

**Submission
No 134**

COERCIVE CONTROL IN DOMESTIC RELATIONSHIPS

Name: Ms Jewell Drury and Mr Adam Tate

Date Received: 12 February 2021

Submission to the The Joint Select Committee on Coercive Control – Parliament of NSW.
February 2021: presented by Adam Tate & Jewell Drury - Advocate For Justice

“One of the best ways to achieve justice is to expose injustice.” Julian Assange

Background of presenters of Submission:

On a National level since early 2015, Jewell Drury has spent her time at “the coal face” supporting Men and Women, grandparents and extended families who have been journeying through Australia’s broken family law system, which continues to tear families apart and denies children their intrinsic human rights to have a relationship with both parents.

Jewell stood as a Senate Candidate for the Australian Better Families Party at the 2019 election. As a mother of 8 children, grandmother to 6 and a foster parent, Jewell understands the importance of family relationships and the dangers and heartache of broken attachments, between parents and their children.

April 2020, saw Jewell resign her position with the Australian Better Families party, to focus full time on her Advocacy for Justice work in creating awareness of the injustices that affect the lives of every Australian and their families.

I believe it’s each of our responsibility, to “call the darkness into the light,” to create awareness of the agendas and goals of governments, organisations and people, that are designed to compromise our freedoms and our children’s future.

Adam Tate is a Family Law Researcher. As a Father of two, Adam has experienced first hand the failures of the present Family Law system, and the gendered DFV system, working tirelessly in his goal to bring change to this arena for the sake of this generation and generations to come.

Adam and Jewell have worked on this submission collaboratively in the hopes that their work would shine the “light” into the dark areas of the DFV and Family Law arena in order to facilitate change.

Coercive Control

Introduction

Firstly we would like to point out that it is noted in the NSW Government Coercive Control discussion paper under Point 1:7 of the “purpose of the paper” that “the discussion paper is a first step in facilitating discussion between **legal, DFV and government stakeholders** and the community, in relation to how to best address harmful coercive control behaviour.”

It’s important from the very outset that we bring a focus to these “**legal, DFV (Domestic and Family Violence) and Government stakeholders**”, who are proposing this new legislation, and seriously bring into question not only their motivations for doing so, but their integrity and the integrity of the basis of their proposal.

The disadvantages of creating an offence of coercive control are numerous and this submission will focus on key facts and observations relating to this.

We are sure the committee is well aware that actual violence and murder are both already, a criminal offence.

Firstly, the current methodology used by people seeking protection in New South Wales, the Apprehended Violence Order (AVO) needs to be understood.

https://www.bocsar.nsw.gov.au/Pages/bocsar_pages/Apprehended-Violence-Orders-.aspx

Looking at the huge gap between domestic and personal orders, on the surface it may look like there is a serious domestic conflict issue, and thus a possible need to focus on a gendered approach, when the general talking points are taken into consideration.

However, when we look at the situation experientially and in reality, such orders are granted with little to no evidence, no investigation, no ability to prove context and are very often used concurrently with the initiation of divorce or family separation proceedings.

Protection orders are initially in the form of "Police Charges" yet the AVO remains an interim civil contract.

We have heard on a large number of occasions that lawyers representing an individual in court, who is there to defend against such charges, very often manages to convince the ignorant and fearful defendant to offer a guilty plea or risk ending up with a custodial sentence.

Once again, the final AVO is still issued as a civil contract and only upon a breach of the order does it become a criminal matter.

Surely the use of coercive control is a prevalent factor throughout the process here, when one's own legal representative can encourage their client to consent to such a potentially detrimental contract, with a wide range of implications and pitfalls.

So what makes this acceptable?

Why is this not a pressing concern for the "social justice warriors" behind this coercive control, proposed legislation?

Could it be that many of them are high stake holders who will benefit from the successful implementation of this bill?

Protection Orders

Protection orders are merely a few pieces of paper stapled together... just a civil contract.

How can they offer protection from an actual incident of life threatening violence?

The most important question should be, in what ways can the placement of these orders, be abused by people using them disingenuously?

In the context of divorce or separation, one party is often encouraged to "get in first", secure protection orders so they can control the family law proceedings. This is colloquially known as the "Silver Bullet".

It is commonly accepted that the AVO, used in this manner is used as a tool of intimidation and financial gain, which leads the aggrieved to the committal of a criminal act in the form of a breach of Section 192 E of the NSW Crimes Act 1900, "whereas a person who, by any deception, dishonestly obtains any financial advantage or causes any financial disadvantage is guilty of the offence of fraud".

Interestingly, by definition "aggrieved" means 'feeling resentment at having been unfairly treated'.

So what if somebody declines to take responsibility or acknowledge some or all of their actions in the context of an event that leads to seeking such protection orders?

Currently they are free to approach the police (before the other party does or if the other party chooses not to) and have that other party charged under the current AVO laws.

It is common knowledge that men tend not to ring the police every time their girlfriend or wife conducts herself in an unlawful and unreasonable manner that by definition is domestic violence, coercive control, acts of physical harm and even grievous bodily harm.

What if the female partner were the “more abusive one”, the instigator, or an individual that could be termed unstable, has a personality disorder and or thrives on high conflict?

Would it be fair to say that an individual not living in complete truth or who is suffering confusion from an emotionally volatile incident or series of events, may choose to take the perspective that they have been treated unfairly?

What if this person ignored their own wrongdoing in context or if this action is heavily incentivised, encouraged or they have been groomed by support services or others to do so?

Numerous peer reviewed studies relating to Psychology and Conflict, clearly indicate the potential and tendency for high conflict persons to take such an approach during and after the “heat of the moment”.

What is the Duluth Model and how does it affect our laws?

The Duluth Model suggests that all perpetrators of Domestic Violence are men and all victims of domestic violence are female. The Duluth Model also suggests that the only time a women is violent is in direct response to the violence that she has suffered.

Due to the “Duluth Model” being the model for our Domestic and Family Violence Laws, there are currently no support or access to services for male victims of Domestic Violence and their children.

The only support offered is through counselling and behaviour modification courses (which are of course designed for perpetrators and not victims.)

Equality is a Human Rights Issue – The Geneva Convention

It is important to remember the following:

- Australia is subject to International human rights laws and to identify men as being the sole perpetrators of abuse is equivalent to America’s dark history when the blacks were racially profiled and deemed automatically guilty, without any fair trial and then convicted by white supremacists.
- The Geneva Convention references the call for equality, as a fundamental human rights issue.
- Therefore, based on International human rights, each case of coercive control or domestic violence MUST be assessed on it’s individual merits rather than gender bias stereotyping.

As a result, based on this information in the Geneva Convention, the Duluth Model MUST be Abolished!!

“Believe Women”

The “Believe Women” campaign is often referred to by White Ribbon.

Basically believe women and disbelieve men.

Let’s investigate the following scenarios....

- Imagine a friend tells you they have been sexually assaulted. What do you do? Your first reaction would be one of sympathy. You would not pepper them with questions: what were they wearing, what were they drinking, what were they thinking? You’d believe them without even a question.
- Now imagine being a human-resources manager. In front of you is an employee making a claim of sexual harassment, against a colleague. Your duty is to ensure the employee’s well-being—but also to decide whether to conduct a formal investigation. You might point them toward counselling resources, but also ask if there is evidence to back up their version of events.
- Now you’re a journalist.... A woman has just come to you alleging that she was sexually assaulted by a public figure. Your response here is the opposite of a friend’s reaction. You ask about collaboration, letters, answering -machine messages, witnesses, emails, photographs, dates, times. You look for weaknesses in the story, the omissions, the contradictions.

Every allegation must be tested, every question must be answered.

You do NOT simply “believe women.”

The Women’s Legal Service NSW shared an Opinion piece on Criminalising Coercive Control by Liz Snell, 23 September 2020

(https://www.wlsnsw.org.au/criminalising-coercive-control/?fbclid=IwAR3jfp_2K9rMXJ1h3kc3LUhNmBJkNN74psQDad8gCjXNxRxS9Leohpc1kDg)

Liz Snell writes “Coercive controlling violence is a pattern of behaviour which may include verbal abuse, economic abuse, psychological abuse, sexual violence and/or physical violence.

“It is gendered – most often perpetrated by men against women and children.”

“Coercive control includes the gradual isolation of a woman from her friends and family and other supports; degrading put downs, humiliation and threats; constant surveillance of the woman; micro managing every aspect of her life through the application of strict rules by her male partner which are frequently changed such as when she can cook, eat, sleep, leave the house, or if separated, it can involve the father frequently seeking to change the agreement about spending time with children – changing the day, the time, the place so as to continue to exert control and dominance over the woman and children. As Evan Stark notes, coercive control strips women and children of their freedom and autonomy.”

This submission will bring to the light that Domestic Violence and therefore Coercive Control, are not in any way gender based, with supporting evidence that Men and Women can be both perpetrators and victims of Domestic Violence in all of its various forms.

In the majority of Male perpetrated Domestic Violence cases, men tend to be more physically abusive. Women however are more susceptible to engaging in acts that are deceptive, manipulative, coercive, or done in a way to control the man without his consent.

The Joint Select Committee after reading this submission, will see absolutely irrefutable proof that Ms Snell's declaration that Coercive Control is "gendered and perpetrated by men against women and children," MUST be completely dismissed as a false narrative which has been constructed to support a gendered and biased agenda.

In fact any submission that would support the passing of this bill, must be completely dismissed as it is based on a False and biased narrative.

"Not everything that is faced can be changed, but nothing can be changed until it is faced." James Baldwin

The Joint Select Committee on Coercive Control will see a multitude of submissions focused, by a united force of Women's Domestic Violence Services and Support Service organisations, regarding the horrific death of Hannah Clarke and her three children, Aaliyah, Laianah and Trey at the hands of Hannah's husband and the children's Father, Rowan Baxter.

It has been stated that Hannah Clarke suffered years of Coercive Control, right up until her tragic murder in 2020. Ms Clarkes death is being hailed as a "classic" example of a man's coercive control over a woman, which ended with her tragic death.

What you will NOT see is a multitude of submissions by a united force of Men's Domestic Violence Services and Support Services.

Why?...because there are no support services or organisations for male victims of Domestic Violence and their children.

What the Joint Select Committee will NOT hear, is the equally horrific domestic violence deaths of many men and their children at the hands of female perpetrators.

Firstly, I would like to bring to the committee's attention, the horrific, evil and barbaric domestic violence murders of three men in particular.

Jeffery Lindsell, Darren Reid and Daniel Surtees were each murdered at the hands of their female partners. Each were murdered in the same way Hannah Clarke was through the barbaric act of being set on fire and burned alive.

Darren Reid and Daniel Surtees were both set alight in front of their children, by their female partners.

These three men are just three, of the myriads of invisible and forgotten male victims of domestic violence.

If given the opportunity to appear before the Joint Select Committee, we are able to bring forward an extensive list of Male Domestic Violence Victims and their children who have been murdered by female perpetrators.

This list will bring to light the clear biased and false narrative which has been constructed throughout the past decade and brings into question the motivation and integrity behind those who are proposing and supportive of this new legislation.

The Untold Male Victims of Domestic Violence, Coercive Control and their Female Perpetrators.

Victim 1- Jeff Lindsell

Jeff Lindsell, 39 years of age, suffered extensive burns to his entire body after his partner Amanda Zukowski, set ablaze the granny flat in which Mr Lindsell was sleeping, in 2017.

It was later found that not only had Ms Zukowski set alight the home, there was clear evidence that she had also tampered with the water meter tap in order to thwart efforts to extinguish the flames.

Jeff's granny flat was situated in his parents back yard. His parents were present at the blaze, when Amanda Zukowski was asked where was Jeff, she replied, "I don't know, he's not in there."

Within minutes, Jeff burst out of his flat in a fireball of flames and fell at his parent's feet in terror. Due to the water meter tap being tampered, those at the scene were unable to extinguish the flames.

Jeff Lindsell died in hospital two days later from third degree burns to his body.

After Jeff's death, his parents, Kathy and Des along with Jeffery's siblings Nathan and Corinne, discovered that Jeff had endured two years of domestic violence including coercive control at the hands of Amanda Zukowski.

Jeff's Mother, Kathy said after her sons murder, "We had no idea Jeff was in a DV relationship because he kept it secret. We should have realised when his personality changed and he withdrew from his family and friends."

On reading the evidence, it is clear that Jeff suffered various forms of Domestic Violence during the relationship. Jeff went from being a happy go lucky character, who loved family gatherings, and who was "everyone's mate" always willing to lend a hand, to being a complete recluse.

"Amanda stopped him from being with his friends and doing family things," Kathy Lindsell said, "When he tried to break up with her, she threatened either her own life or to damage his property. After one break up, he stayed at a mate's place and she smashed the door of his flat. At other times, she smashed his TV and car windscreen and slashed his leather lounge. He had three lounges in two years."

“Jeff had bite marks on his arms and a gash to his eye which became infected. Jeffery was warehouse manager at Harvey Norman, Taren Point and his colleagues told us that she would rock up and order him to come home. His job was suffering.”

“He couldn’t leave her, he was being manipulated.”

On the night of the fire, the couple argued at the Gymea Hotel and walked back to the flat separately about 11pm.

About 1.30 am, Jeffery’s Father, Des was awakened by a neighbour alerting him to the fire.

After an eight-month investigation Mr Lindsell’s former partner Amanda Zukowski was charged with his murder, accused of lighting the fire and tampering with the property’s water supply.

She was arrested and subsequently granted bail in the Supreme Court in November 2018.

Ms Zukowski was to face trial February 3 2020, however the case did not proceed after she was found dead in her home after death by suicide.

The Lindsell family will never recover from the barbaric and evil murder of their Son and Brother.

Corinne Lindsell, Jeff’s sister said, “It upsets me that Domestic Violence by women against men is viewed as less significant. I don’t understand why a man’s life is less important.”

Unlike Hannah Clarkes death, there was no floral tributes laid for Jeff Lindsell.

There was no candlelit vigil.

The Prime Minister Scott Morrison nor any public or political figures attended his funeral.

There was no public outcry ...nor any charity set up in Jeff’s name.

No outrage by the Media nor the public condemnation of his murderer.

There was no domestic violence organisation to be the voice for Jeff Lindsell.

There was no access to Domestic Violence support organisations for Jeff.

Why? because he was a man.

In direct comparison to the murder of Hannah Clarke and her children we heard a unanimous and united voice from both politicians and the public, that Rowan Baxter was an evil and barbaric monster, we saw political leaders and public leaders hold a candlit vigil, attend her funeral and still today publicly speak out against her death.

Jeff Lindsell was an innocent and invisible victim of Domestic Violence at the hands of this barbaric and evil Female Domestic Violence Perpetrator, Amanda Zukowski.

<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2018-06-15/gymea-fire-murder-charge/9873148>

Victim 2 - Darren Reid

December 18, 2016.

When Darren Reid was set on fire in his house in Bendigo, Victoria, it looked like he had bravely stepped in to protect his loved ones from attackers... but his girlfriend and mother of his children, Kate Stone was the real domestic violence perpetrator.

It was just before midnight when the emergency call was placed from the home where Darren, Kate and their five children lived.

When help finally arrived, Kate told police three men had broken into the home, shouting and threatening to kill them.

Her lies continued as she stated to police that "Darren had bravely confronted them, before the intruders doused them both in a flammable liquid as they stood on the verandah."

When one of the home invaders threw a lit lighter towards them, Kate said "Darren had heroically leapt in front of her to take the flame and immediately ignited into a fireball."

The next scene depicted is quite horrific to envisage, as Darren ran in excruciating pain past his 16 year old daughter into the bathroom, shouting.." I'm going to die" before climbing into the bath.

His 11 year old daughter left her bedroom after hearing the screams and smoke alarm. She saw a trail of ash, smoke, burnt carpet and burnt clothes leading to her Dad, who was in a terrible state.

The young girl was hysterical and ran out into the road yelling that her Dad was on fire in the bath.

Darren's other three children were not at home at the time.

Darren was found in the bath half filled with water by paramedics,30 mins later, incredibly still conscious.

Paramedics cut off the clothes that had burnt to his skin and wrapped his wounds before air lifting him to hospital in Melbourne.

Darren was placed in an induced coma with third degree burns to 95% of his body, including his airways.

It was clear he wasn't going to survive and the following afternoon his life support was switched off.

Proof of Domestic Violence

With more investigation, officers heard from neighbours that there were constant rows between Kate and Darren. Darren's Mum recalled her son calling several times from a public phone using reverse charge calls, a month before his death because Kate had locked him out of the house.

He said Kate had chased him out of the house and down the street armed with a carving knife.

Darren had been scared for his life but didn't want the Police involved.

Darren's step Mum also said that Darren wanted to leave Kate.

The truth was later uncovered in the November 2018 trial, where it was found that Kate had committed the most evil and barbaric of acts, while two of her children were home.

The defence said that while Darren was being attended to, he told police a group of men had been responsible.

Even at the point of his body being covered with third degree burns to 95% of his body and so close to inevitable death, Darren was speaking from terror as a victim of Domestic Violence at the hands of the perpetrator Kate Stone.

Darren's Mum said during the last conversation she'd had with her son, he was fearful of his life and that will always haunt her.

"The pain in my heart is unbearable," her statement said, adding that her son was unrecognisable when she'd seen him in hospital.

"A mother is not supposed to bury her son."

Darren's sister Jayne made a statement that spoke about the last moments she had with him.

"I lay with Darren and held his hand under the sheet," she said

"I remember seeing tears come from the corners of his eyes."

Kate was sentenced to 34 years in prison and told she would be eligible for parole in 28 years.

"The Manner in which you murdered Mr Reid was vicious, his last conscious hours were in agony and passed in the belief he would die," the Judge said.

"Your actions were despicable. For no obvious reason, you ended the life of the man you say you loved, in an excruciating manner, making him suffer unimaginable pain."

The Judge added that Darren had the right to be safe in his own home and said that Darren Reid was a victim of Domestic Violence.

https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/real-life-stories/dad-set-fire-wife-ran-18977221.amp?fbclid=IwAR3ztprAkaQq4qYwMjFOc9reEaAUB9gtJBS8PJTYmTu3_kmB6C-ppYBOCo

Unlike Hannah Clarkes death, there was no floral tributes laid for Darren Reid.

- There was no candlelit vigil.
- The Prime Minister Scott Morrison nor any public figures attended his funeral
- There was no public outcry ...nor any charity set up in Darren's name.
- No outrage by the Media or the public condemnation of his murderer.
- There was no domestic violence organisation to be the voice for Darren Reid.
- There was no access to Domestic Violence support systems for Darren and his children.
Why? because he was a man.

In direct comparison to the murder of Hannah Clarke and her children we heard a unanimous and united voice from both politicians and the public, that Rowan Baxter was an evil and barbaric monster, we saw political leaders and public leaders hold a candlelit vigil, attend her funeral and still today publicly speak out against her death.

Darren Reid was an innocent and invisible victim of Domestic Violence at the hands of this barbaric and evil Female Domestic Violence Perpetrator, Kate Stone.

Victim 3 – Daniel Surtees

Australia Day, Jan 26 2020, Victorian Police Officers were called to a Geelong home at 8.30pm to find 36 year old father of five Daniel Surtees, with severe burns to his body.

Paramedics arrived soon afterwards and took Mr Surtees to hospital where he died the following days from his horrific injuries.

The Police arson squad charged his 33 yr old wife of four years, Angela Surtees.

Police allege Ms O'Brien caused the fire after a report, that the couple had a "petty argument" between the couple took place before Mr Surtees was set alight.

It is alleged that Daniel was asleep in his armchair when Angela poured a flammable liquid over Daniel and then ignited the liquid.

The murder trial is still pending.

Daniel and the alleged perpetrator Angela Surtees, have three children together who are currently being raised by a member of Daniel's family.

Unlike Hannah Clarkes death, there was no floral tributes laid for Daniel Surtees.

There was no candlelit vigil.

The Prime Minister Scott Morrison nor any public figures attended his funeral.

There was no public outcry ...nor any charity set up in Daniel's name.

No outrage by the Media or the public condemnation of his murderer.

There was no domestic violence organisation to be the voice for Daniel Surtees.

There was no access to Domestic Violence support systems for Daniel and his children.

Why? because he was a man.

In direct comparison to the murder of Hannah Clarke and her children we heard a unanimous and united voice from both politicians and the public, that Rowan Baxter was an evil and barbaric monster, we saw political leaders and public leaders hold a candlelit vigil, attend her funeral and still today publicly speak out against her death.

Daniel Surtees was an innocent and invisible victim of Domestic Violence at the hands of this barbaric and evil alleged Female Domestic Violence Perpetrator, Angela Surtees.

<https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-7936579/Wife-charged-setting-husband-fire-talked-wedding-posted-singing-songs.html>

The Untold Child Victims of Domestic Violence, Coercive Control and their Female Perpetrators

The murder of children by their mothers, are represented as a mother's tragic cry for help or as a woman who couldn't cope with the pressures of the family, rather than being reported as an evil and barbaric act of Domestic Violence. Why is this the case?

In direct comparison to the murder of Hannah Clarke and her children we heard a unanimous and united voice from both politicians and the public, that Rowan Baxter was an evil and barbaric monster.

Below are only a handful of the actual murders of children at the hands of their Mother.....I have an extensive list of these child victims and the women who committed these vile and evil acts.

Three year old Iyla Lee Katterns, was found dead inside her home in Orange, NSW August 1, 2019. Tamara Gurney was charged with the murder of her daughter after losing a Family Law Court Custody Battle and died by suicide whilst awaiting trial. The mother was charged with murdering the child on the same day she had been ordered to surrender the child to her Father, Nathan Kattern's, after he was awarded full custody after a lengthy court battle. Tamara Gurney was a perpetrator of DV and yet had custody of her child and continued to breach the orders.

Iyla became the ultimate victim of Domestic Violence, when she was murdered tragically at the hands of her Mother.

A homicide report showed that at 9am, February 19,2018 **Ezvin and Furaha Muhoro** were murdered by their Mother, Anne Wachera Muhoro, through suspected poisoning and then set the house on fire, killing herself too .The day they were murdered was the day that Anne and the Father of Ezvin and Furaha were to appear in court for a custody hearing.

Tragically Ezvin and Furaha's had become the ultimate victims of Domestic Violence, when they were murdered tragically at the hands of their Mother.

Akon Guode, killed her **three youngest children** by deliberately driving her car into a lake. Guode was last year jailed for 26½ years for driving into Lake Gladman in Wyndham Vale with four of her children in the car on April 8, 2015.

October 2019 Milka Djurasovic, 38, was found by police with self-inflicted wounds at Mullaloo Beach hours after the bodies of her daughters, **10-year-old Mia and six-year-old Tiana**, were discovered at the family's Madeley home in Perth's northern suburbs.
She was charged with two counts of murder after allegedly bludgeoning her daughters with a hammer.

Charmaine McLeod, 35, murdered her four children **Aaleyn, 6, Matilda, 5, Wyatt, 4 and Zaidok, 2**, when she deliberately collided head-on with a truck on May 27, 2019.
Ms McLeod was also killed. Father, James McLeod has been left with his world in pieces after the murder of his children at the hands of their Mother.

A Horrifying massacre took place at Cairns home six days before Christmas 2014.
Eight children aged between 2 and 14 were stabbed to death by Raina Thaiday, the mother of seven of the children and the aunt of one.

A mother charged with the murder of her eight-year-old son died by suicide, in jail leaving Father, Lee Moran lost for answers as to why his little boy was murdered.
Joanne Finch, 42, from Tootgarook on the Mornington Peninsula, was charged with murder over the death of her **son Brodie Moran, 8**, at their seaside home in March, 2018.

September 24, 2019 **Makavelii Leoni, 13 months**, was not breathing when he was pulled from the bath. This little boy died from a meth overdose in a known drug den, had more than 40 injuries to his tiny body, a court heard.
His mother Lina Daley, 20, who had a history of drug use, claimed she was not to blame.
Bite marks, bruises, head graze and a possible burn mark found baby's body.

These are just a few cases of the hundreds and as previously stated I will provide an extensive list if I am chosen to appear before the committee.

Several questions that need to be asked are :

Why is it that current Domestic Violence laws do not recognise men and their children as victims of Domestic Violence ?

When men report cases of Domestic Violence at the hands of their female partners, why are they treated as perpetrators?

I have received information from several frustrated Police officers that they must follow DV policy guidelines based around the Duluth Model and therefore are instructed to document ANY female perpetrated violence as situational conflict or a disturbance.

Why ?

Because if it isn't documented, there are no statistics.

If there are no statisticsit doesn't exist.

This missing statistical data is one of the many reasons that assure there is no help or support, nor access to any Domestic Violence organisations for Male Victims.

The evidence presented is just a token of the thousands of reports across our nation.

It clearly proves that Domestic Violence has no gender.

Let's identify the true narrative that Domestic Violence is not gendered.

Let's recognise ALL victims of family and domestic violence regardless of their gender.

COERCIVE CONTROL WEAPONISED IN THE FAMILY LAW COURT

Coercive Control is at the core of the Family Law Business Model

There are a multitude of complexities that arise in many Family Law cases, when we find the majority of perpetrators conducting Coercive control in full and open view of the legal fraternity.

The recent Family Law Inquiry has brought forward many submissions where it has been repeatedly reported that children are withheld from the non-primary care giver as a form of coercive control and a legal weapon.

The majority of cases which involve this form of Coercive Control is perpetrated by the primary care giver. According to the abs.gov.au website 2016-2017 "insights into parental leave", it is documented that women took 95% of the primary parental leave .

(abs.gov.au 4125.0 – Gender Indicators, Australia, Sept 2018)

Many Men and Women who made submissions to the recent Family Law Inquiry also reported a common theme of a plethora of False Allegations of Domestic Violence which were then weaponised as a tool to further withhold access to the Father and the Paternal extended families.

These allegations are also used to obtain the financial rewards associated with 100% primary care of the child/ children.

We are seeing almost a pandemic of Domestic Violence allegations used as a precursor to entering the current Adversarial Family Law system.

There are numerous cases which I can bring forward of proven False allegations of DV including acts of Coercive Control but sadly the majority of these allegations go untested for a number of reasons.

A growing majority of men who are facing a DV charge, based on false allegations, are being encouraged to "consent to the order" by their legal representation. They are encouraged to consent to the order as they either, do not have the financial ability to fight the charge, are not in the right emotional state due to being separated from their child after family separation, are emotionally exhausted after the breakdown of the family unit or just because of the time defending such allegations will take away and could possibly affect their employment commitments. They are also told that because a DV order is not a "criminal" charge it won't affect them. They are encouraged to consent to the order just to keep the peace and are told " you don't want to see her anyway, right?"

Once having "consented" to the DV orders, what many of these men are not aware of, is that if there has been initial False allegations, they can be assured that more false allegations will continue.

These new False allegations now put them in "Breach of the DV Orders" which is now a "Criminal Offence".

According to BOSCAR (Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research) the figures for breach of Apprehended Violence orders in October 2019 – September 2020 is a high 19,784. According to the data breaches have increased by 13.7% since Oct 2018- Sept 2020. (Bocsar.nsw.gov.au)

These breaches include breaches through False Allegations, being “set up” through Coercive Control means, texting a happy birthday to a child, leaving a birthday present for a child or posting a photo of their child on Social Media.

One man, who was on a 12 month order was asked by his former partner to return to live in the family home after reconciliation. 3 months later the man was arrested for being in breach of the order even though the couple had gone to counselling, had settled their differences and were both committed to building the relationship.

Under this Coercive Control bill proposal, he could be charged with reconnecting with his former partner through “coercive” means and be imprisoned for 5 – 10 years.

This possibility is outrageous.

There are extreme lengths that a vindictive Primary Caregiver (in the majority cases, the Woman) will implement to control their victim by coercive means, is continually overlooked or excused by the court or Police Officers when reported.

When a man reports coercive controlling behaviour of his partner or former partner to Police they are turned away and told “sorry, there’s nothing we can do, it’s a family law matter.”

Tens of thousands of men within our nation, provide proof of long term coercive control by their former partners to the Family Court and to the Police and are completely ignored.

This gendered bill will only increase these kind of coercive control tactics by a former partner, through continued false allegations, with a renewed and firm goal of imprisonment to further bait the perpetrator, who is pretending to be the victim.

AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY ONLINE SURVEY ONLY TARGETS WOMEN

July 2020 Australian Institute of Criminology released an online survey after surveying 15,000 women regarding Domestic Violence during the initial Covid 19 period.

It was reported that 5.8% of the 15,000 women surveyed experienced “coercive control”.

This data has been used to support the implementation of this bill.

The question that needs to be asked is why were 15,000 men not surveyed and asked the same questions?

Could the answer be that the 15,000 women were targeted in order to produce the desired results to support the Duluth Modelled narrative that only women are victims of “coercive control” and domestic violence?

We declare loudly and clearly to a false narrative fed society and the committee, “The Emperor has no clothes.”

The lesson from the parable of “The Emperor has no clothes” by Hans Christian Anderson (1837) is that when a leader surrounds himself with “yes” men, it often leads to absurd and embarrassing results. It is far better to surround oneself with honest people who are unafraid to ask questions or to point out deficiencies as they see them.

Let us revisit Coercive Control.....

What is Coercive control?

(<http://www.crimeprevention.nsw.gov.au/domesticviolence/Documents/domestic-violence/discussion-paper-coercive-control.pdf>)

2.1 Coercive control in DFV contexts describes patterns of abusive behaviour designed to exercise domination and control over the other party to a relationship. It is often a process that happens slowly over time and can be nuanced in nature, making it difficult to identify.

It can include a range of abusive behaviours – physical, psychological, emotional or financial – the cumulative effect of which over time robs victim-survivors of their autonomy and independence as an individual.

- In response to this point, the long term withholding a child from the non- primary care giver, the ongoing continual refusal to obey court orders with no penalties incurred, the repeated denial of phone or Video phone contact with the child, inflicts psychological and emotional trauma on the victimised parent and child, robbing them of their autonomy and independence, continually being controlled by the perpetrator/aggressor for the life of the child. This type of Coercive Control behaviour also impacts the child's ability to form relationships later in life. If Coercive Control was Criminalized it would have to be a clear and substantiated non gendered law which would include an outcome involving the imprisonment of tens of thousands of women, Australia wide, who are exhibiting the types of coercive behaviour stated above, in order to control their former partners.

2.2 The work of Evan Stark, who originated the concept of coercive control, provides a general typology of this behaviour, identifying four key aspects: violence, intimidation (including threats, surveillance, degradation, withholding money), isolation and control (principally through the micro-regulation of everyday behaviours, and the institution of rules).

- In response to this point, the isolation and control of former partners through the withholding of a child to the other parent is clearly Coercive Control. Many men reported in their Family Law Inquiry submissions evidence of threats, surveillance and degradation at the hands of their former partner being a woman. If this bill was implemented, it would dictate that women exhibiting these kind of behaviours would be imprisoned for a minimum 5 – 10 years.

This can extend to a wide range of behaviours, including but not limited to the following:

- *Deprivation of liberty and autonomy, such as preventing one person from leaving the house at all or requiring them to get permission for any movement beyond the household.*
- *Isolating an individual from friends, family and wider society. This could be done through deprivation of liberty, manipulation by suggesting that friends and family are not in fact supportive, or the use of the victim's social media to drive away family and friends.*

- In response to this point, withholding a child from its parent is to cause that parent isolation. Withholding a child from its parent is also a deprivation of that child's and parent's liberty. The definition of "Liberty" is "the state of being free"... "the power to do as one pleases" ... "the freedom from physical restraint"
If Coercive Control was criminalized, we would see women who exhibit these kind of behaviours, imprisoned for a minimum 5 – 10 years.

• Withholding or controlling access to resources, including money. This can extend from direct demands that all income of the victim be provided to the perpetrator, as well as denying the victim a say in the management of joint property, or using their property without their consent. This can also include the imposition of restrictions on the victim's access to education, employment and training opportunities.

- Numerous Family Law Court Submissions described men who had little or no control to the income they provided to support the Family Unit. In numerous cases, the Fathers weekly income was paid into a joint bank account with the Mother/ Wife managing the household budget. Many times it is reported that there is little or any accountability for the money spent. Many of these men receive an allowance from their wage as a form of "pocket money" and are denied given extra money when it is requested. In the above point, the woman would clearly be the perpetrator in this case. If Coercive Control was criminalized, we would see women exhibiting these kind of behaviours, imprisoned for a minimum 5 – 10 years.

All of the points below have been described in numerous Family Law Inquiry Submissions with the woman accused of these kind of behaviours.

Are we, as a society prepared to criminalize Coercive Control and see tens of thousands of women removed from the family home and their children and imprison them for 5 – 10 years??

- *Psychological control and manipulation, including by making the other person question their memory of events and agreements (i.e. gaslighting), or threatening self-harm or suicide.*
- *Stalking and intimidation, including through technological means such as installing tracking software or apps.*
- *Physical assault or threats of physical assault. Beyond physical assault of the victim, this can also include things such as the destruction of property or harming animals to set an example or to inspire fear for one's individual safety. Threats can also be made against friends or family.*
- *Sexual assault, including non-consensual intercourse or sexual touching. This may also involve the use of image-based abuse, such as threats to share intimate images against the victim's wishes. • Reproductive coercion, such as forcing the victim to become pregnant or denying birth control, or demanding an abortion.*
- *Threatening to take the victim's children away, to send them to state care or to institute court proceedings to deny the victim access to the children.*

ABOLISH THE DULUTH

Our belief is that the continued use of the Duluth model as the basis of domestic violence and family law related policy, is one of the most illogical, unwarranted and deceptive aspects of this industry.

The “Duluth Model” is responsible for convoluted statistics, gender biased assumptions and removes the crucial connection to reality by removing the individual nature of each person’s situation, under the guise that ALL men are perpetrators and ALL women are victims.

There is nothing more insane than using this outdated, mis-modelled, flawed and cherry picked academic data that professes to accurately describe a situation before it has even occurred.

Add to this AVO data that is based on a very sizeable percentage of orders being issued with zero evidence, a culture within law enforcement built around a gender biased narrative and quotas, the ability and heavily incentivised option to use protection orders, using systems abuse and coercive control to gain an advantage in divorce proceedings; and the data being used to paint a particular picture begins to show how unreliable it potentially is.

From the review and analysis of much first hand anecdotal evidence, the ‘official story’ certainly doesn’t seem to match up with the countless claims that the domestic violence industry lacks integrity, lacks the ability and intent to address the validity of evidence, and leads to abusive and delusional partners gaining power, financial advantage and control over their families, by simply adopting a single minded persona of that of a victim.

Gender based definitions that are labeled domestic violence for male perpetrators, but can be labeled as situational conflict or domestic disturbance when perpetrated by a female, further bring into question the notion that a vastly different set of truths are able to be presented using Policing methodology that is severely lacking in integrity.

NSW Police have been subject to training and accreditation by the White Ribbon Organisation, which after financial liquidation, has now had its iconic brand image revived in order to provide additional propaganda and campaign support for those seeking validation of this proposed Coercive Control Legislation.

We hear “off the record” that internal memos distributed throughout the New South Wales Police Force, suggest a heavy focus on gender bias and quotas with regard to the issuing of protection orders.

We hear of Police consistently stating “off the record” that approximately 90% of their work involves removing men from their houses and issuing them with interim AVO’s.

They do this without the ability to use ordinary Police discretionary powers, and with much concern that this system is being abused by people who don’t respect the serious nature of involving the law in their domestic disputes that very rarely would warrant this type of approach.

We have heard “off the record” from numerous Police officers that are disgusted by the way this system has evolved and is being abused, the sheer waste of Police resources and the risks that actual victims of crime face due to this illogical resource allocation, yet they do not speak up publicly because they are under threat of losing their careers if they do talk up and speak the truth.

We hear of men being given custodial sentences for breaching their protection orders, with far too many examples of them being jailed for nothing more than sending a text message, answering a phone call or delivering a birthday card to their unfairly estranged child via the letterbox.

It seems that the use of entrapment to initiate a breach of these orders is validated by current legislation.

As such, the statistics surrounding protection orders serve to support a particular narrative that is then backed up by costly marketing campaigns, social influence and engineering via extensive media reach and coverage.

It appears that there is clearly a very large economy attached to a well connected and coordinated network, that derives their income from workflow generated via this apparatus and model.

As this network derives most of their income on an ideological basis, it can be assumed that their judgement is susceptible to having become clouded, with particular regards to the existing methodologies used, as well as the reality and the negative social implications of continuation upon its current trajectory.

We propose that the approach at present, if it is enabled to continue unquestioned and unrestrained, will come at and even larger cost to the tax payer and society, and at a hugely negative benefit to all; well all except of course those who derive an income from the use of this model, and do so seemingly without much visible care or conscience.

The Family Law Industry has basically morphed into the FOR-PROFIT Domestic Violence Industry and it is obviously no coincidence that this has happened, given a legislative direction that encourages so many so called professionals to seize any opportunity, to pick away like vultures at the carcasses of innocent, wounded and vulnerable families.

Why should it cost so much money, time, emotion, energy and focus just to separate from someone that you have grown apart from, especially if they are volatile and high conflict, and intent on inflicting an ongoing campaign of punishment, escalated abuse and coercive control?

Why should a loving parent, moral and decent individual, have to “become a legal expert and contract law specialist” as part of a covert MARITIME SALVAGE and EXTORTION OPERATION, based purely on ones own love for and sacred commitment to their children?

Bare in mind that the Family Law System still uses an **adversarial model** to resolve family disputes and deal with such highly sensitive matters as child welfare, parenting after separation and the contract based industry claims at its core to hold “the best interest of the child” as their Paramount Consideration.

An Adversarial Model, really? Why?

Sounds totally insane and illogical doesn't it?

The Attorney General Christian Porter has recently stated that **“Everyone involved in the Family Law System has known for years that the system is broken and needs to be reformed as a priority.”**

Excerpt from Media Release,
20 November 2020
AG Porter (below)

<https://www.attorneygeneral.gov.au/media/media-releases/senate-inquiry-endorses-family-court-reform-bills-20-november-2020>

The Attorney Generals admission that the system is broken and has been for years, would appear to indicate that those involved have carried on anyways, knowingly doing harm in the course of their business dealings.

This is akin to trading whilst insolvent, and there are harsh penalties for operating under a corporate structure that is bankrupt, financially and or morally.

Making minor “reforms” or “holding it together with superglue” is going to do nothing to eradicate the widespread misery that the fundamental design flaws cause, by simply doing business with this mob.

It is clear that a bunch of innocent and honest minded children could design a more compassionate and logical, approach to Family Law than what we have been provided with by these so-called experts.

These “experts” have fought against genuine reform for years and have continued using this exploitative model to their own benefit and at the expense of many innocent children and parents.

There are grave concerns about the lack of transparency and accountability within this system as well as serious concerns about the consistencies of outcomes.

It seems that the only consistency appears to be in the misery that it has caused for so many by way of the broken Family Law System and a completely biased DFV industry.

So why would we trust these people when they are now proposing legislation to criminalise Coercive Control (CC), when we consider how this proposed legislation will overlap into other aspects of this existing industry and it's morally bankrupt operations?

These people have already caused so much damage to the innocent, to society as a whole, and to their chances of being allowed to participate in a redesigned and completely new system which must be done expeditiously.

The ‘usual suspects’ took over the Family Law System and fashioned it into the Domestic Violence System, and now they are pushing to gain even more control over society with the ability to further commoditise the bad luck and misfortune of the innocent and vulnerable, through their relationship dysfunction, and the opportunities that will arise from the Criminalisation of these people under this proposed Coercive Control Legislative Scam.

The False Allegation Industry

The only genuine way to help people in a domestic situation, who are experiencing coercive control, is to assist them to leave the relationship and to offer the necessary help to them as per their individual situation.

Under the current framework, those making false allegations for personal gain and the disadvantage of another, have it all too easy.

Those offering support services to these fraudulent individuals also have it all too easy, as they gain financially time and time again.

The False Allegation Industry thrives under the current framework and their clever repetition of manipulated statistics, catchphrases and influence using media bias and propaganda, not only gives the majority of society an impression that is truly different from reality, but it also encourages those who would make false allegations by providing a clear narrative and imagery for them to identify with.

Over the last few years, how often have we heard the statement “one woman killed every week” repeated over and over again as a regular media talking point?

What about the generalisation that more women are killed by men than men are killed by women? It's not a competition or a sporting match, where the team with the highest score wins the game.

This highly insensitive perspective reveals another inhumane aspect of this callous mindset, that uses women and children as it's Trojan Horse, with no concern or empathy for male and child victims, their memories or their loved ones, as such victims highlight the false claims, false narrative and heartless nature of these types.

This approach shows a complete lack of compassion and empathy for true victims and it exposes a disingenuous motive, sending a dangerous message to men, women and children across society for a multitude of different reasons.

The repetition of these statements about murder, safety of women and children, and the need to do more, seems to steer the focus of the majority away from the real issues and extent of protective legislations being used as a form of systems abuse and the serious damage that is caused by those who commit the criminal offences of fraud and perjury in doing so.

In fact this coercive control legislation certainly has the potential to and may actually increase the numbers of people being physically harmed or even murdered, as it offers additional opportunities for disordered people to exert more coercion, control, intimidation and abuse by way of threatening to pursue legal avenues made available by the faults in concept of this proposed legislation.

We have heard of so many situations where women have threatened their husbands that they "will never see their children again" during the course of a heated argument.

What empowers them to use this form of threat and brazen display of coercive control?

When women murder men are these murders always statistically classified as domestic violence murders?

It appears that they are not in a number of different scenarios, and in situations that would almost definitely be statistically included as a domestic violence murder if the genders of the perpetrators were reversed.

What if a woman kills a man and then on record states that she was a victim of years of abuse from the man she has just ended the life of?

Does she get a free pass?

How does she produce sufficient evidence to back this up?

How often has this happened in recent years?

How could this alone affect the statistics and subsequent heartfelt narrative that those proposing this legislation, so heavily rely upon?

Who benefits most from a set of new laws that extend the ability of an abuser to assume the role of victim, with plenty of attached financial incentives to do so, and the ability to do further long term irreparable harm to the victim by seeking to have them jailed?

It seems that the legislation may primarily serve those who are the types who rely on coercive control rather than offering any protection and genuine assistance for true victims.

As an example, in the context of the annual road toll, speeding cameras were introduced as a deterrent but mostly serve to raise revenue and certainly don't reduce the annual death toll on Australian roads.

Not only has it been proven that numerous speed cameras have been fraudulent and produced false evidence of an offence due to being not calibrated properly, but also those targeted unfairly often have no way of mounting an effective defence against this fraudulent revenue raising tactic.

Whatever happened to innocent until proven guilty?

How would that constitutional right be afforded to those accused under this proposed legislation?

Are we also proposing to criminalise false allegations of coercive control?

Should mandatory 5 to 10 year jail terms also be included in the legislation as a deterrent for those considering abusing these laws, and if not why not?

Seeking to jail a person for a 5 to 10 year period is a very extreme measure and it shows little regard for that individual and their individual circumstance, their life, their positive aspects, relationships, or their future.

Just from allegations made, the individual will suffer great damage to their reputation, huge financial burdens, possible job losses, immense stress, potential health issues, unexpected interruption to their life and potentially irreparable damage to the bonds and attachments they have with their children.

If somebody does go to jail for a 5 to 10 year period, knowing what we do about the prison system, they are likely not going to re-emerge as a nicer and more socially adjusted version of themselves upon release.

Does this extremely socially irresponsible legislation that is being proposed create further risk for society and the individual whom made the allegations, as well as others responsible for determining the allegations must warrant such extreme impositions on this individual?

What happens to the imprisoned persons assets and finances if they were partly or jointly owned by themselves and the individual making the allegations?

What additional pressures does this put on both the aggrieved and the accused on top of the costs that will be required to be paid in legal fees and other commissions due to the follow on effects of these actions?

What happens to the imprisoned person's relationship with their children?

What methodology will police use?

Will they thoroughly investigate because it's a criminal matter?

How are they to investigate and how are they to truly get a clear picture of the evidence and counter claims in context?

Will Police be afforded their rightful discretionary powers, because they are not with AVO matters currently?

There must be a standardised process to investigate coercive control allegations, and a methodology that proves its worth should be proposed, long before anything else is considered.

Some people who have committed murder receive lesser jail sentences than 5-10 years.

The stress on police having to deal with large volumes of people who already seem to use them as a way to intimidate and victimise is totally unfair on these frontline workers, and it should be at this point that we realise that a solution must be genuine and not simply to create additional work, revenues and budgetary quotas by incentivised exploitation.

How on earth could anyone investigating allegations of coercive control be certain beyond doubt, of the true context and of the fact that it was one-sided, and that the individual could not safely leave the relationship prior to these extreme measures?

Gender bias is blatant discrimination and without treating each case on its unique individual aspects, the value to society of law itself, diminishes to the point that trust, truth and justice fall by the wayside as opportunists, liars and the pathologically minded seek to take advantage of others, whereas they would not be as easily able or inclined to, without inbuilt perceptions of bias, poor judgment and discriminatory practices.

Under the proposed legislation will women who are accused of coercive control face the same exact scrutiny and penalties as men?

Do those proposing this legislation even care if men, boys, children are abused or even killed by women?

Do they have a conscience or just a disingenuous agenda? It's quite doubtful that one can have both.

Sensitive family matters cannot and should not be dealt with by insensitive and desensitised people.

During relationship break downs, people are under a lot of stress and are arguably at the most vulnerable time in their lives.

Mental health factors often play a key role in the impulsivity of the decision to involve Police in family issues.

It might be worth pondering the notion that if approximately one in five divorces end up in the family court system, and approximately one in five people in society have a mental illness at some point in their lives, then this may be another correlation worth further consideration.

After the COVID-19 pandemic of 2020, we can see a large portion of society suffering job losses, job insecurity, the collapse of many small businesses and a dilution of their income streams, large increases in the inability to pay mortgages and bills on time, the impacts of isolation from lockdowns and the huge amount of stress already across the board from the effects and Government management of this pandemic; which will no doubt have dramatically added to family and relationship pressures across the board.

It seems like a very cruel and disingenuous approach to seek to introduce any legislation that criminalises family and or relationship dysfunction at any time, and especially after such a difficult year in 2020 for all Australians.

The pandemic management is obviously far from over and even when it finally is, it will take some years for most Australians, and the nation itself, to readjust and regain certainty and stability.

The timing of this proposal seems very thoughtless and illogical when one takes a socially minded, responsible and compassionate perspective towards these broader issues.

Not only is this proposed legislation quite clearly a mindless approach, it appears that it could only be proposed by people who lack clear judgement and the ability to see far better ways of solving the problems experienced by those directly impacted by a partner who has some form of mental health issues such as a disordered personality and insecurities that cause them to use a degree of coercive control within the relationship and or family situation.

Luke 11:46 - And he said, "Woe to you also. For you load men with burdens hard to bear, and you yourselves do not touch the burdens with one of your fingers".

It seems logical that to solve this problem the government should be concentrating resources towards helping these people to either understand and correct their negative behaviours, through counselling and therapy, providing innovative solutions instead of committing to the massive future cost of jailing an individual for 5 to 10 years.

A focus on simply helping them to go their separate ways without further conflict, resentment or disadvantage, would be a far more appropriate way forward.

It seems obvious that more serious human rights abuses than positive social outcomes will eventuate from this proposed new legislation.

What guarantees can be assured that an abuser won't be using these laws to play the victim and continue to increase their position of power, advantage and gain over the accused?

How will accusations of coercive control and criminal charges affect family court matters and parent-child relationships, especially if used in the same way as protection orders are as a "Silver Bullet"?

Will this proposed legislation create even more devastating effects and burdens for children, than the current family law system already sadly causes, by its serious design flaws and the widespread abuse of such flaws?

If a genuine and protective parent is "set up" and jailed by an incentivised vindictive parent who is neglectful of the children, it will make it much easier for the children to suffer all sorts of adverse experiences. It happens already when the protective parent is cut out of the child's lives through AVO's and family court orders.

As we have heard "off the record" that it is an all too common practice for family lawyers to coach (mostly) their female clients, in how to make false allegations of domestic violence just prior to separation as a way to exit an unhappy relationship and control the proceedings.

Does this proposed legislation seek to throw these clients "under the bus" making them vulnerable to future criminal charges and lengthy jail sentences?

Surely all parents who have used an AVO to keep the other parent from having a proper relationship let alone any form of relationship with their children, are clearly doing so in most cases to exert an extreme level of coercive control.

Protracted Family court matters funded by legal aid grants and that rely on baseless allegations, Family reports that support the allegations and advise against an amicable child focused solution, concealment of mental health records, endemic collusion that complicates finalising the matter, Independent Children's Lawyers that ignore the children's wishes for both parents and the common tactic of cruelly convincing the children that the other parent is dangerous or doesn't love them, court ordered and very costly supervised access and psychologists reports, are just some of the ways this BROKEN SYSTEM already provides for the use of COERCIVE CONTROL whilst assuring the parent who is guilty of this that they are doing the "right thing".

If a mother or father uses these and other tactics, will they be criminally charged under this proposed legislation?

It would actually be a very good thing for society if legislation was designed to alleviate the widespread suffering of good children and parents who neither asked for or deserved to be controlled, abused and deeply traumatised by the adversarial model used in family court matters and the ease with which such suffering is imposed on them.

Relationship issues simply cannot and should not be criminalised and anyone who seeks to do so isn't genuine in their reasoning, and appears more concerned about making money from exploitation of the relationship dysfunction, than respecting the complexities of children's and parents needs, wishes and individual circumstances.

It would be interesting if those proposing this legislation were putting pressure on legislators and members of parliament to push for these new laws in a way that would be, by definition, be classed as aggravated coercive control.

Executive Order 13818 21 December 2017, Implemented the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act, which imposes sanctions on those responsible for serious human rights abusers and corruption. The extent with which the US Government will target worldwide individuals, organisations and political groups is largely an unknown factor at this point.

We are of the view that given some of the key points raised within this submission, this proposed legislation and the motivations of those organisations strongly pushing for it, along with the potential for serious human rights abuses and corruption to originate as a result, and if worldwide shifts in power resulted in a focus toward creating a fairer and more socially beneficial framework, then those in favour and support of this legislation could well come under very close scrutiny.

Rather than entertaining a proposed legislative addition that is based on deception, false statistics, coordinated and propagandised narratives, biased and discriminatory objectives, that potentially creates hugely negative outcomes for families and society that far outweigh any possible benefits, we feel that a unique opportunity now presents itself, to look at the trajectory of the current system, it's need for huge fundamental changes and to take a 'bigger picture' perspective in order to better consider how alternative solutions could solve the problem of coercive control; consciously, creatively, compassionately and cost effectively.

It is time to thoroughly examine the complexities of family dysfunction, relationship break down, separation and divorce, co-parenting and rational child-focused forward planning, with the view to exploring potential solutions that are in line with a complete redesign of the BROKEN family law system and BIASED Domestic & Family Violence System.

Only then can we look to provide services that are truly mindful, honest and far more successful in the greater scheme of things.

This is the ONLY positive, logical and socially responsible way forward in our view.