



Association of McKenzie Friends

voluntary public interest advocacy

www.mckenzie-friends.co.uk

Chairperson: Belinda McKenzie -- Web Publisher: Sabine K McNeill

EU Law Specialist: Deborah Mahmoudieh

20 November 2015

Child Safety – Evidence of Lawful Suspicions and Concerns about British Family Courts

Is the Safety of Children Guaranteed?

Contents

Child Safety – Evidence of Lawful Suspicions and Concerns about British Family Courts.....	1
Is the Safety of Children Guaranteed?	1
A: Law of Probability.....	2
B1 & B2: Missing in Care.....	3
C: Unwitting Incest: Forced Adoptions.....	3
D: Deaths in State Care.....	3
E: High Court Precedent: Adoptive Returnee.....	3
F: Child Abuse in Care	3
G: Ray Jones: Dangers of Unregulated, Private Child Care Providers	3
H: High Court Precedent: Onus of Proof, Expert Dismissal & Retractions	3
I: EU Child Protection Directive on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography	4
J: UN Committee on the Rights of the Child Report 2014 about the UK	4
K: Behavioural Problems of Children in Care	4
L: Leaving State Care	4
M: Child Identity	4
N: False Allegations of Abuse	4
O: Child Safety UK: A CRISIS REPORT.....	4

A voluntary Initiative of Public Interest Advocates assisting Litigants in Person

21a Goldhurst Terrace – London NW6 3HB – T: 020 7328 3701 – Fax: 020 8348 1637

sabine@3d-metrics.com

P: The Child Protection System in England Written evidence submitted by Ian Josephs to the Education Select Committee in 2011	5
Q: UK MP Report: Endemic Abuse.....	5
Determining the Risks.....	5
'Balance of Probability' as Required Level of Proof.....	5
Identifying Risks.....	6
A) Incest Risk.....	6
B) Emotional Risk	7
C) Future Risk of Social Disadvantage	9
D) Risk of Psychological, Physical and Sexual Abuse & Death	10
D2) Lack of Directives.....	10
D3) Court Precedents: Evidence of Negligence in Assessing Child Safety.....	12
D4) Risk of Absconion or Going Missing From State Care	15
Determining Factors for Child Protection	16
'Mother whose children were taken for adoption joins class action'	17
Summary.....	22
Conclusion	25

[McKenzie Friends](#)ⁱ and [McKenzie Angels](#)ⁱⁱ acting on behalf of the British Citizens of Europe, here present our case reflecting our lawful and reasonable concerns on the issue of the British Family Courts' ability to guarantee the safety of children they place in both state-run and private child care and also, the accountability of those same Courts when risks are realised via actual child suffering.

Contrary to academic practice, below is a list of the documents we present in evidence to support our lawful suspicions and concerns as outlined above.

We submit these documents as; relevant to-date, lawfully valid, and professionally recognised and endorsed, not as Endnotes, but as headings that tell a dreadful, embarrassing and shocking 'public story' about our future generations.

A: Law of Probability

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200708/ldjudgmt/jd080611/child-1.htm>

B1 & B2: Missing in Care

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/419144/Missing_children.pdf

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/117793/missing-persons-strategy.pdf

C: Unwitting Incest: Forced Adoptions

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/7182817.stm>

D: Deaths in State Care

<http://www.thejournal.ie/deaths-children-state-care-preventable-hse-official-report-494026-Jun2012/>

E: High Court Precedent: Adoptive Returnee

<http://www.familylawweek.co.uk/site.aspx?i=ed146290>

<http://www.theguardian.com/society/2015/aug/11/adopted-girl-wins-right-to-return-to-biological-family-after-abuse>

F: Child Abuse in Care

<http://www.familylawweek.co.uk/site.aspx?i=ed146290>

G: Ray Jones: Dangers of Unregulated, Private Child Care Providers

<http://www.communitycare.co.uk/2015/01/07/stealth-privatisation-childrens-services/>

H: High Court Precedent: Onus of Proof, Expert Dismissal & Retractions

<http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWFC/HCI/2015/26.html>

I: EU Child Protection Directive on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1443149158125&uri=CELEX%3A32011L0093>

J: UN Committee on the Rights of the Child Report 2014 about the UK

http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=CRC/C/OPSC/GBR/CO/1

K: Behavioural Problems of Children in Care

<http://www.u.tv/News/2015/10/01/Behavioural-problems-in-40-of-children-in-care-46051>

L: Leaving State Care

<http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/spru/research/pdf/leaving.pdf>

M: Child Identity

<http://study.com/academy/lesson/self-identity-in-children-theory-definition-issues.html>

N: False Allegations of Abuse

<http://www.leadershipcouncil.org/1/res/csa-acc.html>

O: Child Safety UK: A CRISIS REPORT

<https://mckenzie4fairness.files.wordpress.com/2015/10/15-10-25-crisis-report.pdf>

P: The Child Protection System in England Written evidence submitted by Ian Josephs to the Education Select Committee in 2011

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmeduc/writev/1514/cp09.htm>

Q: UK MP Report: Endemic Abuse

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-south-yorkshire-30083835>

Determining the Risks

'Balance of Probability' as Required Level of Proof

1) First we refer to the law of probability as defined in **Document A on [the Law of Probability](#)**:

24. Re B [2008] UKHL 35: "The balance of probability standard means that a court is satisfied an event occurred if the court considers that, on the evidence, the occurrence of the event was more likely than not. When assessing the probabilities the court will have in mind as a factor, to whatever extent is appropriate in the particular case, that the more serious the allegation the less likely it is that the event occurred and, hence, the stronger should be the evidence before the court concludes that the allegation is established on the balance of probability. Fraud is usually less likely than negligence. Deliberate physical injury is usually less likely than accidental physical injury. A step-father is usually less likely to have repeatedly raped and had non-consensual oral sex with his under age stepdaughter than on some occasion to have lost his temper and slapped her. Built into the preponderance of probability standard is a generous degree of flexibility in respect of the seriousness of the allegation.

Although the result is much the same, this does not mean that where a serious allegation is in issue the standard of proof required is higher. It means only that the inherent probability or improbability of an event is itself a matter to be taken into account when weighing the probabilities and deciding whether, on balance, the event occurred. The more improbable the event, the stronger must be the evidence that it did occur before, on the balance of probability, its occurrence will be established."

2) According to evidence presented via professional Reports, Studies, Court Precedents and concerns as listed above, we as representatives of the British public as EU Citizens, in all probability

and in interest of Child Safety and Protection, are criminally negligent should we, in light of all aforementioned evidence, choose to minimise or ignore the fundamental risks now publicly exposed.

3) The risks are real, which means our resulting suspicions and concerns are entirely lawful and therefore, in interests of assuring Child Safety to the highest possible degree as is the fundamental duty of the UK Family Courts, we request that immediate steps are taken to address and resolve all of the concerns as highlighted herein.

Identifying Risks

A) Incest Risk

4) Risk of unwitting incestual relations between forcibly adopted and/or separated siblings and related family: Note we have provided just one example of many, as evidence related to this via **Document C: [Unwitting Incest: Forced Adoptions](#)**; we ask the Respondents to take into account that many such similar cases are undiscovered and/or unreported due to desires for privacy due to possible negative public responses toward individual parties involved and/or against any children conceived via such relationships: We thereby, lawfully conclude that the scale of the problem is much bigger than is presently, officially recognised.

5) The Law is founded on what we know and on what we may lawfully suspect according to what we know; we know that forcibly adopted siblings living under different names can and do meet each other and/or related 1st cousins, aunts and uncles, as 'strangers' in adulthood and commit to sexual relations with one another. The risk continues with future children of those siblings and we are aware of the genetic defects related to children born as a result of incest, the most common of which, relates to 'learning difficulties'.

6) Such risks are greatly amplified the larger the family being separated i.e. 3, 4, 5 or more children. Since many sibling groups are presently being systematically separated into foster care and with 31% of these being placed into forced adoption; *what measures are Britain's Family Courts taking to ensure that all such separated siblings do not suffer the risk of unwitting sexual relations with their external families, siblings and/or their siblings children?*

B) Emotional Risk

7) Emotional risk of damage caused by forced separation of siblings: The risk here is related to loss of identity as it is known that children identify themselves in role of 'brother' or 'sister' as soon as a new family member is born.

8) A child's developing psychology is very fragile and such self-identification as established in relation to their role as older or younger, brother or sister represents a psychological building block on which a child's accepted identity is founded, any external denial of or disruptions to that identity will result in a sense of loss and grief and thereby, weaken the child's identity and his/her subsequent sense-of-self in growing up into adulthood and only because, in the case of state-enforced separation, there is no valid reason (unless a sibling is a serious danger to their sibling) which a child can understand, as to why they can no longer be a sister or a brother.

9) Here we refer to **Document M on [Child Identity](#)**:

'Working through much of the 20th century, Erik Erikson is most famous for developing his psychosocial theory of identity development. Erikson argued that development occurs in stages and is greatly influenced by one's interactions with their environment. In his theory, there are eight stages, though for the purposes of discussing children, we'll only cover the first five.

Erikson framed each stage around a 'crisis' that occurs, and development is affected by how the crisis is resolved. During any single stage, a child is grappling with their identity and may bounce back and forth between extremes. For example, during the second stage, a toddler may feel very autonomous about some things, such as their ability to feed themselves, but when encountering something new and scary, they may feel great doubt about their abilities.

Chart of Erikson

In order to help children cope with these challenges parents and teachers can support them in a number of ways:

Provide children with opportunities to complete tasks independently.

Allow children to make their own decisions when appropriate.

Allow children to design their own activities or incorporate their feedback.'

10) All of the above applies also, to a child's sense of self as gained via relationship with parents and external family, especially grandparents and cousins. While in circumstances of actual abuse, the child's sense of self is damaged; in cases of 'future emotional risk', the child as yet, has suffered no actual damage to their sense of self via their parent and indeed, instinctively clings to the security and trust they naturally invest in their parents: Explaining to such a child that they must say goodbye to parents and all related external family forever because Mum or Dad MIGHT harm them emotionally in the future, does not in any way, support a child's sense of 'justice' and this negation of actually, damaged emotions a child experiences on forced separation, dramatically negates (in the eyes of the child) the concerns of the State relating to a 'future' emotional risk'.

11) To a child who has as yet, suffered NO actual harm or abuse; being forcibly removed from the family home and handed over to strangers by strangers, is the absolute worst horror any child could imagine.

12) Such actions as committed daily on behest of the Family Courts are not only causing children unnecessary and severe emotional damage they are also, a criminal violation of British citizens Human Rights and rights to a fair trial in the sense that a high percentage of children are essentially, illegally abducted on grounds of ONLY a 'future emotional risk' (with no crime actually proven to have been committed or else, no legally identified risk via conviction i.e. named on the 'sex-offender's' register), a risk that is used to justify the ACTUAL emotional harming of children who have NOT suffered abuse and who do NOT need 'rescuing'.

13) *How does the child 'rescued' from a 'future emotional risk' FEEL to be dragged away from their beloved parents, siblings, friends and family? Do they feel rescued or kidnapped?*

14) The overall impact is on the separated child and siblings diminished ability and willingness to trust in authorities and/or to commit to adult relationships in adult life; trust and security are often, seriously negated.

15) All such underlying problems will manifest in a variety of seemingly unrelated behavioural problems such as anger, violence, vandalism, absconion, theft, self harm, perjury and suicide.

16) **Document K on [Behavioural Problems](#)** highlights the fact that 40% of children in State and state-endorsed private care, are suffering from behavioural problems.

17) Since the majority of all children placed in State Care are most commonly separated from family and siblings to protect them from harm and/or risk of harm, the fact that such children are exhibiting a professionally identified, very high rate of behavioural problems, is direct evidence that all such children are in some way damaged by the very mechanisms employed by the present Family Court protocols in placing children into State and private Care and/or, that State & Private Care authorities are not adequately addressing or diminishing behavioural problems in the children they are protecting.

18) Certainly, children who consider themselves 'victims' of the Family Courts and their child care providers, will not be responding favourably to Foster Carers etc., who are naturally, perceived as an 'enemy' instead of a 'carer': Such circumstances do not predict peaceful compliancy on part of a forcibly removed child whose wishes are rarely if ever, taken into account.

C) Future Risk of Social Disadvantage

19) Here we refer to **Document L on [Leaving State Care](#)** in acknowledging the very serious disadvantages children face on leaving State Care as young adults, we note with dismay the very low rate of entrance into higher education and low employment rate among all such youngsters:

20) 'Research undertaken since 1990 has provided a broader range of evidence based on larger scale surveys of care leavers and in-depth studies of the leaving care process. It identified both the accelerated and compressed nature of young people's transitions from care when compared to the wider population of young people. Most young people were found to leave care before the age of 18 (Biehal et al., 1992; Garnett, 1992) and that learning to manage a home, establishing a place in the labour market and starting a family tended to overlap in the period soon after leaving care (Biehal et al., 1995; Corlyon and McGuire, 1997). In relation to education and employment, care leavers were found to be particularly disadvantaged. Only a minority gained qualifications and around one half were likely to be unemployed after leaving care (Biehal et al., 1995; Broad, 1998). In this respect, evidence also pointed to a legacy from care into adulthood (Cheung and Heath, 1994). In consequence many care leavers were surviving on low incomes and were often financially dependent (Broad, 1998).

21) Since as 'Carer' the State is required to provide for children as would a parent, why is there so little provision toward enabling children in State Care to enter Higher Education? No funding for college? No funding for University? No help with learning to drive, establish a home etc?

D) Risk of Psychological, Physical and Sexual Abuse & Death

22) Here we refer to **Documents F & B**: In relation to **Document F**, we note first, the authors comment in the summary of their Report:

'Our findings are likely to underestimate the true extent of the problem, as over half of unsubstantiated allegations could not be proven one way or the other.

Allegations that are unsubstantiated due to a lack of evidence can pose serious dilemmas to practitioners trying to decide on a safe course of action for the child. It is important (whenever it is considered safe) that some time is taken (in conjunction with colleagues) to carefully weigh the evidence in individual cases in an effort to avoid precipitate action.

Further work is needed to understand the variation that was found between countries and local authorities in rates of abuse or neglect in foster care.'

23) We note also, with immense concern that some of the children identified as suffering serious abuse in this report, were discovered only AFTER, earlier victims had reported historical abuse committed against them by those specific State authorised carers and/or adoptive parents.

24) We very strongly agree that the above Report vastly underestimates the true extent of children suffering physical and sexual abuse while in State Care or forced adoption and to degrees of psychological and emotional abuse, which would not be normally tolerated to be committed by a biological parent.

D2) Lack of Directives

26) To support our lawful suspicion and opinion, we refer to the fact that UN & EU Child Protection Directives are presently, largely ignored by British Family Courts: **See Documents I & J**.

27) According to the Directives, onus of proof is reversed which means a child's allegations of abuse are lawfully believed until the suspects concerned can prove their innocence.

28) According to the Directives, every child reporting abuse or crime needs an independent legal representative/guardian.

29) According to the Directives, retractions of a child's allegations are not sufficient evidence to support the closing of a case.

30) According to the Directives, medical evidence supporting a child witness testimony will fundamentally nullify any retractions and insist on further investigations.

31) We here ask the Respondents to equally accept the validity and professional and legally recognised status of the EU & UN Child Protection Directives, as lawful evidence which highlights and supports all of the concerns we reflect in our submissions related to this case.

32) We here ask that in the event of the Respondents refusal to accept the legal validity of EU Child Protection Directives, the Respondents provide an equally valid set of Directives and/or a lawfully and professionally recognised weight of evidence to support their dismissal of those Directives.

33) Regardless of British Child Protection Providers collective ignorance of the EU Child Protection Directives, the lawful fact remains that British children are legally recognised EU Citizens and therefore, have a legal right to protection from and prevention of, crimes against themselves as identified and addressed by the EU Child Protection Directives.

34) The lawful fact is, that British children are placed at very serious risk precisely because EU Child Protection Directives are not in place; children have no guarantee of safety within a legal climate which commonly dismisses the child's right to be believed, their right to an independent legal representative and which instead, invites retractions as 'justification' for closing a report of abuse; a report which is then labelled as "false".

35) We can instantly recognise the risk here in relation to an isolated child's vulnerable position and the 'fear factor' (as identified by EU Child Protection Directives in Section 26). When we weigh up the power imbalance between an isolated child in care reporting genuine abuse and/or emotional harm or neglect and along with the absolute lack of child protections directives in place, is it any wonder that a high portion of allegations are revealed to be dismissed as 'false' or 'unsubstantiated'?

36) We witness how in such an ethos of inviting 'retractions' and the burden of proof placed on child witnesses, the amount of 'false-allegations' begins to mount and which itself, is then used as 'evidence' to support a resulting false supposition that British children are 'commonly' falsely reporting abuse when in reality, the very opposite is true; with only 10% of reports statistically proven false and, taking into account the commonly, very low rates of reports, we can instantly realise the issue of 'false-allegations' is a minor concern in relation to the extent of the crimes and the very low rate of arrests and convictions: **See Document N.**

37) How many children do not have opportunity or courage to report abuse they are suffering in care? Lawfully, we need to take this into account.

38) With no independent legal guardians to look out for children's interests while in State Care or forced adoption, it is against the very foundation of child protection law to negate the aforementioned concerns as either 'minimal' or as an 'acceptable level of risk'.

D3) Court Precedents: Evidence of Negligence in Assessing Child Safety

39) ALL of the concerns, testimonies and risks shared here, are supported by legal evidence and Court Judgements/Precedents: We remind the Respondents of Justice Pauffley's comment in relation to her decision to return a forcibly adopted child to her Mother and who had suffered extradition abroad to strangers where she endured 10 years of extreme abuse: **See Document E.**

40) According to Justice Pauffley, this was something "*no professional involved at the time could envisage*".

<http://www.theguardian.com/society/2015/aug/11/adopted-girl-wins-right-to-return-to-biological-family-after-abuse>

41) A forcibly adopted child suffered extradition into the care of strangers, to Ghana where she suffered "extreme" abuse.

HOW could that happen?

WHY was no one following up on that adopted child's progress and welfare?

WHY did the Judge not bother to address the very serious risk her case has exposed?

Is this case not equally as important a Precedent as that of 'Baby P'?

42) Unfortunately, directly because this terrible tragedy of justice *has* happened to this one and many other children as are legally documented; abuse of children while in care of other official parties, is now something that every parent losing a child to State Care and every professional involved in placing children into care, are now lawfully required to envisage.

43) We now refer to the recent High Court Precedents as outlined here, by Justice Pauffley's judgement on the case example below which was heard publicly and specifically, in order to determine any true risks to child safety whereby further police investigations would be initiated or else, denied: **See Document H**

<http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWFC/HCI/2015/26.html>

44) We here, highlight our concerns that while the medical expert in the aforementioned case, upheld her findings of long-term repeated sexual abuse of two children in giving professional evidence to the High Court, her expert conclusions were dismissed as the opinions of an "over dogmatic expert" and there was no medical evidence presented to *conclusively* prove her findings as false as is required by EU Child Protection Directives: See extracts below from paragraphs 130 & 132 as quoted from **Document H**

45) 'Dr Hodes' very last report – of 5 February 2015 – was written in response to written questions. She states that "the overall situation is such that it is my view that the allegations / accounts need to be taken very seriously despite the confusing picture."p130.

'[Justice Pauffley concludes]: 'Overall, I feel impelled to observe that the level of Dr Hodes' involvement in this case was unusual.

[Why is a medical expert's involvement in a child sexual abuse case described by a High Court Judge as; "UNUSUAL"?)

'I remind myself of the several cautionary considerations when a court is considering the contributions made by experts as comprised within Re U; Re B [2004] EWCA Civ 567 – i) The cause of an injury or an episode that cannot be explained scientifically remains equivocal. ... iv) The court must always be on guard against the over-dogmatic expert, the expert whose reputation or amour propre is at stake, or the expert who has developed a scientific prejudice.' p132

46) In such a legal-climate whereby serious risks posed by multiple professionals working within all areas of child protection, who are directly alleged to be involved in serious crimes against multiple children, including murder; allegations supported by testimony of *two* child witnesses and with professional medical evidence supporting BOTH child testimonies, that are given the '*benefit of doubt*' on grounds of *'retractions'* given while in care of alleged abusers, who are subsequently, left free from police investigations; no child in State Authorised Care care has any reasonable guarantee of safety.

**Retractions are unacceptable according to EU Child Protection Directives and this is due entirely, to the fact that permitting retractions as 'evidence' to halt investigations into serious crimes against children, is to legally 'invite' further abuse of children in persuading them to lie and thereby, leave other children at risk too: Allowing retractions places undue pressure on child witnesses and therefore, places them at risk.*

47) To all intents and purposes, the above UK High Court Judgement as referred to via Document H, is in lawful fact, an abomination of the very Justice that EU Child Protection Directives seek to provide for the children of Europe.

See Directive 26 of EU Child Protection Directives/Document I:

48) 'Investigating offences and bringing charges in criminal proceedings should be facilitated, to take into account the difficulty for child victims of denouncing sexual abuse and the anonymity of offenders in cyberspace. To ensure successful investigations and prosecutions of the offences referred to in this Directive, their initiation should not depend, in principle, on a report or accusation made by the victim or by his or her representative. The length of the sufficient period of time for prosecution should be determined in accordance with national law.'

D4) Risk of Absconson or Going Missing From State Care

49) We refer here to **Documents B1 & B2** as identifying and highlighting the risks associated with children who abscond or go missing while in State Care:

50) *'Inspectors saw evidence of some tenacious partnership working across relevant agencies to safeguard children at risk of going missing. Information was generally shared effectively when children were reported missing and there were some persistent efforts by professionals to engage children.*

However, some inconsistency and gaps in practice meant that professionals were not always fully attuned to the needs of children who went missing. For example, it was not often clear whether checks, usually undertaken by police officers, to ensure that children were safe and well after returning home had been undertaken. When they had been, the outcomes of the checks were often not routinely shared with carers and professionals.

Similarly, more in-depth return interviews with children by an independent person to explore the reasons why they had run away and to identify any support needs were rarely evident. Updated risk management plans that identified specific actions to be taken to prevent children from running away and to keep them safe were rarely evident in the cases seen by inspectors.

The lack of routine attention to learning from the experiences of children also contributed to a generally weak understanding at a senior level of the reasons why children go missing. Strategic planning of services to reduce the number of children who go missing was underdeveloped in most local authorities and was hindered further by some poor record management and unreliable data systems.'

51) Since we are thoroughly aware that a child's repeated absconson from their prime carer is a sign that there is a problem related to that prime carer, it is a dismay to note that again, lack of independent guardianship is placing children at risk by leaving them the only option of putting themselves at greater risk of exploitation and abuse, by running away. Even, on being found, their clearly, unresolved issues are left unaddressed inasmuch as rarely, is anyone in authority much interested in WHY the child chose to abscond.

52) In event of a child attempting to flee abusive carers, on being found, it is the child who is deemed 'wrong' for running away while his/her abusers remain trusted by those same authorities as a care-provider or adoptive parent: We need to accept that when children flee their homes or carers it is MOST PROBABLY because something is wrong either at home or else, they are subject to criminal and/or 'grooming' influences from an external party.

53) All of the above concerns are magnified by the fact that many of the by-now, privatised child care providers are largely unregulated and accountable only by subject of contract to local Authorities: **See Document G:**

Considerable risk'

54) *'No other country anywhere allows decisions about the protection of children to be contracted outside of public services and the state's immediate responsibility...*

'...In England what is intended by the government is even more extreme. Not only is it planned that these companies should be able to get the contracts. It is also intended that they will not be registered, regulated or inspected when providing these services.

...Nowhere else takes the considerable risk of these services only being accountable back to the government or local authorities through a contract. Why not? Well just look at how G4S, SERCO, A4e, and ATOS have let down the public so badly on their expensive profit-generating contracts...

Is it sensible to place child protection and other children's social services in the same jeopardy?'

Ray Jones, Professor of social work at Kingston University and St George's, University of London

Determining Factors for Child Protection

55) While there are many indications to suggest a child is suffering abuse and most especially if a child reports abuse to adults and local authorities, again, we find lack of EU Child Protection Directives dramatically diminishes authority responses to those crimes except, where those concerns are related to instant removal of children deemed 'at risk' from a depressed parent who has asked for help from Social services or else, a parent and children who are identified by Social Services as suffering repeated harassment from a separated, divorced or estranged partner.

56) We note the reluctance to remove hostile parties from the family home and/or to charge such individuals according to the actual crimes they have committed and/or to identify any obvious mental health issues or drug & alcohol addictions.

57) Why are police referring incidents of breaking and entering, verbal and physical abuse against an ex-partner, to Social Services? Does being a partner or an ex-partner give an individual the 'right' to break the law? If Social Services are involved to help the victim and children, how can it be considered 'helping' to then remove the children from their non-abusive parent and thereby expose those children to all the greater risks as are expressed in this Report?

58) Below are a few extracts from **Document O** with accompanying links of evidence, all of which highlight our concerns:

59) 'In dismissing two child witness testimonies [as shared previously via **Document H**], over 1,000+ incidents of serious child abuse against over a possible/probable 1,000+ children are also, dismissed; *how can we fail to compare the lack of professional bodies assigned to investigating actual reports of child abuse by children, to the amount of police and professionals involved in removing baby and children into forced-adoptions when a Mum is judged a 'future-emotional-risk' because she's suffering POST NATAL DEPRESSION ?*

'Mother whose children were taken for adoption joins class action'

'When 'Alison' developed post natal depression she pleaded for help from those she thought were there to assist her.

But instead of gaining support she ended up losing custody of her three beloved daughters.

Social workers said the children were at risk of suffering "emotional abuse", even though they conceded that she cared deeply for them and had worked hard to be a better parent.

Now the 22-year-old, whose real name cannot be used for legal reasons, is pregnant for a fourth time and is terrified that social workers will refuse to give her the chance of caring for the new baby once it is born.'

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/law-and-order/7840835/Mother-whose-children-were-taken-for-adoption-joins-class-action.html>

'Social services took my children

Eileen Fairweather has investigated child care scandals for the past 20 years. But even she was shocked by the way an increasingly Stalinist state has torn apart one woman's family.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/women/mother-tongue/8349748/Social-services-took-my-children.html>

'The 'experts' who break up families: The terrifying story of the prospective MP branded an unfit mother by experts who'd never met her - a nightmare shared by many other families

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2121886/The-experts-break-families-The-terrifying-story-prospective-MP-branded-unfit-mother-experts-whod-met--nightmare-shared-families.html#ixzz3odR1IOQM>

'Is there NO treatment for Post Natal Depression? Do women NEVER recover from it? Is it HELPING to remove a mother's newborn baby and children permanently from her life? Can no one see the irony, that the long-known after effects of childbirth on a mother's psyche, are being used as 'justification' for removing her baby into a forced adoption?

'We are deeply disturbed that many lone parents are now too afraid to ask for help for depression, or to report sexual abuse of their children because they now KNOW, they are likely to lose their children.

'This fear that social services will come and take your children... (Mumsnet group-discussion; 643 Posts)

'I have recently worked with a young Mum who took ages to seek help for her terrible PND because her Mum told her that if she was on antidepressants her shit of a boyfriend (who physically, emotionally and psychologically abused her) would be able to get custody of their two children hmm. Or that social services would be round.

It took me an awful lot of visiting and listening and discussion before she felt able to seek the help she needed. An awful lot of reassurance that she was brilliant mum doing a fantastic job before she could believe me.

Now she is better - on antidepressants but weaning off.

Definitely needs discussion.' *Anon.

'Negative feelings can pass, but if you tell the authorities what you're feeling at your lowest of low (for example I admitted my baby didn't feel like mine when suffering exhaustion and going cold turkey from breastfeeding) that exact thing I said which I didn't even necessarily feel a day or week later, was used against me in court an entire year later and it contributed to the judge taking my son.

I thought if I told social services the worst of how I felt that they would HELP and give me some respite and support.

It was the biggest mistake of my life trusting them.' *Anon.

http://www.mumsnet.com/Talk/feeling_depressed/903685-This-fear-that-social-services-will-come-and-take-your/AllOnOnePage

**Please note that many parents discussing their experiences above, have no choice but to remain anonymous because discussing their case in public can lead to loss of any remaining children in their care and/or automatic imprisonment by order of the Family Courts.*

'The myth that abused children grow up to reabuse, needs also to be dispelled;

'Fact: The majority of sexually abused children are female, and yet the majority of sexual abusers are male. Some studies have found that sexually abusive men are more likely to report a history of sexual abuse than other men. However, the majority of men who sexually abuse children do not report being sexually abused in childhood.'

<http://www.asca.org.au/WHAT-WE-DO/Resources/General-Information/Myths-about-child-abuse>

'The above is an important point because it is now a matter-of-fact that many British parents are losing their children to forced-adoption on the grounds of 'future-emotional-risk', a 'risk' which can be determined PURELY, on the grounds that the parent themselves, suffered abuse as a child.

'We note with alarm, how the insidious threat of losing one's children to forced-adoption will undoubtedly, lead to a dramatic reduction in adults reporting crimes of historical abuse they suffered as children and who subsequently, fail to receive necessary, therapeutic help and/or compensation and with the risk that abusers remain free in their jobs as teachers etc.

'We witness the same approach to women suffering domestic abuse and again, we note with concern the impact in terms of more women and children silently tolerating domestic violence because if they ask for help, they risk losing their children.

'Children of domestic abuse victims increasingly being taken into care

<http://www.theguardian.com/society/2014/jan/15/children-domestic-violence-parents-care> '

60) It is a major concern to witness the manner in which serious crimes of breaking and entering, verbal abuse, harassment and assault even against long estranged partners who live separately from the offender, are casually dismissed by British police and related authorities as 'domestic problems' and with the perpetrators commonly left unarrested or convicted.

61) Even worse is the fact that their continued criminal behaviour will often, ultimately result in removal of children from the victims of ex-partner's harassment and aggression.

62) We note with dismay, the by now, common arrests and harsh prison sentences given to parents who are found to be breaking Family Court Secrecy rules and/or who break the conditions set by the Family Courts: Extract from **Document O**:

63) 'Why is it considered by British police MORE reasonable to invade a packed Liverpool theatre to arrest a grandmother for "hugging" her forcibly adopted granddaughter, than it is for them to immediately arrest people who commit serious crimes against partners, ex-partners and/or children?

'The 72-year-old was reportedly watching comedian Ken Dodd in Liverpool when she was dragged from her seat and held in a police cell until her court appearance this morning.

Mrs Danby's 19-year-old granddaughter has learning difficulties and was removed from her father's care by Derbyshire council in 2007, on what she calls a 'spurious excuse'.

<http://metro.co.uk/2014/12/30/grandmother-arrested-for-breaking-court-order-by-hugging-her-granddaughter-5003787/#ixzz3oSuQ04T5>

64) We cannot fail to recognise the INCREASED and obvious risks to children posed by unregulated private Child Care providers as revealed earlier via **Document G**, and neither, can we continue to blindly ignore the terrible and ACTUAL, emotional damage caused by often unnecessary and brutal, state-enforced separations between genuinely loving parents and children, on grounds of 'future risks' assessed according to; depression, a minor mental health problem or learning difficulty, personal experience of abuse as a child or harassment via an ex partner.

65) With 'condemned' parents being imprisoned for 'abuses' such as waving at their forcibly removed children while violent and dangerous 'partners' or ex-partners are at large to continue harassing and assaulting vulnerable parents and children, the discrimination in police response and resulting convictions, is obviously bias in favour of Family Courts: **Document O**:

'The mothers jailed after waving to their children in the street

It's a mystery why judges and social workers think they have the legal authority to act in such an inhuman way'

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/women/mother-tongue/familyadvice/10899893/The-mothers-jailed-after-waving-to-their-children-in-the-street.html>

66) It seems while many claim there is not enough money to fund full implementation of Child Protection Directives in Britain, it appears there is plenty of funding available for protecting children from crimes which have not yet and may never, occur: The average Family Court Case costs the State; £500,000. This does not include the costs related to care in authority or privatised care and/or placement costs charged by privatised Social and Child Care Services: How much does it cost to imprison a parent whose only crime is to wish their child a 'Happy 21st' on Facebook or else, seek help for their child who is suspected of being abused while in State Care?

Christopher Booker: Telegraph Journalist;

'I recently reported on a mother, still in prison, after her desperately unhappy 13-year-old daughter had run away from a care home where she was being physically ill-treated. The mother had rung the police, but was careful to have no direct contact with her daughter, until the police begged her to go and calm the girl down in her brother's house, where she was screaming and sobbing. For this, the social workers persuaded a judge to jailed her for six months.'

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/women/mother-tongue/familyadvice/10899893/The-mothers-jailed-after-waving-to-their-children-in-the-street.html>

Summary

67) It is for the purpose of identifying and preventing crimes against children, as well as protecting children, that the EU Child Protection Directives were devised as a strategy and indeed, they are shown to be thoroughly vigilant in recognising the types of people involved in such crimes and the kind of fears and obstacles faced by child victims suffering and/or reporting crimes against themselves. At every level, the Directives seeks to address the power imbalance between child and adult and specifically, in order to encourage prompt and increased investigations into all allegations and suspects.

68) Prompt and thorough investigations serve to prove suspects guilt or innocence, protect children, attend to their needs, ensure that no crimes are being committed against children and that children do not remain at risk either presently or in the future.

69) We have shown here conclusively, that without British Family Courts acceptance and upholding of EU Child Protection Directives, British children as EU citizens are suffering heightened levels of abuse both at home and in State Care and that the present systems of Child Protection at work in Britain, most favour protecting child abusers from investigations and/or arrests and convictions and also, seriously undermine a child's already diminished powers in relation to those of their abusers

70) **See Document J:** The UN Report is legal evidence of the crimes committed by multiple professionals who are identified as having also, connections to charities abroad and as currently, operating with "impunity" throughout British authorities and businesses; a 'freedom from arrest' which is obviously, due to powers and influence associated with their professional social status.

71) The British media and Courts are currently full of Reports of child abuse experienced historically and presently, by children in State Care or forced adoption. So great is the problem that British Parliament has established a national 'Child Abuse Inquiry'.

72) In light of the many recent scandals, arrests and convictions involving Child Care Homes, councilors, police officers, government ministers and even, clergy and Judges, the British public have NO choice except to lawfully acknowledge all of that evidence in terms of assessing the risks to Child Welfare now posed by an obviously, corrupted establishment of combined authorities

which are known, to harbour child abusers and which, perhaps unsurprisingly, collectively refuse to uphold the lawfully defined and professionally recommended UN & EU Child Protection Directives.

73) In light of all of the above lawful facts and evidence, what genuinely, loving parent can reasonably be expected to relinquish care and control of their children to those same authorities for sake of protecting their children from a "future emotional risk/harm" as so regularly identified by those same authorities as 'justification' for removing children from the safety of their family home?

74) Indeed, what Court established in interests of child safety could itself, ignore all of the herein identified risks which collectively, pose a greater and far deadlier a risk than that of 'future emotional risk' as so often suspected of the biological parent?

75) Can the Respondents here, provide any assurance that all the herein identified risks and threats are unfounded and/or false?

76) If the Respondents cannot, then they must lawfully accept that the greater risk to the children's welfare here, is via removal from their non-abusive parents care and their placement into the hands of strangers where their safety is lawfully known to be uncertain.

77) In losing children to suspect authorities, the parent is left in lawfully substantiated distress and anguish that their children are being placed at very serious risk of very serious harm.

78) Can *ignorance* of this lawful concern of "future physical risk of abuse and harm" be reasonably justified by the Family Courts when weighed up against the suggested ethical and professional concerns of a possible and as yet, entirely unproven "future emotional risk"? See **Document P**:

79) *'...the UK is the ONLY country in the world to GAG parents who wish to protest publicly when their children are taken...*

Are there really parents who are punished by the State when they have committed no crimes?? YES!! The ONLY people in the UK who suffer this injustice are parents whose children are taken away after so called "experts" make predictions of the future such as "risk of emotional abuse".'

80) In light of the lawful suspicions and resulting concerns, can the professionals identifying 'future emotional risk' not equally be judged as "*over-dogmatic experts*" as Justice Pauffley has opted for as foundation for her judgement as presented in **Document H** ?

81) In regard to all the concerns expressed herein and as supported by accompanying facts and evidence, we request that the concern of 'future risk' to children be removed as a criteria for removing children from their family home except, in cases where that home is known to be willingly and knowingly harbouring a known sex offender or child abuser and/or a sufferer of severe mental health issues.

82) We request that in cases where a future emotional risk is identified and where above defined 'exception' does not apply, that all such children and parents receive help via therapy and a family support worker: When it comes to child safety, it is often a case of 'better-the-devil-you-know' i.e. a parent with minor risks identified and receiving external support and therapy, is much less of a risk than authorised strangers whose threats are unknown and/or hidden.

83) In cases where children are suffering neglect as a result of poverty, we request that children be given voucher-grants for food, clothing, bedding, educational items, holidays and outings to be accompanied by parents and/or legal guardians.

84) We request that all children entering Child Care Services, forced adoption and/or reporting crimes of abuse to police, receive an independent legal guardian whose duty is to ensure the child's safety, welfare and legal and humanitarian rights.

85) We request that EU Child Protection Directives are fully implemented as STANDARD PRACTICE across the UK.

86) We submit that in ignoring or trivialising this Report and all the concerns here identified, British Family Courts are thus ignoring very serious risks to child protection and as a result, can provide little or no assurance or guarantee that a child placed into State Care is any safer and in fact, is not placed at even greater risk of every type of harm and abuse, than posed by the biological parent deemed a "future risk".

87) We feel it is both unlawful and unethical to place children at an unreasonable, much higher risk of suffering much greater damage, for sake of 'protecting' them from a relatively minor risk.

88) Since the risks faced by children entering State Care are real and lawfully identified and proven; what assurances can the Respondents provide to the entirely innocent parent facing loss of child or children on grounds of 'future risk', in relation to the Family Courts own accountability, in the event of the here-identified risks being realised via criminal and/or negligent members now lawfully known and suspected to be working within British child care authorities and other private child care providers?

89) Until British Courts have implemented the here recommended measures to assure the safety of children in State or State-enforced private care, we submit that the Respondents cannot lawfully and in interests of child safety, ignore these legal Precedents and lawfully identified risks, which are directly related to Child Protection.

Conclusion

90) Finally, we express our deepest concern of all which is, that in a legal climate that thoroughly negates a child's credibility and which invites retractions via legal processes in which all but the child has any degree of legal independence and/or, independent professional representation; far too many reports of serious crimes and risks against children are being systematically uninvestigated and/or recorded as 'false', leading to further risks and crimes and, a climate of 'impunity' among abusers; a point most pertinently stated in the United Nations 2014 Child Protection Committee Report: **See Document J.**

91) The lawful risks are first, that a high percentage of children are exposed to the officially ignored threat posed specifically, by high-profile/professional and business-status abusers and/or 'rings' of such abusers whose members are known to cross all the usual social divides of class, religion and ethnicity. The crimes are reaching endemic proportions: See **Document Q**:

'MPs said all councils across England now needed to review child protection policies.

Their report said: "On the evidence we took, the alarming conclusion is that Rotherham was not an outlier and that there is a widespread problem of organised child sexual exploitation in England." '

92) Such 'rings' are collectively, very powerful: In comparison, the individual child-victim is very weak; in the interest of providing Justice for children, British Child Protection Law needs to thoroughly address this power imbalance; again, EU & UN Child Protection Directives are already, many steps ahead.

93) We ask the Respondents to here take into account the terrible truth that present Child Protection Protocols operating in Britain are leaving thousands of children to suffer very serious abuse and which, being left officially unrecognised and therefore, untreated and/or compensated, the child is left to suffer and cope alone with all the resulting damage and often, to find themselves emotionally and psychologically crippled in adult life: Adult child abuse survivors, commonly experience Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, depression and many left primed to suffer alcoholism, drug addiction, self-harm, suicide, and/or further abuse due to low self esteem and negated perceptions of self-worth.

94) It is in the interest of supporting healthy child development into adulthood for the children of Britain, that we have here presented our dire concerns and proposals for immediate change in the way British Authorities address the issue of Child Welfare and Protection: Children are our future.

95) Further in our efforts toward more efficient measures of Child Protection for the children of Britain, we here, formerly request that the term 'minor' be eradicated in relation to the legal definition of a child.

96) The implication of the term 'minor' suggests a child is a lesser/unimportant/insignificant human being, which a child is not a 'lesser'. We feel this legal definition is unwittingly supporting the core-foundation of a degraded social attitude toward children and actual child suffering is subsequently, trivialised and/or negated as State concern.

97) Because children ARE our future, children are in reality, VIP's: We feel the UN and EU Child Protection Directives fully support the child as VIP and we humbly request that the British Family Courts and the Ministry of Justice do the same.

ⁱ <http://mckenzie-friends.co.uk/>

ⁱⁱ <https://mckenzieangels.wordpress.com/>