

Senate Inquiry into Children in Institutional Care

20 March 2004

Dear Committee Members,

As distressing and appalling as the evidence heard by the Committee has been, some cultural aspects of abuse could withstand closer examination.

There is one crime that stands out above all others in the pantheon of human depravity.

That is the crime of bringing an un-wanted child into the world. Quintessentially for the sake of one's sexual gratification. There can be no other rational explanation.

Culturally, English-speaking societies have occupied an unusual niche since the Industrial Revolution at least, in that they have, more than any other, sought to marginalise the rights and interests of children.

It is, anecdotally, 'conventional wisdom' that English-speaking societies are among the worst of child abusers. The evidence that Australia is a desperately mentally ill society is daunting. To wit,

- 'Victorian' (or 'Dickensian') child-rearing (which, incidentally, persists to this day), exemplified by practices such as bashing children (let's not be cute here and pretend it's 'discipline'), and put-down phrases such as 'Silence is golden' and 'Spare the rod...'. I have personally witnessed a number of 'good' Australian families where children are habitually referred to "as you little fucking cunt...".
- God himself, and millions of years, determined the nature of human male genitalia. But that was never going to stop a seriously deranged Australian community from mutilating, wholesale, millions of new-born childrens' genitals, that they might not 'pervert' themselves. Not surprisingly, this practise is utterly revolting to non-English speakers, yet is acceptable to English-speakers. Go figure.
- We allow the sick to pervert our childrens' minds with moronic notions of 'stranger danger' when the evidence is compelling that statistically, strangers are of no danger to children whatever, where-as families are potentially a very great menace indeed.

- The government condones, and subsidises, the placement of new-born children in child-care, when voluminous quantities of non-English research PROVE that the attendant and consequential lack of bonding with a parent figure causes *monstrous*, and essentially *irreparable*, damage to childrens' psyches (see point below). And Howard's regime has the TEMERITY to pretend that it does not know why adolescent suicide rates are soaring!
- Does the committee subscribe to the bizarre sickness that believes that people wake up one day, a pedophile, or can the Committee accept the compelling evidence that adult pedophiles are merely child pedophiles who have grown up? Get it through your diamond-grade skulls; pedophilic practises begin in childhood.
- Meanwhile, the grossly un-professional so-called 'child protection' agencies in Australia are, when they fail to alert the public to the known dangers of emotionally dumping the newborn, without doubt complicit in perpetrating and perpetuating child abuse. The dirty old man down the street is relatively harmless.
- The psychotic notion that on the scale of seriousness, English speakers accept (without evidence, mind you) that emotional, physical and sexual abuse are in order of increasing seriousness and lasting impact, notwithstanding the overwhelming international research evidence that this is utter *bull-shit*. Sexual abuse is the *LEAST* traumatising in the longer run, emotional abuse is by far the *GREATER* (and more serious) abuse.
- It is ironic indeed that the thousands institutionalised were, in many ways the very *LUCKY* ones; they have public curiosity and some residual sympathy from society. Their abuse occurred largely at the hands of non-loved ones. The millions abused in family homes are told, dismissively, to get a grip on themselves and to merely get over it. Unlike those appearing before the committee, we have *NO RECOURSE IN LAW WHATEVER*. So much for human rights! It is infinitely more difficult (and destructive on a child's psyche) to try and reconcile familial abuse, as opposed to abuse perpetrated by strangers.

Millions of Australians would have given their right arm to have been afforded the relative protection of institutionalisation. And still would. Those institutionalised just don't know how good they had it, relatively speaking!

Thanking you,

Matthew Bennett