
From:
Sent: Monday, 9 March 2015 6:33 PM
To: redress
Subject: [REDACTED] Submission on Redress

[REDACTED]

Redress

I would like to address the Redress issue initially on the following aspects

1. \$7.5m compensation (see previous email re how this figure is arrived at).
2. 80 year or one lifetime payback plan for our children so that real redress is both seen and done in a way that is commensurate with the depth and the reality of what the cover up and the crimes has produced.
3. Concerns as a result of a review of the risks and benefits in an early redress scheme simply as a way to attempt to alleviate the risk of survivors being inadvertently duped as a result of their need for urgency.

Trauma Theory and other evidence and knowledge as well no pathway has been established within the legal system that assures justice for survivors (has not passed the test, no precedents, no assurances that recommendations will be implemented in full (failure points galore here) as to the coverup and the abuses has yet to be explored therefore the real causes and role that the legal system has played have yet to be fully exposed thus the risk of a high failure rate is assured on an individual level and a guaranteed moral failure socially is implemented together with an increased risk to survivors after years of re-trauma via the Royal Commission process which simply defers the issue of suicide for the many.

What ability exists for the families and descendent's of survivors to pursue a claim if a survivor dies before their case can be implemented in the legal system?

Many will not pursue civil claims due to their inability to survive the experience emotionally. The lack of trauma awareness in the decision making processes of the Royal Commission must by now becoming an embarrassment not only to the Royal Commission but to the notions of justice and human rights - Part of the journey of lifetime abuse has been to be abandoned to a system that has been permitted to emotionally savage them at a psychological level - the adversarial system will continue and will continue to damage and harm those who turn to it in pursuit of justice and they will have been failed by the Royal Commission. The Royal Commission has an obligation to both the truth and to the evidence; both the truth and the evidence require a far greater awareness of trauma than is currently displayed on behalf of the Royal Commission through its interactions with those coming forward; no redress package would be complete with a comprehensive plan as to how to surmount the issues of bias and ignorance of our biological and psychological needs. To this point the Royal Commission has focused on the legal aspects and has been remiss in investigating the tools utilized by the abusers and those compromised to obtain control over victims so that the failed systems can remain in place so that others can be entrapped into a system of permanent exploitation.

Opening up access to civil action provides no assurance that their abusers will claim bankruptcy or that they will implement some other form of blocking through any one of our legal, political, health, education or policing systems as it has done for past generations in countries right across the globe to minimize costs and to maintain power and control over the millions of subjects they have inculcated into what is in fact (and is supported by the evidence) an exploitation culture that consumes human beings by the millions.

No redress can be claimed while millions of children in Australia are left exposed and vulnerable to the

same exploitation through the use of the same tools of blackmail, threat and intimidation are permitted to continue in the life of any child - this one aspect will clearly define success or failure for this Royal Commission and the children of now and the future.

Redress to victims of crime must include reasonable expenses such as:

- payment of any loss of wages or income. This can be calculated with great precision today through the use of technology and data; this aspect needs to be openly discussed.
- Medical, hospital and ambulance expenses. These aspects are not available through any of the known support systems that we have been able to identify - this aspect must be a consideration.
- Dental and other such treatment expenses. These aspects are not available through any of the known support systems that we have been able to identify - this aspect must be a consideration.
- Physiotherapy, chiropractic, optometry and other similar expenses. These aspects are not available through any of the known support systems that we have been able to identify - this aspect must be a consideration.
- Surgical and related expenses, including plastic surgery. These aspects are not available through any of the known support systems that we have been able to identify - this aspect must be a consideration.
- Psychology and psychiatry counseling expenses. These aspects are not available through any of the known support systems that we have been able to identify - this aspect must be a consideration.
- Clothing expenses. These aspects are not available through any of the known support systems that we have been able to identify - this aspect must be a consideration.
- Security related expenses. These aspects are not available through any of the known support systems that we have been able to identify - this aspect must be a consideration.
- As well as any other relevant out of pocket expenses. This aspect is not available through any of the known support systems that we have been able to identify - this aspect must be a consideration.

All the above are available in typical victims of crime compensation packages in Australia together with lump sum payments when a death occurs as well as compensation to a secondary & related victim of crime, there is also a lump sum payment for pain and suffering.

**** whatever else will assist the victim to recover from the effects of the crime, such as improved home security, self-defence lessons, vocational training, academic tutoring, relocation costs, gym membership, rehabilitative treatment or a holiday

On 3 my concern is to ensure that if in the ensuing 3 years of the Royal Commission that further evidence was to show a different light on the issue would survivors have been sold short - that concern re this is increasingly relevant and pertinent in light of my own recent experience as an atheist survivor with knowledge, data, evidence and experience and an obligation as a human being to engage in an appropriate way with the Royal Commission only to find extreme dysfunction and blocking resulting in the stymieing of any chance of progress or success at the highest levels of the Royal Commission in the way I was treated by [REDACTED] and in the way the Royal Commission has responded to my complaint in this regard.

My second concern in this regard is the balancing of redress towards the survivors and the question as to affordability. Given that the average life of a survivor is shortened by 20 years as a result of the life they have had to live then it would seem appropriate that a repayment time-frame commensurate with the average lifespan which today is 80 years would be a suitable period for an institution to pay over that time-frame as a token gesture of intent to surmount the issues that resulted in their failures, failures that destroyed the lives of so many individuals and so many families. Affordability is the secondary concern in those directions and must not be allowed to diminish in any way the value and the right to proper justice, restoration and redress; with regard to affordability a suitable plan can be devised to allow an institution that plans to be around for another millennium or two to take the necessary time to pay the full amount due - when an institution thinks of itself in terms of thousands of years then the 80 years of a single lifetime is insignificant to such an institution. Both parties will come from that with a better more informed and better

managed future as a result of ensuring that affordability does not rob the survivors and the children of the future of their true worth.

I question what must by now be considered an obsession in the demand to read and to be repeatedly exposed to psychological manipulation and psychological entrapment that I get to wonder if the Royal Commission has a sufficient understanding of human biology and psychology to understand and to cater for the very high risk of habituation which can lead to such aberrations as the defense of untenable positions no matter how they are labeled [REDACTED]. This raises questions that the word serious seems entirely inadequate of describing as these issues go directly to issues of human rights and abuse of trust by the designated authority who was set the task of bringing justice and an understanding to the people of Australia.

It has been my observation that aspects of the Royal Commission network may also be laboring under the delusional notion that there are no or only a few atheist survivors/victims and that they do not matter in this process; no matter the origins of this distortion of reality and no matter how that intention came to be there is little more to say other than to ensure that your support is firstly trauma informed and evidence based and is incapable of putting their/your god or religion before the safety and the well-being of children (this is a clearly identified primary cause); there is little more than that needed when there is such a high level of intelligence and achievement found amongst the range of survivors. What some may call an amazing aspect that has seen the resilience of so many who have continued to push forward in their own healing and have gained real knowledge and a real understanding of the abuses, what initiates them, what supports them and the covering up of those crimes and how to heal and repair themselves, their children and their families is a testament to the failure of the myriad of systems that have been deployed against them over the centuries - we need to find a mutual understanding of words that are used such as inclusion, participate, listen, understand, comprehend, support as these words are bastardized regularly when a stakeholder places their god or their fantasies before the real needs of children and the real needs of those abused as children that is the responsibility of the Royal Commission to investigate.

Redress must include some aspect to protect the rights of those who engage with entities such as this Royal Commission in the future so that the past practice of blocking and stymieing are put aside and a habit of informing and protecting the rights of individuals has an opportunity to flourish. One example of this is the right of individuals to record their telephone conversations with others including the Royal Commission. Included in these rights are the rights of ownership under copyright and many other rights which appear to have been overlooked in the current Royal Commission process - no redress package could be said to be complete without an overhaul of these forms of obstruction.

I raised the issue of cognitive/confirmational bias at the inception of the Royal Commission, the response at that time was to leave it to chance and now chance has resulted in its ugly head being raised in the everyday functions of the Royal Commission; this ugly aspect of human nature is entirely repugnant and inappropriate in these circumstances.

When the support becomes as toxic as has been then it is time to take a rethink in the hope that reality prevails over superstition, fear and embedded trauma. The reality as described in Trauma Theory touches every Catholic child and has and continues to play the most significant role in the ongoing abuse of children via these toxic doctrines of the Catholic belief system; fortunately this is no longer a secret and how the Royal Commission engages or deals with that will set the path for the future of children and will determine if they are to achieve their right to self determination or if they are to continue to be abused on into the future.

The obvious lack of engagement and understanding by the Royal Commission is evidenced by its ignorance of the use of data and technology to engage with stakeholders; an advancement towards redress in this area would include an improvement in the communications skills and awareness by Royal Commission staff and in those making decisions to keep knowledge and information as to the rights of those engaging with it from those it is currently claiming to be acting in their best interest - the hypocrisy of this circumstance must be

addressed so that future inquiries do not fall foul of this problem so that they too will no longer fail the victims, survivors and the children of the future.

Please confirm receipt of this submission

rgds

