

TAXPAYER FUNDED DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INDUSTRY FUELS VIOLENCE

By Kevin Glancy

Unlike the taxpayer funded domestic violence industry, objective people know that violence is not gender specific; that it does not discriminate; that a woman is more likely to be a victim of domestic violence than a man; that when proven, those guilty of such violence should be severely penalised. But that does not mean that the presumption of innocence on which our legal system is based should be tossed aside because of someone's gender. But sadly, in matters of domestic violence it often is.

Imagine if you woke up to this news item;

Every day innocent mothers across Australia are being accused of domestic violence and presumed guilty without a trial. Even murderers, rapists and terrorists get a trial but these mothers because of their gender are considered unworthy of the presumption of innocence. At the moment an allegation is made and the DVO/AVO is granted, they are instantly sentenced, denied access to their children.

Okay! It's fake news – almost. The only thing that isn't true is the gender referred to in the item. It's not mothers who are being denied the presumption of innocence but fathers. Substitute the word 'fathers' for 'mothers' and that's exactly what is happening every day in Australia to innocent males – victims of vexatious and fabricated domestic violence orders. It's all part of the cruel game played out when a marriage breaks down.

It's about the children but not in a good way. Mothers using

their children as weapons and a domestic violence allegation is the trigger. Some fathers also play the same game but it's far less likely. The domestic violence legal process doesn't assist a man in the same way it does a woman.

Heroic mothers and there are many, are those who understand the importance of fathers in their children's lives. They resist the urge to use the domestic violence system and their children to hurt their previous partners.

The over-riding tragedy is that when a marriage breaks down some parents and every Australian government seems to forget that having children is a lifetime commitment. That the moment a child is born that both parents are equally responsible for the economic and emotional welfare of their children regardless of geography, their careers or the state of their relationship. The children should come first.

Former conservative PM John Howard did appreciate that concept and did much to install a post marriage shared parenting approach with regard to Family Law only to see it eroded under Labor's Rudd and Gillard.

Make no mistake Labor is the enemy of traditional families, males in general and a child's right to equal parental access. Its introduction of 'no fault divorce' in 1975 has aided and abetted the growth in family dysfunction. Parents don't have to be responsible and children are the losers. Couple that with socialist cotton wool laws and you have the whole complacent 'it must be somebody else's fault' culture.

Labor's anti-male position is clearly illustrated by their bias towards women through state imposed domestic violence legislation. On the other hand the new Labor-lite Liberal party, anxious to keep one foot on either side of the fence, is too gutless to do anything to stop the rot.

There should be genuine and proven circumstances before state governments interfere with that 'children first', parental

commitment. But that's not how it works. Instead of working to preserve that bond, state governments and those in the taxpayer funded domestic violence industry do their best to destroy it by assisting mothers with biased DV legislation. Granting women a complicit nudge-nudge-wink-wink legal process. One which provides them with a domestic violence order at the drop of a hat and denies fathers of their basic human right – the presumption of innocence.

In effect, when a mother makes an allegation of domestic violence, fathers and their children are instantly torn apart without any evidence to support that allegation other than a statement. Usually, there are no supporting medical reports; no smart phone images of bruises, no police attendance reports and nothing tangible to support the accusation other than a teary-eyed mother making a claim in a court.

I have no time for any perpetrator of domestic violence regardless of gender. As a child I was a victim but like every other crime in Australia, it must be proven beyond doubt. A mere unchallenged statement should never be enough under any circumstances. It wouldn't be enough to apply guilt in the case of an alleged murderer, rapist or a terrorist and just like perpetrators of domestic violence, we all need to be protected from them and yet, a man facing a DV allegation does not get a trial before punishment is applied.

Now, if women were being treated like second class citizens as fathers are, you would expect nothing less than a national outrage. You wouldn't hear the end of it from the likes of the ABC and the host of female journalists who operate in the mainstream media.

You'd certainly expect that White Ribbon and others in the taxpayer funded domestic violence industry would be falling over themselves to stop this judicial abuse of a female's basic human right.

'Treat people irrationally and you can expect them to act irrationally!' They would argue.

We're being paid by taxpayers to reduce domestic violence. This denial of justice will only motivate more domestic violence from women, not less.'

But instead the silence is deafening. Why? Because this disgraceful denial of justice doesn't count in this divisive age of gender-card-carrying, identity politics. Fathers are the victims and it seems that being born a male, particularly a white male is an unforgivable sin.

The obscenity of this denial of human rights is that those beneficiaries of taxpayer funds like White Ribbon et al stand idly by and allow this to happen. By adopting a collective anti-male attitude they in effect, pour kerosene on the emotional fires that burn when a marriage breaks down. Deny a sector of society justice and it can only produce a negative result and in some cases it will motivate an act of domestic violence.

Even the Federal Coalition government is in on the act in reinforcing the anti-male narrative. Under then female Liberal Minister Kelly O'Dwyer, a television campaign was created with our money depicting young school boys as simply on their way to becoming violent men. The stereotyping is as discriminatory as it is disgraceful but that's the anti-male environment we live in. Let's hope this false projection doesn't become a self-fulfilling prophecy.

One can only guess what effect this propaganda is having on young boys as they grow up in the face of their 'we can do no wrong' privileged, female students. How many serial killers will come out of that socialist ideology?

Yet, how many times do we see videos of female violence in the schoolyard or in the street? How often do we hear about female bullying on the nightly news? About female crime? About how

women constantly criticise each other for what they wear. This is the problem with the false narrative that is painted when we mark violence and bullying as gender specific; that it's only a male thing when clearly it isn't. It's propaganda and its aim is to deceive.

That false narrative is obscenely enforced within the legal process. In the real world when a mother applies for a domestic violence order, often fathers don't even know that such an allegation has been made until they return home from work and find that their front door is locked and their key doesn't work anymore. When they ask to see their children their wife tells them. 'You can't! You're not allowed. I've taken out an AVO.'

'What do you mean an AVO? I've never been violent.'

What the wife doesn't say is that soon she will have sole custody of the kids because that's why she lied. The mother has been advised by her solicitor and her female support group to fabricate a statement because it will more than likely ensure that she gets custody of the kids. The Family Law Court will soon get its turn to assist her in that aim.

Of course, stopping this injustice is of no interest to the likes of White Ribbon et al. They use fabricated claims of domestic violence to stack the figures to support the fallacy. It's the key to more taxpayer funds. 'It's a DV epidemic!' They cry and all men are evil. The real epidemic can be found in outback indigenous communities but hey! Who cares about that?

Whenever you hear on the nightly news how many women are victims blah blah blah, consider this.

Only five percent of domestic violence orders are legitimate.

In 1999, a survey conducted with 60 serving NSW magistrates by the Judicial Commission of NSW found that 90 percent of them

believed domestic violence orders (AVOs) were used by applicants and often on the advice of a solicitor – as a tactic in Family Court proceedings to deprive their partners of access to their children. (*‘Call for tougher checks on AVOs’, Sydney Morning Herald, 30 August 1999*)

In 1995, Queensland’s Chief Stipendiary Magistrate Mr Stan Deer acknowledged the problem of domestic violence orders being misused when he stated, “some women are using domestic violence orders to gain a better position in child custody cases”. **Estimates provided by court staff/prosecutors suggested that only 5% of applications for domestic violence orders were legitimate** in their claims. (*Women abusing violence orders: SM, Courier Mail, 5 July 1995*)

In this women can do no wrong ‘#metoo’ climate, a false DV allegation made by a mother to support her post-marriage claim for child custody is even less likely to be scrutinised by a magistrate than it was back in 1995. Where women are involved they are always given the benefit of the doubt regardless of any injustice they might perpetrate. Magistrates have been forced into that level of compliance. It’s a perspective based on a state government and the DV industry fallacy. Women don’t lie, don’t manipulate and are never violent. Of course, reality begs to differ.

Remember how the police ‘helped’ male DV victim, well known singer Jon Stevens?

His shocking and costly ordeal is a classic example of how police in general respond to men who report domestic violence perpetrated by a female.

It’s also the reason why men don’t report domestic violence and any figures about female violence against males are misleading. ABS statistics of one in three males being victims is often derided because it doesn’t suit the narrative. Regardless, you can assume that the real figure is a lot

higher.

In Jon's case on 9th February 2015, the well-known singer called the police to his Point Piper apartment because his girlfriend at the time, Jodhi Meares was intoxicated and behaving irrationally. She was becoming violent and Jon Stevens knew that in simply defending himself he risked being arrested.

There was an unconfirmed report that he had tried to restrain Jodhi by holding her wrists. Trying to defend yourself from a woman in that situation without hurting her is extremely difficult. It's a dilemma many men find themselves in when facing an irrational and violent female who will not stop attacking and I speak from personal experience. On that occasion that woman was armed with a knife. I can remember at the time thinking, I can't win no matter what I do. I was lucky that time and I didn't report it.

In Jon's case, desperate to calm Ms Meares down, he initially rang her sister Sophie, hoping that she would come over and assist in that endeavour. Unfortunately, Sophie was otherwise occupied and couldn't respond. Still desperate and with the situation becoming more explosive, Jon rang the police seeking their help.

Some background is essential as a precursor to what happened next. In August the previous year, the same drunken Jodhi Meares was charged with being four times over the limit after crashing her Range Rover into four cars in the Sydney suburb of Bellevue Hill. She was also charged with driving while suspended. Meares was lucky that no one was killed.

Now armed with that 'intelligence' you might expect that while the police were on their way to Point Piper in response to Jon's call, that they would have considered what they already knew about the woman involved. The woman had form; had a criminal record; is indulgent; does not abide by the law and

is reckless when she drinks alcohol. On that basis alone you would expect that at the very least, the police would have been cautious in their rush to judgement. But far from it.

Following a discussion, the police arrested Jon Stevens and took him away in a paddy wagon, locked him up and slapped him with an AVO. They also charged him with common assault.

Typically, the public read about it on the front pages of the newspapers the next day and Jon Steven's decent reputation and his career was ruined. Brainwashed by the 'men are violent' narrative the public also rushed to judgement and even though the police would later drop the charges, the damage was well and truly done. That incident in which he was innocent cost Jon Stevens thousands of dollars in legal fees, sponsorship and employment, simply for being a gentleman and doing the right thing.

Of course, the media sensationalised the event but when his innocence was established they didn't care so much. Inevitably some of the mud has stuck fast.

Had it been a married couple with children situation, Jon would have instantly lost access to his children. This is the kind of thing that happens to men and fathers all over the country. Try ringing the police when you are facing a violent woman. They will either take you away or tell you to man up. It's the sad lesson Jon Stevens learnt the hard way and why other men do not ring the police for fear of ending up like him.

When custody of the children is the endgame, civilised behaviour is no longer the norm and mothers are very good at being vindictive. Whilst not wishing to minimise the potential of male anger, there is more than a grain of truth in the adage; 'hell hath no fury like a woman scorned'. Reactions when a marriage fails can be brutal and the law is very much on the mother's side.

She can goad him, call him names and push him around. The husband can't respond and if he calls the police they'll more than likely believe her and not him – a la Jon Stevens. The next step is simple. Once the mother decides to fabricate an application for a domestic violence order, the father is on a road to ruin and the truth quickly takes a back seat.

The ordeal that follows is all based on an unproven statement made by the mother. If these fathers are lucky it will be many weeks before they see their children again. Anything from eight weeks or longer. When the father is allowed to see his own children it will be under the supervision of a third person.

In Victoria, he will have to pay around \$400 each time for that access visit during which the supervisor will observe and write a report. The hour to two hour visit occurs at a neutral venue like McDonalds as ordered by the court and by that stage the father has not seen his children for eight to ten weeks or more.

The subjective nature of that access report and the qualifications of the supervisor are also questionable. You can't learn about life and relationships in a book or at university and any report may even be biased against the father which will go against him in the Family Law Court. Bear in mind that the legal system has forced the father's children into an unnatural situation without any evidence to justify it. Emotions can only be raw. The father is perceived as being guilty and presumed as such – that's his new status. He's the villain of the piece.

Along the way the father will be further humiliated. Forced to attend and pay for anger management classes. Forced to pay around \$4,000 for an unnecessary psychiatric report. You can only hazard a guess at that outcome, given the current and discriminatory 'toxic masculinity' philosophy exercised by the leaders of Australia's psychiatric profession.

Meanwhile the mother is indoctrinating the kids and the neighbours. Telling them that her husband and their father is a nasty, violent person. The supervised access visit reinforces that lie when the kids ask, 'Dad! Why is that third person watching us – are you a bad person like mum says you are?'

Female support groups are already teaching the kids what to say when the matter of custody eventually lands in the Family Law Court. Just in case the kids are asked questions.

Now for those who want to swallow the 'all men are violent' doctrine, then how would you expect a man to react to that kind of injustice? Would you expect these fathers to take the law into their own hands when no one will listen to their cries of innocence? Would you expect them to kidnap their children? Would you expect them to act violently towards their wives who lied to the court; committed an act of perjury in order to have that DVO/AVO granted?

Humans are flawed and when denied natural justice and pushed to an emotional breaking point by a gender biased legal system then why should we be surprised at such a violent outcome?

Now this is the kind of news story that should have all Australians up in arms and it's been happening for years. If women were the victims of course it would have been stopped.

Not a single word of condemnation from the Human Rights Commission when the presumption of innocence until proven guilty is a basic human right. Not a peep out of White Ribbon and all those other taxpayer funded rent seekers in the DV industry and here's the rub.

You would think that instead of funding their own careers and indulging in anti-male propaganda, those in the lucrative domestic violence industry might act with some integrity and do something constructive.

You might expect that those in the DV industry would want to turn down the heat in an effort to reduce domestic violence. Losing your children for no justifiable reason and without an opportunity to defend yourself in court will make a parent very angry and it may lead to violence.

Therefore you might expect that the DV industry would demand that state governments instigate severe penalties to discourage vexatious and fabricated claims. It is an act of perjury and it is a crime. Apart from which, the presumption of innocence should always apply before people are punished for a crime they may not have committed.

Wouldn't that be a smart move to stop parents in their quest for custody of their children from muddying the field with fabricated claims? **Wouldn't that make it safer for women who are genuinely under threat? Wouldn't that make it easier for authorities to identify and protect genuine victims of domestic violence?**

Wouldn't ridding the system of dishonest claims reduce the potential for an act of domestic violence in the aftermath of a broken relationship when children are involved and emotions are stretched?

I once held a meeting with twelve men in NSW who all had DVO's against them. They all had one thing in common. They were fathers who had been victims of an unproven allegation of domestic violence and as a consequence had instantly lost access to their children when the orders had been granted.

We'd been speaking for over an hour when the police arrived to arrest one of them. I asked the officers why and their response was that the man's wife had reported that he'd kicked down her front door. I asked the officer when did it happen? To which he replied, 'about 20 minutes ago.'

I told him that the man had been with me for the last hour or so. Because of the nature of my employment at the time the

officer believed me and groaned. He told me that it was so typical. 'These vexatious claims happen every day and constantly waste our time.'

As for your parental rights? Losing the right to see your children as was the case with those 12 fathers and countless others is questionable when there is no genuine evidence that it's warranted.

The sad reality when it comes to violence against children is that it isn't biological fathers that children need to fear. In The Fatal Assault of Children and Young People, a NSW Crime Commission report published in 2002, it examined the deaths of 60 children who died in violent circumstances between January 1996 and July 1999. It found that mothers were responsible in the majority of cases; that more children died as a result of mother violence/neglect than as a result of the biological father's violence/neglect.

The report revealed that mothers are over 4 times more likely to kill their children than biological fathers. The report indicated that when males are involved it's more likely a de facto boyfriend and rarely the biological father. Yet it is the father who is instantly denied access to his children when an untested allegation of domestic violence is aired.

Who can forget the eight children brutally murdered by their mother in Queensland on 19th December 2014? When a mother murders her children it's somehow a mental issue. When a father does it – he's regarded as an animal. It isn't a rational act in either case.

State and federal government attitudes towards domestic violence allegations are based on a falsehood. Beyond the anti-male misinformation spread by organisations like White Ribbon and the media, the rate of domestic violence and violent crime perpetrated by women has been steadily increasing for the last three decades. (ABS)

It's why anti-violence ad campaigns should not be gender specific. We are all vulnerable regardless of gender. These anti-male campaigns ignore the fact that women do murder their partners and husbands but those unfortunate male victims do not receive the same level of outrage and publicity as in the case of a female victim.

Men are an easy target for the domestic violence industry and that's where the taxpayer dollars can be gained. Trouble is, violence in general is ignored. Reality reveals that a man walking alone in the dark is only slightly less vulnerable than a female. A coward punch is generally inflicted on men. We know what terrible things can happen to women and they shouldn't happen but marching to 'save the night' is not going to change this dysfunctional and violent world we live in.

Everyone should have the right to walk the streets at night without being attacked but it is not an ideal world. Most sensible men do not walk the streets at night alone – they know it's far too dangerous.

Males represent around half the population yet about two-thirds of Australian homicide victims are male. We also know men are victims of domestic violence. Under those circumstances, why wouldn't we condemn all violence and not just violence against women? Don't male victims of crime deserve our help?

Children denied access to their father by an unproven accusation on a piece of paper

If children are to be denied their equality – their right to equal access to both parents wouldn't you think that courts would need a bit more than a mere statement to deny them of that right?

Following the instant punishment of children based on an unsubstantiated allegation, if any consideration for the child's rights is made then it happens much later in the

Family Law Court. By then it's too late. The damage has already been well and truly done. By that stage, fathers are more than likely to have been separated from their children for many weeks. Very rarely are fathers given a chance to speak in that court, to defend themselves from allegations made by the mother. By that stage the ship has sailed and it's down to the legal folk to make deals. Most fathers in that situation are so desperate to see their children that they'll agree to just about anything because they've already been broken by the system and cannot afford financially to do anything other than submit.

I attended one case in which a mother accused a father of the most heinous crime that any man can be accused of – of molesting his nine year old daughter. Child molestation and crimes of this nature are often the type of obscene, fabricated claims made by mothers in their vindictive quest for child custody.

In this instance, knowing that he was innocent, the father pleaded with the Family Law Court on six different occasions to investigate him. But the court refused and allowed the allegation to stand without any evidence to support it. The vindictive mother destroyed his business and his reputation in his local community and was awarded \$250,000 for her lies. After she'd been paid she never mentioned it again and was quite happy for him to look after their daughter while she went on a trip overseas.

If you were that father would that have made you angry when not even the court would listen to what you have to say. Meanwhile your wife is not questioned or held to account for her dishonesty? This is a common occurrence in our legal system and because it's happening to men no one cares, least of all those in the domestic violence industry who should.

Until the presumption of innocence is reinstated in the domestic violence arena, then it can be assumed that those in

the taxpayer funded domestic violence industry and state governments are not the slightest bit interested in reducing that violence or in maintaining basic human rights for males and children as they do for everyone else. Virtue signalling males who like to tell men to 'step up' and companies who do likewise should also be ashamed of themselves as long as they ignore this obscenity.

In a supposed civilised country, common sense, let alone basic fairness, dictates that serious penalties should be applied to anyone regardless of gender, who is found to have applied for a DVO/AVO based on a fabrication or for vexatious reasons. It's extraordinary that this act of perjury is not punished as a matter of routine. Lives of fathers and their children are unnecessarily being ruined.

A few years ago I wrote to both the then Federal Attorney General, George Brandis and the Sex Discrimination Commissioner Elizabeth Broderick at the time. I was given lip service. Both ignored the subject and neither of them showed the slightest interest in doing anything about this continuing legal abuse or; in taking any steps that just might stop kerosene being poured on the emotional fires that burn when a marriage breaks down.

I even suggested a classified system for magistrates and judges so that allegations could be assessed before punishment inflicted. To enable courts to offer some protection for vulnerable women without unjustly punishing men.

As an example, categories of A, B and C, would reflect the level of proof provided and the nature of the court's response. An 'A' class allegation would be one supported by hard evidence and may justify that a parent is separated from their child.

'B' class would be a discretionary approach when the allegation is unsupported but is highly credible.

'C' class would be an unsupported allegation made during the breakdown of a marriage with children involved. It would be treated with extreme caution and an order not granted until proof of abuse is provided and/or the defendant is present to provide a defence.

In all cases if a claim is made during a marriage breakdown and children are involved then it must be proven beyond doubt before a parent is separated from their children. Any claim for a domestic violence order under those circumstances is a conflict of interest and should be treated with suspicion.

No application should be approved without the defendant being present and allowed to provide a defence. That should be a basic right as it is for every other crime in Australia. Often the defendant has no idea that an allegation has even been made until he finds that he's not allowed to see his children.

No child should be denied access to a parent unless there are proven circumstances that support such a move. It should never be based on a mere allegation.

Instead courts continue to discriminate – he's a male and therefore he must be guilty so take the kids away. Whether a fabricated claim or not, the children may not necessarily be affected.

It must be remembered that a piece of paper will not stop someone intent on violence. If it is to be effective at all, then there must be a genuine reason for having an order. The field of bogus claims must be cleared. At least then authorities can concentrate on protecting those genuine victims and not wasting their time assisting parents with fabricated claims filed for the purpose of gaining custody of their children.

Domestic violence is a serious crime and beyond the distorted statistics and anti-male propaganda, serious punishment is required when it is proven regardless of gender. But let's

prove it first before we rush to judgement and deny males of their natural right to justice and their children. It will only provoke more violence and not less. Let's not separate fathers from their children without evidence that it is necessary. Courts should not be used as accomplices in this travesty of injustice.

No fault divorce allows people to have affairs during marriage without being held to account. If you're a woman and a mother you'll more than likely be rewarded for that affair with the house and the kids.

I know of cases where mothers have been having affairs and to escape responsibility have taken out a fabricated AVO, leaving the husband without a wife, a home and his children.

The following true account reflects the typical marital affair scenario, supported by the judicial system. It illustrates the ease by which females can use and abuse domestic violence orders to avoid responsibility for their actions. It's become a standard procedure in the era of 'no fault divorce' because women know they can get away with it and the legal system supports them in that endeavour.

The tragic aftermath of a false AVO reveals a complicit domestic violence industry

This is a case in which I tried to assist a father who sought my help. But sadly, it ended in tragedy and I will never forget what happened or my failure to stop it from happening.

The innocent father, an IT professional, had returned home from working interstate for six months to find his wife making love to a male in a car in driveway of their home. They were so involved they had no idea that he was there.

Understandably hurt and angry, rather than confront her, he left the scene to calm down and returned that night intent on trying to save his marriage. He knew what was at stake. He had

four children whom he loved dearly. He'd worked hard to provide his family with a good home and assets, including extensive property interests. He'd heard how other fathers had lost everything and was determined to save his marriage if he could. Having been away for many months working hard for his family, he was anxious to see his children.

After he had calmed down he returned home at around 7 pm that evening. His wife had already changed the door locks and wouldn't speak to him or let him see his children. She told him that he wasn't allowed inside his own home due to an AVO that she had taken out that day. She'd been planning this for some time and while she conducted her affair.

Bear in mind he'd been away for six months, so there had been absolutely no physical contact for that period of time so what on earth did her allegation refer to? Why did the court not question her further when she applied for that AVO? Why did they accept it on face value? Simply asking her when she had last been with her husband would have raised a red flag. She had no evidence whatsoever to support her allegation. Instead the court lit the fuse.

When the unfortunate man spoke to me he was distraught and at that stage hadn't been able to see his four young children for ten weeks. Over the next two hours I did my best to help him, to calm him down and I directed him to a good solicitor. I told him to come and see me at any time. I also gave him my phone number. He seemed in a better mood when he left me and I watched him drive down the street. As he did he smiled and waved at me as he drove away.

I didn't hear of him again until three weeks later, when I opened up the morning newspaper. The headline related to a murder/suicide and before I read the story I somehow knew that it was about 'my desperate friend'.

Around fourteen weeks had passed and the man had still not

been able to see his children. He had forced his way into the kitchen of the family home to plead with his wife to see his children. She refused. Emotionally at breaking point, he had picked up a kitchen knife and fatally stabbed her and then driven to a nearby forest where he hung himself. Tragically, this is what injustice does to a normally passive man.

Four children were left without their parents because the system failed to administer justice. A wife and mother murdered because the taxpayer funded DV industry refuses to influence state governments to stop this daily miscarriage of justice. A system that rewards mothers for lying and in this case as in many others, for destroying a marriage.

Tomorrow six males in this country will commit suicide. This is the average number of male suicides which occur every day according to SANE Australia and the National Mental Health Commission. If that figure applied to women you wouldn't hear the end of it and sadly each year that figure continues to rise.

As a former PM and now Chair of Beyond Blue, Julia Gillard has an obligation to find ways to reduce male suicide and the influence to do something about this judicial abuse which must surely contribute to more suicides. I won't hold my breath.

Those in the taxpayer funded domestic violence industry like White Ribbon should hang their heads in shame for this obscene atrocity that they continue to support. It is one that provides the fuel for acts of domestic violence, the very thing that they are being paid to prevent.

What follows is an actual case study. It is a true story and is a mirror image of many stories that occur every day throughout Australia. Father's lives destroyed by a lie.

JON WILSON SHOULD HAVE MURDERED SOMEONE AT LEAST HE WOULD HAVE GOT A TRIAL

Click the following link to read more

<https://www.theissue.com.au/jon-wilson-should-have-murdered-so-meone-at-least-he-would-have-got-a-trial/>



theissue.com.au