

Epilogue 2 Abstract / Blurp

In this second epilogue, the author recounts reconnecting with Joe, regarded as a stepson, in January 2025. Joe had emailed requesting money while claiming homelessness, prompting a video call that revealed his removal from the family home due to his mother Nellie's accusations and mental health issues, including paranoid delusions. Despite warnings, the author wrote a letter to Joe's mental health provider detailing Nellie's history of psychiatric care, coercive behaviour, and legal manipulations, urging a fair and forensic investigation into Joe's situation. The author also reflects on the devastating impact of the ongoing trauma on Joe and their daughter Jasmine, of parental alienation.

This second epilogue demonstrates the longer term impact of the failure to address parental alienation. It continues to critique the family separation industry's including its biases and failure to prioritise children's best interests through forensic evidence over ideological assumptions, advocating for systemic reform to address mental health and systematic changes to protect families.

Reform recommendations include:

1. The need to ensure full disclosure of mental health records and assets within a nominated timeframes (applicant on submission and suggest the respondent within 4 weeks of notification of legal action).
2. Whenever allegations are made, the mental health of the person making the allegations must be considered as well as reviewing the evidence prior to acting upon those allegations.
3. Training of counsellors, psychologists, social workers in forensic investigation to ensure they do not inadvertently facilitate their clients delusions and address any bias / cognitive anchoring issues that may impact others.
4. Debates need to be held on confidentiality within the helping profession. The words "serious risk" or "imminent risk" may not be sufficient to allow warning to mitigate the risk and impact to the targeted parent and their children.
5. The science behind the diagnosing Parental Alienation is mature and there are robust tests to distinguish it from justified estrangement. Education for all practitioners involved in the family separation industry must cover how to investigate the timeline of event when changes occurred and consideration of the:
 1. 5 Factor model
 2. 17 Alienating strategies
 3. 8 Symptoms of parental alienationAnd be able to refer to those with the respective mental health expertise.
6. The recommendations in the book remain unchanged.

Epilogue 2 Preface

This is the second epilogue to "*The Pinball Machine - The Family Separation Industry and Parental Alienation*" written six years after the original book's publication. I must confess uncertainty as to the facts presented here. The book itself was grounded in firsthand experience, legal judgements and documentation. In contrast this epilogue relies on the conversations with the man I consider my stepson and information from phone calls in early 2025. While the situation is factual from the perspectives of the information given to me and my reaction - including the letter to the mental health provider - this epilogue is what the legal people would call hearsay evidence. I have marked this document with an "as of" marker and will revise as further information emerges and verification continues.

Epilogue 2

On 4th January 2025 I received an email from Joe, whom I regard as a stepson. It was a reply to a 2018 Christmas wishes email, lending it some credibility, but essentially stated he is okay but homeless, asking me to send money to a listed bank account. My initial reaction was that it was likely a hacker or scam. While many people would have just dismissed it and trashed the email, I had to answer. The simple reply was:

"Too many scams around. Are you on WhatsApp or some way we can have video call?"

This was followed up later with the question of how was everyone and did he and Jasmine (his sister and my daughter) have Christmas with Nellie (their mother and my former spouse)!

The verification came on 7th January during an 18-minute video which revealed his real needs. He was under care or investigation due to claims his mother, Nellie, had made, leading to his removal from the family home. He desperately needed someone to inform authorities about Nellie's true nature, saying "they won't listen to anything I say". Despite advice from several people against helping Joe and risking re-involvement, I wrote a letter on the 8th January to the mental health provider, addressed to the person he was meeting (believed to be a case co-ordinator). The letter, redacted here with names changed to match the books aliases outlined:

- some of Joe's revelations (e.g. Nellie hoarding then binging on medication and examples of behaviour that suggest paranoid delusions)
- Nellie's mental health history (from psychiatry care and prescribed drugs as a teen)
- Nellie's actions during our legal proceedings such as paying air fares to person soliciting donations to recruit mercenaries etc.

so if have not read the book, the letter will give you a tiny insight into her behaviours.

The letter stated:

8 January 2025

Xxxxxxxxx XXXX

www.XXXXXXXXXXXXXX.com

XXXXXX XXXXX WhatsApp +31XXXXXXXXX

Joe XXXXX WhatsApp +31XXXXXXXXX

Re: Patient / Client file for Joe XXXXX DOB XX Xxx 19XX

I formally request that this document be included in the patient file of Joe XXXXX. Joe has stated his contact within XXXXXXXX is XXXXX XXXXXXXX. I am not aware if XXXXX is a case worker, counsellor, psychologist, psychiatrist or in what capacity he is operating and ask that you clarify. This letter should be held in confidence as would normally be in a case file and not shown to Nellie!

Joe XXXXX and I conversed last night over a video link and chat using WhatsApp on 7th January 2025.

The situation as I understand it from Joe is that:

1. Nellie (his mother, my ex wife) has been hoarding medication then bingeing.
2. Nellie believes the veterinarian, postman, delivery men etc are going to attack her (i.e. paranoia / delusional)
3. Joe challenged her (non professionally telling her she is "mad" and pleaded for her to get help).
4. Nellie's response was to accuse Joe (not sure to whom and precise allegations) which forced Joe out of the home (the place he is registered with the local government).
5. Social security in the Netherlands is good so Joe is not out on the street but in a homeless shelter.
6. He is now under the "care" or "investigation" by a Xxxxxxx Xxxxxxx of <https://www.xxxxxxxx.xx/> a mental health provider.
7. Joe has asked me to contact Xxxxxxx to give some background to say it is not him that is mad but his mother! (That is something to be professionally determined based upon facts I.e. forensically).
8. Joe has given permission and asked for Xxxxxxx to talk to me (his former stepfather) which I am happy to do.

I have contacted Xxxxxxx by WhatsApp chat (no response) and then by phone and was told that he was with a patient and would call me back (this has not occurred).

Where I fit in

1. *I helped raise Joe for 16 years and regard him as a stepson and contact you in that capacity (note that legalities between the Australia and Netherlands vary so would not be registered there as a stepfather as such and since separated from Nellie no relationship).*
2. *I am aware of Nellie's background and some of her activates in the past that may shed light on the credibility of any statement made about Joe Xxxxxxx by Nellie and directly impact his treatment / investigation that is currently underway.*
3. *I have not heard from or seen Joe Xxxxxxx for many years until Saturday 4th January 2025 so have no first hand information on any psychological conditions, criminal activities or other information (positive or negative) with respect to him since leaving the Netherlands in 2009.*
4. *In terms of my own mental health awareness there was significant personal recovery since escaping Nellie and have, due to my experience, personality and business acumen run mens suicide prevention groups, been on the board (6years of which 3 as Chairman) of a national suicide prevention charity / service provider called Xxxxxxxx Xxxxxxx Xxxxxxxx. I have also been asked to speak to many men and women suffering extreme trauma from separation sometimes even by clinical psychologists, lawyers and others. I have presented in the Australian Senate rooms and Federal Joint Parliamentary Inquiries. I rejoined the board of Xxxxxxxx Xxxxxxx Xxxxxxxx June 2024 (with current appointment expiring around Dec 2025). I am also a registered counsellor with the Australian Counselling Association (ACA).*

Nellie's History and actions

1. *Nellie informed me she was under a psychiatrist as a teenager and on antidepressants. At that time prescribing antidepressants to a teenager would have been extraordinarily rare. I.e. **long history of mental health issues from a young age.***

2. *Nellie has always had relationship issues and estranged from her many brothers, in fact she refused to tell the the names of two of her brothers and stated they stole my inheritance. Apparently her parents loaned money to her two brothers for a farm that failed I.e. bankrupt! Joe is named after his uncle who allegedly walked out one day never to be heard of again and parents died not knowing what happened (Nellie believed through internet searches he fled to New Zealand). I.e. **unstable family upbringing.***
3. *While living in The Hague I tried to organise some counselling and Nellie replied "I'm likely to get an arrogant Dutchman with crappy English and would want to kill him" and I believe she meant it. **Nellie is a very angry person that has few limits as to what she will do.***
4. *Nellie had stated she would make sure I would never see my daughter again if I did not do what she demanded. She had also stated that she would tell the police I had been assaulting her for 10 years and they would believe her because she was a woman and happens all the time. I left 6 days after she physically attacked and managed to close the door on her. I knew I was being set up and would be in litigation (possibly be driven to bankruptcy and suicide if remained). **Nellie showed extreme lack of emotional regulation which I propose as typical of those with Cluster B personality disorder!** I was not aware how serious her condition was and could not bring the daughter with me at the time as passports were locked away and believed with distance it would settle in a matter of months. Without doubt, Nellie committed Domestic Violence using coercive control. **le I would be willing to testify that Nellie has a history of perpetrating Domestic Violence.***
5. *After we had been together several years I thought she was seeing a therapist but later discovered it was a psychiatrist (found a referral letter when she moved out of the Dutch family home). During the Australian Family court proceedings her psychiatric notes from the mid-late 1990's were subpoenaed. These revealed:*
 1. *Nellie stated "that Trevor was her second husband" whereas I found Joes biological fathers name from the child support court documents and Nellie told me that she never lived with him! I.e. **she lied to her psychiatrist.***
 2. *The other thing was that Nellie had become "jealous of the relationship I had with Jasmine and that it was better than hers and she wanted to destroy it". Our daughter would have been 3 at the time and **I would suggest such feelings are not those of a mentally healthy parent.***
6. *During the divorce, case documents showed Nellie paid the air fares of an individual to fly from Sydney to Melbourne.*
 1. *This individual had a web site seeking donations to hire mercenaries.*
 2. *Had published his court case critical of the judge (punishable at the time by significant fines and up to a year imprisonment).*
 3. *Lodged a false report about me for the sale of a property (police dropped when they saw I sold the property under federal court orders made by consent I.e. Nellie knew about it).*
 4. *Amongst other mischievous activities that I believe he perpetrated was that issued me a veiled death threat. While much of this is documented i.e. evidence exists, it shows **Nellie will operate outside the societal legal and ethical frameworks.***
7. *There were 10 court cases here in Australia and in the Netherlands the property case went to the Hoog Raad (that rejected her application). In one Australia ruling it stated "where there can be no criticism of the conduct of the respondent – where the conduct of the applicant and her legal advisers is "appalling"" **Nellies***

behaviour as appalling has been ruled by a court of law and cannot be disputed. Links are available to Australian court cases if required but in Australia they are published under a court designated alias.

8. Nellie for one court case flew Joe to Australia to commit perjury (she was I believe coercively controlling him and I hold no malice). While Joe stuck to the script Nellie gave him she changed the story under cross examination so Joes testimony had no effect. Nellie was warned that perjury can result in a fine along with prison sentence (rarely applied in family law) however she without conscience exposed her son to risk. I was also informed due to the court appearance he could not do exams, lost a semester on his then University course. Nellie has shown several times (e.g. when she cut me off and broke both my arms in bike accident or when cut off services rather than transfer to my name when I was incapacitated with a burst disk) **she has no empathy for others which is typical of those with Cluster B personality issues.**
9. There are many more examples that may assist in a diagnosis contained in the book "The Pinball Machine The Family Separation Industry and Parental Alienation" of which the first 2 sections are about our relationship and what occurred. My Alias in the Book is Trevor Cooper, Xxxx is Nellie, Xxxx Xxxxx is Joe, XXXXXXXXXXXX (our daughter) is Jasmine etc should you require more detailed information. The details of which must not be made public and who they really are under Law however as this is to be kept within case management files and not made public such information would be permitted under the law.

Conclusion and actions from the above information

1. Any investigation into what is going on must be made on the evidence and verifiable facts (not opinions and especially not what is stated by Nellie).
2. It would be a case of gross NEGLIGENCE on behalf of XXXXXXXX and their employees / contractors to assess Joe based solely upon what his mother has stated.
3. If Joe is being prescribed medication based solely on Nellie's accusations, then those prescribing medication may be found to be negligent!
4. The above history has shown that Nellie had mental health issues and I suggest is resistant to therapy.
5. If what Joe has reported is correct (that she is suffering paranoid delusions where people are going to attack her and he had to intervene with respect to a Water Supply issue where they would not visit the house if Nellie was there) then Nellie represents a foreseeable danger to herself and others which XXXXXXXX would have a duty of care to investigate and then act upon.
6. It would be unwise to allow Joe to reside with Nellie until Nellies' current mental health status are established and issues when identified are resolved (which I do not believe is possible).
7. I am available to be contacted per below.

I would hope that you are able to assist Joe in securing housing and not only gainful employment but ensuring he sees the importance of work and financial independence. Nellie, due to her mental health condition is likely I suspect, to regard her children as unworthy (traitors that deserted her and mental health) of any provision in her will.

Kind Regards

Xxxxx XXXXXXXX DipCouns
Xxxxx_XXXXXXX@xxxxxx.com
+61xxxxxxxx (Phone and WhatsApp)

Part of my recent background was to project manage the construction of a pavilion and garden complex for a homeless shelter so I called upon those local contacts. Unfortunately the letter needed to go out quickly before receiving the advice from the CEO of the homeless shelter. That advice was that I should have started the letter with:

"I have known Nellie (my ex Wife) and aware that she has had mental health issues since teenage years till the present but never known Joe to suffer from mental health issues."

along with other suggestions to remove any emotions and various actions (all of which I already had lined up).

The purpose of the letter was to outline Nellies behaviours, history and credibility such that they would listen to Joe's version of events (per his request to me). The second reason is if they would not listen, then there would be an avenue for a complaint, a review and consequences for them in the future.

So what is the logic behind doing this documentation?

The most basic thing we should all know is that you cannot control what others do, but you can control how you react and what you do. Listening to experts years ago, that principle also applies to agencies (particularly child services) that have and manage case files. Many welfare workers / government employees will have made a decision that is sometimes based upon an ideology which may include "the kids best interest is served by being with the mum" so they will record anything in their notes that supports their initial view and fail to record anything to the contrary. This may be due to:

- lack of experience,
- the psychology of cognitive anchoring (also known as cognitive bias) which is established through societal culture, training and organisational work culture. When evidence has shown the truth is counter to their societal culture or training they may suffer significant self doubt. If the truth is does not match the work culture, they may find themselves ostracised and told to look again (I.e. their employment threatened). In fact I know of a counsellor that was sacked for discussing male victims of domestic violence! They find themselves trapped and caught in that narrative as their organisation will not allow counter narratives to exist (let alone be investigated which I have seen in a Police Force personally and well documented by various reports).

This narrative may be imposed by organisational practices (policies rarely state this as would be grounds to being sued through discrimination legislation) and must continue as:

- Individuals need to protect their earlier decision due to a poor organisational cultural where after new evidence emerges, changing position may result in them being reprimanded for getting it wrong initially (especially if there could be legal implications). I.e. they cannot change their position and colloquially speaking need to "cover their arse"!
- The organisations funding is based upon an anchored position. The government may fund them only for women DV and to protect and expand the funding stream they promote the false narrative and will not allow the recording of reported DV against men. I mentioned on page 356 of some examples where police acted inappropriately and know

of a survey of around 20 junior officers that the sergeants would make them rewrite any submission where the female was the perpetrator before allowing its submission into the police data base. Informal methods are often established to protect a funding regimen and become embedded in the organisation culture (sometimes costing them good employees that have a conscience).

Ensuring something is included in a file helps ensure that when reviewed by supervisors or legal counsel that the anchoring (or downright prejudice or negligence) can be exposed so that case workers actions and to present the “facts and evidence” to the supervisor or trial judge. The supervisor or those auditing the file will conclude (when documents submitted and properly constructed) that:

1. Case workers were told xyz,
2. It was documented and even if hearsay
3. What action did they do to verify and protect the child per their mandatory charter and
4. It raises the question if they were they negligent for ignoring it and potentially prosecute!

I also reached out though my network and found a psychologist in the Netherlands whom I contacted, received a response the same day and forwarded to Joe. We could get Joe a mental health advocate (fully funded by the Netherlands mental health system) and could report Nellie so that she could get the care she needed based upon Joe’s reports and hopefully that would change how Joe was being treated.

I spoke to Joe again the following day (after his case worker had received the letter and had a meeting with Joe). Joe told me that the case workers needed to get permission to put the letter on file. As official correspondence I doubt they had any choice but may have lacked the required experience to know that. Their response was, “so your mother has issues as well” to which he replied “no, it is just my mother”.

The conversation continued and that’s when the alarm bells rang for me.

- He asked to see his file and they refused and suggested that they could read out relevant sentences to him. This is against all protocols with respect to client rights that I had been taught.
- They had advised him that he can have someone with him in sessions and he nominated me. The refused his request that I attend some of his sessions via whatever a video app and stated that I was too remote!

It was at this stage Joe’s whole situation began to stink worse than rotten fish.

We then discussed:

- Getting him a mental health advocate and even offered to contact the mental health advocate in the city he resided. He stated he would like to speak to the mental health advocate personally and make sure suitable so complied with his wishes and left it to him.
- If the organisation treating him will not make a formal notification about Nellie to the authorities then we could. I urged him to document Nellies behaviours so that we could submit a report directly to authorities. I suggested that that if the authorities were notified of Nellie’s mental health issues then she may be put under care while she withdrew from

whatever prescribed drugs that were not working and then put on a new regimen and that process may take 6 weeks. Joe would probably have to look after the cat that he purchased for Nellie around a year ago during that time but definitely should never again reside in the home with Nellie upon her return.

After a few days I drafted the second document for him and detailed what he has told me. I put the document on a shared drive that he could access from any computer so his story was clear and intended to force that also into his case file. The aim was to consolidate and document his claims and position so that his mental health provider would listen to him but also if they do not organise a mental health check on Nellie then we souls submit directly to the mental health authorities and get Nellie the help she needs. Some of the things in the letter included:

This document is to provide the basis that would ensure Nellie gets a mental health assessment and from there the help she requires to care for her needs and manage her conditions. I would also hope for some assistance for me (Joe) on how I can assist in managing the situation and specifically my situation with respect to accommodation and work. I have had someone that only speaks English assist me in this document preparation and is therefore in English. (Joe: You need to translate to Dutch for the Dutch institution). A significant document dated 8 January 2025 by her former spouse was sent to XXXXX (of XXXXXXXXX Group) and myself which should be referenced to show Nellie's long history of mental illness and behaviours that may assist in Nellie's diagnosis. More up to date information includes:

- 1. Delusional behaviour was being imposed on the daughter to not answer the door prior to his sister moving overseas.*
- 2. The trauma was such that Jasmine has not contacted her mother for several years*
- 3. Nellie has stated she was in financial trouble and had Joe invest in the family home and that is why his name was on the property title. Trevor (Nellie's former spouse) has stated that this was very unlikely as he knew of the finances from the separation settlement and that she had another source of income with a history of crying poor and hiding money, having Trevor invest in property and then claim sole ownership.*
- 4. Nellie had been unable to hold onto her employment and was put on a scheme which meant serving tea and coffee to at a nursing home / elderly care facility and attacked the client. The manager of the facility has stated she had never seen such behaviour.*
- 5. Several years ago Joe discovered Nellie's bicycle helmet had been damaged and Nellie revealed that she had been hit by a car. It was from around this time that she would randomly abuse people in the street.*
- 6. Since ??? Nellie had been afraid that people were going to attack her and these people included the veterinarian, postman, couriers and others.*
- 7. Nellie attacked Joe with a knife but as he able to manage the situation, it was not reported to the police and Joe stated that he yelled at Nellie that she "was mad and needed help".*
- 8. Nellie then reported Joe and claimed that he had been throwing out food and that she was scared of him. As such they believed what they were told by Nellie and an order placed on Joe who was removed from the property (that he is part owner as on the title) and put in a facility for a month and given drugs. At the end of the month he was made homeless.*

9. *The whole time he Joe was in the facility or being treated as a homeless outpatient they refuse to listen to what he stated.*
10. *Nellie had been treated by a psychiatric facility several years earlier called XXXXXX and had been put on medication.*
11. *Nellie has been storing up her medication and bingeing*
12.

In short I provide this as a written documentation and formally request that the statements made are corroborated and a review Nellie's needs is carried out. I then request a review of my case file based upon those findings be conducted.

As living in a temporary night shelter Joe would need to go to a library or somewhere to access a computer and complete the documentation. He seemed to be unwilling to fill in the blanks with rough dates (months or years), names of organisations and complete the document.

I could not tell if this was due to:

1. His belief that it will now be right. He certainly stated that they will figure it out especially after they had Trevors letter to them on file. That belief however was shattered a week or two later.
2. Enmeshment with mother to the extent he could not say the things that needed to be stated about her.
3. Is traumatised from being locked up for a month, medicated and then put out on the street (made homeless) and unable to act.
4. His claims of feeling physically sick and due to lack of sleep simply cannot think straight.
5. Possibly he may feel that this is the life he deserves due to his mothers conditioning.
6. He is seriously mentally unwell (which I do not believe as his story, after hours talking to him showed no inconsistencies).
7. His upbringing for the first 6 years where he was left at creche or in his room with little interaction with his mother (Nellie told me she would quickly feed him and then just put him in his room and work on renovating the flat) has made him exceptionally unmotivated and lazy.
8. Something else and I hoped that my letter will make its way to someone that can do the diagnosis and ensure he gets the right support.

One of the principles that I live by is that you cannot fix someone that does not want to be fixed. I learned that by a psychologist that enrolled and did his course after arriving home one day and found his wife and 4 children walking down the driveway with a rifle and 5 bullets. When he questioned her, she responded that she was just scaring them (and seemed to think this was acceptable behaviour). He then worked at Lifeline and many other places so very experienced. The best we can do is counsel them using various techniques and offer suggestions but cannot do everything for them or we will have taken over their life and create a dependency which ultimately is damaging for both the client and oneself. We can and must control ourselves when faced with difficult circumstances and protect ourselves through setting boundaries.

The following week Joe's case managers had received advice and agreed for my initial letter to them can go on file but Joe told me they changed their story and saying things to

Joe like “it is not just based just upon what your mother said”! The letter I believe hit a nerve but what he stated in that meeting with the case workers they just issued him more Fluanxol drugs (that were for at the dosage levels that Dr. Google indicates are for schizophrenia which was the original diagnosis they told him) and still did not listen to him. Finding out the dosage levels he was on was yet another shock with alarm bells again ringing loudly. Schizophrenia normally appears in men from late teens to early 20’s while Joe was 38 when admitted.

As the letter was now on file the psychiatrist in the care team will see it and thought it will be interesting to hear of her response (since the initial diagnosis was based upon Nellies statements which may have been her projecting onto Joe and ignored Joe’s statements in what Joe described as a 15 minute meeting).

I summarised a phone call from Sat 18 January 2025 the following day:

“Just a recap on yesterdays call.

- 1. I want to help (or would not have written the document to the mental health provider)*
- 2. I need confirmation from you by completing the draft letter I have shared with you to fill in the blanks and complete.*
- 3. The benefits of filling in is we can then provide proof of your version of events e.g. if you paid a lot of money to buy into the house then there will be a record of bank transactions etc*
- 4. You also need to show what you went through for your psychiatrist. I am happy to speak to psychiatrist and fill in blanks about your early upbringing etc.*
- 5. I am happy to stay up and work with you (during your day time). Has to be soon as resume work in Feb.*
- 6. Once this is done there are people I can contact to help support you (be they lawyers or patient advocate).*
- 7. It is likely that you will have a record of treatment which may impact work opportunities (hence we both need to know what happened). The fact that you had legal process to remove you needs to be dealt with!*
- 8. There will be other ways I may be able to help if you need to get away and work elsewhere that happy to discuss once the document is done.*
- 9. You do not know how to contact Jasmine but my help was never conditional upon that.*
- 10. I have put myself at risk (from Nellie) by doing what I have done so please get the document done.*

Good luck”

Following those conversations I was desperately trying to have Joe think through why he was not documenting what he told me. On the 28 January 2025 sent him what is commonly known as a decision matrix where the pro’s and con’s (or Advantages / Disadvantages or Benefits / Costs) are listed against the action or non-action taken and had filled in as best I could and asked him to think through this matrix and complete if possible:

Decision matrix to document or not document Nellies behaviours and submit to mental health authorities for investigation

| | Document | Do Not Document |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| Pros (Benefits) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They are not recording my version so this will force it into record. 2. Will allow others to verify my version of events 3. Once my version of events verified Mums actions will need to be considered (possibly leading to her treatment and others safety and modifying my treatment) 4. Can be submitted to authorities directly if XXXXXXXXX have not. 5. 6. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do not have to do the few hours work. 2. If done there will be more follow up work (downloading bank statements and other proof of my version) 3. Believe they will eventually realise and mitigates risk if mum found out I reported her. 4. 5. 6. |
| Cons (Costs) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If Mum finds out, even if gets better may have negative consequences (have seen what she did to stepfather) 2. My version of some events cannot be verified (several however can). 3. 4. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They may never accept my verbal version and finish up in assisted care. 2. Will remain homeless until they do consider my documented story. 3. 4. 5. |

Meanwhile his meeting with the psychiatrist had been cancelled / delayed and when he finally had it, the following day he unloaded on me. As listened I told him that a psychiatrist by definition is medically trained i.e. a doctor, that do extra studies to become a psychiatrist and therefore can prescribe drugs and no psychiatrist would behave like that. We concluded something wrong in his Dutch translation and I suspected must have been a radicalised domestic violence psychologist to which he agreed.

At the meeting he specifically asked:

1. Has anyone while he was in care for the month or at any appointment or is there any report by anyone other than Nellie that has seen any behaviours or evidence of him being schizophrenic or delusional?
2. Requested for them to access Nellies psychiatric records (as she attended a mental health service that was actually in the same company group to those overseeing his care). Note: that I previously suggested it may be difficult for them to access Nellie's records due to client confidentiality between therapist and client only which may extend to the therapists supervisor. They would almost certainly not be able to access without a court order which they would need to, and should apply for.

The psychologist, and am assuming that is what she was, stated that "what you are saying about Nellie is irrelevant as she is not our patient, you are" and dismissed requests for them to access her psychiatric records. When he tried to say anything they yelled over the top of him that "he needs to provide the evidence that he was not throwing out food". They abused him stating "you deserve to be out on the street and homeless after what you did to your mother". His regret was that the session was not recorded!

I then asked him how he reacted when they were yelling at him and he surprisingly claimed he remained calm and not as agitated as he was telling me what happened. I told him that it is often a trick to make him angry and then record that he showed significant

anger during the session so congratulated him.

Joe was clearly shaken and so upset he could barely get out properly structured sentences. He later muttered about their circular logic and that “needs to look after himself and get a job, a place to live and warmer jacket and they cannot stop him doing that”. I hopey he will follow his conclusion and maybe the abuse he copped in that session while totally unprofessional, may have done some good but only time will tell in the coming days or weeks.

Around the world many of the extremist feminists have politically lobbied and become well funded and dominate the Domestic Violence industry and risen into positions of power where they bypass ethics and stay with the assumption “it is always the man”. I feared that that is what he faced that day but without him doing some documentation then there was little I could do.

This domestic violence industry machinery needs to be replaced with that of forensic investigation of allegations and actions taken based upon facts rather than the feelings of possibly psychologically disturbed people to ensure children are safe and the system is not weaponised. (**Recommendation 2**)

I still have contacts through the service club in The Netherlands to which I was a member and offered if Joe sends me his qualifications (not sure if he even finished his University Degree in something like film production) and / or a skills resume, that I would be willing to reach out for him. Alas, his response was that is something he has to do himself and wants to find a place to live before looking for work.

I had looked up jobs in call centres (that is something that he expressed an interest and has worked in previously) and suggested that perhaps he may need to relocate to other areas of The Netherlands or further afield to take on a role and that I would be willing to fund a relocation and initial establishment costs however that response was “that is an interesting way of looking at it” and also not accepted. He is absolutely right in that if a job was in a different country (and possibly even another Dutch province) that there may be complications transferring back to his city and find himself at the start of any queues for benefits and homeless accomodation etc.. As I wrote before, he needs to make any decision with respect to his life and his path forward and not me!

If he would simply do the documentation then I could get much of it verified and:

- I have already drafted an email ready to send to the dutch lawyer that managed the legal matters for my separation,
- Contact to ring up the mental health advocate and discuss the matter
- Possibly organise an independent psychiatric evaluation
- Try to use my contacts to get a basic job

The whole matter of whether Joe did invest in the family home and many other factors to be told that “he was financially abusing his mother by not paying rent” is something that can be determined and it needs to be.

Joe is now in a semi permanent homeless shelter where he does not need to commute between a day shelter and night shelter and is fed. The rooms have beds for 10, has a locker to secure passports, phone and valuables but is with what he describes as crackheads and alcoholics and those on bail or parole for assault but there are many

security guards.

The other thing is I now have insights into what happened to Jasmine.

It was on Jasmines birthday in 2022 that I received a message back (after chasing up a request made months earlier) from Jasmines childhood friend that stated:

"Hello! I am very sorry but jasmine does not want any contact with you. The only thing that I can tell you is that She is okay, She is living her life And everything is ok. I hoped for something better than this so i'm sorry".

Things may have changed and Jasmine matured since then and hopefully she will one day read the emails I send every month, and sometimes more often and will one day reach out.

The conversations with Joe gave me the best insight to date of the fate of my daughter, Jasmine's. While Joe originally stated that he may know how to contact Jasmine from an old email he later stated he does not know.

I wrote in the 1st (original book) epilogue that Jasmine had travelled through some of the more dangerous parts of the world and suspected it was like a gap year before returning to the Netherlands and entering her career. Thanks to Joe I finally have some insights.

Her mother got progressively worse and was stopping Jasmine answering the door telling her she may be attacked, likely due to the reported paranoid delusions. The incident with the water connection to the house (item 6 in the letter to Joe's mental health case worker) in more detail is that Jasmine had to ring Joe to come home and help manage Nellie. The water had been cut off (and Nellie had attacked the worker doing that disconnection) and other services were being disconnected so Joe returned to go through things and ensure all bills paid and Nellie not be present (a condition of reconnection to ensure safety of the workers) when getting the water reconnected. While I do not know the full extent of the trauma Jasmine suffered I can only say that it troubles me to imagine what she was told such that she felt that she could not reach out to me or join me. I had sent her details of university courses that she was interested in here in Australia, photos of her Australian bedroom, so I can say is that I tried.

When Jasmine left the Netherlands in 2018 after years of trauma from the separation, with being told whatever would facilitate her being alienated from me and her mothers issues, she left and never intended to return. I will reveal she travelled through Colombia and Mexico (found photos on a travel site) and finished up in the USA. What was new to me is that Joe informed me that she travelled around as an au-pair and therefore did not have a fixed address for many years. While Joe indicated he may have her contact details from emails when we first talked he later found he did not and revealed that Jasmine has not contacted her mother or Joe for several years. The pins on her Pinterest account (I have never "followed" her or tried to contact her within the application for fear that she would block me) showed how she was progressively changed her interest from:

- Camper van fit-outs (ideal for an Au Pair going from job to job and trips), progressed to
- RV fit-outs,
- Cabins and in
- Late 2024 early 2025 continued with cabins, progressed to
- Chicken Coops and designing back yards along with
- Her all time favourite animal being cats.

It is possible, and I choose to be positive, suspecting that she is settling down somewhere.

I am choosing to take it as good news in that she had the strength to break away from her mother and is managing her life. It is what every responsible mentally healthy parent wants for their child which is to be capable and independent. I have written to her every month and sometimes more often if something has happened. In January 2025 I wrote an email to her saying how proud I was that she has taken control of her life. I doubt she has read anything I sent but in case I am wrong will continue.

The lessons learned from the early 2025 update include:

1. Never give up hope.
2. When the alienator stated she would make sure I never saw my daughter again I may never know all of what was done to my daughter and need to accept that.
3. There are things that I still ponder. Before I fled the Netherlands, should I have told Jasmine the danger I was in or what I did, which was to try to shield her and protect her from the parental conflict by not telling her what was going on?
4. Contacts within the PASG (i.e. our network) were of great assistance and sent me details of how the Netherlands Mental Health Systems works, how to report Nellie and get some support to which I cannot thank them enough.
5. Leaving and awarding custody of to the alienating parent has consequences. While I am sure that I would not be alive today if I had not have left and therefore not available to help my stepson (Joe) and hopefully one day my daughter (Jasmine), this example shows that years down the track the consequences of a system that will facilitate leaving a child with an unstable parent can have catastrophic consequences. Many of us also know it can be intergenerational. The research must continue and it is a fight we must win for the sake of everyones mental health and future generations.
6. Diagnosis of those in high conflict divorce / separation, especially when kids are involved should be assessed for mental health conditions rather than draining the family through a failed Family Separation Industry. (part of **Recommendation 1**)

Epilogue Conclusion

What Nellie has done to Joe (her son) was what she threatened to do to me and the reason I felt compelled to leave. I have always felt that if I stayed I would have been trapped in a foreign country and the constant barrage would have resulted in protracted litigation, bankruptcy and my suicide. Nellie appears to have reported Joe for domestic violence and from my observations being incapable of real, only feigned empathy for others as to the consequences for Trevor, Jasmine and now Joe, her own son that followed.

The consequences of me leaving however, remain devastating to this day. You can throw gender statements like “a mans role is to provide and protect his family” but in reality that is every parents defined role and when we fail our children, either in our own eyes or theirs, we perceive that we have failed in that role. This has nothing to do with gender. I failed to protect the kids from the fall out of the dissolution of the family unit which was facilitated by a lack of knowledge of Nellie’s mental health condition and the family separation industry that does not take someones mental health into account and is biassed leading to my realistic fears.

I am only glad that I was able to help raise my daughter for as long as I could and maybe,

just maybe, one day I may secure the role of an active father of a grown woman! I may also be able to guide and help Joe regardless of how difficult this seems right now due to his lack of willingness to help himself. When this changes, I hope I am still able to be there and assist.

More than ever, this case shows the perceived and actual process biases in the system that prevented the best interests of the child(ren) from being met and a possible failure of the dutch system (although believe it is the same in many locations across the world especially Australia). There are several issues that the professionals are hindered by:

1. Having completed a Diploma of counselling I saw just how perversely the bias is introduced with the many examples in the course of domestic violence which were all being perpetrated by males (100% of them) that creates a cognitive anchoring within the sector and puts men at a significant disadvantage and risk.
2. Another problem is actually the basic theory and practice of counselling in that you must walk their journey and see it from their perspective. While there is training in “challenging” and practices such as “Cognitive Behavioural Therapy” and “cognitive restructuring” to help people think another way there was no training or even the subject of forensic investigation / verification covered to see if what they are saying is actually true or false and this needs to be changed. (**Recommendation 3**) Such investigation is effectively banned through confidentiality and the more practical fact that it cannot be charged for.
3. A major issue is that of confidentiality and the duty to disclose. Confidentiality is restricted in Australia to:
 - (1) Mandatory requirements for reporting child abuse
 - (2) an imminent threat to themselves (I.e. suicide) or others and
 - (3) subpoenaed by a court of law (as my lawyers did).The underlying theory to justify confidentiality is that it helps the client open up and reveal their darkest secrets which may not happen otherwise and therefore may not yield a benefit from a counselling type services if not present. (**Recommendation 5**)

The psychiatrist knew, or should have known from his notes that Nellie was a danger to me (and the well being of the relationship with our daughter) and should the word immediate be removed from before “threat”! If he was skilled in Parental Alienation this early sign should have been addressed which shows a lack of training when this occurred which unfortunately remains the case!

In some countries the restriction on confidentiality may be broader and argue that it needs to be. On page 172 of my book I outlined how we had subpoenaed Nellies Psychiatric notes and “concluded she lied to her psychiatrist”. Did the psychiatrist know the facts and just cruise along with what Nellie stated to the Australian psychiatrist, to prescribe her mediation and treatment? I suspect that he would (and definitely should) have treated the situation differently and try to treat her delusions if he had known! Perhaps he was treating her for delusions as I never read the full file. Nellie clearly knew “*the tangled web she wove*” when she became aggressive when being asked if I could attend her therapy session to assist. In many cases the helping professions by continuing therapy based upon what their client say are actually facilitating a shared persecutory delusions by not being able to verify what they are told.

There are also practical constraints that become clear when you realise they are paid

by the hour for their consultations (normally 50 minutes and 10 minutes to get documentation done, compose themselves and get a new customer in the therapy chair). These practical constraints show that it is primarily a business model which would be difficult to overcome.

4. Should Nellie's psychiatrist have had a duty of care to warn me of Nellie's issues after hearing and writing down that she "became jealous and wanted to destroy the relationship I had with Jasmine" and was he negligent? The threat was not immediately life threatening so some people will debate he should not have revealed the information however I would argue strongly, that he did have an obligation to notify me and I assert that the ethical guidelines need to be debated as Nellie had been let loose, to destroy the lives of herself then spouse and then children!

(Recommendation 4)

Should Nellie's mental health (found in subpoenaed records but only available to that court which related to Australian property) have been available at the start of all court cases then this would have guided the judiciary in all matters including custody. I would have been confident in stating in court that Nellie taking sole responsibility of Jasmine was a bad idea and would have had the evidence of her instability (that I thought at the time was simply anger directed at me). The Dutch judge was not given all available information due to how the evidence acts work. Should we have even have been forced to subpoena the psychiatric notes for the Australian family court (as the request was originally rejected by Nellie and her lawyers but quickly dealt with through the subpoena) as the process delayed the availability of the information? Changes are required if we care at all about the children to make all documentation available immediately! **(Recommendation 1)**

The process to release documents between lawyers in the Netherlands (to prove what I stated was true) was another point of frustration when the purpose of the court system is to get to the truth and make the best decision. The preference by some jurisdictions to remove children from conflict (which was something that drove many of my decisions in communications) could have resulted in the court awarding sole custody to Nellie was a real fear in the Dutch custody case. I needed to maintain legal custody while giving up all practical custody in the hope that Jasmine would realise what was occurring and choose to join me. We actively concealed information such as the physical attack by Nellie six days before leaving the Netherlands and skirted around issues to state that we had never opposed Nellie's parenting decisions when we were actually at loggerheads as explained on p151 of the book. I actually:

- Wanted Jasmine to see a psychologist to work through any divorce issues
- I could not reveal the legal advice that I received that I could not get a restraining order against Nellie for self protection and hence the quick departure from the Netherlands.
- The initial and subsequent letter that requested the agreement for Jasmine to spend long vacations with the parent that did not have primary custody!

I still regret not being quick enough when the judge asked "is there was anything else you wish to add" knowing during that hearing that she demanded to personally see Jasmine that I did not ask her to read out the paragraph in the first legal letter (that we had to get special exemption to present to the Dutch court) to ensure Jasmine knew my intention that read:

In relation to the care of Jasmine we confirm our client's request to spend time with Jasmine over Christmas vacation period from the conclusion of the school term until approximately one week prior to the commencement of the following term. In the

long terms we confirm that our client would like to have Jasmine to live with him in Australia however he will, as he has done to date, continue to respect and abide by Jasmine's wishes in this regard.

To date I am not sure Jasmine realised that I wanted her with me and tried my best to be amicable.

It was shortly after that first letter that Nellie and her lawyers started to play dirty (such as lodging the court case in the Netherlands without telling me, while pretending to negotiate amicably in Australia) and for years I hit rock bottom from being without Jasmine and litigation not yielding justice. I actually believed I would likely be left psychologically beyond repair and destitute (in which case Jasmine would be better off with her mother).

This is why the system must change from that of adversarial and concealment of information for advantage to open disclosure (and penalties if one party is not open) to that of determining the mental health and needs of all concerned. Only from that complete information can the "child's best interest" be determined!

While many would say the Family Separation Industry is beyond rectification I disagree. Fundamental back to basics approach at all levels of the separation industry need to be analysed and rectified. Any tactics that provide an advantage, such as false allegations with impunity, delaying a court proceeding (the combination of which is often called the silver bullet attack / defence where a false accusation of domestic violence and delaying a case means the perpetrator has custody sometimes for years and then claim it would be traumatic for the children to change the custody to the parent they no longer know and the courts are often reluctant to change that status quo). Delays are often seen in declaring assets and drag out cases so there needs to be open declarations up front.

(Recommendation 1)

If there was legislation that forced open declaration (with significant penalties for failing to declare and be open) before the matters even went before the court then would that help? If that information was presented to two different lawyers then in almost all cases their estimate of asset division by what is the applicants and respondents lawyers, it would be very close and for the majority of matters, not worth the cost of litigation and would simply be settled and registered with the court!

Lets look at the maths for a property settlement:

Family assets total \$1,000,000.

Applicant lawyer suggest they should receive \$600,000 (60/40 split)

Respondent lawyer suggests they should receive 500,000 (50/50 split)

Difference between estimates is 100,000. (10%)

Final judgement is 550,000 to the applicant (55/45 split)

While I believe both lawyers if reputable would be within 5%, which is half of the above example, the applicant lawyer over estimated what their client would receive by \$50,000 which inflated the conflict. The inflating conflict could be minimised by limiting any benefit the applicant lawyer in this case (that inflated to conflict) to be based upon the percentage of the difference between the estimate they gave their client and the final verdict (i.e. the benefit their client got by going to litigation was \$50k more than what the respondents lawyer offered so limit the income to that amount or a percentage (i.e. performance based)!

Suddenly the financial incentive for some lawyers that encourage litigation (giving the profession a bad reputation) would disappear and maybe they would become the best mediators, get the fixed part of their income (from collating the forms for the assets registration and recommendations to proceed or not with litigation, help register the agreement) and move onto the next matter. Such a system however will only work when full disclosure of the facts are made before litigation is even registered.

This would be reduced even further by removing the current practice that each party is responsible for their litigation costs after litigation commences (especially when there are factual errors in their submissions). This is not a significant deviation from the principles of *Calderbank v Calderbank* where one side offers to settle and the amount they offered turns out to be less than court awards (and are wholly successful etc) then this can result in cost orders against them as the unreasonable party that forced the litigation to proceed (i.e. it costs for being unreasonable and wasting the court and litigants time). i.e. the principle is already established in legal frameworks and was applied when negotiating the settlement for my first two Australian cases and then also applied to my following eight Australian cases! Faced with only arguing about the difference in lawyers estimate and the risk of cost orders, most cases would settle quickly and more money left within the family to raise the children.

It will however not work for some people with anger and personality / mental health issues when their motive (be it conscience or unconsciencely) in going to court is to make the other part suffer which is why open disclosure and mental health screening would need to be undertaken before court litigation commenced to head off those cases.

Currently such cases can cost hundreds of thousands of dollars which depletes the family assets and therefore available funds to raise children, which should be the aim of legislation (rather than plunging them into poverty with all the social ramifications) if the legislation was truly framed around "the best interest of the child"! The cases also take years to settle causing untold additional mental health and suicide issues, social disruption / cohesion, productivity (i.e. employment) which legislation should also aim to reduce. (This leads to **Recommendation 1**)

So why is this not done? Possibly due to vested interest within the Family Separation Industry!

What would have stopped Nellie from going so far off track and ensuring the best interests of the children were met?

1. The recognition from day 1 that Nellie had mental health issues and required help would have been beneficial to Nellie, myself and the kids. A couple of years ago, an elderly social worker from the Australian BPD (Borderline Personality Disorder) Foundation said to me statements like:
 - i) We have lots of clients with Borderline Personality Disorder that litigate endlessly.
 - ii) If you were not trained and experienced in dealing with people with Borderline Personality Disorder then how on earth should you know what to do!
 - iii) There are several Mental Health Conditions that would explain Nellies behaviours.
 - iv) If your daughter ever returns to Australia then I would be happy to sit with her and explain to her why her mother is like she is."

What this shows is that there are some good people out there that are familiar with the mental health conditions that cause conflict (and the pathology by which they cannot stop).

2. One of the principle signs that someone needs help are the statements to police and courts. They can be genuine or they can often be caused by mental health issues. The approach to helping those two scenarios are different and hence factual (forensic) checks must be made before accusations are enacted upon especially when false statements provide an advantage to someone with mental health / personality issues. (per **Recommendation 2**)
3. Parental Alienation is always underpinned by coercive control of the child. Parental Alienation has matured where there are robust checks, to determine if the situation is Parental Alienation or justified estrangement and must be put into standard practice. It is not complicated when facts and timelines are constructed. It is however impossible for those practitioners that only interview the alienating parent along with the children and take whatever they say as the truth and participate in a damaging shared delusion! This is why the current practices of the “helping professions” can be counterproductive to those of the justice system and the best interest of the child. (Leads to **Recommendation 5**)
4. If the people justifiably had faith that the system was fair and would be judged on facts and protected from false accusations, or at least compensated (I.e. the very principle of restorative justice characterised by Justitia, the Roman goddess of Justice that adorns many courts and characterised by the sword, scales and blindfold). Nellie knew she could lie with virtual impunity and while I have been given some costs the lies drained the family assets and we have both now lost our daughter. Knowing she would have been prosecuted for her actions would almost certainly have stopped her. (per **Recommendation 6**)

By having properly trained professional integrated into the system that would have recognised the underlying mental health conditions that were impacting Nellie then they could have been properly acted upon and would have been beneficial to Nellie, myself and the kids.

So what happens when the targeted parent is eliminated? Where the targeted parent is cut off completely from the child? That the child is convinced the targeted parent should never be spoken to or communicated with, through psychological conditioning?

What this case shows is that the coercive and maladaptive parenting continues without constraints and that often the children are forced into situation that are unacceptable to any compassionate society. In this case where Joe has been abused with the assistance of the government and organisations that are highly funded for doing so. Where Jasmine has escaped and will have nothing to do with her abuser but still unsure about a the targeted parent that still loves her, she is alone in the world without support and that cannot be a good thing for her or society in general.

This case is not unusual and am grateful in some respects.

- One friend, a qualified social worker discovered his step son became what he termed “the kicking boy” when he was removed (with the help of the family separation industry) to suffer such psychological damage with cutting etc that eventually died. The social worker would have jumped at the opportunity to help and suffers because he was not made aware (when the child was only suburbs away).

- Another friend whose daughter took up high risk behaviours (typical of alienated children) travelling in a car driven by her boyfriend at an estimated twice the speed limit, died when car ran off the road and burst into flames.
- Another friend's daughter returned to her mother after years of psychological abuse and has spent years trying to restabilise her from cutting etc.
- The examples could go on and on but you should get the point.

The system must go through wholesale transformation as vested interests have ensured the "child's best interest" have become irrelevant!

Where to from here?

For the first two weeks after connecting with Joe my hands were frequently shaking, some would call tremors which is a common physical symptom of anxiety triggered by the body's stress response. While those obvious symptoms have disappeared as I accepted that you cannot help someone (including Joe) that will not help themselves, most of the stress and anxiety has faded. My focus has increased into making sure Jasmine is OK. I wonder if she has avoided me for all those years and what symptoms she experiences whenever she thinks of me and for that matter thinks of her mother and brother. Too stressful for her to think about? Perhaps she is having a similar stress reaction to what I am suffering this year and is why she has left all our lives and not contacted me.

- I will continue to communicate with Joe so that he knows someone does care.
- Hopefully, Joe will fill in the details of what occurred with his mother and hopefully get Nellie investigated, treated, stabilised and weekly checkups for her remaining years so that she is not a danger to others and especially her children.
- Hopefully I will verify what Joe has informed me (once documented) and will then try to assist him more be that through organising legal support or advocacy. Unfortunately he will need to want the help that I am prepared to provide.
- I will begin a search for Jasmine to verify she is OK. From there, hopefully someone will one day assist me in reunification but I recognise that will only happen when she is ready. Hopefully I will find a way to navigate the divide as it is important to break the cycle of Parental Alienation within our family.
- I will continue to advocate for changes and do whatever I can (such as this document as to what is going wrong and what can be done to rectify) to promote systematic changes!
- While the stress from the initial call has subsided, I recognise it is still there and have to try to look after myself through diet exercise and other techniques so not too adversely effected.

Hopefully I will have an update and revise this epilogue soon, possibly with research and with a more positive outcome. We all need to act and act now to protect our nations children.