



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

25 October 2015

Child Safety UK: CRISIS REPORT

A Legal Analysis of Child Witnesses, Child Victims, Abuse Survivors and Other Evidence of Child Abuse

Contents

Child Safety UK: CRISIS REPORT..... 1

 A Legal Analysis of Child Witnesses, Child Victims, Abuse Survivors and Other Evidence of Child Abuse 1

'A new return to Victorian values..... 3

 Secret Courts That Steal Our Children..... 4

 'We must reform Family Courts and Family Law: 4

 Accessing Support and Rights..... 6

 How could I have provided the names and DoB of TRAFFICKED babies? 8

Burying the Issues..... 9

The BBC has operated to negate and silence victims and to dampen public vigilance and concern 11

 Mother whose children were taken for adoption joins class action..... 13

Mrs Justice Pauffley and her High Court Judgements..... 15

Negligent or Suspect Child Welfare Professionals & Authorities? 16

Financial Incentives 19

WHY ARE COUNCILS NOT GETTING REWARDED FOR HIGH ARREST QUOTAS OF PAEDOPHILE GANGS?..... 23

Forced Adoption = Missing Children? 24

British Child Protection Crisis 26

Every child is a VIP because the children ARE our future..... 31

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

Introduction.

This Report presents substantial evidence supporting serious concerns regarding child safety in Britain. Presented here is merely a sample of the evidence accumulated to date. These evidences and concerns cannot be lawfully dismissed in light of the resulting risk to thousands, and even millions, of children both in Britain and abroad.

When we examine the cold, hard facts, the truth of what we're up against as a nation and even, as a species, is legally and ethically, undeniable. The resulting risk to children is immense and effectively amounts to an insidious terrorist threat against every British adult and child, including those of other nations.

While some may yet consider the above statement as 'extreme' or 'radical', the sombre truth is that both the threat and the risk are all too real, as this Report will show.

Doubtless, many will be shocked and then slowly, their shock will fade as they return once more to the cozy-realities of the external world, where they have no idea the person serving their coffee had the potential to be a surgeon but as a result of suffering years of childhood trauma, is on medication for depression and feelings of 'worthlessness'. Or, that the person teaching their child has thus far, gotten away with abusing multiple children including their own because they operate on a conscious level of being that does not include compassion and empathy for others and/or because his/her friends in local authorities have consistently conspired to cover up his/her crimes.

I therefore urge the reader to please see beyond the physical world and accept the greater reality of the thoughts and influences that create the visible worlds we daily inhabit, to please accept this unseen reality cannot be ignored or dismissed; to please understand, the worst aspects of it are actually among the most powerful and they are, collectively and literally, devouring our children.

The social impact of child abuse on human consciousness is no different to the impact of nuclear-radiation on human tissue: just because we cannot visibly see the injuries, this does not mean they are not real and therefore, are not equally as widespread and deadly.

Many among those who, like myself, have survived child abuse of every kind are finding it very traumatic to live with our dire suspicions and the blatant hypocrisy of UK Family Courts. It is a source of continual dismay to witness so little being done after so much has been learned and said.

Take for example, EU Child Protection Directives: at every level they are perfectly designed to adequately and promptly address all forms of abuse against children; to prevent those crimes, arrest, investigate and prosecute suspects, to protect children at every level and to attend to child-victims' needs.

The Directives reflect a detailed and extensive understanding and knowledge of risks to children, the crimes, their impact, the abusers and the kind of pressures and influences placed on child victims reporting abuse to authorities.

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32011L0093>

According to UK Family Courts and Police and their associated child-protection agencies, E.U. Child Protection Directives can be casually dismissed as 'unrealistic,' i.e. fit only for life in a perfect world; while no one has officially or publicly stated this, their collective actions and inactions speak for themselves; the present motto for British Child Protection Authorities appears to be:

"Strain at the gnats and swallow the camels".

The point I wish to make here is that EU Child Protection Directives are not a fantasy for a 'utopian' dream, they are a reality established on reality and for the specific purpose of protecting the next generation so they may actually have time and ability, to build and inhabit the utopia that Child protection Directives clearly hope to support and develop i.e. *a world where instances of child abuse are RARE.*

There is no way we can lay foundations toward establishing a fairer and kinder life-reality for children, if we fail to fully appreciate the serious problems and pitfalls within the present social, political and economic systems presently operating in our nation: Protecting children needs to be TOP OF OUR LIST when it comes to promoting and sustaining positive social development.

Britain is presently engaged in promoting and sustaining the opposite, i.e., a return to Victorian Britain. Indeed, the present UK Family Court system itself has all the broad powers once wielded by Victorian judges, who had power to condemn a child to colonial slavery abroad for such minor offences as stealing an apple.

Sadly, the concerns expressed in this 2011 newspaper article are now a common reality:

'A new return to Victorian values

Radical plans to make it easier for employers to sack their workers could soon become a reality. Yet they remain hugely controversial'

<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/a-new-return-to-victorian-values-6267115.html>

Today, children most at risk of finding themselves transported abroad and/or to suffer abuse and slavery, are among those afforded the unfortunate 'protection' of Britain's Family Courts and their negligent approach to child safety.

As you will realise, after reading this report, it is not my conclusions which are extreme, it is simply the evidence and the crimes. All of which are fully highlighted, supported and validated as a serious, legal and compassionate concern, by the United Nations Child Protection Committee:

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

Forced Adoptions

Secret Courts That Steal Our Children

BY: Stuart Wavell SUNDAY TIMES JULY 6 2003

<http://www.msbp.com/secretcourts.htm>

'Kafkaesque children's courts sitting in private are playing God with the families that come before them,' writes Stuart Wavell.

They sound like a chilling legacy from the bad old days of the Soviet Union — secret courts that have taken thousands of children from their families and put them into foster homes or farmed them out for adoption.

There can be no appeal nor legal redress for most traumatised families. Lone judges, sitting without a jury, sever loved ones from each other on the word of omniscient medical "experts". Any parent foolhardy enough to protest to the press risks dire penalties.

'We must reform Family Courts and Family Law:

1:-The fact is that parents who have committed no crime are losing their children to forced adoption!

2:-Experts who depend on court appearances for a living nearly always agree with the local authority. They make predictions that parents just might abuse their children (including newborn babies) in the future, so

these parents lose their children to permanent foster care or adoption, not for something they have done but for something they might (or might not) do!

3:-Over 2,000 UK children per month are taken into care. Fosterers from private agencies are paid an average £400/week per child (birth mothers get around £20/week), and a foster agency founded by social workers getting around £1500/week per child was recently sold for £130 million! A real money driven industry!!

4:-Parents whose children have been taken are gagged and threatened with prison if they protest publicly. At contact parents are gagged again and forbidden to get emotional, to speak any foreign language, or to discuss the case with their children otherwise contact will be stopped.

5:-More children are taken for emotional abuse than physical and sexual abuse added together. Despite “baby P” the number taken for physical abuse is steadily falling as a percentage of the total number of children taken.

<http://forced-adoption.com/reforms/>

Secret Family Courts are protecting WHOM?

The above reflections on what’s happening in Britain concerning child protection right now, present a fair and accurate summary in light of the weight of historical and existing evidence to support them.

While ‘future emotional risk’ is considered a serious allegation against individual parents, children already adopted and/or in authority care and who report even, serious physical, emotional and sexual abuse, are commonly ignored.

Major study reveals true scale of abuse of children living in care:

‘Shocking’ findings spark calls by campaigners for better monitoring

‘The examples detailed in the report include two cases where the sexual abuse of a fostered child was only discovered after the abuse of other children in the foster family prompted an investigation. One girl told how her regular foster carer had touched her inappropriately and tried to have sex with her. In another case, a male foster carer sexually abused two girls, claiming to be in a relationship with one of them.

Four cases involved the adult birth son of a foster family who was living in the home and abused young girls, three of these cases were sexual abuse over “a long period of time”, some several years.’

<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/major-study-reveals-true-scale-of-abuse-of-children-living-in-care-9587244.html>

We can be sure that officially identified crimes of abuse reflect a tiny minority when we consider how many more are prevented or else, victims are too afraid to make a report in the first place and/or their crime-reports are ignored, or else, they are persuaded to 'retract' them.

Where do children and/or their families turn to for prompt help when the very authorities meant to protect them are lawfully suspected of being complicit in abusing children and/or covering it up, or else are, at the very least, professionally negligent in failing to identify and respond to reasonable and justifiable concerns about child safety?

Accessing Support and Rights

Charities like NSPCC and other registered child protection agencies are often, the first port of call when children report abuse or adults express concerns. The NSPCC will then contact police who will then contact the individuals concerned. Once police are involved, the NSPCC consistently refuse any further involvement with a case and especially, cases where people are concerned about serious risks to children via negligent Family Court decisions and/or lack of police action.

As part of my research and concerns regarding complete ignorance of EU & UN Child Protection Directives via London and other UK police, I contacted the various child protection agencies to share my very serious concerns, which are all fully substantiated with solid, legal evidence, as presented in what is now publicly known as the 'Hampstead Case'. This case is ongoing and multiple children remain at immediate and serious risk.

I asked for direct support on providing immediate protection for children and toward publicly addressing the issue of Child Protection Directives, i.e., very serious crimes against multiple children alleged to have been committed by multiple professionals involved in UK Family Courts, Police, Education and Social Services. These charges are being casually dismissed on the flimsiest grounds by UK London Police & Courts and even WITH a United Nations Child Protection Committee Report, that in July 2014, identified London as a 'child-sex-tourism capital' of the world where perpetrators (described as professionals and business people with connections to charities abroad) are able to operate with "impunity".

Below is a list of just a tiny fraction of the organisations I contacted. I have not included the various individuals/professionals and special child-protection reporters for United Nations and Britain, whom I contacted expressing same concerns:

Child Aid, ANPPCAN, Villages of Hope, Protection Project, Darkness To Light, NSPCC, Save The Children, REPSSI, CRIN, UNICEF, United Nations, Child Welfare South Africa, Keeping Children Safe, Children's Legal Centre, Defense for Children International, UK Home Office, UK Ministry of Justice, UK Children's Commissioner, Afruca, National Child Abuse Inquiry, Police Complaints Commission, Stop The Traffik, Ofcom.

From over 200+ emails, to date, I have received a couple of automated replies and a reply from NSPCC saying they can do nothing to help (the Home Office, though very sympathetic, explained they were powerless to get involved other than to suggest contacting the organisations who had already ignored my concerns).

Finally, a glimmer of hope arrived via a recent reply from Anna Henry, UK Children's Commissioner's Office 'Advice Team'; theirs is the ONLY response I have received where the recipient has actually decided themselves to make further inquiries into the case. However, before they would agree to making any inquiries, they claimed to 'need' children's full names and birthdates.

It is disturbing that full names and birthdates of possible child-victims were requested by the Advice Team since as we know, most child abuse cases are secret from the public and all details of child-victims too. Not every adult reporting suspicions of child abuse will know or have access to the children's personal details.

EU Child Protection Directives do not limit reports of lawful suspicion to 'regular competent authorities'; to a child in need, every adult is a 'competent authority'. Unfortunately, such adults are not recognised as a competent-authority by British courts and police; they are systematically denied any information by way of further inquiries about what is being done to address their concerns. Often, their reports are simply ignored — *especially* if the adult is a non-professional and/or if the child in question is in foster care or has been forcibly adopted.

Ordinarily, we the public would have had nothing but our lawful suspicions and supporting evidence; according to the Children's Commissioner, THAT is not enough for them to get involved or show any further interest in the resulting risks to children.

This is what they say on their website:

'We work on children's rights under the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) and also other international human rights agreements.'

The law says we should work on the rights of all children with a focus on:

- ***children who live away from home***

- **children who receive social care services**
- **vulnerable children.'**

Yet, without suspected child-victim names and Dates of Birth (DoBs), the UK Children's Commission feels free to thoroughly ignore the many dreadful facts that prove conclusively that at least ONE central London authority is actively ignoring the UN Child Protection Committee Report, EU Child Protection Directives and Child Witness testimonies:

- denying children's legal rights,
- handing vulnerable children over to alleged abusers,
- inviting retractions to then justify the illegal closing of a case involving regular and repeated abuse of 20 named children (addresses and even phone numbers supplied), murder of hundreds of trafficked babies at the hands of multiple professionals (70+) and business people working and living in central London;
- 18 suspected Child Victims never visited by Child Welfare authorities;
- 70+ individuals suspected of paedophilia, child trafficking and murder, never investigated nor questioned by police;
- Professional and police medical evidence of repeated, long term sexual abuse of two child-witnesses, ignored by police and Family Courts, and then finally dismissed by UK High Courts;
- A judge who refuses to permit further police investigations when two children retract their retractions (to separate foster carers), and who requests that the evidence be destroyed;
- Serious crimes against children as identified by United Nations Child Protection Committee, now judged a "fantasy" via a new British High Court Precedent for child protection authorities throughout Britain, i.e., they may now choose to dismiss all such allegations as most probably "false".

How could I have provided the names and DoB of TRAFFICKED babies?

In this instance, I was able to provide the requested details of 20 children identified in this case, to the Children's Commission, and subsequently received an email explaining that, while they may ask the local London authorities to consider re-investigating this case, they have no power to demand or insist on a reopening of the case; they see NO problem if addressing serious risks to children is left to the discretion of the very authorities already *proven* to be thoroughly negligent, and who have, as a matter of lawful FACT, already left children at immediate and serious risk.

The Children's Commission and Family Courts utterly fail to recognise the legal fact that, according to EU CP Directives, concerned members of the British public are now a lawfully recognised 'competent authority' in the Hampstead Case, being as this case was forced to go public due to the immeasurable risks to children,

and due directly to all other 'competent authorities' collective and proven failures in protecting children and preventing the sexual abuse and murder of children.

How many children might continue to suffer abuse and murder while the local authorities now take their time in re-examining and then making a decision about whether or not to reopen this case?

How many among those local authorities are themselves complicit in the abuse, and may subsequently use their powers to warn offenders, hide, or even falsify evidence?

How many children are left to grow up with the untreated and ignored physical, emotional and psychological damage?

Children are not just a growing, physical body; they are a DEVELOPING PSYCHOLOGY too. Both need equal attention and care. Both are equally CRIPPLED through abuse.

The psychological damage is equivalent to a broken limb left untreated: the limb/psychology grows up deformed. The adult-survivor will go on to try and live with their disability, functioning at a much lower capacity or else, at some point, they may seek help toward addressing the damage, i.e., rebreaking the 'limb' and then allowing it to set properly, i.e., reliving the trauma.

Without adequate provision and safe spaces for adult-survivors to achieve this necessary healing, many are left even more disabled and at even greater risk of repeated abuse, via the reawakened suffering endured in childhood.

Without skilled assistance, some survivors desperate to solve their issues, break the wrong 'limb', i.e., they cut off from their emotions and empathy and become abusers themselves.

Many choose to end their lives.

Burying the Issues

When we understand the severity of psychological damage caused by child abuse, we can see that the circumstances are akin to there being no Accident & Emergency available for children with broken limbs. If

we could visibly witness the resulting damage, we would as a species be horrified: The damage is far worse and far more widespread than all of the damage suffered by every British soldier in military combat since WW1.

We need to understand that, when it comes to child abuse, what we KNOW = an 'EYE', the eyes of the Law are founded on what we know and on what we lawfully suspect directly *because* of what we know:

We KNOW Britain is FAILING TO PROTECT CHILDREN.

We KNOW that Britain is actively denying children's legal rights to protection and prevention of crimes against them.

We KNOW that thousands of children are suffering serious emotional, physical, psychological and sexual abuse while in care of British Child Care Authorities.

We KNOW thousands of people employed by those authorities are either complicit or coerced into supporting and protecting child abusers.

We KNOW that a child's right to privacy has been subverted to fostering a secrecy that protects the very worst child abusers.

We know the issues of child abuse and forced adoption have been stitched up and covered up, mystified, ignored, and criminalized as a topic of public concern.

We witness the BBC supporting a lawfully suspected paedophile and murderer found 'innocent' by a recent, illegal High Court Judgement on the Hampstead Case, which has left hundreds of children at risk.

The BBC use their extensive coverage of this case to promote the idea that serious crimes against children are a "fantasy" and those who believe them are "evil and foolish" and that "false allegations" of child sexual abuse are a "problem".

They completely ignore the UN Child Protection Report which fully upholds ALL the children's allegations.

They completely ignore the FACT that 'retractions' are deemed unacceptable by EU Child Protection Directives. Therefore, a Court Case that denies police investigations into a possibly huge paedophile ring (alleged to traffic and murder babies), on the 'evidence' of 'retractions' given while in care of alleged abusers, is itself, an ABOMINATION of the very Justice that those CP Directives seek to provide for child victims of abuse.

At NO point, does the BBC acknowledge that the very serious crimes against children they discuss in their coverage of the Hampstead Case, *do* and *are* happening to thousands of children in London every year.

They even promote outright lies against a concerned mother, claiming she video'd her children repeating horrific and false allegations of abuse, which she "*then*" published on the internet. In reality, that mother took those recordings and her children straight to the police.

Only after *months* of police and family court inaction, in sheer desperation, that mother was forced to turn to the public.

Why did the BBC neglect to mention any of that?

Are we the public again expected to be SO naïve as to think that the BBC has neither the time nor the resources to investigate and reasonably QUESTION the many serious failings among ALL the authorities involved in this case?

Are the BBC really SO blind, they cannot fathom nor appreciate the lawful validity of our concerns about the remaining risks to children?

Does the BBC really believe that, as a nation, Britain needs to be MORE concerned about the impact of allegations on suspects than the impact of actual crimes against children?

Myself and others are deeply concerned now about the impact of this BBC report (shown before the watershed) on any children or adult survivors who have suffered or are suffering the same or similar abuse and also, on those who harbour suspicions about children suffering such crimes. Myself and others have reported our concerns to OFCOM, who have as yet declined to respond.

The BBC has operated to negate and silence victims and to dampen public vigilance and concern

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BVp0ggGnGoY>

The issue of BBC's direct involvement in ignoring children's rights, on behalf of promoting empathy for "falsely" accused paedophiles, is a very serious and disturbing development when we know that false accusations are consistently proven to be very rare (less than 10%).

IN LESS THAN A YEAR, BRITISH AUTHORITIES HAVE COLLECTIVELY AND SUCCESSFULLY TRASHED THE UNITED NATIONS CHILD PROTECTION COMMITTEE REPORT AND LABELLED ALL THE CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN IT LISTS AS A “FANTASY” WHICH ONLY THE “EVIL & FOOLISH” BELIEVE.

HOW are British citizens and children ever going to access children’s rights and assure child safety with the necessary, immediate police action, if at every step of the way, we are blocked by a climate of secrecy, ignorance, complicity and denial that the problem exists?

The problem of paedophile gangs, operating within positions of public influence and authority in Britain, DOES exist and it is a very serious problem since the ever increasing evidence shows, conclusively, that the most socially powerful abusers tend to commit the very worst crimes against children, and on a much bigger scale.

Among the terrible multitude of historical and present crimes now being reported and investigated in Britain, there are certain cases that stand out as ‘typical’ in the sense they most fully reflect the levels of horror being systematically covered up and ignored. The Hampstead Case referred to earlier is now an example case being presented before the EU & UN Child Protection Committees, and what will they DO in response — will they smack Britain’s hand? Will they say “naughty Britain” and demand an apology?

How will the EU & UN deliver immediate help to children in immediate need?

Obviously, it is down to we-the-people-of-Britain from all walks of life, to now roll up our sleeves and put our foot down on this issue of Child Protection Law and Child Safety.

When a case involves multiple children and multiple suspects, we are dealing with multiple cases in that single case, because every child involved is an individual with individual rights.

In dismissing two child witness testimonies provided in the Hampstead Case, 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 this, 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.*

Are British children truly 'safer' in forced adoption or state care?

'[Police Detective] Clive Driscoll was the honest detective who investigated the 'CHILD ABUSE RING IN LAMBETH'. In his book, In Pursuit Of The Truth, he refers to an interview with a woman called Vicky, who later starved herself to death.

Vicky had been adopted by a child abusing couple.

Clive Driscoll writes: “She talked about a place in Kent where she had been taken, along with other children, and made to run away from dogs.

“They were dumped in the woods and given a head start before the hunting pack was released. She survived. Other kids weren’t so fortunate.”

<http://aanirfan.blogspot.co.uk/2015/08/children-hunted-by-dogs.html>

Former Detective Chief Inspector Clive Driscoll

‘Clive Driscoll says his inquiry into 1980s London children’s homes was “all too uncomfortable to a lot of people”.

He also believes there were “disruption tactics” within the Met during his inquiry that led to the conviction of two of Stephen Lawrence’s killers.’

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-28316874>

Detective Driscoll talks of ‘senior officers’ who suddenly commandeered his case and eventually removed him from the case, a case which to this day was never fully investigated.

Vicky is not the first or only child in Britain to be adopted by a “child abusing couple”:

‘Adopted girl wins right to return to biological family after abuse’

Mrs Justice Pauffley and her High Court Judgements

‘In a written ruling on the case which has now been made public, Mrs. Justice Pauffley said an adoption order was made when the girl was almost four years old.

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

Certainly, given the severe professional negligence displayed by Justice Pauffley in relation to her involvement in the previously mentioned ‘Hampstead Case’, it is no surprise to read her observation here that: *no professional involved with the girl at that time could have envisaged that within two years she would be “cast out” of the home of the couple who adopted her and sent to live with extended family in Ghana. Nor*

could there have been any indication that, while there, she would be “abused by the adults with whom she had been sent to live.”

Note that Justice Pauffley does not bother to make any recommendations for closer, professional follow-up on adopted children in light of the above case. She treats it as an isolated incident and expresses NO concern about the fact that a child had to wait from age 6 until age 14, to flee and seek help. How many children have not been so fortunate as to get help?

Adoptive parents were able to ‘cast out’ the child and send her abroad without anyone in Child Protection authorities so much as raising an eyebrow. Was the child ‘cast out’ or was she sold? Would a 6-year-old child know or have any evidence to prove she was sold?

UK Family Courts obviously, prefer not to dwell on the fact that forcibly adopted British children face the possibility of being sold as slaves abroad.

Effectively, on giving that child up for forced adoption (due to “future emotional risk?”), a child was sentenced to 10 years imprisonment and extradition in the hands of child abusers. According to Justice Pauffley, this was something “no professional involved with the girl at that time could have envisaged”.

Really? Why not? Is that because we have absolute guarantees that every adoptive parent is above all and any suspicion? That trust is now proven irrefutably false by this case alone, and yet NOTHING has been done to prevent it happening again.

We the British public no longer share Justice Pauffley’s absolute faith in UK child care providers. Indeed, according to the evidence, we are negligent and ignorant of risks to children if we continue to trust her blind-faith which, in light of the undeniable evidence, is not faith but ACTUAL, CRIMINAL NEGLIGENCE, because it is an unfounded and disproven ‘faith’ that serves to protect abusers and leave children at risk.

Negligent or Suspect Child Welfare Professionals & Authorities?

How can we trust them when we have a consistent track record of failure upon failure to adequately address the increasing scale of ongoing child abuse in Britain?

When their main focus of attention is on removing children deemed to be under threat of “future emotional risk”?

When they consistently persecute ‘whistleblower’ parents and hand children over to lawfully suspected abusers?

When children removed from parents are both historically and presently proven to be even more at risk of yet more serious abuse?

When we have NOTHING in place to independently protect children and look out for their safety, once they are in Authority Care?

When they have collectively ignored and failed to question Britain’s decision to ‘opt-out’ of EU & UN Child Protection Directives?

Regardless of British Authorities’ choice in ‘opting out’ of EU Child Protection Directives, British children, as EU citizens, are still ENTITLED to those rights because British Authority’s decision to ‘opt-out’ is not a choice made via any direct consultation with the British public, who to this day are barely aware of their legal and human rights as citizens of the European Union. WHY are the public’s and children’s rights such a MYSTERY?

The young girl mentioned in the case above is a prime example of the present and historical lack of follow-up, on adopted children especially.

In light of the Hampstead Case allegations, which include details of how two (named) British Social Workers contributed to the regular supply of babies, we cannot fail to recognise the risks; the children state, “they get the babies off poor people” .

Or maybe, with local authority assistance, they section an isolated pregnant woman in Britain on a professional training course, who suffers a panic attack and who subsequently is transferred to a secure psychiatric unit, where she is sedated and later wakes up to find the baby in her belly has gone and been handed over for forced-adoption to strangers?

‘Essex county council said the health trust’s clinical decision to apply to the high court for permission to deliver her unborn baby by caesarean section was due to “concerns about risks to mother and child”.

In an interview with an Italian newspaper the woman said: “I want my daughter back. I’m suffering like an animal.”

<http://www.theguardian.com/society/2013/dec/03/italian-woman-forced-caesarean-wants-baby-back-essex-county-council>

PC Stephen Tilley and senior police officer, Ben Hodder were working within Essex authorities at the time of the case mentioned above. Both men have recently been convicted for making and possessing indecent images of children. We can reasonably suspect that the offences they are convicted for are the least of their crimes against children, when we consider their respective public positions as police officers.

<http://www.essexchronicle.co.uk/Convicted-Essex-Police-officers-Stephen-Tilley/story-26384819-detail/story.html>

Is it fair or safe to assume that they were and are the ONLY two such abusers working in Essex authorities? How many child-removal cases were they directly involved in? How many “outspoken” parents did they help arrest and imprison? How many of their peers and seniors were these men bribing or blackmailing and influencing? How many connections with people in child care authorities and family courts do they continue to have?

Who appointed them in their senior positions as police officers?

These are uncomfortable questions but when we have evidence that senior police officers have a desire to sexually abuse children, we have a lawful and compassionate DUTY to fully appreciate ALL the associated risks and implications, if we are to make any real progress in ‘cleansing’ British authorities of its child abusers.

Here, we note with commendation the actions of Essex Chief Constable Stephen Kavanagh in the arrest and convictions of paedophile police officers. While this report focuses on abusers, we are aware there are a majority of people working in Child Care and other British authorities, who are genuine and caring British citizens and who do a tremendous job of service to the British public and our children.

It is indeed as much for all of those lawful and compassionate people that we share the concerns expressed in this report, because the crimes exposed herein reflect the kind of negative and oppressive powers the majority are compelled to submit to, i.e., Detective Clive Driscoll is reduced to sharing his legal evidence and professional concerns through publishing a ‘non-fiction’ book.

We hope our public support will serve to empower those genuinely concerned who are in positions of social-credibility and authority to make a positive difference.

How much longer can we tolerate so many Human Rights violations?

Regardless of the aforementioned Italian mother's mental health problems, she was sufficiently competent to attend a training course in Britain, and she is still a human being with Human Rights. Since WHEN does having a panic attack give British authorities the 'right' to force a pregnant woman to unknowingly go through a caesarian section and her baby NEVER to be seen by herself?

HOW is that going to help the mother's mental health?

WHY was her family in Italy not consulted first?

WHERE is her baby now?

Why such barbarism in the interests of protecting children from POSSIBLE 'future emotional risk', and yet NOTHING to investigate legally VALID suspicions about sexual abuse and murder of children?

Why were British authorities so keen to get their hands on a newborn baby that they could not wait to see if mother's mental health improved, or consult with her family and the baby's father, but instead got an immediate Court Order to remove the baby without her consent, via an invasive and otherwise unnecessary surgical operation that will itself leave a mother scarred for life, and with a permanent physical reminder of the baby she never saw?

WHAT KIND OF JUSTICE SYSTEM GRANTS AN ORDER TO COMMIT SUCH A VILE ACT AGAINST A PERSON WHOSE ONLY 'CRIME' IS THAT THEY HAD A NON VIOLENT PANIC ATTACK?

Again, this case is just one of many, most of which we never hear about because the victims remain incarcerated in mental health units, are in prison, or are staying silent to stay out of prison.

Financial Incentives

When we examine the financial costs related to State Provision for children in care, we cannot help but note that those funds could be far better spent on educating and supporting families, fully implementing Child Protection Directives and identifying and treating potential abusers and victims.

Even in cases where children have suffered severe neglect and (non-sexual) abuse, they commonly continue to feel a strong sense of love for their parents and wish only for relations to improve. Obviously, the humane approach is to provide therapy, assistance and training to help improve child-parent relationships.

The myth that abused children grow up to re-abuse 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>

The reality is that children who grow up dealing with inadequate and even abusive parents are often shown to be the most caring and compassionate adults; these are most often found among the unseen, unheard survivors who never report their abuse. Their increased empathy does little to assist their progress in a largely non-empathic world, many will suffer more abuse in adulthood and, like their childhood abuse, this too will rarely be reported or addressed by British authorities.

In cases of 'future emotional risk', it is often 'better the devil you know' when it comes to protecting children; a parent whose problems are identified, and with child and parent receiving regular support and guidance, is a far safer option when we consider the actual risks of handing vulnerable children over to 'carers' who may then abuse children in their care to a far worse degree than that posed by a perceived 'future-emotional-risk' from a parent.

The point here is that children's emotional attachment and love for parents and family is a vital and essential aspect of their humanity and developing psychology. It is a terrible thing that Family Courts are denying parents the right to say "I love you" or "I miss you" to their estranged child on the grounds such phrases are "emotionally damaging", when the absolute reality is, children NEED to hear those words.

Although we might say 15% of children are suffering some form of abuse in state-care, according to reports, the reality could easily be 40% when we take into account the children who are, for whatever reason, unable to report abuse. We are playing a dangerous and deadly game when we start minimizing the risks to children according to an average, very low percentage-rate of reports; every single child is important and whether it is 5% or 50%, both figures are UNACCEPTABLE.

Many problems involving child neglect especially are directly related to low income and subsequent feelings of low self-esteem and stress commonly suffered by people living in poverty.

It is disturbing, therefore, that the British Government and authorities have no problems permitting a minimum wage that must support up to 3 children or more on less income than the Government itself deems 'necessary' to provide for a SINGLE child in privatised state care, where costs can rise to £1,500+ a week.

Parents forced to survive on State Benefits fare even worse and we feel it is discriminatory that the UK Government provides State payments of £400+ per week, per child to Foster Carers but only £50+ per week, per child to biological parents.

The British media devotes a lot of time toward reflecting British people's supposed grumblings about parents on State Benefits 'draining the public purse' but no moans at all about the £400 - £1500 per week, of State-Funding for every child in authority or foster care?

Benefits Britain: Mum of 7 claims £30k a year from the taxpayer

<http://www.mirror.co.uk/tv/tv-news/benefits-britain-mum-7-claims-5731635>

Had that 'mum' been a G4S Child Care Provider, the UK public purse would have paid her £7,000 per week = £364,000 a year.

'Considerable risk'

'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 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.

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

We very strongly feel that the UK media works to satisfy authority-directed agendas and they do not reflect the true voice or concerns of the general public majority, but instead focus heavily on the negative ramblings of an ill-informed and often abusive, 'right-wing' minority, i.e., those most supportive toward abolishing all forms of Welfare and Human Rights, etc.

The real truth is that working or on State Benefits, the average British parent, according to our Government's OWN estimations of a child's true needs, is dreadfully underfunded.

Why is it considered 'justifiable' for children to suffer poverty and the inevitable associated risks and neglect of their needs, simply because they are being cared for by their parents instead of the State?

When it comes to Child Protection, 'austerity' as an 'economic policy' is in reality, an act of economic terrorism when we look at the dreadful impact on children: Austerity = "FUTURE EMOTIONAL RISK" to every child in Britain.

'Many children are living in Victorian conditions – it's an inequality timebomb'

Frances Ryan

<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/apr/09/children-uk-victorian-conditions-inequality-child-poverty>

Besides complicity in abuse, there is a strong financial incentive for professionals and adjoining authorities to 'cash-in':

'A council has admitted receiving Government money under a controversial "adoption target" scheme that rewards the removal of children from their parents.'

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1584940/Cash-prize-for-council-that-hit-adoption-targets.html>

WHO PROFITS FROM THE ADOPTION RACKET?

<http://forced-adoption.com/cashing-in/>

Local Authorities (stars, beacon status, and financial rewards under public service agreements.

Very highly paid "professionals" presume to "assess" the parenting skills of distraught mothers who have had their children taken into care (around £3000 per 2-3 hour session), "legal aid lawyers" (a case in the family courts costs an average of £70,000 per day so total legal costs of over £500,000 for one case are not unusual!). Therapists, psychiatrists , and counsellors who are paid around £3,000 for a few hours work eagerly predict that parents might "emotionally abuse" their children at some time in the future. Tame medical experts somehow always side with social services against the parents. (They also receive around £3000 for one afternoon session plus a report.)

Foster parents (up to £400 per week per child plus allowances for Xmas and holidays), Special schools charging up to £7000 per week per child (as shown on tv channel 4), Adoption and fostering agencies charging up to £18,000 per placement.

<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/reports/pdf/?>

WHY ARE COUNCILS NOT GETTING REWARDED FOR HIGH ARREST QUOTAS OF PAEDOPHILE GANGS?

We cannot fail to recognise the INCREASED and obvious risks to children posed by unregulated private Child Care providers, 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, with 'condemned' parents being imprisoned for 'abuses' such as "waving at their children":

'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>

It seems that, while there is not enough money to fund full implementation of Child Protection Directives in Britain, there is plenty of funding available for protecting children from crimes which have not yet and may never occur.

It is very clear that children's needs and rights are being heavily negated by the professional adults vying for both 'profits' and 'pleasures' provided by the Judgements of the British Family Courts.

Forced Adoption = Missing Children?

In light of all the concerns expressed here, the British public are naturally extremely concerned as to the welfare and whereabouts of every child forcibly adopted in Britain.

We are painfully aware that, for every case involving abusive, negligent and complicit authorities made public, thousands more remain hidden.

We cannot deny our lawfully valid concerns and suspicions that British Family Court Secrecy Rules are in place specifically to keep a lid on the issue of child abuse, to hide the identity of abusers, to silence victims and concerned parents, and to hoodwink non-abusive peers in authority.

We cannot deny that serious crimes being committed by multiple professionals and business people involved in child-sex-tourism, trafficking and murdering babies, making and selling of child pornography, and generally profiting from what the United Nations Child Protection Committee describe as an international, multibillion dollar "industry", are being casually DISMISSED by British authorities.

We have noted that the vast majority of forcibly adopted children are first referred via other local authorities, i.e., a concerned nurse, teacher, doctor or a police officer; we have every reason to suspect that there are "look outs" among ALL these professionals, who target any lone or vulnerable parents for a false report about abuse-concerns.

While we accept that there are equally many cases where children ARE in need of protection from abusive parents and relatives, the very fact that so many cases as described here EXIST, along with a wealth of historical and present-day evidence, means we cannot, in the interests of child safety, continue to turn a blind eye to the many serious loopholes and possibilities that the present Family Court system provides in FAVOUR of child abusers, and in terms of providing a regular supply of vulnerable children for abuse.

A forcibly adopted child was transported 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?

From the moment that child was given to her adoptive parents, she was essentially “missing” from her biological family in the sense that they had NO idea what was to become of their daughter or where she was, and there was NO ONE in authority that either they or their daughter could turn to directly, for independent and prompt assurance of child-safety.

Is this a REASONABLE process to put parents and children through on the grounds of a POSSIBLE, FUTURE risk?

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 and investigate 70+ paedophile-ring suspects?

‘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>

At every step along the way in UK Child Protection, we see a heavy hand of immediate police action and imprisonment against anyone who breaks Family Court Secrecy Rules, i.e., parents judged a ‘risk’ because they are depressed or have minor learning difficulties. We see a very light and casually dismissive hand wherever suspicions are cast toward paedophile gangs comprised of multiple professionals and/or individuals in authority.

It is obvious to the British public that our police and Family Courts have something to HIDE, and also, something to collectively IGNORE.

British Child Protection Crisis

The sombre and brutal reality myself and many thousands (if not millions) of concerned British citizens must face today, is the undeniable and irrefutable fact that UK child protection is purely at the discretion of the local authorities. If they choose not to believe or investigate, no investigations will happen; if sexual abuse is confirmed, the child is removed from parents; if parents complain or make a fuss, they are imprisoned; if child gives a retraction, even while in care of alleged abusers, then the case can be closed. Even expert medical evidence confirming sexual abuse of two children can be dismissed by the UK High Court.

And all of this while child-witness has NO independent legal guardian.

Somehow, London is the 'child-sex-abuse-capital-of-the-world'.

Somehow, "thousands" of babies and children are being trafficked into London every year.

Somehow, "hundreds" of those children and babies are being "ritually murdered".

Somehow, people are providing multiple children for 'child-sex-tourism'/child-prostitution and making and selling child pornography throughout Britain.

Somehow, thousands of adult survivors are reporting abuse they suffered as children while in State Care.

Somehow, the criminals are able to operate without fear of arrest.

While here, we focus largely on crimes committed in London, the truth is that the problem is endemic across Britain; a nation steeped in a 'tradition' of child abuse where masses of impoverished children were quite uniquely in Europe at the time, once forced to work long hours in mines and factories, or else, 'homed' in workhouses and orphanages.

We need to eradicate the child abusive consciousness presently rampant throughout British culture.

Child Protection Directives will go a long way toward protecting children and preventing the crimes, as well as inhibiting growth of the paedophile-sadist-culture; paedophilia does and can operate as a 'cult,' one which cuts through all the regular social divisions of race and class. The offer of absolute 'freedom' and its associated powers is itself infectious, in the sense otherwise lawful people are invited and/or attracted into those circles of abuse, and with many being 'groomed' from an early age.

The impact of such powerful rings of abusers serves also as a tool for manipulating abusers into positions of public power and with many profiting from bribes, etc. It is now a matter of fact that the infamous paedophile, Jimmy Savile, associate and close friend with many among all British authorities including government, police and Royalty, was also, closely connected to MI5.

'On August the 7th 2014, the North Yorks Enquirer published an article on how MI5 and Special Branch for years protected the paedophile and rapist Sir Cyril Smith [friend of J Savile] from arrest, because of his position as a senior parliamentarian.'

<http://nyenquirer.uk/mi5-special-branch-prominent-paedophiles-cover-peter-jaconelli/>

We cannot help but ask the question: is that WHY men like Cyril Smith were, and very probably still are, in the position of 'senior parliamentarian'? Are they there in Parliament, and in every British authority, to ENSURE that abusers remain free to OPERATE WITH IMPUNITY in Britain? Are people like C. Smith placed in Parliament so they can abuse their powers to establish corporate and secret 'Family Courts' that place children at RISK? Are such people in power to be a 'YES MAN' to policies like bombing Iraq with illegal WMD's and imposing 'austerity' on British children?

MEET PATRICK ROCK: HEAD OF DAVID CAMERON'S POLICY MAKING CABINET - KNOWN AS MR. CAMERON'S "FIXER" - WORKED AT No. 10 DOWNING STREET UNTIL 2014 WHEN HE WAS ARRESTED (HAS SINCE BEEN CONVICTED) FOR POSSESSING INDECENT IMAGES OF CHILDREN:

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/david-cameron/10675036/Who-is-Patrick-Rock.html>

We the British public are now suffering the policies made by a man who for his 'PLEASURE' likes to look at images of children suffering abuse.

Is this an appropriate psychology to be given the power of creating GOVERNMENT POLICY?

We are stupidly naive if we dare to believe Patrick Rock is the only one of his kind presently working within British Parliament.

We note with increasing alarm that some academics and other British professionals are suggesting that paedophilia is a 'natural-male-desire':

'Paedophilia is natural and normal for males'

'The statement that paedophilia is "natural and normal" was made not three decades ago but last July. It was made not in private but as one of the central claims of an academic presentation delivered, at the

invitation of the organisers, to many of the key experts in the field at a conference held by the University of Cambridge.'

The basic ideology of every paedophile is that their imagined 'rights' to sexual gratification override a child's LEGAL rights to protection and respect: Their 'law' is MIGHT = RIGHT. And this is not a law, this ideology is a criminal-consciousness which the laws of RIGHT = MIGHT, i.e., as reflected in CHILD PROTECTION DIRECTIVES, are created to eradicate.

We can see instantly how this fundamental reasoning of 'might=right' forms the foundation for many other human rights violations. While many might comment that paedophiles suffer an 'urge' and do not 'rationalise' their approach to children, the reality remains that they DO put their own desires above the rights of others and at the direct expense of others.

It is this essentially sadistic and psychopathic psychology that corrupts every system of power and authority until eventually, even Human Rights are themselves, 'lawfully' denied.

We need to understand that paedophiles are not all exactly the same in their desires; there is a serious element of sadism involved in the paedophile psychology and this is shown to appear more commonly among 'high profile'/'professional' status abusers who 'enjoy' their power via inflicting pain on others for personal sexual gratification.

'...as people climb the social ladder, their compassionate feelings towards other people decline...'

<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-wealth-reduces-compassion/>

We need to thoroughly acknowledge and appreciate the very heavy weight of impact on the social psychology of Britain as a nation of adults of whom a majority, have suffered some degree of child abuse and/or neglect.

In the interest of successfully addressing and inhibiting the spread of sadism and paedophilia, we need to understand that the worst of that consciousness is raining down from *above* the lower social classes and also, that it does 'infect' the general public consciousness with secret and terrible agendas creating criminal gangs who are then empowered to commit even more terrible, and often seemingly unrelated, crimes involving politics, drugs, finance and even, most dreadfully, war-crimes against children abroad:

'Armed forces minister sorry for misleading MPs over depleted uranium

MoD urged to phase out use of depleted uranium weapons after armed forces minister admits review was never carried out'

<http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2011/nov/14/minister-sorry-dangers-depleted-uranium>

'Toxic legacy of US assault on Fallujah 'worse than Hiroshima'

The shocking rates of infant mortality and cancer in Iraqi city raise new questions about battle'

<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/middle-east/toxic-legacy-of-us-assault-on-fallujah-worse-than-hiroshima-2034065.html>

NOTHING HAS BEEN DONE AND NO QUESTIONS ASKED IN RELATION TO ADDRESSING THE VERY SERIOUS ISSUE OF CLEANING UP AND TREATING OR EVEN, COMPENSATING THE THOUSANDS OF ADULT & CHILD-VICTIMS CURRENTLY SUFFERING THE IMPACT OF BRITAIN'S ILLEGAL INVOLVEMENT IN PRODUCTION, SALE AND DEPLOYMENT OF DEPLETED URANIUM IN IRAQ (and now also, Libya).

No one from the MoD has faced public questioning or prosecution for LYING to Parliament, severe environmental pollution (DU has a half life of 5.4 billion years) and inflicting mass suffering on innocent people, children and unborn babies, whom Britain claimed to be "liberating".

It appears, a simple "SORRY" will suffice.

The Women of Fallujah have been told by their doctors to "stop having babies" because their babies are so commonly born dead and severely deformed.

We need to unequivocally accept that powerful people with an 'appetite' for abusing and even murdering THE most vulnerable children among their own population will not in any way shirk or ask too many questions when they are called upon to support bombing the children of other nations with illegal, depleted uranium weapons.

The crimes are absolutely related in terms of the TYPE of psychology required to permit such horrific actions without asking barely a question. It is a DISMAY to note that it took over a decade for a single British MP to request to actually see the Review that proved Depleted Uranium was safe and a non-environmental threat.

We now witness the truth, that British MPs' absolute FAITH in the MoD's assurances, that DU weapons had been tested and deemed safe according to the terms of the Geneva Convention, was seriously misplaced.

Many millions like myself among the British public are deeply distressed to witness the horrors committed against children abroad in our name. In no way can we differentiate between the abuse British children are presently suffering here in the UK and the collective abuse our present and previous Governments have inflicted and are inflicting on children of other nations, which includes the thousands of foreign-born children being trafficked through Britain's Secret Family Courts every year.

An appetite for sadistic 'pleasures' and children among British Establishments and 'high-societies' demands continual satisfaction; with 2,000 children passing into UK State Care every month, who notices if a few go 'missing' or are being regularly abused?

Who notices the missing thousands of babies and children being trafficked into London every year?

WHO IS CHECKING ON THE ADOPTED CHILDREN?

WHO CHECKS ON AN ADOPTED, TRAFFICKED CHILD?

If our suspicions have no validity, then WHY has Britain failed to implement EU Child Protection Directives?

WHY will no one in British authorities, not even our media — not even our BBC — dare to ask a QUESTION about WHY Britain is "opting out" of EU & UN Child Protection Directives?

The excuse regarding costs is, as previously shown, nonsense, because in fact, damaged children growing up into damaged adults costs Britain far more both socially and financially; certainly, the last generation of abusers and abused children are going to produce the next generation of abusers and abused children; the true costs are both economically and socially huge.

When we look at the amount of funding absorbed by the various, and now proven to be mostly INEPT, child-protection agencies and charities who, collectively, have done *very little toward effectively limiting the rise* of child abuse in Britain, it is clear that funds would be more appropriately spent on training and providing Independent Legal Guardians (who work OUTSIDE the authority of Family Courts, Social Services and Police), for every child reporting abuse and/or involved in a case with the Family Courts, i.e., someone of authority whose duty is to ENSURE Child Protection Directives are followed.

Obviously, we need a whole new approach towards how we run our society:

Zero-tolerance of all forms of child abuse (and this includes targeting children for sale of unhealthy, sugar & chemical-laden foods and drinks).

More education for young teenagers about relationships, parenting, pregnancy, birth, baby and children's needs.

Ending of age-streaming in the education system, i.e., run classes on ability, natural vocation and child-choice.

Replace Britain's present Victorian approach to education with an updated system that works to develop a child's natural skill, abilities, vocations, interests and talents.

Therapy, support, and treatment widely available for all victim-survivors of abuse.

Removal of the legal term 'MINOR' presently defining a child. This term is a very serious issue as it implants the 'seed' into people's minds from a very young age that a child is 'less important'.

Every child is a VIP because the children ARE our future.

All the evidence shows that children need a healthy, stable home-life within a loving family and within a wider community network; community is key to developing a child-friendly consciousness. However, community is lost to many because parents are commonly overworked and have little time to be involved in their local community activities.

We need to accept that a 5 or 6 day working week for parents is robbing children of their RIGHT to parental time and attention.

We need to lose this idea that some work is very much more valuable than others and guarantee every worker a fair and living wage.

We need to provide a fairer, more humane level of Benefits for parents who are unable to work.

We need to invest in communities and enable them to develop a degree of collective self-sufficiency and local support.

We need to give young girls and women more support for issues around menstruation and pregnancy. WHY are women paying for sanitary products when menstruation is vital to our very survival as a species?

We need to give young boys and men more support for issues around their sexual desires and problems.

We need EU Child Protection Directives fully in place.

It is when we start thinking rationally about children's rights and needs, if they are to grow up into healthy and balanced adults, that we begin to realise how irrational is the cock-eyed 'logic' at work within the present educational, social and economic systems we currently endure, where, clearly, **IGNORANCE OF A CHILD'S RIGHTS** is a **KEY** feature that sustains and perpetuates all the social and psycho-sexual problems identified here: ***British children are enduring a CRISIS of abuse.***

We have almost reached a point now of **NO RETURN**, in the sense British children are threatened with exit from the EU, loss of their Human Rights, and subsequently, **NO** Child Protection Directives in place and topped with an **UNREPAYABLE** £1.27 Trillion 'debt' on which interest payments are running at £1 Billion per **WEEK**; all of this as an 'inheritance' for the next generation?

Interest bill on UK's £1.27 trillion debt to hit £1bn a week

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/economics/10849333/Interest-bill-on-UKs-1.27-trillion-debt-to-hit-1bn-a-week.html>

Again, like our High Profile paedophiles, Britain's criminal bankers are deemed "TOO BIG TO PROSECUTE".

If we fail now to take **IMMEDIATE STEPS** to thoroughly address the issues and the severity of their implications, *future social development for British people looks very bleak indeed* — certainly, nothing will improve for the majority.

Cameron 'committed to breaking link with European court of human rights'

<http://www.theguardian.com/law/2015/jun/01/david-cameron-european-court-of-human-rights>

The alarm bells are ringing and we are shouting "HELP! — SAVE THE CHILDREN!"

Why is barely a soul among UK authorities and media responding?

Why are the serious risks and crimes being casually ignored?

Why were Child protection Directives written in the first place if NO ONE is going to honour them?

What have British Authorities produced by way of equivalent studies and reports to support their 'opting-out' of EU & UN CP Directives?

Conclusion:

On reading through this Report, many may disagree with the inclusion of government war-crimes and economic-policy as 'directly-related' to the issue of Forced Adoption and resulting risks to British children.

The reality, however, presents conclusive evidence: tens of thousands of Iraqi children and babies are suffering severe injury, and many are forced to live with adoptive strangers because their biological parents and family members are too badly injured to care for them, or are dead.

Iraqi teenagers are being 'executed' for 'crimes such as 'watching football' or for listening to or playing 'Rock Music'.

ISLAMIC State militants publicly executed 13 football fans for watching Iraq's win against Jordan in the Asian Cup.

<http://www.express.co.uk/news/world/552976/Islamic-State-kill-13-football-fans-Iraq-Jordan-game>

Brutal persecution and killing of 'Emo' teenagers has put musicians and fans of heavy metal music under critical danger in Iraq.

<http://freemuse.org/archives/5229>

As British citizens concerned with the safety and protection of our own children within care of our government and its authorities, we are naturally greatly distressed, and simultaneously hardly surprised, to witness the impact of that same government and its military on the babies and children of other nations: We naturally and compassionately INCLUDE all of those people and children in addressing and acknowledging the needs of people and children living in Britain.

Avoiding reality and its extremes is a 'luxury' those concerned with child protection cannot afford if we are to successfully address the issues of child safety and healthy child development into adulthood. The point being that, when criminals can get away with murder at home, they will commit even worse crimes in the external world, i.e., psychopathic-paedophile-sadists working in positions of senior authority at MI5, MI6, the Ministry of Defense, and/or the Ministry of Justice — or else, a senior Military Officer?

Naturally, it all starts to look a bit too big for comfort, and it's easier to just ignore the children, to bury the worst of the crimes, to quietly feed the criminal demands for money and children, to do as little as we can toward truly caring for and protecting our nation's children, because, all those people in authority, THEY are just TOO important, aren't they?

We are all just too scared to insist they ACCOUNT for themselves, their criminal actions and policies, aren't we?

Is that why we live in a democracy, so we can live in fear and stand idly by, while millions of children are born to suffer ENDEMIC abuse and now, into eternal-debt-slavery? Is that what British soldiers fought two world wars for?

When it comes to Child Protection, we need to face FACTS:

FACT: Every penny now spent by the British Government on funding private child care providers is via PUBLIC BORROWING from the World Bank, and this funding equates to a debt that the children now in authority-care WILL BE EXPECTED TO REPAY DURING THEIR WORKING LIVES.

How fair is that on all the thousands of children who have actually suffered severe abuse via those same child-care providers, and through being wrongfully removed from a non-abusive, impoverished parent who was judged a "future emotional risk"?

As explained previously, what we KNOW equates to an EYE and effectively 'looking out for a child's best interests' as an intelligent species, we need always to 'look-out' in terms of what we know and we know that poverty equates to putting children at a dramatically increased risk of abuse and neglect.

AT WHAT POINT DOES OUR ECONOMY UPHOLD A CHILD'S RIGHTS TO A PEACEFUL HOME AND FAMILY LIFE?

WHAT KIND OF ECONOMY CAN BE EMPLOYED TO BUY AND SELL BABIES AND CHILDREN FOR ABUSE AND EXPLOITATION?

We need to start asking these questions.

We need to stop skirting around the issues and tackle them head-on.

WHY ARE SO MANY BRITISH PEOPLE AFRAID TO ASK QUESTIONS ABOUT CHILD PROTECTION AND CHILDREN'S RIGHTS?

The very fact this fear exists, and is an all prevailing influence throughout British society, is itself evidence that we are, as a nation of citizens, at war with a faceless, nameless enemy: a power and force of consciousness that profits in every which way it can and directly through DENIAL OF CHILDREN'S RIGHTS and NEEDS.

The wound is deep and it is deadly:

The Present Family Court System operating in the interests of child care and protection in Britain is both illegal and criminally negligent, according to EU & UN Child Protection Directives.

Family Courts, police, and other child care authorities and corporations, are operating in ignorance of both child and human rights; their unlawful actions and decisions have damaged and put children at risk.

UK Government is equally complicit and negligent because they have failed to recognise or respond to the legally documented, serious failings of those courts, corporations, and authorities, and their ignorance has, again, both damaged and left children at risk.

UK Government commitment to austerity, lowering and/or denying adequate wages and welfare to parents, is emotionally and physically damaging children.

Other Child Care Agencies and Authorities are, equally, either complicit or negligent in that they have collectively conspired and/or FAILED to voice or support lawful public concerns and suspicions which identify serious flaws within child care authorities, police-investigations, and Family Court decisions, actions and secrecy rules.

All of the above is undeniable in terms of the facts, testimonies and evidence. The resulting extensive risks to children are, therefore, equally undeniable. If we are truly SINCERE about protecting children, things MUST change; below are a few suggestions from a well-informed and very concerned member of the British public:

'We must reform Family Courts and Family Law':

1:-*NO child should be taken from law abiding citizens. There should be no punishment without crime! If a parent is charged with a serious crime the child should be removed but returned if a not guilty verdict is returned.*

2:- *Forced adoption should be abolished. Definition:- Adoption that is forced on parents who oppose it in court because they ask to keep their children*

3:- *No gagging orders should be placed on parents who must be allowed to protest to the media using their own names when their children are taken.*

4:-*Parents should be permitted to have a limited number of friends and relatives to support them and to observe their processes in the family court.*

5:- *No restrictions should be placed on conversations between parents and children at contact and children should be free to report abuse by carers. Freedom of Speech is paramount.*

5:- *Parents who have not committed crimes against children should never be forbidden to contact their children by email, phone, or letter.*

6:- *Parents who are suspected of having mental problems or learning difficulties should be able to consult their own experts and bring them to court with any other relevant witnesses they choose.*

7:-*Parents should be free to bring their own expert witnesses to testify concerning injuries that may or may not have been non-accidental.*

8:-*Parents must be allowed to call their own children to court to testify for them. As former minister for justice, Simon Hughes, said: "children of age 10+ should be free to come to court if they wish to testify on their parent's behalf." The United Nations convention on children's rights confirms these rights.*

9:- *Family courts should pronounce all persons before them innocent of accusations and allegations unless proved guilty beyond reasonable doubt. They should never judge any person to be at fault on the balance of probabilities (51%+)*

10:-*Domestic violence confined to shouting should not result in confiscation of children .Victims of partners who have actually been convicted of domestic violence should never be penalised by removal of their children as long as they have separated from the perpetrator and taken all possible measures to protect their children from future violence by that person.'*

<http://forced-adoption.com/reforms/>

As a nation, we need to wake-up to the damage from decades of child abuse; we need to wake up to ourselves in terms of how effectively we are each conditioned, from birth, to accept the trivialisation of child suffering and needs, and to consistently ignore the resulting impact on future, adult society, in terms of physical, emotional ,and mental health issues that, in turn, can lead to dependency on alcohol and/or illegal drugs.

Some illegal and yet thoroughly harmless 'drugs' like cannabis for example, which is proven to help victim-survivors, mean that many end up being criminalized and/or placed at risk through dependency on criminal gangs of drug-dealers due directly to their need for a safe and effective 'medicine'.

Compare the completely non-toxic and non-addictive properties of cannabis to the LEGALLY PRESCRIBED pharmaceutical drugs commonly prescribed to adult victim-survivors:

'Prozac, Zoloft, Paxil, Lovan and Luvox belong to a class of drugs which alter the mechanism that balances levels of the neurotransmitter serotonin in the brain... these drugs also produce a condition of constant agitation known as akathasia which comes from the Greek word meaning "unable to sit down." It is estimated that 10-25% of Prozac users experience this side effect, often in conjunction with suicidal thoughts, hostility and violent behavior. Akathasia is to impulsive violent behavior as a cliff is to a waterfall. You don't have this kind of violence without akathasia.'

<http://www.life-sources.com/pages/The-12-most-Dangerous-Prescription-Drugs....html>

'The following report details the history of the cover-up and the tactics taken by psychiatrists to misdirect consumers and legislators about both the science of their "disorders" and the dangers of the drugs used to treat them. Many of the documents relating to the FDA, CCHR obtained through Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests in 1992-1993. Additionally, doctors testifying in civil suits involving antidepressants had access to internal pharmaceutical company documents that were eventually made public.'

http://www.cchr.org/sites/default/files/Exposing_the_Dangers_of_Antidepressants_Despite_Cover-Ups.pdf

How much has our NHS spent on all of the above now proven dangerous & addictive pharmaceutical drugs? Drugs that not only increase the victims levels of mental-incapacity but which can, and do, worsen their levels of suffering, to the extent that they present an even greater risk to themselves and others?

Again, we witness an army of profiteers supplying toxic and dangerous products to 'solve' the problem of the MASS psychological damage being inflicted on the children of humanity, not just in Britain but in every nation. We are in NO DOUBT WHATSOEVER that many, if not all, of the drugs listed above have contributed to acts of serious crime and abuse against unsuspecting adults and children.

WHY are SO many British people relying on anti-depressants?

'In their new book, evolutionary anthropologist Helen Fisher of Rutgers University and psychiatrist J. Anderson Thomson of the University of Virginia propose that anti-depressants not only curb our depression, but they also blunt our other emotions, including feelings of passion and love.'

<http://www.manataka.org/page1642.html>

As a victim-survivor who has personally benefitted from using cannabis to effectively deal with my own condition of PTSD and who is thus able to function as a carer and a responsible citizen and who remains connected with my compassion and empathy, I very strongly feel that the criminalization of my most effective and non-addictive medicine is an infringement of my human rights in that myself and so many others in need, are systematically denied our INNATE and UNIVERSAL RIGHT to benefit from a natural, harmless plant.

The issue of decriminalizing Cannabis is included here in relation to child protection because it is actually *THE most effective and safest medicine to give to even very young children recovering from severe trauma and abuse*: The fact that statement may seem absolutely SHOCKING is itself, evidence of exactly how upside down our collective thinking has been turned i.e. accurate knowledge and sanity are socially perceived as a crime and a threat.

'An Irish mother has launched an appeal to help her fund specialist medical marijuana treatment in the US for her baby who has a potentially life-threatening condition.'

<http://www.irishexaminer.com/ireland/35k-for-medical-marijuana-treatment-354028.html>

When we look at the risks of side effects in children commonly prescribed drugs like Ritalin for all kinds of behavioural problems (many of which could be a result of unreported abuse), the idea of using medical cannabis for children does not appear anywhere near as extreme:

'As well as its needed effects, methylphenidate (the active ingredient contained in Ritalin) may cause unwanted side effects that require medical attention.'

<http://www.drugs.com/sfx/ritalin-side-effects.html>

The list of side effects are far too many to share here — among them included a worsening of all the symptoms associated with children diagnosed with ADHD which Ritalin is supposed to 'treat'. We are very concerned about the sheer numbers of Britain's children now on regular prescriptions for Ritalin and other psycho-drugs and the effects of those drugs on children's developing psychology.

Ritalin use for ADHD children soars fourfold

Pupils as young as three are at risk from untested drug cocktails, warn experts as prescriptions soar.

<http://www.theguardian.com/society/2012/may/06/ritalin-adhd-shocks-child-psychologists>

As this report reveals, the times we could implicitly trust our authorities, medics and governments to be acting in our best interests, are well and truly over; when sheer blind faith in the 'professionals' creating and selling drugs on behalf of profit-driven pharmaceutical corporations means millions of children are rendered dependent on prescriptive drugs whose overall effects are at best UNCERTAIN, we do need to start asking questions, i.e., are our children's behavioural problems, in reality, simply a NATURAL response to our child-unfriendly worlds?

Should this mean we can solve the problem by allowing corporations to make a profit from it and putting children's physical and mental health at further risk?

Cannabis was once a common ingredient in many childhood medicines and people continue to use the plant for relief and treatment of all kinds of illnesses today;

'A number of reports about cannabis were published during the late 1990s: by the British Medical Association (1997), the US National Institutes of Health and the American Medical Association (1997) the Department of Health (1998) and the House of Lords Science and Technology Select Committee (1998).

The Select Committee report found cannabis was being used by people with multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, ME and pain, and as an anti-emetic after chemotherapy...'

The point is, our children ARE presently suffering psychological disturbance and damage and they do need help; we are surely wise in choosing the least damaging and most natural remedies to treat them.

Myself and many others are of the opinion that criminalization of cannabis has dramatically increased dependence on alcohol which itself has contributed to more widespread mental health problems in British society and has vastly contributed to all manner of child suffering abuse. We feel cannabis legalization will vastly contribute toward the healing of our national consciousness.

So yes, this report identifies the need for a REVOLUTION in the way we think and in the way we approach the issues of Child Protection.

A revolution does not need to be a bloody and chaotic affair, not when it involves honest and conscientious people from all walks of life who commit, right from the start, *to put child safety first*, and not when we collectively endeavour to abide by the law, to simply stand up for our human rights, to make our individual sacrifices today for a better life for the children of tomorrow, to give our children a chance to BE and to grow up to their fullest and most HUMANE potential.

Yes, it sounds like the Utopian dream the EU & UN Child Protection Directives fundamentally seek to ensure for the future, i.e., 'unrealistic'; but why is it 'unrealistic' to envisage and work toward a fairer, kinder human and environmentally, child-friendly reality?

What do we have to gain from continuing to place our faith and hope and investments in the present nightmares too many children face for their daily 'reality' in this world, except an ever-increasing rise in crimes and interest rates on the ever-increasing debts?

Are we opting to exist in the nightmare-economy that leaves masses of children, maimed, ill, starved and dead, by force or by choice?

If by force; how and why in a democracy?

If by choice; who has the most choice and who has the least?

Finally, I refer again to the application of the term 'MINOR' on a child. Although just a very little thing, that single word 'minor', used in relation to a legal definition of 'child', has had a tremendous and powerful influence on our collective human consciousness, an influence that has operated for CENTURIES, an influence that supports and perpetuates a subliminal acceptance of children as LESSER HUMANS.

Perhaps this is why in Britain today, children's true needs come LAST?

It is high time we put the children FIRST.

Paedophiles and sadists are the 'lesser' human beings who have placed themselves in every British authority as 'VIP' and they ARE utilising their collective powers to abuse and exploit our TRUE VIP's = our CHILDREN - those children have a LOT more to give to every one of us than all of those corrupted authorities put together.

Our children are our true wealth and our true hope for a brighter future.

It may seem like just a little thing, but a single word can make a whole heap of difference and when that 'difference' equates to extensive child suffering being accepted as 'par-for-the-course', it is a word we need to abolish in relation to children, it is a word loaded with insinuation, invitation and freedom to abuse with impunity.

CHILDREN ARE NOT MINOR HUMAN BEINGS.

Let the investigations, the recommendations and the arrests begin.

Let us be strong for the sake of the children and put Children's Rights First.