all the usual things. 16.00 [We] got him to write a court order saying that he had acted against me without findings of fact and conclusions of law so his order was void.

18.30 President can sick his Attorney General and the FBI Director FBI on them. In a 20-minute meeting with them he can tell them to meet with citizens. [Like] JFK sicked his brother RFK against those who were depriving Black folks of their rights in the South. (re desegregation of schools). Watch the movie *Selma*. **Public opinion is the highest court in the land when we get out and demand it.**

Appendix D. Affidavit of Richard Taus, FBI (abridged)

I am a former Special Agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation assigned to the New York Field Office ...**1978 to November 1988**. I was assigned to both the Foreign Counter-intelligence Division and the Criminal Division. I reported and documented to my superiors in the FBI:

– The involvement of officials, agents and operatives of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) with organized crime members and drug-trafficking activities. And the participation of members of the CIA who engaged in the looting of the Savings and Loan (Thrift) Industries, financial scams and fraudulent securities transactions.

– The involvement of people from the National Security Agency Staff and Council and the White House in criminal activities associated with funding the acquisition of military supplies and equipment... Iran-Contra Arms Initiative,

– Associations between known and suspected members of the **Mafia, and CIA agents in conducting drug-trafficking activities and financial frauds.**

I was ordered by my supervisors in the FBI to halt these investigations, destroy my written reports, terminate my informants. Without any support from my superiors at the FBI ...I then sent a letter to the FBI Director, William Sessions, and this was ignored. I proceeded to write [to] Congressional officials, among them Senators Arlan Specter, Alfonse DAmato, John Kerry [what a bunch!] and Congressman Norman Lent, Charles Schumer, and many others who were on both the Senate and House Intelligence Oversight Committees.

I declare and affirm **under penalty of perjury** that these statements are true to the best of my knowledge and belief. Executed this 13th day of **August 1997**...[Emphasis added]

Note: Richard M. Taus is attempting to get parole after 28 years in prison on a false charge of pedophilia. His son David Taus has written a book *To Be a Hero*. Richard has saved us all. -- MM

Appendix E. El Presidente Sees the Light, by Mary Maxwell
(spoofing Clement Clark Moore's "Visit of St Nicholas")

T'was the night before Christmas, And all through the land
Certain people were nervous --"Judgment Day" was at hand.

The children were nestled All snugs in their beds,
While the dream "*No more trafficking*" Played in their heads.

Down Under, the pedo's Had hurt thousands of kids.
Fiona made us wonder Is Oz on the skids?

Dee sprung a survey Said "My statistics will show
It's the Family Court judges Who really must go."

So we fought for Protective parents, Oh, our nerves were well
tested. Now half the judiciary Will soon be arrested!

Then up in Manhattan, Trump arose in his Tower,
And said, Yikes! Look what I've got --I've got *legal power!*

O take me, ye reindeer, O' Donner and Blitzen,
To the FCC's office And we'll *make* people listen!
I'll have CNN's license To broadcast, suspended.
Then ABC's and Murdoch's, All of them, up-ended.

I can order the troops To stand guard over me
As I blow the "9/11" story Straight out to the sea.

Any judges who can't Cut the mustard must go.
The Constitution will reign, Ho ho — ho ho *ho*.

Many innocent prisoners Will soon be set free,
Taus, Jahar, Leonard Peltier, Heck — *I've got the key!*

And you'll hear me exclaim As I ride on my sleigh,
Kiriakou, you did good, Fare-thee-well, C-I-A.

**Appendix F. An Open Letter to Vickie Chapman, Attorney
General of South Australia August 27, 2018**

Dear Vickie, I have known you for twenty years and have nothing but respect for you. I was pleased to hear that you have become the new Attorney General of South Australia.

In this letter I put it to you that **there is no other possible option but for you to begin the prosecution of the Police officers named by Rachel Vaughan in an interview with an ad hoc judicial organization called The International Tribunal for Natural Justice.**

Quite simply, Rachel says she can tell all that needs to be told about the murders of Louise Bell and also Richard Kelvin. We members of the Adelaide public have been given false stories since the 1980s about this.

The public will not put up with knowing that cops did nothing to listen to Rachel Vaughan and in fact that at least one of them spoke to her – she says – “most menacingly.” **We have had quite enough of being treated like idiots, and quite enough of “PPP” – Protected Person Practice.**

It is of great fortune that you are in office, Vickie. We will support you. Have no fear. They can't do to you what they have done to all others. **You are in charge. You are the alpha dog here. Go for it.**

I visited you a few months ago and gave you a hug. At the time I did not know the South Australian information that Ms Vaughan has revealed. (I was in your office merely to invite you to Fringe Show, on false memories of MK-Ultra.)

I am not in Australia at the moment but am sending you a super-big hug. The time has come, Attorney General Chapman. You and you alone have the authority here. **The police have lost all authority, full stop.** The next legal step is legally in your hands. We will help. Our troops can amass on short notice.

Yours sincerely,
Mary Maxwell, LLB

(Update: Vickie's reply said “Contact SA's Minister of Policing)

MS RILAK, appeared in person. [no lawyer]

HIS HONOUR: Yes, thank you, please be seated. Now, Ms Rilak, I have affidavits that you have affirmed on 17 April 2018, another on 9 April 2018, [etc] The latter of those was in support of the show cause application... I have read them and will take as read, are there any other affidavits that you seek to rely upon?

MS RILAK: There are not, thank you.

HIS HONOUR: I have read them. I have also read your very helpful submissions. This is an opportunity in this oral hearing for you to make any submissions that you wish to make orally
....

MS RILAK: I am seeking the High Court intervening to provide the appropriate direction to the Honourable Chief Justice of the Family Court because I am very – I have very little confidence that the things how they progressed even last four or five years, and especially two and a half years that I have not seen my child ...I have little confidence that the things will progress justly and fairly if the matter is still before him.

I have been treated in [that] hearing as an alienating parent and it is a legal principle in the Family Court. When there is disclosure of sexual abuse the child is automatically taken away from the protective parent and given to the abuser. There is no inquiry how the child is doing, nobody is looking after the welfare of the child and that is exactly what happened in my case.

HIS HONOUR: Yes, I have read the Family Court's decision and the decision of the Full Court including in relation to those matters. The difficulties or obstacles at this stage that you face with the show cause application and with your summons are

that this Court will very rarely entertain a fresh application when appeals have already been brought ...in relation to a number of the matters that you seek to reargue today....It would be very rare for this Court, in effect, to remove those matters while they are still in progress where a particular constitutional issue is not raised.

MS RILAK: Your Honour, if the High Court does not provide an appropriate direction, I am afraid that after - we have been in a court at eight years....

We lost a lot of money. We lost a lot of time and the best interest, it is paramount in a Family Court, has not been upheld by any of the judge and I might say that there was a consistently and systematic perversion of justice, not only by one judge or one registrar but it is systematic. So, the primary orders has never been corrected when the error was made and I believe that because the Family Court cannot lose the face ...

[It] has negative effect on my daughter and myself. My child has been sexually abused. That has been thrown away from the primary justice because apparently there was no prima facie.

HIS HONOUR: Ms Rilak, sorry to interrupt you, I just want to make it clear I have read the primary judgment and the Full Court's judgment very carefully

MS RILAK: Your Honour, if the judge made a mistake in the judgment that he will deliver, ...there is no way that that can be addressed until the matter goes before the appeal. I have been in appeal proceedings for several times and every time when I bring matter, the colleagues of the judge make the decision, the colleagues that sit in the same building, they meet in the same corridors, they have lunch together.

So, your Honour, there is a collusion in a Family Court matters and as I reiterate if the High Court cannot intervene to provide

appropriate directions, I have very little confidence that something will happen in the Family Court.

HIS HONOUR: On 4 June the hearing is concerned not just with your interim application that was to see your daughter on her birthday but it is also your application to, in effect, vary the orders that were made where – to provide for telephone contact and access where you now seek to have, effectively, the primary access.

MS RILAK: ...My initiating application to proceed which is at the moment, I believe, on hold while the contravention orders that the father contravened 400 orders to date, that is still on foot.

HIS HONOUR: Those contraventions concerned the [father's] failure to abide by the access regime whereby you are supposed to have supervised access and telephone contact with your daughter?

MS RILAK: That is correct. That is correct..

HIS HONOUR: What orders is that appealing from?

MS RILAK: That is the order from the contravention order that I filed 2016 ... then the barrister was seeking over \$33,000 for one-day hearing. Then it was decided that he cannot seek indemnity costs, so then he settled about 22,000 and then the judge, justice, made the order that within 2 weeks I made the cost order submissions why I should not pay \$22,000.

So, during our Family Court ...the most grievances I have that the best interests of the child is absolutely ignored... It is all about the money. It is all about technicalities and the child fell in between the gaps somewhere and no one is looking after the welfare of the child.

As I mentioned, the Family Court goes by the parenting alienating syndrome which is a legal principle in a Family Court and when there is a disclosure of sexual nature – abuse, then the parent is not able to protect the child but the child is cruelly taken away from the protective parent and given to the perpetrator. Then it is exactly the same as I would witness a crime in a park and I go to the police and I report that crime and I will be sentenced and I will be jailed because I reported that crime. My daughter has disclosed sexual assault. It was my duty to go to the police - - -

HIS HONOUR: Ms Rilak, ...I will hear what you have to say – the submissions that you have to make - now.

MS RILAK: ...For example, my daughter was interviewed by the police in English and her primary language at that time was [not English]. She would not even understand a question put before her.

So, this is very much systemic failure of the court and after my child was cruelly taken away there was no evidence of me being abus[ive], neglect[ful], violent against my child. I have never slapped my child and the evidence put before the court was hearsay by the father, for example. The Family Court does not abide by the Evidence Act. They take the evidence on a face value without any evidence really because none of my witnesses were able to give their part of the story – their side of the story.

The biggest problem is that the court is heavily relying on the expert witness. In my case, the report writer is not specialised in her field.... She does not publish any peer review. She is not even a clinician.

I think she said she is 30 years in a Family Court. She probably purely just writes the reports and within one hour she can predict the father has no mental illness and the mother has a borderline personality disorder

...one psychologist and psychiatrist and they both stated that there is absolutely no traces of any mental disorder. I might suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder because what happened, the trauma and the grief that I have been put through and still continues and the same for my child. There is no evidence how the child is going because I have been erased as a parent, first by the Family Court and then by the father.

So, I have absolutely no access to my daughter, not even school photos. I cannot even order the school photos that I have paid for because the principal believes, incorrectly pointing to the court order by the court, that I have no access to the school, ignoring that I am supposed to have face-to-face contact with my daughter ... I see it is under the order 29 that I can have direct information from the school.... it was only single expert witness ... she concluded that the child was not sexually assaulted. She did not even see the child ...it was out of date by the time it got to the trial.

So the problem is so systematic that I might say they – it actually borderlines criminal negligence. The evidence is fabricated in the Family Court because they do not have to abide by the Evidence Act and whoever pays more money wins; you can buy the justice in a Family Court. The protective parents have no means of protecting the child – we are forbidden to protect the child. Once the child is taken away there is no one who can care for the child in what state is the child. School will not look after the child. The court does not look after the best interests of the child once the primary orders are done. Not the police, not the judge, the Child Protection Agency, no one looks after the wellbeing of the child while the child is taken away from a good loving and protective mother...

The PAS, which is a legal principle, parenting alienation syndrome, was first coined by the doctor, Richard Gardner, and it was refuted on many occasions, but the Family Court in America as well as in Australia follow this legal principle which

says Dr Richard Gardner was of the view that when there is allegation of sexual abuse in a court that the mother wants to take advantage and she calls the child and the child is taken away and given to the perpetrator to cure the alienating syndrome which he calls as mental illness. Now, Richard Gardner's theory came to Australia in probably the 1990s by Kenneth Byrne, a Melbourne psychiatrist, have – can I have a drink of water, please?

HIS HONOUR: Certainly.

MS RILAK: Thank you. When Kenneth Byrne presented this to the judges and so the judges do not believe that sexual assault happens in a family setting - - -

HIS HONOUR: Well, Ms Rilak,... I have read the findings by the Family Court and upheld by the Full Court and there was no finding of sexual assault. This Court does not make any primary findings and is not concerned.

MS RILAK: I understand, your Honour, I understand that the balance of probabilities are much lower in a civil court case than in a criminal court case. So, of course, you cannot put a four or five-years-old child in a witness box that will make evidence against the perpetrator. ...and that is under section 118 of the Constitution as well where the child protection has – the task of the Child Protection Agency is to protect the child. Family Court does not have this task. The Family Court is not concerned about protecting the child. The Family Court decides who the child live with and spend time with.

Appendix H. Family Court Survey Results

Dee McLachlan of GumshoeNews.com in Melbourne ran a survey from October to December, 2018. 79 responses.

Introduction

1. The first question identified who responded to the Survey. They were 70 Protective Mothers, 4 Protective Fathers, 7 Grandparents (or Aunt/Uncle), and 2 Victims over eighteen. [This question had been answered more than 78 times, which I have attributed to re-starts.]

2. How old was your child when you realised that SEXUAL ABUSE (or a serious injury) occurred? Number of responses: [79 responded to this question]

Less than 2 years: 11x chosen (13.92%)
2 – 4 years: 33x chosen (41.77%)
5 – 8 years: 27x chosen (34.18%)
9 – 12 years: 7x chosen (8.86%)
Older than 12 years: 1x chosen (1.27%)

3. Who was the first person the child disclosed sexual abuse to? Number of responses: [75]

Mother or Father: 60x chosen (80.00%)
Grandparent: 5x chosen (6.67%)
Teacher, school counselor, etc: 3x chosen (4.00%)
Someone else: 7x chosen (9.33%)

4. Who did you contact once you realised there had been abuse? Number of responses: [77, These were multiple choice questions, and the responder was invited to tick more than one box, e.g., MC]

Family (40)
The police (41)
My doctor, the hospital (34)

Child Protection Services (48)

Other (27)

5. When you confronted the perpetrator about the abuse, did they do any of the following? [77, MC]

Deny the allegations (60)

Threaten with violence (24)

Advance proceedings into Family Court (34)

Call me delusional, resulting in me having to undergo mental health health assessments (37)

Other (17)

Believing the Child:

6. How many people [the number] has your child disclosed to so far? In most cases the child had disclosed to many people.

11, 8, 2, 3, 4 or 5, 1, 20, 13, Only me, 2, 1, 3, 5, 2, 1, 10+, Minimum dozen people, 6, dozens, approx 20 re sexual abuse and 30 plus re physical abuse, 4, 6, 4-5, 8, 5, 6+, Four, 5, 10, 10, Three, 3, 4, more than 10, 3, 3 generations family + doctor, [Because child would not go into formal interview room alone with JIRT staff, case was closed, child was 3yrs old.] 5, Three, 6, At least 10 people, 6, 7, 7, 11, 5, Grandmother and me, to school friends also, 5, 2, 15, 9, I don't know apart 2, 9, 6, 10, fourteen people, 10, To many to count, 3, Grandchild disclosed witnessing the oral sex to more than 10 people and assaults to 23+, 7, 1, Qld police child protection, 3, 4, 10, At least 15, 7+, 6.

7. Who DID believe your child? Did someone (even one person) from the categories below believe your child? [71] [MC]

Members of my family (58)

Anyone in the police, detective etc (21)

Child Protective Service Officers (15)

Social workers, supervised visit personnel (12)

A doctor, nurse, medical personnel (29)

Court reporters, supervision services (3)

ICL, independent child lawyer (2)
Your psychologist/psychiatrist (41)
Court appointed experts (6)
Court appointed psychiatrist (3)
The judge (the court) (2)
Other (20)

8. Who did NOT believe your child? Did someone (even one person) from the categories below not believe your child? [71] [MC]

Members of my family (11)
Anyone in the police, detective etc (38)
Child Protective Service Officers (38)
Social workers, supervised visit personnel (21)
A doctor, nurse, medical personnel (6)
Court reporters, supervision services (40)
ICL, independent child lawyer (47)
Your psychologist/psychiatrist (2)
Court appointed experts (40)
Court appointed psychiatrist (23)
The judge (the court) (49)
Other (12)

9. Who DID BELIEVE your child — but was/were PREVENTED from speaking or testifying in any way? [63] [MC]

Members of my family (43)
Anyone in the police, detective etc (7)
Child Protective Service Officers (8)
Social workers, supervised visit personnel (10)
A doctor, nurse, medical personnel (19)
Court reporters, supervision services (0)
ICL, independent child lawyer (1)
Your psychologist/psychiatrist (22)
Court appointed experts (0)
Court appointed psychiatrist (1)
Other (16)

10. Who DID BELIEVE your child — but did NOTHING TO ASSIST? [53] [MC]

Members of my family (12)
Anyone in the police, detective etc (23)
Child Protective Service Officers (20)
Social workers, supervised visit personnel (10)
A doctor, nurse, medical personnel (12)
Court reporters, supervision services (6)
ICL, independent child lawyer (7)
Your psychologist/psychiatrist (7)
Court appointed experts (9)
Court appointed psychiatrist (4)
The judge (the court) (9)
Other (10)

General Questions

11. In what State do you live, and where did this happen?

NSW – 28
VIC – 11
QLD – 20
SA – 6
WA – 8
TAS – 3
NT – 0

And it was spread across the country. There were no clusters. This problem is Australia-wide. The cities and towns were:

Sydney (7), Melbourne (7) Brisbane (6), Adelaide (5), Perth (4), Canberra and ACT (3), Hobart (2), Gold Coast (2), Wollongong (2), and Townsville (2). Other places include: Coffs Harbor, Wyong, Weston, Maroochydore, Mandurah, Northern Beaches, Lindfield, Bendigo, Mandurah, Hillston, Nerang, near Mullumbimby, Bunbury, Buderim, Nulkaba, Lismore, Rockhampton, Cairns, Wynyard, Newcastle, and two international responders snuck in from Harrowgate, England, and Arizona US.

13. How many children are involved in the family court issue? [73]

- 1 child 34x chosen (46.58%)
- 2 children 22x chosen (30.14%)
- 3 or more: 17x chosen (23.29%)

14. How many years have you been 'involved' in family court proceedings? [72]

- Less than 1 year: 4x chosen (5.56%)
- 1 – 3 years: 25x chosen (34.72%)
- 4 – 8 years: 25x chosen (34.72%)
- More than 8 years: 18x chosen (25.00%)

15. How much MONEY have you lost (or spent) trying to achieve (or manage) your outcome in the family court, so far? (This a TOTAL of solicitor fees, transcripts, supervised visits, court fees, etc) [71]

- 0 – \$50,000: 28x chosen (39.44%)
- \$51,000 – 150,000: 16x chosen (22.54%)
- \$151,000 – 350,000: 16x chosen (22.54%)
- \$351,000 — 750,000: 7x chosen (9.86%)
- More than \$750,000: 4x chosen (5.63%)

16. As a result, have you... [67]

- Lost ownership of a house? (32)
- Lost a job, or business? (38)
- Lost support or partial support from friends and/or family? (50)
- This has put me in debt (50)

How Evidence Got Handled

17. Do you believe crucial evidence of abuse or injury was disregarded in your case? [69]

- Yes: 67x chosen (97.10%)
- No: 2x chosen (2.90%)

18. Which of these people / departments DISREGARDED evidence of abuse/injury? [67] [MC]

Members of my family (7)
Doctor, medical personnel (13)
The police (46)
Your psychologist / psychiatrist (7)
Social workers, supervised visit personnel (29)
Child Protective Services (44)
ICL, Independent child lawyer (52)
Court reporters, pre-court services (43)
Court appointed psychiatrist (29)
Court appointed experts (45)
The judge (the court) (58)
Other (9)

19. Was evidence DESTROYED? (I do not want to lead the witness.) [64]

Yes: 36x chosen (56.25%)
No: 28x chosen (43.75%)

20. Which of these people / departments DESTROYED evidence of abuse? [51] [MC]

Members of my family (3)
Doctor, medical personnel (2)
The police (18)
Your psychologist / psychiatrist (1)
Social workers, supervised visit personnel (11)
Child Protective Services (11)
ICL, Independent child lawyer (14)
Court reporters, pre-court services (9)
Court appointed psychiatrist (7)
Court appointed experts (10)
NO evidence was destroyed (8) Other (20)

21. Did the Judge destroy evidence, or order that evidence be destroyed? [55]

Yes: 17x chosen (30.91%)

No: 38x chosen (69.09%)

22. What kind of evidence was DISREGARDED by Police, CPS or the Family Court, etc? [48] [MC]

Video evidence (16)

Audio evidence (16)

Photographic evidence (22)

Medical reports (25)

Blood evidence, and/or DNA (2)

Child disclosures reported to me (38)

Child disclosures to various authorities (police, CPS etc) (36)

Psychology or psychiatric reports (27)

Any Expert (8)

Reports of serious behavioural problems, fears etc, (31)

Reports that my child ran away from police, or from a home (9)

Other (6)

23. What evidence was DESTROYED, Trashed, or was ordered to be destroyed? [48] [MC]

Video evidence (6)

Audio evidence (8)

Photographic evidence (9)

Medical reports (6)

Blood evidence, and/or DNA (1)

Child disclosures reported to me (12)

Child disclosures to various authorities (police, CPS etc) (11)

Psychology or psychiatric reports (5)

Any Expert (1)

Reports of serious behavioural problems, fears etc (12)

Reports that my child ran away from the police, or from

a home (1) Other (5)

24. Do you have physical proof (documents, injunctions, emails, etc) of the deliberate destruction of evidence? [56]

Yes: 21x chosen (37.50%)

No: 35x chosen (62.50%)

Family Court Judges

25. Who was the Judge in your case? [59]

One answer: I'm scared to divulge too much information as he is threatening further court action. Countless names — a few repeated. [as written]

Carmody, Murphy, Bell, Justice Tree, Judy Turner, Magistrate Kaeser, Scarlett, Boyle, Paul Howard, Johnston, Stewart, Deputy Chief Justice Faulks, Amanda Tonkin, Shane Gill, Justice Rees, Cronin, Judge John Coker, Judge Baker, Judge Kelly, Howard, Vasta, Justice Kirsty McMillan, Andrews, Justice Berman, John Geral Barlow, Catherine Carew, Justice Johnson, Croker, Loughnan Forrest Rees Cleary, Stephen Scarlet, Middleton, Meyers, Magistrate Joe Harman, Judge Coates, Stuart Austin, Justice Tree, Young, Demack, Duncanson, Piter, Tree, Harmon, Justice Philip Butchart, Justice Steven Strickland, Austin, Cronin, Multiple Judges, Robert Benjamin, David Monaghan, Judge Ryan, Magistrate Berman, Pascoe, Aldridge, Ryan, Coates, Justice Barry, Jarrett, Justain Curtain, Murphy, Kent, Federal Magistrates Jarret and De Mack, Justice Kent, Justice Forrest, Justice Hogan, Judge Cassidy, Justice Forrest, Justice Katherine Carew, Loughnan

Experts and Lawyers

26. Who was/were the Expert/s in your case? [58]

(A few names did keep surfacing. One was Dr Rikard-Bell, whom I [McLachlan] have written about before. I was appalled by his interview with the ABC. His name came up 15 times as an expert, and as someone who obstructed justice.)

27. Anyone that you believe OBSTRUCTED JUSTICE for your child? [57]

Those who obstructed justice will have to be an article all of its own. Countless names, and organisations — across the board.

28. Did a court EXPERT, i.e., PSYCHIATRIST, claim that you were “coaching” — i.e. that you were trying to sway or enhance your child’s version? [66]

Yes: 53x chosen (80.30%)
No: 13x chosen (19.70%)

29. Who was the Psychiatrist / Expert? [54 replied with names.]

30. Do you believe someone in the authority tried to “COACH” your child — and sway your child’s version to him/her admitting to less or no abuse? [62]

Yes: 42x chosen (67.74%)
No: 20x chosen (32.26%)

31. Who do you believe “COACHED” your child — or altered their original disclosures, or outlook? (The next question is about changing reports etc) [48] [MC]

Members of my family (9)
Doctor, medical personnel (3)
The police (13)
Your psychologist / psychiatrist (7)
Social workers, supervised visit personnel (8)
Child Protective Services (14)
ICL, Independent child lawyer (19)
Court reporters, pre-court services (16)
Court appointed psychiatrist (10)
Court appointed experts (13)
The judge (the court) (4)
Other (20)

32. Who do you believe CHANGED, or FALSIFIED REPORTS — or COMMITTED PEJURY? [53] [MC] [NOTE: Questionnaire misspelled ‘perjury’]

Members of my family (7)
Doctor, medical personnel (5)

The police (17)
Your psychologist / psychiatrist (9)
Social workers, supervised visit personnel (12)
Child Protective Services (26)
ICL, Independent child lawyer (28)
Court reporters, pre-court services (25)
Court appointed psychiatrist (16)
Court appointed experts (15)
The judge (the court) (21)
Other (19)

33. Do you have physical evidence of this corruption, falsifying reports and people committing perjury? [59]

Yes: 34x chosen (57.63%)

No: 25x chosen (42.37%)

34. Explain briefly who, what and how evidence was falsified — if applicable. [36 responded]

35. Have you presented this proof to authorities? [53]

Yes: 22x chosen (41.51%)

No: 31x chosen (58.49%)

36. Were you told by your legal representative NOT to report abuse — as you could be at risk of losing custody? [63]

Yes: 49x chosen (77.78%)

No: 14x chosen (22.22%)

37. Did the police, at any time, REFUSE to investigate abuse claims because the matter was before the Family court? [62]

Yes: 50x chosen (80.65%)

No: 12x chosen (19.35%)

38. During or after court proceedings, did anyone warn you to NOT REPORT any further abuse — or any further claims? [54]
[MC]

Doctor, medical personnel (4)
The police (17)
Social workers, supervised visit personnel (8)
Child Protective Services (16)
ICL, Independent child lawyer (17) (Amazing)
Court reporters, pre-court services (8)
Court appointed psychiatrist (6)
The Judge (the court) (18)
Other (30)

39. What “punishment” would be put on you, if you did bring forward more accounts or evidence of abuse? [55]

Nearly all were threatened that they’d never see their kids again.
No contact.

40. SUPERVISED VISITATION: Have you in the past, or are you presently in an arrangement of supervised visitation? [64]

Yes: 35x chosen (54.69%)
No: 29x chosen (45.31%)

41. Were THREATS ever made by supervision personnel that you could lose visitation rights, or your child altogether? [56]

Yes: 26x chosen (46.43%)
No: 30x chosen (53.57%)

42. Anything to add for advice and threats? [36 responded]

43. Was your child asked to reveal their disclosures in an interview — with their abuser present?: [59]

Yes: 26x chosen (44.07%)
No: 33x chosen (55.93%)

44. Did the court ever PREVENT you from seeking medical or psychological assistance for your child? [64]

Yes: 42x chosen (65.63%)
No: 12x chosen (18.75%)
Other: 10x chosen (15.63%)

45. Did the ICL (Independent Children's lawyer) speak with the child they were representing or rely on information given to them? [62] [Sorry, this question is confusing]

Yes: 10x chosen (16.13%)
No: 31x chosen (50.00%)
Other: 21x chosen (33.87%)

Mental Health Issues

46. Did your child undergo 'therapy' ordered by the Judge to 'make them understand that the abuse NEVER happened'? [64]

Yes: 12x chosen (18.75%)
No: 38x chosen (59.38%)
Other: 14x chosen (21.88%)

47. Did you have to undergo MENTAL HEALTH ass-essments? [65]

Yes: 35x chosen (53.85%)
No: 19x chosen (29.23%)
Other: 11x chosen (16.92%)

48. At any point, was your child removed from you, because your were/are labelled an "ANXIOUS PARENT"? [64]

Yes: 12x chosen (18.75%)
No: 36x chosen (56.25%)
Other: 16x chosen (25.00%)

49. (Sorry to ask) What abuse do you believe occurred — or was disclosed in some way? [64] [MC]

They don't want to say (7)
Touching, Fiddling, (38)

“Milking the cow” (one kid)
“Doodle vomit” (another example) (13)
Photographic or video sessions (camera flashes) (12)
Penetration (18)
Bleeding rectum etc (9)
Injuries, scars (29)
Rashes, swelling, other medical issues (26)
Descriptions of sex toys (7)
Rituals (7)
Urolagnia, other fetishes (6)
Other (39)

50. In general, what is or has been the emotional state of your child
— on the whole? [65] [MC]

Okay, managing (8)
Appears to be dissociating (33)
Behavioural problems (anger, etc) (48)
Has run away (16)
Suicidal, or talked about that (32)
In fear of his/her life (25)
Other (25)

51. Was the abuser, the alleged pedophile, investigated? [60]

Yes: 15x chosen (25.00%)
No: 45x chosen (75.00%)

52. Was the abuser, the alleged pedophile, prosecuted? [61]

Yes: 3x chosen (4.92%)
No: 58x chosen (95.08%)

53. Did anyone go to jail? [63]

Yes: 2x chosen (3.17%)
No: 61x chosen (96.83%)

54. Did the court order that your child/ren live with their abuser after evidence of abuse was presented? [61]

Yes: 40x chosen (65.57%)

No: 21x chosen (34.43%)

Justice

55. If you only had ONE choice — what OUTCOME would you vote for? [65]

A Royal Commission into the Family Court: 28x chosen (43.08%)

A Special Unit, with the power to prosecute, to investigate criminality in the Family Court, CPS etc — with the promise to jail anyone that broke the law : 35x chosen (53.85%)

Financial Compensation : 2x chosen (3.08%)

BOOKS BY MARY W MAXWELL

Human Evolution (1984)
Morality among Nations (1990)
The Sociobiological Imagination (1990)
Moral Inertia (1991)
Prosecution for Treason (2011)
Consider the Lilies (2013)
A Balm in Gilead (2014)
Fraud Upon the Court (2015)
Truth in Journalism (2015)
Port Arthur: Enough Is Enough (2015)
Inquest: Siege in Sydney (2017)
Deliverance! (2018)
A Moot Court Trial for Martin Bryant (2018)
The Soul of Boston and the Marathon Bombing (2019)
The Reunion and Family Law (2019)

And under the pseudonym Fortunata Fifi:

Teen Etiquette with Feelings (2012)

Acknowledgements

I thank, in no particular order, the huge number of people who have helped me. I thank Robert the Bruce for saving Scotland so that I could meet my husband. I thank William Shakespeare for organizing the English language. I thank my landlord Ted for installing air conditioning (I said this was in no particular order.)

I thank all the Protective parents and empathize with their incredible suffering. I thank Deb for being emotionally rich. I thank George Maxwell for absolutely everything. I thank Tim Minchin for “A Lovely Day in Ballarat.” I thank Dad for all the songs he taught me, both patriotic and religious. I thank old Blackstone for having one eye on the pillory. I thank Dee McLachlan for transitioning and founding that inspired newspaper. I thank Riley for brains.

I thank [redacted] for persevering against all those bad judges, may God forgive them. I thank Ed Wilson for massive mentoring. I thank the species that went before us and made possible the eye, the hand, and so forth (no, seriously). I thank my mother for being selfless and I mean selfless. I thank the whistle blowers and the survivors of MK-Ultra, total game-changers, they. I thank Trish for insisting on positive first (not that I wouldn't have anyway). I thank Fiona Barnett for not knowing when to quit.

I thank Youtube for letting me think I am Edith Piaf and Paul Robeson all rolled into one. I thank the Adelaide Fringe. I thank Prema for giving me a miniaturized Bible. I thank my travel agent Teresa who helps me do my running away. I thank my lawyer Paul D'Angelo. I thank the dear commenters at GumshoeNews for midnight companionship. I thank every ghost gum that ever lived. I thank the good cops and those who are hoping to “come out.” (Don't wait too long, guys.)

I thank the chillums who try to protect their Protective parents -- wouldn't that put everybody to shame.

There are some people whom I do not thank, but we won't go into that just now. They know whom they are.